

Durham E-Theses

The history of parliamentary representation in the city and county of Durham 1675-1832

Daykin, C. W.

How to cite:

Daykin, C. W. (1961) *The history of parliamentary representation in the city and county of Durham 1675-1832*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online:
<http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/9888/>

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

THE HISTORY OF PARLIAMENTARY REPRESENTATION IN THE
CITY AND COUNTY OF DURHAM 1675-1832.

A Thesis submitted for the Degree of Master of Letters
in the University of Durham.

35, Gwendolen Avenue,
Putney,
London S.W.15.

5th April, 1961.

C.W.Daykin, Esq. B.A.

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Page.

	List of Abbreviations.	ii
Chapter 1.	The Gaining of Representation.	1
Chapter 2.	Economic Background 1675-1832	47
Chapter 3.	Early Members of Parliament 1675-81	99
Chapter 4.	The State of Durham Politics 1680-1760	120
Chapter 5.	The Struggle for County and City 1760-2 and its aftermath.	186
Chapter 6.	Durham Politics in the Time of Pitt and Fox 1784-1806.	263
Chapter 7.	The Emergence of John George Lambton 1806-1820.	304
Chapter 8.	Lambton and the Church.	349
Chapter 9.	The Passing of The First Reform Bill.	387
Chapter 10.	The Effects of the First Reform Bill on City and County.	449
Appendix A.	Members of Parliament for the City of Durham 1678-1832.	506
Appendix B.	Members of Parliament for the County of Durham 1675-1832.	511
Appendix C.	Bishops of Durham 1660-1832	516
Appendix D.	Act of Enfranchisement 1673.	517
Appendix E.	The Vote in the House of Commons on Major- General Lambton's Petition, 11th May, 1762.	521
	Bibliography	527

Abbreviations

Add.	Additional
Adds.	Additions
B.L.	Bodleian Library
B.M.	British Museum
Cap.	Chapter
Car.	Charles
D. & C. Library	Dean and Chapter Library, Durham Cathedral.
D.N.B.	Dictionary of National Biography
Dur.	Durham
D.A.	Durham Advertiser
D.C.	Durham Chronicle
D.C.A.	Durham County Advertiser
Ed.	Edited
F.	Folio
F.S.A.	Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries
H.M.C.	Historical Manuscripts Commission
Ibid.	The same
J.H.C.	Journals of the House of Commons
J.H.L.	Journals of the House of Lords
K.C.B.	Knight Commander of the Bath
K.G.	Knight of the Garter
M.A.	Master of Arts
MS.	Manuscript
MSS.	Manuscripts

Misc.	Miscellaneous
N.L.	Newspaper Library
n.	Note
Op. cit.	Works cited (above)
O.M.	Order of Merit
P.R.O.	Public Record Office
Soc.	Society
S.P.Dom.	State Papers Domestic

CHAPTER 1.THE GAINING OF REPRESENTATION.

During the Tudor period the number of Members of Parliament was increased by more than half. Although there were fewer than three hundred representatives when Henry VII ascended the throne, there were more than four hundred and fifty when Elizabeth died. In the reign of Henry VIII alone, there were added eight members to Lancashire, two each to London and Middlesex, Cornwall, Norfolk, Suffolk and Buckinghamshire, and one to Shropshire. By 1603 twenty four Welsh members had been introduced, while from Cheshire also, and, for a time, even from Calais, came men to join in the proceedings of the Commons at Westminster.¹

This monumental phase of constitutional development overlapped into Stuart times, for during the reigns of James I and Charles I another forty five seats swelled the composition of the Lower House.² But the County Palatine of Durham remained beyond the widened frontiers of this system. Even though recognition in the sense of separate parliamentary representation was at last bestowed on the City and County in 1673, these were the

1. Returns of Members of Parliament Vol. 1; Pollard - Evolution of Parliament p. 162; Sir Lindsay Keir - The Constitutional History of Modern Britain 1485-1937 pp. 138-9; Mackenzie - The English Parliament p. 98.

2. Sir John Neale - The Elizabethan House of Commons p. 140.

very last places to benefit in this way before 1832.

Had not then Durham gentry been infected with the same feverish desire of their contemporaries elsewhere in the kingdom to be at the very centre of things, as knights of their shire and burgesses of their cathedral city? Did they not wish, out of ambition, hopes of enhanced dignity and prestige, or for business and commercial reasons, to sit in Parliament? Were they not willing to contend among themselves at the poll, with the attainment of the very summit of social status within their own county elite as the beckoning prize? Were Durham landowners aloof from the dazzling prospects which the chance of coveted membership of a more confident and powerful House of Commons was dangling before their fellows in other parts of England?

It will indeed be shown that Durham men were not blind to the advantages and allurements of having their own members, and that they were not hesitant in pressing for this privilege. For the continued expansion of the House of Commons underlined the more noticeably their own deficiency, which was not remedied until well into the reign of Charles II.

That they were put to the test for so long was¹ largely because of their bishop's still extensive pala-

1. Fordyce - The History and Antiquities of the County Palatine of Durham. Vol. 1. pp. 150-1; Surtees - History and Antiquities of the County Palatine of Durham. Appendix No. 2. cxi vii-cxlvix.

tine jurisdiction, and the inflexibility with which certain occupants of the See of Durham, especially James and Cosin, viewed their obligations. Here then is a singular situation which arouses immediate curiosity in the parliamentary history of Durham. For the march of constitutional progress in the form of parliamentary representation had by-passed for so long the County in particular, and also the City, because of the presence and impediment of this still awe-inspiring relic of the Middle Ages, the See of Durham, in all its princely pomp, spiritual and temporal. Despite the termination of its independence by act of parliament in 1536,¹ the County Palatine of Durham, under its guardian and oracle the Bishop, was still to be reckoned with. Casting its spell over local history it frequently diverted this into channels of its own making.

It will be one of the purposes of this work to see in what other ways the peculiar position of the Bishop rendered the history of parliamentary representation in Durham a case apart. For the unusual prestige and unparalleled dignity of this episcopacy lasted, despite certain setbacks, throughout the period 1675-1832. It was not until 21st June, 1836, that there came about 'an Act for separating the Palatine Jurisdiction of the County Palatine of Durham from the Bishoprick of Durham'.²

¹ G.R. Elton - England under the Tudors p.176.

² Statutes at Large. Vol. XXXIV. pp.130-2. Paras 1-VIII 6 & 7 William IV. cap.19.

Even when separate parliamentary representation was secured, the very procedure of initiating elections at Durham and certifying their results came to assume a special form, because of the Bishop. Ties between Bishops and many of the Members were often close, and some of them will have to be unravelled in later pages. Crewe and his successors were intensely interested in the choice of candidates and members, and in local politics generally. This was the wont of later Stuart and Hanoverian bishops, but at Durham their concern was often abnormally acute. Bishops of Durham were probably quicker than their colleagues in other sees to sense insults and feel affronted if they were not consulted adequately by local politicians, or if electoral matters were perceived by them to be moving in an opposite direction to their own wishes. This touchiness was a by-product of their still great reliance on their palatine power. It doubtless augmented the fear and respect which the Bishop could evoke as employer, landlord and electoral sponsor and patron. And in these capacities he probably outshone most, if not all, other bishops.

In what other ways was the electoral pattern at Durham unique? What is the significance of such characteristics, and what paradoxes do they unveil? Can too much emphasis be laid on them? On the other

hand what resemblances do elections and the events leading to them at Durham bear to what was happening elsewhere? It is the main object of this work to try to suggest answers to these questions, and to relate chronologically the wide onrush of the history of parliamentary representation in Durham until the First Reform Bill. Finally we must ask how far Durham politics were rendered different, and how far they remained unchanged by this great remedial piece of legislation.

But perhaps the first question can be partially dealt with now. Much is derived from and returns to the special position of the Bishopric. Its holders in the early nineteenth, for various reasons, not least of which was a hardened and more business like attitude towards the renewal of leases and fines thereupon, invited the strident fury of 'Radical Jack' (John George) Lambton and others. He was the most illustrious and eloquent of all Durham members, and never more eloquent than when condemning his chosen enemy, the Church at Durham. His own county was his political training ground, where the mind and words of the man who conceived the Great Reform Bill first became sharpened in political conflict. This controversial and volatile personality, and his great political and national significance, helped to divide Durham politicians into two irreconcilable sides over Reform, and, in the front ranks of his opponents were the priests

of the very Church of which he was the hammer. Yet, given the ardent spirit and reforming zeal of Radical Jack, and the desperate clinging to the past and present by the Bishop and his courtiers, it is seemingly paradoxical that the anxious months from the end of the Wellington Government until the passing of the Bill went by so quietly, with virtually no disturbance of order in City and County.

In sitting for his county J.G. Lambton was carrying forward into another generation his family's long record of parliamentary service in both Durham constituencies. This was shared for most of its length with that of the Tempests. Sir Lewis Namier has written of the 'quasi-feudal tradition' in the North, in accordance with which the landed classes bestrode the parliamentary representation of even the 'big, populous boroughs.'¹ The longevity of the Lambtons and Tempests, singly and in partnership, as Durham members was unusual, even by northern standards.² Yet it did not rest, as will be seen, on local political absolutism. There was fairly wide support and, for long, a good deal of affection for both families in these two relatively wide and independent constituencies. And - here again, by

1. Sir Lewis Namier - The Structure of Politics at the Accession of George III p.86.

2. Mention must be made of the tenure of one of the seats at Newcastle-on-Tyne by three successive generations of the Riddleys from 1741 to 1836.

and paradox, an exception merges into, blends with the usual and normal - 'over-emphasis of a hereditary claim was liable to injure a candidate, for he would lay himself open to the accusation of disrespect to his neighbours in treating the county as if it were a pocket borough.¹ J.G. Lambton and his uncle Ralph would, if alive today, bear witness to the accuracy of this judgement.

The Lambtons and Tempests and many other local landed gentry, as well as the Bishop himself - again so unlike other Bishops - and the Dean and Chapter, were considerable coal owners. Durham was distinct in being a great coal producing county in the sixteenth century. It constituted a very ample proportion of that great northern coalfield, which, in the decade 1681-90, yielded nearly half as much again as its nearest rival, the Midlands, which embraced ten counties.² Most of the Durham coal mines had, until the reign of Henry VIII, been the property of the Bishop or of the Dean and Chapter. But, in a manner to be revealed later, many had come into the possession of local merchants and gentlemen, and were the foundation of many fortunes, which were in turn the source of heavy election expenditure by the descendants of these men.

It is clear that eagerness to protect their upsurging

1. Namier op. cit. p.5.

2. Dr. G.M. Trevelyan O.M. - English Social History p. 285n. quoting Nef - The Rise of the British Coal Industry.

commercial and industrial interests was largely behind the agitation of the men of Durham for their own Members of Parliament. Moreover, from the beginning most Durham representatives concerned themselves with coal. They could hardly do otherwise, being coal owners themselves. An ignorance of the coal trade or a failure to attend to it in its many ramifications would have caused them to lose much ground and popularity¹. We might even ask whether Durham men, from the families of Liddell, Lambton, Tempest and Bowes at any rate, went into parliament primarily to safeguard and advance their own economic interests. Was the truth that most Members of Parliament, as Sir Lewis Namier has shown², went to Westminster mainly to make a figure, quite a secondary consideration with these North East coal owners? Were the latter so appallingly parochial and single minded that their presence in the House of Commons can be explained entirely in terms of the very early and plentiful harvest of what lay beneath their feet? An attempt has been made in Chapter Two to put these questions and their answers in some perspective.

1. In 1789 Lord Barnard turned down the chance to stand for the County on the ground of his 'inexperience in business' which made him 'unequal to undertaking the charge of transacting in Parliament all that must naturally occur in a County of such opulence and weight in the State.' Baker - Baker Papers. Election Addresses. 4th April, 1789.
 2. Namier op. cit. p.2.

All this is not to deny that an excessive concentration on real and apparent divergences between political habits and happenings in Durham and other places can be dangerous. It is especially so if it blinds one to the many similarities that existed in this period between the elections and their trappings in the County of Durham and in other counties, for at least the franchise in all of them rested on the basis of the forty shilling freeholder. Also there were another twenty one boroughs in England, beside the City of Durham, with an electorate of over one thousand in 1760. Nevertheless it does not seem prudent or appropriate to embark on such a study of similarities, or on a chronological account, of parliamentary representation in the Durham constituencies until the outworks and nucleus of the strength of that commanding and regal figure, the Prince Bishop, have been examined. For to him, and to the nature of his office, despite the more tolerant inclinations of Bishops Neile and Morton, must largely be attributed the fact that Durham was, by a margin of over one hundred and twenty years, the last county to be accorded the right of parliamentary representation.

Lapsley has shown that even before the Norman Conquest the Church of St. Cuthbert was a great franchise or immunity,¹ for the Bishopric of Durham covered all

1. Lapsley - The County Palatine of Durham - pp. 21, 27.

the land between the River Tyne and the River Tees.

Furthermore there were the territories of Allertonshire and Howdenshire; the manors of Worham and Holy Island, or Islandshire; the manor or lordship of Bedlington, known as Bedlingtonshire, on the Northumbrian coast between the rivers Blyth and Wansbeck; and the manor of Craike, near York.¹ The freeholders of these areas voted in Durham elections to the unreformed House of Commons after the parliamentary franchise was finally granted to that County.

The career of Bishop Hugh du Puiset, who on 18th September, 1189 purchased from Richard I the manor and wapentake of Sadberge, was a prime factor in establishing for his successor's the same rights and privileges within the bishopric as the king enjoyed in the kingdom.² Here was an achievement of the very first order. Other reasons for the exalted situation of the Bishop of Durham included the degree of local independence in financial and military affairs consequent upon the Bishop's task of meeting and repulsing any Scottish invasions.³ For until 1536, at any rate, the king's writ did not run in the Palatinate, and his officers were without authority to act there.⁴

1. Dean and Chapter Library, Durham Cathedral - Speafman - An Enquiry into the Ancient and Present State of the County Palatine of Durham - Part 1. pp. 1-2.

2. G.V. Scammell - Hugh du Puiset, Bishop of Durham p. 49.

3. Lapsley op. cit. pp. 27-30.

4. Lapsley ibid. pp. 42-5.

Many of the Bishop's powers were exercised by him, not as head of the civil government of the Palatinate, but as a great feudal lord,¹ although as such he had to give military service. Also, Bishop after Bishop benefitted until the middle of the fifteenth century from the royal observance of a principle that the bishopric should not be taxed by the king. Such an immunity was long dated, and confirmed by various charters. And, despite an Act of Parliament of 1449 providing for the raising of a subsidy throughout the kingdom, notwithstanding any immunities or exemptions, Durham, with Northumberland, Cumberland and Westmorland, was left unburdened by taxation throughout Tudor times.² Indeed, with the consent of his Council, which was also responsible for judicial affairs throughout the Palatinate, the Bishop himself raised men and levied taxes without reference to the authority of Parliament.³ In the administration of his own Courts he had his Chancellor, Justices, Steward, Sheriff and Coroners. By virtue of his judicial supremacy,⁴ he supplemented and corrected the common law by an equitable jurisdiction in chancery and by an admiralty jurisdiction in properly constituted courts.⁵

1. Lapsley *ibid.* pp. 54-67, 306

2. *ibid.* pp. 294-300

3. Surtees *op. cit.* Appendix No 2. p. cxlvii

4. Lapsley *op. cit.* pp. 68-75.

5. *Ibid* p. 75.

But the sunshine of Palatine splendour was at an early time sullied and dimmed by the gathering clouds of royal challenge. From the beginning of the fourteenth century the king had intervened frequently in cases of default of justice on the part of the Bishop, and where the royal prerogative had been assailed. For, 'the whole judicial system of the Palatinate was overshadowed by the ultimate supremacy of the crown.'¹ Thus appeal could be made from the Bishop's Court to the Court of King's Bench, once petition had been made first to, and the case had come before the Bishop himself.² In Lapsley's opinion 'that date (1300) marks the culmination, the maturity of the Bishop's regality.'³

Many changes affected the Bishopric under the Tudors, who were loathe to stomach the prevalence of anything resembling a feudal institution. An act of Parliament in 1534 determined that all lands and tenements where those attainted of treason had any estates of inheritance should be forfeited to the King. There was no saving clause in favour of the Bishop of Durham.⁴ Also the Act of Resumption of 1536 took from the Bishop much of his judicial consequence. In the Palatinate none but the King was to pardon treasons and felonies, and appoint justices. All writs, indictments and processes were to be in the King's name, while common law judges

1. Lapsley op. cit. p. 210

2. Ibid. pp. 209-16.

3. Ibid. op cit. pp. 75-6.

4. Record Commission. Statutes of the Realm. Vol III. pp. 508-9. 26 Henry VIII cap. XIII.

in the Palatinate were to be appointed by the Crown.¹ Finally, much of the admiralty jurisdiction of the Bishop was taken over by the Council of the North, of which Tunstall, Bishop of Durham, was president in 1536.

The assault of the Crown on the Palatinate was mounted further in the reign of Elizabeth I. The royal lawyers found it convenient to adhere to the theory that the palatine power had been conferred for the purpose of repelling Scottish invaders. Yet Bishop Pilkington had emerged from the Northern Rising with his reputation much tarnished, for he had fled from the path of the enemy. So the Queen determined that the great coal yielding estates of the Nevilles in the Palatinate should fall as forfeit to her. Thus the Act of Attainder, which was passed while the suit between Queen and Bishop was being heard, provided that all the lands and goods of the traitors in the late rebellion should go to the Queen.²

These abridgements in the Bishop's powers and the temporary waning of his prestige doubtless helped to incite the townsmen of the county of Durham to demand representation in Parliament. So much depended on the attitude of the occupant of the See of Durham, and on how far he interpreted such demands as subversive to his still extraordinary dominion. For from his

1. Record Commission. Statutes of the Realm. Vol. III. pp. 555-8. 27 Henry VIII Cap. xxiv. para. 1-xx.

2. Ibid. Vol IV pt. 1. pp. 549-562. 13 Elizabeth I. Cap XVI

predecessors the constitutional lifeblood of the original boroughs of the Palatinate had mainly emanated. Durham itself and Wearmouth, for example, owed their early charters to Hugh de Puiset in the second half of the twelfth century. Also, from time to time the Bishop would confer temporary privileges on his boroughs, including the holding of markets and fairs in a number of these towns.

In 1565 Bishop Pilkington made over the annual September fair in the City of Durham to the corporation of that place, and ordained that, in addition to the bailiff appointed by himself, there should be an elected alderman and twelve assistants, of whom the latter were to hold office for life. These arrangements remained in vogue until Bishop Matthew granted his charter to the city in 1602. It extended and liberalised somewhat the settlement prescribed by its forerunner.

Of the other towns which were to send Members to Parliament by the end of 1832, Gateshead had also acquired a charter from Bishop du Puiset in 1164. Usually the bailiff, here also appointed by the Bishop, was the agent of administration.¹ Throughout the eighteenth century, however, the parish vestry, the 'Twenty Four,' discharged many of the obligations of local government.

1. Surtees - op. cit. Vol II. pp. 106-110.

While South Shields, so important for its salt pans, had risen under the patronage of the Prior of Durham, further south, Wearmouth (Sunderland) had first been recognised as a place of maritime importance by a charter from Hugh de Puiset. Yet another bailiff held sway, and owed his position to a patent under the Bishop. In 1634 from the hands of Bishop Morton a new charter of incorporation was issued to the burgesses and inhabitants by the title of a Mayor, twelve Aldermen and the Commonalty of the Borough of Sunderland. This charter was allowed to lapse and expire, but the rights given to the burgesses then and previously did not remain theoretical or inanimate. ¹

Although freeholders in these places could participate in County elections after 1673, Gateshead, South Shields, and Sunderland were not individually represented in Parliament (for the first time) until 1832. Stockton, Darlington, Hartlepool and Barnard Castle had to wait still longer, although voices had been raised on their behalf as early as the seventeenth century.

Surtees estimates that the incorporation of Stockton probably took place not later than 1200.

A new charter was obtained on 4th June, 1602, from Bishop Matthew. Then in 1666 Bishop Cosin's Charter ²

1. Surtees - op. cit. Vol. I pp. 255-9. Vol II pp. 94-8.

2. Surtees - ibid. Vol III pp. 173-6.

confirmed those of his predecessors, according to which the Bishop of Durham was Lord of the Borough, and acted through the inevitable bailiff, as he did in Darlington. The latter was a borough by prescription, and its privileges are supposed to date from a time earlier than that of Bishop du Puiset.¹

Hartlepool was the only royal borough in the palatinate. A charter of King John in 1200 guaranteed to it the same rights as Newcastle. There were many disputes between the town and successive Bishops of Durham, but by the sixteenth century the grip of the latter was considerably weakened. By the end of that century, however, it had been established, by arbitration, that the manors of the lordship of Hartness lay within the precincts of the liberties of the Bishops of Durham between the Rivers Tyne and Tees.²

Barnard Castle was another town in the south of Durham for which representation was to be sought in vain. The Bishop claimed the numerous honours and considerable lands of Barnard Castle and Gainford as part of his wapentake of Sadberge, but after 1307 they were outside his control. On the forfeiture of the Nevilles of Westmorland in 1571, the Crown seized the name of Barnard.³ Later Sir Henry Vane the Elder purchased from two citizens

1. Surtees - op. cit. Vol. III. pp. 357.

2. Ibid pp 99-105

3. Surtees - ibid. Vol IV pp64-7; Lapsley op. cit. pp 47-9

of London, grantees of the Crown, the demesne lands on which the future of his family and descendants ~~was~~¹ to be based.

So only in Hartlepool and Barnard Castle, of Durham towns, was the Bishop still not the mainspring of an often strong element of self-government. Would he willingly consent to further independence for these towns, even though this would require considerable self-effacement on his part? Or would the privilege have to be wrung out of him by a protracted campaign of generations? It is not clear how far the burgesses of these towns combined or were at all responsible for the only known attempt in the Tudor period to secure Members for Durham. This was when, on 18th January, 1563, a bill was introduced into Parliament with a clause which provided for two knights for the County of Durham. But the clause was later deleted.²

No matter how much or how little initiative they may have shown in the conception and drafting of this bill, the men of Durham must, even in these early Elizabethan times, have been aware of the growing industrial and commercial importance of their County. Coal, lead, iron and salt were there in sufficient quantities to whet

1. Surtees - pp. 51, 67-8. Vol. IV.

2. B.M. Journals of the House of Commons. (printed) Vol. 1: p. 63; D. & C. Library. Sharp M.S. 145. Preface. p. VII. Pollard op. cit. p. 326.n.

men's financial appetites. And the day was at hand when many more would regard their representation in the High Court of Parliament solely by the Prince Bishop as an anachronism, and as an unsavoury reminder of the once predominant Church polity of the Middle Ages. In this context the humiliations to be inflicted upon Bishop Pilkington for his feebleness in the crisis of 1569 were to be all the more noticeable and provocative.

Later much discontent was aroused by the tactlessness of Bishop James. The latter had won an Exchequer suit, following a controversy with the citizens of Durham over the extent of their privileges. This hinged on the question whether the authority of the mayor was derived from the Bishop or from the Common Council. The citizens gained nothing by citing the very charter of 1602 which had largely handed over predominance in the city to the guilds.¹ The Bishop's triumph was followed by a long embitterment with the town.

From 1614 there are many recordings in the Journals of the House of Commons of attempts by statute to achieve representation for the City and County of Durham. Thus on the 21st May, 1614, a bill was read for 'Knights and Burgesses to have place in Parliament for the County Palatyne, City of Durham and Borough or Town of Barnards-Castell'.² It was pointed out, especially by Sir Henry

1. P.R.O. State Papers Domestic 14. Vol I. No. 72. Bishop of Durham to Salisbury.

2. J.H.C. (Printed) Vol I. p. 492.

Anderson, Member for Newcastle-upon-Tyne, and a great merchant there,¹ that subsidies were now being demanded from the men of the Palatinate, who had formerly been exempted from such exactions.² The dissolution of Parliament, together with Bishop James' opposition prevented the Bill from proceeding further than the Second Reading.³ Little wonder that the Bishop's death led to riots.⁴ It also begat hope.

In 1620 a number of Durham gentlemen gave authority to one Sir Bartram Bulmer, and Mr. Ralph Fetherstonhalgh, Member for Morpeth 1620-3, to conduct through Parliament a bill for Knights and Burgesses for the County. George Martyne, auditor to Bishop Neile of Durham, was anxious that his master should have the final say as to who should be the first of these knights and burgesses. For Neile was not opposed to the project.⁵ A petition from the Mayor and some of the Aldermen and Burgesses was drawn up on 26th October, with a view to hastening their desired enfranchisement.⁶ The signatories included George Martyne himself and William Belasyse, who, as Sir William, was High Sheriff in 1633, the year in which Charles I visited Raby.

1. He tried to help secure parliamentary representation for Durham in Parliament in 1621. - M.F. Keeler. The Long Parliament 1640-1. pp. 86-7.

2. J.H.C. (Printed) Vol 1. pp. 457-8.

3. Ibid. Vol I. pp. 484, 502.

4. S.P. Dom 14. Vol XCIII, No 33. 19th May. 1617. Robert Cooper to Lake.

5. Sharp M.S. 82. Preface. Inset III. 10th January, 1620. George Martyne to Bishop Neile.

6. Ibid. Extract from a M.S. book in the possession of T. Greenwell, Esq, Mayor of Durham,

Surtees' commentary is here most apposite: 'The subject was again agitated in the next Parliament,¹..... And it should seem not only that Knights and Citizens were claimed for the City and Borough, but that the extravagant proposition of Fourteen Members in all for divers Boroughs within the county was made and entertained. Hartlepool and Barnard Castle narrowly escaped this dangerous honour; the rest were very reasonably rejected because of Pestering the House.² A similar lack of success attended Bills introduced in the sessions of 1623 and 1624, With the king's belief that the members of the Commons were already too numerous being decisive on the latter occasion.³ It seems that this had remained the view of James I - or rather he resorted to it as far as Durham was concerned - from a very early stage in his reign.⁴

When his son was on the throne the financial straits of the Crown grew more and more desperate, and led to the imposition of Ship Money, in 1635 on the ports of Stockton, Sunderland, and Hartlepool. They were to provide and equip one vessel, charged at £1850, to be met by a rate on the whole county.⁵ This amounted to a flagrant

1. That of 1621-2.

2. Surtees. op. cit. Vol. I. pp. cxlviii- Appendix. No. 2; J.H.C. (Printed) Vol. I. p. 539.

3. Ibid; J.H.C. (Printed) Vol. I. pp 749- 50, 766; S.P. Dom 14. Vol clxvii. No. 10. 2nd June, 1624.

4. MacKenzie op. cit. pp. 98-9.

5. Surtees Vol I. Appendix pp. XCIV quotes Lansdowne M.S. No. 960.

invasion of the time honoured exemption of the Sheriff of the Palatinate from attending and accounting in the Royal Exchequer. It elicited still more downright and unequivocal reactions from the men of Durham. On 17th March, 1639, Bishop Morton published a most encouraging reply to a petition from the Mayor and Citizens of the City for two Burgesses.¹ But nothing was heard of the subsequent bill after Sir Thomas Widdrington, Member for Berwick, later Speaker in the House of Commons, and a man of considerable legal knowledge², reported it from committee on 19th July, 1641.³

The Civil War soon brought in its train incalculable wretchedness for the people of the Palatinate from the time the Scottish General Leslie crossed the Tyne at Stella in 1640. The General and the Scottish Commissioners ordered the sequestration of all rents and profits of Bishops, Deans, and Chapters. By the time of the treaty with Scotland on 7th August, 1641, the English Government owed £25, 663. 13. 10d, arising out of the Scottish occupation; to the Bishop of Durham, although the Bishopric was now virtually dissolved.⁴

1. Sharp M.S. 82. Inset Preface p.v.

2. In 1655 he was made Chancellor of the County Palatine of Durham, and the Bishop's Temporal Chancellor in 1660. D.N.B. Vol 61. pp. 182-3.

3. J.H.C. (Printed) Vol. 2. p. 215.

4. Surtees. op. cit. Vol. 1. Appendix p. XCVII,

The kindly and likable Bishop Morton was impeached for high treason in 1641, and by 1644 the Bishopric of Durham was in effect governed for Parliament by Sir William Armine and the other Commissioners. Prominent among these were the Lilburnes ¹. The Palatinate was formally abolished on 9th October, 1646, ² and its lands placed under trustees on 17th November of that year. ³ It was also determined, by the latter order, that the Bishop's lands should be sold.

This unprecedented upheaval was also reflected in judicial chaos, and in a virtual standstill of all legal business. ⁴ Acts of Parliament of 1649 and 9th July, 1651, ⁵ aimed at attaching the County Palatine to the northern circuit. Then, on 9th July, 1654, ⁶ a further Act placed Durham, judicially, on the same footing as other English counties. Far reaching financial alterations had also been made. From 1646, a Sheriff for the County was appointed annually by Parliament to account at Westminster. These changes persisted until the Restoration.

Families such as the Lambtons, Tempests, Liddells and Edens, who had stood by Charles I, and from whom many Durham Members of Parliament were to graduate, found,

1. Surtees op cit. Vol. 1. p.c.

2. Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum 1642-1660, ed. C.H. Firth and R.S. Rait. Vol. 1. pp. 879-83.

3. Ibid. pp. 887-904. Surtees op. cit. Vol. 1. pp. CI-CIII. Lapsley op. cit. p. 199.

4. Surtees op. cit. Vol. 1. pp. CIII-CIV. Lapsley op. cit. p. 199.

5. Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum 1642-1660. Ed. C.H. Firth and R.S. Rait, Vol. II. pp. 517-20.

6. Ibid. Vol. II. pp. 907-10. Lapsley op. cit. pp. 199-200.

with the cessation of hostilities, that further sufferings awaited them. Parliament, harrassed by financial difficulties, called upon the defeated for payment. Apart from those denied a pardon, all who had aided the King were to compound for their 'delinquency' by massive fines, ranging from a half to a sixth of the value of their estates.²

These, and other agonies inflicted on the men of the Palatinate, seemed/^{only}to accelerate the frequency of their attempts to secure parliamentary representation. Accordingly, the Inhabitants of the County petitioned for Members of their own on 8th April, 1645, on 3rd December, 1646² and on 24th April, 1650.³ On 28th April, 1653, an address to the Lord General and Council of Officers, from a Committee who supposed themselves to stand for the County of Durham, renewed many of the often stated arguments.⁴ Among the twenty three who signed was Anthony Smith, soon to be conspicuous for a brief hour.

Some fleeting measure of success did follow these strivings when the Rump, dissolved by Cromwell on 20th April, 1653, gave way to Barebones' Parliament. At this gathering, on 5th July, of the same year, Henry Dawson represented the County of Durham. An alderman of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, and Mayor of that town in 1646, and 1653, he

1. J.H.C. (Printed) Vol. 4. p. 103.

2. Ibid. p. 736.

3. Ibid. Vol 6. p. 410; Sharp M.S. 145. Preface p.viii.

4. Bodleian Library. Gough Adds. Durham M.S. 4^o1. f. 46.

enjoyed his new honour for only a month. He died in August,¹ and ² no one was elected in his place for the lifetime of that parliament, which endured until December 1653, when Cromwell became Protector. So even Durham was a beneficiary under a transient Cromwellian redistribution of seats. But more was in the offing.

To the first parliament of the Protectorate, on 3rd September, 1654, there came on behalf of the County of Durham, Colonel Robert Lilburne and George Lilburne,³ the very antithesis of the Royalist squires who were before very long to launch their respective families into what would become the charmed but restricted circle of leading Durham politicians. The former was the brother of the redoubtable Colonel John Lilburne, and in 1647 had been Governor of Newcastle. He had signed the death warrant of Charles I, and, as a Major-General in the North of England, had exercised, with Sir Arthur Haslerigg, a most weighty determination in the affairs of Durham. Under General Lambert he had great authority in the County and City of York, and had been invested with the chief command in Scotland in 1653, in the absence of Monk, who

1. Sharp M.S. 82. p. 7n; Bean - History of Parliamentary Representation in the Six Northern Counties of England 1603-1886. p. 115.

2. Full lists of City and County Members, and election details are given in Appendices A and B.

3. Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum. 1642-1660. Ed. C.H. Firth and R.S. Rait. Vol. II. pp. 813-22. 16th December, 1653; Sharp M.S. 82. p. 7; Bean op. cit. p. 97.

was with the fleet against the Dutch.¹ His uncle, George Lilburne, had acted as the only magistrate within the borough of Sunderland, and had served on all committees of sequestration within that area.²

In the same parliament there sat for the City of Durham Anthony Smith, who was free of the Mercers' Guild, and soon to make an unobtrusive and complete exit from the political stage. He was an alderman of Durham, and mayor in 1657. He was also a magistrate for the County of Durham in 1658, and had spent a great deal of money towards the realisation of the proposed Durham college, of which he had been appointed a Visitor in 1656.³

Smith was also a Member of the second parliament of the Protectorate, the first session of which opened on 17th September, 1656. He was among those who voted that the Crown and title of King be offered to Oliver Cromwell,⁴ as was Captain Thomas Lilburne, Member for the County of Durham.⁵

The latter was the eldest son of George Lilburne. As a Major in the army of General Monk, and member for Newcastle from 1658, he let it be known how pleasing the

1. Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum. 1642-1660. Ed. C.H. Firth and R.S. Rait. Vol. II. pp. 813-22; 16th December, 1653; Sharp M.S. 82. p. 7.n; Bean op. cit. p. 117-8.

2. Ibid.

3. Sharp M.S. 94. f. 307. To the Wardens and Stewards of the Company of Drapers and Taylors resident in the Citie of Durham.

4. Sharp M.S. 82. p. 22.n.

5. Ibid. pp. 7-8 n; Bean op. cit. pp. 114, 118.

Restoration was to him. His fellow representative for the County of Durham was James Clavering, a former High Sheriff. He was a consistently staunch royalist, and had been under considerable suspicion during the Commonwealth. He was made a baronet (of Axwell) in June, 1661, Mayor of Newcastle in 1663, and Governor of the Hostman's Company in 1664, from June 1673 until December 1674 he was again High Sheriff of the County of Durham, for which he was a candidate at the election of 1675.¹ Only his name, among those of these earliest members, was to be reechoed by a descendant in the later history of Durham parliamentary representation.

however,

For the more immediate future, there were to be no more elections in Durham for nearly twenty years. What had been granted so unceremoniously was silently withdrawn. The Cromwellian reform of the franchise, such as it had been, was abandoned. After 1656 no Members were returned by either City or County until 1675. This negation of the wishes of so many prominent personalities in Durham was not easily stomachied. On 31st March, 1659, a petition from the knights, justices of the peace, gentlemen, ministers, and freeholders of Durham was read, and it was resolved that this be referred to a Committee, which was to bring in a bill for knights and burgesses for Durham.² But nothing developed of such a prospect.

1. C.E. Whiting - Nathaniel Lord Crewe, Bishop of Durham p. 76.

2. J.H.C. (Printed) Vol. 7. p. 622.

This appears to have been the final attempt¹, during the Commonwealth, of the men of Durham to seek redress of this particular grievance by legislation. In 1660 much of the old order reappeared. John Cosin, as Bishop², 'at once proceeded to exercise all the judicial privileges enjoyed by his predecessors.'² The Sheriff of the County Palatine was no longer obliged to account at Westminster.³ With the restoration of Charles II had come 'the ancient Rights and Liberties of the County Palatine, with Courts of Chancery and Common Pleas and officers thereof.....'⁴ as before. Although Bishop Cosin aimed at restoring the pomp and grandeur of the Palatinate, he could not halt the threat arising out of the embryonic but galloping commercial development. Coal and Cosin's conception of the authoritative, all-comprehensive Church of England were ill assorted bed fellows. He was also tormented by the difficulties and irritations caused by the Catholic recusants, the Protestant Nonconformists, the plots of the Anabaptists and the Fifth Monarchy men, and the stubbornness of the Quakers.

These were only some of the problems facing Cosin, who was never well served by his lieutenants. Professor

1. J.H.C. (Printed) Vol. 7. p. 622.

2. Lapsley op. cit. p. 200.

3. Ibid p. 300.

4. S.P. Dom. 29 Vol. xxi. No. 152. Nov? 1660.

Hughes has shown¹ the alarming conspiracy between Sir Gilbert Gerard and Miles Stapleton, also a son-in-law of Cosin, to gather for themselves a considerable share of the episcopal properties. Gerard, Member of Parliament for Northallerton 1661-81, was the High Sheriff of the County Palatine 1667-75,^{save for 1673-4,} and Cosin's favourite son-in-law. Stapleton was the Bishop's secretary and man of business. They aimed at amassing for themselves all church lands with rich mining possibilities. Among other acquisitions, they were able to lay hold of the Grand Lease itself.²

However credulous and short sighted Cosin may have appeared in this respect, he was determined, despite his loss of the right of wardships, for which he was reimbursed,³ to exert a predominant voice in all temporal aspects of the Palatinate. But he was soon confronted with vociferous demands for parliamentary representation. Within a year of the Restoration, Parliament had before it a bill enabling the County and City of Durham to elect Members. On 8th August 1660, it passed through its final stages in the House of Commons.⁴ But it made no further

1. Professor Edward Hughes - North Country Life in the Eighteenth Century - The North East 1700-50. p. 306. quoting D & C Register 1655-72. ff. 369-419.

2. Of the coal bearing manors of Gateshead and Whickham.

3. Lapsley op. cit. pp. 200-1.

4. J.H.C. (Printed) Vol. 8. pp. 108, 114.

progress.¹

Cosin was most intransigent towards those who were not satisfied with being represented at Westminster solely by the Bishop himself. His stubborn consistency went far to inflame the tempers of his adversaries, and to engender fresh animosities. This is the conclusion drawn from an examination of certain documents relevant to the controversy.

First will be stated the case for those gentry of the county, whose endurance and pertinacity so angered the Bishop. Their premises may be summarised under five heads:² 1. Knights and burgesses were sent to Parliament from every county and city in England to present grievances, and to consent to public taxes and business. Formerly, the contributions of the County Palatine had been voluntary, and where grants had been made, it had been affirmed that their privileges were thereby in no way infringed. As the men of the County were now summoned to help meet the public charges of the Kingdom, it was only right and proper that they should have the privileges which usually accompanied such obligations.

2. Many dangers would ensue if there were not present, at the passing of statutes concerning trade, those who were able to speak for the particular counties, cities^{and}/

1. Journal of the House of Lords (Printed) Vol.II. p.129.

2. D. & C. Library Durham - Hunter M.S. 24. unfoliated. also Randall M.S. 5. f. 46. S.P. Dom. 29 Vol. XXIV. Nos. 107, 108. 13th July? 1660.

boroughs affected by such statutes. (This was a throbbing anxiety, not least on personal grounds, to Durham squires cum coal owners.)

3. Individual persons, and the entire County in general, suffered from the want of Members of their own to further their addresses in the House of Commons. Strangers could not be expected to do this adequately. The impoverishment afflicting so many inhabitants of Durham during and after the Scottish invasion of 1640 was cited.

4. The granting of knights and burgesses would not detract from the Bishop's palatine jurisdiction.

5. The Bishop of Durham could not conceivably represent the County for ever. He was only a Lord of Parliament, and therefore not privy to the debates or proceedings of the House of Commons.

The main planks of the Bishop's apology were also cogently phrased, though coated with a characteristic extravagance: ¹

1. The Bishop of Durham was bound specially by oath to preserve the immunity of the County Palatine from having to send knights and burgesses to the House of Commons. This was in keeping with the Bishop's accustomed right and prescription in that County Palatine, as confirmed by all His Majesty's progenitors. The only previous represen-

1. S.P. Dom. 29 Vol. XXIV. No. 39. Dec? 1660. Hunter MS. 24, also Randall MS. ff. 47-53.

tatives had been chosen by a disaffected and disloyal party in the County, by order of the usurper Cromwell, who, with his pretended Parliament, had taken away the Bishopric and all the rights of the County Palatine. These had now reverted to the Bishop.

2. It was of no avail to quote the case of Chester, a County Palatine by prescription, which had been given knights and burgesses by Act of Parliament in the reign of Henry VIII. The County Palatine of Durham had never been taken into the Crown, as had that of Chester. In 1543 the inhabitants of Chester had petitioned the King and Parliament for knights and burgesses of their own, lest their liberties were harmed by their neighbours of Wales. This was a different history from that of Durham. The Act of 1543 altered the system of customary writs out of Exchequer regarding the payment of debts in Chester. Exigents could not be awarded in Chester out of the King's Bench and Common Pleas against anyone dwelling in that North- Western area. Many other privileges had been lost there.

2. The Freeholders and Inhabitants within the County Palatine of Durham had ever been subject to pay all aids and taxes imposed upon them by Act of Parliament. The clergy of the County and the Bishop's customary tenants and copyholders, by far the greater number of the County, had shown no dissatisfaction over payments imposed on them by law. The Bishop in Parliament watched carefully

the proportion of taxes, for which they were rated equally with other Counties. Also, the Bishop had had the foresight to save the County from having to pay towards the election and maintenance of knights and burgesses. The Bishop was thus the guardian of the good and welfare of the County, saving the people trouble and expense!

4. There was extant no single instance of the freeholders and inhabitants suffering in trade from the lack of knights and burgesses. Yet there were examples of such injury in counties with representatives. Parliament, the fount of justice and honour, was always ready to receive complaints and grievances. And the Bishop was a member of the House of Lords. (Thus he would patronise and attend to any important business of the freeholders and inhabitants.)

5. The City of Durham and other corporations in that County held their charters from the Bishops, whose privileges they were sworn to observe. When the first agitation for knights and burgesses had begun over fifty years before, it had been opposed by the justices, gentlemen and freeholders of the whole county. The desire to humble the Bishop, his courts and his clergy was a danger to Church and State.

Finally, if any writs were brought to the Bishop for any election of knights and burgesses to be made within his jurisdiction, he was bound by oath to answer for the preservation of the ancient customs and liberties of that County Palatine, that the King's Writ did not run in the

County Palatine of Durham. (Cosin was obviously determined to ignore the statutes of 1534 and 1536 and other aforementioned inroads made by the Tudors.)

The contribution of Miles Stapleton to the debate was typical, both of the position he occupied, and of his anxiety to uphold his master's preeminence for interests of his own. In his 'Reasons against Knights and Burgesses for Durham,'¹ he explained that the right of the Lord Bishop of Durham to appear solely at the King's High Court of Parliament, and there to give advice and to consent to all laws as should be binding, had been established since the body of Saint Cuthbert was brought to Durham. This right was held by prescription, and had been strengthened by continued possession. It was consonant with the laws and usages of the King, and had often been confirmed by the Charters of Kings, and by Acts of Parliament. The desire to have knights and burgesses involved the taking away of this, another man's right.

It had been proposed that the knights be elected by the freeholders, as was the law and practice in other Counties. Yet in Durham those who held by court roll and by lease were at least twice as many of the freeholders. Nor was it fair to propose two citizens for the City of Durham, when there were, within the County, other borough towns with equal right, and with more ancient corporations. As for the efficacy of having knights and burgesses at all,

1. Hunter M.S. 24.

Newcastle had been overrated during the last three years. Yet Newcastle had Members of its own.

Nothing daunted by the skilful and energetic advocacy of Cosin and Stapleton, the Grand Jury, at the General Quarter Sessions of the Peace, held on 3rd. October, 1666, presented a petition to the Court in the names, and on behalf of all Freeholders of the County. This petition sought the assistance of the Justices of the Peace, who were urged to nominate as quickly as possible any they thought fit to act in London as Knights and Burgesses.

'Which petition being read in Open Court, the Right Reverend John Cosin, Lord Bishop of Durham, did enter his protestation against the same, and John Sudbury, Doctor of Divinity, Dean of Durham, Isaac Basire, Doctor of Divinity, Thomas Cradocke, Esquire, Samuel Davison, Esquire, and William Blakiston, Esquire, five of the Justices then present in Court, did declare and enter their dissent or dislike thereunto. But Sir Nicholas Cole, Knight and Baronet, Henry Lambton, Esquire, John Tempest, Esquire, Anthony Byerley, Ralph Davison, Cuthbert Carr, Lodowick Hall, Robert Clavering, Ralph Carr, John Morland and Christopher Sanderson, Esquires, eleven Justices then also present in Court,¹ did approve of the said petition, and gave their assent to the same.'² The names of Blakiston, Cole, Lambton, Tempest and Clavering recur

1. Many of these Justices had supported Charles I in the Civil War, and had compounded for their estates.

2. D.C. Library. Allan MS. 7. pp. 194-5, Randall MS. 5.f.41.

throughout the records of Durham elections.

The Bishop could not easily ignore or brush aside such a demonstration.¹ On 6th December, 1667, Doctor Thomas Smith informed Williamson, Secretary to Arlington, the Secretary of State, that the Bishop was, at that moment, more willing than previously to meet the freeholders' demands. But he did insist on their heeding his recommendations as to the choice of Members of Parliament.² Curiously enough, Smith did his best to persuade Williamson himself to stand for the County of Durham. He discussed with him at some length the best means of accomplishing this. He urged him to enlist the support of Colonel Tempest, as 'the factotum here, both in town and country.'³ Although Williamson was amenable to the suggestion, and actually contacted Tempest, he seems to have taken no further action.³ 'Outsiders' rarely inspired Durham electors or fared well on the hustings there.

Much depended on the relations between the Bishop and this Colonel John Tempest, the son of Sir Thomas Tempest, Attorney General for Ireland. Tempest, a colonel of a regiment in the Royalist army, was descended from the

1. D. & C. Library. Allan M.S. 7. pp. 194.5. Randall M.S. 5.f. 41.

2. S.P. Dom. Car. II. 224. No. 52.

3. Ibid. p. 115. 10th December, 1667, Smith to Williamson. Williamson was at this time strenuously trying to get into the House of Commons. He did not succeed in doing so until October, 1669. - D.N.B. Vol. 62. pp. 2-7.

ancient family of Holmside, which originated in the County Palatine.¹ It was probably on 14th December in 1667, that the Bishop wrote to Tempest and William Davison, eldest son of Ralph Davison of Wynyard,² and grandson of Sir Alexander Davison.

Tempest and Davison had been sent to London by the magistrates to do all they could there for the cause of Durham representation in Parliament. The Bishop complained '.... but by your actions that have followed such your submissive words, it appeareth plainly that when you speake the words, you never intended to submit to me at all, and have therefore prosecuted such your Intentions with all Eagerness contrary to my advice.... You have no Precedent either for preferring a Bill without the Bishop's consent....'³ In a postscript the Bishop added that he was severely perturbed at the absence from the bill of any clause safeguarding his own rights and privileges. Nor had Tempest and Davison maintained their promise to yield to the Bishop for the time being the choice of one knight and one burgess.⁴ Here was the major stumbling block, and the limit to the Bishop's concessions.

Cosin also resented the manner in which Tempest returned in triumph from London to the Palatinate with one hundred and fifty horsemen. This was an adornment usually

1. Sharp M.S. 82. p. 8; Sharp M.S. 145. p. 14 n; Bean op. cit. p. 122.

2. Ralph Davison was the son-in-law of Bishop Cosin.

3. Randall M.S. 5. f. 43.

4. Ibid.

reserved for royalty, the Bishop himself, or one of his officers, or the Lieutenant or Deputy Lieutenant of the County Palatine.¹

The bill referred to in the letter to Tempest and Davison was doubtless that read for the first and second times on 13th December, 1667 and 13th February, 1668,^{2 3} respectively, before being committed.⁴ On March 9th it was resolved that the bill be engrossed.⁵

Some of the speeches made on the day the bill was lost are worth noting: Mr. Thomas. Crouch.⁶ The West and North have already so many Knights and Burgesses, that the Midland in all Taxes smart for it, in their being over-rated.

Mr. John. Steward.⁷ It is a hard case that that county should be Taxed in all parliaments, and yet have no Representatives.

Mr John Vaughan.⁸ Thinks the inconvenience of Durham is now no more than formerly. If we have all our Members here, we have no room for them. If we bring in more Members, we may, by the same reason, multiply them

1. Hunter MS. 24. Unfoliated. Undated. Bishop Cosin to Miles Stapleton; Sharp MS. 145. Preface p. IX n.

2. J.H.C. (Printed) Vol. 9. p. 37.

3. Ibid. p. 48; S.P. Dom. Car. II. 234. No; 178.

4. S.P. Dom. Car. II. 234. No. 178. 14th February, 1667. William Davison to Williamson.

5. J.H.C. (Printed) Vol. 9. p. 63.

6. Member for Cambridge University. Of the Court Party.

7. Member for Midhurst, Sussex.

8. Member for Cardiganshire. He was knighted in 1668. Same year made Lord Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas. Bean op. cit. p. 386.

to as many more. The County of York has many, but they may as well put in for Knights for every Riding; and the Northern parts are sufficiently provided for already.

SIR Thomas Strickland.¹ The County Palatine of Durham was never taxed in Parliament by ancient privilege before King James' time, and so needed no Representatives; but now being Taxed, it is but reasonable they should have.

Sir Thomas Meeres.² Moves that the Shires may have an increase of Knights, and that some of the small Boroughs, where there are but few Electors, may be taken away, and a Bill for that purpose.³ Thus again a genuine reluctance to admit more members clashed with the conception that there should be No Taxation without Representation.

The bill was defeated on 26th March by 50 votes to 65. Bishop Cosin 'opposed the Bill and his Interest carried his point.' One of the tellers for the majority was Sir Gilbert Gerard.⁴ But it was not long until the main barrier to parliamentary representation for Durham was removed, for the implacable Cosin died on 15th January, 1672. The vacancy of the see of Durham provided the long awaited opportunity.

On 28th February, 1673, leave was given to introduce

1. Member for Westmorland. Of the Court Party. Knighted at Edgehill. Privy Purse to Charles II and Privy Councillor to James II. Bean op. cit. p. 613.

2. Member for Lincoln. Of the Country Party.

3. Allan M.S.7. f. 196. Grey's Debates (in Parliament) Vol. I. pp. 120-1. 26th March, 1668.

4. J.H.C. (Printed) Vol. 9. p. 69.

a Bill for Durham members.¹ This was read a first time on 1st March,² and a second time on 8th March.³ On the 10th of that month the Bill was referred to a Committee, and on 17th⁴ it was reported, read, and ordered to be engrossed, with some agreed amendments. The Bill had passed through all its stages on 24th March,⁵ before the next Bishop, Crewe, entered into his diocese. This relatively easy transition came as an anti-climax after the many years of galling frustration, particularly for those gentlemen and freeholders who had been foremost in the struggle.

After the end of the session of Parliament sitting on 24th March, 1673, the County Palatine of Durham was to be allowed to send two knights, and the City of Durham two citizens. The permanence of this grant was assured. The election writ, to be issued by the Lord Chancellor or Keeper of the Great Seal of England, was not to be dispatched straight to the Sheriff of the County of Durham, as was the custom and practice in other counties. It was to be directed to the Lord Bishop of Durham, or to his Temporal Chancellor, either of whom would then transmit the writ in the form of a precept to the Sheriff. So from the very first, in one respect at least, the representation of Durham followed a new and uncharted direction.

1. Ibid. p. 259.

2. Ibid. p. 260.

3. Ibid. p. 265.

4. Ibid.

5. S.P. Dom. Car. II. 334. No. 221.

The knights were to be elected by the freeholders, while the mayor, aldermen, and freemen of the City of Durham would elect the burgesses. These knights and burgesses were to enjoy the same liberties, advantages, dignities and privileges as the other representatives who sat in Parliament.

Although the County returned members in 1675, there were no members for the City until 1678. This anomaly arose because of doubts as to who should issue the writ in the latter constituency. The act of enfranchisement was very vague about this, and the question came before the Committee of Privileges and Elections of the House of Commons.

From this body Sir Thomas Meeres, the very active Member for Lincoln,¹ reported that it was clear how and to whom the writ for an election in the County of Durham was to be issued. But the position regarding the City was by no means so obvious. The Chairman of the Committee had been called upon to draw up a special report listing the various problems. In this report attention was directed to the crucial difficulty of knowing who would order the election, or be judge of the poll in the City of Durham. The Sheriff of the County had no writ, but only a precept, and was not authorised by the Act to perform either function. If the Mayor were to discharge

1. He was Chairman of a Committee of the Whole House on two occasions 1670-3 - Parliamentary Diary of Sir Edward Dering 1670-3 - B.D. Henning.

these duties then he would need a precept from the Sheriff, who himself acted by precept. Moreover, there was no sanction in the Act for such a second precept. The Committee of Privileges and Elections thereupon referred the matter to the collective wisdom of the whole House¹. But the impasse was still not overcome by the dawn of 1677.

On 9th March of that year it was moved that the Speaker issue his Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown, for making out writs to elect two Members for the Town and Corporation of Durham. But there were still doubts as to how this was to be done under the Act of 1673. The case was again referred to the Committee of Privileges and Elections, who were to inspect the Act, and make a further report to the whole House.²

The enigma persisted, for there was still discussion in 1678 about how a Durham City election was to be set in motion. Sir Thomas Meeres reported that the Committee of Privileges and Elections believed that the Speaker should make out his Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown to issue a special writ to the Lord Bishop of Durham, or his Temporal Chancellor, for the election of two citizens.² That was to overcome the inadequacies of the earlier writ. This Report was delivered at the Clerk's Table, and was read. The Question was then put, To agree

1. J.H.C. (Printed) Vol. 9. p. 337. 14th May, 1675.

2. J.H.C. (Printed) Vol. 9. pp. 445-6. 25th February, 1678.

with the Committee. It was resolved in the affirmative, and ordered that the Speaker should issue a writ as advised. ¹

The Hunter Manuscripts give further information about the procedure decided upon and soon to be commenced. After the King's writ had been received by the Bishop or his Temporal Chancellor, either of these was to make a new Writ or Mandate of the Chancery of Durham, under the Seal of the County Palatine, therein reciting the former Writ, and commanding the Sheriff to carry it out. Thus the Sheriff would have more than a mere precept, and could make a warrant to the Mayor of Durham. In fact, armed with such a Writ or mandate of the Chancery of Durham, the Sheriff himself could act as Returning Officer. ²

Thus the first election of Members for the City of Durham, under the Act of 1673, had been unavoidably postponed. But once won, clarified and affirmed, the privilege of the City to choose its own representatives endured throughout and beyond the years covered by this work.

It is the purpose, in the following pages, to show, frequently in detail, who the Durham County and City Members were, ³ and how, generally, they belonged to the

1. J.H.C. (Printed) Vol. 9. pp. 445-6. 25th February, 1678.

2. Hunter M.S. 37. Unfoliated.

3. P.R.O. Durham 3/149-150. Writs and Indentures of Durham Elections.

more prominent families of the County. It is also necessary to reveal, where possible, on whose support, locally and nationally, these Members relied.¹ Accounts of the course of Durham elections themselves should often be useful in meeting the latter requirement. Nor were the speeches made at Westminster, such as they were, less demonstrative of political inclination and adhesion than those delivered in the Town Hall, or outside the Rose and Crown and Waterloo hostelrys in Durham itself. Yet many Durham representatives were content to remain silent when in the House of Commons. (This taciturnity was particularly marked until after 1760.) Others were most loquacious, a few assumed important positions of profit under the Crown, while two^{fellow} contemporaries, J.G. Lambton and Sir Henry Hardinge, one Whig and the other Tory, were both to attain very high office and lasting fame. This is particularly true of the anti-clerical Lambton.

Since the See of Durham had for long proved such a bulwark against the gaining of parliamentary representation for City and County, references must be made to relations between Bishops and Members. The Bishop of Durham, in the person of the inept Nathaniel Lord Crewe, had deferred somewhat gracefully but tamely to a fait accompli. How far did he and his successors now try

1. For example see the Baker-Baker Collection (Papers) in the Prior's Kitchen, Durham.

to condition, qualify, restrict and control what the freeholders and freemen had won?

With their many dependants and tenants, both lay and clerical, and the magic and lustré of their title, and all it connoted, did they not have at their elbow the makings of an impressive electoral machine? This machine was possibly more formidable than what most other episcopal handmaids of the State could command. It was seemingly at its zenith in the years approaching and just after the middle of the eighteenth century. Wilting under the blows received after 1761 by his senior partner, the second Earl of Darlington, the Bishop held his electioneering resources in reserve until they were again rolled forward to do battle after the first decade of the next century. They were once more held and vanquished, this time by 'Radical Jack' and by those who were loyal to the Lambtons and the ideals of their valiant young leader. Again a well-known nobleman - this time the third Marquis of Londonderry - shared the ill repute under which the Bishop and the cathedral clergy laboured.

It is true that the head of the proud Palatinate had been brought to heel in many ways by the Tudors, and that Cosin had adopted an unrealistic and almost megalomaniacal attitude towards what was possible and practicable. Admittedly in 1689 the Bishop lost the power of appointing to the office of lord lieutenant, and relaxed his grasp on the conservatorship of the River Wear in 1717.

But as Professor Hughes has shown, 'the shell of Palatinate jurisdiction remained intact throughout the eighteenth century,'¹ and 'Bishop Egerton² still appointed by letters-patent not only the sheriff but his own attorney-and solicitor general, the auditor and the clerk of court, bailiffs and seneschalls, coroners and apparitors, constables and gaolers, masters of hospitals and of the schools on Palace Green.....'³

But before we study the impact of all this on parliamentary representation the industrial undercurrents, which were to prove such vigorous determinants of political behaviour and alignments, must be traced. Here again the hand of the Bishop is often discernible ----- he had much to gain and lose from the Industrial Revolution in the North East. Also, the question of how far coal was the chief instrument for propelling Durham men into the political arena has to be met.

It will not be difficult to find Durham Members probing and manipulating behind the scenes, and mobilising opinion among fellow owners over some feature of the coal industry and trade. Here and there they wrangle over certain developments, introduce bills and busy themselves on parliamentary committees. Peers such as Durham and Londonderry often turn angrily on such of their lordships who bring to light supposed abuses in the trade.

-
1. Hughes op. cit. p. 229.
 2. 1771-87.
 3. Hughes op. cit. p. 230.

What should we deduce from all this - that reasons of coal was the only, or even the prime inspiration of political conduct among Durham representatives?

CHAPTER 2ECONOMIC BACKGROUND 1675-1832.

During this ~~period~~ and beyond, a controversy over coal could easily become an acute north eastern, and almost national issue. In North East England money was readily diverted to coal mining by such families as the Tempests. For to profits from this, and allied trades, was to be ascribed the celerity of their rise from yeomen to merchants, and their later transformation into gentry. Moreover, the Tempests, the Liddells, and others of their kind, set the pace in the political and economic development of their county. For example, the fourth baronet of the Liddells became Lord Ravensworth,¹ whose pits had increased in both output and fame, despite the intricacies and expense of way leaves by which the coal was taken to the Tyne.²

Northern Members of Parliament ran grave risks if they failed to champion the coal industry. Indeed, they would have been extremely foolish not to have done so, for, more often than not, their own fortunes were largely derived from coal. Here, close to their hearts and pockets, lay the raw material of local interests, for

1. He was a Member for Morpeth from 1734 until 1747. He was one of the Committees selected by ballot to enquire/cit. into the conduct of the Earl of Orford. - Bean. p. 558.op.
2. Nef - The Rise of the British Coal Industry - Vol. I. pp. 27-8.

which eighteenth century constituents expected close consideration from their representatives. Yet the coal owners did not always pursue the same ends with continuity or consistency. For temporary arrangements for co-existence might be made between various individual owners on Tyne and Wear. Consequently it is found that such Durham Members as John Hedworth, George Bowes and Henry Lambton made their presence and opinions felt on House of Commons Committees,¹ and in the negotiations attendant upon restrictive associations in the coal trade, of which they were often among the chief architects.

An outstanding factor in the industrial history of the North East was the intense and growing rivalry of Tyne and Wear, which prevailed throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Of all the coal produced in Durham and Northumberland at the end of the seventeenth century two thirds came from the Newcastle district,² while these two counties provided at least a third of what was mined in Britain at this time.³ The official records show an annual shipment of coal in 1659 of more than 450,000 tons from the Tyne. The 600,000 tons mark was regularly exceeded by 1710, while at the same time about 800,000 tons of coal were actually produced annually from the cluster of pits to be found for several miles

1. J.H.C. Various.

2. *Nef op. cit.* Vol. I. p. 29.

3. *Ibid.* Vol. II. p. 18.

on either side of the Tyne.¹

Undoubtedly an outstanding reason for the prosperity of the Tyne coal trade was the arrangement of 12th November, 1583, whereby, through Thomas Sutton, the Queen assigned her lease of the manors of Whickham and Gateshead to Henry Anderson and William Selby, the leading merchants of Newcastle.² The men of this town gained in Whickham what was destined to become the greatest colliery in England, with an annual production reaching 100,000 tons before the end of the seventeenth century.³ The Manor of Gateshead occupied the best position for shipping coal of any place in the Tyne Valley,⁴ while the value of the Grand Lease colliery was £4500.⁵

Sunderland, handicapped by its harbour, and with its river less navigable, was not so fortunately placed as Newcastle.⁶ But from 1600 the Wear mines began to respond to the growing demand for coal in the South of England, until Sunderland had taken her place next to Newcastle⁷ as the leading coal-shipping centre in the British Isles. After the Restoration shipments from the Wear exceeded 110,000 tons per annum. In 1688 the appropriate figure

1. Nef. - op cit. Vol I. pp. 25-9.

2. Ibid. p 151.

3. The Queen, had, on 28th April, 1582, leased these manors from the Bishop of Durham for ninety nine years.

4. Nef. ibid. Vol. I. pp. 150-1.

5. Nef. ibid. Vol. I. p. 361

6. Ibid. p. 361.

7. Fordyce - op. cit. Vol. II. p. 399.

7. Nef op. cit. Vol I. pp. 29-30

was about 180,000, although, at the end of the seventeenth century, the Sunderland chaldron was larger than its Newcastle counterpart. In fractions, the Wear shipments in 1660 were about a quarter of those of the Tyne, and in 1680 nearly a third.¹ As the market grew, many seams close to the river^{Wear} proved inadequate. Thus, by the beginning of the eighteenth century, some of the leading Wear mines, in the areas of Fatfield and Birtley, were a considerable distance from the river.²

A study of the ownership of some of the Tyne and Wear mines affords a significant commentary^{on the} political history of eighteenth century Durham. Although clerics vied with laymen as to the extremity of their being implicated in coal, the Bishop of Durham did not rank as high in this respect as he had done in previous centuries. His powers over coal had been weakened by the deliberate policy of the Crown, and by competition with the merchants of Newcastle. Nor, until the episcopal recovery of the middle and later eighteenth century, could the Bishop exact large sums from the lessees of his coal mines.³ It is true that in South Durham, by the time of the Civil War, a second line of collieries belonging to the Bishop were in action, and that those at Shildon, Coundon, Auckland Park, Hamsterley and Etherley, among others, were more northerly than the earlier line of pits. Yet

1. Nef. op. cit. Vol I. pp. 30-1.

2. Ibid. pp. 31-2.

3. Nef. Ibid. Vol. 1. pp. 37, 148, 134, 137.

Bishop Talbot, almost as misguided as his predecessors in granting rich episcopal lands to greedy relatives, made a lease to his son-in-law and Spiritual and Temporal Chancellor, Dr. Sayer, of all the coal mines within the enclosed copyholds at West Auckland; ¹ a joint lease of the important coalbearing manors of Houghton and Newbottle to Dr. Sayer, to other members of the Bishop's family, and to Mr. Stonehewer, his secretary; and yet another lease to Dr. Sayer, this time of the rich colliery at Tanfield Western Leigh. ² The lease of Tanfield Eastern Leigh had been lavished on to the Honourable Mr. Wortley and his partners. ³

Nef has shown that the total annual income from the Bishop's coal mines in 1635, in both north and south Durham, was only £278. 7. 5d. This was less than had been paid for the lease of mines in Whickham and Gateshead in the fourteenth century. ⁴ The Bishop did, however, until 1717 still exercise rights over the Wear, such as the appointment of Commissioners. From 1667 to 1669 he issued commissions for measuring the coal keels on that river. Thus he could not be oblivious to various schemes for Wear navigation, and, in 1760, with the Earl of Darlington, Bishop Trevor was particularly concerned in the electoral representation of the City and County of Durham, with which the navigation controversy was not unconnected.

1. D. & C. Library. Spearman's Enquiry. p. 79.

2. Ibid. pp. 80, 83.

3. Ibid.

4. Nef - op cit. Vol. 1. p. 154.

The Dean and Chapter of Durham still worked collieries at Rainton and Spennymoor. But their main stake, such as it was, in north eastern trade, proceeded from their land¹ at South Shields, the centre of an important salt industry. Even so it will be seen later in this chapter that such collieries as Rainton were certainly great money earners, in the third decade of the nineteenth century at any rate. For the Dean and Chapter, like eighteenth century Bishops, beginning with Talbot himself, came to set stiffer terms for the renewal of leases.

But by 1680 the Bishop, and Dean and Chapter, either did not possess, or had lost control of,² many of the most valuable mines in the County of Durham. On the other hand, many of the local gentry in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were delving deeper into coal mines. For instance, Sir William Gascoigne, besides his pits in the West Riding, also had those within his estate at Ravensworth, which included the manors of Ravenshelme and Lamesley, both close to the river Tyne. Gascoigne, by marrying the daughter of the powerful Henry Anderson, a local coal owner and trader, the holder, with William Selby, of the Grand Lease, and the driving force in Newcastle, allied himself most usefully with the great merchants of that town. He then began to develop the mines beneath the vast wastes of Chester-le-Street, but,

1. Nef - op. cit. Vol. 1. p. 155. n.

2. See especially Hughes op. cit. p.306.

in 1607, sold the estate at Ravensworth to his wife's brother-in-law, Thomas Liddell, a wealthy Newcastle merchant.¹

Since Ravensworth Colliery alone had an annual value of £1,200 in 1636,² Sir Thomas Liddell, as he became later, had made a most profitable business transaction. He also held parts in the Grand Lease, and, in Lumley and Chester-le-Street, collieries on the Wear.³ As a royalist during the Civil War, he compounded for his estate as a delinquent for £4,000.⁴ Yet he must have left some substantial contribution to the fortunes of his family. For the Liddells began their parliamentary career in 1688, and Sir Henry Liddell, later the first Lord Ravensworth, was able to buy the lease of the Manor of Whickham for £22,000 from William Cotesworth's heir in 1727.⁵ Twelve years earlier, ^{the grandfather of} this same Liddell, after carrying his case to the House of Lords, and, probably because of his obvious loyalty to the Government, had worsted Bishop Crewe in a dispute over the ownership of the mines and wastes on much of Gateshead Common, within his manor and lordship of Lamesley and Ravensworth.⁶

1. Nef. Vol. II. pp. 10-11; S P. Dom. Charles I, Vol. D, II, No. 78.

2. Nef - op. cit. Vol. I. p. 362. n.

3. Ibid. Vol. II. p. 64; S.P. Dom. Eliz. I. Vol. CCLXIII No. 72, I.

4. Surtees - op. cit. Vol. I. p. CXXXVIII. para. XXXVI.

5. Hughes - op. cit. p. 309.

6. Crewe op. cit. p. 300 quoting Surtees op. cit. Vol. II. p. 214, and North Country Diaries, Diary of John Thomlinson, p. 105.

The Lambtons were also heavily involved in coal. There had been an abundance of collieries before the Civil War on the estate of Sir William Lambton, who was an alderman of Sunderland in 1634. The colliery at Lambton alone probably had an annual output of over 30,000 tons on the eve of the Civil War, when its rent was £800.¹ Since Sir William Lambton was killed at Marston Moor, it was his eldest son, Henry, married to a daughter of Sir Alexander Davison, merchant of Newcastle,² who was called upon to compound for the family estates for £960.³ This imposition was additional to the damage wrought to the collieries by flooding, when the bishopric was occupied by the Scots.⁴ However, the Lambtons recovered remarkably quickly. In 1714 the whole estate of Harraton, which, from 1629 to 1638 had produced shipments of from 6,000 to 10,000 tons per annum, was reunited in the Lambton family by their purchase of the moiety of Sir William Williamson, High Sheriff of the County Palatine of Durham from 1723 to 1747,⁵ whose wife's sister was married to Ralph, fourth son of the said Henry Lambton. For the wives of Ralph Lambton and Sir William Williamson were the coheirs of the last John Hedworth of Harraton.⁶

1. Surtees Soc. Vol. C.X.I, (1905) p. 263.

2. Surtees, op. cit. Vol. III. p. 160.

3. Ibid. Vol. I. p. CXXXVIII.

4. Ibid. Vol. II. p. 176

5. Ibid. p. 182.

6. Ibid. pp. 178-82.

Other families whose fortunes flowed to a greater or lesser extent from mining were the Coles, the Tempests, the Bowes and the Vanes. The Coles, fervent supporters of the King in the Civil War, were Newcastle merchants, with a list of colliery interests almost as striking as those of the Liddells. Again, like the Liddells and others, their estates had been sequestered, Sir Nicholas Cole having compounded for £312. 10. 0.¹

Nicholas Cole, with his father and brother, Ralph and James respectively, was said to have at his command in 1617 an annual production of more than 14,000 tons of coal. This amount was sold by the three men to the shipmasters of the Tyne for nearly £4,000. So lucrative was this trade that Ralph purchased the estate of Kepier Hospital in Durham from the family of Chief Justice Heath. In 1636 he paid £7,000 for the manor of Brancepeth, the old family seat of the Earls of Westmorland, which he held in trust for his son Nicholas, who had married the daughter of Sir Thomas Liddell. There were still other rungs on the ladder of respectability to be surmounted, for Nicholas was made a baronet by Charles I,² and his son, Sir Ralph Cole, was Member of Parliament for the City of Durham in 1678 and 1679.

The Tempests, who were to be long and closely identified with Durham politics throughout the eighteenth

1. Surtees op. cit. Vol. I. p. CXXXVIII.
 2. Nef op. cit. Vol. II. pp. 41-2.

century, owed much of the origin of their riches to when they were merchants of Newcastle. Like many of these merchants, they turned to the promoting of collieries in Durham, and to buying land there.¹ In 1642 Sir Thomas Tempest settled the manors of Swainston and the Isle² on his only son, who had just married the heiress of John Heath of Kepier. Later Sir Thomas Tempest recovered his estates for £134.³ Yet his son, John Tempest, when nominated, on the Restoration, for the honour of Knight of the Royal Oak, was said to have estates worth £1,000 a year.⁴ This was the Colonel Tempest who had struggled so long against Bishop Cosin, and was to be one of the first Members for the County of Durham.

The Bowes of Streatlam had been a prominent Palatinate official family since the end of the thirteenth century. Sir George Bowes had received, for his steadfastness to Queen Elizabeth during the Northern Rising, not only the title, by special patent, of Provost Marshal North of the Trent, but also some portions of forfeited estates, which were, however, encumbered with heavy debts.⁵ He also acquired the lease of some mines from the Crown.⁶ Sir Talbot Bowes, the eldest surviving son of Sir George.

-
1. Nef op. cit. Vol. II. p. 279.
 2. Lying to the south west of Bradbury.
 3. Surtees op. cit. Vol. I. p. CXXXVIII para. XXXVI.
 4. Ibid p. CXXXIX. para. XXXVIII.
 5. Fordyce - op. cit. Vol. II. pp. 52. 50-3.
 6. Surtees - op. cit. Vol. IV. p. 67.

Bowes, by his second marriage, then gained Streatlam and other land, by provisions of the entail. With his younger brother Thomas, he made an agreement with Sir George Bowes of Biddick, by which the family estates were divided almost exactly into two parts, Sir George holding half of Streatlam itself. But many of the estates were gradually reunited by the prudence of Sir Talbot and his successors.

Sir William Bowes, Member for the County of Durham, 1679, 1681, 1695, and 1702-1707, was the great-nephew of Sir Talbot, and great grandson of Sir George. By a marriage of astuteness, so characteristic of these families, with the granddaughter of Sir George Bowes of Biddick, and only surviving daughter of Sir Francis Blakiston, he hastened the process by which the Bowes of Streatham reestablished a hold on all their family possessions. And into their hands also came the Blakiston home of Gibside, with its mines near the south bank of the Tyne.¹ The heir to Sir William's landed and monied wealth was his eldest surviving son, ^{George,} the 'Count', who became a flamboyant figure in the North of England through his sporting and artistic pursuits, coal interests and social prestige, and who was Member for the County of Durham from 1727 until 1760.

Tempests

While the Liddells, Lambtons, Coles, and Bowes,

1. Fordyce op. cit. Vol. II. p. 54.

through their choice of sides during the Civil War, had had to compound for their estates, the Vanes, who had been active Parliamentarians, had not suffered such a handicap. In fact they had been assigned, by the surviving grantees, the unexpired residue of the term in the demesne lands of Barnard Castle and Raby. In 1640 "Sir Henry Vane had a grant from the Crown of various privileges annexed to his honour or lordship of Raby and Barnard Castle". These lands had formerly been vested in the Crown, after the attainder, following the Northern Rising, of the Earl of Westmorland.¹

These, with the exception of the Coles, whose influence was of short duration, were the main Durham parliamentary families. The Liddells, the Coles, and the Tempests, with other groups like the Claverings, had been attracted into Durham, having already amassed great sums on the Tyne. Coal was their common denominator and magnet. The Lambtons and the Bowes had been in the County for a much longer time, but they too joined the rush for profits from mining. Indeed, the Lambtons and the Lumleys were doubly fortunate in that there was extraordinarily vast mineral wealth under their land. The Vanes were able to take swift advantage from having been on the winning side during the Civil War, and the nemesis which overtook them, on the Restoration, did not prove fatal.

1. Surtees. Vol. IV. pp. 51, 67-9; Fordyce op. cit. Vol. II. p. 104.

There were a number of instances when the lobbying, and often the direct action, of representatives of these houses over coal had prompt repercussions at Westminster. For example, the keelmen of the Tyne, in the spring of 1714, drew up a petition to throw open colliery way-leaves. They persuaded William Wrightson, a Tory Member for Newcastle, 1710-22¹, to promote this, but the Liddells and John Hedworth, who had just embarked on his long parliamentary career as a knight of his shire, objected strongly to the petition. They began to sound all Members of Parliameht, and engaged emissaries and a prominent solicitor to act for them. Members of the Clavering and Lambton families worked unsparingly for Hedworth outside Parliament. In the face of such organised opposition, the petition was not presented. ²

Many of the Durham Members of Parliament took part in the various combinations among colliery owners. One purpose of these was, by regulating production, and by restricting competition among themselves, to counter the efforts of traders to keep down the prices of coal. By these means, and by selling in common, the colliery owners would be able to confront the shipmaster-buyers with a united front. But often they were distracted from

1. After his defeat in 1722 he transferred, by winning a by-election, to the County of Northumberland later in the same year.

2. Hughes op. cit. pp. 290-2.

these designs by the resulting outcry in London.¹

Combinations from Newcastle, to 'regulate' the proportions of the two great North eastern ports, were not infrequently occasioned by Sunderland's expanding share in the coal trade.² In 1719 the leading proprietors at Sunderland, in order to force upwards the poor prices at London, agreed to act as the ships' masters desired, by not loading without certificates. For the ship's masters, were trying to ensure that the customary practice of ships in the coal trade not operating during the winter months should become recognised policy. But the Newcastle merchants, led by Colonel George Liddell, later Member for Berwick, 1727-40, and his father the baronet, were afraid that Sunderland, being nearer to London, would thrive thereby. Colonel Liddell was indeed mindful of the Act of 1717 to improve the harbour at Sunderland.³

The basis of the Wear scheme rested on the exclusion for a year from a share in the coal trade of any fitter who did not sell as he was ordered. Mr. Hedworth, a foremost supporter of the Sunderland trade, was particularly rigorous in his interpretation of this. Although many Tyneside coal-owners were disposed to enter the agreement, Liddell tried to appease the widespread clamour in the City of London over the resulting rise

1. Nef - op. cit. Vol. II. pp. 110-15.
 2. Ibid. p. 118.
 3. Hughes. - op. cit. pp. 200-16.

in the price of coal.

At a conference at the Guildhall in London, seven of the leading Tyne owners met Mr. Hedworth and Baron Hilton of Hilton, who were there for the Wear owners. Despite the indignation shown by the Court of Aldermen of the City towards the prevailing restrictive practices, Hedworth again pressed the fitters not to load any ship which did not furnish certificates of its cargoes having been delivered in turn. Liddell opposed this for the same reasons as before, added to his anxiety to avoid parliamentary intervention on behalf of the London consumer.¹

Colonel Liddell, who was related by marriage to the Claverings of Axwell Park, had himself long been contemplating some form of regulation for the coal owners. As the colonel's father, Sir Henry Liddell,² was now very old (he was to die in 1723), he did not want to commit his young grandson, the future Lord Ravensworth, to any scheme that would bind him overmuch. In April, 1726, articles of agreement for a term of fifty one years were signed between George Bowes and Cotesworth,³ who had formerly been in open enmity.

After negotiations in London in the summer of 1726, a more comprehensive and significant settlement was

1. Hughes - op. cit. pp. 216-32.

2. Sir Henry's eldest son, Thomas, who had died in 1715, had married the daughter of Sir James Clavering.

3. Lessee of the Manors of Gateshead and Whickham.

reached between the Wortleys, possibly the greatest coal owners in the North, the Liddells, Bowes and Cotesworth. Thus began the 'Grand Alliance,' which was embodied in articles of partnership for ninety nine years. The participants granted one another mutual way-leave rights, and decided to work agreed quantities at the 'partnership' collieries. The consent of the other partners had to be obtained to the purchase or lease by a member of any new collieries or way-leaves. In any case all such new undertakings were to be worked strictly as joint concerns. Cotesworth died soon after this formidable group had taken shape. Then in 1727 the young heir of Ravensworth bought the lease to the manor of Whickham from Cotesworth's son. ¹

This combination acted as a spur to the men of the Wear. Garbutt's History of Sunderland states: 'November 3, 1727 - the Coal Owners in the County of Durham agreed not to sell coals to any fitter for less than 11/6 per chaldron; agreement for 7 years.' ² Among the owners mentioned were Richard Lumley, Earl of Scarborough, John Hedworth and Henry Lambton. Hedworth had, previously that year, been returned again, with the impulsive George Bowes, for the County of Durham. Both found in their local political eminence an additional source of strength for what they sought to achieve in the coal trade.

1. Hughes - op. cit. pp. 233-6.

2. Quoted in Durham County Advertiser - 12th April, 1828.

Bowes received evidence of unmistakable determination on the part of the Wear owners, in the form of a letter from his namesake, George Bowes, a merchant in London:

'.... the coals continuing at such an Excessive price and like to go on, and in short 3 parts in four of all the coales that comes to the Wharfs being Sunderland, who come up, unload, and so run for it, and laugh at the contract.¹ (presumably the Grand Alliance.)

Figures in the Sharp Manuscripts are eloquent of the real threat presented to Newcastle by the progress in the coal trade of its rival. In 1728 out of a total vend at Sunderland of 113,800 chaldrons, the following chaldrons were contributed by the individual owners:

<u>SUNDERLAND</u>	<u>VEND.</u>	
Lord Scarborough ²	16,000	
Mr. Hedworth ³	18,000	
Mr. Lambton	12,300	
Mr. Smith	15,000	
Mr. Nicholas Lambton	14,000	
Mrs. Wharton	17,000	
Mr. Hylton and partners	7,500	
Mr. Allan	<u>14,000</u>	4
	<u>113,800</u>	

Indeed, in 1727, and again in 1728, the Sunderland vend was over half that of Newcastle, although in the following

-
1. B.M. Add. MS. 40748 (Bowes MS.) f. 51. 20th August, 1728
 2. This was Richard, the second Earl. He was Lord Lieutenant of Northumberland and Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
 3. Probably Mr. Henry Lambton, Member for the City of Durham 1734-61.
 4. Sharp MS. 161. p. 89.

year the Sunderland figures fell while those of Newcastle rose. ¹

There are also details available of the allotments of Mr. Wortley, Sir Henry Liddell and Mr. Bowes, three of the mainstays of the Grand Alliance, in the Tyne vend:

" Particular Vends of Coals Coastways and Over Sea in the year 1728:"

Mr. Wortley from the partnership colliery	34441
chaldrons	
Sir Henry Liddell from the partnership	39016
colliery	
Mr. Bowes from the partnership colliery	30681
	104138
Sir Henry Liddell's Family Coal	19867
Mr. Bowes' Family Coal	7373
	131378

River Tyne Vend. Anno. 1728 Total 233795.²

The 'partnership' collieries, specially provided for in the 'Grand Alliance',³ included those of Beckley, Bucksnook, Burdon Moor, Cawsey and Tanfield. Among those collieries added to a list drawn up in 1730 were those of Lanchester Fell, Medomsley, Davison and Tanfield, Beamish, Beamish South Moor and Brunton.⁴

But the 'Alliance' did not proceed without trouble from within. This was apparent even in the early days. Great suspicion probably persisted between Colonel Liddell

-
1. Sharp MS. 161. p.96.
 2. Sharp MS. 161. p.88. Figures denoted chaldrons.
 3. Ibid. 161. pp.63, 78.
 4. Ibid. p.95.

and the powerful George Bowes,¹ who was a great coal owner in his own right. For besides his share in the 'partnership' schemes, and the extensive mines at Gibside, he worked such collieries as those at Streatlam, Cleatlam, Hollerbush, Evenwood, Craggwood and Northwood. For the last three he paid rent to the Bishop of Durham, and for Cleatlam to the Dean and Chapter,² while he and Dame Jane Clavering were joint lessees of Collierly and Ewhurst Head.³ In 1728, through the coal crisis in London, 'the poor are under melancholy apprehensions,' and there was the chance of a visit to Gibside of '8 or so of the greatest traders in London in the Coal way.'⁴ So wrote George Bowes, namesake of the Durham Member, from London. In 1730 George Bowes of Gibside was undertaking to provide for ten years all the coal for the great Crowley iron works.⁵

Intense competition with the 'Alliance' still persisted from Sunderland, Blyth, and such independent Tyne ~~proprietors~~ proprietors as Alderman Ridley. In the winter of 1729-30, Colonel Liddell and the Earl of Scarborough were in agreement that the position could only be remedied by a new Regulation, the need for which Wortley and Bowes, without bothering to inform Liddell, asked Hedworth to

1. Add. MS. 4078 (Bowes MS.) ff.23-4. 20th June, 1727. Lady Bowes to her son, George Bowes.

2. Sharp MS. 161. p. 56.

3. Sharp MS. 161. pp. 126-8

4. Add. MS. 40748 (Bowes MS.) ff.53-4. 24th. August, 1728.

5. Sharp MS. 161. p. 92.

to suggest to Ridley,¹ Bowes, ever thrustful, submitted to owners on both rivers a detailed plan for a general Regulation of the Coal Trade, allowing for the River Wear a vend of 120,000 chaldrons a year, and for the Tyne of 300,000 chaldrons. He was very earnest in advertising the merits of his proposals.² But Ridley seemed very unsympathetic, perhaps because his vend was to be below those of both Liddell and Bowes.³

After he had rejected Ridley's own plan,⁴ Bowes initiated a vicious price-cutting war. Here his stubbornness, which was working to his own advantage in the way of considerable profits, compelled his partners to do likewise, for fear of otherwise losing their trade. In February, 1731, Lord Scarborough and Hedworth declared that they were still in favour of a Regulation, but Hedworth would not accept under 130,000 chaldrons for the Wear vend. Henry Lambton, Member for the City of Durham, 1734-61, was now at the head of the Wear owners, and his obstinacy was one of the main reasons why no agreement was reached on 23rd December, 1731 between the owners of the two rivers.⁵

It seems that some form of 'Regulation' was achieved in the early seventeen thirties, with Wortley remaining outside it. One of its purposes was to close down redundant pits. This was unfortunate for the consumer, particularly during the exacting winter of 1739-40, as coal

1. Hughes op. cit. pp. 236-9.

2. Sharp MS. 161. p. 100.

3. Ibid. p. 102.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid. p. 104.

rose enormously in price; so much so that another parliamentary committee of inquiry was established. There was re-enacted a forty year old statute empowering the Lord Mayor of London to determine the price of coals. Their price reduction was a particular evil in 1745, with its consequent labour difficulties, and wastage of the coal owner's money. At length, in 1747, yet another 'Regulation' was arrived at.¹ It included Matthew Ridley, son and heir of that Richard Ridley who had declined to enter the suggested combination of 1731. It would appear that the River Wear vend for the half-year ending Dec., 1747 was 76,884 chaldrons. Of this, John Tempest provided 10,359 chaldrons, Henry Lambton 8,937, and Sir Richard Hylton and Ralph Milbanke, jointly, 8,622.² Again it is significant that most of the leading owners bore names which occur again and again in the annals of parliamentary representation for Durham. John Tempest and Henry Lambton were themselves, of course, in the House of Commons in this year of 1747.

Alongside the vicissitudes attending these Regulations, and the years when their absence was keenly felt, there endured the question of the navigation of the River Wear. One facet of this was the project to improve the harbour at Sunderland. Tyne coal owners realised that, if this were implemented, many disadvantages would accrue to them.

1. Hughes op. cit. pp. 246-8.

2. Fordyce - op. cit. Vol. 1. p. 494 n.

The Bill to better Sunderland harbour in 1717 was promoted by Hedworth and Thomas Conyers of Elemore, the latter of whom represented the City of Durham continuously from 1702 to 1727.¹ The Bill also aimed at making the River Wear navigable as far as Newbridge. Thus it incurred the animosity of Cotesworth, who regarded it as prejudicial to the Tyne coal trade.

The bill was passed eventually, but rendered less dangerous to Tyne interests.² The Wear was to be navigated from Sunderland to Durham. Many on the Committee which had examined the measure had wanted this; hence the support of Lord William Powlett, who, although a friend of Cotesworth, had estates and lead mines in North Yorkshire. It was argued that from this degree of navigation would unfold benefits to trade and to the poor. The woollen manufactory would also be encouraged, and carriage would be provided for lead, coals, lime, stone, timber, deals, butter and tallow to and from Durham, Westmorland, Cumberland, Yorkshire and other counties. Contact with Sunderland, London, and other ports would be facilitated, and decidedly more watermen and seamen would be employed.³ All this would have very grave consequences for the Tyne trade, as the Liddells, Bowes and their colleagues saw.

But that part of the Act which envisaged navigation as far as Durham was not executed.⁴ By 1727 it was clear that the duties raised in accordance with its terms were

1. Sharp MS. 82. p. 26.n. Bean op. cit. p. 148.

2. Hughes op. cit. pp. 293-9.

3. Baker - Baker Papers.

4. J.H.C. Vol. 18. p. 495. 9th March, 1717.

not sufficient.¹ So additional powers for collecting more were granted the Wear Commissioners in an Act introduced as a Bill by Mr. Hedworth and Mr. Conyers in that year.² But no material progress was made, and in 1737, with their original powers due to lapse in the following year, the Wear Commissioners petitioned,³ showing that much remained to be done, both in the improvement of Sunderland harbour and the navigation of the river. Mr. Hedworth, in his report from Committee on this petition on 14th March, 1737, testified to the accuracy of these forbodings. Yet no action matured from this, possibly because Hedworth 'yielded to the notions and arguments of others, and gave up the Bill,' before journeying to Bath 'to recruit' his health.⁴

It was not until 20th February, 1747, that Mr. Bowes, Member for the County, and Mr. Henry Lambton and Mr. Tempest, Members for the City of Durham, brought in a further Bill 'for the better preservation and improvement of the Wear and ^{the} Port and Haven of Sunderland.'⁵ In any case it is questionable how wholehearted Bowes, as a Tyne owner, was over this. In the first instance the Wear was to be navigated to New Bridge, in the Parish of Chester-le-Street, and then to the City of Durham. Two days after

-
1. J.H.C. Vol. 20. p. 776 - 27th February, 1727.
 2. Ibid. p. 785 3rd March, 1727.
 3. Ibid. Vol. 22 p. 766. 2nd March, 1737.
 4. Durham University Library - Durham City and County Elections 1650-1831. f. 20. 14th April, 1737. John Hedworth to ---
 5. J.H.C. Vol. 25.p. 296. 20th February, 1747.

the Second Reading, which was taken on 4th March,¹ the Mayor, Aldermen, Commonalty and trading inhabitants of the City of Durham petitioned for the deletion from the bill of the term, 'or so far as can be effected,' as a qualifying clause to the proposed second lap of navigation to the City. They recited how much extra trade Durham, by its convenient situation, would derive from navigation to its very walls. The price of coal to all parts of the country would be lowered, and many large mines, hitherto unopened because of the heavy cost of way leaves, could thus be wrought.

This petition, although it was referred to the Committee on the bill, does not seem to have influenced events in any way;² but the majority of the citizens of Durham, undaunted, were backing Mr. Robert Wharton in his candidature as member for the City, because of his enthusiasm for navigation as far as his prospective constituency. On the other hand, the Bishop, Chandler, with the Dean and Chapter, were antagonistic. The Bishop felt that the transport of goods to the coast by water would be at a dearer rate than by land from Chester-le-Street, the usual method followed. It is not certain what part the Bishop played in the election, but Wharton was defeated at the poll.³

1. Ibid. p. 309.

2. J.H.C. Vol 25. p. 311. 6th March, 1747.

3. Add. MS. 32711 (Newcastle MS.) f. 554. 26th June, 1747. Bishop Chandler to the Duke of Newcastle.

The bill had stipulated that the Wear should be navigated as far as Newbridge by 1759. By 1758 it was obvious that this would not be achieved. On 31st January, 1759, the Mayor and leading citizens of Durham, supported by Bishop Trevor, ^{and} the Dean and Chapter, addressed a curious petition to the University of Cambridge, of which the Duke of Newcastle, Trevor's patron, had become Chancellor in 1748. This showed that, with the exception of those collieries immediately adjacent to the navigable part, coal could only be carried to the river by permission of three unnamed coal owners. These coal owners had thereby cornered for themselves too much of the coal trade on the river, and were excluding the vend of over a hundred thousand chaldrons.¹

It is possible that Henry Lambton was one of the three virtual monopolists referred to, for a further petition on 16th March, 1759, from the Mayor and Aldermen of Durham to the House of Commons, showed that navigation had been taken no further than the Lambton staith just above Biddick Ford.² Certainly the Lambtons and Tempests, from their strong positions in the Wear coal trade, and in the parliamentary representation of the City of Durham, had every reason to look askance at possibilities of further navigation. In 1758 the Wear vend of coals was 180,449½.

1. Add. MS. 33061 (Newcastle MS.) f. 254.

2. J.H.C. Vol. 28. p. 488.

chaldrons, to which Henry Lambton contributed 19,213¹/₂ chaldrons, and John Tempest 20,886.¹

Lambton was, time and again, embarrassed by the inquiries of a number of his constituents as to where he stood in this affair. For he had made generous subscriptions, appeared at meetings, and publicly favoured the cause of navigation. He had, indeed, promised heartily to further it; yet suspicions lingered as to his real feelings. Early in 1759 he felt himself compelled to deny all knowledge of any enmity to navigation on the part of his agents, or of anyone under his influence.² For, as Professor Hughes has shown, it was just such local issues that 'were the staple of politics in the eighteenth century.'³

But the Vanes, led by the second Lord Darlington, turned to their own advantage the prevailing concern among so many citizens of Durham for navigation. Already Darlington had his eyes fixed keenly on the representation of the City of Durham, so long adorned by Lambton and Tempest. Accordingly, 'a scheme was immediately set on foot to make the River Wear navigable. For some months the people was all treated at Raby (home of Lord Darlington) - the Durham Aldermen, in particular all that had Fields, yards or even passages to the River, had great promised of being enriched - Money began to be subscribed - Mr. Lumley 2000 £, many country gentlemen also subscribed.

1. Fordyce op. cit. Vol II. p. 508.

2. Baker-Baker Papers.

3. Hughes op. cit. p. 302.

for the benefit of Durham....¹

For their part in these proceedings the Bishop of Durham, the Earl of Scarborough, and Mr. James Lumley were made free of the City, on 13th July, in the Mercers' Company.² Lumley, a Member for Arundel since 6th May, 1741, and a foremost zealot for Navigation, had on 4th March, 1747, offered, in the House of Commons, to pay personally for the cost of the extension of navigation to Newbridge from Blacksford, which had been intended as the last lap in Wear navigation.³ Later in 1759 another Act of Parliament was added. It ordained that the river should be navigable as far as Durham, this time from Biddick and Ford, but there is no record of this being carried out.

It will be seen later how the events outlined immediately above constituted an interesting background to the convulsions which dominated the years 1760 to 1762. While the cry for Wear navigation was renewed at intervals during the second half of the eighteenth century, for example by Major Gowland's son and his opponent in 1813, enthusiasm for the deepening of rivers abated all over England, as the potentialities of railways came to be realised in the nineteenth century. For the seventy and more years following 1760 were marked by the quickening tempo of industrial development.

1. Baker-Baker Papers. Memorable Events 1746-75.
 2. Mercers' Company Minute Book 1709-82. Unfoliated. The Bishop was a major political ally of Lord Darlington.
 3. J.H.C. Vol. 25. p. 309.

The Northern coalfield, throughout that later period, blossomed forth and prospered. In the absence of railways, no inland district could challenge the supremacy of the North in the London market; a supremacy which was based on technical, economic and geographical advantages. In 1780, of the total coal exports into London, which reached 866,627 tons, the Northern ports provided 854,299 tons.¹ Moreover, the application of the steam engine to coal mining resulted in the opening of many new pits on both Tyne and Wear, while mines already in existence increased their output.

If the figures of the Wear Vend of coals are examined, the leading owners can easily be distinguished. For example, from 30th June, 1814 to 31st December, 1814, 231,985½ chaldrons left that river. Here are some of the foremost contributors. In every case but the last they were from landed families which had provided, or were to provide, Durham Members of Parliament.

Sir T.H. Liddell Bart & Partners	12,729 chaldrons
Morton-John Davison ²	15,850½ "
Sir Ralph Milbanke, Bart.	7,346 "
John George Lambton	61,642 "
Lady Frances Vane, Tempest ³	65,047 "
William Russell, Esq., & Co.	13,564 "
J. Nesham, Esq., & Partners	20,225 ⁵ "

1. D.J. Williams - Capitalist Combination in the Coal Industry p. 29.

2. Second son of Sir John Eden, Member for the County 1774-90.

3. Daughter of Sir Henry Vane Tempest, and later the wife of the third Marquis of Londonderry.

4. Grandfather of that William Russell who was M.P. for the County 1830-2.

5. Surtees op. cit. Vol I. Part II. p. 265.

Not one was solely an industrialist or merchant. In other counties such men were the pacemakers of economic expansion, yet they were often denied the choice plums of political opportunity.

At the end of the Napoleonic Wars, the Tempest collieries still held a clear lead over all others, save those of the Lambtons, and the way was open for the rivalry in both industrial and political spheres between John George Lambton, Lord Durham, and Charles Stewart, who, by marrying Lady Frances Anne Vane-Tempest, became one of the two greatest coal-magnates in North East England.¹ Between 31st December, 1831 and 30th June, 1832 Lords Durham and Londonderry headed the list of owners in the Wear Vind with 78,716 and 40,212 chaldrons respectively, figures which must be set against a background of severe labour troubles.²

The number of coal mines under the control of the Lambtons may be seen from this roll of some of the manors and estates belonging to Lord Durham: Lambton, Harraton, Harraton Outside, Fatfield, Picktree, Leefield, Flatts, Bromholme, Whitehall, Felton, Plawsworth, Kimblesworth, Morton, Bourn Moor, Painsher, Offerton, Houghton, Herrington, Flinton Hall, Ayton Wood, South Biddick, Lanchester and Witton Gilbert.³ Also, Mr. J.G. Lambton

1. Durham University Journal 1955-6. A.J. Taylor - The Third Marquis of Londonderry and the North East Coal Trade p. 21.

2. Durham Chronicle 20th July, 1832.

3. Ibid 3rd September, 1831.

had purchased in 1819 the Newbottle Collieries from the Nesham family for £70,000 ¹. Most of the Lambton collieries were well concentrated, and situated in a very good household coal district to the south and south west of Sunderland. The coal could be readily shipped at staithes on the Wear, and at docks at Sunderland.

Lord Londonderry's pits were ^{mostly} east of an imaginary line running from Sunderland to Durham, with large groups in the Rainton and Pitkington districts. Among these collieries was North Hetton, the royalties to which were leased by the Marquis from the Dean and Chapter of Durham. ² In 1826 Lord Londonderry sold the lease, of a portion of this to a group of four purchasers. One of these was Mr. William Russell of Brancepeth, later Member for the County of Durham, who alone, in the first half of 1832, contributed 8975 chaldrons to the Wear Vend. ³ In 1833, or 1834, the same royalties were resold to Lords Londonderry and Durham, and the Hetton Coal Company, ⁴ which included among its partners Colonel Braddyll and his son Edward, firm friends and political adherents of Londonderry.

On 20th July, 1831, Londonderry visited the Dean and Chapter at Durham, and, after much hard bargaining ⁵,

1. Fordyce - op. cit. Vol II. p. 565.

2. Fordyce A History of Coal, Coke and Iron Fields p. 92

3. D.C. 20th July, 1832.

4. Fordyce. A History of Coal, Coke and Iron Fields p. 93

5. D.C. 23rd July, 1831.

renewed his Rainton coal lease, on payment of a fine of £44, 266 " 12 " 10, to his wealthy ecclesiastical landlords. He had just disbursed £4, 134. 8. 4d., for over-workings at that colliery,¹ and £1, 178. 15. 2d., in the previous year/^{for} the same reason.² With the commanding position of East Durham coal in the London market,³ he was just about the richest coal proprietor in all England, and affluent and presumptuous enough to think he could carry all before him in what local county and borough elections he entered.

Londonderry was aiming at still higher pinnacles of industrial imperialism. His decision to commence the building of Seaham Harbour, and the railway connecting it with his pits (for he had purchased the Seaham estate from Sir Ralph Milbanke), was the by-product of the discovery of coal deposits beneath the limestone in the east of the County of Durham. Also he was painfully aware of the heavy duties he ~~paid~~^{paid} to the Wear Commissioners for his coals. It was estimated that Seaham Harbour, the foundation stone of which was laid by the Marchioness of Londonderry on 28th November,⁴ would save many thousands of pounds a year in the conveyance and shipment of the production of her husband's numerous collieries, which

1. D.&C. Library. D. & C. Audit Books No 10. 1814-32. Treasurer's Charge Audit 1832.

2. Ibid. Treasurer's Charge Audit 1834.

3. D.U.J. 1955-6. A.J. Taylor op. cit. p. 21.

4. Durham County Advertiser, 7th December, 1828. Seaham Harbour was opened on 25th July, 1831. In less than three months 209 vessels of a total registered tonnage^{4,31,000} had used the port. Edith Lady Londonderry - Frances Anne p. 158.

would thus be served by a much nearer outlet to the sea. Also the Durham coast could be supplied with coal which did not bear Sunderland port duties, while a line of communication between Seaham and the coal and lead districts which lay to the south and south-west of Durham would be shorter than the railway between those districts and Stockton.¹ These were not the only benefits Lord Londonderry hoped to derive from Seaham Harbour. He was certainly considering the building of a branch railway from Seaham to the City of Durham, which was only one of the reasons for his concern as to who should represent that City in Parliament.² By his machinations in essaying to hold ~~down~~ at least one Durham seat he aroused widespread unpopularity and hostility, not least from those who followed the Lambtons.

There can be no doubt that Londonderry had been persuaded to pursue his Seaham scheme more vigorously by the knowledge that the Tees Navigation, Stockton - Darlington Railways, and Clarence Railway projects would otherwise be to his disadvantage. His pits in the Rainton-Penshaw area, at least six in number,³ were not so well situated for transport of coals to the sea as were those of the Lambtons. Such progress had been made in the Tees

1. D.C.A. 7th December, 1828.

2 Ibid. 1st November, 1828.

3. Those by the name of Whitefield, Shiney Row, Meadows, Adventure, Resolution and Alexandria. Durham Chronicle 12th February, 1831.

area that by 1832 the Southern half of Durham County was fast overhauling the industrial lead^{held} by the Northern half, and the Tees mine owners were engaged in a relentless price war with their counterparts from Newcastle and Sunderland.¹ Indeed the Quaker family of Pease and their partners were handsomely set up in the mining area round Bishop Auckland, Spennymoor and Crook, which owed so much of its onrush of opulence to the Navigation of the Tees from Portrack in the County of Durham to Acklam in Yorkshire,² and to the Stockton and Darlington Railway.

It was in 1821 that an Act had been passed 'for making and maintaining a Rail-way or Tram-road from the River Tees at Stockton to Witton Park Colliery, with several branches, therefrom, all in the County of Durham.'³ Two years earlier a similar bill, the second reading of which was moved by the future Lord Durham, had failed to make headway, largely because of the intractability of the third Earl of Darlington, through whose land the railway would pass.⁴ The later measure was also moved by Lambton,⁵ who had, in the County election of 1820,

1. Williams op. cit. pp. 41-2.

2. Achieved as the result of a bill moved by Lord William Powlett, son of the third Earl of Darlington and first Marquis of Cleveland. The bill became law on 19th June, 1828, and the channel was opened on 10th February, 1831, - Surtees op. cit. vol. III, p. 177; J.H.C. Vol. 83 pp. 55, 172, 238, 389, 448-9.

3. Surtees op. cit. vol. III p. 359; Fordyce - op. cit. Vol. II. pp. 484-5.

4. Newcastle Courant. 10th April, 1819.

5. J.H.C. Vol. 76. p. 92. 20th February, 1821.

defeated Richard Wharton, a political henchman of Lord Londonderry, and definitely ill disposed to a Stockton-Darlington Railway.¹

The success of the railway, which was opened to traffic on 27th September, 1825, and the improvements of the Tees, were undeniable. While 7,295 tons of coal were shipped from that river in 1826, for 1832 the amount rocketed to 231,959 tons.² Aided considerably in the Commons by J.G. Lambton,³ the railway company then pressed forward with the construction of new branch lines. It had already been favoured by the Clarence Railway Bill, which had received the Royal Assent on 23rd May, 1828,⁴ and provided for a line from the Tees at Port Clarence to meet the Stockton and Darlington Railway at Sim Pasture Farm, Heighington.⁵ From the outset this plan, and especially the proposed extension to the City of Durham, encountered the antagonism of Lord Londonderry and Sir Henry Hardinge, close friend, colleague and brother-in-law of the former, and Member for the City of Durham 1820-30. Perhaps Londonderry was averse to the way in which the Bishop and Dean and Chapter of Durham had hailed the railway to the City as a means of connecting their mines of Shadforth and Sherburn with the Tees. It is even more probable that he saw in the extension ^{a threat} to his own cherished

1. J.H.C. Vol. 76. 20th February, 1821. p. 92.

2. Fordyce op. cit. vol II. p. 197.

3. J.H.C. Vol 78 pp. 71, 78; Vol 79. pp. 28, 299.

4. Ibid. Vol. 83. p. 375.

5. D.C. 23rd May, 1829; Fordyce op. cit. Vol I. pp. 113-4.

dream of a line from Seaham to the City of Durham. In any case, despite the early championship of Mr. M.A. Taylor,¹ the Clarence Railway Company had not, by the end of 1832, fulfilled their earlier purpose of reaching Durham².

But Londonderry was not only straining against the menacing winds of competition from the south. At times, and particularly in 1826, he regarded the restrictions of the Limitation of the Vend also as obstructing his vigorous development of his own 'empire'.³ Yet he often campaigned in the House of Lords on behalf of the Northern coal owners generally. There are abundant instances of this after 1829. Just as he often rejected the complaint that these owners were accumulating large profits, so, on 9th May, 1828, his brother-in-law, Sir Henry Hardinge and Lord William Powlett, Members for the City and County of Durham respectively, had taken a similar stand in the⁴ House of Commons. Indeed, those who made up the Limitation of the Vend were busy throughout most of the early nineteenth century in answering accusations of monopoly, combination, and extortion, and blaming the dealers in London for such abuses as existed.

It is important to see how such situations came about. At the same time as the political horizon of Durham was then overcast, the bitter trade belligerency in the

1. D.C. 23rd May, 1829.

2. D.C. 12th November, 1831; D.A. 24 February, 1832. p. 270 and after.

3. D.U.J. 1955-6. Taylor op. cit. p. 22.

4. D.C.A. 17th May, 1828.

seventeen sixties had resulted in lower prices and profits, and brought several Newcastle and Sunderland coal proprietors to the verge of ruin. However, in 1771 there was launched the famous Limitation of the Vend, which, with a few intermissions, was in force until 1844.¹ Many features of earlier 'regulations' were adopted. Although the agreement lapsed in 1780, the ensuing period of disastrous competition, which struck collieries and ships alike, caused saner counsels to prevail. Thus, in 1786-87, there was drawn up a general compact between the owners of Tyne and Wear. A committee of nine from the Tyne, and seven from the Wear, had full executive powers to regulate the output of each pit and district.

Despite obstacles, and often acute dissension, self-interest, reflected in the knowledge that open competition would be cut-throat/^{as} investment in coal mining was proceeding rapidly, kept would-be separatists within the compact.² Among its leaders were the Russells of Brancepeth, whose name eventually became enrolled among those of the parliamentary families of Durham, and the Brandlings of Gosforth, related by marriage to Rowland Burdon, Member for the County from 1790 until 1806. With them were the Liddells of Ravensworth, Lords Strathmore³ and Wharnccliffe, and Matthew Bell of Woolsington, Member for Northumberland

1. Williams. Op. cit. pp. 25-6.

2. Williams op. cit. pp. 25-45.

3. Heir to the Bowes.

from 1826 until 1831.¹ Bell was the great-nephew of C.J. Brandling, Member for Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1784-97, and father-in-law of Rowland Burdon.²

The division of the vend between Tyne and Wear was determined on a ratio of three to two. From 1770 to 1776 the average annual export from Newcastle was 380,000 chaldrons, of which 260,000 were dispatched to London.³ The average annual export for the period 1791-99 was 476,634 chaldrons. Against this, Sunderland exported 213,645 Newcastle chaldrons in 1770, and in 1800 attained 303,459 $\frac{1}{2}$ chaldrons.⁴ Whether by coincidence or not this peaceful co-existence between the owners of the two rivers, from 1771 to 1780, and from 1786 until after the turn of the century, was contemporaneous with ^{a relative electoral calm, in} strong contrast to the political troubles of the early sixties.

^{1819-32,}
The period/was the occasion of the greatest anxiety to the coal owners taking part in this Limitation. The Durham Chronicle, on 13th February 1830, devoted a long editorial to "The Coal Trade and How to Cure the Evil." It claimed that a Wear owner, on every chaldron sent to London, made a profit of only 12/9d. Out of this had to come disbursements on labour and capital, transport costs, wayleave rents, and payments for machinery and other capital equipment, including the laying of railway lines.

1. Bean op. cit. pp. 486-7.

2. Ibid p. 580.

3. Fordyce. A History of Coal, Coke and Iron Fields, p.105

4. Fordyce - History of Durham. Vol. II. p. 508.

This editorial complained of the Government duty on all coal carried by sea to any part of England. Yet coal consumed in the neighbourhood of the collieries, or sent by inland navigation for one hundred or two hundred miles, paid no duty, save that from Staffordshire to London, on which only 1/- per ton was levied. The Durham Chronicle called on for the repeal, or at least equalisation of the duties, so that the Northern owners should be treated similarly to their colleagues of the inland coal districts.

These duties had been an issue for sometime, and had been debated in the House of Commons before J.G. Lambton, on 5th March, 1819, sought to show that the inland counties had nothing to fear from alterations in the system of taxation.¹ He inveighed against this unequal system again on 1st April, 1824, and alleged that 400,000 chaldrons of coals were wasted annually in the northern coal field because the high rate of duties prohibited exports. About a week later Sir Matthew White Ridley the Younger, Member for Newcastle on Tyne, 1812-36, had reminded the House that there was a duty of 10/8 a chaldron on all coal exported from the Tyne to the London market, and one of 10/2 a chaldron sent from the Wear to the capital.² The Government, in 1825, reduced its impost to one of 4/- per chaldron. But to this was added a payment, upon every ton of coals, to the Orphan Fund of the City of London.³

1. Newcastle Courant, 13th March, 1819.

2. D.C.A. 10th April, 1824.

3. D.C. 17th February, 1827.

In 1829 Lords Londonderry and Durham, at one over this, took the initiative. The former, on 24th March, called in vain on the Duke of Wellington to place the coal trade beyond petty taxation. He drew attention to the bill of the City of London, by which it was proposed to continue a duty of 6d. per chaldron as a contribution to the cost of building the approaches to London Bridge.¹ Lord Durham, in the same debate, had objected to the City of London 'smuggling in a Bill for the renewal of a tax which would expire in 9 months from the present time.' Eventually both peers withdrew their opposition to the bill, on the understanding that it was a temporary measure, and that the City of London would later hand over in lieu a considerable sum of money to the Government.²

The Wear owners were sufficiently worried about the coal taxes to hold a meeting at Chester-le-Street on October 25th, 1830. The chair was taken by George Baker of Elemore,³ while at Newcastle, on the same day, the Tyne owners were gathering under the guidance of R.W. Brandling. On 11th November, the Marquis of Londonderry indefatigably presented, in the House of Lords, petitions from the Peers, commoners, proprietors and lessees of Tyne and Wear coal mines,⁴ praying for the repeal of all duties on coals,

1.- D.C.A. 28th March, 1829.

2. D.C. 27th June, 1829.

3. Unsuccessful candidate for City of Durham, 1813 - A staunch supporter of the Lambtons.

4, D.A. 19th November, 1830. p. 165.

especially those carried coastwise.¹

No immediate relief seemed forthcoming until the Government toyed with the idea of repealing the Richmond Shilling. This impost, which had originated when the Company of Hostmen, in their Charter of Incorporation, granted Queen Elizabeth one shilling for every chaldron of coal, had been transferred by the Crown in 1677 to the Duke of Richmond, the natural son of Charles II. In 1799 it had been purchased by Act of Parliament from the family of the Duke by the Government for about £400,000. Tyne owners generally felt that this duty should have ceased many years previously, since the Company of Hostmen had long since lost the exclusive privilege of vending coals on the Tyne.¹² Their hopes were about to be rudely shattered, for, despite the government statement that the removal of coal duties, including the Richmond shilling, was to be effective in three months from Lord Althorp's speech in the House of Commons on 7th March, 1831,² the bill was not proceeded with.³

So the pressure brought to bear by the 'north east's' two great coal owning peers had come to nought. Nevertheless, Lords Londonderry and Durham had served the trade, and themselves, well by their persistent solicitude in and out of Parliament for the well being of coal mining.

1. D.C. 5th March, 1831.

2. D.C. 12th March, 1831.

3. J.H.C. (Printed.) Vol. 86. pp. 511-2. 20th April, 1831.

in the ways outlined above. These two powerful proprietors had been very ably and enthusiastically seconded by the various Members for the City and County in Durham, who themselves had been frequently prompted by their constituents.

An example of the folly of a Durham Member in not supporting local coal and shipping may be gleaned from the fate of Richard Wharton on 1820. He condemned as tyrannical and unjust the Sunderland Navigation Bill for the deepening of the harbour. This had received its second reading on 16th March, 1819.¹ Significantly, the most violent and virulent antagonism to Wharton, in his canvass of the County of Durham in 1820, was shown at Sunderland. Lambton, his victor on that occasion, sustained the Navigation Bill ardently.²

The apprehensions and interests of Sunderland and Radical Jack continued to flow confluent. Both he and his fellow County Member, Powlett, insisted on the need to maintain the laws giving protection to the shipping of that town against foreign competition.³ Throughout 1829 these representatives were, with Lord Londonderry, trying to avert the renewal of the Charter of the East India Company, so that Sunderland shipping could benefit from that charter having fallen into disuse.⁴

1. Newcastle Courant. 20th March, 1819.

2. Ibid. 3rd April, 1819.

3. Newcastle Chronicle, 30th March, 1822; D.C.A. 22nd April, 1826; D.C. 10th March, 1827.

4. D.C. 15th May, 1830, 9th May, 1829, 1st May, 1830.

By 1831 a great dilemma confronted the leaders of Sunderland's commerce, and acted as a bold accompaniment to the unwavering chorus for parliamentary reform which was sweeping the hustings. The trade of the town had increased so enormously that it was then the fourth port in the kingdom. Yet dark clouds were gathering on the skyline of this prosperity, despite the Royal Assent on 29th May, 1830 to a bill enlarging the powers ^{under} several acts for the improvement of the Wear and the port of Sunderland.¹ At a meeting on 5th September, 1831, Sir Cuthbert Sharp, Collector of the Customs, put forward a motion expressing grave concern at the deleterious effects of insufficient accommodation for shipping in Sunderland harbour. He concluded that the construction of a large dock must be given urgent priority, and emphasized that more traffic was to be expected from the many new collieries about to be opened in the neighbourhood. Also, Sunderland had to contend not only with the Navigation of the Tees, and Seaham Harbour, but also with the Carlisle and Newcastle Railway,² and the steam ferry at Shields; and unless renovations were begun promptly, much of the produce of Wear collieries would be shipped from the Tyne.³ The hard headed Wear men were at the cross roads, and the fruits of two hundred years of toil and acumen imperilled.

1. J.H.C. Vol 85. p. 500. 29th May, 1830.

2. Lord Durham and Lord William Powlett were among the Directors of this Railroad Company in 1829.

3. D.C. 20th August, 1831.

The contradictory plans which were then put forward by different groups in Sunderland led to the utmost enmity and ill-will. The controversy became intensified, and centred round the personality of Sir Hedworth Williamson, seventh baronet of Whitburn, and a member of the River Wear Commission. His great grandfather, grandfather and father had held the office of High Sheriff of the County Palatine of Durham successively from September, 1723 until March, 1810.¹ Sir Hedworth had married, on 18th April, 1826, the third daughter of the second Lord Ravensworth, formerly Sir Thomas Henry Liddell, Member for the County of Durham in 1806. He was thus connected with a distinguished 'Tyne' family.

Sir Hedworth frequently declared his concern over the danger of much of Sunderland's trade going to Seaham, and the shipping of the Wear sinking into obscurity as a result of the degradations of Tyne and Tees. Yet he was depicted by some as too intent on enriching his own property, and the township of Monkwearmouth, at the cost of Sunderland's commercial well being.² A great furore was set in motion by Williamson's attitude to a bill to erect docks on the south side of Sunderland. This was, by the end of January, 1832, in Committee in the House of Commons. It was opposed by Williamson, and by his fellow

1. Sharp MS. 82. p. 21n.

2. J.H.C. Vol. 87. 26th January, 1832. p. 52.

County Member, William Russell.¹ With these two 'Reformers' was arraigned the Marquis of Londonderry himself. His disapproval extended formally to the clause providing for an increase in the coal duties which would help meet the expense of the enterprise. Londonderry was said to have retained counsel against the bill, and to be wary of any threat to Seaham from additions to Sunderland's docks, whether on the north or south side of the Wear.²

To his relief, the bill was lost in committee, nine votes having been cast against, and five for. Among the minority were Mr. W.R.C. Chaytor, Member for the City of Durham, and chairman of the committee examining the bill. Mr. Beaumont, Whig Member for Northumberland 1818-26^{1830-7,} and/ and an energetic Reformer, ~~1830-7~~, was among the nine, the teller for whom was Mr. Hodgson, Tory Member for Newcastle-on-Tyne from 1830 to 1835. A number of members were absent when the vote was taken, although they had been present on the previous day. They included the Honourable Arthur Trevor, Member for the City of Durham, and friend of Lord Londonderry, the latter's son, Viscount Castlereagh, Member for County Down, and Sir Matthew White Ridley, the Younger, the other Member for Newcastle-

1. Raine MS. 6. f. 33. 2nd April, 1832. Copy of the Official Letter from the Solicitors to the Bill to the Committee of Wet Docks, Sunderland.

2. Ibid. f. 47 1st. September, 1832. "One of you" to "The Reformers of Sunderland."

on-Tyne.¹ On the evening of the 4th April the effigies of Williamson and Russell were burnt in Sunderland.² Sir Hedworth Williamson then went ahead with his plans for a North Docks Bill.³ There were to be ample berths for ships in deep water, while a suspension bridge and railway were to convey coals from south to north. But to follow the Docks' question to its end it is necessary to examine aspects of the North Durham Election of 1832, in which one of the candidates was Hedworth Lambton, brother of Lord Durham.

Many efforts were made, not always convincingly, by Lord Durham's partisans to disavow any union between his brother and Williamson. The third candidate was Mr. E.R.G. Braddyll, virtually a nominee of Lord Londonderry. Although Braddyll affirmed in his election speeches his attachment to the trade and commerce of Sunderland, he gave the impression of being opposed equally to North and South Dock schemes. This was precisely the standpoint of Lord Londonderry, and congruent with an understandable grudge on the part of his lordship against any development which might point menacingly at Seaham Harbour.

The North Dock Bill suffered, in July, 1832, the same fate as its predecessor. It was thrown out of the Committee of the House of Lords by twelve votes to two,

1. Raine MS. 6. f. 33. 2nd April, 1832. J.H.C. Vol. 87. 29th February, 1832, p. 153. Bean op. cit. pp. 585, 588.
 2. D.A. 6th April, 1832. p. 318.
 3. J.H.C. Vol. 87. p. 95, 13th February, 1832; p. 126, 20th February, 1832.

with Lord Ravensworth one of the minority. Among those against the bill were Mr. Hodgson, Member for Newcastle. The devotees of the bill knew that a survey for a railway from Durham to South Shields was taking place under the supervision of Mr. Buddle, chief industrial agent and manager for Lord Londonderry. This was a counter attack to preserve the advantages of the Londonderry collieries at Rainton and Penshaw. Also, South Shields was thereby to act as a substitute for Seaham Harbour during the three or four months of the year when the latter was unsafe.¹² During much of 1832 the Sunderland and Shields Railway Bill was before Parliament. In its favour were Mr. Hodgson, Lord Castlereagh, and two of his father's lieutenants, Sir Henry Hardinge and the Honourable Arthur Trevor. Against the bill were Sir Hedworth Williamson, Mr. Russell and Mr. Chaytor,³ also at one over Parliamentary Reform.

Finding it best to compromise, the North Dock men seem to have persuaded the Wear Commissioners to apply to the House of Commons for power to erect docks on both North and South sides of the river. Two of the most eminent engineers of the day, Rennie and Walker, were consulted.⁴

1. Raine MS. 6. ff. 64, 73.

2. Many felt that the Corporation of Newcastle were behind this railway. Newcastle then had jurisdiction over the river at South Shields. Possibly Hodgson's support for the scheme bears out this view.

3. D.A. 30th March, 1832. p. 310; D.C. 18th February, 1832.

4. Raine MS. 7. 2nd January, 1833.

Williamson, however, refused to acknowledge defeat, and put forward fresh proposals for docks to be based on Monkwearmouth Shore. There was to be a railway from this dock, while another was to pass through the site of Williamson's suggested dock at Monkwearmouth, and to lead to Hylton Ferry. Here there was to be another bridge over the Wear, carrying the railway to a junction with the South Durham coalfield.¹

The merits of this plan were openly broadcast. It would accommodate both the North and South Durham coalfields, whereas the South Dock scheme would serve the latter coalfield only. Also the railway and dock rates would be less than those prevailing on the Durham and Shields, and Hartlepool Railways.² These arguments failed to carry the day. For the Committee of the Sunderland Ship Owners Society remained adamant, and would contrinute to a South Dock only.

This was the position at the time of the poll. Mr. Braddyll and Sir Hedworth Williamson had already fought a duel, on the 27th September previous, following speeches made by the respective parties. The affair terminated without injury to either man.³ Then, after two days' voting, December 18th and 19th, Hedworth Lambton and Sir Hedworth Williamson were returned with 2558 and 2182

1. Raine MS. 6. f.67. 17th November, 1832. "One of Yourselves."

2. Raine MS. 6. f.68. 20th November, 1832.

3. Sharp MS. 82. p. 21.

votes respectively, Edward Braddyll having been defeated with 1676.¹ It is probable that only Williamson's ^{had} 'orthodoxy' on Parliamentary Reform /saved him from being cast aside as a candidate by Reformers who were angered by his part in the North Docks episode.

This was the year in which the first election for Sunderland afforded yet another example of the special troubles of a candidate who was stamped by publicists, rightly or wrongly, as passive, indifferent or even inimical towards any of the agencies on which the livelihood of his prospective constituents depended. Yet the victim who was thus stigmatised took his stand almost entirely upon his long experience in matters of shipping. This was the able and versatile Alderman Thompson, an eminent iron-master and shipowner. He had been an Alderman of the City of London, and was Lord Mayor in 1828-9. He had served as a director of the Bank of England, and was some time Chairman of the Committee at Lloyds. In the House of Commons he had sat for Callington 1820-26, and for the City of London 1826-32.²

Thompson's special knowledge of shipping was blatantly lauded by some at the expense of another candidate for Sunderland. This was the Honourable Captain George Barrington, a son-in-law of Earl Grey, and therefore

1. Sharp MS. 82. p. 21.

2. Fordyce op. cit. vol. II. p. 490. Raine MS. 6. f.79. 4th December, 1832.

brother-in-law of Lord Durham. Barrington was also a Junior Lord of the Admiralty, and Steward of the Bishop of Durham's copyhold manors.¹ Another contender was Mr. David Barclay, the brother-in-law of Sir Hedworth Williamson, and one of the heaviest subscribers to the North Dock scheme, the merits of which he was pledged to advocate, if returned, in the House of Commons.² He was also reputed to be a principal shareholder in the Stockton and Darlington Railway.³

It is not possible to estimate ^{just} how much Alderman Thompson's failure to secure election on this occasion was due to economic reasons. But he found one often repeated charge very difficult to answer; that "..... they (those supporting the Alderman) consist principally of the Marquis of Londonderry's Fitters, wholesale monopolisers, and those who are deeply interested in the Prosperity of Stockton, Hartlepool and Seaham".⁴ If this was accurate the prospect of Thompson's return could hardly have been calculated to excite the imagination of Sunderland men.

For despite the great opulence and social primacy of the Marquis of Londonderry, the patronage of ^{this} Croesus of the North was far from a sure passport to Parliament

1. Raine MS. 6. f. 79.

2. Raine MS. 6. f. 87.

3. Ibid. f. 110. 20th Dec. 1832. "One of You".

4. Ibid. f. 76. 30th November, 1832. "Sunderland" to "The Electors of the Borough of Sunderland." An anonymous pamphlet.

for an aspiring candidate. This must not only be attributed to his Lordship's opinions on Parliamentary Reform. He was also odiously unpopular in many parts of the County for his arrogance, his obsessive predilection for Seaham Harbour and the calculated oblivion into which he would have allowed Sunderland to decay. Thus the nominees he tried to foist upon the Durham voters, particularly on those of the City, were doubly suspect as anti-Reform, and as unlikely to advance the true interests of Sunderland and the Wear, whose swordsman in both fields was 'Radical Jack' Lambton.

For, as in the earlier days when Wear Navigation was much bruited, commercial and political issues were increasingly incapable of divorce. While it is not always exactly obvious/how far the conduct of Durham Members and candidates was actuated by their industrial and commercial commitments, that many of them had such connections to a most intricate degree is undoubted. That they could consistently ignore only with peril their own and their constituents' growing entanglement with and fidelity to local industries is equally incontestable. And when Durham men found a tireless defender of the coal industry and trade they were most loath to let him go. Witness the dismay that smote the ranks of the majority of the freeholders 1801-2 at the prospect of Rowland Burdon retiring from Parliament.

As time went on more complications set in. While

their predecessors of 1680 to 1760 had to choose between protagonism towards the Tyne or Wear, according to the venue and size of their own shares in the North Eastern coal trade, the parliamentary candidates for Durham in the later eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries were subject to other pressures also. For the shipping industry also began to demand a place in the sun; conflicting railway schemes, whether for the glory of Newcastle, Sunderland, Shields or Seaham as coal ports, were mooted; and towns in the south of the county were also savouring the heady wine of industrial prominence.

Unpopular opinions, indiscretions, crass and overt selfishness and self-aggrandisement, and even silence in the face of such cross currents, were blunders likely to project a Durham politician into premature withdrawal from a contest, or carry him into the vortex of defeat itself. But it is hardly conceivable that the ambitious and power seeking Vanes, and the ^{politically} more/lethargic ¹ but nevertheless tough and resilient Lambtons, Tempests and others should not have seen an irresistible attraction in membership of the Commons for its own intrinsic value, and what it could lead to. For a seat at Westminster was an open sesame to so many worlds, political, professional and social. On one's doorstep there was the added prestige of appearing as a tribune of the people

1. This lethargy did not of course afflict W.H. Lambton or his son, Radical Jack.

at race meetings and hunting parties. There was the satisfaction of making contributions to charity, which would be carefully noted, and the seeking of favours, places and patronage, which were the currency of eighteenth century politics.

Surely the verdict of Sir Lewis Namier: '..... what mattered to them (the country gentlemen) was' (more than anything else)'..... the primacy in their own 'country' attested by their being chosen to represent their county or some respectable borough,¹ applies also to Durham squires. Extracts from letters and election papers pronounce that it does. Perhaps the best proof of this is again that anguished period 1760-2, when either the Vanes had to lower their sights, or the Lambtons back out unconditionally from the representation of the City, and the Tempests bow before a most discomfoting situation.

There just is not enough evidence to support any belief or theory that local industrial issues were solely obsessive or even always paramount with Durham candidates and Members. To assert that they were would be to forsake the realm of the concrete for that of the speculative. Rather does the evidence portray that marriage of the normal reasons of the times for going into Parliament with the enticements of coal which makes the political history of Durham so interesting, complex and uncommon.

1. Namier op. cit. p. 4.

CHAPTER 3.EARLY MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT
1675-81.

The first Members of Parliament for the County of Durham, under the enfranchising Act, were returned in 1675, after the Cavalier Parliament had prevented the proposed French Catholic plot from being implemented. The Test Act had been passed, the Cabal dissolved, and the French alliance discarded. Taking as his creed intolerant Anglicanism and royal prerogative, the Earl of Danby, the King's new Minister, had used extensive bribery out of the public revenue, and the bait of office to strengthen the Tory party. At the same time Shaftesbury was basing the Whig party on the doctrines of toleration and parliamentary supremacy. ^{Eventually} Parliament was prorogued from November 1674 until April 1675. ¹

Accordingly, a writ of King Charles II was directed to the Bishop of Durham for two Knights to be chosen, through the free men of the County of Durham, "and the said election may be made distinctly and openly under the Seal of the said County Palatine and the seals of them who were present at such Election. Certify ye unto us in our Chancery of Great Britain without delay remitting to us one part of the aforesaid Indentures ² shewed to those

1. Dr. G.M. Trevelyan, O.M. - England Under the Stuarts. pp. 377-380.

2. The other part of the indentures was to be retained in the Bishop's Chancery at Durham.

present together with this Writ. Witness ourself at Westminster the 20th Day of May in the 27th year of our reign."

The Bishop of Durham then forwarded a separate writ to the Sheriff of Durham. "..... Therefore we command you that you duly execute the tenor of this Writ in all things.... witness Nathaniel Bishop of Durham at Durham on the 7th Day of June in the 27th year of our¹ Reign." Thus was the original writ transmitted as a precept. These extracts illustrate further the individuality of the Palatinate in parliamentary elections.

The three candidates at the election of 1675 were John Tempest of the Isle and of Old Durham, Thomas Vane of Raby Castle, and Sir James Clavering, Bart. They were all representatives of leading Durham families, and their descendants were to be among the principal actors throughout the years as the political history of the County and City unfolded.

Colonel John Tempest, of course, had been an inspired architect in the procurement of parliamentary representation, both during and after his endeavours to outflank the watchfulness of the lofty Cosin. Thomas Vane was the fifth son of the ill-fated Sir Harry Vane the Younger. He married Frances, the daughter of Sir Thomas Liddell, who had defended Newcastle heroically for Charles I.² This was not the only marriage alliance between the two families, for the successor of Sir Thomas Liddell, the

1. Hunter MS. 37. Unfoliated. See p.39 of this work.
 2. Sharp MS. 82. p. 8n. Bean op. cit. p. 122.

first baronet, took a Vane for his consort.¹ The third candidate, Sir James Clavering of Axwell, came from an equally renowned local family. Indeed, in their male line, the Claverings were supposed to be descended from Charlemagne, their surname having been assumed from the hundred of Clavering in Essex. Through his mother Sir James was related to the Shaftos, yet another Durham family for whom, by the middle of the eighteenth century, the past aroused proud memories. He had enjoyed a fleeting glimpse of Westminster as a Member for the County in the second Protectorate Parliament.

The poll took place on June 21st, 22nd and 23rd. In all, 1446 freeholders voted. "Last Monday at Durham began the election for that county, which continued till 9 Wednesday night. Sir J. Clavering, Col. Tempest, and Squire Vane were voted for. The first had 735 votes, the second 1034, and the last 854, whereon Sir Gilbert Gerard, the high sheriff, declared Colonel Tempest and Squire Vane to be fairly and freely elected knights of the shire to the great joy and satisfaction of the people in general."²³ Another letter reaching Sir Joseph Williamson, Principal Secretary of State, at Whitehall, told how "the poll.....

1. At a much later date the Vanes and Liddells were to be bitter political foes.

2. S.P. Dom. Car. II. 371. No 129. 25th June, 1675. Richard Potts to Williamson.

3. Sharp gives the figures as Tempest 1034, Vane 856 and Clavering 747. Sharp MS. 82 p. 8. Fordyce agrees with Sharp.

continued from Monday morning to Wednesday night, and, then, contrary to the expectations of most of the gentry it was Sir J. Clavering's (and the county's) misfortune to have the fewest votes." ¹

Since Thomas Vane was seriously ill with smallpox, his brother, Christopher Vane, had acted as his proxy during the poll. On the night of Thursday the 24th June the younger Vane arrived at Raby Castle with the news of his brother's triumph. This was short lived, as the victor died of the dread disease on Friday morning, the 25th June. According to one report, many said that he had died before the end of the election and the signing of the indenture. ² The same report held that Sir James Clavering had the best interest of the gentry, which tallies with the account contained in the earlier letter to Williamson. But he had been unfairly treated during the poll. Such harshness was said to have merited Mr. Vane's return being disputed by Sir James. It was hoped that this inconvenience could be avoided if the sheriff would make a return for Sir James, on a motion in the House. Thus there would be no need for a new writ. This was where Williamson's

1. S.P. Dom. Car II. 371. No. 128. 25th June, 1675. Anthony Isaacson to Williamson.

2. Ibid. 374. No. 21. 8th October, 1675. Sir James Anderson and William Christian to Williamson. This was undoubtedly the William Christian who contested Durham City in 1678. At this time he was Mayor of Newcastle. Sir James Anderson was a member of the well-known and powerful Newcastle commercial family.

indulgence and assistance were courted,' Sir James being as well qualified both for his Majesty's and country's service as any person whatsoever, and having, as he and we all conclude, a just right of election, he is willing to stand by that and not any other way, to give himself or his friends the trouble of attending or waiting at Committees, if he may not enjoy that kindness and favour really designed him by the country....¹

According to Christopher Sanderson of Egglestone, one of the justices who had advocated enfranchisement in 1666, Sir Robert Eden, soon to be a member for the County, and William Belasyse of Owton were the only local men of consequence who had championed Vane's cause. Vane had, however, been able to depend upon great help from his following within the lordship of Raby, and from Barnard Castle, where most of the voters farmed under his family. He had also been strongly supported by the members of the various sects in the County, who had been favoured by him since he had become a justice in 1674. Sanderson was firmly of the opinion that Christopher Vane could best be checkmated in his bid for his dead brother's seat by being excluded from the Commission of the Peace.² An examination of the lists of justices from 1675 onwards will reveal

¹ P.Dom. Ibid. Sanderson was a prominent Newcastle hostmen, merchant, magistrate, colliery owner and coal dealer. After the Civil War, he compounded for his estates, which included the part ownership of mines on both banks of the Tyne. Nef op. cit. Vol. II. pp. 26 n, 64, 120, 290.
² S.P. Dom. Car.II. 371. No. 142. 23rd July, 1675. Christopher Sanderson to Williamson.

that the attainment of the Commission of the Peace was an important milestone for any man in Durham, as elsewhere, who wished to be a Member of Parliament.

In October of 1675 the House of Commons ordered a writ for a by-election to fill the vacancy left by the death of Thomas Vane. The date of the writ was the 14th October¹. Christopher Vane was then returned unopposed as knight of the shire on 25th October, for there is no evidence of any canvassing or campaigning of any sort on behalf of Clavering or anyone else. Indeed Vane seemed to bask secure in the goodwill of the Bishop and most of the gentry.² Thus, in circumstances of enviable placidity, began the long career of the Vanes as Members of Parliament for Durham.

Meanwhile, at Westminster, Shaftesbury and the new Country Party, weak in parliamentary strength, were urging a dissolution, for they were confident that the constituencies would send them back with increased numbers. Louis XIV, anxious to keep England disabled, as far as foreign adventures were concerned, sympathised actively with the movement for a general election, and sought to promote civil discord by bribing many of the Whig members.

When the Cavalier Parliament met for its last session on 21st October, 1678, the leaders of the Whigs affirmed the definite existence of a popish plot, and led the House

1. Hunter. MS. 37. Unfoliated.

2. S.P. Dom. Car. II. 373. No. 100. 8th September, 1675. William Christian to Williamson.

in debate, in committee work, and in the examination of prisoners, witnesses and documents. The implication of James, Duke of York in the letters of his Secretary, Coleman, gave rise to the first adumbration of Exclusion by Sacheverell. Next was revealed Danby's unwilling complicity, in the secret treaty of March, 1678, with Louis XIV. In January, 1679, Charles dissolved the Cavalier Parliament to save his unfortunate minister, whose impeachment was voted, and whose head was in danger. From the headquarters of the jubilant Whigs, at the Green Ribbon Club, was set on foot a considerable party organisation.¹ But they had nothing to celebrate over the result of the Durham County election.

Sir Robert Eden of West Auckland, Bart., and John Tempest were returned on 24th February, 1679. Eden polled 1338 votes, Tempest 1173, and Christopher Vane 921. So the only change was that Sir Robert Eden displaced Vane, whose eclipse was the more surprising in view of his victory at the earlier by-election.

The Edens had been the proprietors of Windlestone from the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, and had also acquired much property in West Auckland. During the Civil War they had fought on the side of Charles I, after which Sir Robert was created a baronet on the 13th November, 1672, and represented the County in the Parliaments of spring 1679, 1690, 1698, 1702, 1705, 1708

1. Trevelyan op. cit. pp. 380-96.

and 1710. He had married the daughter and heiress of John Lambton, of the City of Durham.¹ Here again is a case typical of many in Durham and other counties, where a wedding had interlinked two proud landed families to the common enhancement of their ranking among their contemporaries.

The defeated candidate, Christopher Vane, petitioned on 26th March, 1679, that he had been duly elected.² He complained of the illegal practices of the Sheriff, Sir Nicholas Conyers, in concert with the Under Sheriff and others, in setting at liberty a great number of Popish recusants. These, who had recently been committed by the Justices of the Peace, had promised to vote for Eden and Tempest. The High Sheriff and Under Sheriff were also said to have countenanced other partial and illegal practices in the manner of polling, including the abuse showered by their bailiffs on several men who were ready to vote for Vane. Many of the latter's party were thus discouraged from voting, while several others, legally entitled to the franchise, were turned away. Also several unqualified people had been allowed to vote for Eden and Tempest.

Vane maintained he had a majority of the lawful votes. Although his demand to be returned was refused,³ his

1. Sharp MS. 82. p. 9n.

2. Sharp MS. 145. pp. 15n. - 16n.

3. Hunter MS. 37. Unfoliated.

petition was referred to the Committee of Privileges and Elections. A committee, on which sat Sir Robert Eden and Mr. Tempest themselves, was also ordered to examine the conduct of the Sheriff. ¹ There were no further developments.

Both Eden and Tempest voted against the first Exclusion Bill, when it was given a third reading in the House of Commons in May, 1679.² On the prompting of a number of his advisers, including Halifax, Charles then prorogued, and in July dissolved the parliament which had assembled after the resounding electoral victory of the Whigs.³

Neither Eden nor Tempest stood at the ensuing poll, so there were two new County Members, William Bowes of Streatlam Castle, of great name, and Thomas Featherstonhaugh of Stanhope Hall, the first and last of his family to set out for Parliament from Durham. They polled 1048 and 979 votes respectively. Their opponents were the persistent Christopher Vane with 803, and Sir Mark Milbanke with 671. Christopher Vane was never again to sit for Durham, although he did serve as Member for Boroughbridge 1688-9. He was undoubtedly pleasing to Charles' successor, for he was sworn a member of the Privy Council to James II, in July 1688, and created Baron Barnard of Barnard Castle, on July 8th,

1. J.H.C. Printed Vol. 9. p. 576. 26th May, 1679. Also p. 594. 12th April, 1679.

2. S.P. Dom. Car. II. 417. No 232 (1) endorsed, in nineteenth Century hand, 'found with 14th June, 1683.'

3. Trevelyan op. cit. p. 406.

1699.¹

Bowes, who had come head of the poll, with Bishop Crewe² ~~assistant~~ was the great-nephew of Sir Talbot Bowes, a former Member of Parliament for Richmond in Yorkshire. Besides being elected in 1679, William Bowes sat in the Parliaments of 1681, 1695, 1702 and 1705. On 13th April, 1684, he was knighted by Charles II, and the following year received the appointment of Master Forester and Chief Warden of all the King's forests and chases in the lordship of Barnard Castle, Teesdale and Marwood.²

The other successful candidate, Thomas Featherstonhaugh, whose family had been seated at Stanhope from the reign of King Stephen,³ was the brother-in-law of that Sir James Clavering, baronet of Axwell, who had been defeated in 1675. The remaining contestant, Sir Mark Milbanke, the son of a former Mayor of Newcastle, had been created a baronet on 7th August, 1661, and High Sheriff⁴ of Northumberland in 1679.

After the rejection of the second Exclusion Bill in the House of Lords on 15th November, 1680, by thirty three votes, Charles prorogued and then dissolved his Whig Parliament.⁵ William Bowes and Thomas Featherstonhaugh were again returned for the County of Durham. Bowes polled 1186, Featherstonhaugh 978, and the unfortunate

1. Sharp MS. 82. pp. 8-9n. Sharp MS. 145 p. 15. n; Bean op. cit. p. 123.

2. Sharp MS. 82. pp. 9,9n; Fordyce op. cit. Vol II. pp. 53-4.

3. Sharp MS. 82 p. 9n.

4. Ibid. pp. 9-10n. Bean op. cit. p. 118.

5. Sir Keith Feiling - A History of the Tory Party 1640-1714. pp. 182-3.

Christopher Vane 681.¹ It is highly possible that the County Members enjoyed more than the blessing of Bishop Crewe, for at morning service at Easington on a Sunday in February, 1681, prior to the poll, Archdeacon Granville exhorted the freeholders among his congregation to vote for Bowes and Featherstonhaugh because of their well affected disposition towards the Church.² So once again the Whigs had failed to make any penetration of Durham County representation. And this was woven into a pattern of which even Cosin would have applauded the tailoring, so consoling must the trend of these early Durham election results have been to the Tory Bishop Cr  we and his clergy. Yet Whig gentlemen were returned in most of the country's constituencies. Almost every member of the Whig majority had pledged himself to accept nothing short of Exclusion. Then came Charles II's masterly move in calling the Houses together at Oxford, where they were dissolved on 28th March, 1681.³

By this time there had been four elections in the City of Durham, of which/^{the}first three were contested. Procedural difficulties and quandaries were resolved in 1678. Accordingly, the Mayor of the City of Durham received the High Sheriff's Precept to elect two citizens to represent the City in Parliament. This was based on

1. Sharp MS. 82. p. 10.

2. Whiting op. cit. quoting Roger Granville - Life of Denis Granville, pp. 243-6.

3. Trevelyan - op. cit. pp. 412-17.

that officer's 'Precept or Writ of Mandamus this day made and awarded by the Lord Bishop of Durham out of the Chancery of Durham, and under the Seal of the County Palatine of Durham, in the like Case used, to me directed, grounded upon his Majesties Writ issued out of his High Court of Chancery of England to the said Lord Bishop directed, bearing Teste of Westminster the first day of March instant.' The Mayor was to 'certify your said Election in due form with this Precept unto me at my (the Sheriff's) office in Durham without delay: That I may return the same into the said High Court of Chancery of England, according to the Exigency of the said Writ..!¹

A proclamation was then issued regarding the election: 'All Persons concerned are to take notice that the Election of two Burgesses for this Present Parliament for this City of Durham is appointed to begin on Wednesday the 27th of March instant between the hours of eight and nine of the Clock in the forenoon at the Toll Booth in the said City, When and where all the Freemen of this City aforesaid are hereby summoned to appear and be present if they please.'² Because of the great number of freemen the franchise was fairly wide by seventeenth and eighteenth century standards.

The result of the poll was: 'Sir Ralph Cole Bart, 408, Sergt. Turner 187, Jo. Parkhurst 379, Will. Tempest 391, W. Christian 171'³

1. Hunter MS. 37. Unfoliated.

2. Ibid.

3. Hunter MS. 37. Unfoliated.

Yet, on 27th March, it was John Parkhurst, Esquire, who was declared elected with Ralph Cole, Baronet.¹ The Indenture of Return² was signed by Nicholas Conyers, Sheriff of the County, John Stokeld, Mayor of Durham, and others, including William Blakiston,³ John Morland,⁴ Aldermen of the City, and Miles Stapleton.⁵

The avoidance of rowdyism and chaos during the proceedings was regarded as imperative. The candidates had agreed to the different companies of the City being called, and polling, in order. The first company in dignity in the Mayor's Book was to lead the way in this procedure. While one Company at a time was appearing in the court to poll, as many members as possible of that Company could register their votes. After each man had thus exercised his right of franchise, he had to depart. As an added precaution, the Wardens of the respective Companies were ordered to attend with their books and rolls of their Companies, so as to certify their members. Bailiffs and officers were to see that these regulations were observed. Only the magistrates and officers, together with the candidates, and their respective clerks, were to be present in the court while voting was

1. Ibid. It was by no means unknown for Returning Officers in those days to pervert election results.

2. Ibid.

3. Returned at Election for the City of Durham, 10th September, 1679.

4. Father of the M.P. for the City 1689-95.

5. Formerly Secretary to Bishop Cosin. Free of the Drapers and Taylors.

proceeding.¹

In all, eight hundred and thirty eight freemen took advantage of the recent enfranchisement of their City. This number was subdivided as follows: 'Mercers and Grocers 53: Drapers and Taylors 94: Skinners and Glovers 89: Tanners 40: Weavers 72: Dyers and Fullers 33: Cordwainers 100: Sadlers 25: Butchers 67: Smiths 43: Carpenters, Joiners and Coopers 78: Masons 62: Goldsmiths 22: Curriers and Chandlers 21: Barbers and Ropers 25: Cutlers 4: Feltmakers 10: Plumbers and Glaziers - ,Potters Painters and Braziers -' ² Thus numerically the City of Durham was one of the largest borough constituencies in the kingdom.

But the diligence and wariness of the Mayor and his officers had failed to prevent irregularities. On the 1st April, 1678, the Mayor declared that he had scrupulously examined the rolls and books of the various Companies. He had also perused the Mayor's Book of all the Freemen. This led him to assert that twenty-seven men, whom he named, neither were, nor ever had been, sworn or admitted Freemen of the City. Yet they had used false votes at the recent poll. A scrutiny of parish registers ~~had~~ proved that a further six electors, of whom only one was a freeman, were below the age of twenty-one, and thus, in the interpretation of the law, were infants. They and three others had either cast their votes several times,

1. Hunter MS. 37. Unfoliated.

2. Sharp MS. 82. p.23. Surtees op. cit. Vol. 4. p. 11.

or different persons of the same names had polled. Of the above twenty-seven, twelve had voted for Tempest, while of the said six, three again had supported Tempest.¹

This was not the only vibration to be felt from the late contest. One of the defeated candidates, William Tempest, petitioned on April 15th, 1678,² against the return of John Parkhurst, who had come third in the poll. Tempest maintained that this was an undue return, and that he, Tempest, had been rightfully elected, having obtained twelve more votes than Parkhurst. He renewed his petition on May 23rd³ and October 21st. of the same year. The outcome of his supplication of May 23rd was that the petition was ordered to be referred to the Committee of Privileges and Elections, which was to make its report to the House of Commons. On October 21st⁴ Tempest made a definite complaint against an undue practice of the Mayor of Durham and the Sheriff of the County of Durham in returning Parkhurst. Again, the petition was sent before the Committee for Privileges and Elections. But it does not appear, from the Journals of the House of Commons, that there was any redress of Tempest's grievances. Perhaps the fact that at least fifteen of his votes were illegal, as has been shown above, counted against him. Such were the doubts and recriminations

1. Hunter MS. Unfoliated. Sharp MS. 82. p. 23n; Sharp MS. 145. p. 32n.

2. Sharp MS. 82. p. 23.n.

3. J.H.C. (Printed) Vol. 9. p. 482.

4. J.H.C. (Printed) Vol. 9. p. 517.

which lingered in the wake of the first full and official City election.

John Parkhurst of Catesby, in the County of Northampton, was the son of Sir Robert Parkhurst, Member for Guildford, 1625-49, and was Steward to Lord Crewe, Bishop of Durham, who, however, dismissed him for voting in favour of the first Exclusion Bill in May, 1679.¹ His candidacy for the City had been mooted as early as 1676. 'Another grett secret I will impart to you. Supposeing my Lord Roscommon² should wave standing for Durham, and my Lord recommend Mr. Parkhurst, who has some invitations to stand, pray give me your opinion if you think he may carry it for one, upon my Lord's interest: ... who you think the fittest persons to make application to and to ingage in effecting this, and who are the foreward and leading men among the Comons. You are so knowing in this affair, as you are able to give a great help to the management of this;.....'⁴ Thus was addressed Miles Stapleton, the Bishop's Secretary, in a letter which indicates graphically the steps which often had to be taken in those days to ensure the return of a candidate.

Although this was the first and only time that

1. Sharp MS. 82. pp. 22n-23n. This may be why Parkhurst did not sit again for Durham.
 2. The nephew of Strafford, he was Master of Horse to the Duchess of York. D.N.B. Vol. 15. pp. 87-8.
 3. Presumably the Bishop of Durham.
 4. D. & C. Library MS. quoted in Sharp MS. 145 p. 32n. 15th February, 1675-6. E. Arden to Miles Stapleton. Arden was also a Secretary to the Bishop of Durham --- Whiting - op. cit. pp. 96, 122.

Parkhurst represented the City of Durham, he was a Member for Northamptonshire in four later Parliaments. He had been made Constable of Durham Castle for life in October, 1676, but surrendered this office in July, 1684. His second son was Temporal Chancellor of the diocese from 1719 to 1764.¹ Parkhurst's was by no means the only instance of a servant of the Palatinate becoming a Durham member.

Parkhurst's aggrieved opponent was the son of Colonel John Tempest of Old Durham, then Member for the County, and the grandson of Sir Thomas Tempest. A captain in the army, he had married the niece of Dean Sudbury of Durham. His expenses, at the election of February, 1679, were stated as £239. 11. 5d. Deeply engaged in the Tory interest, he was suspected, after 1688, of plotting in favour of the exiled Stuarts. In March, 1695, some messengers came to arrest him. Tempest, however, was too ill to be moved from his house at Old Durham, and bail was applied ^{for} on his behalf.² He died in 1699, without, apparently, undergoing any punishment or suffering for his alleged entwinement with the Jacobites.³

Sir Ralph Cole, who had headed the poll, was the son of Sir Nicholas Cole, the first baronet of Brancepeth, and the grandson of the Newcastle merchant who had bought

1. Sharp MS. 82. pp. 22n. - 23n; Returns of Members of Parliament.

2. Sharp MS. 82. p. 23n. Mr. Cuthbert Bowes to Dr. Adams, prebendary of Durham, 19th March, 1695; Bean op. cit. p. 156.

3. Sharp MS. 82. p. 23n.

Brancepeth Castle in 1633. His family had risen literally from the smithy to the baronetage. He himself was free of the Guild of the Smiths within the City of Durham, and in 1685 commanded the Durham Regiment of Militia. In 1671 he conveyed the mines of Cocken colliery to Ralph Carr, son-in-law of Sir William Blakiston of Gibside, and, in 1701, in consideration of £16,000, with an annuity of £500 for life, and £200 to his wife, for her life, if she survived him, he conveyed the castle and estates of Brancepeth to Sir Henry Belasyse.¹ The latter was the son of Sir Richard Belasyse, of Ludworth, and afterwards Member of Parliament ^{for} the City of Durham in four parliaments, three of which were successive. Sir Ralph Cole died in 1704, in circumstances of increasing poverty, having probably impaired his fortune by maintaining Italian painters in his house.² His grandchildren possessed neither land nor money.

Of the two remaining participants in that election, J. Turner of Kirkleatham was a serjeant-at-law, and sometime Recorder of the City of Durham, while William Christian was a lawyer practising in the County. He became free of the Drapers' Company in the City of Durham, on 29th May, 1673,³ and in 1675 was made Sheriff of Newcastle.⁴

1. Fordyce - op. cit. vol.I. p. 431.

2. Sharp MS. 82. p.22n.

3. Ibid. p.23n.

4. C.E. Whiting - The Bishopric of Durham in the Days of Bishop Crew. D.U.J. June, 1938. p. 457.

The three subsequent elections in the City of Durham appear to have been comparatively uneventful. On 20th February, 1679, William Tempest and Sir Ralph Cole were returned to the first Whig Parliament. They polled 571 and 515 votes, respectively, against William Blakiston's 436. The last named gentleman was the son of William Blakiston, of Newton, near Durham, and was descended from the ancient family of Blakiston, of Blakiston. He had been a colonel in the army, and was mayor of the City of Durham in 1678. He was Vice-Admiral of the County of Durham, by patent from Bishop Cosin, and represented the City of Durham in the second Whig Parliament on 10th September, 1679.¹

On the latter occasion his fellow member was Sir Richard Lloyd, who, in 1674, had been made Advocate of the Court of Admiralty, of which he became a judge in 1685. As Spiritual Chancellor to Bishop Crewe from the end of 1675, he was knighted in January, 1676. In September, 1684 he was appointed an official of the Arches Court, and, in the same year, Dean of that Court. He was to represent the City of Durham in the parliaments of 1681 and 1685.²

There are a number of points worthy of particular notice over this City Election of September, 1679. First, it was the hardest fought contest yet held in

1. Sharp MS. 82. p. 24n. Sharp MS. 145. p. 33n; Bean op. cit. p. 147.

2. Sharp MS. 82 p. 24n; Sharp MS. 145. p. 34n.; Bean op. cit. p. 152.

either City or County, for while Blakiston obtained 514 votes, and Sir Richard Lloyd 506, William Tempest, with 504 votes, was a decidedly strong candidate.¹ Second, the Bishop of Durham, Nathaniel, Lord Crewe, having been admitted into the Company of Mercers on 16th October, 1676, is supposed to have voted for Blakiston and Tempest,² and not for Lloyd.³ The only change in the representation of the City in the election of 10th February, 1681 was the return of William Tempest, in place of William Blakiston, without a poll.⁴ No doubt the choice of such an affirmed Tory was pleasing to Bishop Crewe, with whose political opinions most of the early Durham Members agreed. Parkhurst had been an exception, but his heresy over Exclusion had been extirpated.

Eleven men had thus represented the City and County of Durham between 1675 and 1681. Of these, Blakiston, Lloyd, and Parkhurst had been important Palatinate officials, a most significant fact. Cole and ^{local} Featherstonhaugh were from landed families, as, indeed, was Blakiston. But Cole's fortunes were found to be resting on unsubstantial ground. As a harbinger of what

-
1. Sharp MS. 82 p. 24; Prior's Kitchen. Raine MS. 5. No. 81. Poll Book, City 1679.
 2. Sharp MS. 145. p. 34n.
 3. Yet Lloyd is held to have enjoyed his favour. S.P. Dom. Car. II. Entry Book 64. p. 108.
 4. Sharp MS. 82. p. 24.

was to come, the Tempests and Vanes had provided two Members each. Of the other houses which were to be so outstanding in Durham's parliamentary history, the Bowes and the Edens were honoured by one representative each in these early years.

The elections had largely been fought between scions of leading families of the County. Those returned were to hand on traditions of membership of Parliament to succeeding generations. And, of course, they intermarried, quarrelled and coalesced among themselves, and with others of gentlemanly lineage, thus forming a society that was intimate and not easy to enter. Nor was there yet any blemish to sully the canvas of harmony and calm that prevailed politically between cleric and squire at Durham. Crewe might not have exercised an absolute say over electoral nominations, but three of his officials had been sent to Westminster, two of them, Lloyd and Blakiston, to the same Parliament for the same constituency. Durham had been kept safe for Church and King, when other parts of the country had been submerged by the tide of Exclusionist Whiggism. Moreover, examples have been noted of the Bishop's inclination towards certain candidates preceding or coinciding with their enjoyment of the confidence of the electors.

CHAPTER 4.THE STATE OF DURHAM POLITICS 1680-1760.

In Durham, from 1680-1760, as in the preceding years, most of the knights of the shire, and the parliamentary representatives of the city, were sons of landed families, which had a strongly entrenched stake in the trade, commerce and industry of the North of England. An examination of the political peregrinations of the Bowes, Edens, Lambtons, Tempests, Vanes and Liddells until 1760 will show how near they came to monopolising the four Durham seats.

Of the Bowes, William later Sir William, represented the County of Durham from 1679 to 1685, and again from 1702 until 1707. His son, the powerful and influential George Bowes, was a member for the County from 1727 until his death in 1760, and was undoubtedly one of the most captivating personalities in eighteenth century Durham. He was Chairman of the Grand Jury in the years 1730, 1736, 1741, 1747, 1750, 1753, and 1757, and an active magistrate. His exertions in the crisis of 1745 were exemplary. Having at that time raised a considerable force, he was appointed in September, 1745, a Deputy Lieutenant of the County, and a Captain of the First Troop of Horse Militia. In the following month he was promoted to the rank of Colonel of the Armed Association.

In his younger days he had stood as a parliamentary

candidate for Berwick-on-Tweed. He was also an Alderman of Durham, having been Mayor of that City in 1739. At the time of his death in 1760 one of the County seats had been held by a Bowes for forty four out of the previous eighty years, of which thirty three were consecutive.¹

One of his father's colleagues, Sir Robert Eden,² who had been elected for the County of Durham to the first Whig Parliament, was again returned for the same constituency in 1690, 1698 and in 1702. From this last year he sat until his retirement in 1713. Then his eldest son took over, without having to submit himself to a contest. Sir John Eden, as the latter became on the death of the first baronet in March, 1720, remained a Member for the County of Durham until 1721. He married Catherine, the only daughter of Mark Shafto, Sheriff of Durham. "It is related of him," wrote Sir Cuthbert Sharp, "that on some project for equalising the land-tax which was brought before Parliament, he placed a brown loaf and a pair of wooden clogs on the table, saying, 'There - when the South eats and wears what we do in the North, then make us like and like'..." He died in 1728, ~~one~~ year after he had ceased to be a Member of Parliament.³

-
1. Sharp MS. 82. p. 14n.; Bean op. cit. p. 113.
 2. Sharp MS. 82. p. 9n.
 3. Sharp MS. 82. p. 13n.

William, who had followed William Blakiston and Charles Montagu as the Bishop's Vice-admiral, was the first from the Lambtons. to represent either County or City. His family has been traced as being seated at Lambton in County Durham from the end of the twelfth century, but other evidence, such as attestations of charters, proves a residence commencing almost with the coming of the Normans.¹

William Lambton, grandson of that Sir William who had fallen for Charles I at Marston Moor, was a Member of four parliaments from 1685 until 1698, when, in the County Election, he came bottom of the poll to Sir Robert Eden and Lionel Vane. His rejection was of short standing, for he was returned for the County to both parliaments of 1701, after which he did not represent that constituency again until 1710-13. The reason for this long period in the wings is not known.² Of him Sir Cuthbert Sharp has told the following tale:³ "Once on the meeting of a new Parliament, the door-keeper seeing him (Wm. Lambton) dressed in a plain grey home-spun coat, made of the wool of his own sheep, and thick shoes, would not admit him farther than the lobby, where he sat quietly enough until a friend in a finer coat came up, who remonstrated with the door-keeper on his shutting out one of the most honourable and respectable Members of the House of Commons. The door-keeper changed his tune,

1. Surtees - op. cit. Vol II. p. 170. pp. 174-5.
 2. Sharp MS. 82. p. 10n.
 3. Sir C. Sharp - Hartlepool p. 81, quoted in Sharp MS. 145 p. 20.

and hoped his honour would give him something as a remembrance. Up started Will, more vexed at the fellow's servility than at his former rudeness, and gave him a hearty box on the ear saying, "there's a god's-penny for thee; I think thou'lt ken auld Will Lambton again."

The nephew of this William Lambton was the pioneer of his family's long and distinguished tenure ~~one~~ of the City seats. This was Henry Lambton, the bustling coal-owner and ~~and the son of that Ralph Lambton~~ Wear leader, who had married the daughter and co-heiress of John Hedworth of Harraton. Henry Lambton emerged from the election of 1729 as the defeated candidate for the City of Durham. He then lodged a petition against certain proceedings at that election, which will be considered more fully later. In 1734 he was duly elected for the City, which he represented until his death in 1760:¹ Between 1680 and 1760, his career as a Member of the City and County of Durham was only outdistanced in time by that of George Bowes.

Any scrutiny of the records will reveal that the name of Tempest was inseparable from that of Lambton for decades in the history of the representation of the City.² William Tempest was returned for the City of Durham without a poll in 1681, and again in 1690. His son, John Tempest of Old Durham, replaced Sir William Bowes in

1. Sharp MS. 82. p. 31.

2. See appendices A and B.

in 1707 as Member for the County of Durham until 1708. When a vacancy was created for the City of Durham in 1742, by the death of John Shafto, the son and namesake of this John Tempest was elected, and undertook a stewardship which remained unbroken until 1768.¹

One of the County seats had, by 1760, been made almost a family concern - in this instance by the Vanes. Lionel Vane, grandson of Sir Henry Vane, senior, Secretary of State to Charles I, was one of the Members for the County from 1698 until 1702.² Then in 1708 the Honourable William Vane was returned for the same constituency. He was the second surviving son of Christopher Vane, the first Lord Barnard. He did not sit for Durham after 1710, but in 1720 was created Viscount Duncannon, and, later that year, Viscount Vane and Baron Duncannon, all in the Peerage of Ireland. A disappointed candidate at the Durham County Election of 1722, he was a Member for Steyning from 1727 until 1734, dying three days after his return for the County of Kent in that year.³

The year 1747 was the first time since 1708 that a Vane was once more declared one of the County members. The Honourable Henry Vane, nephew of the above Viscount Vane, and eldest son of the second Lord Barnard,⁴ was

Sharp MS. 182. pp. 31n., 35n.

2. Sharp MS. 82. p. 11n.

3. Ibid. p. 12n, Bean op. cit. p. 123.

4. Gilbert Lord Barnard was a Privy Councillor, Lord of the Treasury, Lord Lieutenant and Vice-Admiral of the County of Durham.

elected for the County of Durham on 1st July, 1747.¹ He had already gained political experience in other parts of the country. Having married Grace, the daughter of the Duke of Cleveland, he had been Member for Launceston in 1726, for St Mawes from 1727 to 1741, and for Ripon in 1741, ^{before} embarking on his parliamentary career in Durham. Moreover, he was by 1747 well established in government service, for he had, in June, 1742, been appointed Vice-Treasurer, and Receiver-General and Paymaster of all the Kings' Revenues in Ireland. To what heights might his family not soar in Durham and London, if to the fascination of national office and the pride of name were added electoral manipulation lubricated by drive and ambition?

On Vane's accepting the office of a Lord of the Treasury, a new writ was issued on 21st April, 1749,² but on the 3rd May that same year, he was again elected for the County of Durham. Meanwhile, in February, 1748, Lord Barnard had been admitted a Freeman of the City of Durham in the Taylors' Company, and the way was thus paved for all his sons to become free of the City of Durham by patrimony.³ Two years later the Honourable Henry Vane was made Lieutenant and Vice-Admiral of the County of Durham, offices held previously held by his father.

1. Sharp MS. 82. p. 15.; Bean op. cit. p. 123.

2. P.R.O. Dur. 3/149.f.38. Sharp MS. 82. p.15.

3. Baker-Baker Papers - Memorable Events 1746-75.

Nor was it long before he followed the elder Vane to the House of Lords, for, on the death of the latter, his heir became Baron Barnard on 27th April, 1753. Within a month his eldest son, also the Honourable Henry Vane, found himself, on 19th May, a Member for the county of Durham,¹ with apparently no hint of any challenge or opposition. The star of the Vanes was in the political ascendant, and still scintillating, for in December, 1755, Lord Barnard, already a Privy Counsellor, became Joint Pay-Master of the forces (in December, 1755) and also Colonel of the Durham Militia. That he was far from relinquishing his hold on local affairs is corroborated by his having accepted, two months earlier,² the mayoralty of Durham.

This younger Vane's array of offices and practical acquaintance with public life were little less impressive. A company commander in the Coldstream Guards, he had been Member of Parliament for Downton from 1749 to 1753, and Mayor of Durham in 1753. After the elevation of the head of the Vanes to the Earldom of Darlington on ~~5th~~ April, 1754, his son, having been returned again for the County, with George Bowes, three weeks later, remained in the House of Commons as Henry Lord Viscount Barnard until 1758. On 6th May¹ of that year he succeeded his father as Earl, and as Lord Lieutenant and Vice-Admiral of the County, which were becoming family heirlooms. He was

1. Sharp MS. 82. p. 15. Dur. 3/149. ff. 35-6.

2. Sharp MS. 82. p. 15n; Bean op. cit. p. 123.

appointed Master of the Jewel Office in June, 1763, and Governor of Carlisle Castle in August of that year. The confidant of the Duke of Newcastle, and the keen¹ agriculturalist, who was praised by Arthur Young, was not, however, content to laze in the splendour of what local pre-eminence was conferred by his 'inheritance' from his father of the Colonelcy of the Durham Militia and the other offices already noted.

In his place as Member for the County, there was returned, on 22nd March, his younger brother the Honourable Raby Vane.² Thus, for a further while, the family grasp of one of the County seats was maintained. By marriage,³ and contacts arising out of the positions held by the Lords Darlington over sixteen eventful years, valuable political connections were forged with national figures whom the second Earl was to call on for assistance in his unsparing bid to seize parliamentary control of Durham. Here alliance with the Whig bishop of the day might be decisive.

The final family to be mentioned as a nursery of parliamentary representatives is that of the Liddells. Henry Liddell, who was elected as a Member for the City of Durham to the Convention Parliament of 1689, was the

-
1. Sharp MS. 82 p. 15n.; Bean op. cit. p. 123.
 2. Dur. 3/149 ff. 30-1; Sharp MS. 82 p. 15 n.
 3. In 1757 the second Earl had married the sister of Sir James Lowther.

great grandson of ~~the~~ the first baronet of Ravensworth, the doughty defender of Newcastle. He was also the eldest son of Sir Thomas Liddell, whom he followed as third baronet. In 1721 he was made High Sheriff of Durham, having sat in Parliament for the City again from 1695 until 1698. Later he was a Member for Newcastle from 1700 until 1705, and again from 1705 until 1710.¹

His eldest son, Thomas, in 1707 married Jane, daughter of James Clavering, of Greencroft. This was the origin of the alliance of the two families which was to flourish later in the eighteenth century. Although no other Liddell became a Durham Member for either constituency, the eldest son of the above Thomas Liddell was, as Sir Henry Liddell, the fourth baronet, elevated to the peerage in 1747 as Baron Ravensworth of Ravensworth Castle, and was a political power to be reckoned with in Durham. He was a senior partner in the Grand Alliance, and, as the inveterate foe of the second Lord Darlington, he had no small effect upon the political fortunes of his County.²

So between 1680 and 1760 a Bowes was a representative for the county for approximately fifty two years, while an Eden held a county seat for forty two years, although in neither case are the numbers of years quoted

1. Fordyce op. cit. Vol. II. p. 643; Surtees op. cit. Vol. II. p. 213; Sharp MS. 82 p. 25n.; Bean op. cit. p. 152.
 2. Fordyce - op. cit. Vol. II. p. 643.

consecutive. Although no Liddell was returned for the County during this period, a member of that house sat for the City for six years, four of which were continuous.¹ Yet, however much custom may have apparently blended with social duty in the casting of votes for ^{or} in the unopposed return of men with such familiar names, neither alternative became automatic or a prescriptive right of these houses.

There was also John Hedworth, of Chester Deanery, the great grandson of that John Hedworth, of Chester Deanery, who was the third son of John Hedworth of Harraton, by Jane Belasyse. As the last in the male line of his family, John Hedworth was remarkable, if only because of his long service as a Member for the County of Durham from 1713 until his death in 1747. He was related to some notable Durham families; ² once again mingling of the blood gave rise to wider political opportunities. His mother was the daughter of Henry Lambton, of Lambton, while one of his sisters was the wife of Cuthbert, the son of George Morland, of Windlestone, Member for the City 1689-95. Finally, Hedworth's elder daughter married Sir Richard Hylton, of Hylton, Baronet, and the younger Sir Ralph Milbanke,

1. Sharp MS. 82, 145.

2. Surtées op. cit. Vol. II. p. 151.

Baronet, father of the candidate for the County in 1774.^{1 2}

Members of these families took a conspicuous part in local administration and government. In addition to the Vanes of Raby acting as Lord Lieutenants, Sir Henry Liddell, Sir Robert Eden, Baronets, Sir William Bowes, and William Lambton were among the Deputy Lieutenants of the County of Durham. Again, the names of Sir William Bowes, George Bowes, Sir Robert Eden, William Lambton, Henry Lambton, John Tempest, Henry Vane, junior (later the second Earl of Darlington), and John Hedworth, appear frequently on the lists of the Grand Juries.³ In those days the gap between the Commission of the Peace and Membership of the Commons was often easily negotiated, and the attainment of the one regarded as a fitting and natural preliminary to the accomplishment of the other.

But much of the effectiveness of the work of the Justices of the Peace, and of the Members of Parliament, continued to depend on whether they were on good terms with the Bishop of Durham. For that prelate still chose the Sheriff and the Chairman of the Quarter Sessions. Moreover, many Members and their kith and kin had been Palatinate officials. Indeed few could afford to ignore the Bishop of the day.

1. Sharp MS. 82. p. 13n.

2. Surtees op. cit. Vol. II. p. 151; Fordyce op. cit. Vol. II. p. 608.

3. Sharp MSS. 61-61A. All mentioned in this paragraph were Members of Parliament at one time or another.

William, later Sir William Bowes, was well aware of this. His brother John was a prebendary of Durham Cathedral, while another brother George was Solicitor-General to Bishop Crewe, and Recorder of the City of Durham.¹ On 29th September, 1683, during the so called Tory Reaction, Secretary Jenkins² wrote to Bishop Crewe, asking him 'to prevent unreasonable expectations' among certain of the Durham gentry of their getting seats in the events of a new Parliament being called. Jenkins went on to commend the Bishop for his 'zeal for His Majesty's Service', and for giving his 'countenance and protection' on previous occasions to Sir Richard Lloyd and Mrs. William Bowes.³ The Secretary of State hoped that these two gentlemen, worthy friends of his, would continue to merit the Bishop's support.⁴ For the Government of this time, and those of later days, quite definitely expected a bishop to assume a leading role in local politics.⁵ No Bishop of Durham, mindful of the past, would have wished otherwise. Usually his episcopal influence was seconded, and sometimes detracted from by the views and exertions of an outspoken Dean and

1. Fordyce op.cit. Vol. II. p. 54.

2. Bowes had one time served abroad under Sir Leoline Jenkins, Secretary of State.

3. Returned Summer, 1679 and 1681 for City and County respectively.

4. S.P. Dom. Car II. Entry Book 64. p. 108.

5. Crewe, however, never again enjoyed the confidence of the Government after his attachment to James II in 1688.

Chapter.

On this occasion Bowes had apparently written earlier to Secretary Jenkins, asking him to intervene on his behalf with the Bishop, which Jenkins had promised to do. But Bowes was not returned in 1685, although Bishop Crewe had written from Covent Garden in February, 1684, recommending Bowes and Sir Robert Eden to the High Sheriff.¹

Very often to be an undoubted churchman was to have impeccable credentials in the opinion of the majority of a Durham electorate. This was certainly the case when two such candidates, William Tempest and George Morland, were standing,² for they were both returned without a poll on 3rd March, 1690.³ Also, the cry of the Church in Danger was a particularly strong Anglican battle cry in Durham. This is illustrated by an instance in the career of Sir Henry Belasyse, who had been a Member for the City of Durham from 1701 until 1708, and came from one of the Palatinate's most ancient families. The son of Sir Richard Belasyse, of Ludworth and Owton, and of Margaret, daughter of Sir William Lambton, he was a Lieutenant General in the British Army in Flanders, and was knighted by William III. He was Governor and Mayor of Galway in 1691, Governor of Berwick-on-Tweed,

1. Sharp MS. 82. p. 10. Inset.

2. Hunter MS. 12. f.133.

3. Sharp MS. 82. p. 26.

and Member of Parliament for Morpeth from 1695 until 1701. As Colonel of the Second Regiment of Foot he had helped to capture Vigo in 1702. Returned again for the City of Durham in 1710, he was made Commissioner, in 1712, for inquiring into the state of forces in Spain and Portugal. As such he was required to examine the payments to these forces, and to the garrisons of Gibraltar and Port Mahon.¹

Sir Henry had written from Brancepeth Castle on 20th August, 1710, to Harley, the head of the new Administration, about '... the great joy with which the county received the news of your being head of the new Ministry.... they will pay their taxes cheerfully, since they now think their Church out of danger.' (The Toryism of their Bishop was again reflected in what was becoming to the men of Durham an almost endemic antipathy to the Whigs.)

'I hope our four representatives for the next election will be of one mind, Sir Robert Eden and old Mr. Lambton will be for the County, Tom Conyers and I have joined for the city in order to throw out Nicholson,...' ² who was a Member for the City of Durham 1708-10.³

Thomas Conyers was a Member for the City of Durham from 1698 to 1701, and from 1702 until 1727. He was the

1. Sharp MS. 82. p. 27n. Bean op. cit. pp. 146-7.
 2. H.M.C. Portland MS. No. 29. Vol. IV. p. 570.
 3. Sharp MS. 82. pp. 27n.-8n.

father-in-law of George Baker, also a City representative from 1713 until 1722.¹ On 25th August, 1710, Conyers also wrote to Harley "... the Church has joined Sir H. Bellasis to me, and I hope I shall bring him in though Nicholson² spends very high. Sir H. begins to bleed (presumably spend) very freely, if he had begun sooner it would have been much better. We shall have Sir R. Eden and Honest William Lambton, I hope without opposition....."³

Unfortunately neither letter reveals exact details of help afforded by the Bishop and Dean and Chapter of Durham, but there were returned 'four members of one mind' - Conyers and Belasyse for the City, and Eden and Lambton for the County, all of whom agreed politically with the new Government and with the clerical powers at Durham. Throughout the country emerged a large Tory majority. As Feiling stated, 'the major (key) was "hussas for the Queen, Church prosperity, and success to the new faithful ministry," and "a violent torrent against everything that did smell of low Church."⁴

On other occasions the identity of the candidates was even more satisfying to the Bishop. One of Crewe's nephews, the Honourable C. Montague, son of the first Earl of Sandwich, and part of the formidable Montague-

1. Ibid. p. 26n.

2. Almost certainly a Whig.

3. H.M.C. Portland MS. No. 29. Vol. IV. p. 575.

4. Feiling op. cit. p. 423.

Wortley coal combination, was a Member of Parliament for the City of Durham. from 1685 until 1689, and again from 1695 to 1702. He was also the brother of John Montague, Dean of Durham, and had been made Vice-Admiral of Durham County, by patents from Bishop Cosin. In July, 1684, he became Constable of Durham Castle, but afterwards reigned in favour of his son. Later he was High Sheriff of the County from March, 1686 to 1709. Yet another Palatinate office fell to his lot in the following year, 1687, when on 19th November he was made Spiritual Chancellor of the diocese. Thus blood relationship was not his only link with the Bishop.¹ But his eldest son, who had been a Member for Chippenham in 1708, and for Camelford in 1714, found his wooing of the City of Durham in the election of 1722 unrequited.²

Lord Crewe, who had been under a cloud since he had associated himself with Jacobitism, died in 1722. To Durham in his stead came a typical Whig prelate,³ William Talbot, who had powerful friends and patrons. Among these was his relative, the Earl of Shrewsbury, a veteran of the Revolution Settlement, who had done yeoman service in government for both William III and Anne, and helped

1. Sharp MS. 82. p.25n; Bean op. cit. p. 154.

2. Ibid p.30n. Ibid.

3. Typical not least in the sense of his defence of the Church establishment as an essential feature of the Revolution Settlement. Sykes - Church and State in England in the XVIIIth Century p. 46.

frustrate Bolingbroke and the Old Pretender in 1713. Within a year of Bishop Talbot's translation from Salisbury his own son was returned for the City of Durham. The younger Talbot had been made Solicitor-General to the Prince of Wales, in May, 1717. In April, 1726, he was appointed Solicitor-General to the King, and remained in this position until November, 1733, when he was elevated as Lord High Chancellor, and created Baron Talbot of Hensol, in Glamorganshire. He had been a Member of Parliament for Tregony in 1720, and continued as a burgess for the City of Durham from 1722 until 1733, when his ascent to the woolsack caused the issue of a new writ.¹ He was one of the most illustrious of all Durham Members.

The true electoral power of the Bishop and Dean and Chapter, strengthened by the advent of the energetic Talbot, was demonstrated in the County Election of 1727. This year helped to set the seal to the Whig supremacy under Walpole, and it was notable in Durham for the political introduction of George Bowes.² The previous election for the County in 1722 had resulted in the return for the third time in succession of Sir John Eden and John Hedworth, both of whom had, in the previous parliament, usually voted with Walpole in his opposition to the Ministry. William Lord Viscount Vane and Ralph

1. Sharp MS. 82. pp. 29-30.; Bean op. cit. p. 156.

2. Dur. 3/149. ff. 51-52.

Robinson were the defeated candidates.¹

On 20th June, 1727, Lady Bowes, from Gibside, wrote an urgent letter to her son: '..... everyone is in a mist to know whether you and Hedworth joined or not..... Mr. Bellasy's servants riding all up to town makeing Interest for Hedworth... a Great Inquiry is made on all hands to know whether or not you have the Bishops' and the Deans' Interest for all the Chapter tenants refuse to do anything either the one way or the other till they certainly know which way the Dean gives his Interest.²... Just now there is a poor silly man come from Durham who tells me that there were people going abt. Durham for Eden and Hedworth but not one word of any going abt. for you.....'³ Yet Hedworth, for his part, told his kinsman, Henry Lambton, that 'Mr. Bowes has not left one corner of the county unattempted already, and has affected to give out that I would not stand.....'⁴

On 4th July, 1727, the Bishop of Durham himself wrote to Bowes: 'The divisions in the County of Durham on occasion of the ensuing election have given much uneasiness to my Ld. Scarborough⁵ and myself.....'

1. Sharp MS. 82. p. 13 and n.

2. My italics.

3. Add MS. 40748 (Bowes MS.) ff.23-4. quoted in Hughes op. cit. p. 261.

4. Sharp MS. 82. p. 14 n.

5. This was Richard, the second Earl. He had been Member for East Grinstead and Arundel in turn, in the reign of Queen Anne.

if you will secure Mr. Vane¹ to be elected at Morpeth, we will undertake he shall desist from Durham, and the whole Barnard interest shall be for you and Mr. Hedworth, wch. joyned with my Lord Scarborough and mine must put a stop to any other opposition.² By this method the county will be quieted, the true interest preferr'd, your election will be sure, and you will save a great deal of expence, whereas if the contest goes on, the expence will be certain, and the success may be very doubtfull keep this thing secret as we shall doe here.'³ Such financial considerations were strong reasons why eighteenth century politicians were so eager 'not to disturb the peace of the county.'

On 18th July, 1727, Dr. Exton Sayers, Secretary to Bishop Talbot, imparted to Bowes the welcome news that.... Mr Vane at last desists and has promised to send orders by this post to make the family Interest for you and Mr. Hedworth jointly: the Bishop of Durham and Lord Scarborough desire me to make you their Compliments and to let you know that their orders are the Laws......'⁴ Sayers explained that Bowes had been introduced gradually to the County in such a way as to 'securing that 5 unanimity which could not otherwise have been obtained,' Bowes received further assurances of an easy passage from

1. Probably either Lord William Vane, second son of the first Lord Barnard, or Mr. George Vane of Long Newton, son of Lionel Vane, Member for the County 1698-1702.

2. My italics.

3. Add. M. S. 40748 (Bowes MS.) f. 28.

4. My Italics.

5. Add. MS. 40748 (Bowes MS.) f. 31.

Lord Barnard, through his agent, Mr. Coles. ^{1 2} Eden had
apparently withdrawn. The Bishop's ^{towards him} enmity³ had probably
been too difficult a hurdle to clear.

There could be no doubt of the growing political sway
of the Vanes. This can be traced from 17th August, 1698,
at the latest, when the first Lord Barnard, formerly
Christopher Vane, had stated his readiness to support Sir
William Bowes in any Durham election in which a Vane was
not standing.⁴ Sir William later notified Lord Barnard
of the course of the 1698 contest, in which the
triumphant parties were those blessed with the Vane
interest.⁵ They were Sir Robert Eden, and Lionel Vane
of Long Newton, whose father was the second son of Sir
Henry Vane the Elder.

Moreover, the Barnard ^{'interest'} was only ranged behind
Bowes in 1727, after ample solicitude had been expressed
for the political safety of Lord William Vane, who then
transferred his affections to the constituency of Steyning
in Sussex. On 27th July, 1727, he wrote to George Bowes,
wishing him complete victory at Durham. He was pleased
with reports of the progress of Bowes, 'especially if
my poor assistance has contributed anything towards it...
Your being pleas'd to say you will not joyn Mr.
Hedworth without my consent is exceedingly honourable,

1. Add. MS. 40748. (Bowes MS.) f. 31.

2. This was Gilbert, Lord Barnard, son of the former
Christopher Vane, who was made the first Lord Barnard.

3. See later in this chapter.

4. Add. MS. 40747 (Bowes MS.) f. 37.

5. Sharp MS. 82. Inset p. 11.

and obliging, and tho' for the credite of your Election, I could wish itt might be carried without a conjunction, yet rather than you should be in the least hazarded, I heartily consent to itt, and I hope my Cou. Vane to whom I propose to write tonight, will do the same.... It is probable that 'my Cou. Vane' was Mr. George Vane of Long Newton, son of Lionel Vane, Member for the County 1698-1702.

Bowes and Hedworth were returned without opposition on 23rd. ²August, 1727. Lord Vane, too, was successful in Steyning. It had been originally intended that Vane should sit at Morpeth, thus making way for Bowes in the County of Durham.³ However, Mr. Robinson, later Sir Thomas, the Governor of Barbados, wished to stand for this Northumberland town, but he was ready to waive his pretensions, when he saw how Bowes was placed. His generosity and eagerness to help Bowes impressed the Bishop of Durham, and, with Vane's installation at Steyning assured, Robinson was returned for Morpeth with ⁴Government aid.

However the Members of Parliament for the City and County of Durham were not always compliant with the whims and behests of their particular bishop. For example, in 1728 George Bowes aroused the resentment of Bishop Talbot

1. Sharp MS. 82. p. 14.

2. Add. MS. 40748 (Bowes MS.) 18th July, 1727. f. 31.

3. Sharp MS. 82. p. 14.

4. Add. MS. 40748 (Bowes MS.) 4th July, 1727. f. 28.

5. The Bishop of Durham to George Bowes.
Ibid. 18th July, 1727. f. 31. Dr Exton Sayers to George Bowes.

by opposing the appointment of one of the Bishop's nominees to the aldermanic bench of the City of Durham.¹ Nor could the Bishop of Durham ~~always~~ ride unchallenged over the wishes and rights of the freeholders.

Bishop Talbot encountered strong and organised local opposition when he tried to achieve unrestricted freedom for his fellow bishops and himself over the granting of leases. Statutes of Henry VIII and Elizabeth debarred bishops from granting leases for a term longer than twenty one years. Indeed all such leases had to be confirmed by the particular dean and chapter.²

Under the auspices of Bishop Talbot, a bill was introduced into the House of Lords,³ where it passed all its stages, 'to enable Archbishops, Bishops, Colleges, Deans and Chapters, Hospitals, Parsons, Vicars, and others having Spiritual Promotions to make leases of their mines, which have not been accustomedly letten not exceeding the term of one and twenty years and without taking any fine upon the granting or renewing of the same.'⁴ So Bishops would not longer have to obtain the consent and confirmation of their chapters to such leases. Great excitement and commotion were thereby caused among the

1. Add. MS. 40748 (Bowes MS.) ff. 55-6. G. Bowes to G. Bowes Esq, M.P. 18th July, 1727.

2. Record Commission-Statutes of the Realm. 32 Henry VIII. cap. 28. 1. Eliz. cap. 19.

3. Surtees op. cit. Vol. I. p. CXXI. n.

4. Surtees op. cit. Vol. I. p. CXXI.

copyholders and ancient leaseholders of the bishopric. Previously, bishop and dean and chapter had, de facto, received the rents arising from the mineral wealth under their uninclosed moors or wastes. Certainly, their claim to these always stood, whether or not they enforced it by law.

The Dean and Chapter of Durham, and the copyholders and leaseholders of the County were writhing in indignation at this bill. Spearman considered that the Bishop's aim was to enrich himself and his family at the cost of the copyholders and ancient leaseholders, who would thereby lose the mines within their enclosed grounds.¹ Trevor-Roper holds that this indeed was the Bishop's motive in promoting the bill.²

Gilbert Spearman, of Tanfield Western Leigh, near the Whickham mines, owned both freeholds and copyhold land. Not overmuch attention should be paid to his Enquiry, for his family had lost office under the Bishop, and held much copyhold land. This professional grudge³ was supplemented by the running dispute Spearman was

1. Hutchinson - History and Antiquities of The County Palatine of Durham. Vol. 1. pp. 566-72; G. Spearman - An Enquiry pp. 57-80.

2. Durham University Journal, March, 1946. Trevor-Roper - The Bishopric of Durham and the Capitalist Reformation. p. 58.

3. Spearman had not succeeded to the office of his father, that of Under-Sheriff of the County Palatine. This had been abolished by Bishop Talbot. Lapsley op. cit. p. 202.

conducting with Dr. Sayer, Bishop Talbot's son-in-law. John Hedworth, Member for the County, became drawn into the dissension, from which his colleague, Sir John Eden, emerged with much credit and widespread popularity.¹

Mr. Spearman had been told by a neighbour how the Bishop's stewards had jested that Dr. Sayer had been given a lease of the mines within Mr. Spearman's copyhold. Not only was Mr. Spearman's request for an inspection of the Auditor's Books refused, but the Bishop persisted in his denial of this reputed grant. Moreover, he renewed an earlier promise to confer on Mr. Spearman such a lease as would satisfy him entirely - even when Spearman was informed by one of the Bishop's officers that Sayer had indeed triumphed at Spearman's expense.

Mr. Hedworth then offered Spearman a handsome retainer to be Counsel for him, having previously applied to him for his vote and interest in the approaching election. Spearman refused this, but promised to serve Hedworth in the election of 1722, as he had done previously. All he asked of Hedworth was for him to use his influence to keep the Bishop to his promise to grant Spearman a favourable lease. Hedworth agreed, urging evasively that it would not be decent to press the Bishop before the election.²

Eventually, Hedworth brought Spearman a most

1. An Enquiry p. 81.

2. An Enquiry pp. 81-2.

unsatisfactory reply from the Bishop.¹ From that day Spearman opposed Hedworth politically. When he wished to get his son into the Customs, he overlooked any assistance Hedworth might give. Instead, he applied direct to Bowes.²

Thus Spearman was sufficiently incensed against the Bishop and his policy to write the trenchant Enquiry. This was not the end of his wrath. When it was plain in 1729 that he had lost his case, he began revengefully a campaign for the abolition of the Palatinate, and the enfranchisement of copyhold and leasehold lands. He tried, thereby, to prove that the Durham copyholder had a right, sanctioned by custom, to the minerals beneath this feet.

The forceful William Cotesworth feared the reaction of this so called Bishops' Bill upon his leases. He sought the advice of counsel, and prepared to fight the measure. Here he was joined by others, including Mr. Henry Lambton, and particularly by Sir John Eden.³ They were reinforced by the petition from the sub-dean and chapter of Durham, with whom Bishop Talbot had apparently had differences over mining leases and other matters.

1. An Enquiry p. 83.

2. Sharp MS. 72. An Enquiry. Inset p. 128. 18th July, 1729. G. Spearman to G. Bowes.

3. Hughes op. cit. p. 315.

Sir John Eden vigorously opposed the bill in the House of Commons.¹ But his fellow County Member, Mr. Hedworth, refused to help the tenants, or to withstand the Bishop's designs in any way. Meanwhile the bill, in the face of such resistance, underwent great alteration, and was shelved. Talbot then resorted to more clandestine methods by taking advantage of the demise of many old prebendaries of Durham, and preferring many of his friends in their places. Thus he built up a majority among the chapter to confirm such leases as he should desire.

Just as Bishop Talbot had to endure the reproaches and hostility of the men of Durham, so the exultant Sir John Eden was received on his return with an overpowering demonstration of gratitude. To escort him to the City of Durham, from his entry into the Palatinate, was waiting such a cavalcade of gentry, freeholders, copyholders, and leaseholders, as the bishop was accustomed to have welcoming him from a southern sojourn. Bishop Talbot's chagrin must have been deep and mortifying as Sir John Eden entered the City of Durham with thirty coaches on 23rd January, 1723.² But Eden was never again to sit for Durham in a new parliament.

1. The Bishop had granted a lease to Sayer of all the coal mines within the enclosed copyholds of Sir John, and others at West Auckland. These were afterwards demised to Sir John, under a yearly rent of £100. Eden regretted afterwards that he had made this agreement. An Enquiry p. 79.

2. Fordyce op. cit. Vol. 1. p. 81.

By contrast the relationships between Bishop Chandler and George Bowes were often harmonious. This redounded to the particular advantage of the latter. In 1747, Bishop Chandler consulted Bowes over a successor to the aging Mr. Hedworth as Chairman of the Quarter Sessions, and over the appointment of a new Colonel of the Durham Militia.¹ This was not surprising or inappropriate, for, as the Palatinate had become increasingly threatened by the rebellion of 1745, Bishop Chandler had, on 17th September, offered the command of the First Troop of Horse to Bowes, now a Deputy Lieutenant. Chandler praised the County Member as 'one of the first, who have profest a ready zeal to serve His Majesty in this critical Juncture.'²

Bowes was prompt to accept this commission. With Hedworth he complained to the Duke of Newcastle on 21st September over Sir John Cope not having the power to pursue the rebels into England, and insisted on immediate protection for the Palatinate.³ Bowes himself was not at all sanguine about the outcome of his many labours, although he strove very hard to promote a Warrant of Association.⁴ What progress he did make in this respect was limited by

1. Add. MS. 40748 (Bowes MS.) f. 99. Bishop Chandler to George Bowes. 3rd November, 1747.

2. Sharp MS. 150. p. 14.

3. Ibid. p. 5.

4. Ibid. p. 16. 27th September, 1745. G. Bowes to the Bishop of Durham. Bowes was Colonel of this Armed Association.

the shortage of arms in the County, and the apparent apathy held by some of the gentry towards such an Association regiment. To the bishop he deplored the failure at the last meeting of the Armed Association of any of the Deputy Lieutenants to display any enthusiasm or initiative.¹

On 2nd November, 1745, the King had approved the appointment of the following as Deputy Lieutenants: - Henry Thomas Carr, Thomas Liddell, (later the first Lord Ravensworth), Thomas Clavering (later the baronet who contested the County Elections of 1760 and 1761), Lionel Vane,² Nicholas Lambton,³ and George Grey junior, esquires.⁴ By 18th November, the rebels were reported at Penrith,⁵ and John Hedworth was pleading cold and gout as preventing him from attending vital meetings.⁶ As for Bowes, he continued to lament bitterly how His Majesty's Service was suffering from the continued absence of the Deputy Lieutenants.

With the Pretender marching on Lancaster, the Bishop of Durham informed Bowes of how he had heard of the

1. Sharp MS. 150 p. 24. Undated.

2. Of Long Newton. Probably the Lionel Vane who was Secretary to Frederick, Prince of Wales.

3. Of Biddick.

4. Sharp MS. 150. p. 21. Richard Chandler to George Bowes.

5. Ibid. p 25. 18th November, 1745, Henry Vane to George Bowes.

6. Ibid. p. 26. 20th November, 1745. John Hedworth to George Bowes.

dissolution of the Association and of a petition from the Deputy Lieutenants 'to pray his Majesty for his order to raise the Militia.'¹ While the military situation was apparently deteriorating the Bishop, too, was awaiting urgently the necessary Order of Council for the raising of the Militia. On 10th December, Mr. Christopher Johnson, for the Bishop, told Bowes that this had at last arrived. After much heart searching and a dangerous delay of a week the Bishop asked Bowes to accept the Commission of Lieutenant-Colonel in the new Militia, but then undermined his authority by holding out, as a sop, the Colonelcy to the now lackadaisical Hedworth, whose mental and physical powers now seemed totally inadequate for such a post.

Bowes quite naturally refused to have any truck with an inferior Commission, especially under Hedworth, who, 'in the face of all the Gentlemen of the County refused to command me when I voluntarily offered to serve under Him in the time of danger, by which means, and by no claim of Merit, or desire of my own, I was unexpectedly raised to an Honour which incapacitates me to serve under a Colonel who 'tis said was very unwilling to appear in that Capacity had not your Lordship insisted on his accepting of that Command.....'² Bowes gave much the same reasons at a meeting of the Deputy Lieutenants. Clearly, from this correspondence, Bowes, although intensely egoistical, and

1. Sharp MS. 150. p. 36. 3rd December, 1745.
 2. Sharp MS. 150 p. 47.

of a quarrelsome disposition, as his turbulent relations with some of his fellow coal owners show, carried himself with singular ability and honour, far outreaching the conduct of his contemporaries, particularly Hedworth, in this crisis.

Despite his easy going disposition, of which his dealings with Bowes ~~are~~ only one example, Bishop Chandler could be quite antagonistic to anyone he considered an unsatisfactory candidate in a Durham election. In 1747 he was confronted with a situation in which Robert Wharton, a local tradesman, was put forward for the City of Durham without his prior approval and consent as Bishop. On 26th June, 1747, Chandler wrote sardonically to the Duke of Newcastle, the Secretary of State: 'If friends of the Government have set up Mr. Wharton, it is more than I know; They did not concert it with me, nor with the Dean and Chapter, who have a better interest in the City, by reason of their large property there, than the BP hath,^{2 3} Wharton had been Mayor of the City during the disputed by-ploughed election of 1729. He had/a most partisan and extreme furrow in this event, and had been consistently opposed to the position and privileges of the Bishop with regard to the City of Durham. Aware as he was of these circumstances

1. Sharp MS. 150. p. 47.

2. My italics.

3. Add. MS. 32711 (Newcastle MS.) f. 554 quoted in Hughes op. cit. p. 261.

Bishop Chandler yet did not wish to offend the Duke of Newcastle. If Newcastle was attached to the idea of Wharton's entering Parliament for the City, then 'all past conduct (of Wharton) shall be forgot by me at your Grace's desire.' The only difficulty was that the Bishop had already promised Mr. Lambton 'wholly what Interest I have'. But if Henry Lambton would agree to join with Wharton the Bishop's political benediction would be expended on them both.¹

Such was the deference, not always unqualified, of Whig bishops to the requirements of the Government. It is uncertain how far Newcastle approved, or was able to follow, the Bishop's suggestion of joining Wharton with Lambton. Anyway, in the contested election, Wharton, despite the fact that the Vanes of Raby and the Liddells were on his side,² came bottom of the poll to Lambton and Tempest,³ and did not stand at any later Durham election. The association of Lambton and Tempest had survived its first challenge. It was to mature and become virtually invincible.

The Canvass Book of George Bowes for 1739 is rich in entries which should dispel any illusions as to the political hold of the Bishop, and indeed of the Dean and Chapter, over their immediate tenants; the previous County

1. Add. MS. 32711 (Newcastle MS.) f. 554, quoted in Hughes op. cit. p. 261.
 2. Baker-Baker Papers. Memorable Events 1746-75.
 3. Sharp MS. 82. p. 32.

election had been held in 1734, when Bowes and Hedworth had been returned unopposed. Any sample of names and comments from these notes is both typical and apposite:

Bp.- Auckland.

Arundale. Had prob.^[misid] one to the Bp. - and will not engage the other.

Rd. Clapham. pro. if agreeable to the Bp.¹

Edward Lazonby: Entirely under the Bishop.²

These were only three of '1694 tenants and properties' of the Bishop, found by Professor Hughes from his examination of the Cotesworth Manuscripts. They were 'widely dispersed throughout the county with particular concentrations at Darlington, Easington, Bishop Wearmouth, the Boldons and Whitburn, and at Lanchester and the Aucklands. The tenants included Lords Lonsdale, Scarborough, and Widdrington, besides most of the local gentry, but the great bulk were small freeholders of copyholders.² Professor Hughes goes on to show that 'the rental itself is incomplete; it does not include the Grand Lease of Gateshead and Whickham.'³

If only because of the great number of such tenants the ecclesiastical power at Durham was still strong and active in 1760.⁴ No candidate could afford to underestimate

1. Sharp MS. 125. Canvass Book 1739. p. 19.

2. Ibid. p. 20.

3. Hughes op. cit. pp. 305-6.

4. See again italicised quotations in this chapter.

it, or, for that matter, to forget that even in the North East many dependants would definitely prefer not to call down the fury of their landlords, whether these were clerical or lay, by voting contrary to instructions.

Nor could any potential Member, in Durham as elsewhere, fail to realise that the very basis of political life in the eighteenth century was the prospect of enjoying places and pensions of all kinds, whether for the edification of the humblest freeholder or of landlords with several votes at their disposal. This sort of spoils system was conditioned partly by the lack of sharp contrasts of ideas. Moreover, it was considered that the practice of self-interest in these spheres needed no justification. Provision by the State was regarded as entirely legitimate. What mattered was the way and circumstances in which these favours were received, and the person from whom they were sought and accepted. This was the distinction between finding one's rightful account and taking a bribe; for Members of Parliament were frequently receiving large numbers of applications from constituents and others. Examples of all this, and of other typical electoral flora and fauna, which will be described below, were plentiful in both Durham and other counties.

The question so often asked about each eighteenth century Member of Parliament came to be 'What Interest

has he?' Thus Dr. Edmund Tew, Rector of Boldon, wrote to Bowes on 22nd November, 1747, asking the latter to name him¹ 'to the House to be their Preacher on the 30th Jany, next.' Often Bowes had to admit that he himself had not enough sway to ensure the granting of the requests made to him. He would frequently seek the assistance and influence of the Bishop of Durham. For example, on the 20th October, 1745, he confessed to the Bishop that he was reluctant to admit his want of interest 'amongst the Great Ones, to make an Exciseman.'² The tone of a letter to Fox, the Secretary at War, was similar: 'I'm greatly obliged to you for the Remembrance of my Relation, who having long despaired of my being able to procure him a Commission, prudently applyed to some other Gentlemen for their interest so that I'm not certain whether the young Fellow is provided for. But if he is not I fancy he will think himself very happy³ in being honoured with a pair of Colours in the Guards....'

Often Members of Parliament themselves would press for personal advancement from Ministers. Many would be eager to recoup heavy election expenses. Bowes himself was appointed Collector of Customs of Bridlington in 1730.⁴ Also, the letters quoted in the previous chapter, in which Sir Henry Belasyse and Thomas Conyers, in turn, assured Harley in 1710 how they hoped to be returned to Parliament, contain earnest pleadings for official recognition.

1. Add. MS. 40748 (Bowes MS.) f. 101.

2. Sharp MS. 150. p. 23.

3. Sharp MS. 150. 6th December, 1747, George Bowes to Henry Fox.

4. Hughes op.cit. p.277n.

Sir Henry Belasyse, on 20th August, coveted a commission as Lieutenant-General.¹ Thomas Conyers, writing on 25th August, made a more general request: 'I find all our friends are getting into good posts. I hope I have as just pretensions as others, therefore desire your favour, and where to place me I leave to yourself but shall be unwilling to live constantly in town.....'²

There is no record of any advantage accruing to Conyers, but Sir Henry Belasyse was made a Commissioner of the Accounts of the Army in Spain, Portugal, Gibraltar and Port Mahon in 1712. On 9th February motion was made in the House of Commons that a new writ should be issued for the City of Durham. On the question that Sir Henry Belasyse, having accepted a Commission, his election was thereby become void, the House divided, and decided, by 182 to 99, in favour of a new writ.³

In the same way there were new writs for the City of Durham on the 23rd April, 1726, because Charles Talbot had been appointed Solicitor General, and on 17th January, 1734, owing to that gentleman having become Lord High Chancellor. These resulted, in the first case, in Talbot's return for the City of Durham, on 2nd May, 1726,⁴ and, in the second,⁵ in the advent to the House of Commons

1. H.M.C. Portland MS. No. 29. Vol IV. p. 570.

2. Ibid. p. 575.

3. Sharp MS. 82. p. 28. Sharp MS. 145. p. 38. Bean op. cit. pp. 129-30.

4. Dur. 3/149. ff. 54-55. Sharp MS. 82. p. 30.

5. Sharp MS. 82. p. 31.

of Henry Lambton: For the County of Durham, new writs were necessary when the first Lord Darlington, as the Honourable Henry Vane, became a Lord of the Treasury, and when he and his son were, one after the other, raised to the peerage.

The number of contested elections in the eighteenth century was necessarily curtailed by the huge cost involved in such ventures¹ - by the wear and tear on a candidate's pocket, which so often obliged him to look to an office of profit as a panacea of his financial ills, as well as an acknowledgement of his having arrived in the rarefied air of the political stratosphere. In the City of Durham, from 1680 to 1760, only the elections of 1689, 1698, 1704, 1705, 1722, 1747 and the by-elections of 1712 and 1729 were contested. Over the same period, the County elections of 1681, 1698 and 1722, and the by-election of September, 1760, were the only ones where voting was necessary.²

By 1760 only one election for the County of Durham had given rise to a petition. That was when, on 19th October, 1722, the defeated candidate, William Lord Vane claimed that Hedworth had used many arbitrary and unwarrantable practices to become elected. Hedworth remained in that parliament for Durham.

1. George Bowes was said to have spent between £5,000 and £10,000 before his return for Berwick in 1722. Hughes op. cit. p. 277.

2. Dur. 3/149-50. The 1701 election was that of January.

There were more disputed elections in the City, over at least one of which the wrangling was long and rancorous. For students of eighteenth century politics and local history they are replete with colourful interest. In 1710 James Nicholson offered himself as a candidate, but declined a poll. This was because, so he alleged, a great number of honorary freemen had been created in favour of Belasyse and Conyers, who were ultimately successful.¹ Two years later, at the by-election caused by Sir Henry Belasyse's appointment as a Commissioner of the Accounts of the Army, Anthony Hall, an alderman of Durham, was defeated. He thereupon petitioned that he was duly elected, since great numbers of voters, adverse to him, had received alms, and had been influenced by bribery.² Other illegal practices had been pursued by the victor, Robert Shafto of Whitworth, and his agents. Shafto had thus been returned by a small majority. Again, there is no known sequel to this petition.³ This Robert Shafto came from a recognised Tory family, and was the eldest son of Mark Shafto, High Sheriff of the County of Durham by patent in 1709. He was returned again for the City of Durham in 1727.

1. Sharp MS. 145. p. 38 n.

2. 'Election taken place between seven o'clock in the morning and nine at night on the same day... above one hundred and seventy honorary freemen voted, many of whom made a short time previous to the poll.' Coronation Papers. Sharp MS. 145. p. 40n.

3. Dur 3/149. ff. 51-3; Sharp MS. 82. pp. 29-30;

In 1722 James Montague, who had come bottom of the poll to Charles Talbot and Thomas Conyers, petitioned on 25th October against the malpractices supposedly perpetrated by Conyers. His doubts as to Conyers' qualifications were also voiced. So here was the second occasion during Conyers' ^{career of} ~~twenty years~~ and more as a County Member when the circumstances of his return were open to dispute. This time the plaintiff was a great nephew of Bishop Crewe. Nevertheless, Conyers was able to survive this test, for the petition was afterwards, by leave,¹ withdrawn. Perhaps the heavy expense, which was often inseparable from such petitions, was a sufficient deterrent to Montague from going through with his protest.

It was seven years later, however, that the by-election of 1729 for the City of Durham gave rise to one of the greatest political brawls of the eighteenth century in the Palatinate. This by-election ~~was~~ ^{was} one of the most unruly, even by contemporary standards, and was, in that century, to be overshadowed for the turmoil it unleashed only by that of December, 1761. On both occasions the Mayor of Durham was strongly and effectively prejudiced as Returning Officer, and both times a Lambton was the injured party.

1. Sharp MS. 145 p. 40n.

Robert Shafto had died on the 21st December, 1728, and a new writ was issued on the 15th January, 1729. After a severe contest, and a poll lasting several days, John Shafto, the brother of the deceased, was elected on 29th January,¹ Altogether 1133 freemen had voted. The result was Shafto 577 votes, Henry Lambton 553, Cradock 2, and Sir Thomas Hanmer 1. The last named was a distinguished man of letters, and Speaker of the House of Commons in 1713.² John Shafto was the father of the renowned Robert Shafto, Member for the County of Durham 1760-68.³

The victorious party had gone to extraordinary lengths to secure their triumph. When the Dean of Durhan had visited Elvet before the election, on behalf of Mr. Lambton, he had been insulted by a body of three hundred armed with clubs. Their leaders were the Mayor, Mr Shafto, and Mr. George Bowes.⁴ The Mayor was also to the fore when the insult was repeated in a very riotous manner before the Deanery itself. Great pressure was put upon those who intended to vote for Lambton in order to discourage them from so doing.⁵

1. Dur. 3/149. ff. 56-7.

2. Sharp MS. 82. p. 31; Bean op. cit. p. 150.

3. Ibid. p. 30.

4. This by-election came at a time of particularly intense rivalry between the coal owners of Tyne and Wear. Bowes was one of the most refractory of the former, while Lambton, as a rising star of the latter, was displaying equal obstinacy.

5. D. & C. Library. Raine MS. 18. f. 4. 30th January, 1729. Ralph Gowland to Samuel Gowland.

There were many other alleged incidents which impelled Henry Lambton to petition. A great number of papists were said to have been polled. Lambton and his friends asseverated that but for these votes Shafto would have lost the election. Altogether seventeen papists, who had sworn the oaths of Supremacy and Abjuration, voted for Shafto, for whom there were another six unsworn papists.¹ Lambton's adherents claimed that twenty three other objectionable persons had voted for Mr Shafto, thus making a total of forty six questionable supporters. Yet Mr. Shafto's supposed simple majority was only twenty four. Also it was said that another twenty men, who had not been admitted to a Company or Trade, and who were not entered in the books of such, had polled for Shafto. Some witnesses put this number even higher. Much rested on how Lambton and his counsellors presented what seemed an unanswerable case.

The legal position was abundantly clear. That the said twenty had been permitted to vote was a direct breach of a bye-law that had been passed by the Corporation of the City of Durham on 8th November, 1728. It had been intended, thereby, to prevent people, not free of the City, from pursuing their trades within the liberties of that City. It was also aimed to prevent apprentices from gaining their freedom by illegal practices of the several companies, instead of by patrimony, or by the required

1. Raine MS. 18. f. 4 30th January, 1729. Ralph Gowland to Samuel Gowland.

length of service. The apprentice now had to go with the Warden of his Company to the Mayor. On the production of the Company's Book, where his admission was entered, and after the necessary fees had been paid, he was admitted and sworn before the Mayor and Freemen of the City. Each year there were four occasions, known as Guilds, when this was possible¹. A prospective freeman had to be called over at three such meetings, and be approved by the Mayor, one or more Aldermen, and the Wardens and Stewards of the Company to which he applied. All members of each company thus had a chance to object to the qualifications of anyone seeking his freedom.²

In this affray of 1729 the Mayor of Durham, as returning officer, had broken the law in having allowed to vote so many who were not qualified, according to the bye-law. Moreover, he was said to have admitted at least two infants, and to have sworn one freeman, if not more, after the Teste of the Writ, who had then added to Shafto's majority.³

Furthermore, Mr. Lambton estimated that he had been deprived of nine votes, because, although they had been admitted in the Sadler's Company/^{by}the Warden, Mr. George

1. First Monday after Martinmas. First Mon. after Candlemas. First Mon. after May Day, First Mon. after Lammas. Raine MS. 18.

2. Baker-Baker Papers. 8th Nov. 1728. Bye-Law. City of Durham.

3. Raine MS. 18. f.4.

Brown, they had been rejected by the Mayor before the Teste of the Writ.¹ Again, clusters of freemen had either been too terrorised to go to the poll, or had been forcibly detained from voting for Lambton by Shafto's agents and hired bullies.

Nor did the complaints against the Mayor's partiality cease with the quotation of these injustices. He had followed the practice of ordering an immediate query as to the qualifications of any of Mr. Lambton's would be voters, as soon as the slightest objection was raised against them. But he promptly overruled any doubts raised against Shafto's supporters. He was said to have closed the poll, on the last night but one, about twenty minutes before the hour agreed. At this time Lambton maintained that he had present a number sufficient to have given him the lead.

There were other strong instances given of a most marked degree of bribery and corruption. Lambton's entourage said they possessed two informations on oath from persons who had been offered gold to vote for Mr. Shafto. They had refused this and voted for Lambton. Another freeholder was sent twenty guineas to take Shafto's side at the poll. When he voted for Lambton, an action was brought against him in the Court of Common Pleas.

1. These nine also drew up a petition.

To add to this record of duplicity, the Mayor was said to have tried to conceal his designs by voting for Lambton, when the latter left the Bench. At the same time, he ordered his Sergeant and all his other officers to vote for Shafto.¹ In fact he mortgaged and prostituted the very reputation of the civic power in Durham, which was wholly and systematically weighted against Lambton.

It is interesting to notice that the Mayor in this turbulent election was Robert Wharton. A local tradesman and an alderman of the City, he was again Mayor in 1736, and was defeated by Henry Lambton and John Tempest in the contested city election of 1747,² to which reference has already been made.

Ralph Gowland perceived the national significance of the events already outlined. Writing to his brother and fellow lawyer, on 31st January, 1729, he warned: 'This Election was made the greatest Test of Whig and Tory of any election that ever was known, and the Tories had no other refuge for their security than to spirit up the Papists to perjure themselves and renounce the Pope's supremacy, for which undoubtedly they must have had secret indulgences or must receive Absolution by the Priest - It's hoped and much desired by all true friends to the present Government that Mr. Lambton may succeed in his

1. Raine MS. 18. f. 14.

2. Sharp MS. 82. p. 32. Bean op. cit. p. 157.

in his petition and be voted the sitting Member.....¹
 Gowland was, of course, a strong partisan of Lambton, who, throughout his career, was loyal to the Whig Government of the day, while the Shaftos were well known Durham Tories. By now most Durham elections involved a jockeying for position between rival Whig groups, brought together by personal and industrial motives, rather than by party loyalties.

Lambton was strongly encouraged in drawing up his petition by Lord Scarborough, Sir William Williamson, Sheriff of the County of Durham, and Dr. Sayer,² son-in-law of Bishop Talbot, and Spiritual Chancellor of Durham. Lambton's advisers required the Trade Books of the City of Durham to be produced for inspection. The poll books were then scrutinized. Here Ralph Gowland gloomily pointed out to his brother, '.... It's certain unless a new Law be made of the Popish votes are rejected that they have it in their power in any future Election to give the decision thereof in their favour, having above 50 votes on that side for the City and perhaps 200 for the County - the consequence is apparent.'³

The original petitions, drawn up on behalf of Lambton, and of the aggrieved freemen admitted by the Warden of the

1. Raine MS. 18. f. 5.

2. Member for Totnes (Devon) from 22nd August, 1727. Reelected 20th May, 1730, after appointment to office of profit under Crown. Previously, from 13th May, 1726, he had been Member for Helston (Cornwall) - Returns of Members of Parliament Vol II. pp. 51, 63.

3. Raine MS. 18 f. 8. 10th February, 1729.

of the Sadlers, were found wanting by the lawyers. Ralph Gowland urged his brother, on 10th February, 1729, to get the advice of Sir William Williamson and Dr. Sayer as to a competent person who would assist with the petitions. Mr. Hedworth was then thus mentioned, as one who had witnessed the Mayor of Durham's behaviour.¹

It is difficult to say just what was the outcome. Difficulties were encountered over three Wardens of Trades in the City of Durham, who would not allow their books to be perused. Finally, William Lambton, a lawyer, and the brother of Henry Lambton, was asked to inspect these, provided he could get an order empowering him to do so. The Town Clerk was equally stubborn in refusing to show his books, admittances, or entries of freemen.

It is not really exactly certain what were Henry Lambton's precise intentions. In a letter to his brother Samuel in London, Ralph Gowland wrote on 8th February: '.... Unless Mr. Lambton hath a prospect of being the Sitting Member upon the event or success of this petition he will not (as I believe) proceed by petition, because if he can only make void the election it will not answer² his design...'. Nearly a month later Ralph Gowland was no more convinced as to what Lambton would do.³ For Shafto continued to represent the City of Durham until his death in 1742,

1. Raine MS. 18. f. 8.

2. Raine MS. 18. f. 7.

3. Ibid. f. 16. 1st March, 1729. Ralph Gowland to Samuel Gowland.

while Lambton had to wait another five years before entering the House of Commons. Another mystery surrounding this election concerned the attitude of the Bishop. It is strange that there is no account of where so positive a man as Talbot stood. If he ^{then} inclined to the same side as this Spiritual Chancellor and the Dean, he was powerless to check and divert the stream of events. Surely as a Whig prelate, and, as such, a leading handmaid of the Hanoverian State, he must have wanted Lambton returned. Or was he still smarting from the drubbing he had received over the Bishops' Bill? If so, was his authority now less? Or was it that he was not so able to affect the outcome of a disputed election in the City, where his strength was in any case inferior to that of the Dean and Chapter, as he was ^{to} have no mean say in the County, with prompt reminders to his tenants as to how they should discharge their voting obligations.

Interference with the course of an election by the returning officer could lead to petitions. But the more usual method of influencing a result was for the leading local lords and gentry, as well as ecclesiastical potentates, like the Bishop of Durham, to direct how those under them should poll. Thus candidates for Durham, as well as for other counties, would solicit the votes and interest of the 'Gentlemen, Clergy and Freeholders;' and 'interest' was translated into the means of compulsion

which they could deploy on their dependants. For tenants were quite ready to serve their lords in the way of recording votes as directed, but the hereditary northern independence could ^{not} be ignored, particularly in constituencies such as those of Durham, which were the very contradiction of close or pocket boroughs. Not only must landowners pay their respect to the electorate in the common political round of inordinate expenditure and public entertainments, but candidates and their attendant company had to be prepared to undergo long and arduous canvassing tours.

Thus, on 23rd June, 1727, George Bowes, during the campaign for the county of Durham, wrote to London to his namesake, the future Member for the County: 'Yesterday at ten in the morning I came to Darlington.... Mr. Allan others and myself solicited the Town. Mr. Hedworth had sent there before but I hope you have one vote through his Interest there and Mr. Hedworth's plan is minutely compleat he has sent his Circulars thro the whole County according to the method I have been hinting. I called at J. Nalleds of Gainforth Your Tyths Tennts. are secured, Mr. Lodge has been very diligent he has secured one way or another as he tells me all sides there that can any way offer for your Interest I writ this day about 30 letters and Subscribed near two hundred more in your name to the Neighbourhood. I staid still your Letters came

to Mr. Lodge but was sorry to find no certainty of the Vanes. I sounded Gorse of Stainthorpe, his orders are to Secure all your Stainthorpe friends are well, all the Townships. your dependts. are steady. Good Mrs. Burdon I called on, she has used all her measures in her husbands absence, West Auckland Mr. Carr I called on, he thinks to be of opinion you are too late of applying: but he is a secure friend of Sir Johns¹ I dispatched at Auckland about 50 Circulars see as many friends as I could and thro' violent hurry bad roads and incessant rainy day I am got here at nine at night just to secure the post, but I am vastly concerned to hear that there is no orders for me as was promised..... Mr. Hedworth first sent his Servts. with Circulars everywhere he is following them as fast as he can. Sir John declared but last Tuesday. I have sent to Selby by Express yesterday to endeavour to keep steady Northham and Flamshire votes..... Mr. Lodge solicited on Sunday morning your sister Bowes the night the Express came, with success.

..... Mr. Hedworth has been abt. Gateshead, and will be at Darl-n next Tuesday on his Tour thro' the County. Your serious friend say Mr. Vanes² Interest is not worth

1. Presumably Sir John Eden.

2. Probably Mr. George Vane of Long Newton, son of Lionel Vane, Member for the County 1698-1702, or his cousin Lord William Vane.

a farthing without my Lord Vanes,¹ but joined very considerable. Some are of opinion that if Sir John is attacked in his most sensible part, viz. his North - and Elamshire votes and Crake he will not stand it..... it is the General opinion if you and Mr. Hedworth join you may be successfull. Mr. Lambton must be desired to send Circulars to all Sunderland votes to back your Circular...
 your coming down is what seems the necessary part!²

A further undated letter, from the same correspondent to the other George Bowes, referred again to the great physical and mental demands made by exhaustive canvassing. It warned Bowes 'for Gods sake hasten. Mr. Hedworth sollicitis night and day, and nothing but a constant sollicitation must be used night and day till it is over. I am almost dead with fatigue. There is general dislike for Sir John (Eden) in every corner.' Very aptly this letter was headed 'from my pillow four in the morning'.³

The first letter was written exactly two months before the declaration of return, which was a formality, as Sir John Eden, although a County Member since 1713, did not, on this occasion, engage in the contest. As has been seen he could not rely on the Bishop, while Hedworth and Bowes may have joined forces. But they were certainly on

1. (Probably) Gilbert, second Lord Barnard or Lord William Vane, his brother.

2. Add MS. 40748 (Bowes MS.) ff. 45-6 quoted in Hughes op. cit. pp. 264-5.

3. Ibid. ff. 47-8 quoted in Hughes op. cit. p. 265.

opposite sides in 1727. in the coal trade, espousing the causes of the Wear and Tyne owners respectively at a time when the former were determined not to be overawed by the latter. And by the end of 1745, it will be recalled, although they were still the County representatives, they were singularly lacking in unity and cordiality.

Sir John Eden did receive a very disheartening rebuff at Stockton, where he had expected a rousing welcome.¹ This may be one of the factors which deterred him from persisting with the contest, for then, as now, a luckless day at canvassing could prove quite depressing to a tired candidate.

The impression which the prospective candidate made on a town, during his 'perambulation', would often be decided by how many influential local gentry escorted him. Lists of such gentlemen appear frequently in the Sharp Manuscripts and the Baker-Baker Papers. Small notebooks were used by the canvassers, who went from door to door, and street to street. Many of the entries are very amusing, yet highly characteristic of eighteenth century politics. A selection of replies from a canvass book, quoted in the Sharp Manuscripts, yields the following: 'Promised, but desired it might not be known - Leaned towards me - Can't refuse, but won't engage -..... Said he would not deny me, if his grandson be got into

1. Add MS. 40748 (Bowes MS.) f. 25. 2nd July, 1727. G. Vane to George Bowes.

the excise - His wife said, If all the hairs of her head were turn'd into voters I should have them all!!!!¹ The election alluded to was that of 1747 for the County. The canvass book was compiled on behalf of George Bowes.

There is abundant evidence in Bowes' Canvassing Book for the County of Durham in 1732 of the political domination of many tenants by their landlords. Since the year 1732 occurs again and again in the book it must be presumed that Bowes was canvassing well ahead of the election of 1734, which was held in accordance with the Septennial Act:

Alderson, George	Cockfield	Single	If Mr. Vane 2 does not stand
Cotesworth, Wm.	Middleton in	do	If his Lord
	Teasdale.		Ld. Barnard permit ³
Pearson, Tho.	pro:	if he could without	4
		forfeiting his place.	
Palmer. Mr.	Long Newton	pro: single if Mr. G.	
		Vane give leave. ⁵	

Some freeholders were annoyingly indecisive:

Clavering, James Esq. wd. not pro: but I might say in his neighbourhood he wish'd me well. 6

Smales, Mr. Met with at Halnaby who partly promised and said he would not be agst me....⁷

1. Sharp MS. 145. p. 22n.

2. Sharp MS. 134. p. 2. Probably Mr. George Vane of Long Newton.

3. Ibid. p. 8.

4. Ibid p. 40.

5. Sharp MS. 134 p. 40.

6. Ibid p. 9.

7. Ibid. p. 119.

Often a freeholder would exact the definite promise of a favour, before he would commit himself to support a particular candidate. In the same Canvass Book for 1732, there are many instances of this. For example, a group of freeholders only set their names to a document promising Bowes their votes if he would find a place for the bearer of the document, the son of the late Vicar of Hart.¹ In 1739, the year of the outbreak of the War of Jenkins' Ear, which excited much patriotic fervour, Bowes' Canvass Book² records that Robert Wilson of Easington 'pro. single if his Cous: Lamb is got into the Excise but if any other gets him in, then a split vote'.³

On the basis of canvassing returns, predictions were often made by a prospective candidate's agents of the likely outcome of a poll in a particular part or parts of a constituency. Thus, the following were the votes calculated for Bowes in 1732, throughout the County of Durham:

	<u>Single</u>	<u>Split</u>	<u>Total</u>
Total	585	1286	1871

This was made up of thirteen different areas, including:

	<u>Single</u>	<u>Split</u>	<u>Total</u>
Gateshead	35	55	90
So. Shields etc.	40	100	140
Sunderland	5	115	120

1. Sharp MS. 165 p. 83.

2. The next election was not until 1741.

3. Sharp MS. 125. p. 46.

Hartlepool	11	32	43
Durham	20	150	170 ¹

And again, this time for Sunderland alone, as a result of a canvass on 20th November, 1732:

'Then went through the whole Town and found as below.

Votes promis'd to my self	81
Absent	113
Cust. House offs. and sick not spoke to	10
Fitters, and Agents to Mr. H.: ² Called on 17 but not askd. with those who refusd to declare	<u>5</u>
Bad votes	³
Total	<u>226</u>

If the good work of the canvassers were not to be in vain, treating was essential, especially in a County or any other more 'open' constituency. These extracts are from the diary of Wm. Ettricke of High Barnes, quoted in the Sharp Manuscripts: 'Nov. 20. 1732 - I went down to Sunderland to wait on Mr. Hedworth, who went about the town to ask for votes for Parliament - man, and dined at his treat. - Aug. 29th, 1739. At Sunderland, with Mr. Headworth, a parliamenteering, and dined with a great many gentlemen, at his treat.'⁴ The dates of these extracts is another indication that the designation of the years 1732 and 1739^{in the} Canvass Books of George Bowes was accurate.

-
1. Sharp MS. 134. Inset p. 171.
 2. Almost certainly Mr. Hedworth.
 3. Sharp MS. 134. p. 142.
 4. Sharp MS. 145. p. 21n.

Also Bowes and Hedworth seemed to be collaborating.

The excitement, and even pageantry, of polling day, when the freeholders rode into the City of Durham, or any county town, has long been a thing of the past. But in eighteenth century elections in Durham all the details of a candidate's supporters entering and staying in the City to vote were attended to most meticulously by his agents. In those times, while bribery was everywhere practised, extreme cases could lead to the unseating of a candidate on an election petition. It was necessary to be discreet and careful. Horse hire, and other means of transporting voters to the poll, were regarded as reasonable and appropriate. Yet even an experienced candidate like Hedworth would be wary of entering into any positive bargain with his supporters. Very often men would rely, until well after the election, on the honesty and integrity of candidates, but sometimes these qualities were found wanting. Professor Hughes has quoted a paper in the Cotesworth Manuscripts telling 'of sums owing by Lord [William] Vane to publick houses in Gateshead for procuring votes for him,' in his campaign for the County of Durham in 1722.¹

long and
Neither the arduous operations which some Durham Members had to conduct, nor the tranquillity of undisputed

1. Hughes op. cit. pp. 279-80.

returns which so very often graced other elections, seemed generally conducive to the expenditure of exceptional energy at Westminster. The records reveal that, from 1675 until 1760, there were only ten speeches made by Durham Members. Nine of these were delivered by Charles Talbot, who was a trusted adherent of Walpole before he first assumed office in 1726. On 21st January, 1733 he spoke for the Government in the debate on the establishment of Hessian troops,¹ defended the existing number of the land forces on 5th February of that year,² and consented to the proposed small increase in the size of the army on 6th February, 1734.³ The remaining contribution was made by George Bowes in 1749, when he pleaded the stronger claims of Newcastle, in resisting the government move to compensate Glasgow to the tune of £10,000 for losses suffered in the rebellion of 1745.⁴

In view of this bleak record a study of various motions on which the votes of Durham representatives were cast is more rewarding. Such an examination at once reveals apparent inconsistencies on the part of some Durham Members.

On 5th February, 1689, both County Members, Robert Byerley and William Lambton, 'Old True Blue', with

-
1. House of Commons. History and Proceedings. Vol. 2. p. 34.
 2. Ibid p. 273.
 3. Parliamentary History. Vol 9. pp. 279-81.
 4. Ibid. Vol. 14. pp. 497-502, quoted in Hughes op. cit. p. 302.

George Morland for the City, had been among the minority of one hundred and fifty who had voted against making the Prince and Princess of Orange King and Queen.¹ Yet Morland, with Henry Liddell, had been returned for the City on 11th January, 1689, 'in pursuance of his highness the Prince of Orange's letter.'² Their opponent had been William Tempest, the Tory and supposed Jacobite. Again, William Lambton (despite his attitude in 1689), in the company of Sir William Bowes, for the County, and of Liddell with the Honourable Charles Montague for the City, joined, on 27th February 1696, an Association and Subscription to stand by William III.³

Of these, only Bowes remained in Parliament after the General Election, in July, 1702, when the Tories won in convincing fashion. With Queen Anne inclining strongly to the right wing of the Church of England, a bill was introduced to prevent Occasional Conformity. Any men who, after qualifying for State or municipal office by taking the sacrament in Church, had afterwards attended a Nonconformist place of worship, would be punished severely. The bill was passed by a large majority in the House of Commons. However, it was subjected in the House of Lords to such a series of amendments as ensured its rejection on return to the Commons, and it was lost

1. Sharp MS. 36. p. 5.

2. Sharp MS. 145. p. 35 n. This was stated in the Mayor's reply.

3. J.H.C. (Printed.) Vol. II. p. 471.

altogether in the Upper Chamber in the session 1703-4.

After Blenheim, the High Tories tried again to force the Occasional Conformity Bill through the House of Lords. The Ministry had been reconstructed, with Harley as Secretary of State, and St. John Secretary at War. As Harleyites became more and more estranged from the right-wing Tories, the latter 'tacked' the Occasional Conformity Bill to the financial measures of the year. The 'tack' was defeated in the House of Commons on 28th November, 1704, by 251 to 134 votes, with such Ministerial Tories as Harley, St. John and Hedges among the majority.¹

Of Durham representatives the High Tory Sir Henry Belasyse was for the 'tack', while Sir Robert Eden, Sir William Bowes, and Thomas Conyers were 'in the list of those who are not numbered amongst the tackers or sneakers'.² As the 'sneakers' were those Tories who had not voted in favour of the 'tack' motion, this could mean that none of these three men had voted at all. On the other hand they could have been included in the 134 as Whigs, but in view of their later behaviour and affiliations this is unlikely.³

Thus Belasyse and Conyers, both of whom, with Eden,

1. Feiling op. cit. pp. 360-77. Trevelyan op. cit. pp. 484-6, 493.

2. Sharp MS. 36. p. 4. Black and White Lists 1704; Sharp MS. 145 p. 19n.

3. Sharp MS. 36 p. 5.

welcomed Harley's 'accession' in 1710 as salutary to the Church, were not at one over this issue. At the General Election, in the spring of 1705, the weight of the Crown's influence was thrown behind Whig candidates against the 'tackers'. Sir Henry Belasyse was one of the ¹ eighty 'tackers' to survive.

Three years later the results of the polls confirmed the continued revival of the Whigs. Then their fortunes declined, as Louis XIV's offers of peace were spurned in 1709, and the battle of Malplaquet proved a Pyrrhic victory.² In December the Government decided to impeach Dr. Sacheverell for a sermon against the doctrines of the Glorious Revolution. This was a dangerous step, in view of Harley's desire to return to power. Admittedly the House of Lords declared the Doctor guilty, but, by only seventeen votes, suspended him from preaching for three years by six votes, and, by one, turned down a move to render him incapable of preferment during the same time.³

In the Sharp Manuscripts there is this interesting information: 'Members who voted for and against Dr. Sacheverell. For - Sir Robert Eden. Against - Hon. W. Vane, Thos. Conyers and James Nicholson.⁴ If this is

1. Trevelyan op. cit. pp. 493-4.

2. Ibid. op. cit. pp. 497-501.

3. Feiling op. cit. pp. 411-17; Trevelyan op. cit. pp. 501-2.

4. Sharp MS. 145 p. 19n. Black and White Lists.

accurate Conyers was found completely out of character with his otherwise supposed Church and Tory proclivities.

Eden and Conyers both voted for the Treaty of Commerce between Britain and France,¹ which was brought before the House of Commons in June, 1713. A great outcry arose from vested interests which would be harmed by its passage: the Portugal trade, with the prohibitive duties against French wines, and the silk industry, in particular. The Government were beaten by 194 to 185 on the motion for engrossment, when the bill had passed through Committee, the majority vote including, apart from the Whigs, those Tories who opposed the French Treaty, and those who were against Lord Oxford.² In this company was found Robert Shafto, soon to lose his seat for the City of Durham to George Baker, ~~the~~ Conyers' son-in-law.

In the following year the question of the Protestant Succession was upmost in men's minds. The Whigs were still in the minority after the election of 1713, but their hopes were rising, as the Queen was clearly dying.

How far did the political complexion of Durham Members change once a new sovereign and the head of a new dynasty was on the throne? So far it had been chiefly Tory - after the fashion of Bishop Crewe - there had been the 'four members of one mind' at the Tory victory of

1. Sharp MS. 36. p. 4.

2. Feiling op. cit. pp. 449-50

1710, Sir Robert Eden and William Lambton for the County, and Thomas Conyers and Sir Henry Belasyse for the City. Both elections in 1713 were uncontested. For the County there were Sir Robert's son, Sir John Eden, married into the Tory Shafto family, but credited to the Whig party. John Hedworth's Whiggism was undoubted, but was usually unfurled against the Government. For the City Conyers continued -- in what guise is not known - and with him was his son-in-law, young George Baker, the first of a series of politically minded and Whig George Bakers.¹ Not that too much should be deduced from party appellations in those days, or these labels ^{be} considered to have remained hard and fast.

All four Members voted against the repeal of the Triennial Act on 24th April, 1716,² and, ^{7th} on January and 7th December, 1719, respectively, against the Bill to repeal the Acts preventing Occasional Conformity, and hindering the growth of Schism,³ and against the abortive Peerage Bill, also in 1719.⁴ In the last three of these divisions the Durham Members were aligned with Walpole and the anti-ministerial Whigs, as well as with the Tories and the independent-minded country gentlemen.

The repeal of the Triennial Act was a most important

1. Bean op. cit. pp. 98-139.

2. Parl. Hist. Vol. 7. pp. 367-74.

3. Ibid. pp. 585-8.

4. Sharp MS. 145 p. 39n.; Parl. Hist. Vol. 7. pp. 624-7. 1st December, 1719.

result of the rebellion of 1715. By means of the sovereignty of the Crown in Parliament, it was decided to extend the life of the existing, and of all following Parliaments, to seven years.¹ All Durham Members were ranged with the Tories and anti-ministerial Whigs against this, as they were against the repeal of the Acts which had underlined Bolingbroke's seizure of the Tory leadership from Harley, and against the Peerage Bill, which was aimed at strengthening and consolidating the ministerial Whig position in the House of Lords. However, after Walpole had shown how the bill would provide the Upper House with a statutory permanent veto, it was thrown out.

Hedworth also went into the division against Walpole's Excise Scheme of 1733. So did Bowes and Shafto, who had acted in conjunction at the by-election for the City of Durham of 1729. Shafto was regarded as a Tory, and his forceful candidature of 1729 was seen by Ralph Gowland, the lawyer, as Tory strategy. Hedworth and Bowes can probably best be described at that time as anti-ministerial Whigs. They did not strut before the political world resplendent in Walpole's goodwill, which was only reserved, in Durham, for Charles Talbot, son of the Bishop. The then Solicitor-General to the King, he had demonstrated his fidelity afresh in the trouble over the Excise Scheme.²

1. Feiling - The Second Tory Party 1714-1832. p. 16.
 2. Parl Hist. Vol. 8. pp. 1308-13.

Bowes and Shafto were also found together on 13th March, 1734, among the minority of 184 for the repeal of the Septennial Act. This lobby was largely composed of anti-Ministerial Whigs and Tories led by Wyndham. Both Durham Members had thus acted consistently in view of their having voted against the Excise Scheme, and their general opposition to the Minister.¹

The movement against Sir Robert Walpole became reinforced by Whig peers, certain elements in the Cabinet, and then by the Prince of Wales. On 6th March, 1739, the Convention of Pardo came before the House of Commons. This was an attempt by Britain and Spain to settle the causes of the dispute over the right to send negro slaves to the Spanish colonies, and to dispatch one ship a year to trade at Cartagena or PortoBello. By the terms of the Convention £95,000 was granted to Britain as compensation, but the right of search was not abandoned. After Pitt had denounced the Convention, that so called settlement was approved by the House of Commons. Here the Durham representatives failed to act unanimously. Henry Lambton and John Hedworth, the latter certainly not a 'rebel' Whig on this occasion, had voted for the Convention, and Bowes and Shafto against,² the third important division

1. Parl.Hist.Vol. 9. pp. 479-82.

2. Sharp MS. 82. Inset p. 14.

recited here in which they had gone against Walpole.

The last recorded divisions before 1760 in which Durham Members were involved, concerned a Place Bill, and whether Hanoverian troops should be taken into British pay. On 29th January, 1740, Henry Lambton voted against a moderate Place Bill, while John Hedworth and John Shafto were for this. George ^{Bowes}/was absent.¹ On 10th December, 1742, George Bowes and John Tempest, who had supplanted Shafto for the City of Durham, voted against taking Hanoverian troops into British pay. Hedworth and Lambton were absent.²

It is not known how seriously these North Eastern landowners felt on any of these issues on which they had voted, for none of them, except Talbot, an office holder, actually participated in the relevant debates. There is no evidence of any of them having committed to paper his views about the subjects over which he had entered the division lobbies. Coal, the safety of their own positions as Members, keeping a watchful eye on things in Durham, and the usual sports and pursuits of eighteenth century gentlemen were probably their main preoccupations. Generally, many of them were subject to fits of lethargy, and were irregular in attendance on political business. But this was a common malaise with many politicians of those times who were not office-holders or 'professionals.'

1. Ibid. History and Proceedings. House of Commons. Death of Q. Anne to Present Time. Vol. 6. Appendix pp. 9-16.

2. Sharp MS. 145 p. 42n; Parl Hist. Vol. 12. pp. 1053-8.

Horse racing and hunting were favourite diversions with many eighteenth century Members of Parliament. George Bowes was second to none in attention to these pastimes, for he had his stud of race horses at Streatlam. The other owners with whom he was frequently laying bets on the performances of their respective animals included Lord Rockingham, later Prime Minister.¹ Hunting was also a passion with Bowes, and from 1738 he had kept a large pack of hounds.² He took a lively interest in their welfare and achievements, and, what is more, was prompt to rebuke harshly whoever was looking after them if he deviated from his masters' instructions as to their use and care.³ Indeed it was Bowes who first introduced fox hunting into the County of Durham. His great wealth, gained from his unscrupulous pursuit of his own advantage in the coal trade, enabled him to indulge his love of all field sports and various forms of art collecting.⁴

Perhaps the chief solace of many of these Northern Members of Parliament was the detailed improvement of their estates. For it was these estates which were to accompany the interest they aimed to 'commit to latest posterity'.
Add MS. 40748 (Bowes MS.) f. 120.

1. ^ 14th April, 1759, Lord Rockingham to George Bowes.

2. Ralph Arnold - *The Unhappy Countess* p. 15.

3. Add MS. 40748 (Bowes MS.) f. 119. George Bowes to Thomas Colpitts, his Steward.

4. Arnold op. cit. pp. 14-17.

The Bowes Manuscripts, for example, contain convincing evidence of George Bowes' meticulous attention to his home and estate at Gibside, where, according to his specifications, a vast and spectacular mausoleum was built under the chapel. The well known architect James Paine was engaged on this and numerous other improvements and additions to Gibside,¹ where the magnificent layout was the object of years of devotion by Bowes.²

To acquire as much land as possible, to amass fortunes and, with these, to provide amply for their children, and to bequeath to succeeding generations more money, and a more richly adorned homestead - were the desires, conscious and unconscious, of many contemporary families of similar standing. All this was true of the Bowes of Streatlam and Gibside, the Edens of Windlestone and West Auckland, the Lambtons of Lambton, Bishopwearmouth, Hardwick and Great Stainton, the Tempests of Old Durham, the Isle, Stella and Wynyard, the Liddells of Ravensworth, and the Vanes of Raby and Longnewton.

All this presupposed that no single family should, in its searing ambition, carve for itself from the Durham seats too large a portion. This would cut the political lifeline of another house or houses, who, in defeat, would also lose face socially. One such ambitious family, with

1. Add MS. 40748 f. 123. 23rd June, 1760. James Paine to George Bowes.

2. Arnold op. cit. p. 16.

its formidable clerical ally, had been looking around greedily for some time. Its opportunity was at hand.

CHAPTER 5.THE STRUGGLE for COUNTY and CITY 1760-2 AND ITS AFTERMATH

In Durham the years 1760-62 were outstanding throughout the eighteenth century for the political bitterness excited by opposing groups of ambitious men. During this time there were four elections, divided equally between City and County. No political history of Durham could be complete without a detailed description of them. Each contest was fought with great passion and unrelenting ruthlessness, and each seemed to leave in its train additional grievances and new points of dispute. The gust of fury and sense of burning injustice caused by the last of these elections led to the hearing in the House of Commons of a petition on behalf of the defeated candidate. But this did not allay immediately the tempers which had become so incensed.

The Bishop of Durham and the second Earl of Darlington were leading figures in this drama. Sir Lewis Namier has shown that 'in County Durham the Bishop Palatine and the Earl of Darlington, when united, had an exceptionally powerful territorial interest'.¹ Darlington, aided by the Bishop and many lesser allies, was trying to establish

1. Namier - op. cit. p. 72. The junction of the Bishop of Durham and the Vanes existed from, at the latest, the County Election of 1727. As we have seen, large groups of the Bishop's tenants lived at Darlington and the Aucklands, close to the verge of the lands held by the Vanes.

control by proxy of the representation of both City and County. For his method was that of promoting the attempts in both constituencies of some of his relatives and aides-de-camp to become Members of Parliament. Whenever he decided to exert the greatest possible pressure he called for the assistance of his near relation, the Duke of Newcastle. It was to this politician that Trevor of Durham himself owed his much coveted bishopric, the richest see in England, and almost as opulent as the Archbishopric of Canterbury.¹ Trevor remained ever faithful to his patron.

So the Earl of Darlington fell prey to the allurements of increasing power and consequence, and thus brought about a strong muster against himself. For the Lambtons and the Tempests, with their loyal body of supporters, could hardly afford, if twilight were not to descend on their political significance, to let these schemes go unchallenged. Eventually they were able to defeat the Raby interest by standing resolutely for the 'liberties' of the freeholders of the County and, more particularly, for the 'freedom' and 'independence' of the City of Durham. Both families, particularly the Lambtons, for they were the more sorely tested, recognised that not only would political

1. Sykes op. cit. pp. 39, 61, 177. See also *ibid.* p. 160 for quotation from Add. MS. 32968 f. 333, which shows the repute in which the See of Durham was held.

displacement in the City representation be unbearably mortifying in itself. Such a humiliation would also lessen their stock among their fellow landed and coal owning gentry of the North East. To this standing high they attached inestimable value.

On 6th March 1758, the first Earl of Darlington had died in London. His eldest son, Lord Barnard. became the second Earl of Darlington. There was thus a vacancy in the representation of the County. The writ was issued on 10th March, and on 22nd March, 1758, the new Earl's younger brother, the Honourable Raby Vane, was returned unopposed.¹

But although the other political camp at Durham, led by George Bowes, had not formed an effective front against the Vane's retention of this seat, an open clash, symptomatic of what was to ensue, attracted immediate attention among the 'political county'. At the Michaelmas Sessions that year Bowes proposed to the Bench that an address should be presented to the King on the taking of Louisburg. Lord Darlington and his 'friends' would not sign this, whereas Mr. Bowes and all his following, including the City Members, Henry Lambton and John Tempest, contributed promptly. 'This began discontent of bad neighbourhood.'² It was then that Lord Darlington, keen on gaining ground and popularity among the freemen of the

1. Sharp MS. 82.p.115n.

2. Baker-Baker Papers. Memorable Events 1746-75. Bowes and Lambton had apparently recovered from their political differences of 1729 and afterwards. More likely they had united against the common foe.

City, had begun to champion openly Wear navigation, a cause which neither Bowes on the one hand, nor Lambton and Tempest on the other, would embrace wholeheartedly.¹

Before the death of the ailing George Bowes, the Earl of Darlington had notified the Duke of Newcastle of the probability of an early by-election. In the likelihood of this, the Duke promised support to the Raby interest.² He advocated the selection of 'a Gentleman of consequence and consideration in your County'. Mr. Bowes died on 17th September, 1760 and, according to the Baker-Baker Papers, 'before he was buried - on the 26th Id. Darlington had canvased the County for Mr. Shafto'.

Sir Lewis Namier has shown that 'in many counties in the east and north, where the Whig magnates had a very considerable or even predominant influence, they tried none the less to placate the rank and file of the Tory gentry; Whig candidates would seek the support and concurrence of the Tories, while, on other occasions, Tory gentlemen would be accepted as candidates on declaring their allegiance to the ruling dynasty and a general adherence to the Government'³ He goes on to quote the case of Robert Shafto, who 'though of a Tory family, was returned to Parliament for the County of Durham as a semi-convert to

1. See Chapter 2. pp. 69-72.

2. Add. MS. 32911 (Newcastle MS.) f. 218.

3. Namier - England in the Age of the American Revolution - p 222.

Whiggism, under the auspices of Lord Darlington and the Bishop of Durham'.¹ He adds, 'thus the Durham Tories, so far from resenting Shafto's candidature under Whig auspices, were glad of it, personal connections and considerations being all that, in this case, was left of the parties'.² Such an arrangement was by no means a rarity in those times. Certainly no one could say of any contest in which the young Shafto took part, 'This Election was made the greatest ^{Test} [between] of Whig and Tory of any election that ever was known'.³

Robert Shafto, then only in his twentieth year, was the eldest son of Mr. J. Shafto, Member for the City of Durham 1729-42. Later he became a Lieutenant-Colonel in the Durham Militia, and Member of Parliament for Downton 1779-90.⁴ But he was not accepted as a prospective Member for the County by all Durham Whigs. The other candidate, Sir Thomas Clavering, Bart., had been in the House of Commons from 19th January, 1753 for St Mawes, and from 1754 as Member for Shaftesbury. He, like the Vanes, realised that a General Election was due in 1761. He became, on the death of his father, Sir James, the seventh baronet of Axwell Park, in 1746, and was to represent the County in the four Parliaments immediately after that

1. Ibid. p 224.

2. Ibid.

3. See account in previous chapter of by-election in City of Durham, 1729, espec. Raine MS. 18. f 5, quotation from on pp. 162-3.

4. Sharp MS. 82. p. 15. Bean op. cit. p. 121.

of 1761.¹ He was backed in 1760 and in 1761 by a phalanx headed by Lord Ravensworth, the Duke of Northumberland, and the Bowes connection, which included the Lambtons and the Tempests, and Sir Edward Blackett.² This was very much an amalgam of the Tyne and Wear coal 'interests'. It was not enough.

After the funeral of George Bowes, his old friend, Lord Ravensworth³ wrote to the Duke of Newcastle on 26th September, 1760. He showed how 'by the Friendship of your Grace, and your Brother', Sir Thomas Clavering had sat throughout almost the entire length of two parliaments, and was thus considerably experienced as a Member. Ravensworth asked Newcastle to secure for Clavering the favour of the Bishop of Durham and Lord Darlington. He did this in full confidence, emphasizing that Sir Thomas' family had been 'as true a one for the Protestant Succession, and to the present Royal Family', as any in the County of Durham. Ravensworth then began to play upon Newcastle's fears of grave disquiet at election time.⁴

1. Ibid. p. 16n; Bean op. cit. p. 114.

2. High Sheriff of Northumberland, 1757, and Member for that County 1768-74. He was the cousin of Sir Walter Blackett, Member for Newcastle 1734-77. Bean op. cit. pp. 477, 579.

3. Also, Lord Ravensworth's brother, Thomas Liddell, had married Margaret, sister of George Bowes. Over two years later Lord Ravensworth was still counted as a stalwart of the Duke of Newcastle, according to the latter's list of 18th December, 1762 - Namier op. cit. p. 422n.

4. Add MS. 32912. (Newcastle MS.) f. 155. quoted in Hughes op. cit. p. 285.

Newcastle's reply on 29th September, 1760 was discouraging. He had previously pledged himself to help Lord Darlington,¹ and, on the same day, had written to Bishop Trevor, saying how glad he was to see him united with the head of the Vanes. Yet he urged Trevor to use his own influence with Darlington to prevent a contest. He foresaw that Clavering would be backed by many important local Whigs, and that the chances of a costly contested election would thus be dangerously high. Moreover, as the odds were that Clavering would win in such circumstances, Raby Vane's tenure of the County Seat might be jeopardised. Newcastle, that wily election manager, was anxious that Durham should not set a bad example: '.... When once opposition is on Foot in one County, it soon spreads; and none at present is so likely to spread as one amongst Friends, and those esteemed to be of the same Party.....'²

Bishop Trevor knew very well that the great aristocratic houses in the north had to be careful not to arouse by hasty manoeuvres the animosity and jealousy of the gentlemen of a county which was so open a constituency as Durham. Very often it was wisest to leave the choice of a candidate to the general meeting of the county. In a letter to Lord Mansfield, the Bishop showed that Lord Darlington and himself were inclined to this course,

1. Add. MS. 32912. f. 207. mentioned in Hughes op. cit. p. 285.

2. Add. MS. 32912 (Newcastle MS.) ff. 209-11. 29th September, 1760. The Duke of Newcastle to the Bishop of Durham, quoted in Hughes op. cit. pp. 285-7.

as the safest and most discreet way through the difficulties.¹ An exhortation to await the outcome of this meeting had been their reply to Clavering's application for their aid.²

Bishop Trevor had another motive in gaining time for himself to 'feel the pulse' of the County. He was looking for another candidate who would gather to his own cause those forces so likely to divide over the rival virtues of Shafto and Clavering.³

For the Bishop had quite definite qualms over abetting the already overmighty Vanes. He thought it sufficient for them to have one, rather than both, of the County seats in their dominion. For Trevor of Durham was not only in the first tier of Georgian prelates, and, as such, a great landed lord with immense temporal dignity, who was conscientiously occupied, like other bishops of the time, with parliamentary elections and other secular affairs. He was more than all this. He was the head of the renowned and time honoured Palatinate.

On 7th October, 1760, he reported to the Duke of Newcastle that he was himself at variance with Lord Darlington, who had declared against any compromise with

1. Add MS. 32912. (Newcastle MS.) ff. 446-7, 3rd September 1760. The Bishop of Durham to Lord Mansfield.

2. Ibid. ff. 209-11, 29th September, 1760. The Duke of Newcastle to the Bishop of Durham, quoted in Hughes op. cit. pp. 285-7.

3. Add. MS. 32912 (Newcastle MS.) ff. 303-4, quoted in Hughes op. cit. p. 287. 2nd October, 1760. Bishop Trevor to the Duke of Newcastle.

Sir Thomas Clavering. But the position was so aggravated by the rapid strides being made by Shafto in his campaign, that the Bishop felt himself reduced to the necessity either of going with the stream, or running the stork of separating myself publicly from Lord Darlington and appearing at least on the weaker side.¹ Trevor was obviously in a quandary right up to the very day of the County meeting, which was held on 8th October.

The only available record of what happened there is contained in the Baker-Baker Papers. As the Bakers were for Lambton and Tempest and against Darlington in the approaching City of Durham conflagration, the accounts of political events in this Collection are somewhat biased. It seems, however, that originally the Bishop intended to add his interest to whichever candidate commanded the greater acclaim from those present at the meeting. Although that candidate was Clavering, who was attended by a great number of Mr. Bowes' friends, the Bishop wavered and weakened in his resolve, before lining up behind Shafto, for whom Lord Darlington² and other Vanes, Sir Ralph Milbanke³ and Mr. Morton Davison⁴ had declared. Their

1. Add. MS. 32912. (Newcastle MS.) ff. 455-6 quoted in Hughes op. cit. pp. 287-8.

2. Baker-Baker Papers. Memorable Events. 1746-75.

3. Fifth baronet of Halnaby, and grandson of Sir Mark Milbanke, candidate for the County of Durham 1679.

4. Uncle of Sir John Eden, Member for the County 1774-90, to whom Davison devised his estates at Beamish.

1955

candidate had been shrewd enough to announce 'his attachment to the Government upon Whig principles,' and, privately before the Bishop, to the Duke of Newcastle himself, to whom Trevor declared, 'Sir Thomas goes on with his canvass, but I should think, that upon once more feeling the pulse of the County, he will desist. I do not imagine that expense will be now of any service to him; and, beyond his family connexions, and the coal interest upon the river Tyne, is of little worth.'¹

For Lord Darlington was still leaving no stone unturned in his determination to quell the presumption of one whose nomination he interpreted as a conspiracy against the standing and aspirations of his own family and their allies.² Among the local ensemble of the leader of the Vanes were Sir Walter Blackett,³ Sir Thomas Robinson,⁴ Sir Ralph Milbanke, Mr Morton Davison, and, trailing behind somewhat reluctantly, the Bishop of Durham. And, of course, Darlington could count on active sympathy, if not more, in higher quarters. R. Robinson, a chief agent for Sir Thomas Clavering, wrote on 11th November from London to Mrs. Baker, wife of George Baker,⁵ the grandson of Thomas Conyers; 'Sir Thomas returned from London last

1. Add. MS.32912 (Newcastle MS.) ff.493-4, 9th October, 1760. Bishop Trevor to the Duke of Newcastle. Quoted in Hughes op. cit. pp. 228-9.

2. Add. MS. 32913 (Newcastle MS.) ff. 18-19 10th October, 1760. Earl of Darlington to Duke of Newcastle.

3. Member for Newcastle-upon-Tyne 1734-77. A Tory.

4. Member for Morpeth 1727. Commissioner of Excise 1735-42. Governor of Barbados 1742-47.

5. His father, also George Baker, had sat for the City 1713-21.

night.... it is evident the Duke of N. and Lord Mansfield (not to omit our Lawn Sleeves) act a very strenuous part on this occasion'.¹

On Thursday, 9th December, 1760, polling began. Two days later, Mr Shafto had 472 votes to Sir Thomas Clavering's 468, but then Clavering's adversary began to forge ahead, until, with only 545 against Shafto's 916, the baronet, after a dispirited speech, declined the poll.² Voting was still proceeded with, for, on 13th December, Robert Shafto was returned decisively with 1434 against Sir Thomas Clavering's stagnant 545.³

It is maintained in a document in the Baker-Baker Papers⁴ that Clavering had shaken and disheartened his own faithful by retiring with a great number of potential votes from freeholders resident in London uncast. But he was probably justified in acknowledging when he did that the dice were running against him. Strangely enough John Wesley had sent a circular to Methodists, dated 20th November, 1760, commending Clavering to them.⁵

-
1. Baker-Baker Papers. Nine letters re. County and City of Durham, 1760 and '61.
 2. Ibid; Memorable Events 1746-75; Sharp MS. 82 p; 16.
 3. Dur. 3/149 ff. 28-9; Sharp MS. 82 p. 16.
 4. Memorable Events 1746-75.
 5. Sharp 82 p. 15, quoted in Hughes op. cit. p. 289.

But, to Lord Darlington's amazement, Clavering was waiting to throw down the gauntlet at the General Election, which was expected soon. This was despite his overwhelming defeat at the by-election, after five weeks' start.¹ The baronets' second opportunity was soon forthcoming, as George II died on 25th October, 1760. As joint candidates Robert Shafto and Frederick Vane,² whose brother Raby had preferred the less troubled retreat of Carlisle,³ on 28th October sought 'the favour of your votes and interest'⁴ from the Gentlemen, Clergy and Freeholders of the County of Durham. Sir Thomas Clavering renewed his appeal on the grounds of 'the great appearance in my favour..... and the encouragement I have since met with in going round the County.....'⁵

Sir Thomas then made extensive canvasses of the County, and of the London voters. By returns at hand on 27th December he had the promise of 839 single votes, and 531 split votes. He had made a fervent appeal for money, lack of which had been one of his principal drawbacks in the earlier affray. At a meeting at Newcastle on 14th January, 1761, the Duke of Northumberland subscribed £500; Lord Ravensworth then quadrupled this by giving £2000. Altogether about £5000 was raised,⁶ for County

1. Add. M.S. 32916 (Newcastle MS.) ff. 12-13. Lord Darlington to Duke of Newcastle, 12th December, 1760.

2. Sharp MS. 82. p. 16n.

3. Bean op. cit. p. 34.

4. Baker-Baker Papers.

5. Ibid.

6. Memorable Events 1746-75.

elections entailed great outlay. Only in Hertfordshire and Westmorland, besides Durham, was a County election in 1761 fought to a finish.

Polling lasted from 1st to 4th April, and from 6th to 10th April inclusive. There were then 2748 electors, an appreciable advance on the 1446 of 1675. The result within the separate wards was as follows:

	Shafto	Vane	Clavering.
Darlington	739	735	374
Stockton	301	319	176
Easington.	315	271	306
Chester	<u>234</u>	<u>228</u>	<u>526</u>
	1589	1553	1382 ¹

From this it can be seen that the strongholds of Vane and Shafto lay in the Darlington and Stockton Wards, while Clavering was more firmly supported in the north of the County, near his home at Axwell Park.

The disposition of plumpers and split votes is also noteworthy:

	Shafto	Vane	Clavering
Plumpers	10	17	942
Split votes.	<u>1579</u>	<u>1536</u>	<u>440</u>
	<u>1589</u>	<u>1553</u>	<u>1382</u>

Sir Thomas's opponents had only begun to dominate

1. Dur. 3/149. ff. 25-26.

the poll on the eighth day, Thursday 9th April. The voting then stood - Shafto 1514, Vane 1477 and Clavering 1379. On the previous day, it had been Shafto 1385, Vane 1342 and Clavering 1339.¹ Thus Clavering was once more surprisingly vanquished. The 'Raby Interest' celebrated with a Ball. Among the guests were Sir John Eden and a Major Gowland, of whom more will be said later.

The Baker-Baker Papers show how the Earl of Darlington could overawe many voters, particularly in the South and South-Western parts of the County. An election song is eloquent of one of his methods of ~~persuading~~ ^{winning} compliance.

'The Back Door Trott' was written by Mr. Hutchison of Barnard Castle. ^{tells how} 'A place at Barnard/ belongs to Lord Darlington called the Mains-Field- that are behind some of the Houses, and his Lordship orderd. these freeholders that would not vote for him and his Interest to have their Back Doors walled up.' ²

Nor was Bishop Trevor backward in reminding those whom he deemed owed court to him over their exercise of the franchise. His Secretary, Nicholas Halhead sent letters to most, if not all, clergymen in the County of Durham, couched in these peremptory terms: 'Your vote and interest for Mr. V and Mr. S at such election, for Representatives to serve in Parliament, are desired by my Lord B. of D'³

1. Sharp MS. 145.p.24n.

2. Baker-Baker Papers. - The County of Durham 1761.

3. Baker-Baker Papers. Election Cuttings, Broad-sides and Songs. City of Durham 1753-87.

A political tract of the time claimed that forty thousand such letters had been dispersed throughout the County of Durham. The Bishop also had clergy in the South, with votes in Durham, instructed as to journeying north for the 1761 County election.¹ But of course the automatic obedience of all clergy to their bishops in such matters was an ideal rather than a fact in eighteenth century elections. Much depended on where those priests who were presented to their livings by country gentlemen placed their loyalties. In turn this might hinge on the relations between individual gentlemen and the Bishop.

In any case the Vanes and their partisans did not rely solely on intimidatory tactics and lordly behests. Nothing in the way of organisation could be left to chance. For example, one of the chief concerns of the agents of Shafto, as of those of Clavering, was to be watchful over the possible polling of unqualified voters by the opposition. In practice, the county franchise of forty shilling freeholders was open to wide interpretation. The term freehold was often extended to leaseholds for life, annuities, rent-charges and mortgages. In 1760 in Durham both sides decided to ascertain whether prospective voters were assessed to the Land Tax for the year 1759, according to the 18th and 19th George II. Efforts were

1. Raine MS. 21. Inset 16. 24th March, 1761. Thomas Thoresby to William Hugall.

made to procure such assessments or duplicates for that year.¹

On 7th November, 1760 a meeting of the Earl of Darlington, the Honourable Frederick Vane, Robert Shafto, and others at Bambrough's inn at Durham,² decided that gentlemen were to be detailed to lead Shafto's voters to the poll. Those from Berwickshire were to vote at the booth set aside for the Darlington Ward. Those from Northamptonshire, Islandshire, and Bedlingtonshire were to resort to the Chester Ward Booth. On this and other resolutions the candidates were agreed. Freeholders living in Bedlingtonshire, Newcastle, Gateshead and the East of Chester Ward South of the Tyne were to be brought into Durham the day before the commencement of polling. Those from Easington, Darlington, and Stockton Wards were to be taken on such days, and in such numbers as would later be thought best. They should enter Durham by townships. Finally, a Committee Room and a Cheque Office were to be established, and a Counsel was to be present, while houses and stables were to be engaged for the voters. Obviously the descent of so great a body from so many diverse and distant directions posed many problems for the hosts in the county town.

1. Raine MS. 19. Inset 6.
2. Raine MS. 19. Inset 12.

The preparations of the agents of the Vanes for the General Election of 1761 bore as hallmarks the same thoroughness and attention to detail as did those of the earlier encounter. All those likely to vote for one, or both, of the 'joint candidates', Vane and Shafto, were to have previous notice of the first polling day, so they would reach Durham in time. The agents were to make a record of where post chaises could be obtained for carrying the sick and the aged to that place, while on no account was any treating by the agents of the 'joint candidates' to be at all inferior to that resorted to by Clavering's helpers.

Clavering's people also realised, from previous experience, that the outcome of the election of 1761 might well rest on the efficient marshalling of voters into Durham. So they made many of their freeholders congregate at Elemore, home of the Bakers, before proceeding to the final gathering on Gilesgate Moor. The voters in and about Sunderland were to go to Houghton, and, with the people from Lumley, to join those from the South East on Gilesgate Moor. On the other hand, those from the North East Division who wished to go to Elemore first could do so. No freeholder who had promised for Sir Thomas was to be left behind, and proper carriages were to be sent for those freeholders who could not ride on horseback. This huge concourse were accommodated in

Claypath, Gilesgate and the Market Place.¹

The Vanes were probably ahead of Clavering in the tirelessness of their workers, ^{who were} ~~in~~ straining their utmost for every possible vote, outside as well as inside the county. Joseph Hanby, First Lieutenant of the Monmouth, promised to support the joint candidates as soon as Lord Darlington should obtain leave for him from the Admiralty. He also took the opportunity to inquire whether his lordship could procure him a command.² On 18th February, 1761, one J. Cleaver had written from London, emphasising that he had previously sent to Stanhope and Morpeth, in his endeavour to enlist Lord Carlisle's agents for Vane and Shafto.³

In 1761 the London voters who were for Vane and Shafto were specially escorted to Durham. They were to be there not later than 3rd April. Some of them were given parts of their expenses in advance, but this was not in accordance with the stipulations of Lord Darlington's agents in London and the County of Durham, between whom a great deal of correspondence passed.⁴ Among the one hundred and thirty freeholders of the County of Durham, living in or near London, were Sir Thomas Robinson⁵

1. Baker-Baker Papers. Ninety Letters re. County and City Elections 1760-1. R. Robinson to Mrs. Baker.

2. Raine MS. 21. Inset 9, 6th March, 1761. Joseph Hanby to -----

3. Ibid.

4. Baker-Baker Papers; Raine MS. 21 espec. Insets 16 and 18.

5. Made Baron Grantham on 7th April, 1761.

Bart., and Sir James Lowther,¹ both of whom voted for Vane and Shafto.²

the costs of

A large portion of this 1761 election went towards bringing distant voters to Durham. For, as in other counties, candidates had, from their own purses, to convey to the poll, maintain and compensate for loss of earnings, the many non-resident freeholders:

March 17th: Sent to Mr. Thoresby of London a Bill Drawn by Lord Darlington on Messrs. Drummond and Company for £150 towards the expense of bringing down the London Voters.
£150.0.0.

March 20th: For bringing the Northhamshire Voters
25.0.0.

April 22nd: Paid Mr. Vane's half of £20 paid Francis Menham a Soldier for his trouble and expense in coming from Hounslow to Durham and returning back again
10.0.0.

The account book of 1761, from which these entries are taken, gives a comprehensive survey of the amount contributed by Lord Darlington himself, in furtherance of his cherished ambitions:

Wm. Hugall Debt. to the Right Honble. the Earl of Darlington for Bills and Cash received on account of the General Election in April 1761.

1. Member for Cumberland 1757-April, 1761, after which, until December, 1762, he sat for Westmorland. Brother-in-law of the second Earl of Darlington, and prospective son-in-law of the Earl of Bute. Lord Darlington had married Lowther's sister in 1757. D.N.B. vol. 34. p. 217.

2. Baker-Baker Papers. Poll Book County Election 1761.

March 17th: Recd. of Lord Darlington 2 Bills
drawn by his Lordship on Messrs.
Drummond and Co. Bankers in
London for 200.0.0.

April 3rd. Recd. of his Lordship Bills and
Cash to the amount of 320.0.0.

Nov. By cash recd. for Bills drawn by his
Lordship's order on Mr. Drummond from
11th June 1762 to the 27th
following 500.0.0

In these and in other ways Hugall received £3280 to be
expended in pursuance of Lord Darlington's machinations.¹
A not inconsiderable sum was spent on treating:

June 23rd. Paid Mr. Lowson Mr. Vane's half of
£55.0.1½ being money paid by him to
several Publicans at Darlington and
that neighbourhood for Treats at their
Houses on account of the General
Election 27. 10.0½²

The inroads made by wages and fees should also be noted:

1762.

June 2nd. Paid Mr. Thomas Hugall Deputy
County Clerk Mr. Vane's third of
£113.8.6. for the Poll Clerks and
swearing Clerk's trouble and
attendance at the Several Booths
during the Poll. 3 37. 16. 0.

There are many reminders of the spectacle and colour of
the eighteenth century election. Mr. Vane paid his share of
£2.2.0 to the Abbey Ringers for their toil when he and Mr.
Shafto canvassed Durham immediately after the by-election
of 1760. The 'Joint Candidates' each paid £30. 17.6 to the
door keepers, bell-ringers, way cleaners and drummers of the

1. P.R.O. Dur. 3/215. Account Book 1761.
2. Dur. 3/215.
3. Ibid.

City during the poll of the General Election. There is also the entry showing how Mr. Vane's half of twelve guineas was disbursed on four of the band of music belonging to the Royal Foresters. This band had played before the voters at the election, and was at the ball afterwards. From this account book may also be gleaned some insight into the turbulence which was so often characteristic of parliamentary contests in those days:

April 24th. Paid Cuth Hilton 6d, being
 Mr. Vane's half of 1s paid him
 for putting a pane of glass into
 Mr. Peacock's windows whch. had
 been broke at the Election Room
 upon the Green 0.0.6.

The carrying out of these, and many other transactions, left Mr. William Hugall with a balance of £20. 6. 6¼, which he held on behalf of Lord Darlington.

In contrast there is only a minute fraction of information available as to the finances of the Clavering interest. However, it is known that during the election of 1761 George Baker of Elemore acted for Sir Thomas in much the same capacity as did Hugall for Darlington and the Joint Candidates. The Baker-Baker Papers give details of Baker holding £125.0.0. With this he was able to pay for treats, printing (some of this was done in Scotland), cockades, horse hire, the services of a fiddler, and the usual embellishments of an eighteenth century election. Finally, there was a balance of £55. 18.4., and on 8th December, 1762, Sir Thomas Clavering

an acknowledgement

sent his henchman a receipt for £55.18.0, 'Being the Balance of this account and in full for his subscription towards carrying on the contested election for the county of Durham in the year 1761--- ¹

As a complement to Lord Darlington's strategems in the County there was his bid for supremacy in the City of Durham. Here polling had taken place on 30th and 31st March and 1st April, 1761. The result was the return of John Tempest and Henry Lambton, who had represented the constituency together in the Parliaments of 1747 and 1754. 1050 freemen voted: an increase of 212 since the election of 1678. Tempest polled 705 votes, Lambton 546 and Gowland 526. The loser demanded a scrutiny, but when this was offered him by the Mayor, Mr. Richard Wharton, he declined to avail himself of it.²

Gowland, a native of Little Eppleton, was the son of Averil Skinner and Samuel Gowland, probably the lawyer of that name who had been involved in the City by-election of 1731. He was the grandson of R. Gowland, a former Attorney of Durham and a learned antiquarian. He rose to be a major in the Durham Militia, and was in the County of Durham well before this election, probably working as an agent of Lord Darlington, and already

1. Baker-Baker Papers. Correspondence, Accounts etc. re. County Election 1760-61.

2. Sharp MS. 82. pp. 32-3; Sharp MS. 145. p. 43; P.R.O. Dur. 3/149 ff. 25-27.

hopeful of being nominated for some constituency.¹

Although initially defeated, a further chance to represent the City came his way, when on 26th June, 1761, Henry Lambton died suddenly in his carriage at the very entrance to Lambton Hall. But while Gowland hesitated to declare himself, the brother of the deceased was nominated on 7th July, and five days later sought the aid of the Duke of Newcastle.² A sturdy, dogged and independent minded personality, and thus typical of many of the County Members of that time, Major-General John Lambton was a freeman of the City of Durham in the Guild of the Smiths. Born in 1710, he was the fourth son of Ralph Lambton, and his wife, Dorothy, daughter of John Hedworth of Harraton. He had fashioned/himself a military career of solid achievement, steady progress and abundant promise, for he was appointed ensign in the Coldstream Guards on the 12th October, 1732, became lieutenant 1739, regimental quarter-master February, 1742, and lieutenant-colonel on 24th January, 1746. From 28th April, 1758 until his death in 1794, he was the first colonel of the Sixty Eighth Foot, (later the First Battalion the Durham Light Infantry), which had been raised two years before as a second battalion for the Royal Welch Fusiliers,

1. Baker-Baker Papers. Nine Letters re. County and City Elections 1760-1. 25th March, 1761. R. Robinson to G. Baker; Sharp MS. 82. p. 32.n.

2. Add. MS. 32925. (Newcastle Papers.) Vol. CCXL. f. 32.

and was chiefly recruited in Durham. John Lambton, a Major-General from 26th February, 1761, was to rise further in the eyes and estimation of the local squirearchy by marrying the daughter of the eighth Earl of Strathmore, and to represent the City in five successive parliaments. He died on 22nd March, 1794.¹

Eventually Major Gowland addressed the freemen on 5th August, 1761,² but it was not until 22nd August that he made his first canvass of the City. With him were the two County Members. Lambton thus had a good start in this respect. He did not relax. On 24th August, Sir Hedworth Williamson, Sir Thomas Clavering, Mr. William Lambton and Mr. Baker were among those who dined at Lambton. Three days later, General Lambton, with these gentlemen (save his brother) and others, made a further canvass of the City, and on 9th September, 1761, which was Coronation Day, he gave a Ball at the Assembly Rooms in Durham.³

The real significance of Gowland's nomination was that it led to a great upheaval on the City Council, so that Durham might have foisted upon it a pro-Darlington Mayor who would also fill the key role of Returning Officer. According to Bishop Matthews' Charter of 1602,⁴

-
1. Sharp MS. 82. p. 33n; D.N.B. Vol. 32. pp 21-2; Stuart J. Reid - Life and Letters of the first Earl of Durham, Vol. 1. p. 15.
 2. Baker-Baker Papers. City of Durham Elections 1753-87.
 3. Baker-Baker Papers. Memorable Events 1746-75.
 4. Fordyce op. cit. Vol. 1. 214-5.

each of the twelve guilds had to provide an assistant burgess (now alderman), who must be a freeman, householder and inhabitant of the City of Durham and the Borough of Framwellgate. Every year, on 3rd October, the aldermen and the mayor were to elect a Common Council of twenty-four - the inhabitants of the former Charter - two from each of the twelve guilds mentioned in the Charter. The twenty four were also to be actual residents, and every 4th October they combined with the aldermen in choosing a new mayor from the aldermen.

In 1761 there were three men who, by these terms, had no right to be aldermen. Their names, those of Lord Darlington himself, a Mr. Vane and Mr. Thomas Bainbridge, were indicated in a document giving the aldermen for that year. It is not definite which Mr. Vane this was, for both Gilbert and Frederick Vane¹ were later served with Quo Warrantes and proceeded against in 1767. The other aldermen, after Mr. Hornsby, the Mayor, included Mr. Tempest, the Member of Parliament, Mr. Thomas Dunn, Mr Bowser, Mr Lamb and Mr. John Drake Bainbridge,² all of whom were swept into the maelstrom of later happenings.

One of these five, John Drake Bainbridge, was to soar very rapidly to the position of Mayor of the City. It was not until 4th October, 1760, that he was made an

1. Uncle and brother respectively of Lord Darlington.
 2. Baker-Baker Papers. Lists of Members of Trading Companies in Durham 1760-92.

alderman, a vacancy having been left by the decease of George Bowes.¹ Yet only a year later, 4th October, 1761, he was Mayor.

He was now ideally situated to play his intended part in the Vane subterfuge. On 10th October, 1761, the Mayor and the majority of aldermen did not re-elect sixteen of the Common Councillors, and put in their place others, 'of inferior fortunes',² who then, with six aldermen, ventured to repeal the bye-law of 8th November, 1728. This, and other regulations of 1728, had established that non-freemen exercising their trades within the liberties were to pay twenty shillings a week for as long as they continued to do so. All apprentices, on behalf of whom application for admission to their freedom was made, should have served manually for seven years. For swearing in an illegal person there was a penalty of thirty pounds against the master, and a similar amount against the Mayor. This vital bye-law had also determined that an apprentice was required to pass three of the four annual guild meetings before he could attain his freedom.

In spite of these strict rulings there had been frequent attempts at their evasion, although their validity had been confirmed in the Court of King's Bench in 1754.³ In 1757, however, the freedom of the Company

1. Prior's Kitchen. City of Durham Corporation. Election Book 1746-70.

2. Ibid; MS. Jucker - The Jenkinson Papers 1760-66 p.23.

3. Prior's Kitchen. Mercers' Company Book, 1709-82.

of Masons was conferred on one Robert Green, who had not been duly elected or admitted to the Company. Also, as he had not even passed his Guilds, the Court of King's Bench decided against Green being entitled to the franchise. This had been a test case; for some were seeking to overcome every guard and restriction on the legal extension of the franchise. Their arguments may be summarised as follows: those who were vested by the Charter with the power of making bye-laws were the Mayor, Aldermen and Council, or the major part of them. Had not these men the means^{and} the right, also, to amend or alter? Moreover, they maintained, there was not, in October, 1761, time to hold three quarterly guilds for the creation of new and legal freemen before the poll. (And Lord Darlington had to pack the electorate if Gowland were to trounce the Lambtons.)

So a new bye-law was substituted for that of 1728. Presence at one Guild Day only was now considered sufficient. Applications for admission to the freedom need only have the approval of the Mayor, and one or more Alderman or Aldermen, and the wardens or stewards of the various companies. In the absence of the Mayor, the meeting should be conducted by three or more of the Aldermen, and the wardens and stewards of the companies. It was in vain that companies such as the Mercers protested vigorously.¹

1. Mercers' Company Book, 1709-82. 16th and 19th October, 1761.

Here was the prelude to the proliferation of a host of new freemen on 2nd November, in accordance with this latest bye-law. The crucial meeting on that day was magnified by the presence of seven Aldermen who were all prejudiced in favour of Gowland, and by that of the new Councillors. The Mayor was noticeably missing. In his stead, as Deputy Mayor, ~~presided~~ Lord Darlington.¹ Robert Robinson, who had been appointed Town Clerk that very morning,² read over precipitately the names of two hundred and sixty four men who were to be made free. Most of them lived at a distance from Durham, in towns as far afield as Whitehaven, Cockermouth, Carlisle, Liverpool and Leeds. They 'had not the least colour of right by servitude or patrimony but were Private Gentlemen, Militia men and servants.' A number of wardens and several freemen from all the companies were loud in their objections against this bold and ominous move, but the Town Clerk was quite impervious to these, and rushed hurriedly through the formalities.

During the meeting none of General Lambton's friends was allowed to enter the Toll Booth, but many of Gowland's cronies were smuggled in at a back door. Doubtless they lent their voices to the 'ceremony' which ended with the creation of two hundred and fifteen

1. Baker-Baker Papers.

2. The Baker-Baker Papers show that he had been appointed by Lord Darlington.

new, illegal, and 'mushroom' freemen,¹ some of whom were on the books of the Masons, the others being on those of the Dyers. These were the only guilds in the books of which protests had not been entered, once reports² were received of the malpractices of 2nd November. It must be assumed that their wardens had succumbed to Lord Darlington's enveiglements.

Some of the Aldermen and Common Council who had a right to be present, had had no previous intimation of the meeting, or even of the intention to repeal the old bye-law. Also, the quorum of the new presiding power at the Guild, three Aldermen, in the absence of the Mayor, was not warranted by the Charter. The contention of Gowland's friends that the new freemen were all honorary, and that therefore no qualifications were necessary, was next encountered. But no power was vested in any part of the Corporation to make honorary freemen, who could only be created, if at all, with the consent of the whole Corporation. In any case, those of November, 1761, had been made on the basis of a supposed qualification only.³

The genuine freemen of Durham were numbed and horrified, but ^{were} never cowed by what had happened. In 1761

1. Baker-Baker Papers. Incl. in Poll Book County of Durham, April, 1761, and City of Durham, December, 1761.

2. Baker-Baker Papers.

3. Ibid.

less than an hour two hundred and fifteen men had received an honour and privilege for which a long apprenticeship was one of the principal qualifications. The deft management of Lord Darlington, as an Alderman and former Mayor of the City, was recognised as chiefly responsible for so distressing a miscarriage. Lambton and Tempest, who had much to suffer from this bold stroke, drew many supporters from those freemen who were aghast and fuming at the assault on their rights and the insult to their dignity.

Meanwhile, the campaigns of the rival candidates had been evolving apace. The broad arrangements for the contest were very similar to those followed in the county elections of 1760 and 1761. It was, for instance, thought advisable by the Major's backers to treat the freemen in his interest with ale only. No more was to be spent on treats than was thought desirable by the gentlemen presiding in each district, and each company was to be dismissed as soon 'as they appear to be in liquor',¹ probably as much for the avoidance of incidents^{as} for the saving of money.

Mr. French, Gowland's London agent, hoped to find seventy good votes from the capital, and to send them north. But he deprecated the length to which those behind Gowland were going to ensure victory. In

1. Raine MS. 20. Inset 2.

particular he felt the creation of the 'mushroom' freemen might lose many friends.¹

On 9th November, 1761, French had reported that Mr. Raby Vane had moved the House for the Writ, which would not be out 'these ten days'. In the meantime he advised retaining the London voters in the south, although many of them 'had not worked the week past, and if they stayed in town, as they had parted with their masters etc. they would either live at your expense or go over to the other side.....'.² Thus nineteen of the most indolent had to be sent north on the Friday, and eighteen on the Saturday - all by coach. Before making this decision French had consulted Sir William Meredith, Tory Member for Liverpool, who looked to Gowland's winning through.³ But then Meredith's sister, Henrietta, was married to Frederick Vane.⁴

General Lambton was also employing agents to attract possible voters in London, where he had the promise of at least eighteen: for example, Thomas Davidson, a Barber, 'promised G.⁵ since gone off to L.' while Mark Moss, a Carpenter, 'took the best offer'.⁶

But his main stand was in defence of the affronted

1. Raine MS. 20. Inset 6. 11th November, 1761. French to Gowland.

2. Ibid.

3. Fordyce - History of the County of Durham Vol II p. 107.

4. Gowland.

5. Lambton.

6. Baker-Baker Papers.

and injured bona-fide freemen of the City of Durham, whom he assured by letter on 12th November that he would do his utmost 'to bring to exemplary justice some late violators of your rights and privileges'.¹

Two other issues were to the fore in this desperate engagement. Towards the end of 1761, Gowland had directed toasts to be drunk in opposition to those who were against Wear Navigation, which was still a most pregnant question. These toasts were to contain the prayer that no enemy to trade and navigation should ever represent the City of Durham. This, of course, was in accordance with Lord Darlington's strategy. But whatever advantage Gowland may have derived thereby was lessened by his being represented as an enemy to the Church. His adversaries made great play with this, and distributed many election songs which were phrased to defame Gowland on this score.¹

The polling was to take place over six days from 7th to 12th December, 1761. Already, on 23rd October, the Earl of Darlington had again been in communication with the Duke of Newcastle so that, should the 'mushroom' business come before Parliament, he would have the backing of the Government. He also begged the Duke of Newcastle to excuse him from

1. Baker-Baker Papers.

2. Baker-Baker Papers. Election Songs and Newspaper Cuttings 1761.

the opening of the parliamentary session, 'having engaged to serve a Friend who stands a contest for the City of Durham, and whose affairs require my Presence; whether he will succeed or not, is impossible to say, as City Elections, you know, are very precarious;¹ He spends little, or no money, and his opponent a good deal'.² Gowland had, in this election campaign, as in the previous contest, continually pleaded poverty.

On 7th December, 1761, the friends of the candidates agreed that, in the actual recording of votes, there should be no violence. Each side should vote in turn, and provide a committee of two to resolve any disputes or riots during the poll.

It is maintained in a 'Short Statement on the Durham Election, 1761'³ that the peace was broken by General Lambton, on the first day of the poll. He was said to have introduced about one hundred colliers and pitmen working for his brother, Mr William Lambton, and others of his friends. They were ordered to leave the Market Place, but the General's agents persuaded them to stay in the town, where they were regularly billeted in his houses in different streets that night. Lord Darlington alleged that they 'dissuaded' a lot of voters from going

1. My italics.

2. Add MS. 32929 (Newcastle MS.) f. 480. Earl of Darlington to Duke of Newcastle, quoted in Hughes op. cit. p. 263n.

3. Sharp MS. 94. Inset p. 255.

to the poll, and that they were sufficiently turbulent¹ to hold up the taking of votes. Gowland later corroborated this accusation. Some miners had also been riotous on the morning of 8th December, having broken windows of all whom they knew to be for Gowland. They were taken before Justices of the Peace, but it is believed that most of the men went home peacefully.³

The voting for the candidates for each day of the poll was as under:

<u>Days of the Poll</u>	<u>Gowland.</u>	<u>Lambton.</u>
Monday, 7th December, 1761	70	70
Tuesday, 8th December, 1761	91	91
Wednesday, 9th December, 1761	151	151
Thursday, 10th December, 1761	130	130
Friday, 11th December, 1761	200	200
Saturday, 12th December, 1761	<u>133</u>	<u>110</u> ⁴
	775	752

The official result was declared as Gowland 775, Lambton 752.⁵ Thus Gowland had a majority of twenty three.

'The poll for the City was closed this evening at 3 o'clock, when the majority was declared in favour of Mr. Gowland 23,' wrote the Earl of Darlington to the Duke

1. Add. MS. 32932 (Newcastle MS.) f. 156. 12th December, 1761. Earl of Darlington to the Duke of Newcastle.
 2. Baker-Baker Papers. Election Cuttings. City of Durham, 1753-87.
 3. Sharp MS. 94. After p. 255.
 4. Raine MS. 20. Inset 1.
 5. Dur. 3/149. ff. 23-24.

of Newcastle.¹ Yet if the two hundred and fifteen 'mushroom' freemen, all of whom voted for Gowland, are deducted, this leaves Gowland with 560 votes, and gives a majority of one hundred and ninety two for Lambton in the City of Durham election which Professor Hughes has² described as 'the most controversial of the century', Durham was certainly no rotten or pocket borough.

Gowland's return was so unpopular that he was left by the freemen to walk home. On the other hand, General Lambton was chaired and cheered by a body estimated at not less than one thousand five hundred. Gowland, beset with difficulties, tried to raise a subscription to defray his expenses. At a meeting to help him over his debts, not one shilling was proffered, even though the company included Lord Darlington, Mr. Shafto, Sir Ralph Milbanke and Sir John Eden. On 13th December, 1761, the wretched man was left to the mercy of his creditors, and from that day, until 20th December, he was busy sending off his goods, having stripped his house of furniture, and left his plate in trust with the Postmaster. On 23rd December he dismissed his servants without paying them their wages - on the pretext that they were supporters of Lambton; on 24th December 1761 he left Durham for London, two days after his postilion had been knocked down in³ mistake for himself.

1. Add. MS. 32932 (Newcastle MS.) f. 156.

2. Hughes. op. cit. p. 262.

3. Baker-Baker Papers. Memorable Events. 1746-75.

While Gowland was the butt of this tragicomedy General Lambton was inspired into taking prompt and positive action. He wrote to the freemen on 12th December, 1761, immediately after the declaration of Major Gowland's return, and pledged his 'determined Resolution' to try to regain for them their 'Freedom of electing your own representatives.'¹ His petition to the House of Commons was almost synchronised with another from the Freemen of the City of Durham.

Gowland, well aware of the course being followed by his ^{eventual} victors, was sparing himself no trouble in prostrating himself before every likely source of benevolence in London. He retained two lawyers, Perrott² and Hotham, to plead his case at the hearing of the petitions, and, on 18th December, appealed to Charles Jenkinson,³ Bute's Under-Secretary of State, who was Member for Cockermouth in the interest of Sir John Lowther, Bute's son-in-law, and brother-in-law of Lord Darlington. Indeed Gowland was attending the House every afternoon and evening, presumably for the purpose of lobbying, for he was unceasing in his labours to establish contacts with Members.⁴ He hoped that the fact that Nenter,

1. Baker-Baker Papers. Election Cuttings, City of Durham 1753-87.

2. Raine MS. 20. Undated. Gowland to --- (probably his agent, Thomas Raper of Bedale.)

3. Jucker op. cit. p. 23.

4. Raine MS. 20. 25th January. Gowland to - (probably Thomas Raper.)

Bute's private secretary, was one of his principal managers,¹ would prove decisive, and he relied heavily on Lord Darlington, who had married Sir James Lowther's sister.² Miss Jane Tempest, sister of the Member for Durham City, informed Mrs. Baker that Gowland was prepared, however, for the possibility of eventual defeat, and was frequenting auctions, hoping to purchase furniture for the house he was to take, although his credit did not stand very highly among business men and traders. Miss Tempest felt that 'he (Gowland) never means to honour you with his Company again in the North unless there should be some very dirty work to do too bad for anybody else to undertake'.³

He was now at bay. From Durham Thomas Raper,⁴ Gowland's chief agent, reported that the Mayor and Town Clerk had been served with the Speaker's Warrant for the inspection, by Lambton's solicitors, of the Charter, books and papers belonging to the Corporation of the City of Durham. Also, both dignitaries were to be at the House of Commons on 4th May, 1762. Determined that the initiative should not be wrested from him, Raper had asked for the inspection of the books and papers of five or six companies whose wardens were opposed to Gowland, for he

1. Baker-Baker Papers. Correspondence re. Major-General John Lambton's Petition. 6th May, 1762. Miss Tempest to Mrs. Baker.

2. Jucker op. cit. pp. 86-7.

3. Baker-Baker Papers. 23rd February, 1762.

4. Raine MS. 20. Inset 18. 9th February, 1762. Raper to Gowland.

wished to see what, if any, occasional freemen had been made previously from time to time in those companies. He hoped to find, therein, abundant and demonstrable precedents for the more recent creation of the two hundred and fifteen mushrooms.

Gowland seemed very eager to have Lambton's petition examined earlier than had been arranged, but Lambton was advised by his friends to decline any such suggestion. For one thing, his counsel were, at that moment, on circuit. Lord Strange,¹ Mr. Prowse,² and Mr. Fuller³ upheld that advice. In the House of Commons, Gowland, ever an opportunist, and seconded by Raby Vane, himself moved that the petition be heard as soon as possible. But his audacity came to nothing. Indeed even though Mr. Tempest, Mr Shuttleworth⁴ and Mr. Fuller spoke against the motion, there was no division, and the Speaker declared that the hearing of the petition stood fixed for 4th May, 1762.⁵

In anticipation of this, on 3rd May, John Drake
Mayor
Bainbridge / and Returning Officer at the disputed election, asked to be allowed to defend himself at the

1. Eldest son of the Earl of Derby. M.P. for Lancashire 1741-71, and Chancellor of the Duchy 1762-71. Jucker p. 93. n.

2. Tory Member for Somerset 1740-67.

3. Merchant Member for Maidstone. Squire and iron master in Sussex. Personal friend of the Duke of Newcastle.

4. Tory Member for Lancashire.

5. Baker-Baker Papers. Memorable Events; 9th March. 1762: Miss J. Tempest to Mrs. Baker. Ibid. General Lambton to Mrs. Baker.

Bar of the House. The following day Lambton's evidence was taken, and the speeches of his counsel heard. On the 5th May the witnesses for Lambton were interrogated. Later Mr. Tempest was questioned as to what had happened at the guild meeting and during the election. Among those listening to his evidence was Major Gowland, whose inquiries were dictated to him by his master, Lord Darlington.¹

Lambton's counsel made much of the composite nature of the 'mushroom' freemen: 'In speaking of the honorary freemen, he took notice that officers of the army and militia, gentlemen of distant and different counties, knights, and baronets, were daily taking up their freedom as blacksmiths, plumbers, etc.....'² On 6th May the House scrutinised the book in which the names of these 'freemen' had been called over at the guild of 2nd November, 1761.³ On the next day, passing over to the offensive, Counsel for the petitioner objected to the two hundred and fifteen being recognised as freemen. He also alleged that ninety one of them had been sworn after the Keste of the Writ.

Both camps tried to don the halo of historical precedent. Lambton's lawyers referred to petitions⁴ which

1. Baker-Baker Papers. 6th May, 1762. Miss J. Tempest to Mrs. Baker.

2. Sharp MS. 82.p.34. MS. Diary of William Allan of Richmond, 5th May, 1762.

3. Baker-Baker Papers. Correspondence re Major-General John Lambton's Petition. Miss Tempest to Mrs. Baker.

4. J.H.C. Vol. 29. pp. 324-32.

had been heard on 12th March, 1701, 28th January, 1702, 1st April, 1714 and 4th February 1724, concerning elections at Norwich, Plympton, Ipswich and Stafford respectively. Gowland's counsel retaliated by reading extracts from Corporation books of Durham to show that from 1577 to 1677 various notable personalities had been elevated to the freedom of that City by redemption. Further disclosures from the Books of the Dyers, Mercers and Barbers revealed that men so admitted had signed a return of a Member of Parliament at the election of 1708, and that others, similarly invested with their freedom, had gone to the poll in 1722.¹

Finally, on 11th May there was a debate on the motion 'that the two hundred and fifteen persons made or pretended to be made free of the City of Durham since the death of Henry Lambton, Esq. late Member of the said City, had not a right to vote in the late election to serve in Parliament for the said City'. This debate ran sweetly for Lambton, as there was a feeling in the House, and also in the City of London, that the rights of all Corporations were bound up with ^{those of} Durham.² But this was not all. Lord Darlington's immediate ambitions were not only maimed on the floor of the House, but stifled in the division in which eighty eight were in favour of Lambton, against seventy two for Gowland.

1. Raine MS. 20. Inset 15; Bean op. cit. pp. 133-4.
 2. Baker-Baker Papers. Various.

After the rejection of a motion that Gowland was duly elected, the House, by resolution, declared Major-General Lambton the sitting Member, and ordered the Deputy-Clerk of the Crown to amend the return. This was the news which James West 'breathlessly' communicated to his chief.¹

Local members who had stood with Lambton included, besides Tempest, ^{if not} George Delaval, ^{first} returned for the County of Northumberland in 1757, a ~~powerful~~ coal owner and a man on whom the Duke of Newcastle could repose, ~~Then certainly~~ was Sir Walter Blackett, another upholder of the Duke of Newcastle, and a Tory Member for Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Having voted for Vane and Shafto in the previous County Election, he had later defected from the side of Darlington.² While Frederick Vane had acted as one of their tellers, his brother Raby, together with their uncle by marriage, Thomas Staunton,³ Member for Ipswich,^{4 5}

1. Bean op. cit. p. 134; Add. MS. (Newcastle Papers) 32938. Vol ccliii. f. 166. 11th May at night, 1762. James West to the Duke of Newcastle; J.H.C. Vol. 29. p. 337.

2. Baker-Baker Papers. Poll Book County Election 1761.

3. He had married Jane, third daughter of Gilbert, second Baron Barnard, and sister of the first Lord Darlington - Jucker op. cit. p. 131 n.

4. Neither George Delaval, nor his fellow Member for Northumberland, Sir Henry Grey, Bt., appears to have voted in this division. But the name of Sir Francis Delaval, K.B., M.P. for Andover, and George Delaval's relative, is among the 88.

5. The other Member for Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Mr. Matthew Ridley, was a teller for the 88.

and Robert Shafto were among the seventy two who were prepared to condone, if not behave as accessories in, Lord Darlington's ~~resort~~ ¹ to what the diarist William Allen has called 'the illegal and arbitrary influence of corporative authority'.²

Surprisingly enough, only a handful of the principal office holders in the House of Commons voted in this division of 11th May.³ Thus Edward Bacon, Commissioner of the Board of Trade, was with the majority, and James West,⁴ Secretary to the Treasury, George Bussey, Viscount Villiers, a Lord Commissioner of the Admiralty, Soame Jenyns, another Commissioner of the Board of Trade, and Sir Charles Frederick, the Surveyor-General of the Ordnance,

1. See Appendix E for the names of the 88 and the 72.

2. Baker-Baker Papers. Correspondence re. Major-General John Lambton's Petition. 23rd February, 1762. Miss Tempest to Mrs. Baker.

Ibid. 27th February, 1762. Ibid.

9th March, 1762. Ibid.

Ibid. General Lambton to Mrs. Baker.

2nd May, 1762. Charlotte Finch to Mrs. Baker.

5th May, 1762, Thos. Whitworth to Mrs. Baker.

Ibid. Lady Clavering to Mrs. Baker.

Ibid. Miss Tempest to Mrs. Baker.

6th May, 1762. Ibid.

7th May. 1762 Thos. Whitworth to Mrs. Baker.

8th May. 1762 Mrs. D. Cowper to Mrs. Baker.

9th May. 1762. Thos. Whitworth to Mrs. Baker.

10th May. 1762. Lady R. Windsor to Mrs.

Baker.

Undated. Thos. Whitworth to Mrs. Baker.

3. Add MS. (Newcastle Papers) 32938. Vol CCLIII. f. 166. 11th May, 1762 at night. James West to the Duke of Newcastle; Jucker op. cit. pp. 23-4.

4. Sometimes spelt Bussy.

with the minority.¹ Indeed only one hundred and sixty four, including tellers, had taken part, out of a House of Commons of five hundred and fifty eight. Newcastle had decided to remain neutral,² despite the blandishments of both Darlington and Lambton, for the General had, on 23rd. December, 1761,³ renewed his earlier bid for the Duke's intervention.

But some of the Members of Parliament who were most closely connected with Newcastle, or indeed owed their seats to him, were definitely not impartial. Thus James West, Secretary to the Treasury 1746-62, save 1756-7, and Andrew Wilkinson, Newcastle's chief steward and political agent in Yorkshire, were among the 72, as were Brice Fisher, who sat for ~~Berkeleys~~ ^{Berkeleys} ~~bridge~~, and William Hall, Viscount Gage, an Irish peer, who was also virtually returned by the Duke, in this case for Seaford. In the same lobby was Charles Jenkinson, an Under-Secretary of State, who was to be Bute's private secretary when the latter took over from Newcastle as First Lord of the Treasury ten days after this division.⁴

Yet it is hard, and indeed perilous, to try to extract categorical conclusions from any speculation about the composition of the 88 and the 72. For

1. J. Haydn - The Book of Dignities pp. 88-212.

2. Jucker op. cit. p. 24. ³ Add. MS. (Newcastle MS.) 32932 f. 314.

4. Details of those who took part in this division are taken mainly from the works of Sir Lewis Namier, but the actual names have been found only in a list among the Baker - Baker Collection in the Prior's Kitchen, Durham.

example not all Newcastle's political intimates were found on one side, for Sir Francis Poole, his cousin, who had leaned heavily on him at Lewes, was with the winners. Nor is it safe, although a cursory examination of the lists seems to suggest that it is, to pronounce that more of the 88 than of the 72 remained loyal to Newcastle throughout 1762, his year of crisis and humiliation. Both sides contained sizable groups of men who sooner or later abandoned him for the rising sun of the Court and Bute, or had already done so.

Similarly, although the majority included at least nineteen County Members, excluding the possibility that the Mr. Morgan among the 88 was he who sat for Brecon County, or he who represented Monmouth County, there were nine, and perhaps eleven, knights of the shire among the minority. Here the uncertainty is due to doubt as to which Mr. Onslow and Mr. Lascelles the document in the Baker-Baker Papers, the sole traceable source on this division, is referring. Apart from the counties the other group of more 'open' constituencies were mainly made up of these boroughs with over a thousand electors each. Even from these, seven men exonerated Gowland from any irregularity in acting as a full and legally elected Member, while only ten could be associated with the protest against the franchise at Durham having been tampered with by such a wholesale and headlong addition to it.

As soon as the result of the hearing of the petition was known there, bonfires blazed all over the County of Durham. On 17th May, 1762, Gowland thanked those who had stood by him¹, but left his debts and bills to be settled by friends. Such were his straits that he was driven to sell a colliery at Hetton, probably to Mr. Tempest.² The last that is known of this adventurer is that he was returned unopposed as a Tory in 1775 for Cockermouth, one of the seats of Bute's son-in-law, Sir James Lowther, which was held in the 1761 Parliament³ by Charles Jenkinson.

Meanwhile the congratulations of the freemen were conveyed to 'General Lambton, who has strenuously supported and defended our Constitutional Rights and Privileges against the late ungenerous and illegal attempts of a faction to have deprived us of them'⁴ On 18th June, 1762, the General made a hero's entry into Durham. At Sunderland Bridge 'the gentlemen and carriages were all set to receive him with music, drums and banners. He was chaired again when he arrived in the Head of Elvet and attended by no less than 2000 people through the streets round the green and Market Place to the Queen's Head where an entertainment was

1. Baker-Baker Papers. Gowland to Freemen of the City of Durham.

2. Baker-Baker Papers.

3. Bean op. cit. p. 70; Jucker op. cit. p. 23.

4. Baker-Baker Papers. Election Cuttings City of Durham 1753-87.

provided for him and Mr. Tempest by their friends at their expense.¹

W. Appleby, a pamphleteer whose pen had been one of Darlington's greatest irritants, took this opportunity to focus the minds of the ^{genuine} freemen on the wrongs they had so lately suffered. He reminded them that no charter gave any power or authority to the Mayor, Aldermen and Common Council, as such, to legislate for, or to interfere with, any of the companies without their concurrence. All these companies were entitled to act under their respective charters, make their own laws, and bring actions at law accordingly; the Mayor, Aldermen, and Common Council took cognizance only of the civil polity and government of the City. Appleby warned the freemen to look in future more carefully to the wording of any general compact or ^{agreement} guild, in case such should again be the subject of perversion. The success of General Lambton's petition, he was sure, could be ascribed to its disclosure of how, in 1761, the Mayor, Aldermen and Common Council had falsely assumed the title of Mayor, Aldermen and Commonalty.² Here, argued Appleby, was the reason for their temporary success.³ Their ultimate failure may be traced to the

1. Ibid. Memorable Events. 1746-75.

2. *My italics.*

3. Sharp MS. 82. Inset p. 35.

general rule that a large urban electorate could not be mesmerised or tricked into submission by a single interest, no matter how skilfully it was deployed. Darlington had had the benefit of the Bishop's weighty support, even though this was given rather tepidly. He was also only too conscious that the number and fidelity of the lesser mortals whose political self-expression he regulated were the real criteria of a peer's standing. Nevertheless his calculations had been totally upset. They had foundered against the recalcitrance and spirited resistance of the true Durham freemen, in their clustering round Lambton, and in their well set out petition to the House of Commons, which, with that of the General, poignantly impressed a sufficient number of Members of Parliament. The causes of these freemen and of the Lambtons had, under the common threat, become one. As such they had prevailed.

Nevertheless the ill-will excited by the events in the City in 1761 did not easily subside. Nor were the majority of freemen of Durham content merely with the eventual vindication of General Lambton and themselves. The commotion on the City Council, the repeal of the bye law of 1728, its replacement by another, and the creation of the 'mushroom' freemen had all been complementary phases of one plan. They, and the damage they had spread, had to be undone, and, as far as possible, prevented from ever again becoming practicable.

Thus, in 1763 there was passed an Act, to take effect from 1st May of that year, which debarred any persons from voting as freemen, on penalty of £100, unless they had been in possession of their freedom twelve calendar months before the first day of the election. That this was aimed directly at 'mushrooms' is seen from the clause saying that it was not to apply to those persons entitled to their freedom by birth, marriage or servitude.¹ On 25th February, 1774, Clavering, Lambton and Tempest, of whom the last two had much to fear from the lack of such protection, were among those who voted for a bill perpetuating this act.²

It was not long before the honorary freemen who had initially swept Gowland to an unstable, fleeting and false victory resigned in 1764 in a body from their respective companies.³ They had been subjected to 'separate Informations in the Nature of Quo Warrantos' exhibited in the Court of King's Bench.⁴ Attention was then turned to John Drake Bainbridge, Mayor of the City of Durham, and Returning Officer during the 'managed' election of 1761. It was established that, although he had become free of the Barbers, that was not a Company from which the Common Council men were

-
1. J.H.C. Vol. 29. n. 500; Statutes at Large. Vol. 25. 1761-3. Cap XV. pp. 317-9.
 2. Parl.Hist. Vol. 17. pp. 1061-77.
 3. Baker-Baker Papers. Lawyer Hopper's Schemes and Plans 1766-7. 28th April, 1764. Mr. Wetherell to Mrs. Baker.
 4. Baker-Baker Papers. Lawyer Hopper's Schemes and Plans 1766-7.

chosen. He had certainly taken his freedom in the Tanners before 4th October, 1760, when he became an Alderman. But he had not then passed his required Guilds. According to a ruling¹ served upon him from the King's Bench in 1765, he was disqualified from being free of the Tanners' company. However, this was not to be the farewell of John Bainbridge to politics in Durham.

Much depended on how detailed a check could be maintained on those honoured with the freedom. Lambtons' friends wanted to ensure that legal objections to a man taking his freedom would be upheld. They also wished to leave open a way by which the friends of a candidate for the freedom could intercede if the Corporation were illegally withholding that freedom. Obviously the character and integrity of each particular Warden, and regular attendance by reliable persons at the Guilds were the linchpins of such safeguards. The indefatigable lawyer, Ralph Hopper, was anxious lest any further bye laws be repealed, and insisted that the Mayor should dissolve any meeting in which such a proposal was put forward. The same practice should be followed if any 'mushroom' freemen were being called at a Guild meeting.²

1. Ibid. Various affidavits in the Mushroom Trial since 1766.

2. Baker-Baker Papers. Lawyer Hopper's Schemes and Plans 1766-7. Ralph Hopper to George Baker.

As the time approached in 1766 for the making of a new Mayor, Hopper was uneasy lest Lord Darlington and his subordinates on the Council might put forward one of their own faction. For that peer still controlled the County representation, and had not abandoned the hope of seizing indirectly at least one of the City seats. By the Charter, of course, the composition of the new Common Council was to be settled the day before the selection of the new Mayor. Hopper wished Mr. Tempest, Mr. Dunn, and Mr. Bowser¹ to object if the existing Common Council were reelected, and to rely² upon its being ousted by Quo Warranto. There was definitely a plot to make Lamb the Mayor, and to retain him in that position as the puppet of Lord Darlington. Hopper's answer to such a contingency was for the anti-Darlington aldermen to choose a Common Council and Mayor of their own,³ in order to forestall any plot to produce more honorary freemen.

As a first step to averting such a calamity, it was hoped that either Tempest, the County Member, or Dunn would become the legal Mayor. Tempest, who seemed reluctant to exert himself, was warned how detrimental to his future the consolidation of such a hostile Common Council would be, for this body would

1. The out going Mayor.

2. Baker-Baker Papers. Lawyer Hopper's Schemes and Plans 1766-7. Ralph Hopper to George Baker.

3. Ibid. 22nd September, 1766. Lawyer Hopper to Mrs. Baker.

then conjure up a vast number of fictitious parliamentary electors in Lord Darlington's interest.¹

Hopper's expectations proved remarkably accurate. Mr. Lamb was made Mayor by the 'Darlington' aldermen and the old Common Council, while Mr. Tempest, with Mr. Dunn as deputy, were the preferences of those like Bowser and Dunn who had awakened to the lawyer's fearful predictions.² Mr. Tempest, despite the exhortations of his friends, had not been present. A further indignity awaited him. Although Mr. Bowser, as ex-Mayor, wrote to the Bishop informing him of Mr. Tempest's election, the Bishop refused to install Tempest, and instead swore in Mr. Lamb.³ Here was yet another instance of how the Bishop of Durham could never be inconspicuous in the civic or parliamentary history of the Palatinate. He could and did affect affairs in so many ways.

But the Darlington group had by no means carried the day. At the expense of Lord Strathmore, who married the daughter of the late George Bowes, former Member for the County, suits had been commenced against three Aldermen of the City of Durham. These were the Earl of Darlington, Mr. Gilbert Vane,⁴ and Mr. Frederick

1. Baker and Baker Papers. Lawyer Hopper's Schemes and Plans 1766-7. 1st October, 1766. Mr. Robinson to Mr. Tempest.

2. Ibid. Memorable Events 1746-75.

3. Ibid. Lawyer Hopper's Schemes and Plans 1766-7. 26th August, 1774. The answer to Sir. H. Williamson's inquiries to prove Mr. Bainbridge not the Mayor of Durham.

4. Uncle of Lord Darlington.

Vane.¹ They were accused of not having been elected according to the rules of the Charter, as they were not resident within the City of Durham and Framwellgate. The result of the Quo Warranto proceedings in the Court of the King's Bench in July, 1767, was that the three Vanes were set aside as Aldermen.²

In the same month of July 1767, the searchlight of retributive legalism was turned on the bogus Mayor, John Lamb. He had been served with a writ to know by what authority he was both acting as Mayor, and demanding the Mayor's Plate from his predecessor, Mr. Bowser.³ Earlier, on 4th February, 1767, Hopper the lawyer had moved successfully for proceedings at law to be begun against Lamb. He surmised that the latter might try to get himself removed from the Mayoralty by the Bishop, for some cause to be allowed by seven aldermen, according to the directions of the Charter. Hopper was so worried over this that he urged Mr. Baker to caution the aldermen who were against Lamb and his masters not to sign any such allowance.⁴

But the Lambton and Tempest interest now found themselves curbed, for, despite the decision against him, Lamb continued to discharge many of the duties of Mayor.

-
1. Brother of Lord Darlington, and Member for the County.
 2. Baker-Baker Papers. Various affidavits in the Mushroom Trial 1766. Bishop Matthew's Charter had established that an Alderman of the City of Durham must be a Burgess and Inhabitant of the City of Durham and Framwellgate.
 3. Baker-Baker Papers 1766. Lawyer Hopper's Schemes and Plans 1766-7. R. Robinson to Mrs. Baker. October, 1766.
 4. Ibid. 4th February, 1767. Michael Hodgson to Mr. Baker.

until October, 1767. Then he was followed by none other than John Drake Bainbridge. In 1768 and 1769 the fact that Thomas Hornsby and Lamb himself were, in turn, raised to the rank of leading citizen portrays the inadequacy thus far of the counter-attack against the Darlington faction.

From September, 1770, at the latest, Lord Darlington, with his tools Lamb and Hornsby, was visibly seeking to make Bishop Matthews' Charter void. He and his abettors were setting forth the disadvantage to the poor and needy of not having their full deserts from the Charity money, because of the lack of a legal mayor and of the required number of aldermen to sanction such disbursements.

A familiar figure was summoned to help in the hatching of this conspiracy. On 4th October, 1770, Lamb made a show of having John Drake Bainbridge elected yet again as Mayor of the City. Bainbridge then dutifully waited on the Bishop at Auckland on 26th October, and was sworn into office. In the first week of November of the same year, the new Mayor summoned a meeting of all the trades of the City, at which he recommended that, for the good of the town, a petition for a new Charter be presented to the Bishop. He pointed out that there were so few aldermen (others having died recently), that they were disabled from doing many corporate acts, for many of which a particular number of aldermen with the Mayor were required. Several then signed a petition which Bainbridge had ready

for that purpose.¹

An interview with the resourceful Hopper inspired a number of the more discerning freemen to draw up a counter petition. This represented that the other petition had been signed by only a small number of the freemen of the City,² and insisted that in future the Common Council men should be elected by the fifteen Companies, of which each should choose two representatives, instead of by the Mayor and Aldermen. The Common Council should then adopt as aldermen 'persons of such reputation residing in Durham according to the ancient custom of the old Charter.'³ Here was yet another attempt to purge the City of Lord Darlington's influence, this time by basing the whole structure of its body politic on the Companies, which were overwhelmingly for Lambton and Tempest. To ensure that there should be no loophole in this design, the Bishop, at the outset, was asked to appoint as the new Mayor, Alderman and Common Council such men as would be recommended to him by a majority of the Companies at a General Meeting.⁴

This second petition was signed by four hundred and fifty freemen, and was laid before the Bishop at Auckland by the City Members of Parliament on 13th November.

-
1. Baker-Baker Papers. Lawyer Hopper's Schemes and Plans 1766-7; Remarkable Events 1746-75.
 2. Mercers' Company Book. 1709-82.
 3. Baker-Baker Papers. Unclassified. Also Memorable Events 1746-75.
 4. Mercers' Company Book, 1709-82.

Mr. Bainbridge had previously surrendered the City charter to the Bishop, and, at the same time, presented the first petition. James Wallace, the Bishop's Attorney General, undertook on 2nd January, 1771, to examine both petitions at his Chambers in Lincoln's Inn, on 13th February of that year. But no further step was taken towards a solution for many months. The deadlock not only continued, but was complicated in June, 1771 when Bishop Trevor died.¹

The City Members continued to press for a new and better Charter, although Hopper preferred having no Charter to a new one exactly like that which had been given up.² The companies of the City also kept Bishop Egerton apprised of their views, and a particularly strong petition was signed by 'many Freemen of the City of Durham' on 9th January, 1773. The obvious inconveniences cited in 1770 were now multiplied, as there had been no Mayor of any sort since that year.

At length on 2nd October, 1780, the Bishop granted a new Charter, 'the old one..... by Bishop Matthew, in 1601, having for some years before been dissolved,³ and the burgesses rendered incapable of acting under it.'⁴ But the requirements of those who had drawn up the counter petition of 1770 were met scarcely half-way. For although

1. Baker-Baker Papers. Memorable Events 1746-75.

2. Ibid. 27th January, 1773. Mr. Hopper to Mrs. Baker.

3. B.M. Newspaper Library. Newcastle Chronicle, 27th February, 1773.

4. Hutchinson - op cit. Vol.III. p. V. And probably with the spirit of compromise predominant.

in the beginning the Corporation were picked by the Bishop with meticulous care,¹ and, after this first year, the Common Councillors were to come from the original trades of the City, all twenty four were still to be elected, as of old, by the Mayor and Alderman. The Mayor was to be chosen annually from the Aldermen, who were, however,² definitely to be resident.

All this was solemnised and then celebrated joyously at Durham Castle on 2nd October, 1780. The new Charter, signed and sealed, was delivered to the Mayor by the Bishop, with wishes for prosperity to the new Corporation. The Mayor and Aldermen, gowned, took turns to kneel and take the required oath. The first Mayor under the New Charter was, ironically, John Drake Bainbridge, this time with no doubt as to the legality of his commission. With the Corporation and Freemen, he was entertained sumptuously in the Great Hall of the Castle, while fountains in the courtyard ran with liquor. The Charter was read aloud, and the rest of the day given to festivity and rejoicing.

The Bishop's action was in harmony with his policy of appeasing and reconciling those rival factions which he had found so embittered.³ In order to preserve the most impeccable neutrality between the candidates at the General

1. Fordyce. op. cit. Vol. 1. p. 216.

2. Fordyce op. cit. Vol. 1. pp. 216-7

3. Hutchinson op. cit. Vol. III. p. V; Fordyce ibid.

Election of 1780, he had purposely postponed granting the Charter until after that event. So by diplomacy he avoided that heavy swelling of the electorate which would have followed upon the bestowing of a new authority to raise legal freemen. For no such granting of freedom had been possible in Durham since the abandonment of Bishop Matthews' Charter in 1770.¹ The enthronement of a new bishop gave hopes of a way being found through the impasse, but this was not achieved until nine years after his predecessors death.

The Baker-Baker Papers describe in great detail Lord Darlington's stealthy tunnelling under the foundations of the Lambton - Tempest expectancy of a further prolonged spell in parliament which had already spanned over two decades. For most of 1763-80 the head of the Vanes found lawyer Hopper and others often more than a move ahead in repelling his thrusts, and depriving him of the means of performing an encore of his 1761 'mushroom' Act. Yet one can only conclude, from a complete dearth of evidence to the contrary, that Lambton and the two Tempests were often somewhat torpid and passive while the battle was raging again for superiority on the City Council, and over the Aldermanic Bench and Mayoralty. There is not in the Baker-Baker Papers a single reference to any swift action, or bold gesture of defiance, or even word of encouragement

1. Hutchinson op. cit. Vol. III p. v.

from either of these gentlemen to gladden those who were on their guard lest the City be taken from 'within'. It is true, as has been noted above, that Lambton and Tempest had 'continued to press for a new and better charter'. But with what resolution and energy? There is no mention of anything positive emanating from^{them}/over the convulsions on the City Council 1766-70. But sustained political partisanship was not yet a Lambton trait, even allowing for Henry Lambton's mercurial temperament as a Wear owner, and for his brother's role in the years 1761-2, when his family's immediate political interests had plainly been threatened with extinction. As for the Tempests, they, both father and son, had been conspicuously immobile during^{at} these troubled times, when Darlington had tried to strike^{at} them too through the subversion of the polity of the City.

However the same two surnames still took pride of place on the indentures of return. Lieutenant-General John Lambton, as he had been from April, 1770, was still a Member in 1780. His fellow was John Tempest, junior, who, after his father's death, had entered into possession of the seat virtually as a legacy on 21st March, 1768, and was to represent the constituency until 12th August, 1794.

In 1768, both Lambton and the younger Tempest had the field to themselves.¹ However, in 1774 there was a third candidate. This was Mark Millbanke, uncle of that Mr.

¹ Dur. 3/149. ff. 21-2.

Milbanke who sat for the County in 1790. He served as a Vice-Admiral ^{at} the relief of Gibraltar in 1782, and had been Ambassador to the Court of Morocco in 1766.¹ The contest lasted from 11th to 14th October, when Captain Milbanke, ^{then} as he/was, after a hard fight, declined polling any further. Mr. Tempest had 386^{2 3} votes, General Lambton 325, and Captain Milbanke 248.

The news of the dissolution of Parliament had arrived at Durham on 2nd October, 1774. The following day Lambton and Tempest had waited upon the Bishop at Auckland, and the Dean at Durham, and, having elicited guarantees of support from both these churchmen, must have felt reasonably confident. As there was no Mayor of the City, the High Sheriff took the poll. Proceedings were punctuated by the exchange of blows, fostered by the distribution of money and liquor, on Milbanke's behalf, by Lord Darlington in his last desperate fling.⁴ But every year that elapsed saw the plant of Lambton - Tempest representation taking deeper root, favoured as it was by time and custom.

The next election, that of 1780, ended with an almost perfunctory return of the same members.⁵ The Newcastle Chronicle, markedly pro-Lambton, in its issue of 16th

1. Sharp MS. 82. p. 35n. Bean op. cit. p. 152.

2. Ibid. Newcastle Chronicle, 15th October, 1774; Sharp MS. 92. Poll Book.

3 & 4 Dur. 3/149. ff. 16-18. Baker-Baker Papers, including Memorable Events 1746-75.

5. Dur. 3/149. ff. 13, 15.

September, 1780, reported that as their return was 'duly declared, all ranks of people testified their approbation with general bursts of applause at the choice the free citizens of Durham made of two gentlemen of such upright conduct, who invariably voted against the corrupt and destructive measures of the present abandoned Administration,' that of Lord North.

Yet in the elections of 1774 and 1780, and that of 1768, there is not one mention of events in the American colonies in the addresses of either City, or of either County Member. Platitudes and references to the independence of the City, 'the rights of the freemen,' and the 'peace of the county' abounded. Allusions to Government policy of any sort were noticeably absent. And when they were at Westminster the enthusiasm of these two City gentlemen apparently began and ended with the recording of their votes. Neither spoke in the House of Commons; nevertheless there is no doubt of Lambton's unswerving loyalty to the Whigs, and to Fox personally. He declined the peerage offered him by the Duke of Portland in 1793, when the latter joined Pitt.¹

Also a study of division lists reveals that General Lambton, like others from the wider urban electorates, voted consistently against the measures which led to the rebellion of the American colonists,² while Tempest shared

-
1. Stuart Reid - op. cit. Vol I. p. 178.
 2. Ibid. pp. 14-15. The Cavendish Debates and The Parliamentary History of England have been inspected in vain for speeches in the House of Commons by Lambton and Tempest.

his colleagues' dislike of the administration of Lord North.¹ But from 1784 they parted company politically, for Tempest was a Pittite, though, characteristically, never a vigorous one.² Earlier, together with Frederick Vane and Robert Shafto, the County members, they comprised four of the strong minority of 218, in which those from the counties and the large urban constituencies were conspicuous, in the debate of 17th-18th February, 1764 concerning General Warrants and the seizure of papers.² On 22nd February, 1775 they were among the members who fruitlessly supported Wilke's³ motion to expunge the resolution demanding his expulsion.³

The arrival of Parliamentary and Economic Reform as serious subjects for discussion and inclusion in political programmes followed closely in the train of disgust at the humiliation suffered over the secession of the American colonists. On 15th March, 1782 Lambton, Tempest and Clavering were among the minority who were narrowly defeated when Sir John Rous' motion for withdrawing the confidence of Parliament from His Majesty's ministers was lost.⁴ Five days later Lord North resigned.⁵

Lambton welcomed the idea of some degree of parliamentary reform as a way of ameliorating 'the present

1. Sharp MS. 82 p. 35n.

2. Ibid. p. 34. n; Parl Hist. Vol. 15. pp. 1403-6.

3. Newcastle Chronicle - 18th March, 1775; Parl.Hist. Vol. 18. pp. 377-9.

4. Parl. Hist. Vol 22. pp. 1199-1211.

5. Feiling op. cit. p. 142.

discontents', and was firmly behind Pitt when, in the spring of 1783 that statesman proposed modifications in the way in which the people were represented. Nevertheless, he was, as an unshakable Whig, at times inclined to distrust the young minister.¹

That which assembled in April, 1784 was his last Parliament, to which Lambton was returned again unopposed. He had been made a full General in November, 1782, much about the time when the Sixty Eighth Regiment of Foot became known as the 'Durham' Regiment.² His parliamentary life ended with his retirement in January, 1787, his constituents having presented him with a touching address in gratitude for his services to them. Although lacking the brilliance, ambition and exceptional ability of his son and grandson he was a figure of unquestioned strength and stolidity.

As the See of Durham was then vacant, Bishop Egerton having died, a new writ was not obtained until 16th February. With the return of William Henry Lambton, eldest son of the General, on 9th March, 1787, his family's representation of the City, unbroken since 1734,³ was injected with a fresh lease of life. This was the more so since the new member was the first of his clan to absorb himself in the affairs of state without being inhibited by too potent a nostalgia for hearth and home.

1. Stuart Reid op. cit. Vol. I. p. 15.

2. Sharp MS. 82 pp. 33n, 35.

3. Ibid. p. 35.

His father and the two Tempests were typical of the country gentlemen in the House of Commons who were drawn with such vivid penetration by Sir Lewis Namier. One of the chief reasons these attached so much value to being in the House was that, by common acceptance, they thereby headed the ranks of the most notable gentlemen in their counties. 'For the distinguishing characteristics of the country gentlemen were as a rule neither political acumen and experience nor Parliamentary eloquence, but an independent character and station in life, and indifference to office.'¹ All this applied to these three Durham Members, who were so doggedly silent during parliamentary debates.

In the County of Durham, Sir Thomas Clavering came very near to rivalling General Lambton's parliamentary career in longevity, for he had determined after his unexpected defeats of 1760 and 1761 to try again for his native shire. Perhaps the Vanes would prove more accommodating this time. As the General Election of 1768, required by the Septennial Act, approached, Clavering began to look around. When Mr. Shafto, in July, 1766, declared that he would not be a candidate again, Clavering lost little time in renewing his pretensions. Not only did he beg Mrs. Bowes to give him her interest, but on 1st November, 1766, he visited the Bishop at Auckland. There, at his Canossa, he made a truce. On Clavering's

1. Namier - Structure of Politics. p. 6.

assurance not to oppose the Honourable Frederick Vane, Bishop Trevor promised not to obstruct the baronet. Sir Thomas' next journey was to Raby Castle.¹ He must have been pleased with the outcome, perhaps after making further compromises, for in August, 1766, both he and Vane offered themselves publicly as candidates for the County. Vane mentioned that he had that day been carefully vetted by the Grand Jury.² This was often an important preliminary to eighteenth century nominations.

But it was felt by many on the Grand Jury that it would be inappropriate to omit the convening of a general meeting of the county. So Sir Thomas set out on a lengthy canvass, which included Durham, Sunderland, Stockton and Hartlepool. His strategy seemed to be based upon dis-
counting publicly the likelihood of a contested election.³ Meanwhile he left no stone unturned in bowing before those who could prevent him from satisfying his yearning. He again had an interview with the Bishop, and, on 4th August, 1766, dined with Sir Hedworth Williamson, the High Sheriff.⁴ In all their advertisements Vane and Clavering were invariably billed as 'we', and gave a joint entertainment and ball. On 23rd March, 1768, both were returned unopposed for the County.⁵ Thus had the wheel

1. Baker-Baker Papers. Memorable Events 1746-75.

2. Ibid. Election Cuttings 1753-87.

3. Baker-Baker Papers. Memorable Events. 1746-75.

4. Ibid.

5. Dur. 3/149. ff. 19-20.

come full circle for Sir Thomas.

Although it had taken Sir Thomas at least eight years to secure a seat for the County of Durham, he was not, of course, by any means new to parliamentary life. Indeed he easily distinguished himself as the most prominent by far of all contemporary Durham representatives. For example he spoke in the House on many occasions between his return in 1768 and the dissolution of 1774.

He was at the heart of the bewilderment and resentment at Wilkes' rejection by the House of Commons after his return by the electors of Middlesex for the fourth time. Thus, on 15th March, 1770, Clavering attacked the Remonstrance of the City of London to the King, which called for the dissolution of Parliament and the removal of 'evil counsellors'.¹ Four days later he proposed an address to the King 'that to deny the legality of the present parliament, to assert that the proceedings thereof are not valid, is highly unwarrantable, and has a manifest tendency to disturb the peace of the kingdom, by withdrawing His Majesty's subjects from their obedience to the laws of the realm.'² Defending what he held to be the respective rights of the King and the House of Commons, he affirmed that he would support as the King's Ministers

1. Rt. Hon. Sir Henry Cavendish, Bart. -- Debates of the House of Commons during the Thirteenth Parliament of Great Britain. 10th May, 1768-27th March, 1771. Vol. 1. p. 518. Second Speech, pp. 519-20; *Parl. Hist.* Vol. 16 pp. 874-5.

2. *Parliamentary History* Vol. 16. p. 895. *History, Debates, and Proceedings of Parliament 1743-74.* Cavendish Debates Vol. 1 p. 535.

those who discharged ¹ efficiently the business of the country. These were sentiments and attitudes typical of those held by so many of the county tribunes of that time.

One of the most speechful of the 'back benchers', Clavering also took part in the debate on 14th April, 1772 on a bill to regulate the import and export of corn. In seconding a motion regarding wheat, he moved that the export of rye be prohibited when the price was 28/- a quarter. This was of great moment for his constituents, as rye was essential for the 'geordie' loaf.² Other subjects attracting his attention from 1768 and 1774 varied from a bill to discharge prisoners without their paying fees, which Sir Thomas felt could be covered by a county rate,³ to the state of the linen trade.⁴

The other Member for the County, the Honourable Frederick Vane, addressed the House of Commons on three occasions, an achievement hitherto only surpassed among Durham Members by Charles Talbot and by Clavering himself. On 11th February, 1771, torn by the conflicting claims on his loyalty of his brother-in-law, Sir William Meredith, and his other well known kinsman by marriage, Sir James Lowther, over the Nullum Tempus Act, he preferred those of the latter.⁵ He also spoke twice in the debate on the

1. Cavendish Debates Vol 1. p.p.539, 542.

2. Parl.Hist Vol. 17 p. 478; Hughes op cit. p. 303.

3. Proceedings of Parliament 1743-74. Vol. 6. pp. 444-5. 18th February, 1773.

4. Ibid. Vol. 7. pp. 43-4. 17th February, 1774.

5. Cavendish Debates Vol. II. pp.328-9; Parl. Hist. Vol. 17. pp 12-13.

alleged extravagance and rapacity of the East India Company, and the accusations¹ against Clive of exorbitance. In the first instance, on 18th December, 1772, he took the Government to task for its tardiness in examining the state of the Company,² and, on 10th May, 1773, attacked what he believed to be the unscrupulous acquisition of wealth by the Company's servants.³

Vane was not to orate again in the House of Commons. As Foreman of the Grand Jury he proposed to the High Sheriff on 28th July, 1774, the calling of a General Meeting of the Freeholders, again for the purpose of nominating two parliamentary candidates for the County of Durham. Vane showed⁴ that on this occasion his private situation would not allow him to offer himself. His withdrawal from parliamentary life had been rumoured for some time, and it had been assumed that Sir John Eden would take his place.

Sir John, a practising magistrate, and later Chairman of the Durham Quarter Sessions, had succeeded his father, Sir Robert, as fourth baronet,⁵ in June, 1755. He was not immediately singled out for distinction by the Raby 'gang'. Several meetings had been held amongst Lord

1. Feiling op. cit. p. 117.

2. Parl. Hist. Vol. 17. pp. 661-2.

3. Ibid. p. 867.

4. Baker-Baker Papers. Election Cuttings 1753-87.

5. Sharp MS. 82. p. 16 n; Bean op. cit. p. 115.

Darlington's faction pending the Honourable Frederick Vane's declaration, and his lordship had first offered his interest and protecting wing to Sir Ralph Milbanke, who declined to accept. Sir John Eden then became the most personable and likely alternative. He and his uncle and political mentor, Morton Davison, had been numbered among the Darlington coterie for the years 1760-3 at least.¹ In fawning upon various gentlemen for their 'votes and interest' he flaunted an engagement of assistance from the Bishop of Durham, a testimonial of the highest worth and respectability.²

On the first day of Assizes, 26th July, in the Grand Jury Room after dinner, the Honourable Frederick Vane made his intended declaration. Many speeches followed from those assembled, 'mostly giving proof of the wine they had been drinking than of their understanding.' The following day Sir John Eden publicly announced that he wished to assume the mantle of Frederick Vane. It was thereupon decided that he must submit himself to the ordeal of a County meeting,³ of which a considerable number were held throughout the years spanned by this work. It was becoming almost customary for would-be Members to go through the motions of deferring to the bent of their prospective constituents, who were guided, as in other shires, by the leading gentlemen of the county.

1. Baker-Baker Papers.

2. Ibid. Memorable Events 1746-75.

3. Ibid.

Reports of what happened at this gathering on 23rd August were given not only by anonymous political pamphleteers,¹ but were included in a notebook among the Baker-Baker Collection entitled Memorable Events 1746-75. All these sources are unmistakably inspired with a common prejudice against Lord Darlington, and thus against both Clavering and Eden, on this and later occasions. According to these accounts both County Members, particularly the latter, endured a very stormy passage. Eden, always a very inept and incoherent public speaker, made a particularly poor showing. Unidentified pamphleteers stigmatised both men as minions of Lord North, and labelled Clavering as a turncoat in having abased himself before the clergy, who had recently been working for him with great industry. Yet in 1760 and 1761 they had treated him as politically excommunicated, and intrigued and campaigned against him.

These writers assert that the High Sheriff, Sir Hedworth Williamson 'saved' Clavering and Eden by blatantly 'fixing' this meeting towards its close, so that both baronets were nominated in the face of open ridicule from many of the freeholders who despised and loathed them. Whether or not this was exaggerated, the combination of Lord Darlington and the Durham clergy was enough to see Eden home, and to retain Clavering as a knight of the shire. Rebuffed and beaten back again and again as he had been from the City Lord Darlington could not be

1. Baker-Baker Papers. Election Cuttings 1753-87. Especially "To the Freeholders of the County of Durham"-Junius.

dislodged from the County seats. In this election not one challenger had at any time raised his standard.¹ Expense was probably one of the forbidding factors.

After the return of Clavering and Eden on 12th October, 1774, without a contest, almost six years passed before there was another election.² Eden, who seemed to have difficulty in addressing any assembly, was a colourless nonentity in the House of Commons. He was absent from Westminster for long intervals. Indeed Professor Hughes has shown that 'Sir John Eden paired off for weeks on end'³

On 9th September, 1780, twelve days before they were again returned unopposed⁴ the two representatives for the County of Durham were denounced in the Newcastle Chronicle. They were accused of having 'supported every incroachment of prerogative,' 'concurred in the imposition of every tax that now weighs down the nation', and tolerated a 'war, in which we have been stripped of our colonies, our commerce, and our ancient empire of the ocean.'⁵ According to certain squibs and broadsheets at this time the votes of both men were at the beck and call of Lord North. This could hardly be said of Clavering, who was definitely anti-North over certain issues. For

-
1. Baker-Baker Papers. Election Cuttings 1753-87. To the Freeholders of the County of Durham - Junius.
 2. Dur 3/149 ff. 16-17; Sharp MS. 82. ff. 16-17.
 3. Professor Edward Hughes - North Country Life in the Eighteenth Century - History 1940 - p. 128.
 4. Dur. 3/149 ff. 13-14; Sharp MS. 82. P. 17.
 5. Newcastle Chronicle. 9th September, 1780.

example, in February of that year Sir George Savile's¹ motion for an account of places and pensions was carried, despite Lord North's amendment, which Eden, but not Clavering and the City Members, had found acceptable. These three voted against the amendment of that Minister to every crack of whose whip Clavering was believed to respond.² Again, both Durham County Members were among the sixty one English knights of the shire who voted with the majority on 6th April, 1780 over Dunning's famous resolution that the Crown's influence 'has increased, is increasing and ought to be diminished.' As both Lambton and Tempest went through the same lobby as their County colleagues, Lord North could not count on any Durham Member in this instance.³

Yet exactly a week later, Clavering spoke against Crewe's bill to disqualify officers of the revenue from voting at the election for Members of Parliament. He could not be convinced that these officials were at all suborned, and would have no truck with the disfranchisement of such a large body of electors.⁴ Nor was his vote on 6th April to be an inescapable millstone round his neck, which would condition him, on every occasion, into

-
1. Sir George Savile, Bart. M.P. for Yorkshire.
 2. Newcastle Chronicle. 11th March, 1780. Proceedings of the House of Commons - Monday, 21st February, 1780.
 3. Newcastle Chronicle 22nd April, 15th July, 1780; *Parliamentary History* Vol. 21. pp. 368-71; Feiling op. cit p. 136.
 4. *Parl. Hist.* Vol. 21. pp. 409-11; Newcastle Chronicle, 22nd April, 1780.

discriminating against the influence of the Crown. What is not disclosed is whether Clavering was induced by the government to adopt this viewpoint. Or was he again exemplifying the typical independent approach of the country gentleman? Sir John Eden was either against Crewe's bill, or absent, but the City Members were among the related two hundred and twenty six to drive home this nail in the coffin of parliamentary corruption.²

Clavering was not so irremovably anti-North as were Lambton and Tempest. But he was by no means a victim of thoughtless idolatry towards this minister. For, as we have seen, in the final bid to overcome North in the Commons on 15th March, 1782, Clavering agreed with Lambton and Tempest that the construction of a new government was the only fitting concluding chapter to the sorry tale of so many grave embarrassments and upsets.³ Of these the American holocaust was but one.

It was not in the character of any of the Durham Members, or of Lambton, Tempest or Eden at any rate, to initiate or add to any extra-parliamentary activity which may have been mounted against North's administration from 1780. This brand of political indifference affected their constituents. For the County and City of Durham were not among the twenty eight counties and long tally of large

1. Parl. Hist. Vol. 21. pp. 368-71; Newcastle Chronicle 29th April, 1780.

2. Newcastle Chronicle, 22nd April, 1780.

3. Parl. Hist. Vol. 22. pp. 1199-1211.

cities which had followed the example of the Yorkshire freeholders in petitioning the House of Commons to withhold supplies until expenditure, pensions and sinecures were curtailed.¹ The County of Durham held comparatively aloof from such a movement, although there was^{no} shortage² of anti-Government literature in the North East.

Lord North's resignation having been precipitated by the surrender of Yorktown, there was only a brief intermission before he was back in office again, this time with Fox. But on 18th December, 1783 both were dismissed, while on 26th March, 1784 Parliament was dissolved in preparation for an election which Feiling has described as 'the first in which the whole weight of government coincided with the whole impetus of public feeling.'³ Seventy coalition Whigs lost their seats. But only a few ripples disturbed the languid political waters of the County and City of Durham, where Clavering and Eden, and Lambton and Tempest, respectively, were returned without a poll.⁴ As has been seen Tempest was the only one of the four who was a Pittite,⁵ and he was never an enthusiastic one.

1. Feiling op. cit. p. 135; Newcastle Chronicle, 8th April, 1780.

2. Newcastle Chronicle, 9th October, 1779, 29th January, 1780.

3. Feiling op. cit. p. 160.

4. Dur. 3/149 ff. 9-12; Sharp MS. 82. pp. 17, 35.

5. Newcastle Chronicle; 3rd April, 1784. 'A Freeholder'.

According to one pamphleteer Tempest had been thinking of transferring to the County. Indeed it had looked as though Clavering, long tormented by gout, would have to lay down his knighthood of the Shire. However, any hopes that Tempest may have had of a relatively peaceful assumption of higher political status were soon squashed. For Sir Thomas, on 31st March, broadcast his optimism of being soon restored to health.

The baronet was almost too late. At least one aspirant stayed in the running until the County Meeting. Here Sir Henry George Liddell, Baronet,² rose to nominate Sir Thomas, and George Clavering interposed that his brother hoped soon to be sufficiently recovered to discharge his duties in Parliament. After a show of hands for Sir Thomas, Mr. Ralph Milbanke, son of Sir Ralph, finding discretion and frugality to be the better part of valour and potential penury, withdrew, ostensibly out of respect for that sacred cow, 'the peace of the county.'³ This was the much invoked sophistication of eighteenth century political jargon, to which would be candidates reported if they were unwilling or unable to confront the vast expense of a contested election. No doubt its validity helps to explain why there was^{no} opposition in 1768 to Clavering, or in 1774, 1780 and 1784 to Clavering

1. Newcastle Chronicle. 3rd April, 1784.

2. Nephew of the first Lord Ravensworth, who had backed Clavering in 1760 and 1761.

3. Newcastle Chronicle. 3rd April, 1784.

and Eden.

It may be assumed that misgivings about the limit of his cash reserves deterred Milbanke from capitalizing further from the hostility to Clavering of so many at the County Meeting, and from speculating on what side of the fence the scores who refused to commit themselves would come down. Sir Thomas was probably reprieved by the presence of a great concourse of friendly faces from the neighbourhood of Newcastle and Sunderland,¹ for his main strength had always lain in that region of the County. But Milbanke's speech and bearing had undoubtedly advanced his prospects for another day, if the squibs of unidentified pamphleteers are any yardstick here. All those whose works are included in the Baker-Baker Papers² persevered in denouncing Clavering and Eden, particularly the latter, as having been obsequious and subservient to Fox and North.^{is} What is certain^{is} that Eden had by now become well conditioned to staying absent from important debates and divisions. He still could not rouse himself into breaking his silence when he was in the House of Commons.³

That of 1784-90 was, however, the last parliament of both Sir Thomas Clavering and General Lambton. Presumably gout was again a painful handicap to Sir

-
1. Newcastle Chronicle, 10th April, 1784.
 2. Baker-Baker Papers. 10th April, 1784. 'A Plain Well Meaning Freeholder.'
 3. Baker-Baker Papers. Various.

Thomas. This seems to have been instrumental in a fading of his loquacity in the House of Commons, for he spoke rarely, if at all, after 1781, having previously made many contributions of a wide range and sympathy. On 24th May, 1780, he had moved for leave to bring in a bill providing maintenance for the wives and widows of men impressed into the sea service. This had been refused by¹ thirty six to twenty eight. He spoke on 22nd May, 1781 on the question of a gratuity of £1200 to a Dr. Smith for attending the prisoners in the different goals near² London. On another occasion he gave an account of the hardship suffered by ship owners, in having their properties confiscated for the misconduct of those to whom they had entrusted the care of their vessels.³

However, whether for family or personal reasons, or an addition of both, Clavering could by no means command such affection and gratitude among his constituents as were accorded to John Lambton. The General's many charitable acts had not been forgotten by those whom he⁴ represented, and were of more material value to them than their Members winning laurels in debate. But many citizens would consider that his greatest boon to them was his brilliant son, who was far more articulate than his father in his devotion to Fox and his principles, and was most

-
1. Newcastle Chronicle, 3rd June. 1780.
 2. Ibid. 2nd June. 1781.
 3. Ibid. 9th June. 1781.
 4. Ibid. 13th March, 1784.

eloquent in that opposition to Pitt which was joined by a number of Durham Members of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

That this young man could devote so much time to opposing the Government is in part a reflection on the relative safety of his seat. The years since 1762, and especially since 1770, had seen local politics carried on in a less feverish mood than had been the case during that hectic spasm 1760-2. Lord Darlington had failed both to infiltrate into the City and to take it by force. With him the Bishop also had gone down in defeat. Whatever discredit may have redounded to the See of Durham was doubtless lessened by Bishop Egerton's patient diplomacy and recognition of facts. 'He restored harmony in the county, which had been divided by elections, and in the city, which had been torn to pieces by disputes',¹ claimed one writer.

But Egerton died in 1787. Before so very long the more moderate episcopal approach to politics was to be abandoned, and bolder and more boisterous counsels to prevail. Until then the game of 'ins and outs' in the Durham constituencies was to continue at only a slight acceleration, and that mainly in the City, of the slower and less demanding speed which had been set in 1768. This was despite the breaking of the turmoil of the French Revolution upon our affairs.

DURHAM POLITICS IN THE TIME OF PITT AND FOX, 1784-1806.

The year 1784 was the beginning of a period which was marked nationally by a more visible dividing line between parties. But the unbroken representation of the City of Durham by the houses of Lambton and Tempest from 1734 and 1742 respectively appeared relatively unchallenged and likely to continue.

William Henry Lambton was soon to embark on his meteoric career. Indeed there is no telling to what heights he might not have risen had he survived the tuberculosis which was also to haunt and hunt down many of his descendants. He was the eldest son of General John Lambton, whom he succeeded as Member for the City of Durham on 9th March, 1787,¹ at the age of twenty three. At Cambridge University he had renewed his schoolboy friendship with Charles Grey, later the father-in-law of the first Earl of Durham. In Parliament General Lambton's son, having immediately inclined to the minority led by Charles James Fox, again met Grey, who had sat for Northumberland since 1786.²

The first Durham Member with a national reputation since the days of Charles Talbot, Lambton soon won fame for himself as a parliamentary speaker, even in the heyday of Pitt and Fox. He was said to be most eloquent, with

1. Dur. 3/149. ff. 7-8; Sharp MS. 82. pp. 35-6.

2. Stuart Reid - op.cit. - Vol. 1. pp. 16-17.

3. Lambton had married the daughter of the eighth Earl of Strathmore.

'acute powers of reasoning' and a 'fund of illusion and illustration', derived from a considerable classical education.¹ He was interested in all topics of the day, both major and minor, from the farming of the duties on post horses,² to the measures of repression which formed the burden of the Government's response to the French Revolution. On such subjects, as on Parliamentary Reform, which he felt must surely come, Lambton spoke many times, and always in tune with the tenets of his leader, Fox.

In 1792 he appeared as one of the pioneer members of the Friends of the People, a society with a steep and aristocratic rate of subscription, which desired more frequent elections and aimed at 'a more equal representation of the people in Parliament.' Grey, Whitbread and Sheridan were included in the Committee of Twelve. Also among the founders were Lord John Russell, later sixth Duke of Bedford 1802-39, Tierney, Cartwright and Michael Angelo Taylor, Member for the City of Durham 1800³ and 1818-31.

Not only did Lambton speak on 30th April, 1792 in favour of Grey's notice of his imminent motion on parliamentary reform,⁴ but he was also responsible for the "Address to the Nation from the Friends of the People." This drew attention to the gathering panic caused by the French Revolution, but disclaimed the need to adopt in

1. Surtees - op. cit. Vol. 11. p. 173.

2. Annual Register - Vol XXIX - pp. 134-5.

3. Annual Register - Vol. XXXIV. Appendix to the Chronicle. pp. 76-8. Lord John Russell was the father of the more famous

4. Parl. Hist. Vol. 29. p. 1332.

England, for constitutional ills, similar "remedies" to those being practised in France.

The Government of Pitt were harrassed by the formation of other political societies at home, and worried by the news of the overthrowal of the French monarchy and the September Massacres.¹ In May, 1792 they issued a proclamation against seditious writings. Throughout the next two years there were trials of editors, Nonconformist preachers and Radicals.

Lambton did not hesitate to condemn this proclamation both in the House of Commons and to his constituents. At Westminster, on 25th May, 1792, he attacked the policy of what he dubbed the governing of men by their fears, and called for the immediate introduction of a measure of parliamentary reform.²³ At a County Meeting at Durham in 1793 he questioned the judgement of Mr. Rowland Burdon,

1. Feiling - op. cit. - pp. 189-192.

2. Among the petitions later sent to Parliament for a Reform in the Representation of the People was one from the Inhabitants of the City of Durham and its Neighbourhood, following a meeting on 22nd April, 1793. Such later stalwarts of Parliamentary Reform as Dr. J.R. Fenwick were among its sponsors. It was presented to the House of Commons on 2nd May, 1793 by W.H. Lambton. Newcastle Chronicle, 27th April, 1793. Annual Register Vol. XXXV. p. 149.

3. Parl. Hist. Vol. 29. pp. 1507-8.

Member for the County, in having ascribed the issue of the proclamation to the formation of the Friends of the People. He also courted the full upsurge of clerical displeasure, as his son was to do more intensely, by criticising Bishop Barrington for having moved an address from the laity of the county in favour of the proclamation. The Bishop had done this immediately after he had procured the signatures of many of the clergy of the diocese to the same end.¹ Here was another Bishop militant and rampant. He was to be seconded by the cathedral clergy in associating irrevocably the See of Durham with the Tory repression and against Parliamentary Reform. Rowland Burdon was the only Durham Member at this particular time to share the Bishops' fears and antipathies. But although Lambton was supported at the meeting by Grey himself,² and by the other Durham County Member, Ralph Milbanke,³ the majority present acclaimed the issuing of the proclamation.

The Government went on to prohibit all public meetings not licensed by magistrates, and even to suspend Habeas Corpus itself. Thus a bill empowered the detention, without trial, of any who were suspected of conspiring against the King or the Government. Apart from being

^{Papers}
1. Newcastle Courant, undated, quoted in the Baker-Baker/
2. Newcastle Courant, undated, quoted in the Baker-Baker Papers.

3. His speech, and that of Burdon, are referred to again later in this chapter. John Tempest, junior, Lambton's colleague for the City, seems to have been absent.

in the forefront of the opposition to this proposal, Lambton had already fulminated against previous landmarks of the Tory policy. Indeed, after acting as a teller for the minority of forty four in Fox's resolution against war with France,¹ he had been mobbed as a Jacobin.² The whole kernel of Lambton's view was, as he stated in the House on 16th and 17th May, 1794, that the existing powers of the English Government were enough to deal with any emergency,³ without a resort being made to unconstitutional means.⁴ Milbanke, speaking on 17th May, was broadly in agreement, but Burdon, the Tory and Pittite, showed that he was willing to accede to the use of partial selections and extracts from the letters of societies as evidence against those societies.⁵ This Lambton had bitterly condemned.

He was also in the van of the parliamentary attack on the Government for the suspension of Habeas Corpus. But there were only forty one votes, including that of Mr. Milbanke, for the repeal of the suspension, and one hundred and eighty five against. On the same day, 5th January, 1795, Milbanke had condemned the practice of disapproving the verdicts of juries when these went against the Government.⁶ However, their declamations went unheeded,

1. Parl. Hist. Vol. 30. p. 453. 18th February, 1793.

2. Stuart Reid op. cit. Vol. 1. p. 22.

3. Parl. Hist. Vol. 31. 16th and 17th May, 1794. pp. 511, 528-9.

4. Ibid. p. 530.

5. Ibid. p. 921. 16th June, 1794.

6. Ibid. pp. 1129-30.

for the suspension, and the Tory repression of which it was a salient feature, remained in force.

Lambton, true to his Foxite Whiggism, was particularly disquieted over the enormous power entrusted, as a result of the suspension, to the minister, who might now imprison individuals on what pretences he thought fit. Indeed no man could, with impunity, disapprove openly of ministerial measures.¹ Yet the suspension of Habeas Corpus was against the 'vital principle of English Law' that every man was innocent until proved guilty. Lambton continued: 'For my part I have always thought that the true English policy was to unite them (rich and poor) in one band of harmony and love for the Constitution, under which they were both protected, not to encourage suspicion in one and envy in the other, so as to make rich and poor two separate and hostile parties.....'² This, spoken on 23rd January, 1795, with ardour and compassion, was one of the last great utterances of William Henry Lambton in the House of Commons.³ He had previously demonstrated afresh his humanity and idealism by urging Wilberforce to take action against the slave trade.⁴ His patriotism was proved by his drawing attention to the massive progress in quality and quantity of the French navy,⁵ although he had spoken

1. Parl. Hist. Vol. 31. p. 1145.

2. Ibid. pp. 1145-6.

3. Stuart Reid - op. cit. Vol. 1. p. 23.

4. Annual Register, 21st March, 1793. Vol. XXXV. p.88.

5. Ibid.

almost as many times against the war with France as he had on the liberty of the subject.

On 27th November, 1796, together with all the Opposition except Sheridan, he walked out of the Commons Chamber in protest against the Seditious Meetings Bill. With Milbanke, who had also spoken against this measure, Lambton believed that the conduct of Ministers had given rise to the very societies they feared so much.¹ It was virtually his farewell to the House. For the stark tragedy was that in the same year consumption had been fast overtaking Lambton. This was a double calamity. Not only was his growing political stature blighted in the spring tide of its promise, but here had been the first of the Lambtons, and one of the earliest of the Durham Members, to think and act beyond the confines of estate, neighbourhood and local constituency. Compelled to seek the kindlier climate of Italy, he kept in constant touch with what was happening in his homeland.² But although he approved of such measures of national self-protection as the raising of volunteers, his Foxite preoccupation with liberty was unremitting. Writing from Rome on 15th July, 1797, he felt that it would be 'impossible to live under^{the} hourly increasing despotism of England.'³ He died at Pisa on 30th November, 1797. Just over a year

-
1. Parl. Hist. Vol. 32. pp. 322, 394-7. Annual Register. 27th November, 1796. Vol. XXXVIII. p. 43.
 2. Sharp MS. 82. p. 36. n.
 3. Stuart Reid. op. cit. Vol. 1. p. 34.

previously he had been returned to Parliament unopposed for the third consecutive time.

The other seat in the City of Durham had been occupied from 21st March, 1768, by John Tempest, junior.¹ In January and February, 1784, he and other Members of Parliament went to meetings at the St. Albans Tavern, which were designed to add to Pitt's parliamentary strength.² But Tempest never shook off the inertia which restrained him from entering positively into the parliamentary fray. He was still the typical eighteenth century country gentleman member.³ The verdict passed on him/his great niece, Frances Anne,⁴ is most pithy: 'He was, I believe, a quiet good man, respected in his own circle, but little known beyond.'⁵

He died on 12th August, 1794, and on 17th October, in his place, his nephew, Sir Henry Vane Tempest, Baronet,⁶ was returned; largely as a result of the diligence and acumen of his friends and of the Tempest 'interest'.⁷ He was the son of the Reverend Sir Henry Vane, first baronet of Long Newton, one time Prebendary of Durham, and

1. Sharp MS. 82. pp. 35-6.

2. Annual Register. Vol. XXVII. p. 268.

3. See Namier op. cit. pp. 4-7.

4. Later the wife of the third Marquess of Londonderry.

5. Diary of Frances Anne quoted in Frances Anne - Edith Lady Londonderry p. 1.

6. Dur. 3/150. ff. 104-5; Sharp MS. 82. pp. 35-6.

7. Edith Lady Londonderry op. cit. p. 11.

descendant of Sir Harry Vane the elder. He had followed his father as second baronet in June, 1794, and in 1799 married the eldest daughter of the Marquis and Earl of Antrim and Viscount Dunluce in Ireland. This lady was Countess of Antrim and Viscountess Dunluce in her own right. On inheriting the Tempest collieries and estates, for his mother was Mr. Tempest's¹ sister, the young Sir Henry assumed the surname and arms of that family. This was in accordance with the will of his uncle, the deceased John Tempest, junior.

Sir Henry's marriage presaged one of the greatest concentrations of industrial and territorial power in the North East, for his daughter, Lady Frances AnneEmily Vane Tempest, became the wife on 3rd April, 1819, of Charles William Stewart, Baron Stewart, of Mount Stewart and of Ballilawn, Donegal, Ireland. To him fell Irish honours as the third Marquis of Londonderry, on the death of his brother, better known as Lord Castlereagh, on 12th August, 1822.² By his union with Frances AnneLord Stewart acquired the management of the expansive estates of the Vane Tempests. These included Wynyard, which had been purchased by John Tempest, senior,³ and some of the most productive coal mines in the County of Durham.⁴

1. Sharp MS. 82. pp. 19n., 36n. Fordyce op. cit. Vol. II pp. 217-8.

2. Fordyce op. cit. Vol. II. pp. 323-24. By royal licence, dated 6th May, 1819, Lord Stewart and his wife 'were authorised to take and use the surname of Vane only, and to subscribe the same before all titles of honour.' Ibid p.323

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid. p. 324. See Chapter 2 of this work.

Sir Henry Vane Tempest had already spent a long period abroad for reasons of health. On the death of his uncle, lack of communication with friends and relations¹ had made his exact whereabouts difficult to ascertain. There were varying opinions as to his calibre and character. First, Sharp's History of Hartlepool, of which town Vane Tempest was Mayor in 1798 and 1806,² paid tribute to his earnest attention to the wishes and wants of the people of Durham, but showed him as never inevitably bound to any definite line of conduct in Parliament. True, he was usually a supporter of the administration of Mr. Pitt, as had been his father, and of the chief measures of Mr. Percival.³ But he often voted against these Ministers, thus showing that he was never the lickspittle of any set of men. In the House of Commons he only spoke when he felt deeply stirred by the subject of debate. Then he was outstanding for the nobility of his language, and the convincing energy of his delivery.⁴ Such were Sharp's judgements, but then Sir Cuthbert Sharp was an unflagging Pittite, and certainly did not give the whole truth about this subject.

Sir Henry undoubtedly fell prey to bouts of wild dissipation in London, which in time undermined his never robust health. In addition to owning and breeding race

1. Sharp MS. 82. p. 19n.

2. Ibid.

3. Sir Henry Vane Tempest was a Member for the County of Durham 1807-13.

4. Sharp MS. 82. p. 19n.

horses, he was an ^{over-}enthusiastic patron of cock-fighting, and maintained a bear garden at Wynyard. His gambling and gaming, inordinate even for those days, were the subject of many anonymous condemnatory pamphlets.¹

Sir Henry resigned the representation of the City of Durham on 28th February, 1800, having applied for the Wardenship of the Chiltern Hundreds.² He pleaded the necessity of seeing to his private interests, which demanded his presence in Ireland.³

There were two candidates for the vacant seat. Of these, Matthew Russell⁴ was the son of that William Russell, one of the richest commoners of his time. A great coal owner in the counties of Northumberland and Durham, William Russell had purchased Wallsend Colliery in 1781. Fortified by the immense wealth from this, he bought extensive properties in various parts of the County of Durham. Of these Brancepeth Castle had been sold to him in 1796 by Mr. John Tempest, junior, of Wynyard, for £70,000. Russell had further distinguished himself by his benevolence to the poor, and by his large contribution to the raising of infantry in the county in 1795. His marriage connections were far from negligible. His second

-
1. Edith Lady Londonderry - Frances Anne pp. 7-10; B.L. Gough Adds. Durham MS. espec 8^o 35. pp. 10-14. No. 6.
 2. Sharp MS. 82. p. 36.
 3. B.M. (Printed) 8135 a 13. City of Durham Election 1800. p.2. To the Mayor, Alderman, and independent Freemen of the City of Durham.
 4. B.M. (Printed) 8135a 13. p. 3. Matthew Russell to the Worshipful the Mayor, Aldermen and the other Freemen of the City of Durham.

wife was a grand-daughter of Sir Ralph Milbanke, Baronet of Halnaby, the father of Mark Milbanke who had been a candidate for the County of Durham in 1774.¹

Williams' son, Matthew, was at one time a Major in the Durham Militia. He became a Vice-Lieutenant of the County, and was a wealthy man in his own right, having spent about £250,000 in rebuilding the greater part of Brancepeth Castle. In 1800 his supporters laid great store on two special characteristics. First, they claimed he was a fervent follower of Pitt,² and second, they pointed out that he had a great flair for business, which would redound to the advantage of the coal trade. This was a sure, in fact an essential key to strike in any Durham contest.

Despite this vaunted qualification Russell did not win a seat in the City of Durham then or at any future time, although he was to hold ^{one} seat of the constituency of Saltash from 1802, save for a brief interval in 1807, until his death in May 1822.³ His only son William represented the County of Durham from 1828-1832.⁴

The successful candidate, Michael Angelo Taylor, was a lively personality of a strong individual stamp. He was

1. Prior's Kitchen. Surtees op. cit. Longstaffe Additions Vol. IV pp. 127-170. Cutting from undated copy of Gateshead Observer.

2. 8135a. 13. City Election 1800. pp. 12-13. Election Ballads, 7th March, 1800. Ibid. 8th March, 1800.

3. Sharp MS. 82.p.37n. Surtees op. cit. Vol. IV. pt.2. p.3.; Fordyce op. cit. Vol. I. p.433. Returns of Members of Parliament.

4. Sharp MS. 82 Inset p.21.n.

conspicuous in many debates in the House of Commons, which was far from true of most Members who sat for the City and County of Durham during this period. After an early flirtation with Pitt's¹ Toryism in 1784 Taylor crossed over to join Charles James Fox, and became prominent in the Whig opposition led by Fox and Grey. Later he developed sharply defined views on such questions as war and peace, and the state of the Court of Chancery. Election ballads of 1800 portray him as a strong pacifist, and as being² strenuously opposed to all forms of war taxation. The accuracy of this portrait was confirmed by his many speeches in Parliament.

He was the son of Sir Robert Taylor, architect to the Bank of England, and had been called to the Bar at Lincoln's Inn in 1774. As a talented young lawyer, he had assisted Edmund Burke in the prosecution of Warren Hastings. An original member of the Friends of the People, his parliamentary career had begun in 1784, when he represented Poole. Although he was defeated in 1790, it was not long before he was sitting again for Poole from 25th February 1791, on petition, after accepting election for Heytesbury, Wiltshire. Aldborough, Suffolk, was his next constituency in 1796. From there he turned his attention to the City of Durham, confident that he did not lack entirely the local ties which the freemen expected to find in candidates.

1. D.N.B. Vol. 55. p. 454.

2. Baker-Baker Papers.

For he had married Frances Anne, the only daughter of the Reverend Sir Henry Vane, Baronet. This made him the brother-in-law of Sir Henry Vane Tempest,¹ and uncle by marriage of the younger Frances Anne.

In his election campaign at Durham Mr. Taylor faced many difficulties. There was a widespread report that Sir Henry Vane Tempest had fully intended to hand the seat to Mr. Taylor, and that the latter was in effect the baronet's nominee. This was alleged late in the contest by Mr. Russell, who declared that both distant voters and gentlemen with property in the County of Durham had been some time previously engaged for his opponent.² Durham freemen were, of course, very touchy over the slightest hint of the intrusion in their midst of anything savouring of a nomination borough, so Taylor had to deny stoutly these accusations.

But behind Mr. Taylor, in a solid compact, were the Liddells, Sir Ralph Milbanke, despite his connections by marriage with Russell, Sir John Eden, and Sir Hedworth Williamson, the High Sheriff of the County.³ Milbanke and Eden were certainly Foxite Whigs, while Williamson and the Liddells were probably of the same affection.

As one candidate was thus a Pittite, making the first attempt of any of his family to break into the City

1. Sharp MS. 82. p. 37n; Bean op. cit. p. 156; Returns of Members of Parliament.

2. B.M. 8135a. 13. p. 62. 19th March, 1800. p. 62. Matthew Russell to the Worthy Freemen of the City of Durham.

3. 8135a. 13. p. 25. 10th March, 1800. Also Raine MS. 92. pp. 42-3. Song.

representation, which had been engrossed so long by the Lambtons and Tempests, and as the other was a Foxite, backed by the interest of his in-laws the Tempests, it was therefore not unexpected that the contest would be bitter and tense. The voting commenced on 11th March, and lasted until Sunday, 16th March, when Russell signified to the Mayor that he would then decline the poll. He told the freemen that, from an examination of his own books, Mr. Taylor had a clear majority.¹ Taylor continued, however, to urge his supporters to^{poll to} the last man,² until the final figures were Taylor 464, and Russell 360.³

The last day of the poll, 17th March, had been memorable for the sudden announcement of a third, though hardly a serious candidate. This was George Baker of Elemore, who received only seven votes. His grandfather, also George Baker, had represented the City of Durham from 1713 until 1722, and his father had followed the fortunes of John Lambton closely during the years 1760-62. George Baker, the candidate in 1800, was a well known sportsman, and was reputed to be one of the best gentlemen riders in the country. He was again defeated in the City election⁴ of 1813.

1. 8135a. 13 p. 55. 16th March, 1800.

2. Ibid. 17th March, 1800 p. 57.

3. Dur. 3/150 ff. 90-4. Sharp MS 82 pp. 36-7; Sharp MS. 92 Poll Book.

4. Sharp MS. 82. p. 39n; Bean op. cit p. 146.

But Taylor did not enjoy the fruits of his entry into the Tempest 'inheritance' for long. Parliament was dissolved in June, 1802, three months after the Peace of Amiens. The result of the new election in the City of Durham was: Ralph John Lambton 530, Richard Wharton 517, and Michael Angelo Taylor 498. As many as nine hundred and eighty three freemen had polled, of whom four hundred and nine were single voters, or plumpers, for the Tory.

¹ Perhaps this impressive number of plumpers is chiefly Wharton. Why these voting figures seem so much larger than those taken at the 1774 election. Even so the 983 is clearly more modest than the 1312 legal voters of the 1761 by-election.

This was the Lambton who had, after the death of his brilliant brother, William Henry, become a Member for the

City on 8th January, 1798.² He was also responsible as

guardian for his nephew, the precocious John George

Lambton. As a Member of the House of Commons he was as

sluggish as so many other country gentry of the times.

Ralph Lambton's abilities/^{probably} showed best on the hunting

field, where he was particularly accomplished. For many

years he was a Master-of-Hounds, until February 1837,

when a severe fall from his horse confined him to his

couch until his death in February, 1844.³

Just before the election of 1802, Lambton was considerably embarrassed by rumours of an understanding between Taylor, as the Tempest heir, and himself. At this time the political manoeuvres of Taylor's brother-in-law, Sir Henry Vane Tempest, were arousing great

1. Dur. 3/150. ff. 84-85. Sharp MS. 82. p. 37; Sharp MS. 145. p. 49n. Sharp MS. 92. Poll. Book. pp. 109-135.

2. Dur. 3/150 ff. 95-7; Sharp MS. 82 p. 36.

3. Bean. op. cit. p. 152.

indignation in many quarters. So Lambton was prudent to disavow the existence of a coalition with either Sir Henry or Mr. Taylor. Also Durham freemen never liked candidates to coalesce too openly, unless with the obvious approval of most of the electors. They were wary, especially at this time, of an election being too flagrantly 'fixed' without their being first consulted. Anonymous scribe writers nevertheless insisted that at least one canvass had been carried out on behalf of both Lambton¹ and Taylor jointly by Sir Thomas Henry Liddell, now the sixth baronet of Ravensworth.² Whatever the truth of this it seems unlikely that either Lambton or Taylor could fail to be alienated by Wharton.

It had not been easy to find a third candidate for this election. Major Russell had declined to come forward again, as had many others of the older county families. Eventually, Mr. Wharton, an adamant Tory and Pittite, was persuaded to lead the 'independent Freemen' in their 'glorious efforts to shake off the yoke which has galled you so many years...³ For he tried to show that the long hold of the Lambton and Tempest families over the parliamentary representation of the City had been detrimental to the rights of the freemen, and regarded,

1. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 8^o 35. No. 44. 24th May, 1802.

2. Fordyce op. cit. Vol. II. p. 676.

3. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 8^o 35. p. 41. No 24. 23rd January, 1802. Richard Wharton to the Independent Freemen.

or feigned to regard, himself as their deliverer.¹ He inveighed against the corporation of the City, alleging that they had helped his opponents in the contest by various malpractices, of which the preventing of the wardens of the companies from rejecting illegal and occasional freemen was only one.² It is not easy to justify Richard Wharton's posing as a latter day General Lambton. The future was to reveal how diehard a Tory he was, and, moreover, a Tory who upheld and welcomed the policies of the Liverpool Government between 1815 and 1822, and the standpoint of Phillpotts and the College during this time.

On 7th December, 1802, a petition charging Mr. Wharton with bribery and corruption was presented by some of the electors for the City of Durham to the House of Commons. So he was hoist with his own petard. It was said that Wharton, his friends and agents had given meat and drink on a lavish scale before the teste of the writ. Furthermore, eighty freemen had been persuaded to travel from London to Durham, and maintained there. They had then received compensation for loss of time, and also money to take them back to London. In this way, claimed the petitioners, Wharton had illegally incurred great expense, and the privileges of the petitioners and the

1. Ibid. pp. 98-104. Proceedings of the Durham City Election, Monday, 19th, July, 1802.

2. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 8° 35. p. 100. Proceedings of the Durham City Election, Monday, 19th July, 1802.

other citizens and freemen had been violated. Clearly he had committed the unpardonable crime in those days of carrying liberality in such matters to glaringly extreme lengths.

This petition/^{was} again presented on 23rd November, 1803. Finally a Committee declared, on 20th February, 1804, that Wharton was not duly elected, and the late contest, so far as it related to him, was considered void.¹ A new writ was then issued. There were three days of polling, beginning on 2nd March, 1804, at the end of which Robert Eden Duncombe Shafto of Whitworth, the eldest surviving son of the former Member for the County from 1760 to 1768, Mr Robert Shafto,² and, like his father, a Tory,³ was returned with 385 votes.⁴ He had a majority of 96 over Francis Tweddell, a renowned scholar and traveller.⁵ There was one other candidate, Charles Spearman of Thornley, a magistrate for the County of Durham, but he had been proposed on the final day of the poll and received only 13 votes.⁶

1. Sharp MS. 82. p. 37. Sharp MS. 145. p. 49.n.

2. Sharp MS. 82 p. 38n.

3. But note that on 8th June, 1804 he voted with the Opposition against the Additional Force Bill (Parl. Debates Vol. 2. pp. 607-8), and, on 18th June, against the Second Reading of the Amendments to this. With him on both occasions were Sir R. Milbanke and R.J. Lambton. (Ibid. pp. 754-5).

4. Dur. 3/150. ff. 81-3; Sharp MS. 82 p. 38; Sharp MS. 92. pp. 87-107.

5. Sharp MS. 82 p. 38n.

6. Ibid.

This was by no means the political finale in Durham of Richard Wharton, the grandson of Robert Wharton, the local tradesmen who had been unsuccessful at the hustings in 1747. Richard was to be returned without opposition for the City in 1806. From then until 1820 he remained in Parliament for the same constituency, until he was rejected as a candidate for the County of Durham, in a campaign of unusual violence and virulence. An eminent barrister-at-law, for some time from 24th January, 1809, he was Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, and, from 1809 until 1814, Secretary of the Treasury.¹ So he was one of the few Durham Members to hold a Government office.

The membership of Wharton and R.J. Lambton for the City was reaffirmed on 7th November, 1806.² This sharing of the City representation between Tory and Whig was to be a familiar pattern of Durham politics in the early nineteenth century, although the coincidence of growing political differences with personal and family affiliations must not be overlooked. However, the fact that Whartons' Toryism was that of the kidney of Sidmouth, Eldon, Phillpotts and of the third Marquis of Londonderry was of grim foreboding to many. He had ended the long archway of

1. Sharp MS. 82. pp. 21, 37 n.; Parliamentary Debates from 1803 Vol. 12 p. 122; A. Aspinall - The Letters of King George IV. Vol. I. pp. 360-1. No. 371.
 2. Dur 3/150. ff. 77-8; Sharp MS. 82. p. 38.

years during which the Tempests or a relative of theirs had engrossed one of the City seats. Yet ironically his hatred of the idea of Parliamentary Reform was to be exceeded among Durham laymen only by that of the most formidable Tempest of all, Lord Londonderry.

Indeed the beginning of a pronounced political demarcation among the Durham gentry for reasons other than personal ones was now in sight. For deep in their devotion to Fox and his memory were his disciples among the Members and the County families of Durham, such as R.J. Lambton, whose brother had been one of Fox's chief ensigns, Sir Ralph Milbanke, Baronet, Member for the County, and Sir Thomas Henry Liddell, soon to be Milbanke's fellow representative. It is clear that the appetite of the Foxite Whigs was not satiated with the command of two Durham seats and the prospect of taking a third.

A letter from Viscount Lowther to George Canning showed the former's anxiety to awaken Grenville to the steps being taken to enlarge the Foxite interest in the North of England; for example, after a dinner at Raby, which is described by Feiling as one of the 'Whig' palaces;¹ two candidates each were to be nominated for the County and the City. The third Earl of Darlington had given his benediction to their projected canvasses, which would be hallowed by the full application of his interest.

1. Feiling op. cit. p. 251.

Lowther, whose relationship with the Vanes of Raby was derived from the marriage of the second Earl of Darlington to the sister of James Lowther, first Earl of Lonsdale, then asked: 'To what can all this tend but to place the King under the command of his son, voting with a sturdy faction during the remainder of his reign.....'¹

Certainly ~~such~~ an aim, in Durham at any rate, seemed to enjoy priority with Lord Darlington over following what had almost become a family tradition of allying with the Bishop of Durham for their common gain electorally.

This, the third Earl of Darlington, held the positions of Lord Lieutenant and Vice-Admiral of Durham, as well as that of Colonel of the Durham Militia, almost as family heirlooms. He had been Member of Parliament for Totnes 1788-90, and for Winchelsea 1790-2². For a long time he was a great friend of Grey, with whom he corresponded freely. He was created Marquis of Cleveland on 17th September, 1827, and in January, 1833, he was advanced³ to the titles of Duke of Cleveland and Baron Raby.

It would appear that he was a driving force behind the return of Milbanke and Liddell for the County on 10th November, 1806⁴, a date which signalled the replacement of Rowland Burdon by Liddell without a contest, and the

1. H.M.C. Lonsdale MS. No.33. p. 215. 26th October, 1806.

2. Fordyce op. cit. Vol. II. p. 108; D.N.B. Vol. 58 p. 130.

3. Fordyce. op. cit. Vol.II. p. 107.

4. Sharp MS. 82. p. 18.

withdrawal from Parliament of Rowland Burdon. Burdon was, however, to remain one of the most ~~St~~resolute Durham Tories. His career, and that of his colleague, Sir Ralph Milbanke, are probably best reviewed entirely in retrospect. At the same time the trend of parliamentary representation in the County since 1784 must be indicated.

Rowland Burdon's¹ father and namesake had bought the Manor of Castle Eden in 1758. The future Member for the County of Durham contracted a most serviceable political alliance by marrying in 1780, Margaret, the daughter of Charles Brandling of Gosforth, Northumberland.² With banking interests in Newcastle chiefly in the firm of Burdon and Surtees, he was the first merchant and man of commerce to represent the County of Durham. He soon proved a liberal benefactor of the town of Sunderland, although his father-in-law was a giant in the Newcastle coal trade. But then this was a period in which Tyne and Wear were not at one another's throat over coal. Burdon was chiefly remembered in Sunderland for his cast iron bridge over the Wear, as his enthusiasm was largely responsible for the passing of an act in 1792 for the erection of this structure. The actual design, as accepted by the town of Sunderland, was in accordance with

1. Surtees op. cit. Vol. I. p. 43.

2. High Sheriff of Northumberland, 1781, and returned as Member for Newcastle, 1784, 1790 and 1796. His fourth son was Robert William Brandling, one of the leaders in the Limitation of the Vend agreement in the early nineteenth century.

the ideas of Burdon himself, who provided £30,000 towards its fulfilment, and laid the foundation stone, amidst great rejoicing, on 24th September, 1793. The bridge was¹ opened for general use on 9th August, 1796.

Burdon had been a Member for the County uninterruptedly since 1790, when his fate had hung in the balance for a few weeks. Indeed various prospective candidates had begun to make themselves heard well before 1789 had run its course. The name of Lord Barnard, then a Member for Totnes, and, in 1792, to become the third Earl of Darlington,² was the first mooted. Significantly he declined the nomination on account of his business inexperience.³ Until the wishes of his father, the second Earl of Darlington, were revealed, Lord Barnard, in April, 1789, acquainted Sir John Eden, one of the sitting members, with his hope that the latter would continue to represent the Durham freeholders, 'as long as you have a desire' to do so.⁴ But, on 26th August, 1789, Barnard sent a letter to Mr. Henry Pinkney of Great Chilton,⁵ asking for his vote and services for Burdon, or for Burdon and Milbanke jointly. He gave as an explanation of his new found sharpness towards Sir John Eden the fact that he had earlier misunderstood the sentiments of his family, who

1. Fordyce. op. cit. vol. II. p. 367 n.

2. Baker-Baker Papers. Election Addresses. 4th April, 1789. Lord Barnard to -.

3. Ibid. 13th April, 1789.

4. Ibid. 9th September, 1789.

5. Ibid.

were now opposed to Eden.¹ One can only surmise the cause of this change ² ~~off~~front.

Meanwhile Rowland Burdon had made his first application to the electorate. He prided himself on his attachment to ~~the~~ Mr. Pitts' Administration, 'which has so happily conducted this nation through a most alarming crisis.' Another candidate was Ralph Milbanke, who was a great grandson of Sir Mark Milbanke, a candidate for the County of Durham in 1679. He was also the eldest son of Sir Ralph Milbanke, the fifth baronet, whom he was to succeed on 8th January, 1798, and the nephew of Mr. Mark Milbanke, candidate for the City of Durham, 1774. Like his uncle he had served his country at sea, and was a Captain in the Navy in 1782. Twenty four years later he ³ was to command the Cumberland Volunteers.

On 1st July, Milbanke reminded those freeholders who were to read his address, that in 1784, in order to preserve the peace of the County, he had withdrawn as a candidate. He had done this in spite of the respectable number of friends ready to support him actively. But he had also declared then that he would renew his candidacy ⁴ at the next favourable opportunity. He regarded that time as having arrived with the worsening of the health

1. Ibid. 16th September, 1789. Sir John Eden to the Editors of the Newcastle Courant.

2. Of course in Durham, as elsewhere, considerations of party were not infrequently subordinated to those of personality, family or local issues.

3. Sharp MS. 82. p. 17n.; Bean op. cit. pp. 118-9.

4. Baker-Baker Papers. Election Addresses.

of one of the County Members.¹

By the end of 1789 it had become clear that the expected dissolution would not occur for some few months, so political activity dwindled until June, 1790. On the fifteenth of that month, Sir Thomas Clavering, virtually crippled by gout, took a regretful farewell of his constituents. For the dissolution was now at hand.

From a poll of 3407 freeholders Rowland Burdon and Ralph Milbanke were returned on 8th July with 2073 and 1799 votes respectively.² Sir John Eden was overthrown with 1696 votes.³ In his address to the freeholders, he commented on the narrowness of the majority against him, and attributed it to the defection of many, including 'some even in high stations, who had promised me their countenance.'⁴ This was doubtless an allusion to the second Lord Darlington and his family, who, with Lord Strathmore, had given their interest to Burdon.⁵ Thus had the Vanes cast aside their willing tool of earlier days.

A number of election songs emphasized the benefits likely to accrue to the commerce of the County.

1. Ibid.

2. Sharp MS. 82. p. 17 Durham 3/149. ff. 3-4. Sharp MS. 145. p. 26n.

3. Sharp MS. 82. p. 17.

4. Baker-Baker Papers. Election Addresses, 8th July, 1790.

5. Baker-Baker Papers.

from Burdon's¹ conscientious approach and business background. Similarly, at least one song laid store on Milbanke's² being the grandson of John Hedworth, Member for the County from 1713 until 1747, regarding whom:
 'No promise, no Bribe, his firm Soul 'e'er could bend;
 At no Courts would he cringe, to no Premier would bow.
 What your Hedworth was once, that your Milbanke is now..²'

At least one section of Milbanke's constituents would have corroborated this. Milbanke himself declared that the freeholders of the Park and Forest of Weardale, where the Bishop of Durham was lord of the manor, could not have exercised their voting rights without his intervention on their behalf. This statement, and supporting evidence from the Baker-Baker Papers appears to hold more weight than the less convincing assertions of the pamphleteers writing on behalf of Eden and Burdon that their candidates had been equally zealous. Milbanke probably owed his return to the many votes he received from this quarter.³

Milbanke also threw himself into the crusade for the ending of the slave trade. This gnawing desire for abolition was a major theme of many of his speeches after that of 2nd April, 1792, when he promised to vote

1. Baker-Baker Papers. Election Ballads.
2. Baker-Baker Papers. Election Addresses. 8th July, 1790.
3. Ibid 3rd July, 5th July, 1790; Fordyce op. cit. Vol. 1. p. 673. Vol. 29. p. 1104.

for Wilberforce's¹ motion. Although Burdon was at first lukewarm to this cause, both County Members were found among the minority voting for an abolition bill on 15th March, 1796.² Milbanke's³ hostility towards the traffic in slaves persisted until Wilberforce at length achieved legislative success in 1806 after what had been a seemingly endless series of motions and bills.

The County now had two able and energetic representatives, who were endowed with the courage to declare convictions that were based on tenaciously held principles. But the political gulf between Milbanke and Burdon widened as the domestic measures of the government of Pitt became more repressive. Both had quite a lot to say at the County Meeting of 1793. However, the voice of Milbanke, now one of the Friends of the People, was Foxite and Lambtonian in the ideals it emitted, and in its refusal to vote for the proposed address to the King 'on his late proclamation for the suppression of seditious publications! Mr. Burdon, on the other hand, could find no fault in the address, for, to his mind, the proclamation against seditious writings had been wise and necessary. As for Parliamentary Reform he held that the only constitutional agency for this was the House of Commons, and that the peaceful state of the nation must not be jeopardised

1. Parl. Hist. Vol. 29. p. 1104.

2. Parl. Hist. Vol. 29. pp. 286, 1273; Vol. 30. pp. 901-2.

3. See espec. Parl. Debates from 1803. Vol. 2. p. 547, and Vol. 8. p. 1050.

by any experimenting with the system of representation. Here were reactions typical of the closing of the ranks of so many Englishmen against the chance of infection from the French Revolution.

At this County Meeting Charles Grey had described Rowland Burdon as 'not a Member of the Cabinet, but intimately connected with Ministers.' Burdon spoke quite frequently in the House of Commons, and, although he was with the Government over the war against France, he was often agitating for lower taxation. An example of this was when he and his father-in-law, Charles Brandling, went against the proposed paper tax on 21st March, 1794.² Burdon and Milbanke were returned without a poll in 1796.³ The latter, now a baronet, was still a Foxite, and continuing to work hard for parliamentary reform. He was one of the ninety one who voted for and spoke⁴ on Charles Grey's plan of household suffrage in 1797. On the other hand the Government again had Burdon's support throughout and after the crisis of 1797, when Britain stood alone in Europe. On 21st December, 1799, in the debate on the Second Reading of the Bill to continue the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act for a time to be limited, he paid

1. Baker-Baker Papers. Durham County Meeting, 1793.

2. Newcastle Chronicle. 29th March, 1794.

3. Sharp MS. 82. p. 18.

4. Annual Register Vol. XXXIX p. 258; Parl. Hist. Vol. 32. p. 686.

tribute to the good treatment given to prisoners held under
this Act.¹

On 7th September, 1801, however, Burdon suddenly announced that he would not be a candidate at the next election, and imputed this decision to the increasing complexity of other aspects of public business which absorbed him. He wished to spend the remainder of his days watching over 'the preservation and completion of these works, which, I trust, will bear a permanent testimony to my disinterested regard for the prosperity and
improvement of the County of Durham'.²

This notice caused widespread distress throughout many parts of the County. Many wondered by what formula they could retain Mr. Burdon's active services on their behalf. His industry and integrity were highly praised. These feelings grew stronger when it appeared that the ailing and frequently dissolute Sir Henry Vane Tempest was ready to offer himself as a candidate for the County in Burdon's place. As this baronet's brother-in-law, Mr. M.A. Taylor, was already a Member for the City of Durham, many feared the spinning of a family web to ensnare seats in Durham after the fashion of that of the second Earl of Darlington some forty years before. The same determination, in numerous circles, to prevent one family

1. Annual Register. Vol. XXXXI p. 199.

2. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 8^o 35 No. 1. pp. 1-2. To the Gentlemen, Clergy and Freeholders of the County of Durham.

from grasping too much political power was a principal reason why Mr. R.J. Lambton had to conclude his representation of the City of Durham in 1813. But now some Durham electors were scheming the complete electoral downfall of the Tempests.

At first it appeared difficult to find another John Lambton, by whose means the ambitious Sir Henry Vane Tempest might be counteracted, as no one from the leading political families hastened to come forward as a candidate.¹ Expense seemed a prime factor in this dead-lock.² There was, however, some hope that Major Russell of Brancepeth Castle, who had languished in the contest for the City in 1800, might try again for that constituency, were there an opportunity for him to declare himself. Meetings of freemen were held at both Durham and London with the intention of persuading him to do this.³ Indeed their plan was to oust Taylor from his City seat, and to persuade Burdon to continue for the County. In this way the outlay of money would be much reduced, for there would be no need for the freeholders to go to the poll. Moreover, the Tempests would be utterly overwhelmed, and all vestiges of their share in Durham representation exorcised. Finally the choice of the 'independent freemen' fell on Richard Wharton.

1. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 8°35. No. 4. p. 7. 10th October, 1801.

2. Ibid. No. 15. pp. 29-30. 5th December, 1801.

3. Ibid. Nos. 10-13. pp. 24-6. October-November, 1801.

It was not until 24th May, 1802, that the position in the County was any clearer. Then, two definite facts came into view. First, a large number of Durham gentlemen resolved to call a County Meeting, and present a petition to Burdon, imploring him to stand again. Second, Sir Henry Vane Tempest found the disapprobation of his scheme to penetrate the county representation so strong that he was wavering towards dropping the project forthwith.¹

By 2nd July not only had one hundred and forty eight freeholders from Gateshead appealed to Burdon to pause and reflect,² but sixty four freeholders of Durham living in London had urged him to continue his great services on behalf of the ports of Newcastle and Sunderland.³ Further to this the friends of Mr. Burdon now decided to force the issue by confronting him with his own nomination at the County Meeting on 22nd July. They would do their best to pack this with many freeholders of like minds. If there should be any electoral opposition, then a subscription was to be raised to defray his expenses.⁴ The freeholders were apprised of the intention to nominate Mr. Burdon.⁵ Meetings agreeing with all this were held in the leading towns of the county, and also in London, while it was

1. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 8^o 35^r. No. 44. pp. 83-5. 24th May, 1802. 'A Citizen' to the Freemen of the City of Durham.

2. Ibid. p. 155.

3. Ibid. pp. 150-2. 30th June, 1802.

4. Ibid. pp. 155-6, 8th July, 1802.

5. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 8^o 35. p. 159. 14th July, 1802.

1. 1802. 14th July, 1802.

decided that delegates from the capital were to attend the nomination meeting at Durham. The Durham freeholders in London were also to be ready to journey to the north for the election.¹ From Gray's Inn Coffee House, London, the protagonists of Burdon dispelled all fears of any illegality in electing anyone who had declined to offer himself as a candidate.² For they cited the ruling made regarding Sir Thomas Estcourt who was returned for Gloucester, 1624;³ '.... no man, being lawfully chosen,⁴ can refuse the place'.

Two days before the County Meeting, a most telling appeal to rally to Burdon was broadcast from his Committee-Room at Gray's Inn Coffee House, London, on the ground that no one else could represent Durham with so much obvious advantage to its commerce.⁵ Such was the apotheosis of the man to whom the alternative was Vane-Tempest. For Burdon had been more than a competent representative of a county vibrating from the pace of what was a particularly swift industrial revolution.

At the County Meeting Mr. Burdon, proposed by William Russell, father of Matthew who had been urged to come forward again for the City, at length submitted to the

1. Ibid. pp. 164-5. 15th July, 1802. Meeting of the Freeholders of the County of Durham in London.

2. Ibid. p. 173. 19th July, 1802.

3. Returns of Members of Parliament Vol 1. p. 457.

4. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 8^o 35. p. 173, quoting Glanville's Reports of Elections, p. 101.

5. Ibid. pp. 178-9. 20th July, 1802.

prolonged and fervent wishes of such a considerable section of the freeholders. These men then heard him justify his conduct in Parliament, for this practice was becoming customary for a former Member seeking re-election. Burdon was convinced that too great a love of peace had been the downfall of Holland and Switzerland, and that Britain had no option but to go on waging war. Thus the commerce of a county such as Durham had to be protected against French aggression. Here he skilfully appealed to the self-interest of his audience, and, indeed, to their instincts of self-preservation. He left them in no doubt that he put his duty to constituents and country before his personal comfort.¹ After this most welcome reassurance there was no other course open to Sir Henry Vane Tempest but to beat a retreat. Meetings of congratulation on Burdon's revocation of his earlier resolution were held at the larger centres of population in the County. At the dinner at Gray's Inn Coffee House on 24th July it was strongly recommended that the celebration of Mr. Burdon's certain election should become an annual event.² On 26th July he was clamorously returned with Sir Ralph Milbanke.³

Where any likely colleague to Burdon had been mentioned in the petitions and requisitions to him, the references had all been to Sir Ralph Milbanke. And so

1. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 8^o 35. pp. 180-5. 22nd July, 1802.

2. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4^o 35 p. 201.

3. Dur 3/150 ff. 86-7; Sharp MS. 82 p. 18; Gough Adds. Durham MS. 8^o 35. p. 185.

his fellow Whigs, Sir John Eden, now for twelve years an ex-Member, and the Lambtonian George Baker of Elemore had respectively proposed and seconded Sir Ralph at the County Meeting on Thursday, 22nd July, 1802. In reply, Milbanke reminded his listeners that he had invariably opposed the war and the accumulating taxes, and made earnest endeavours¹ for peace.

The solicitude of Milbanke for the manufactures of his county was both sincere and evident, and not merely inspired by an itch to steal some of Burdon's² thunder. For he was himself among the principal coal owners, as his father and grandfather had been before him. Doubtless his political loyalties led him to diagnose the recent decline in the welfare and prosperity of North East industries differently. He attributed this to the war,³ whereas Burdon considered that the low state of the coal trade and shipping was only temporary. Rather should the blame, according to Burdon, be attached to the early stages of the peace of Amiens, which had caused a glut of shipping. Once these conditions ceased to operate, the trade would⁴ resume its former and customary vigour.

And so for the second consecutive time there had been no defection in the County of Durham from these legates

1. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 8^o 35. pp. 180-1.

2. See Chapter 2.

Gough Adds. Ibid. p. 186.

4. Ibid. 8^o 36. p. 187. 26th July, 1802.

of Pitt and Fox respectively. Even without the ardour for Burdon both Tories and Whigs in Durham realised that a contested election and the loss of either of these undoubted champions of the peculiar interests of the North East would be too high a price to pay for the supplanting of either of them in the cause of greater abstract political orthodoxy and purity. Party and political affinities were still far from being all important in Durham, and in many other counties.

It was not long, however, before Rowland Burdon, who had spoken very infrequently in the House of Commons during his final years there, had to surrender all hope of sitting again for any constituency. He was hard hit by the failure of the Bank of Surtees and Company. Thus in 1806 he finally declined acting any longer as a representative of the County. More than this, his life interest in the estate of Castle Eden was advertised for public sale, while his family property was saved from alienation only by the intervention of the gentry of the County. A Committee was appointed to raise by subscription a loan of £15,050. for the purchase of his life and reversionary interests in Castle Eden, upon security of that estate at 4 per cent. Mr. Burdon, however, refused to accept any help further than a loan, to which the leading subscribers included the Bishop of Durham and William Russell, each with £1,000, and Messrs. Cooke and

Company, bankers of Sunderland with £500.¹ It was eventually arranged that the estates were to be conveyed to trustees, of whom William Russell was the best known, for ninety nine years at the clear yearly value of about £1,600. Whatever clear annual surplus of rents and profits remained after these payments and trust expenses, was to be given to Mr. Burdon. This was not the dusk of Burdon's association with the politics of the County of Durham. He had before him many more years as a politician and a magistrate, during which he spoke and worked against parliamentary reform.

In Burdon's stead at the County Election on 10th November, 1806, Sir Thomas Henry Liddell, Baronet, of Ravensworth, was returned peacefully with Sir Ralph Milbanke,² The new member was the eldest son of Sir H.G. Liddell, the fifth baronet of Ravensworth. He was also the great nephew of the first Baron Ravensworth, whose peerage had become extinct on his death in January, 1784. Sir T.H. Liddell had married in 1796 the grand daughter of the eighth Earl of Strathmore. Thus old ties between the Liddells and the Bowes were revived and reinforced. In July, 1821, he was created Lord Ravensworth.³ He was later the political foe of Mr. J.G. Lambton,^{so in a sense} the ally of the third Marquis of Londonderry, and almost certainly a Tory

1. Fordyce - op. cit. - Vol. II. p. 368; n.

2. Dur. 3/150. ff. 79-80. Sharp MS. 82 p. 18.

3. Sharp MS. 82. p. 18; n. Fordyce op. cit. Vol. II. p. 644; Bean op. cit. p. 101.

from sometime ~~after~~ 1807, despite his probable earlier Whig proclivities. And so the not unfamiliar pattern of the Whigs and Tories sharing the representation in Durham County and City was again being exhibited. But in Durham, personal, local and commercial factors continued to affect election returns..

At the time of this election the threat of a French invasion had, with the eclipse of that country's sea power, largely subsided. The men of Durham, under their nobles and gentry, had been ready to bear themselves bravely in the teeth of such a menace from the early days of the war.

On Saturday, 18th May, 1793, the Newcastle Chronicle announced that the third Earl of Darlington had been made Lord Lieutenant of the County of Durham. This office had been occupied by the Earl's father and grandfather. In the following year the Earl recruited a corps¹ of fencible cavalry, to be known as the Loyal Durham Rangers. This was to consist of four troops which were to be commanded by his Lordship. The corps was completed in August 1794.

An Armed Association was also formed in the City of Durham in 1798. Three hundred men were raised with Ralph John Fenwick as commandant. This was probably the Fenwick who had been out in front in the demand of the citizens² of Durham in 1793 for the Abolition of the Slave Trade,

1. Newcastle Chronicle. 9th August, 1794.

2. Ibid. 23rd February, 1793.

and who was in 1831 and 1832 to prevent the commotion in the County of Durham for Reform from overflowing and getting out of hand. Sir Henry Vane Tempest subscribed fifty guineas towards the uniforms of young men desirous of joining the Durham Armed Association,¹ which, with a corps of cavalry, remained embodied until 1802. Both were again called out on the resumption of the war, in 1803,² and on 1st February, 1804, the date of the last invasion scare which summoned Durham men to the Palace Green in martial order.³

Similar initiative had been demonstrated in other parts of the county. The tenth Earl of Strathmore, following in the footsteps of his maternal grandfather, George Bowes, raised, at his own expense, a force of Derwent infantry and Gibside cavalry, which he also commanded. At Sunderland there was a body of Volunteer Infantry, which was disbanded at the time of the Peace of Amiens. On the renewal of hostilities, another corps, to which Lady Milbanke presented colours,⁴ was raised.

It was led by Sir Ralph Milbanke, who, on his retirement from the representation of the County in 1812, was to be thanked by his constituents for his faithful services, which had been rendered in so many ways.⁵ Perhaps his main disappointment was that men whose political tenets he could not admire had continued to hold office. He

1. Newcastle Chronicle, 9th August, 1794.

2. Local Records - Northumberland, Durham etc. Sykes op. cit. Vol. II. p. 17.

3. Ibid. p. 19.

4. Fordyce op. cit. Vol. II. pp. 404-5.

5. Sharp MS. 82. p. 17n.

confessed as much to Grey.

He had co-existed with Burdon from 1790 to 1802 in a spirit of electoral accommodation between Durham Whigs and Tories, which was evident in both City and County, at a time when the French Revolution was casting its doleful shadow over Britain. Sharp clashes of principle and a stubborn clinging to contrary attitudes towards the problems posed by this great event were intruding into the politics of the Durham constituencies, as they were into those of others. Yet willingness and ability to nurse coal and shipping, and acceptance by, if not popularity with families of rank and standing, were still most essential for anyone who aspired to be a Durham knight of the shire. That Milbanke and Burdon had these qualifications is seen by the fact that neither in 1796 nor in 1802 did they have to endure a poll, although the mounting cost of county elections was another reason for this.

In the City one of the salient facts had been the dissolution of the Lambton - Tempest partnership of decades, with the defeat of M.A. Taylor in 1802. This had happened in a large constituency which contained enough men of proud and independent spirit to be sufficiently stirred and angered by the hitherto unoffending² Tempests hankering

1. Prior's Kitchen, Grey of Howick Collection. Correspondence of the Second Earl Grey. Box 41. File 5. Unfoliated. 12th January, 1810.

2. As far as the majority of the legal freemen were concerned.

after what had been denied the Vanes. Even the Lambtons themselves were not to be allowed to add to their one Durham seat.

But this was in the future, when the young J.G. Lambton was to take up the torch of his father, which had been held for him, somewhat diffidently, by his uncle in caretaker fashion. The advent of this fiery youth was to be accompanied by the spreading of political intemperance, locally as well as nationally, over Parliamentary Reform.

CHAPTER 7.THE EMERGENCE OF JOHN GEORGE LAMBTON, 1806-1820.

When Parliament met in December, 1806, Napoleon seemed at the height of his power. He had trampled down Prussia at Jena, issued the Berlin decree of a blockade of Britain, and pushed ^{back} the Russians beyond Warsaw. In January 1807 the British Government retaliated with the Orders in Council, which increased the danger of war with America. But the strains and tensions from the revival of the Catholic Question were just as ominous.

Howick, later the second Earl Grey, had, as Foreign Secretary, produced a further bill opening to Catholics the staff appointments and higher commands in the Army and Navy.¹ Already the Mutiny Act of February, 1807, had provided for commissions for Catholic soldiers. On 15th March, 1807, Grenville, because of the conscientious scruples of the King, persuaded most of his Cabinet to withdraw the offending bill. When the King demanded that Ministers should promise to ask no further Catholic concessions, the Government resigned. Portland then agreed² to form a Ministry.

As the new Government wilted under great difficulties in the House of Commons, eventually Parliament was dissolved. At the General Election the Government relied

1. Feiling op. cit. pp. 251-2.

2. Feiling op. cit. p. 253.

on the widespread Protestant fervour, and their numerical superiority was reflected in the approval of the King's Speech to the new Parliament by 350 to 155.¹

The representation of the City of Durham was unaffected, for R.J. Lambton and Richard Wharton, Whig and Tory respectively, were again returned on 14th May. Sir Frederick Morton Eden, Baronet, had been a candidate, but had not hazarded a poll.² He was the son of Sir Robert Eden, Governor of Maryland, who was the younger brother of Sir John Eden, Member for the County from 1774 to 1790.³

In the County of Durham there was a contest, the first since 1790. Vane Tempest was still bent on becoming a County Member. But, as he was severely indisposed, he fruitlessly applied to the Prince Regent for his brother-in-law, the effervescent M.A. Taylor, to be persuaded to substitute for him.⁴ At length he himself agreed to interpose in the 'independent interest.'⁵ On the day of election, Milbanke, Vane Tempest and Cuthbert Ellison of Hebburn,⁶ a Whig, were proposed and seconded. Sir Thomas Henry Liddell, who had canvassed the County, and,

1. Feiling op. cit. pp. 256-7.

2. Dur. 3/150. ff. 73-74. Sharp MS. 82. pp. 38-38n.

3. Fordyce op. cit. Vol. 1. p. 576.

4. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4⁸ 25. p. 6. 3rd September, 1813. M.A. Taylor-Freeman of the City of Durham in the Town Hall, Durham. Taylor was originally a friend of the Prince Regent, from whom he became estranged in 1811. D.N.B. Vol. 55. p. 454.

5. Edith Lady Londonderry op. cit. p. 18.

6. The Lord of the Manor of Gateshead, and Lieutenant-Colonel of the Gateshead Volunteers, he was, from 1812-30, Member for Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Bean op. cit. p. 582.

curiously enough, Rowland Burdon were originally candidates, but both these ~~well known~~ former Members declined nomination. With no regard for party they transferred their interest to Ellison, so that Vane Tempest might be handsomely and discouragingly beaten. But this was not to be, for, after an encounter of three days, Ellison withdrew on 23rd May with 396 votes. Sir Ralph Milbanke and Sir Henry Vane Tempest were declared elected on 25th May, 1807, with 574 and 563 votes respectively. Thus Vane Tempest clasped the hitherto elusive prize of sitting for his County,¹ and put his family back in the political saddle.

There is no doubt that Milbanke had behind him the agents of a formidable array of noblemen and gentlemen. This is disclosed by relevant account books, which reveal the existence of a coalition between Milbanke and Ellison. In these books are the names of the Duke of Northumberland and the third Earl of Darlington.² Also mentioned as a helpmate of Milbanke and Ellison is Sir Matthew White Ridley the Elder, the Whig who represented Newcastle-upon-Tyne from 1774 to 1812.

From these books a survey of such charges as are

1. Dur. 3/150. ff. 75-76. Sharp MS. 82. pp. 18-18n.

2. Prior's Kitchen. Misc. MS. 1807. It is doubtful whether Darlington wished to emulate his father by trying to gain an obvious ascendancy over Durham politics and politicians. Having learnt from the lessons of 1760-2 and after, he probably favoured less provocative methods.

3. Misc. MS. 1807.

listed below shows the detailed extent to which treating and other necessary forms of wheedling electors were still being taken.¹

For example: To entertaining the friends of Mr. Ellison & Sir Ralph Milbanke at the House of Geo. Scott Sign of the Greyhound Claypath Durham.

May

25th Breakfast for 11	11...0
Dinner for 36	4..15..0
Ale -Porter	18..6
Spirits	6 .. 1..0
Wine 42 bottles	9 .. 9..0
Hay and Corn	<u>5..6</u>
	22 " 0 "0
Other bills delivered	<u>31 " 7 "10</u>
4 Beds for the Voters	53 " 7 "10
	<u>1 " 4 -</u>
	<u>54 " 11" 10..2</u>

Transport was another essential item:

1807

Milbanke and Ellison

May 20th	1 Chaise to Newcastle waiting all night	£2" 2 "0
22nd	4 Chaises to Bishop Auckland	2-10 "0
23rd	1 Chaise to Rushford	15" 0
23rd	1 ditto to Sunderland	1.. 0 "0
24th	1 ditto to Hartlepool etc.	1.. 5 "0
24th	1 ditto to Castle Eden etc.	15 "0.
25th	2 ditto to Hartlepool etc.	2-10..0
27th	1 ditto to Sunderland	16..3

£11 "13"3³

1. Misc. MS. 1807
2. Misc. MS. 1807. Unfoliated.
3. Ibid. Unfoliated.

And this was not, by the standards of the normal county struggle, an expensive election, although it was a hard fought one.

There is no explicit evidence of the claims of the Catholics having been a major issue in this election, or of having filled more than a subsidiary role to the tussles of the dominant County families. Yet on 1st June, 1807, a County Meeting was held at Durham 'For the Purpose of Addressing his Majesty on the Late Change of Administration'.¹ The chief subject for discussion was the circumstances in which the Ministry of All the Talents had fallen. This, of course, entailed a consideration of the entire Catholic question. The majority at the meeting, as at that of 1793, were fully concurrent with the policy of the Tory government of the day. Again the Durham College and clergy may be reasonably suspected of having been instrumental in this. A loyal and laudatory address to the King was presented by the Earl of Strathmore,² who was the son of that Earl who had married in 1767 the daughter and the heiress of George Bowes. The address was seconded by Mr. Matthew Russell, of Brancepeth Castle, who had tried to represent the City of Durham in 1800.³

In reply Doctor J.R. Fenwick, an ardent Whig, whose

1. Baker-Baker Papers.

2. The tenth Earl. A representative peer of Scotland, 1796, 1802 and 1807. Fordyce op. cit. Vol. II. pp. 54-55.

3. Baker-Baker Papers.

political abilities were to be so beneficial to the Lambton family and Parliamentary Reform, defended the bill which had led to the downfall of the late Cabinet. He claimed that it was intended merely to enable His Majesty to avail himself of the services of all his subjects. Not only did he object to Strathmore's address, but he flourished ¹ another, which embodied what he had just expressed. With him were R.J. Lambton and Sir Ralph Milbanke. The latter ² seconded Fenwick's address in much the same vein as he was to speak at greater length on this very subject in the House of Commons on 1st June, 1810. ³ In a short speech Sir Thomas Henry Liddell also took the side of the Ministry ⁴ of All the Talents against their successors.

In the apparent absence of Sir Henry Vane Tempest, a counter blast to the declarations of the previous speakers was supplied by Mr. Richard Wharton, Member for the City of Durham, who was against any kind of Catholic Emancipation. ⁵ He was to resist Parliamentary Reform with the same rigidity, and with a similar lack of regard for popularity. Eventually Lord Strathmore's address was carried easily. Again the Tories had triumphed at a Durham

1. Baker-Baker Papers.

2. Ibid.

3. Parl. Debates. Vol. 17. pp. 256-7. There he was supporting Mr. Grattan's motion on the petition of Roman Catholics.

4. Baker-Baker Papers.

5. Ibid.

¹
County Meeting.

The next five years were occupied with many events in the war with Napoleon.² After Corunna and Wagram, the Opposition, having lost a Catholic resolution, relied on Grenville's didacticism that the Peninsular War was a 'hopeless contest'.³ The Ministry, barely surviving the outcries caused by the Convention of Cintra, and the Walcheren fiasco, was left leaderless by the death of Portland.⁴ But Percival carried his Address, Wellington moved towards the lines of Torres Vedras, and in 1811 the French left Portugal.⁵ When Wellington captured Ciudad Rodrigo, and turned against Badajoz, Perceval seemed justified in having kept the campaign in motion. But on 11th May, 1812, he was shot dead. The Ministers, with the Catholic question one of the many causes of difference among them, then resigned. Perceval had maintained the principle of leaving this problem open in his Cabinet.

On 8th June, 1812 the Prince Regent called upon Liverpool to form a government, which was little changed from its immediate predecessor. Its fortunes were heightened by Wellington's entry into Madrid, and Napoleon's fatal Muscovite fascination.⁶ In the House of Commons ample majorities consoled the new Government, which also

1. Baker-Baker Papers.

2. Feiling op. cit. p. 256.

3. Ibid. pp. 256-7.

4. Ibid. pp. 258-9.

5. Ibid. pp. 261-6.

6. Ibid. pp. 270-3.

had agreed to differ over the Catholic question. In September, 1812, Liverpool obtained a dissolution. At the ensuing election Tory gains were calculated at nearly ¹ sixty seats.

In Durham there was no addition to existing Tory strength there. In the City Ralph John Lambton and Richard Wharton were both returned on 7th October, without opposition, for the third time in succession.² The County Election was also tranquil, with Sir Henry Vane Tempest³ again being elected on 14th October. Sir Ralph Milbanke had retired, having received a unanimous vote of thanks from his constituents for his faithful services in Parliament.⁴ His place was taken by Viscount Barnard, the eldest son of the third Earl of Darlington,⁵ and the first Vane of Raby to occupy a Durham seat since 1774,⁶

It was not long before Sir Henry Vane Tempest died on 1st August, 1813, worn out from the ravages of gout and asthma, the victim of dissipation, and with his finances shattered.⁷ He had not spoken at all in the Commons as as Member for his County. Nor had he walked into the

1. Ibid. pp. 273-5.

2. Dur. 3/150. ff. 69-70. Sharp MS 82. p. 38.

3. Ibid. ff. 71-2; Ibid. p. 19.

4. Sharp MS. 82. pp. 17n., 20n.

5. Ibid. p. 19. Lord Darlington, a faithful Whig, and hopeful of receiving an office of State from the Prince Regent, was one of those disillusioned by 'Prinnys' attachment to the Percival administration.---- A. Aspinall op. cit. Vol. 1. pp. 23-4. No. 13. Earl of Darlington to

6 Ibid. pp. 19n-20n. the Prince Regent.

7. Edith Lady Londonderry op. cit. p. 17.

division lobbies other than infrequently and fitfully since 1807, and then he had usually gone against the Government, save over Catholic relief.¹

The youthful John George Lambton thereupon introduced himself to the freeholders. He was to be the most remarkable and outstanding of all the Durham Members of Parliament. Indeed he was to tower above most of his contemporaries as one of the most talented and far sighted nineteenth century statesmen. To follow his career, as one must, is to travel often to Westminster and into the innermost counsels of the Whig party, and later of the Cabinet. What is particularly difficult is to avoid being inebriated with that uncritical hero worship of Radical Jack which stands out from so much of the political literature of Durham in those days.

This very gifted son of William Henry Lambton was born on 12th April, 1792.² Originally entrusted to the care of his uncle, Mr. Ralph Lambton, the boy was later taught by the famous Dr. Thomas Beddoes. It was in this man's hands that his intelligence was early awakened, and guided along enlightened, liberal and scientific lines. The young Lambton was granted his wish to try his fortunes

1. Parl. Debates.

2. Sharp MS. 82. p. 20n. D.N.B. vol. 32. p. 22. Stuart Reid op. cit. Vol. I. pp. 38-39.

as a soldier, when, on 8th June, 1809, he received a cornetcy in the 10th Hussars. In 1810, he became a lieutenant, but the following year relinquished his commission. On 1st January, 1812, he married at Gretna Green, Henrietta Cholmondeley, the natural daughter of Lord Cholmondeley. At the age of twenty one, he came into possession of Lambton Castle, and the responsibilities appropriate to its landed wealth and many collieries. Then he found that the family estate had been charged with heavy amounts by General John Lambton and William Henry, Lambton, in turn.¹

At the County Meeting at the New Courts, Durham, on 25th August, 1813, John George Lambton was nominated as a candidate by Sir Ralph Milbanke, and seconded by George Baker of Elemore, two of the leading Durham Whigs. Lambton then outlined some of the political principles and philosophies which were to inspire him until his death. After promising to attend to the landed and commercial interests of the County, he showed that, if he were to neglect or sacrifice these, he would be jeopardising his own properties. Abhorrent of the practice whereby seats in the House of Commons were openly bought and sold, he looked to 'a more equal representation of the commons of this kingdom.' He was just as candid about religion, for he felt it essential to bring about a reconciliation of

1. D.N.B. Ibid. p. 22. Stuart Reid op. cit. Vol. 1. pp. 39-65.

all the King's subjects, whatever their beliefs. Thus the Catholics should no longer be kept beyond the pale,¹ in respect of constitutional posts and privileges. No previous Durham candidate had rendered such a comprehensive account of what he believed. Little of it could have brought any comfort to the Bishop and his clergy.

There were no other nominations. On 26th August, Lambton took his stand 'upon the Principle of Independence, unbiassed by Party Considerations,' not an unusual cliché and anchorage for politicians in those days.² At the consequent Election Meeting on 20th September he was returned unopposed.³

Lambton made his maiden speech, from the benches of the disunited Whigs, on the night of 12th May, 1814. Norway, then part of the Danish monarchy, had been promised by the Czar of Russia in 1812, to Bernadotte, Crown Prince of Sweden, as a reward for the latter's assistance against Napoleon. The allies at the Peace of Paris confirmed this, and the Swedish troops marched into Norway, while the British fleet stood by to assist Bernadotte against any Norwegian resistance. Indignantly and eloquently, and in keeping with his hatred of oppression wherever he found it, Lambton attacked the Liverpool Government by seconding C.W. Wynn's motion for an address to the Crown

1. Sharp MS. 82. Inset p. 21.

2. Sharp MS. 82. Inset p. 21. To the Gentlemen, Clergy and Freeholders of the County of Durham.

3. Dur. 3/150. ff. 67-68; Sharp MS. 82. p. 20.

in favour of mediation on behalf of Norway. He was furious that 'we are called upon as Englishmen, as lovers of liberty, and as admirers of patriotism, to damp by the foulest means the rising energies of Norwegian liberty, and to trample underfoot the heroic efforts^{of} a brave people to assert their own independence.'¹

While Lambton's political apprenticeship had been opening so propitiously, it had led to one of the stormiest by-elections in the history of the City of Durham. There had been unmistakable signs within the past dozen years that many freemen had been tiring of the virtual possession of both City seats since 1742 by the families of Lambton and Tempest. Many political squibs, though anonymous, testify to this. For although Sir Henry Vane-Tempest had resigned in 1800, he had really handed over his seat to a relative by marriage, Michael Angelo Taylor. However, this arrangement had only lasted until 1802, when Wharton was elected alongside Ralph John Lambton.

While the death of Sir Henry Vane-Tempest without a male heir pronounced the epitaph of his family's odyssey as parliamentary representatives, the Lambtons were within an ace of achieving something which had been beyond their reach in earlier decades. Provided Ralph John Lambton were to remain a Member for the City, the

1. D.N.B. Vol. 32. p.22; Stuart Reid op. cit. pp. 70-2; Newcastle Chronicle 21st May, 1814. Parl Debates Vol. 27. pp. 842-3.

young scion of their house could, by endearing himself to the freeholders, ensure that his family filled two of the four Durham seats. But memories of the second Earl of Darlington and 1760-1 were recalled by various squib¹ writers.

Thus, at the County Meeting of 25th August,² that year, the youthful Lambton had been asked to pledge that, if elected a Member for the County, his uncle, Mr. Ralph Lambton, would no longer represent the City. He accordingly engaged that the latter would retire from Parliament as early as possible.³ Perhaps the elder Lambton was not sorry to do so. No debate in the Commons drew him to his feet, although he often voted against the Government, and particularly so over the claims of the Roman Catholics.⁴

The very next day, 26th August, a number of freemen of the City of Durham met at the Town Hall to decide on a replacement for Ralph Lambton. Their choice somewhat ironically settled on Michael Angelo Taylor, then⁵ representing Poole, from whose electors he promised, on⁶ 3rd September, that he would ask for his release. But

1. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4^o 25. pp. 7-8. 10th September, 1813. 'True Friend' to the Worthy and Truly Independent Freemen of the City of Durham.

2. Sharp MS. 82. Inset. p. 21.

3. Ibid.

4. Parl Debates. Various.

5. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4^o 25. pp. 5-6. 27th August, 1813. Veterinary Dr. Marshall to -.

6 Ibid. p. 6. 3rd September, 1813.

on 28th September he had to admit that he would not be free to stand for Durham until the calling of a new¹ Parliament.

By this time another gentleman was on the scene, and unreservedly seeking the seat which was expected soon to become vacant. This was George Allan, M.A. F.S.A., of Blackwell Grange, with its extensive estates, and the eldest son of Mr. George Allan, an eminent antiquary. The younger Allan, born in 1767, had been called to the Bar at Lincoln's Inn in 1790. He then became a magistrate and later a Deputy-Lieutenant of the County of Durham. He was a man of considerable literary talents, and it was through his kindness that the topographical treasures of Blackwell were made available to Surtees² and to Sir Cuthbert Sharp.

By his hostility to anything smacking of Roman Catholic Emancipation, his refusal to recognise any need for Parliamentary Reform, his warm approval of the war, and his general approach to politics, he identified himself with the post-1793 school of Pitt.³ Thus his political views were similar to those of Wharton, and the City of Durham was to have two affirmed Tories as its Members for nearly five years. For the Durham freemen were not only

1. Newcastle Chronicle, 2nd October, 1813.

2. Sharp MS. 82. p. 39; n; Fordyce op. cit. Vol. I. p. 195 n.

3. Newcastle Chronicle. 30th October, 1813. Allan's address to the Freemen of the City of Durham, 6th September, 1813.

to make, in the occupation of this seat, a change of family, but also one of party. Such was the disturbance of what had been a delicate but not wholly deliberate political balance.

On 23rd September, 1813, Ralph John Lambton announced his compliance with his nephews' promise. After representing the City of Durham for five successive parliaments he acknowledged, manfully and with dignity, the validity of the objection against one family holding two out of four Durham parliamentary seats.¹

Hearing of the constraint imposed on Mr. Taylor, and doubtlessly encouraged by R.J. Lambton's announcement, there flashed into prominence the son of the notorious Major Gowland, of 1761-2 infamy. He espoused with all respectability the Established Church and the Liverpool Government, 'so long as its Rulers shall continue to deserve the confidence of the country.' But in his folly he went on to remind the freemen that 'so glorious a struggle was made by my late respected father' for their very independence and welfare² to which he was similarly pledged. This was singularly ill advised and tactless, particularly from a man who was apparently a stranger to

1. Newcastle Chronicle. 25th September 1813: Gough Adds. Durham. MS. 4^o 25. p.m. 8th January, 1814. 'The Publisher' To the Freemen of the City of Durham.

2. Newcastle Chronicle. 16th October, 1813. 10th October, 1813, to the Worthy and Independent Freemen of the City of Durham.

the freemen of Durham.¹ It probably lost him any ground that may have been gained by the insistence of his supporters in election ballads that he was in favour of a peace settlement, while Allan was all for the war being continued.²

Both sides now pressed forward with their canvassing, and preparations for a poll. Mr. Allan, who took his campaigning exceptionally seriously,³ visited the freemen resident in Hull, Beverley, and London, and in other towns.⁴ The only rebuff he seemed to have suffered in all his canvassing was at the hands of Lady Antrim, the widow of Sir Henry Vane Tempest. She admitted that her husband had often expressed his obligation to Allan for his support.⁵ Yet on 11th November, having returned from Northumberland, Allan heard that Lady Antrim had declared publicly for Mr. Gowland,⁶ who had been making use of her ladyship's name in his appeals. Allan's strong reproaches and representations to Lady Antrim failed to have any effect.⁷ M.A. Taylor, too, was to find his strained relations with this lady an electoral handicap.

On the 22nd November, the election writ, made necessary by Mr. Ralph Lambton's acceptance of the

1. Gough Adds. Durham. MS. 4o 25. p. 27. Amen.

2. Ibid. p. 28. The Contrasts. 27th November, 1813.

3. Ibid. p. IV. 8th January, 1814. 'The Publisher'.

4. Ibid. p. 20.

5. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4o 25. p. 24. 3rd November, 1813. Countess of Lady Antrim to George Allan.

6. Ibid. pp. 24-5. 12th November, 1813. George Allen to Countess of Antrim.

7. Ibid. p. 25. 12th November, 1813. Countess of Antrim to George Allan.

Chiltern Hundreds, was issued, and it was decided that voting should take place on 1st December.¹ Limits to Gowland's powers of endurance then became visible. After promising to encourage a struggle to have the Wear navigated, and inviting further comparisons with his father, he withdrew on 30th November. His reason was the familiar plea of the expense to which he would be put if he were to do otherwise.² He gives the impression of having been purely and simply a political adventurer, and took off from Durham politics very soon after he had alighted in the midst of the startled freemen'..... On Tuesday morning.... Mr. Gowland in a farewell address, declined the contest.... impossible to describe the enthusiastic joy of the supporters of Mr. Allan on this occasion; they paraded the streets with banners and music, and even the bells of Crossgate were ordered to send forth their melodious sounds in triumph of the complete victory which had been gained.'³

But this rejoicing was premature. An appeal was made to George Baker, of Elemore Hall, a Whig and a great friend of the Lambtons, who had made a belated and hapless entree in the City Election of 1800. There was an immediate response,⁴ and on Wednesday morning (the day

1. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4^o 25. p. IV. 8th January, 1814. 'The Publisher' Sharp MS. 82. pp. 38-9.

2. Ibid. 4^o 35. pp. 29-30; 4^o 25. p. IV. 8th January, 1814. 'The Publisher' Sharp MS. 82. p. 39n.

3. Raine MS. 93. Inset f. 14.

4. Sharp MS. 82. p. 39n. It will be remembered that Baker seconded J.G. Lambton's nomination for the County.

appointed for the election)' Mr. Baker was met on Gilligate moor, by a large body of freemen, preceded by music and eight flags..... About half past nine the two candidates repaired to the town-hall, where the court was opened with the usual formality; but so great was the tumult, that the business of the meeting could not be proceeded in, and the parties were obliged to adjourn to their respective committee rooms, till a sufficient number of constables were sworn in to maintain order.....¹

It is unlikely that this commotion had entirely spent its fury when the writ and proclamation were read, and while Allan and Baker were being respectively nominated. Allan castigated Gowland for referring to the events and issues of 1761, before resting his own cause vaguely on Freedom and Independence. He paid lip service to the most extended ^{but unspecified} application of religious freedom, from which he possibly in his own mind excluded the Roman Catholics. His audience could not have avoided contrasting his silence on this matter with the assertion of Mr. Baker's proposer, Mr. E. Shipperdson, also a Whig, that, if returned, Baker would be very happy to see the Catholics receive equal privileges. Mr. Baker himself then emphasized his friendship for 'religious liberty and parliamentary Reform.'² He did not define 'religious liberty' further.

1. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4^o 25. p. 32.
 2. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4^o 25. p. 32.

A show of hands was then given in favour of Mr. Baker,¹ but a poll was demanded by the friends of Mr. Allan. The casting of votes lasted for nine days,² the longest ~~period~~ ^{for this in an election} period³ in the history of Durham. Allan's advisers, confronted with a strong opponent, had to act quickly. Under pseudonyms they decided to attack Baker chiefly on the ground of his supposed Popish connections, his partiality to the claims of the Catholics, and his personal habits and pleasures.³ Baker was also delineated as a creature of the Lambtons, and as a means by which that family planned to exercise a less discernible control⁴ over one of the City seats. This was a more skilful and perhaps accurate form of aggression. For the Lambtons and the Bakers had long been bound by the strongest personal ties of familiarity and regard.
first

For the ~~three~~ first days of the poll Mr. Baker kept up with his opponent. On Friday evening, 3rd December, the position was Baker 310, Allan 308. Both candidates had polled as fast as the votes could be taken. Yet on Saturday, 4th December, Mr Allan was able to finish 55 ahead, because he had a much greater number of London voters available than had Mr. Baker. As the speedy^{often} production of voters, ~~from~~ distant parts, was not

1. Ibid. p. 32-3.

2. Sharp MS. 82. p. 39.

3. Gough Adds. Durham, MS. 4^o 25. pp. 45-6. 'Dunelmensis'; Ibid. pp. 35-40. p. 35. 2nd December, 1813. 'Veritas'.

4. Ibid. p. 33. 1st December, 1813. 'Plain Truth'.

infrequently the key to victory, candidates sent instructions for non-resident freemen to appear from all directions.

There were abundant examples of turbulence by partisans of both sides. All were symbolic of the way in which political rivalry was being fanned into greater fury by the growing impact of outside events and facts. Some of the exploits reported of this election were 'in the lowest and most vehement style of vulgarity..... one person.. actually introduced a cat into the hall, as an auxiliary in his abuse of Mr. Allan, but as she was not a freeman, the Mayor ordered her to be turned out.' By 11 o'clock, Wednesday morning, 8th December, it did not seem likely that Allan's¹ lead, now 59, could be reduced, let alone erased. The poll was concluded on Friday, 10th December, the very day on which Allan had taken care, of necessity, to assure the freemen of his enthusiasm for a navigation of the Wear to assist the trade of the City.² As his friends in London had informed him that they could not find sufficient freemen to cancel the deficit under which he laboured, Baker saw no point in prolonging the agony of being baulked for the second time for the City of Durham. With the final position: Mr. Allan 440, Mr. Baker 360,³ the return was signed.³ Allan had, with some

1. Raine. MS. 93. f. 14.

2. Gough. Adds. Durham. MS. 4^o 25. p.48. 10th December, 1813.

3. Raine. MS.93. f 15; Sharp MS. 82. p. 39; Sharp MS.92. Poll Book. p. 138; Dur. 3/150. ff. 63-66; p. 39; Newcastle Chronicle. 18th December, 1813.

justification, pronounced this 'A Contest which has been¹ unequalled in the Annals of this City.'

While Taylor had been sympathetic to Baker in this election, over four years later the dissolution of 1818 found him intent on his own reinstatement for the City.² He had averted his gaze when the solicitor of his niece, Frances Anne Vane-Tempest, had, as early as 1816, made him the half promise of 'a quiet seat' if his hopes of sitting for Durham should again be frustrated.³ Taylor's preference for Durham was hailed rapturously by a great meeting of freemen living in London, who formed a Committee to canvass for him there. They were moved with gratitude towards Taylor, who, although he had represented Poole from 1812, had often presented petitions from the Durham freemen, and had conscientiously busied⁴ himself with their private and collective grievances. In the House of Commons he was fresh with the laurels of the Metropolitan Paving Act of 1817, which he had⁵ conceived and advocated with infectious zeal.

On 19th March Taylor arrived in Durham, where he was immediately affronted by a declaration to the freemen

1. Newcastle Chronicle, 18th December, 1813, 10th December, 1813. Mr. Allan to the Freemen of the City of Durham.

2. Raine. MS. 94. f. 1.

3. Correspondence of the second Earl Grey; Box 54. File 7. f. 14. Taylor to Grey. 17th October, 1816.

4. Raine MS. 94. f. 3.

5. D.N.B. Vol. 55. p. 454.

from the Countess of Antrim that Taylor had neither her interest, nor that of his niece, Lady Frances Vane Tempest. Both the Countess and Taylor's wife were the co-guardians and trustees of the younger lady, and as such were frequently at discord. Taylor expressed no surprise at not enjoying the good wishes of Lady Antrim, but could not believe he stood so badly with Lady Frances.¹

Taylor's next step was to make a long speech to the freemen assembled in the Town Hall, in which he reaffirmed how closely his marriage into the Tempest family wedded him to the County of Durham. To be so interwoven by birth of marital bonds was more than advisable for anyone attempting either Durham constituency. He then supplemented a survey of his extensive welfare work, which encompassed freemen and freeholders alike, by far the most detailed demonstration of political philosophy and conduct yet rendered by a Durham candidate. His bitter opposition to the Habeas Corpus Suspension Act, fervid pacificism, belief in religious toleration, unconcealed enmity to the slave trade, and obsessive dislike of the property tax, sinecures, undeserved pensions and everything tending to impair the liberty of the subject, of which he was a constant watchdog, were all laid before his hearers. They, in turn, warmed to his fierce sincerity and eccentric candour and élan. As this

1. Raine MS. 94 f.6. 19th March, 1818. To the Freemen of the City of Durham.

extraordinary man, then sixty years of age, left the meeting, and walked through the streets, he was loudly¹ cheered.

His rivals were the sitting members, Richard Wharton and George Allan. The former was still very emphatically a Ministerialist, and, in recent years, had frequently been a Government spokesman in the Commons, usually on financial affairs. One squib writer dubbed him 'Pensioner² Dick, the Minister's Tool.' Allan this time was a reluctant candidate, and quite prepared to retire to private life.³ Although he had consistently voted for the Government, his support was confined almost entirely to the division lobbies. For he made only one speech in the House, when he proposed on 2nd March, 1818, that the Election Laws Amendment Act be read that day six months.⁴

He suddenly took leave of the freemen on 15th June, 1818, and explained that the heavy expenses of his first election of 1813 did not warrant his persevering in a second struggle.⁵ Perhaps he would not have bade farewell to Parliament had there been no likelihood of a contest. But a financial embarrassment left him naked and unarmed in the path of the blustering buoyancy of Mr. Taylor. Even so he was agreeable to some of his friends keeping

1. Raine MS. 94. f. 13.

2. Ibid. f. 21. 2nd May, 1818.

3. Raine MS. 94. f. 7. 20th March, 1818. To the Freemen of the City of Durham.

4. Parl. Debates Vol. 37. pp. 693-5.

5. Sharp MS. 82. p. 39n. - 40n.

his name on the poll until 19th June, for they hoped that he could be returned without his having to meet any more bills.¹

However, the Tory ~~control~~² of both City seats was to be undermined and toppled. The result of the poll ² by that day was Taylor 437, Wharton 347 and Allan 27. And so it was as a Durham Member that Taylor in the next two years and more was to work for the removal of many legal anomalies, and the speedier dispatching of cases by the courts. Thus, on 4th February, 1819, he promised to press soon for a General Gaol Delivery, Commission of Assize and Nisi Prius ³ twice a year for the northern counties, including Durham. On 30th March and 20th May he spoke on bankrupt jurisdiction and delays in Chancery, with which he was to be occupied in the Commons for many more years.⁴ Such was the breadth of his interests that in 1820 and 1821 he was also perturbed at the amount of smoke issuing forth from steam engines, and steered to success a bill aimed at lessening this nuisance.⁵

By the time the result of the poll had been declared in the City, Mr. Lambton had established himself

1. Ibid; Raine MS. 94. f. 22. 17th June, 1818, Mr. Allan to the Freeman of the City of Durham; f. 23. 18th June, Mr. Allan to the Freeman of the City of Durham.

2. Dur 3/150. ff. 57, 59-60; Sharp MS. 82. p. 40n; Raine MS. 94. f. 24.

3. Parl Debates Vol. 39. pp. 293-4.

4. Ibid. Vol. 39. pp. 1261-3, vol. 40. pp. 560-1. Vol. 5. New Series. pp. 1025-37.

5. Parl Debates. New Series. Vol. 1. pp. 50-2, Vol. 2. p. 217. Vol. 5. pp. 439-41, 535-6, and 654-5.

as a most thrustful member for the County, in a period of great economic distress. With the end of the war with Napoleon, every industry connected with fighting was threatened with ruin. Government expenditure and prices fell, while the discharge of many soldiers and sailors led to the labour market becoming overstocked. The repercussions of all this were felt widely.¹ Yet taxes were still relatively high.

In January, 1815, a meeting was held in the County to consider petitioning the removal of the property tax at the end of the current financial year. Sir Ralph Milbanke moved a series of resolutions to this effect. For the country had been promised, he said, that this imposition should cease with the war.² J.G. Lambton also entered the debate. Dramatically he saw this tax of ten per cent as 'the greatest inroad upon those liberties which had been handed down to them, sealed by the blood of their forefathers', Since it fell with vicious severity upon the middle classes, and upon those with small fixed incomes. It was but one instance of the bounding extravagance of the government.³

After the meeting had adopted Sir Ralph Milbanke's resolutions by a considerable majority, they then drew up a petition to be presented to the House of Commons by

1. Feiling op. cit. pp. 285-7.

2. Newcastle Chronicle. 28th January, 1815.

3. Ibid.

their members.¹ The high tide of Toryism at County Meetings, so marked in 1793 and 1807, had abated and ebbed, although it was by no means a spent force.

Although he did not, perhaps wisely, take the floor as often as one might have expected him to, Lambton had made two notable speeches in the House of Commons in 1815. On 21st February, he protested in vain against England being left to enforce the decision of the Congress of Vienna that Genoa should be annexed to Savoy.² For the second time he was standing against the absorption of a small power into a larger one.

He was also incensed by the Government's pronounced partiality towards the landed interest, and moved an amendment on 3rd March³ to defer the second reading of the 1815 Corn Bill to that day six months.⁴ The high price of corn was a further source of income for such a large landowner as Lambton, but, with his immense compassion for those who were entrusted to his care, he was only too impatient to forego this. Doubtless his colleague, Lord Barnard, who spoke for the bill, acted primarily as an agriculturist.⁴ The amendment was negatived by 218 to 56, and the bill ordered to be committed.⁵

1. Newcastle Chronicle. 28th January, 1815.

2. Newcastle Chronicle. 25th February, 1815. Annual Register Vol. LVII. p. 4. Parl. Debates Vol. 29. pp. 928-33.

3. Annual Register. Vol. LVII p. 5.

4. Parl Debates Vol. 30. p. 118.

5. Stuart Reid. op. cit., Vol. I. pp. 78-9; Parl. Debates Vol. 30. pp. 27-30, 37.

While Lambton's representation of his native county ^{to be} was renewed in a ^{soon} later year, there was a change in his fellow member, for the Honourable William John Frederick Vane Powlett was returned on the 1st August, 1815. He was then only twenty three. He had assumed the surname of Powlett by royal licence in April, 1813, in accordance with the will of the Duchess of Bolton, his maternal grandmother.² His brother, Henry Viscount Barnard, a Whig, and another near mute Member,³ had vacated the seat by accepting a commission in the army, and in his final address to the freeholders had commended Mr. Powlett.⁴ He was nominated at the County Court after a platitudinous but necessary recital of his own stake in the County's welfare, his independence, arising out of his place and fortune, and, of course, his dedication to the virility of the commercial and maritime interests of Durham. None ventured to gainsay or outbid such ornate testimonials.⁵ Thus the partnership of honoured names, Lambton and Vane, continued.

In his earliest years as a Member Powlett seemed to be on the most friendly terms with his most immediate colleague, whose speeches were, by 1817, conceded as being of the highest order. As eloquence and courage were equally matched in his perorations, Lambton already

-
1. Dur. 3/150. ff. 61-62. Sharp MS. 82. p. 20.
 2. Sharp MS. 82. p. 20n.
 3. Parl. Debates. Various.
 4. Sharp MS. Inset p. 21, 25th July, 1815.
 5. Sharp MS. 82. Inset p. 21. 1st August, 1815.

ranked with such Whig leaders as Tierney and Horner, Mackintosh and Romilly. After the death of his first wife he was closer to Earl Grey, for whom his already high esteem and affection matured further. For he married¹ Grey's eldest daughter, the Lady Louisa.

All was not well among the Whigs. Most of them were opposed to the Tory code of coercion. But they were equally, if not more hostile, to the Radical ideas of universal suffrage and annual parliaments, which they considered as preliminary to other and more dangerous levelling schemes. Thus they were now largely apathetic towards Parliamentary Reform, or fearful of the debility² it would cause. Those who were convinced of the need of such reform refrained from any action which might provoke³ further disunity.

Grey had, in 1810, postponed all further idea of Parliamentary Reform until such a time as the people of England should foster such a movement of their own volition. Setting stricter limits to the degree of reform he desired, he refused to move until the middle class saw the situation as he did. He would, on no account, risk any more division among the Whigs. Moreover, he was thoroughly alarmed by the swift dissemination

1. Stuart Reid. op. cit., Vol. I. pp. 93-6.

2. Feiling. op. cit. p. 281.

3. Chester New - Lord Durham. p.37.

of Radical ideas, chiefly by means of the democratic press.¹

But Lambton would not allow Grey and the Whigs to banish Parliamentary Reform from their minds, although he had no sympathy with any Radical doctrine emphasizing the preeminence of abstract rights. But he often emulated and used Radical methods of bringing to light what he considered the current political and social malaise. For, although he had a great veneration for the constitution, he interpreted this as a collection of institutions which must be constantly adapted to the needs of a changing world. Thus he came to occupy an invaluable intermediary position between two great forces. He was a tireless spur to the Whigs, and was often infuriated beyond measure at the trepidation and apparent timidity of his elders. At the same time he was in himself an assurance to many Radicals that improvements in the representation of the country could be wrought peacefully.² This was the measure of the national importance in those days of Durham's best known representative.

In 1816 the harvest failures and rapid rise in wheat prices led to lawlessness and political demagoguery reaching a new low^{level}. Apprehensive of what might follow, the Government, in 1817, suspended Habeas Corpus until

1. Chester New - op. cit. pp. 38-40.

2. Chester New op. cit. pp. 41-84. Stuart Reid. op.cit. Vol. I. pp. 96-7. Leonard Cooper - Radical Jack pp. 55-7.

January of the following year. Large majorities renewed those acts of a previous generation against political clubs and public meetings. Lord Sidmouth, the Home Secretary, gave authority for magistrates to arrest and hold to bail¹ those who sold seditious or blasphemous literature.

Against this darkening background, a petition in favour of Parliamentary Reform had been introduced into the House of Commons in 1817 by the Corporation of London. Lambton seized this opportunity to seek an inquiry, not only into the state of representation, but also into all aspects of public economy. He dissociated himself entirely from wild and irresponsible babblings about reform. Here, he considered, was the chance for the House to wrest the question from foolish hands. But it was not to be, for although Brougham and Burdett were with Lambton, their demand was rejected² by Castlereagh.

In the following year Lambton was one who barred the prompt passage of an indemnity bill, which had been first moved on 9th March, 1818, to protect magistrates who had summarily arrested people suspected of high treason, or who had suppressed political meetings.³ Although his fellow Member, Lord William Powlett, leapt to the defence⁴ of this Bill, Lambton, on 11th March, accused the

-
1. Feiling op. cit. pp. 289-93.
 2. Stuart Reid. op. cit., Vol. I. pp. 100-1.
 3. Cooper op. cit. pp. 59-60.
 4. Parl. Debates. Vol. 37. p. 922.

Government of having condoned many arbitrary and disgraceful deeds under cover of the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act.¹ The Second Reading of the Alien² Bill on 15th May, 1818, roused even further Lambton's ire and invective.² He had already spoken on 7th May on the first reading,³ when he had tried in vain to extort the production of copies of the correspondence between the British and Netherlands Governments regarding aliens.⁴ Despite his tenacity, for he was the first on his feet after Castlereagh had moved the Second Reading, this bill was approved by 97 to 35. Thus, when Parliament was soon afterwards dissolved by the Prince Regent,⁵ Lambton's impressive record in its last year included four major if unsuccessful tilts at the apparatus of what he considered to be Tory despotism. Powlett, on the other hand, through his attitude over the Indemnity Bill to magistrates of 1818, had failed to justify the hope would-be reformers had placed in him.

Both Lambton and Powlett were returned unopposed for the County of Durham on 24th June, 1818.⁶ At this time one of Lambton's most immediate problems was Grey's inclination to preserve an Olympian aloofness from the

1. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4^o 70. 1. 22. 1820 County of Durham Election. 'Look on This Picture and On that.' Parl. Debates. Vol. 37. pp. 1041-2.

2. Parl Debates Vol. 38 pp. 735-41.

3. Ibid. pp. 564-5.

4. Annual Register. Vol. LX p. 123.

5. Annual Register. Vol. LX. p. 123, pp. 123-4. Stuart Reid. op. cit., Vol. I. p. 110.

6. Dur. 3/150. ff. 57-58. Sharp MS. 82. p. 20.

Whig counsels, and even to retire to his beloved Howick, while the Whigs themselves seemed to be losing heart over Parliamentary Reform. Accordingly he wrote to Grey on 26th March, urging him not to 'vacate the situation you now hold of being Fox's representative', but to remain, at the very least, the nominal leader. Only thus would Lambton serve under Tierney or anyone else. The alternative would be for the Whigs to splinter into five or six parties, which would not even unite against the Government. Later, at the behest of both Grey and Brougham, Lambton agreed to sign a requisition to Tierney to become Whig leader in the House of Commons. Meanwhile he himself formed a committee to supervise the publicity to be given the Whigs in the newspapers, and to arrange for a weekly dinner party for Whig Members of both Houses.¹ Thus Lambton went a long way to renovating the rather archaic organisation of his party.

The new Parliament met on 14th January, 1819, and in its early months Lambton's eloquence was lavished on such varied subjects as the coal duties, the publishing trade, and a proposed prohibitive duty on foreign wheat.² Soon all his intrepid nature was to be concentrated on Peterloo and its aftermath.

At a time of great misery in certain industrial areas,

1. Stuart Reid. op. cit. Vol. I. pp. 105-9; Chester New op. cit., pp 21-3.

2. Newcastle Chronicle. 13th March, 8th May, 1819.

including the North East, political unions were beginning to cover Lancashire and the Midlands, where reform petitions and mass meetings became the rule. All this was preliminary and incidental to the coming together on 16th August of over sixty thousand people in St. Peter's Fields, Manchester, to hear Orator Hunt. When the magistrates used the unpopular local yeomanry to arrest Hunt a melee ensued, until the 15th Hussars were ordered by the magistrates to clear the ground. As a result eleven people were killed, including one yeoman and one special constable, and many¹ hundreds lay injured.

Two days later a deputation from the Manchester magistrates to the Cabinet pleaded self-defence, and described threatening banners displayed by the crowd. They held that the yeomanry were first attacked with missiles. Indeed law officers advised the Cabinet that the meeting had been illegal, and thus could be dispersed by force. It was intimated that Scotland was in a more dangerous state than Lancashire, and that it would be fatal to disavow men who had done what they considered to be their duty. Thus the Prince Regent was advised to send his high approbation to the magistrates, officers and troops² involved.

Reactions to Peterloo were rapid and spontaneous. Meetings of protest and indignation were held all over the

1. Feiling op. cit. pp. 297-8.

2. Ibid. pp. 298-9.

country. In the North East of England the Black Dwarf was widely read,¹ and there were abundant signs that political feelings there were being excited and quickened, although they were never translated into such extra-constitutional abnormalities as Wharton and other Tories imagined would occur. Some two weeks previously a Declaration of the Political Protestants of Newcastle-upon-Tyne and neighbourhood, dated 3rd August, 1819, and printed in the Black Dwarf, had suggested positive action to protect their country 'from absolute despotism... or a dreadful revolution'. Thus they should meet weekly in classes of not more than twenty, subscribing one penny each, in order to buy the required information on current topics.²

Newcastle was patrolled continually by the military. The magistrates had endeavoured to foster an armed loyal association, but had met with such a weak response that they disbanded the force.³ On 11th October, 1819 the Town Moor was the scene of a General Meeting of the Inhabitants. Tens of thousands assembled, including many from the Reform Societies of Gateshead, North and South Shields, and Sunderland, and did not depart before passing twelve resolutions condemning the Manchester magistrates.⁴

1. Feiling p. 298.

2. B.M. (Printed) 8135 e 2. Political Tracts 1819. f.1.

3. Ibid. f. 4. 6th November, 1819. Difference between arming against a Foreign Foe and an unoffending people.

4. B.M. (Printed) 8135 e. 2. f. 4. pp. 2-16.

In the County of Durham G.A. Lambert, Clerk to the Chester Ward Magistrates, wrote to J.G. Lambton,¹ inviting him to sanction and approve a loyal declaration, copies of which lay for signature in the Justice Rooms at South Shields, Chester, Gateshead and Lanchester. The magistrates of Chester Ward had already given their approval. Lambton replied promptly, declining to sign the document, which the inhabitants of Chester Ward had not been able to discuss in a public meeting, and which, he felt, calumniated² ignominiously the loyalty of the neighbourhood. For Lambton was deeply involved in the after effects of Peterloo on Durham political life. Thereby we learn more of the man, what he stood for and against, and what was happening in Durham.

While he was in the process of organising a great protest against Peterloo in the City of Durham, Lambton turned aside swiftly to checkmate pro-Government forces, which were being marshalled at Sunderland on 16th October under Prebendary Philpotts and the Durham clergy. The Sunderland magistrates stated^{that} they had been urged by 'many respectable inhabitants' to call this assembly, with a view to passing resolutions expressing their devotion to the Constitution, and the laws of the country. Having summoned to his aid by messengers all available friends and supporters, Lambton burst into the hall, and, playing

1. Ibid. f. 10. 13th October, 1819.

2. Ibid. p 10. 15th October, 1819.

for time, objected to the proposal that the chair be taken by Rowland Burdon, the former Member for the County, who, he said, lived beyond Sunderland, and had no ties of property with the town. Undoubtedly Lambton was aware of the probability of Burdon endorsing the action of the Manchester magistrates which had given rise to Peterloo. A procedural deadlock resulted. Lambton, whose retinue was swelling every minute with fresh arrivals, was voted into the chair amid uproar, and secured an adjournment until the following Tuesday, to give time for a still larger attendance. Although the Radical Reformers regarded this as a triumph for themselves, Lambton was right in suspecting that Phillpotts and the magistrates had aimed at a closed meeting of those they considered suitable, such as senior and junior clergy and Tory laymen. Lambton himself, easily the most skilful and ebullient Durham Member, had only been advised of this strategy anonymously.

On the next Tuesday, the reformers from Sunderland and other parts of the County met in Bridge Street. They were heralded under banners, and their leaders carried wands of mourning. Amidst great applause Lambton was voted chairman. He argued powerfully that even had the Manchester meeting been riotous, then the civil power, and not the military, should have tried to disperse it. The meeting

1. 8135 e. 2. Political Tracts 1819. f. 10. Meetings at Sunderland; Newcastle Chronicle, 16th October, 1819; Cooper op. cit. pp. 63-5.

had, in fact, been both legal and constitutional. Thus he hoped that both Magistrates and Yeomen would receive their deserts.¹ This stern denunciation of Philpotts' strategy in arranging in a clandestine manner the packed meeting which had been so roughly handled by Lambton added fuel to the already blazing fire of their common hatred. The Church at Durham was now more openly committed to political partisanship than at any time since the days of Bishop Trevor.

Resolutions against the Manchester proceedings, and an address to the Prince Regent, praying for an inquiry, were moved and carried unanimously. Meanwhile, as this meeting was being held in the Assembly Room of the Exchange, many Radicals from the processions of reformers had moved to the Moor. For they claimed that a private meeting was in session inside the Exchange. No doubt those of their number inside the hall had been stung by Lambton's rebuke that such as themselves were the greatest enemies to the desired investigation.² For Lambton was still contemptuously averse to the ends pursued by the Radicals, who in turn were burning with resentment at his scathing coldness towards them. They did not refrain from challenging and attacking him, both by letter and by spoken word.³

1. 8135 e. 2. Political Tracts 1819. f. 10. Meetings at Sunderland; Cooper op. cit. p. 65.

2. 8135 e 2. Ibid.

3. 8135 e. 2. Political Tracts 1819. f. 10, 28th October, 1819; Ibid. Undated.

Wrath over Peterloo was also vented in the City of Durham, and in other north eastern towns. In addition, there was a great County Meeting, which pressed for a full inquiry into the events of 16th August. A set of resolutions were moved by Dr. Fenwick, seconded by George Baker,¹ and adopted by the meeting. These resolutions were similar to those passed at Sunderland, although they carefully disclaimed any concurrence with the principles of the convenors of the Manchester gathering.²

The County Meeting was particularly memorable for one of Radical Jack's most inspired and impassioned, if extravagantly emotional, speeches. He conjured up the image of men who had recently 'imbrued their hands in the blood of their countrymen, nay, in that of helpless unresisting women and children', and had plunged 'their fratricidal swords into the hearts of Englishmen.'³ He considered there had been no act of common violence antecedent to the Yeomanry using their swords, nor a breach of the peace before the reading of the Riot Act in a remote corner. If men were to 'submit to witness in silent indifference, such a violation of the laws, and of their most sacred rights, they may soon expect to see the next outrage committed at their own doors, and on their own persons.' He then called on the whole country to express its feelings, and on

-
1. Unsuccessful candidate for the City of Durham in 1812.
 2. 8135 e. 2. Political Tracts 1819. f. 15.
 3. Newcastle Chronicle, 30th October, 1819.

the country gentlemen to guide and lead at meetings. The alternative was a military despotism, for the paramount right at issue was 'whether Englishmen are to be allowed to assemble constitutionally, or whether they are to be dispersed when so assembled, at the point of the sword.'¹

Richard Wharton, the only other Durham Member of whose opinions on Peterloo there seems to be any register, had, with many other Tory landowners, boycotted this occasion. His fear was that all publications and resolutions surmising upon, let alone censuring, the conduct of the Manchester justices, would do untold harm at this time. For the excesses which had tortured France could descend upon England if assemblies and petitions ever got out of² hand.

Doubtless the torment of such fears had been added to by the reluctance of the Lord Lieutenant, the Earl of Darlington, to call a meeting of the County, although he shared the abhorrence and disgust of his friend Grey over Peterloo. But he was very sceptical as to whether a County Meeting ever did any good; 'it is notorious in the County of Durham that few Meetings have ever been held where the avowed object has been adhered to and generally been a Debate of Violence and Personality.'³ Certainly feeble

1. Newcastle Chronicle. 30th October, 1819.

2. 8135 e. 2.f. 14. 20th October, 1819. To the Worthy and Independent Freemen of the City of Durham, pp 1-8.

3. Correspondence of the Second Earl Grey. Box 10 File 8. Earl of Darlington to Grey. f. 14. 14th September, 1819, and f.

15. 22nd September, 1819. Darlington did not attend the subsequent meeting.

heartedness and equivocation of expression found little place in the usual run of Durham County Meetings.

The most resounding broadside fired against the views of Lambton and his following came from Prebendary Phillpotts himself, who later became Bishop of Exeter. Fanatically opposed to all vestiges of the Reform Movement, he was one of the most brilliant political writers in the North. From the College, Durham, on the 26th October, 1819, he denounced the resolutions passed at the recent County Meeting,¹ and reprobated as an act of high treason the meeting in St. Peter's Fields.² Not only had the Durham County Meeting gone utterly astray in chastising the Ministers, but in so doing it had usurped the function of a Grand Jury.³ Finally, he turned on J.G. Lambton, whom he accused of having prevented the possibility of a fair trial of the conduct of the Manchester magistrates.⁴

It is a moot point how those in the County of Durham who were aghast at the bloodshed at Peterloo, and the sickening approximation to despotism, could, without Radical Jack, have found such an outlet for their nausea. For in Phillpotts⁵ there stalked a pamphleteer of vehemence, and a leader and rallying point of reactionary Toryism.

1. 8135 e. 2. f. 15. A Letter to the Freeholders of the County of Durham, pp. 5-8.

2. Ibid. pp 8-17.

3. 8135 e. 2. f. 15. pp. 18-26.

4. 8135 e. 2. f. 15. pp. 26-31.

5. Priest, magistrate and political controversialist. 1815 held second stall at Durham, 1820 Rector of Stanhope, 1828 Dean of Chester, 1830 Bishop of Exeter. D.N.B. Vol. 15. Reissue. pp. 1108-11.

and
of undeniable command/resource. He was a foe worthy of Lambton's mettle, and their loathing of one another was to illuminate for some time the local history of the struggle for Reform of Parliament.

The Government, confronted with meetings, after the Durham fashion, all over the country, could not relax, although they felt encouraged by so much upper and middle-class feeling behind them, and were relieved when the Whigs as a party shrank from the responsibility of all-out-attack. Then in November the Six Acts were introduced. Among other provisions, they restricted public meetings, although authorized meetings of the Gentlemen, clergy, and freeholders of the various counties were still allowed. Later the Government accepted amendments raising the ban on indoor meetings, and confining the operation of the Acts to five¹ years.

Powlett was not among the minority on 2nd December on the Second Reading of the Seditious Meetings Prevention² Bill, nor was his name with those of Lambton and Taylor in the minority in the Seizure of Arms Bill on 14th December.³ Indeed on 15th December he agreed that the latter bill should be applied to the northern part of the County of Durham, which included the Lambton 'country' itself. The Opposition voted without Powlett against the Third Reading

1. Feiling, op. cit. pp. 299-301.

2. Parl Debates. Vol. 41. p. 678.

3. Ibid. p. 1163

4. Parl. Debates. Vol. 41. p. 1178.

of the bill,¹ while he was usually absent from the minorities ^{for} Parliamentary Reform at this time. Nor did he join with Lambton in stubbornly and persistently acquitting the Durham pitmen ~~of~~ disloyalty. Although he admitted that the majority of the people of the County were bearing economic distress with exemplary patience, he was certain that there was a considerable amount of disaffection afoot.² This statement, and the frame of mind it typified, were prime factors in his declining popularity with would-be reformers among the Whigs and Radicals.

Lambton's behaviour was very different. During the domestic³ debates on the Government's⁴ policy, he spoke four times. On 3rd December, he strongly denied a belief, widely held, that about fifteen thousand men of the banks of Wear and Tyne were in a state of rebellion. Such people, he allowed, very much desired Parliamentary Reform, but they had no intentions of subverting the Constitution or the Government.⁵

He wanted to know why the Government had not acquainted the House with the real state of the county of Durham, which had been communicated to London after a meeting of the Deputy Lieutenants had been called at Gates-

1. Ibid. pp. 1233-4.

2. Ibid. p. 1125.

3. Feiling op. cit. pp. 301-2.

4. Newcastle Chronicle. 11th December, 1819; Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4^o 70. f. 100. Debates in Parliament relating to the County of Durham; Parl Debates Vol. 41. pp. 702-3.

5. Chester New op. cit. p. 54; Parl. Debates. Vol. 41. pp. 702-3.

head. There was more to be feared, Radical Jack mused, from the legislation of the House of Commons than from those who had been so much suspected.¹ His defence of the men of Durham was remembered by a majority of his constituents, and weighed against the mistrust in which the pitmen were held by Wharton, Phillpotts, and, to a lesser extent, by Powlett.

The growing detestation of many Durham freeholders and burgesses towards Wharton was exacerbated by the report of his open exchange with Lambton in the Commons on 10th December. There Wharton had again dwelt on the supposed great disaffection in certain districts of the County. That this was about to explode in an eruption of armed force was to be seen, he reasoned, from the deportment of the colliers, who were divided into classes of twenty, and met every day for military training. He also alleged that their leaders corresponded regularly with the colliers of the West Riding of Yorkshire, and were plotting to transfer property from those who owned it to those who did not. All this Lambton denied. He reminded Wharton that for five or six years he had hardly resided in the County of Durham at all. As for the groups known as classes, now on the decrease, their only purpose was for miners to read to their fellows publications on reform. Indeed Lambton declared he had never known the pitmen more peaceful and

¹ Newcastle Chronicle. 18th December, 1819; Gough Adds. Durham Ms. 40 70. 1. 100.

1 willing to work, and announced that he still intended to propose in Committee that the County of Durham be excluded from the operation of the Seizure of Arms Act.²

Before delivering this dauntless and angry rejoinder he had taken the most momentous step in the first stage of his political career. For on 6th December he gave notice that he would move for a Reform of Parliament. This would entail his calling for the repeal of the Septennial Act, and for shorter Parliaments. He wanted all copyholders and householders paying direct taxes to enjoy the franchise. But while Lambton envisaged the destruction of many rotten boroughs, he stopped well short of universal suffrage, from which he shrank in horror.³

He had now decided to steer his own course. For even those Whigs who favoured reform proffered many different interpretations of the meaning of that word. They were appalled by his ideas of household suffrage, and repelled by the extraordinary welcome he received from miners and others all over the North.⁴

Lambton, who was difficult to work with, was ostracized socially by many of his colleagues. Lord Grey himself deplored such draconian sanctions, but there is no doubt

1. Ibid. Debates in Parliament Relating to the County of Durham; Parl Debates. Vol. 41. pp. 1005-7.

2. Parl. Debates Vol. 41. pp. 1006-7.

3. Chester New op.cit. p. 54: Stuart Reid op. cit. Vol. 1. pp. 124-130.

4. Chester New op. cit. pp. 54-7. Stuart Reid op. cit. Vol. 1. pp. 123-33.

that he was extremely sceptical of the wisdom of his son-in-law's latest proposals. He did not think this the moment for political redress. Rather was he alarmed lest these very proposals might split the Whigs irretrievably, and commit them too far if ever they should attain office again. Lambton's impatient and headstrong temperament could never brook or understand such considerations.

This then was the situation when Parliament was dissolved on 28th February, 1820, following the death of George III, and Lambton entered the electoral lists again, stimulated by the appreciation of so many of his constituents for what he had lately attempted at Westminster.¹ This was as well, for he had to survive a premeditated and articulate attempt to unhorse him, and to supplant him by one who was hostile to Parliamentary Reform, and thus more innocuous to the See and Church at Durham. For here was an endeavour to restore clerical influence over Durham politics reminiscent of the days when Bishop Trevor was hand in glove with the second Earl of Darlington. It was aided unconsciously by the presence of a fairly large section of Tory landowners who could not tolerate Phillpotts and his kind, but were irritated by the over confident assertiveness of Lambton, and what they detected as radical tendencies in him. Led by Sir Thomas Henry Liddell they were looking for a more restrained candidate.²

1. Newcastle Chronicle. 1st January, 1820.
 2. Cooper op. cit. p. 66.

CHAPTER 8LAMBTON AND THE CHURCH.

In the Election of 1820, the Tories of Durham, with the cathedral clergy in their van, were determined to oust Lambton from Parliament. For they considered him the most advanced of the Whig reformers, and realised how ready he was to express his exasperation at anything which savoured of ecclesiastical dictation. In their counsels the bold¹ Phillpotts posed as the premier sage, trumpeter and duellist.

Lambton and Powlett, on the 2nd and 7th February respectively, had announced their intentions of standing again for Parliament.² It had been rumoured that Richard Wharton, now the Chief Government Whip, would come forward for the County, and no longer represent the City of Durham, which he had done from 1802, with only a short interruption.³ It is not known how much say the newly married Frances Anne had over the fate of the latter seat, nor whether she too pressed Wharton to transfer his affections to the County. Anyway Wharton himself declared his new aim publicly on 27th February, 1820.⁴

This was four days after a statement had been issued

-
1. Chester New. op. cit. pp. 58-9.
 2. Newcastle Chronicle. 12th February, 1820.
 3. Ibid. 26th February, 1820.
 4. Newcastle Chronicle. 4th March, 1820. To the Freeholders of the County of Durham.

from Mr. Wharton's Committee Room at Sunderland, giving in full a requisition which had been made to him, and showing how, after the death of George III, several unnamed freeholders had determined to end Lambton's stay in Parliament, so far as the County of Durham was concerned. As no county gentleman would agree to joust with Lambton, application had been made to Wharton, who had asked that a requisition from a sufficient number of gentry, clergy and freeholders be first presented to him.¹ Almost simultaneously a fund was opened to meet his election expenses, for he was taking upon himself 'a fight to the death' with a doughty opponent, and it was expected that his own finances would be too meagre to withstand the prodigious demands on them.²

Mr. Wharton's challenge was greeted by many anonymous detractors with unrestrained abuse, even by the standards of political writing at the time. There were cited his support of the property and malt taxes and the Habeas Corpus Suspension Acts; as examples of his constancy towards the Percival and Liverpool Administrations, both in his capacity as Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means 1809-15, and afterwards. There were also reminders of how he had laid before the House flimsy evidence of the alleged disloyalty of the County of Durham during the troubles over

1. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4^o 70. f. 1. 17.

2. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4^o 70. f. 17.

¹
Peterloo.

His political aides were, firstly, those who had signed the requisition, an interesting bunch, which included no fewer than fifty clergymen, of whom Phillpotts, Prosser and Gray, all of the College, and Thomas Le Mesurier, Rector of Haughton le Skerne,² were the best known. With them were Rowland Burdon and Cuthbert Heron, Recorder of South Shields, who had been among the foremost of those who had dissuaded Burdon from retiring into private life in 1802; Robert Colling of Hurworth, Francis Johnson of Aykley Heads, J.B.S. Morritt of Rokeby, Daniel Seddon of Durham and William Sleigh of Stockton, Justices of the Peace; Stephen, Richard, and Thomas Pemberton of Bishopwearmouth, affluent business men, Thomas Jennett, Mayor of Stockton and H.C. Selby of Swansfield, 'late an Agent to the Duke of Northumberland'³

Those members of the aristocracy and county families who were against Lambton included Lord Stewart, husband of Lady Frances Anne Vane Tempest, the tenth Lord Strathmore

-
1. Ibid. f. l. 19. 'A Durham Freeholder! To the Freeholders of the County of Durham; Newcastle Chronicle. 11th March, 1820. 'A Lover of Truth and Liberty'; Gough Adds. Durham MS. 40 71. f. 1. 26. 8th March, 1820. 'True Blue', ff. 1. 76. 32.
 2. Newcastle Chronicle. 18th March, 1820. Durham County Meeting. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 40 70. f. 1. 112.
 3. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 40 70. f. 1. 125. List of Mr. R. Wharton's Requisitionists.

and Sir Thomas Henry Liddell, later Lord Ravensworth.¹ It was as the puppet of the future Lord Londonderry, and the creature of the Church in the County Palatine that Wharton was denounced by most anti-Tory publicists.²

In addition Richard Wharton was also succoured, according to Dr. J.R. Fenwick, by the Earl of Darlington,³ in that the latter was said to have decided that those of his tenants who voted according to his will would split upon Wharton; 'the assertion has been made in that (Wharton's)⁴ Committee and the leading men there are acting upon it.'

Although Fenwick was convinced of the accuracy of this report, it seems somewhat surprising that Darlington, who controlled the boroughs of Camelford, Tregory, Ilchester and Milborne (Somerset),⁵ should have done anything to compromise Lambton. For Darlington was then in the high noon of an intimate friendship with Grey, with whom his correspondence was at this time worded in terms of adulation, and almost flattery and sycophancy.⁶

1. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4^o 71. f. 1. 79. Song - Young Lambton would to Durham go; Newcastle Chronicle. 25th March, 1820. 27th February, 1820. Sir T.H. Liddell to J.G. Lambton. 3rd March, 1820, J.G. Lambton to Sir T.H. Liddell.

2. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4^o 70. ff. 1. 104, 128; 4^o 71 ff. 1. 76, 32.

3. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4^o 71. f. 1.5. 4th March, 1820 also shows how Wharton's Committee believed they had the backing of Lord Darlington.

4. Correspondence of the Second Earl Grey. Box 14 File 6. Unfoliated. 9th March, 1820. Dr. J.R. Fenwick to Grey.

5. Ibid. f. 18.

6. Correspondence of the Second Earl Grey. Darlington to Grey. Various.

Lambton, who was not caught unawares by Wharton's¹ provocation, conducted a remarkably intensive campaign, in which the frequency and vigour of his speeches² vied with his flamboyant canvassing. For it was his practice on these tours to have outriders preceding and liveried footmen adorning his coach. His committee made an estimate on 4th March of the results achieved thus far, and found that visits to Sunderland, Stockton and Sedgefield had been very bountiful in plumpers promised.³ At Gateshead and Newcastle, where he was attended, among others, by his brother Hedworth, and Sir Matthew White Ridley, ^{the Younger,} a Whig, and still ~~the~~ Member for Newcastle-upon-Tyne, he could look forward to 281 plumpers, 38 split votes, with 7 undetermined⁴ and 9 refusals.

Lambton seems to have been particularly well received at Darlington. In his concluding speech there on 6th March, he drew great applause by his avowed determination that his opponents 'SHALL NOT ... plough up the Field of your Independence and sow it with the SEED of CORRUPTION!' His Committee reported on the same day that there had been unearthed there 95 plumpers, 46 splits, 3 refusals, and 9 not seen.⁵ At Barnard Castle on 7th March, Lambton called

-
1. Newcastle Chronicle. 26th February, 1820. Lambton to the Freeholders, 24th February, 1820.
 2. Chester New op. cit. p. 61.
 3. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4^o 70. f. l. 151. Results of Mr. Lambton's Canvass.
 4. Ibid. ff. l. 134, 138, 139.
 5. Ibid. 4^o 71. ff. l. 38-40.

for A LONG, A STRONG PULL, AND A PULL ALTOGETHER.¹ Through-
out these perambulations and others, Lambton's appeal was
based chiefly on four heads; his condemnation of Petefloo,
his opposition to the Six Acts, his defence of the people
of Durham against accusations of lawlessness and disloyalty,
and his plans for the Reform of Parliament.² On all he had
much to say that was incisive and stimulating to his
hearers.

Despite the smoke screens put up by his Committee,³
there were many alarming aspects to the canvass of Mr.
Wharton. His visits to Newcastle, Bishop Auckland,
Darlington and Sunderland were accorded similar and
disturbing demonstrations of open hostility. Wharton himself
explained to the freeholders of the County of Durham,
resident in and near Darlington, how he had been compelled
to leave that town without a personal canvass, and blamed
'scandalous and illegal conduct' among Lambton's followers.⁴
The uproar at Sunderland was much more demoralising. Many
at this town had apparently been much enraged by Wharton's
having foolishly and tactlessly championed the Pemberton
Quays project, which they felt would have done irreparable
harm to the Port of Sunderland.⁵ The Pembertons were ship-

1. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4^o 71. f. 1. 41.

2. Chester New op. cit. pp. 60-1.

3. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4^o 71. f. 1. 82. To the
Independent Freeholders.

4. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4^o 71. f. 1. 84. 9th March,
1820.

5. Newcastle Chronicle. 11th March, 1820. 'A Lover of
Truth and Liberty'.

owners, who, with the Dean and Chapter, had petitioned against the successful bill of 1819 introduced by Lambton for improving the Wear and the Port and Harbour of Sunderland.¹ They had also been all the more insistent on Wharton coming forward for the County when their plan² to erect quays was thwarted by Lambton. So disliked was Wharton at Sunderland that he found it impossible to carry out any canvass there, too. He decided to make no further attempt to do so until he had the full backing of the Civil Authority.³ He himself described to the freeholders of the County what had happened at Sunderland: 'This morning, a very alarming riot took place at Sunderland. I and a few of my friends returning about ten' o'clock from Kay's Long Room, were attacked by a vast multitude, and assaulted with slates, potatoes, mud and at last with stones, in a manner so furious that our lives were in considerable danger..... originated in eagerness for Mr. Lambton, and a notion that I had supported the Corn Bill, which passed when I was resident in Italy on account of ill health. The tumult became so alarming at last, that the Magistrates present thought it necessary to demand the aid of a military force, and read the Riot Act.... not till ^{of} after a detention three hours or thereabouts, that I was

1. J.H.C. Vol. 74. pp. 50, 190, 196, 228, 273, 552.

2. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4^o 70. f. l. 104. 'The Right Side of the Picture'; Newcastle Chronicle. 4th March. 1820.

3. Ibid. f.l. 85. 29th February, 1820. To the Freeholders of the County of Durham, resident in Sunderland, Bishopwearmouth and Monkwearmouth.

enabled to get into my carriage and leave the town'¹.....

Meanwhile Mr. Powlett was proceeding with his own canvass in somewhat less frenzied circumstances. On 2nd March he had reported himself greatly satisfied with his reception at Sinderland and the Wearmouths.² He appeared bent on avoiding controversy, and at Durham on 4th March declared that he would maintain strict neutrality towards the other two candidates.³

Monday, 13th March was the day of the commencement of the poll. The ceremonial and ostentation of the proceedings were worthy of the last contested Durham County election before the passing of the Reform Bill. In this election there was, and could be, no quarter, such were the issues, and such was the yawning chasm separating Lambton and Wharton. 'About half-past nine o'clock, Mr. Powlett and a large party of his friends, preceded by a band of music and several flags bearing appropriate inscriptions, proceeded from the Waterloo Inn to the hustings, erected on the green in front of the new County Courts. The voters from Newcastle and neighbourhood, in the interest of Mr. Lambton, having soon after arrived in a party consisting of 14 or 15 carriages, headed by the open barouche of Sir M.W.⁴ Ridley, highly decorated with blue favours, and carrying

1. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4^o 70. f. 1. 89. 29th February, 1820.

2. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4^o 70. f. 1. 130. To the Freeholders of the County of Durham.

3. Ibid. f. 1. 148. For 1820.

4. The Younger. M.P. for Newcastle.

the Newcastle and Gateshead Committee, and accompanied by from 400. to 500 horsemen, Mr. Lambton and his friends, also preceded by a band of music and various flags, moved in grand procession from his lodgings at the foot of Elvet Bridge to the hustings. The appearance of both these candidates on the hustings was greeted with loud cheers by their friends. Mr. Wharton's friends did not come in any regular manner, nor were any colours or cockades in his favour exhibited. He was not present himself, being confined, as we were afterwards told, by indisposition.' After the reading of the Riot and Bribery Acts, and other formalities and preliminaries, the High Sheriff, the Honourable William Keppel Barrington,¹ the High Sheriff, addressed the Meeting, which he hoped 'would shew by their due observance of order and regularity, how much the freeholders at large disapproved of those disgraceful proceedings, which he was sorry to say, had disgraced some of the principal towns during the canvass of one of the candidates'.² This only serves to confirm the impression already left of the tumults so often attendant on Wharton's canvassing.

Lambton was nominated by George Baker, of Elemore Hall, who had stood for the City of Durham in 1800 and 1813,³ and seconded by Sir Matthew White Ridley. To the

1. Great nephew of the Bishop of Durham.

2. Newcastle Chronicle. 18th March, 1820. Durham County Election.

3. His father and mother had remained steadfast friends of the Lambtons 1760-2.

freeholders 'Radical Jack' pledged the cause of 'Lambton, Liberty, and Independence, unshackled by Priestcraft and unpolluted by Ministerial Corruption.' General Aylmer proposed the Honourable W. Powlett, who was seconded by Colonel Chaytor, a descendant of that Sir William Chaytor who had spent so long as a debtor in the Fleet Prison. Colonel Sleigh, a justice who had signed the Requisition, and William Grieve of Ord House were respectively Wharton's² proposer and seconder.

All this was precursory to the Sheriff taking the sense of the meeting, when there was an almost unanimous show of hands for Lambton. Powlett was acclaimed only a little less convincingly. But a mere few upheld Wharton's cause. The Sheriff testified that Lambton and Powlett seemed elected. Mr. Grieve then demanded a poll for Wharton. Accordingly the Under Sheriff declared the meeting closed, and appointed twelve o'clock for the³ beginning of the voting. In their speeches both Powlett and Lambton inveighed against the heavy taxation to which the country was being subjected, but Powlett was careful to go no further than reciting the Whig tenets of economy, retrenchment and liberty, both civil and religious.⁴

Lambton's remarks were far more addressed to the

-
1. Newcastle Chronicle. 18th March, 1820. Durham County Election.
 2. Ibid.
 3. Ibid.
 4. Newcastle Chronicle. 18th March, 1820.

immediate present. At some length he outlined many examples of intimidation of electors. In all cases he held that Wharton and his associates had been responsible;

'Commissioners of Roads have threatened individuals with loss of employment if they voted for me.... magistrates have also told others that they should never have more of what they call County work if they supported me'.¹ Later in the week, the aged Bishop Shute Barrington was accused of having ordered trees to be cut down on the estates of lease-holders who voted for Mr. Lambton.²

Lambton was undoubtedly agitated and stung by the relentless coalition of so many clerics against him. While he did not find it easy at any time to restrain his words where the clergy, and particularly those of the College, were involved, he did have some justification for his passionate vitriolism at their expense. This view is given further credence by a letter from the Reverend ^{Edward} Grey, Rector of Whickham, to his brother, Lambton's father-in-law, and later the Prime Minister:

Whickham,

March 18, 1820.

'I have always thought it a pity, that he (Lambton) should condemn the clergy indiscriminately: but I have ever vindicated him on the ground of the provocation given him

1. Ibid.

2. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4^o 1.128. 15th March, 1820. The College Gazette. Vol. 1. No. 2.

by the members of that body in this county. He has now, I think, set all right. His active clerical opponents have lowered themselves, as I conceive, tremendously in the eyes of the public: and what their consciences may say to them, for being the promoters of the confusion of this week, I will not pretend to determine. I am glad, that I have not to answer for it. The clergy of this county are far too much concerned in secular matters, either for their own peace¹
or for the good of religion. I am rejoiced however to find, that, notwithstanding his cause to complain of the clergy about him, Mr. Lambton has stated his respect for religion and its ministers, and thus stopped the mouths of those who would hold him as wanting in regard and veneration for everything sacred....'² This letter, from a clergyman, only serves to confirm the impression that the heavy hand of the still redoubtable See at Durham, with Phillpotts and fellow Collegians as its shock troops, had been thrust into politics to an unprecedented extent.

Wharton, suffering from gout in the foot, had been unable to attend the County Meeting. But he did issue a long address to the freeholders on 16th March, devoting most of the space to a reply to Lambton's speech at the nomination meeting of the previous Monday. Not only did he defend the Government's financial policy from Lambton's

1. My italics.

2. Correspondence of the Second Earl Grey, Box 18, File 10.f. 8.

charges of extravagance and extortion. He also differed from Lambton on the question of the ordinary laws being sufficient to maintain order, as Lambton had asserted. Quoting the incidents at Sunderland, which had only strengthened the foundations of his preconceived opinions, Wharton insisted that once the public mind was tainted with anarchy, pillage and murder, hardly any laws were adequate to protect life and property.¹ But however sincere Wharton may have been he could not escape the odium of having set in motion a false alarm about armed pitmen and radicals in the North being on the verge of rebellion.²

At this point neither Wharton nor Lambton had budged an inch since Peterloo. There was a major cause of the acute acrimony between them, which was reflected in the tension charged atmosphere of the polling. To so many voters the image of Wharton was of one who could always be relied upon to betray the true interests, on all counts, political, industrial and commercial, of those whose confidence he was seeking. Anyway he lost more ground each day:

		<u>Lambton.</u>	<u>Powlett.</u>	<u>Wharton.</u>
Monday	13th March, 1820	182	89	53 ³
Tuesday	14th March, 1820	529	299	233 ⁴
Wednesday	15th March, 1820	922	505	438 ⁵

1. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4^o 71. f. 136.

2. Cooper op. cit. p. 71.

3. Gough: Adds. Durham MS. 4^o 71. f. 1. 10.1. Committee Room, Sunderland.

4. Ibid. f. 1. 114. Durham; Newcastle Chronicle, 18th March, 1820.

5. Ibid. f. A.124. Committee Room, Durham; Ibid.

	<u>Lambton.</u>	<u>Powlett</u>	<u>Wharton.</u>
Thursday 16th March, 1820	1311	791	639 ¹
Friday 17th, March, 1820	1672	1102	865 ²
Saturday 18th March, 1820	1731	1137	874 ³

In all 2712 freeholders voted. ⁴ The distribution of Plumpers and Split Votes was as follows:

	<u>Lambton.</u>	<u>Powlett</u>	<u>Wharton.</u>
Plumpers	908	307	458
Split Votes	823	830	416
	<u>1731</u>	<u>1137</u>	<u>874</u> ⁵

The friends of Mr. Wharton had early on Saturday, 18th March, seen the inanity of persisting. The two successful candidates then addressed the electors. Lambton declared that although he had 1417 freeholders still unpolled, he felt that the County spoke with him. His Committee declared that the 1731 who had voted for him, and the 1417 promised⁶ made up 3148, three quarters of the County freeholders.

He had held his seat by about ~~nine~~ hundred, the largest majority in any Durham County election since 1760. Not that this, or his great number of plumpers, was totally expressive of the widespread adoration in which he revelled,

1. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4^o 71 f. 1. 134; Newcastle Chronicle, 18th March, 1820.

2. Ibid. f. 139. Ibid; Newcastle Chronicle, 25th March, 1820.

3. Sharp MS. 82. p. 21. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4^o 4.

4. Ibid. p. 21n; Ibid.

5. Dur. 3/150. f. 54. Indenture of Return, Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4^o 4.

6. Newcastle Chronicle. 25th March, 1820; Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4^o 71. f. 1. 150. 1820, 20th March.

for he had very many admirers among the working men and smaller tradesmen of the North, most of whom had to remain electorally dumb.¹ But he was poorer by some £30,000, most of which had accumulated through heavy bills arising out of hospitality in all its ramifications at the local inns. The 'legal entertainment' alone of the voters had come to £1000 a day.²

Lambton was much indebted throughout this campaign and at other times to advice and assistance from the Grey family, as a further letter from the Reverend Edward Grey to his brother, the second Earl, shows. This was written on 10th March, and in it Edward Grey voiced emphatically his deep desire to be of service to Lambton in his election preparations. He explained to his eminent brother how he had obtained an assurance from his old curate that the latter would not vote for Wharton. And this was by no means the only clergyman he canvassed on Lambton's behalf.³

To Lambton himself political survival after such a crucial test was a warrant of freedom to embark on work which he had long been contemplating. He looked forward most to the carrying of a measure of moderate and constitutional reform in the representations of the people, by which, he believed, all discontent in the country

1. Cooper op. cit. p. 70.

2. B.M (Printed) 8135. c.1. f. 8. Lord Durham's Speech on the Second Reading of the Reform Bill in the House of Lords. 13th April, 1832. pp. 11-21.

3. Correspondence of the Second Earl Grey. Box 18. File 10.f. 6.

would be eradicated. In his own county he maintained his attack on his clerical foes. This is shown by another letter from the Reverend Edward Grey to his brother, in which the writer is obviously perturbed by the rash and unqualified ferocity of ^{Lambton's} onslaught, although he admits how extremely involved the Durham clergy were in local politics.

Hertford Street,
(Lord Grey's town house.)

January 2, 1821.

'... As far as I know, the County of Durham is the first place, where the clergy have been called together by ecclesiastical authority for the support of ministers. No one can lament more than I do the unwise and improper part which the clergy are taking in the disputes of the times:²
but I am sure you will excuse me when I observe, that those, who justly censure them for such conduct, do not always appear to me sufficiently cautious in distinguishing the condemnation of their errors from any thing like disaffection to the church establishment to which they belong and which by no means countenances the proceedings found fault with. Admiring, as I do, the manliness, spirit, and ability, manifested by Mr. Lambton on all occasions where I have had an opportunity of observing them; and sincerely regarding him, as I do, not only for his own sake, but as a branch of your family; the only particle of unpleasant feeling I have on his public appearances in our county would be

1. Newcastle Chronicle. 15th April, 1820.
2. My italics.

entirely removed, would he only, when he finds it necessary to censure the clergy, express his regard for the establishment, and likewise his conviction that that establishment does not warrant the political interference he complains of. I want him to appear as a friend to the Church of England.....¹ But moderation was unknown to Radical Jack.

J.G. Lambton had emerged from the rigours of the poll so victoriously, but with his phobia against the clergy of his County yet more deep rooted. Meanwhile Michael Angelo Taylor and Sir Henry Hardinge, K.C. B., had been returned unopposed² for the City of Durham on 8th March, 1820. The latter, educated at Durham School, was the grandson of Nicholas Hardinge, one time Clerk of the House of Commons, Joint Secretary of the Treasury, and brother-in-law of Lord Chancellor Camden. Sir Henry was also the son of the Reverend Henry Hardinge, who had been Rector of Stanhope, and, most significant of all, he was the brother-in-law of Lord Stewart, later the third Marquis of Londonderry. His military achievements did not rest with his being a Colonel in the Grenadier Guards. For during the Peninsular campaign he was Deputy-Quarter-Master General of the Portuguese army, in which he commanded a brigade. Moreover, he had

-
1. Correspondence of the Second Earl Grey. Box 18. File 10. f. 9.
 2. Sharp MS. 82. p. 40; Dur. 3/150. f. 56.
 3. Raine MS. 95. f. 21. 'A Durham Freeman' to the Loyal and Independent Freemen of Durham.

acquitted himself with special distinction at Albuera, and, on the recommendation of the Duke of Wellington, was awarded a cross with five clasps for his Peninsular record.

Before he accompanied Lord Stewart to the Congress of Vienna, he had been created a Knight Commander of the Order of the Bath. He was then posted at the Headquarters of the Prussian Army, under Marshal Blucher, as a confidential officer, with the rank of Brigadier-General. At the battle of Ligny, his left hand was shattered by a cannon-ball, and had to be amputated. But Hardinge continued his duties at the Prussian Headquarters during the whole time of the Allied occupation of France.¹

Sir Henry Hardinge had been introduced to the Durham freemen in London by Sir Cuthbert Sharp, the local historian, and Recorder of South Shields. There were many who hastened to harmonise round this distinguished soldier and immensely able administrator, who was still only thirty seven years of age. His military talent and his skill as a diplomat² were widely praised, as was his family background. For, in addition to those relatives already mentioned, Sir Henry's elder brother, Captain George Nicholas Hardinge, had been killed in a naval action against the French.³ Also, his uncle, George Hardinge, had been

1. Sharp MS. 145. p. 3n.

2. Raine MS. 95. f. 19. 9th February, 1820. Major General B.D'Urban, Memoir of the Services of Durham City Election f. 47. Also f. 20; D.N.B. Vol. XXIV. p. 343.

3. 'A Durham Freeman to the Editor of the Durham Advertiser.' Raine MS. 95. f. 20.

3. Sharp MS. 145. p. 3n.

Judge of the Court of Great Sessions of Wales, and
 Solicitor General to the Queen.¹

But there was among many of the freemen a strong belief, based on no dearth of evidence, that Hardinge, as the friend and relative of Lord Stewart, was the direct nominee² of the House of Wynyard, and thus 'the Castlereagh Candidate.' As such he would vote, right or wrong, with His Majesty's³ Ministers. Hardinge's political opinions were certainly in striking contrast to those of Taylor. The latter's pacificism - for to him the only justification for his country going to war was the presence of a foreign army on British soil⁴ -- and his resistance in the division lobbies to the Habeas Corpus Suspension Act and the Property Tax, were pleaded forcefully by him as grounds for his reelection.

On 8th March, 1820, Taylor was formally proposed by Mr. Edward Shipperdson. This J.P., who was becoming one of the leading Durham advocates for Reform, did not exaggerate when he recited how Mr. Taylor had struggled to uphold the liberties of the country, resisted expensive measures, and tried to check excessive taxation. Sir Henry Hardinge's proposer was the Reverend Edward Davison,

1. Raine MS. 95. f. 21.

2. Ibid. f. 38. 19th February, 1820. From the Durham Chronicle.

3. Ibid. f. 28. 15th February, 1820. 'A Freeman'. 'A Hint to Electors.'

4. Ibid. f. 12. M.A. Taylor to the Freemen in the Town Hall, Durham.

a lifelong friend of the Hardinge family. In the absence of any competition Taylor and Hardinge, were declared duly elected. The familiar alloy of Whig and Tory was again legal currency in the City. It is probable that Taylor was still deprived of the Tempest interest, which was deployed on Hardinge's behalf, but he had built up his own following in this large constituency.

Let us for a moment set Hardinge and Taylor alongside Vane Lambton and Powlett, proud bearers of great Durham names. Never before had City and County been represented simultaneously by three gentlemen - Lambton, Hardinge and Taylor - of such collective ability, or by four of such loquacity. That they should all express their views from time to time in the Commons was so far unique for Durham Members. But during the Parliament which first met in 1820 Lambton was the most vocal of the four, both at Westminster, and in the various political gatherings held in his native county. If much of the political history of Durham is viewed through his words and deeds it is not because his fellow representatives were insignificant or even without lustre; but because he was by far the brightest and most transcendent star in the Durham firmament. As he enveloped in his circuit virtually all the causes of his day, national and local, his career is the most penetrating conductor of light on them.

1. Raine MS. 95. f. 47. Durham County Advertiser. Durham City Election, 1820. Newcastle Chronicle, 16th March, 1820.

After the General Election the Government had coasted home with a comfortable majority of over 200 on the first important vote on the Civil List. But their complacency was rudely shattered with the sudden return of Queen Caroline on 6th June, 1820. Eventually Liverpool introduced a bill to take away her title, and to annul her marriage. Could the Whigs, so cloven on this, as on other questions, prosper from the mishandling by the Government of such a delicate subject? For the dubious, and, in many cases, scandalous nature of the Italian witnesses against the Queen was offensive to so many. And the slender Government majority of nine in the House of Lords on the Third Reading of the Bill of Pains and Penalties caused Liverpool to withdraw¹ his bill.

The course and sequel of the Queen's trial had been followed very closely in the County of Durham. Here the parliamentary representatives, notwithstanding their want of cohesion over Parliamentary Reform, were^{yet} as one over the Government's policy towards the Queen. ^{On other issues,} For the City, certainly Hardinge was ranged with, and Taylor against, the King's Ministers. ^{2 But} the tide of Whiggism was clearly continuing to flow strongly in Durham, more so than in many counties.

There were joyous celebrations in the County on the withdrawal of the Bill of Pains and Penalties, and from

1. Feiling op. cit. pp. 306-8.

2. Parl Debates. New Series. Vol. 4. pp. 507-11.

various towns loyal and congratulatory addresses were sent to the Queen. Earl Grey, the Earl of Darlington, Sir Matthew White Ridley, J.G. Lambton, R.J. Lambton, M.A. Taylor, G. Baker, R.E.D. Shafto and Cuthbert Rippon, some of whom were in the advance guard of the campaign for Parliamentary Reform, nationally as well as locally, all signed the requisition for a County Meeting of protest against 'the Degradation of the Queen'.¹ This was the very first of the meetings in the country addressed to her predicament.

After both he and Powlett had pleaded her innocence it was the inevitable Lambton who moved an Address to the King; a series of resolutions calling for the strongest censure of the Bill of Pains and Penalties, and the vesting in the Queen of all the privileges and rights to which she was entitled.² This was also the main text of his speech in the House of Commons on 5th February, 1821, when he seconded the Marquis of Tavistock's ineffective motion deprecating the recent behaviour of the ministers.³ This suggests that it was quite possibly he who drafted the resolutions of his County meeting, the course of which he took charge and steered with his customary drive and vivacity.

By this time the country had grown tired of the fiasco.

-
1. Newcastle Chronicle, 9th December, 1820.
 2. Ibid, 16th December, 1820; B.M. (Printed) 8135 e. 4. f.
 27. The Substance of the Speech of J.G. Lambton Esq, M.P. at the Durham County Meeting, 13th December, 1820. pp. 3-17.
 3. Parl. Debates Vol. 4. pp. 368-84; Newcastle Chronicle, 10th February, 1821.

Yet the death of the wretched lady on 7th August, 1821, did not immediately still the spirit of controversy which had so recently and completely dogged her. As a result of the inability of those in charge of the funeral arrangements to maintain order among the public, Sir Robert Wilson, Member of Parliament for Southwark, and a distinguished army officer, was deprived of his decorations, and dismissed the services as a token of the King's displeasure. Lambton, ever eager to vent his spleen on injustice, in whatever guise it reared its head, bristled and resounded against what he considered such scurviness, and subscribed a thousand guineas to a fund aimed at compensating the injured officer. However it was not until the accession of William IV that Sir Robert Wilson was reinstated, with the rank of Lieutenant General.¹

Since his return to Parliament in 1820, Lambton had been yearning to introduce his motion on Parliamentary Reform. Other happenings had compelled its postponement. Early in 1821 the time seemed ripe, and he, Grey's son-in-law, the rich head of a renowned county family, the great and indulgent employer of industrial labour, and the chief intermediary between the aristocratic Whig leaders and the demagogic Radicals of the great towns, was ready. He was not dismayed that so many Whigs, including a number of borough owners, dreaded a change in the distribution of electoral power, and that

1. Stuart Reid op. cit. Vol. I. p. 153-5.

Grey himself was still for indefinite delay. He was not blind to the fact that anything he introduced might be regarded by some as a descent towards Jacobinism. Nor was he discouraged by Holland's shocked observation that his suggestion of household suffrage was 'as bad as a¹ revolution'.

At the Fox Anniversary banquet at Edinburgh on 12th January, 1821, with M.A. Taylor and Sir Matthew White^{2/3} Ridgely among the diners, and at the dinner of the Friends of the People at the City of London Tavern, on 28th March, before the Lord Mayor, and about fifty noblemen, Members of Parliament and consequential gentlemen, he foreshadowed and hinted strongly at what he was soon to unfold.⁴ At last on 17th April, 1821, in the Commons Lambton rose to make his long awaited proposals. He held the unreformed state of the House mainly responsible for the financial and economic ills which he detailed. He aimed to purify the Constitution by enabling the House to act as a check on the Crown. He therefore insisted that the elective franchise should be extended to all freeholders, leaseholders and copyholders. All decayed, venal and corrupt boroughs should be disfranchised, without compensation to their owners, and Triennial Parliaments should again be in vogue. The

1. Cooper op. cit. pp. 71-4.

2. Stuart Reid op. cit. Vol. I. p. 143; Chester New op. cit. p. 68.

3. Newcastle Chronicle, 3rd February, 1821.

4. Ibid. 31st March, 1821; Parl Debates. Vol. 5. pp. 359-85.

provisions of this bill differed from the Reform Bill of 1832 in only two special instances. First, he called in 1821 for an extension of the suffrage to all householders paying rates instead of to £10 householders, as in 1832. Second, he envisaged a plan for uniform electoral districts, which was omitted from the later measure. Instead of introducing a bill directly, to embrace his many far reaching clauses, he moved for a Committee of Inquiry of the whole House. After this he would put forward resolutions based on his preparations, and then move the bill itself.¹ Those who cooperated most faithfully with him at this time were Whitbread, Hobhouse, and his great friend, Sir Robert Wilson.²

This monumental work of Lambton was a long way from Radicalism, for it laid emphasis on the ownership of property as the precondition of voting. The Government thought otherwise, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Vansittart, on 18th April, declared that Lambton had put forward what 'approached very nearly to Universal Suffrage'. Later that day, Canning, the Leader of the House, shrewdly recommended that, in the absence of his friends, and, above all, of the Honourable Member for ^{the County of} Durham himself, the debate should be closed. The House then divided on Lambton's motion. There were 43 for the motion and 55

1. Stuart Reid op. cit. Vol. 1. pp. 148-9; Chester New op. cit. pp. 68-70.

2. Stuart Reid op. cit. Vol. 1. p. 149; Cooper op. cit. p. 74.

against.¹ As the other orders of the day were being reviewed, Lambton, who had now returned, to derisive laughter, tried to move the adjournment of the House. But he was informed by the Speaker that he could not do this, as he had risen to order on a subject other than that being discussed. Mr. Lambton, with much peevishness, deplored that the question he had raised had been dismissed so abruptly just because he had been taking refreshment.

This was a terrible misfortune and humiliation for him, which he had at first accepted very ungraciously. He thought his leaders had left him to his fate, his relations with his father-in-law were deteriorating, and he even thought of leaving the Whigs.² Yet his oratory and bearing in introducing his work had won the admiration of very many Members of both sides of the House. 'Lambton's speech was quite perfect,' Canning had said.³ Huskisson paid tribute to 'the temper and moderation with which the Honourable Gentleman had brought the subject forward.'⁴

Lambton made no immediate attempts to revive the issue of Parliamentary Representation within the House of Commons. The remainder of 1821 was uneventful for him in a parliamentary sense, although, with Taylor, he did vote in favour of Lord John Russell's motion of 9th May for

-
1. Neither Powlett nor Taylor voted with the minority in this division. Parl. Debates. Vol. 5. p. 453.
 2. Newcastle Chronicle. 28th April, 1821; Cooper op. cit. pp. 74-5.
 3. Stuart Reid. op. cit. Vol. I. p. 149.
 4. Newcastle Chronicle. 28th April, 1821.

Parliamentary Reform. Hardinge, not unexpectedly, voted against this¹, while Powlett, still unable to brook any Reform which entailed the truncation of a number of boroughs, was not in the division.² Powlett did, however, seemingly inconsistently join with Lambton in supporting Lord John Russell's motions for Parliamentary Reform on 25th April, 1822, and 24th April, 1823,³ but Taylor was absent on both occasions. He was less absorbed in this subject than in his passion for legal reform, particularly of the Court of Chancery.⁴

Despite his relative torpor in Parliament during the second half of 1821, Lambton saw the collapse of the Tories as the essential preliminary to any attainment of unity among the Whigs.⁵ This was most likely to be achieved, he thought, by backing Canning. Even with the dramatic and fateful suicide of Castlereagh, the King was, at first, resolved that Canning must still go to India as Governor-General. But later he acquiesced in a Cabinet reconstruction which wafted Canning to the Foreign Office.⁶

Among the subsequent appointments was that of the able Sir Henry Hardinge to be Clerk of the Ordnance, in which capacity he was to address the House many times on military subjects. The necessary writ was issued on 25th March,

1. B.M. (Printed.) Periodical Publications 3557W. pp. 306-11 and pp. 295-6.

2½ Parl. Debates. Vol. 5. pp. 624-6.

3. Ibid. Vol 7. pp. 139-141; Vol. 8. pp. 1287-9.

4. B.M. (Printed.) Periodical Publications 3557 W. pp. 306-11 and pp. 295-6.

5. Feiling op. cit. pp 308-9.

6. Feiling op. cit. pp. 312-7.

¹
1823. Meanwhile, a number of freemen of the City had acted very quickly. They drew up an address to R.J. Lambton, uncle of the Member for the County, and a former Member for the City. On the unexceptionable and blameless grounds of 'independence and patriotism', they asked him to agree to his nomination. His enforced resignation of 1813 had obviously been an acid pill for them to swallow. Besides they were possibly intoxicated with a hero worship of 'Radical Jack' and of the Lambtons in general. For if Mr. R.J. Lambton did not accede to their wishes at this juncture, they would next approach his nephew, Mr Hedworth Lambton, brother of Mr. J.G. Lambton.² Among the sixty two who signed the Address were such confederates of the Lambtons as Dr. J.R. Fenwick. They were determined to do their utmost to wrest from the Tories their only stronghold among the Durham seats.

On 31st March, 1823, resort was made to Mr. Hedworth Lambton, as his uncle would not be enticed on to the hustings again.³ But the communication did not reach Hedworth, so in desperation the good offices of J.G. Lambton were implored. These local Whig Reformers were not going to surrender easily their hopes of pulling the Tories completely off their balance in the electoral tug of war for this marginal seat. The resulting bitterness from this and later affrays lasted until 1832, and was one of the

1. Sharp MS. 82. p. 41.

2. Raine MS. 96. f.1. 28th March, 1823. To the Independent Freemen of the City of Durham.

3. Ibid. f. 5. To the Independent Freemen of the City of Durham.

main characteristics in Durham of the decade that preceded the passing of the Reform Bill. This was largely because Lord Londonderry's attempts to install successive protégés in the seat in question caused him to be identified by so many as a second Lord Darlington, and another overmighty political baron. 'Radical Jack's' reply to the address of the sixty two expressed gratitude to the freemen for their favourable disposition towards his family, but he confessed he had not recently been in contact with his brother, who had left England in 1822 for a fairly lengthy time abroad. Finally, the County Member wisely and tactfully made it quite plain that he would not interfere in any way in the approaching/election.¹ He was probably loathe to forfeit any of the high respect in which he was held by an over vaunting ambition for his family, and by straining to bring about that very situation which his uncle, by his resignation in 1813, had contrived to avoid. Thus those freemen who were opposed to Hardinge had to explain to their fellows that they had not been able to find time for any canvassing on behalf of Mr. Hedworth Lambton.² At the end of 3rd April, the first day of the poll, they admitted Hardinge's flying start of two hundred and sixteen votes, against their own sixty six. They tried to excuse their meagre performance on the ground that Hardinge had polled nearly every vote he could expect

1. Raine MS. 96. f. 10. 2nd April, 1823. To the Independent Freemen of the City of Durham.

2. Ibid. f. 9. 2nd April, 1823. To the Independent Freemen of the City of Durham.

from the City itself, in addition to almost all the¹ freemen who worked in the Londonderry collieries.

Hardinge, an unswerving Tory who venerated Pitt, Castlereagh and Canning alike, was flowing with pride at the thought of working in peace time conditions under his² old commander, the Duke of Wellington. It is true that he owed his seat in 1820, and candidature in 1823, very largely to Lord Londonderry. According to Edith Lady Londonderry the Marquess had agreed to return him again in 1823, in the supposition, which proved to be erroneous, that he himself would be given command of the Londonderry militia. He had to reconcile himself to his disappointment, after fatuously threatening that Hardinge would resign his newly acquired office.³ Sir Henry was not the kind of man to submit easily to anything smacking of subservience, or to anyone of Londonderry's temperament, anymore than he would allow political differences in themselves to breed personal animosities, or to blind him to the good of all his constituents, whatever their politics.⁴ Later a great rift was to open between himself and the Marquis.

In the short election proceedings themselves both Durham newspapers threw down the gage, preparatory to a long period of intensive verbal warfare.⁵ According to the Durham Chronicle the disheartening letter from Mr. J.G.

1. Raine MS. 96. f.11. 3rd April, 1823.

2. Ibid. f. 6. 31st March, 1823. The Duke was Master - General of the Ordnance.

3. Edith Lady Londonderry op. cit. pp. 126-7.

4. Raine MS. 96. f. 25; Sharp MS. 82. Inset after p. 41.

5. Raine MS. 96. ff. 23-7, 34, 38.

to
 Lambton determined his brother's suitors/bow to the inevitable on the morning of Friday, 4th April. The final stage of the poll was Hardinge 249 votes, Hedworth Lambton 66.¹ It is probable that a strong reason for Hardinge's majority was the now ingrained desire among enough Durham electors to prevent the Lambtons or any other family holding a County and a City seat at the same time.

This obsession coincided with the Toryism of the Durham County Advertiser, which was a constant tub thumper of Lord Londonderry, and therefore of Sir Henry Hardinge. This newspaper was equally firm in its hatred of the Lambtons. Its description of the election is also indicative of the wild glee and boisterous antics that usually consumed those on the winning side: 'About three hundred freemen were treated by Sir Henry Hardinge at the different public houses of the City.' 'Cries of "Hardinge for ever"..... were oftentimes repeated, until the victorious freemen/^{were} in their turn overpowered by the all-potent forces of the jolly god!'²

So John George Lambton remained the only representative of his family in a parliament in which commerce and finance were frequently debated. His views on these subjects were, of course, usually sharply defined. Trade was flourishing, with exports having risen from about £33,000,000. in 1819 to over £48,000,000 in 1824,³ the zenith

1. Ibid. f 15. Final State of the Poll; Sharp MS. 82 p. 41; Dur. 3/150 f. 52.

2. Raine MS. 96. f. 34. 11th April, 1823. Second Edition Durham Advertiser Office.

3. Feiling op. cit. p. 317.

of the boom. Although the Navigation Laws were somewhat abridged, coastwise and inter-imperial trade were reserved for British and colonial ships. But the colonies were free to export wherever they wished, although they were encouraged by heavy preferences to send most of their goods to Britain. Yet the pressure from the Whigs, including Lambton and M.A. Taylor, and Powlett less often,¹ for the reduction of direct taxes, imposed limits on how far the Government could go in the way of tariff reform.²

Disagreement over this cut across party lines, but the Government had most to fear from the country gentlemen. These, including Lord Darlington and Powlett, were demanding still more protection, for excellent harvests and over-production had prevented the price of corn, though high enough to cause distress, from reaching 80/- a quarter.³ Huskisson and Robinson, on the other hand, insisted that this could only be attained if plans for a further stimulation of trade were laid aside.⁴

1. Parl Debates Vols 5-8. Various references.

2. Feiling op. cit. pp. 317-20.

3. Ibid pp. 321-2; Dr. G. M. Trevelyan O.M. - British History in the Nineteenth Century (and After 1782-1919. pp. 204-5.

4. Feiling op. cit. pp. 322-3, 340-1; Trevelyan op. cit. pp. 204-5.

Yet the comparatively prosperous state of the nation, while it lasted, was instrumental in banishing interest in a reform of the legislature. John Russell had moved on 25th April, 1822 for the addition of a hundred new seats, of which sixty were to go to the counties. His crushing defeat was repeated in 1823¹, after which the question was shelved for another three years.

Lambton could not for the moment see any way through the fog of this stalemate. His silence must be attributed somewhat to this. And while many were ready to chide him for delay over Parliamentary Reform, he was politically and socially avoided by great sections of the Whig aristocracy.

Also Canning, who was so clearly in the ascendant in prestige and power, was absolutely against what he thought to be sweeping principles of reform.² Moreover, Lambton himself was very ill by the end of 1825,³ with afflictions which were to lay him low increasingly in the next eight momentous years.

Here is probably what stilled and stunned him during the current phase of anti-slavery agitation. For on this occasion the burden of mobilising and directing local opinion fell upon Dr. Fenwick and M.A. Taylor. The petition of a 'most respectably, though not very numerously attended' meeting in the Town Hall, Durham, was presented⁴ by Taylor.

1. Feiling op. cit. p. 324; Parl. Debates. New Series. Vol 7. pp. 51-141; Ibid. Vol 8. pp. 1260-89.

2. Feiling op. cit. p. 329.

3. Stuart Reid. op. cit. Vol. I. p. 168.

4. D.C.A. 4th May, 1826.

What were the other issues of the time, and what were the attitudes of the four Durham Members towards them? Certainly the men of the North East were paying attention to the controversy over Roman Catholic Emancipation. 'The Catholic Association of the Counties of Northumberland Durham, and Newcastle on Tyne'¹ was an example of the many hopes which had been excited by the return of Canning as Foreign Secretary in 1822.² In Ireland itself there was a fierce unrest, which had religious, racial and agrarian complexities. These were excited and harnessed by O'Connell's Catholic Association.³

The situation in Ireland was becoming uglier; the 'Catholic' side of the Cabinet reluctantly consented to another bill against the societies. The Whigs demanded that some conciliation should accompany any suppression. Thus Burdett introduced a relief bill in February, 1825, shortly after Grey's resignation of the leadership of his party, and found that on 28th February not only Lambton and Powlett, but also Hardinge, were with him in the majority in favour of his motion for a Committee on the claims of the Catholics.⁴ The bill included arrangements for a State payment for the Catholic priesthood, and an increase in the Irish county franchise from 40/- to £10.⁵

1. D.C.A. 22nd January, 1825.

2. Feiling op. cit. p. 334.

3. Ibid. p. 336.

4. Parl. Debates. Vol. 12. pp. 840-4. M.A. Taylor had paired off for this division. On 28th February, 1821 all four Durham M.P.s had voted for a similar motion - Vol. 4. pp. 1030-4.

5. Feiling op. cit. p. 337.

The third reading was taken on 9th May, 1825, when the debate revealed a remarkable cleavage between Brougham and Lambton. The latter objected stubbornly to the disfranchisement clauses, despite the pleas of Hobhouse that he would thus play into the hands of those who were against Catholic Emancipation.¹ Lambton had again run contrary to the main trend of Whig opinion, and had characteristically refused to give way on a point of principle. For he felt it better to defer Catholic Emancipation rather than introduce it under conditions which would depreciate its value.² But many in his own party were now even more tired of him.

The bill passed the House of Commons by 21 votes, including those of Hardinge and Powlett.³ Yet the Cabinet, already distracted by differences over South America, was tottering. In the House of Lords, a majority of forty eight against the bill sounded the death knell of Burdett's hopes on this occasion.⁴ The Cabinet was also split over foreign affairs, for a difficult problem had been posed by the French invasion of Spain in 1823. Frederick VII had been restored and all Acts of the Cortes annulled.⁵ In Britain the Commons approved neutrality by 372 to 20,⁶

-
1. D.C.A. 14th May, 1825; Parl. Debates Vol. 13. pp. 477-9.
 2. Chester New op. cit. p. 87; Stuart Reid op. cit. Vol. 1 p. 166.
 3. Parl. Debates. Vol. 12. pp. 558-62.
 4. Feiling op. cit. pp. 337-9.
 5. Ibid. pp. 329-31.
 6. Stuart Reid op. cit. Vol. 1. p. 331.

for Canning would not intervene directly, an attitude¹ which commended itself to both Sir Henry Hardinge and Lambton. 'Radical Jack' was in the chair of the Spanish Sub-Committee which met at the Crown and Anchor, London. From this position, on 27th May, 1823, he proposed the sending of arms to the Liberals in Spain, and began a subscription, putting down his own name for a thousand² pounds.

Despite the policy of non-intervention in Spain, Canning warned France that England would not allow Portugal, or the Spanish colonies, to be attacked. He then dragged reluctant recognition of the independent status of Spain's South American Colonies from the unwilling hands of the King and the Tory right wing, and had all commercial² England on his side.

Then from 1823 to 1826, he recognised Greek belligerency, protested to Turkey over her acts of barbarism, and acted with Russia against her, thus detaching Russia from Austria.⁴ Indeed, as Foreign Secretary he had placed 'unreformed England at the head of the Liberal movement in Europe and America.'⁵ In this he had been supported by a mere half of the Tory Cabinet and party, and compelled to lean on a number of the Opposition against the rest of his party.⁶

-
1. Raine MS. 96. f. 24: 4th April, 1823.
 2. Stuart Reid op. cit. Vol. 1. pp. 158-60.
 3. Feiling op. cit. pp. 331-2.
 4. Ibid. p. 333.
 5. Trevelyan - Lord Grey of the Reform Bill. p. 198.
 6. Feiling op. cit. p. 333.

Of the Durham Whigs it is not clear how far Taylor and Powlett were with Canning, but Lambton found that these policies had fired his imagination and enthusiasm.

Undeterred by his bad health he was also busy fighting the renewal of the Alien Bill, protesting against the way in which the liberty of the Press was endangered in India, and presenting a petition in the House of Commons for the encouragement of the Fine Arts.¹ Also he had been one of the first subscribers to University College, London, and was the Chairman of the Company organised in 1825 to make the first effort to set up a British colony in New Zealand. Also near to his heart was the idea of the Mechanics' Institutes, then in its fragile infancy.²

Known fondly to many Durham people as 'Radical Jack', or the 'King of the Colliers', Lambton was the undoubted leader of one of the two strongly opposed political groups into which Durham was divided as surely as it was in 1760-2, although this time on grounds of political principle as well as of personal and family rivalry. With him were George Baker of Elemore and M.A. Taylor, who was then concentrating particularly on the abuses of the Court of Chancery, and directing his fire at anything likely to increase taxation. Less heartily stood Powlett and his father, the third Earl of Darlington, grandson and son respectively of that Vane who had been the electoral

1. Stuart Reid. op. cit. Vol. I. pp. 162-3.

2. Chester New. op. cit. p. 86.

hobgoblin of the Lambtons. From Newcastle the ^{younger} Sir Matthew White Ridley was a ready exponent of the views of this group, of which the clarion was the Durham Chronicle.

On the other side were the Marquis of Londonderry, the Liddells, Sir Henry Hardinge, and Rowland Burdon, the former member for the County of Durham. They had already been worsted in the defeat of Richard Wharton at the hands of J.G. Lambton in 1820. Their propagandist was the Durham County Advertiser. Their cause was consecrated and exalted by their busy agents, the clergy of the Cathedral, with the Bishop, Shute Barrington until 1826, and after him Van Mildert, deeply perturbed by the spreading of the gospel of Parliamentary Reform. Here again new alignments were apparent. Lord Londonderry had married the lady who herself combined the names of Vane and Tempest, which, in 1760, had been found on opposing sides.

This political chasm was to be widened and deepened by the crises attendant on the First Reform Bill, with the gain or loss of parliamentary seats by either camp acting as a criterion of temporary success or failure. But that very marginal City seat, held from 1820 to 1830 by Sir Henry Hardinge, was to be the main bone of contention. For not all would agree with the fractious and peevish Lord Londonderry that this was 'my borough',¹ especially as this great landed, coal and would-be electoral baron appeared in ever stronger anti-Reform colours.

1. Quotation in Edith Lady Londonderry op. cit. p. 151.

CHAPTER 9.THE PASSING OF THE FIRST REFORM BILL.

The respective strength of the rival political groups was hardly tested in 1826. Against a background of industrial depression and unrest, strikes, and rising food prices, parliament was dissolved on 1st June. Two days later the writs were issued. But in neither the City nor County of Durham was there a poll. Indeed the same representatives were returned as in 1820.¹ Here was the calm before the tempest that was to rise and rage round Parliamentary Reform, the more so since he who in Durham was so adored or reviled, according to men's beliefs and tastes, was to conceive, battle for and rear a bill to sweep away glaring electoral enormities.

It is appropriate to follow the struggle for the bill in broad outline, particularly because it was the child of Radical Jack. But we must also note the effect of this massive measure, and the wrangling it unleashed, on Durham politics and politicians. It is also as important to perceive what shadows and changes its passing left upon the whole electoral panorama of City and County, as it is to see what was untouched.

In the City in 1826 there was common ground over the Catholic question between the two members, each of whom had considerable respect and regard for the other.² Taylor desired to see 'the Catholics of Ireland in possession of their free

1. Dur. 3/150. f.49. Indenture of Return of City Members. Sharp MS. 82. pp.41,21.

2. Sharp MS. Inset after p. 41.

and legitimate rights.' But he could not agree to the payment of a large sum out of taxes to the Catholic clergy there.¹ Hardinge secure in his agreement with his patron, Lord Londonderry, on this score, declared that he was at variance with some members of the Government over the Catholic problem, as he was with a great number of his friends in the City of Durham. But he would never vote for Catholic Emancipation without protection for the Protestant Church.²

Lambton, of course, was in the van of the demand from Durham and the rest of the nation for Parliamentary Reform, while his anxiety for the expanding and industrial interests of the County was as great as ever. His proposer was, as in 1820, George Baker, while his nomination was seconded by Sir Hedworth Williamson, of Whitburn Hall, a future Member for the County of Durham, and another to whose heart Lambton's political principles appealed.³ One of Lambton's chief preoccupations in this campaign was to explain that if only his health had allowed, he would have supported the Liverpool Government in the previous parliament. He ascribed this change of heart mainly to the advent of Mr. Canning, whose policies, he felt, met with popular acclaim.

1. Sharp MS. Inset after p. 41.

2. Ibid.

3. D.C.A. 22nd April, 1826; Williamson's father had been high Sheriff of the County Palatine of Durham from 1789, until 1810. The office had been in the Williamson Family continuously from 1723. This Sir Hedworth Williamson had recently married the Honourable Ann Liddell, daughter of Lord Ravensworth.

Neither Lambton nor Powlett would make the tactical error of favouring openly in election addresses any one of the three paramount interests of the country and county, manufacturing, mercantile, and agricultural, to the detriment of the others. Both imputed the current depression to overtrading. While Lambton would go little further than to advocate, with some vagueness, economy and retrenchment in public expenditure, Powlett advised a free importation of corn. But he compromised this suggestion with one of a protecting duty, the extent of which he would not define or suggest.¹ It is probable that his heart, like that of his father, lay almost entirely with the landed interest.

After the comparative ease of his return,² Lambton, in the throes of deep bodily and mental anguish, spent the winter of 1826 abroad, having sold his racing establishment, and thus brought to an end the famous meetings at Lambton Park.³ While he was away, there were important developments at Westminster. First, Liverpool backed Canning against Wellington over the question of aiding Portugal, in the event of a Spanish invasion, but stood resolutely against Catholic Emancipation.⁴ His severe stroke on 17th February, 1827 created a new situation.⁵ Burdett, seeking to take advantage of it, moved a resolution on 6th March

1. Sharp MS. 82 Inset after p.41.

2. Dur. 3/150. f.47.

3. Stuart Reid op.cit. Vol.1. p.174.

4. Feiling op. cit. pp.345-7.

5. Ibid. p.348.

to consider immediately the anti-Catholic laws. It was defeated by only four votes. Powlett, Hardinge and Taylor were all with the minority.¹

Eventually, Canning was asked to form a government, which was to be on 'Lord Liverpool's principles.' Upon this Wellington, Peel, Bathurst and, among others, Sir Henry Hardinge resigned.² Canning, with the full agreement of the King, was determined to reject all ideas of Parliamentary Reform, and to prevent the introduction of Catholic Emancipation as a Cabinet measure. He turned to the Whigs, and found that they too ^{were} ~~sundered~~. Lambton, Holland, Lansdowne, Brougham and others were all for an alliance with Canning, for they saw that otherwise power would return to the Ultra Tories.³ But Grey remained aloof, for he distrusted Canning intensely as a political mountebank, and thought the Whigs would be totally destroyed as a party if they upheld a Tory Ministry, without acquiring any say over its policy. Grey thus became detached from many of his colleagues, including Lambton, his own son-in-law,⁴ and , temporarily, from his hitherto bosom friend, the Earl of Darlington.⁵

But Canning was clearly and painfully ailing, and on 8th August he died.⁶ Everything was again in a state of flux.

1. D. C. A. 17th March, 1827.

2. Sharp MS. 82. p.41.

3. Trevelyan - Lord Grey of the Reform Bill pp.201-2; Feiling op. cit. pp.352-4.

4. Trevelyan. op. cit. pp.201-5.

5. Correspondence of the Second Earl Grey. Box 10 File 8. various ff.

6. Feiling op. cit. pp. 356-7.

Trevelyan has shown that 'If he (Canning) had lived, his genius, so justly attractive to young Liberals, would have continued to lead the progressive politicians of the country, by the path of a liberal foreign policy, further and further away from Parliamentary Reform.¹ But for Canning's death the Whigs would not have become reunited. Nor would Lord Durham have been able to see the realisation of the first instalment of Parliamentary Reform in 1832.²

Eventually, in January, 1828, came the fall of Goderich's ³ short lived Government. The Duke of Wellington was then given a free hand in the selection of a Cabinet, saving that the King barred Grey. With Huskisson's appointment to the Colonial office and the entry into office by others of the former Liverpool Government, Canning's party was ~~seemingly~~ broken.⁴

The men of Durham had followed these caprices of fortune with circumspection. They had been particularly partisan over the Catholic question, and most of the notable people, including the Marquis of Londonderry, were on the side of Emancipation. The Earl of
 A Darlington, presenting a petition for this ^{allowed,} to be on 3rd May, 1827, told the House of Lords that only the influence of the clergy had prevented a greater number of similarly drafted petitions. Dr. H. Phillpotts was again the hornet among the clerics, who

1. Trevelyan op. cit. p.202.

2. Feiling op. cit. pp.352-4; Trevelyan op. cit. pp.201-2.

3. Ibid pp.357-60.

4. Ibid pp.360-2.

once again were meddling with politics.¹

The attainment by the Duke of Wellington of the responsibilities of Prime Minister recalled his visit to the county of Durham only a few months previously. The company to dinner on 24th September, 1827, at Wynyard, the home of the Marquis of Londonderry, had included Lord Castlereagh, the son of the Marquis, Sir Henry Hardinge, and Sir Roger Gresley, who was to become well known to the freemen of the City. Other leading Durham Tories graced these festivities and the tour of the Londonderry collieries. Among them were Lord Ravensworth, formerly Sir Thomas Liddell, the Honourable H. T. Liddell,² Rowland Burdon, Sir Cuthbert Sharp,³ the Reverend H. Phillpotts and the Reverend Edward Davison.⁴ Here was the essential cell of resistance in Durham to Parliamentary Reform.

Shortly afterwards, the Durham Whigs, not to be outdone, had lavished hospitality on the King's brother, the Duke of Sussex. On 11th October, he was received at Raby Castle by the Marquis of Cleveland, who had been recently elevated from the Earldom of Darlington to this higher rank, and by Lord William Powlett, as his son had now become. Mr. M. A. Taylor, Mr. R. E. D. Shafto, and Mr. Charles Tennyson, uncle of Mr. William Russell,⁵ and Member for Bletchingley, also bedecked this Whig levee.⁶

1. D. C. 12th May, 1827.
2. Member for the County of Northumberland.
3. Collector of the Customs at Sunderland.
4. D. C. A. 29th September, 1827.
5. Member for the County of Durham 1828-32.
6. D. C. 13th October, 1827.

The consequence of these anti-Londonderry and pro-Reform groups was further boosted when the leading political personality in Durham was also raised to the peerage. By letters patent, dated 18th January, 1828, John George Lambton was created Baron Durham of the City of Durham and of Lambton Castle in the County of Durham.¹ The offer of a barony to him had been contemplated by Canning, who had been impressed by the warmth of Lambton's sympathy with many of his aims. Lambton himself somewhat arrogantly regarded his ennoblement as a belated recognition of a right which had been long denied his family,² and acted as though it were he who had conferred the honour on Goderich's government by taking the title.³ Actually he had hoped for an earldom.⁴

Lord Durham, on 18th January, assuring his former constituents that no event can ever weaken those ties by which our common interests have been, and always must be, inseparably united...;⁵ also made known the circumstances of his having accepted a peerage. He was anxious to dispel the illusion that he was indebted to the Duke of Wellington. Actually, the Duke had not been gazetted First Lord of the Treasury until 25th January. This was a full week after the peerage had been bestowed, and even longer from the time that Lord Goderich, who thought that Grey, with his impulsive son-in-law close by him in the Lords

-
1. Chester New op.cit. p.94; D.N.B.Vol.32 p.22, quoting Journals of the House of Lords. Vol. 60 p.10. Stuart J. Reid op.cit. Vol.1 p.181.
 2. A. Aspinall op.cit. Vol.III. p.330. No. 1423. 19th November, 1827. Viscount Goderich to the King.
 3. Ibid. Vol.III p.1453. Footnote 2, quoted in Chester New op.cit.p.94.
 4. Cooper op.cit. pp.89-90.
 5. D.C. 26th January, 1828.

would radiate less brightly,¹ had told Lambton of His Majesty's intention to call him to the Upper Chamber.²

The writ for the necessary by-election was issued on 29th January.³ As the rumours of Lambton's impending peerage had become more widespread, so had reports of various men offering themselves as candidates for the expected vacant seat. Sir Hedworth Williamson and Mr. William Russell, who were to be the County Members at the passing of the Reform Bill, were deemed the two most likely candidates. Both were then abroad. But, with Mr. Charles Tennyson, his uncle,⁴ acting for him, Mr. Russell became Lambton's heir apparent.

The Durham Chronicle immediately appointed itself as his zealot, and eulogised him for his position and wealth, which thus gave him a third unimpeachable qualification, 'a stake in the County.' Russell's father had contested the County of Durham in 1800, and sat for Saltash from 1802 until his death in 1822.⁵ The young William Russell had succeeded to great estates and riches, including Brancepeth Castle, and ^{possessed} prolific coal mines at ^{Wallsen} North Hetton and Washington. He also possessed powers of nomination to both seats at Bletchingley and to one at Saltash. He had already been Member for Saltash from 1822 to 1826, and then for Bletchingley from 1826 to May, 1827,⁶ sharing the representation of the latter with his uncle. Charles Tennyson continued

1. A. Aspinall op.cit. Vol.III p.330. Footnote 4 to Item 1423, quoting Add.MSS. 38752 f.17.

2. D.C. 2nd January, 1828; Stuart Reid op.cit.Vol.I pp.181-2.

3. Sharp MS. 82. Inset p.21.

4. M.P for Bletchingley until May, 1831. In 1827 he had tried in vain to have the franchise at East Retford transferred to Birmingham.

5. Sharp MS. 82. p.37. Bean op. cit. p.121.

6. Ibid. Inset p.21n; Bean ibid.

to sit for Bletchingley after January, 1831, when he was appointed Clerk of the Ordnance. He then won a seat at Stamford in the General Election of that year.¹

The actual day of the 1828 Durham by-election was 13th February. Russell was still the only candidate. As he entered Durham that day in an open carriage, the tenantry rode before and behind him, two abreast. Preceding him was his band and twenty banners. Altogether the scene was worthy of John George Lambton himself.

Nor did Lord Durham find his successor's political tenets very different from his own. Russell, from his speeches in the County Court, prior to the declaration of return, and from those he made afterwards, unfurled the conventional Whig advocacy of Roman Catholic Emancipation, and the solicitude, imperative for a candidate in the North East, for the agricultural, industrial and commercial interests of his County.² Moreover, like Durham and Cleveland, ^{who was then neither supporting nor opposing Government} but unlike Grey, [^] he was ready to lend his voice and votes to the Duke of Wellington's Government, provided it maintained the liberal measures brought forward by Canning.³ Indeed, while there is no evidence of Lord Durham having in any way 'nominated' Russell, the latter was undoubtedly 'safe'.

Meanwhile there had been a more protracted election in the City. This was caused by Sir Henry Hardinge's reappointment to

1. Returns of Members of Parliament.

2. D.C.A. 16th February, 1828; Dur. 3/150. f.42.

4. D.C. 23rd February, 1828

3. Dr. G.M. Trevelyan O.M. - Lord Grey of the Reform Bill
p. 212.

the office of Clerk of the Ordnance. A number of freemen had felt for some time that Hardinge's official duties had prevented his attending adequately to the calls of his constituents.¹ Hardinge had always denied this, just as he prided himself on having dispensed whatever places lay within his competence on the grounds of merit and not of party.² Curiously enough the impossibility of his giving time to local interests was Hardinge's nominal reason for retirement from his Durham City seat in 1830. At first it seemed that nothing would come of these misgivings, for no local gentleman would allow himself to be the mouthpiece of the disgruntled freemen.³ So the challenger was, quite uncustomarily, imported. On Sunday morning, 3rd February, it was believed that Mr. Maynard, a well established solicitor in the City of London, had received a communication from Mr. Ralph Lindsay, an East India merchant, and a former school fellow of Sir Henry Hardinge. This stated that an unnamed gentleman would set out from London for Durham to oppose Hardinge.⁴ Two days later, at the Waterloo Hotel, Durham, a handbill from Maynard was read to a large and bewildered crowd. Apparently Maynard had heard from Lindsay that Alexander Robertson, of the City of London and also an East India merchant, and a former Member for

1. D.C. 13th September, 1828, 'A Freeman';

2. Sharp MS. 82. Inset after p.41. City Election 1826.

3. D.C.A. 2nd February, 1828.

4. D.C. 9th February 1828.

Grampound, would arrive in Durham that day.¹ His Committee had called on the freemen to throw off the yoke of the House of Wynyard. Consequently the Town Hall was crowded to capacity, on 5th February, as Hardinge and Robertson arrived to be nominated.

Sir Henry then challenged the right of Mr. Lindsay, who was not a freeman, to foist an outsider on the City without even obtaining the latter's consent. He was extremely angry at this case of vexatious opposition, which affronted his soldier's code of gentlemanly conduct. But it transpired that he had little reason for worry. At the end of the day's polling he was well ahead, with 230 against Robertson's 63.²

On Wednesday, 6th February, a letter arrived from Mr. Lindsay promising that Robertson would be in Durham the following morning.³ But the sparsity of votes for him caused the Deputy Recorder, Mr. Ward, who was no ally of Hardinge, to intercede, and, in the absence of the Mayor, to call for the termination of the poll unless a vote for Mr. Robertson were tendered within half an hour. After violent uproar, and two further hours of voting, the poll was finally closed. Sir Henry Hardinge was then duly declared elected with 289 votes against 76.⁴ This had been altogether a singular and absorbing election, especially since Robertson's address did not reach Durham until after the poll.⁵

1. D.C. 9th February, 1828.

2. Ibid.

3. D.C.A. 9th February, 1828

4. Dur. 3/150. f.45. D.C.A. 9th February, 1828

5. Bean op. cit. p. 137 n.

The Durham Chronicle claimed that a very large meeting of Durham freemen, resident in London, had signed a requisition to Mr. Robertson, entreating his candidature. These freemen aspired to throw down the gauntlet to Lord Londonderry's influence over the return of one of the City of Durham Members.¹ For Sir Henry Hardinge was regarded by this journal as virtually the nominee of the Marquis, although relations between the General and the Marquis were becoming severely strained, largely on account of the continued exclusion of Londonderry from high office by his old commander, the Duke of Wellington.²

For Mr. Robertson it was argued that the poll had been ended arbitrarily before the arrival of the London voters who would have brought him victory,³ and that the Mayor at the 1813 City election, when there had been a pronounced paucity of voters during the first five days, had been advised that he could not close the election in the way recently demonstrated.⁴ But a petition against the return of Sir Henry Hardinge^{on} these grounds came to nothing, as the necessary recognizances were not entered into within the time required by the Standing Orders of the House of Commons.⁵

1. D.C. 9th February, 1828.

2. Edith Lady Londonderry op. cit. p.149.

3. D.C. 9th February, 1828.

4. Ibid. 16th February, 1828.

5. D.C.A. 1st March, 1828; D.C. 8th March, 1828.

Although there are to hand no sufficiently revealing disclosures to explain beyond doubt why Robertson's candidature was thrust upon the City of Durham, anonymous writers have contributed what may only be regarded as suggestions. First, there is the allegation that Mr. Lindsay received hundreds of pounds as a retainer from Mr. Palmer, one of the Whig Members for Surrey, for finding an adversary for Sir Henry.¹ Second, it was stated that behind this lay an idea for making a railroad through Durham and Yorkshire. Among the chief beneficiaries were to be a number of London merchants, who therefore pushed the scheme wholeheartedly. The ensuing bill to carry out the project was opposed vigorously by the Members for both County and City of Durham. In their fury these London merchants and their allies singled out Sir Henry Hardinge for political destruction, for he, with his colleagues, had seen that the enterprise was designed to hand over much of Durham's trade and commerce to Yorkshire. Indeed the bill had been adopted eagerly by fifteen Members from that County.² Unfortunately these versions of the undercurrent to this contest must remain unconfirmed through lack of evidence. But the respect which Hardinge's personal qualities undoubtedly commanded, in addition to the traditional dislike in Durham for

1. D.C.A. 1st March, 1828.

2. Ibid. On the 7th March, 1828, Colonel William Chaytor was among those who presented petitions against the Stockton and Darlington Railway Company's Bill to make certain branches from that Railway in the Counties of Durham and York. J.H.C. (Printed) Vol. 83 p.141.

'foreigners', especially those who indulged in 'vexatious' opposition, surely go a long way to explain the rejection of Robertson.

Sir Henry was soon the central figure again in fresh electoral discords at Durham. Having been promoted to the Secretaryship at War, he had, yet again, to vacate his seat. The likelihood of the constituency being sought by another was not his only difficulty. He had to prepare for the possibility of the complete withdrawal of support by his patron, the Marquis of Londonderry, whose mortification at finding himself still in the wilderness was turned into intense bitterness by the promotion of his political protégé to the War Office. Nor could the Marquis accept Hardinge's readiness to meet his own election expenses, for this would, in effect, free half the parliamentary representation of the City of Durham from dependence on himself.¹ 'You said it was a great pity Sir H. Hardinge ever sat for my borough', he wrote to Mrs. Arbuthnot on 7th June, '....Sir Henry's offer of raising money to pay his own elections is as absurd as preposterous, because if a borough seat gives political importance, who would allow that (by the payment of the occupant) to be rendered independent of the patron's control?'² Londonderry resigned himself to supervising and financing Hardinge's reelection as the lesser evil.³

The new writ was issued on 30th May, 1828. His opponent,

1. Edith, Lady Londonderry op. cit. pp.150-1.

2. Quoted in Edith, Lady Londonderry op. cit. p. 151.

3. Edith, Lady Londonderry op. cit. p. 151.

on this occasion, was Colonel William Chaytor of Witton Castle,¹ whose father, also William Chaytor, had been returned for Penryn in 1774, and sat for Hedon from 1780 until 1790. The Colonel was sometime a Magistrate, Deputy-Lieutenant of the County of Durham and Commandant of the North Riding Militia.²

A meeting of Durham freemen in London had, at the instigation of Mr. Lindsay, sponsored Chaytor's candidature. The Durham Chronicle described the Colonel as having had no previous experience of electioneering, and as unwilling to join in such wrangles. Moreover he was regarded as an appallingly bad speaker. Both Hardinge and Chaytor were Tories, but of differing texture. For example, while Chaytor was believed to be against Roman Catholic Emancipation, Hardinge was receptive both to this and to the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts.³

Mr. Lindsay arrived in the City of Durham on Monday, 1st June, and at once began working for Chaytor.⁴ Confronted with Hardinge's avowed determination never to allow the City seat to be put up for sale, as though it were a rotten borough, Chaytor on 7th June decided he had had enough. As a reason, or excuse, he referred to the late hour at which he had commenced his canvass. He vouched, however, for himself or his son standing for the City of Durham at the next vacancy.⁵

1. Fordyce op. cit. Vol.1. p.623.

2. Sharp MS. 82. p.41. Inset - note; Sharp MS. 145.p. 54n.

3. D.C. 7th June, 1828. From Morning Advertiser, 8th June, 1828. D.C.A. 14th June, 1828.

4. Ibid.

5. Dur. 3/150. f.40. Indenture of Return; D.C.A. 14th June, 1828.

Another impediment to Chaytor had been Hardinge's formidable record as an administrator, and particularly the telling propaganda point that he had been responsible for the saving of over one million pounds as Clerk of the Ordnance.¹ Joseph Hume, who had many a clash with Sir Henry in the House of Commons, complimented him on his clear and accurate expositions, while Sir James Graham also paid tribute to his abilities. And of course many freemen saw in Hardinge's eminence a kind of reflected glory.

Just as Sir Henry had been to the fore in both local and national politics, so his fellow Member for the City, Mr. M.A. Taylor, had, terrier-like, never ceased to agitate for legal reform. He could never be thrown off the scent by the regular defeat of his many motions, demanding full investigation into delays in Chancery. He had first drawn attention to the defective system of this Court in 1809,² and, in his crusade for reforms there, had benefited from the sympathetic help of both Canning and Sir Samuel Romilly. Taylor thought that the heart of the trouble lay in the Lord Chancellor being within the political system, and that there should be established a Court of Equity, with a judge completely removed from politics.³ Although the Government in 1828 concurred with Taylor's motion for a thorough inquiry, it forestalled him in his desire for more positive action. For, against his wishes, there was inserted a crippling

1. D.C.A. 14th June, 1828.

2. D.C. 3rd March, 1827.

3. D.C.A. 16th February, 1828.

amendment to his resolution which, among other things, required the action of the Lord Chancellor as a Judge of Appeal in Equity.¹ Yet Taylor's bold speeches and indefatigable campaigning did much to pave the way for later improvements in the legal system.

Thus, by the end of 1828, the two Members for the City of Durham had made their mark on parliamentary proceedings and national events. Of these two, one held an important Ministerial position, while the other, in his own particular way, was a penetrating and dauntless critic of the new Government. Another Durham Member was the son of a Whig nobleman, and he too now looked askance at the Duke of Wellington's administration, which was surrounded by rough waters.

For the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts was to lead to Roman Catholic Emancipation, which both disrupted the Tories, and opened the door to Parliamentary Reform. There had been many petitions seeking the removal of the Test and Corporation Acts. Among them were those from the Dissenters of South Shields, and of Stockton-on-Tees, presented by the Honourable W. Powlett, on 30th May, 1827, and by Mr. M. A. Taylor, on 31st May, 1827, respectively.² Meanwhile, Lord John Russell gave notice of a motion urging the repeal of the Acts regarding Protestant Dissenters. Having been defeated in the House of Commons, the

1. D.C. 3rd May, 1827.

2. D.C.A. 9th June, 1827.

Cabinet decided to allow the bill of repeal to pass.¹ All the Durham Members appear to have been in its favour, unlike Bishop van Mildert in the House of Lords.²

There was now unleashed a flood of petitions demanding equal civic rights for the Roman Catholics. On 12th May, 1828 Sir Francis Burdett's motion for a Committee of Inquiry into the punitive laws against Catholics, was carried by 6 votes. Again all the Durham Members, with the Honourable H. T. Liddell, Member for Northumberland, voted with the majority. But their Lordships thought otherwise, and none more so than Bishop van Mildert of Durham, whose anti-Catholicism did not tally with Londonderry's appreciation that tranquillity in Ireland was worth Catholic Members of Parliament.³ The Durham County Advertiser and the Marquis were similarly out of step with one another.⁴ It was not only national but also local Toryism which had been thrown into disorder and disarray by the introduction of emancipating legislation after the election for County Clare, and the worsening state of Ireland.⁵

Peel's resolution for the removal of Catholic disabilities had been put to the vote on the night of 5th March, ^{1829.} Those in favour included Lord William Powlett, Mr. William Russell, and

1. Feiling. op. cit. p.365.

2. D.C. 3rd May, 1828.

3. D.C.A. 14th June, 21st June, 1828.

4. Ibid. 7th March, 1829.

5. Feiling op. cit. pp. 367-70.

his uncle, Mr. Charles Tennyson, Sir H. Hardinge, Mr. M.A. Taylor, and the Honourable H. T. Liddell. With them were two eldest sons of peers, Lord Castlereagh, Member for County Down, and the son of the Marquis of Londonderry, and Lord Darlington, Member for Saltash, and heir of the Marquis of Cleveland.¹ Altogether one hundred and seventy three Tories opposed the second reading, while one hundred and nine Tory peers resisted all idea of concession. The majority in the House of Lords included Earl Grey, the Marquis of Londonderry, who was outstanding in the Upper Chamber for his denunciation of Government policy in other respects, Lords Durham and Ravensworth, and the Bishops of Chester and St. Davids (both of whom were Prebendaries of Durham.) The Marquis of Cleveland voted with them by proxy. The Bishop of Durham, in person, and the Earl of Scarborough, by proxy, were among the minority.²

The prospect of Parliamentary Reform was to be no less unpalatable to van Mildert, but, although his clergy were to contend against it with might and main, their efforts were to be dissipated in a lost cause, even when joined with those of the imperious Londonderry. The mammoth task of standing out against the desires of increasingly more freemen and freeholders for Parliamentary Reform must have been apparent to the Bishop. These desires, in two constituencies where abject submissiveness had never been the main order of the day, were in accordance with

1. D. C. 14th March, 1829.

2. Ibid. 11th April, 1829.

what was becoming the broad stream of national aspiration. It was an additional misfortune for the Church at Durham to be fastened with the shame of trying to dam and frustrate this. In seeming to do so it was signing its own political death warrant.

For the concluding months of the Duke of Wellington's administration witnessed 'common economic misery(which) sharpened the sense of common political wrongs, and predisposed the whole nation to unite in the demand for Reform! ¹ The Government seemed to be able to rely in Durham not only on the Marquis of Cleveland, who had now left the Whigs, but also on Mr. M. A. Taylor. The latter had, in the summer of 1828, been made Foreman of the Grand Jury at the Durham Assizes. ² In February, 1830, he explained that although he had no brief for the Ultra Tories, since the Ministers had already carried two great public questions he would await their efforts to implement a policy of retrenchment ^{on home affairs at any rate, had} Grey's determination not to assail the Government, ^{partially} sustained the Duke. While the latter was sheltered from the Ultra Tories, and under the temporary protection of one section or another of his adversaries, some of the Ultra Tories turned to Parliamentary Reform. ⁴ It was to take advantage of these conditions that on 27th February, 1830, Lord John Russell put forward a motion to extend the franchise to Birmingham, Manchester, and Leeds. This was defeated by 48 votes, with the Ultra Tories abstaining. Lord William Powlett was among the

-
1. Dr. G. M. Trevelyan. O. M. - British History in the Nineteenth Century and After. pp. 226-7.
 2. D. C. 4th July, 1829.
 3. Ibid. 20 February, 1830
 4. Feiling op. cit. p. 376.

minority.¹ He accounted for his apparent inconsistency by admitting that, although he had always previously voted against Reform, nevertheless these three great trading towns fully deserve the franchise. This was the limit of Powlett's concession, and he could never be persuaded to agree to the abolition of any boroughs.²

The onslaught on the Government mounted in intensity. Even the Durham County Advertiser, still smouldering with rage over Catholic Emancipation, seemed to have deserted the Duke.³ Then the death of King George IV on 26th June was followed by the dissolution of Parliament,⁴ with Grey openly opposed to the Duke.

With agricultural unrest assuming ugly proportions in Kent, and the Paris barricades and the abdication of Charles X inciting the minds of men like Lord Durham,⁵ the General Election could hardly have come at a more troubled time. In the City of Durham it had been realised for some months that Sir Henry Hardinge would not be seeking return. He had failed to compose his differences with Londonderry, who was ever fretting over his claims to an official appointment being persistently overlooked by the Duke of Wellington. Hardinge, for his part, had informed Londonderry that he would not hold office without the Duke, and had thus dissociated himself from Londonderry's abortive advances to Grey, which had been undertaken with a view to forming

1. D. C. 27th February, 1830; See p.375 of this work for the inaccuracy of this assertion.
 2. Parl. Debates. New Series. Vol. 22. pp.895-6.
 3. D.C.A. 3rd July, 1830.
 4. Stuart Reid op. cit. Vol. 1. p. 205.
 5. Chester New op. cit. pp.99-100.

a coalition against Wellington. As he expected shortly to become Chief Secretary for Ireland, and as he could no longer live with Londonderry's obtuseness, spleen and selfishness, Hardinge decided to look for another seat.¹

He gave as the pretext for his withdrawal from Durham politics his inability to 'do full justice to the various local interests which affect so large a body of constituents.'² Returned for the Cornish borough of Newport in 1830, and again in 1831,³ his political career continued to flourish, and reached its apex with his appointment as Governor-General of India in May, 1844. In April 1846 he was created Viscount Hardinge of Lahore, and King's Norton, Derbyshire. He became a Field-Marshal in October, 1855, seven and three quarter years after the termination of his Governor-Generalship of India.⁴

There was thus at Durham a new candidate, Sir Roger Gresley, the eighth baronet of Drakelow, Derbyshire. He was married to the Lady Sophia, daughter of the Earl of Coventry, and both he and his wife were great friends of the Londonderries. Still a young man, he had been a candidate for Lichfield in 1826.⁵

1. Edith Lady Londonderry op. cit. pp. 159-169.

2. Baker-Baker Papers. Proceedings at the Durham City Election 1830. 28th June, 1830. p.22.

3. Sharp MS. 145. p.53. Hardinge had been returned for St.Germans (Cornwall) on 31st July in the General Election of 1830. When, after the election, a Member sitting for Newport was appointed Escheator of Munster, Hardinge was returned for the vacated seat on 17th December, 1830 - Returns of Members of Parliament Part II. p. 316; Bean op. cit. p.150.

4. Bean op.cit. ibid.

5. D.C.A. 9th June, 1830; Sharp MS. 145. p.54n; Bean op.cit.p.149

He does not seem to have had any property in or near Durham, but he drew most of his income from land, which was probably why he was all for agricultural protection.¹ He leaned heavily on Lord Londonderry, who was now assured of a servant who would be unquestioning and whose obedience would be unquestionable.² A man of the calibre of Sir Henry Hardinge could not approximate to such perfection.

Gresley's Whig opponent, M.A. Taylor, a veteran of seventy two years of age, and of five elections for the City of Durham alone, had been deterred from reaching Durham earlier by his parliamentary duties, and the illness of his wife.³ His friends thus canvassed on his behalf, and issued literature lauding his long and faithful service to Durham. They expressed their indebtedness to Taylor for there now being a Spring Assize in the Four Northern Counties, and reminded all of his uncompromising stand against arbitrary imprisonment, and his exemplary devotion to many local charities.⁴ Taylor himself entered Durham on 8th July and, from the Waterloo Inn, scotched rumours that he was about to retire ^{account of} on age and infirmities.⁵

Colonel Chaytor kept his promise to reenter the hustings at the first opportunity. He was described as 'a Country Gentleman

-
1. Baker-Baker Papers. Proceedings at the Durham City Election 1830. Additional Speeches pp. 65-9.
 2. Edith Lady Londonderry op. cit. P. 169; Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4035. 5th July, 1830. 'A Freeman' to the Independent Freemen of the City of Durham and other tracts.
 3. Baker-Baker Papers. Proceedings at the Durham City Election 1830. Additional Speeches. pp. 65-6.
 4. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4035. 'A Friend to Consisterey' to the Freemen of Durham.
 5. Baker-Baker Papers. Proceedings at the Durham City Election 1830. Additional Speeches p. 66.

of plain, homely manners, but with a fund of good sense, excellent good nature, and a tact for business.¹ His publicists took pains to assure their readers of Chaytor's thorough knowledge of Durham's agricultural, commercial and ~~sheeping~~ interests, and of his constant residence in that County.² Chaytor himself, on 16th July, affirmed that he would poll to the last man to prevent the City of Durham from becoming a close borough. As evidence for his strong suspicions he referred to certain hand-bills containing a letter from Sir Henry Hardinge. In this the former Durham Member had stated that he would be succeeded by Gresley.³

That he was the 'tool and lieutenant of the Marquis of Londonderry' Gresley tried, not very convincingly, to deny. Even he felt bound to admit, however, that he was 'proud to acknowledge I am supported by the interest he holds in the county on account of his property and friends.'⁴

The poll was headed by Mr. M.A. Taylor, with 546 votes, including 192 plumpers, and Sir Roger Gresley, with 486 votes, including as many as 302 plumpers.⁵ Colonel Chaytor had 436 votes, of which 102 were plumpers.⁶ During this well mannered encounter Parliamentary Reform had scarcely been mentioned, apart from Chaytor's preference for a moderate measure of enfranchisement.⁷ Indeed Chaytor remained on the fence over this supreme

1. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4035. 3rd July 1830. To the Worthy and Independent Freemen of the City of Durham.

2. Ibid. 20th July, 1830.

3. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4035. 20th July, 1830. Additional Speeches. pp. 6-7.

4. Ibid. pp. 20-1.

5. Dur. 3/150.f.37. Indenture of Return.

6. Sharp MS. 82. p. 41. Inset; Sharp MS. 145. p. 54. Bean op.cit. p. 138

7. Baker-Baker Papers. Proceedings at the Durham City Election 1830. 28th June, 1830. p. 18.

issue until January 1831, when he declared that he was 'a complete Whig; and that the quest for Parliamentary Reform was his mission also.¹

Gresley's joy was short lived. Two freemen, on 15th November 1830, petitioned that he had, with his agents, managers and others, transgressed the laws of bribery and corruption, by attempting to gain votes by threats, promises and gifts.² Actually he had probably been indiscreet and over - generous in respect of maintainance and conveyance expenses. The petition was examined by the Commons on 8th March, and the Committee's judgement was given against Gresley, whose return was declared void. It is a pity that we do not know how or by whom the expense of this petition was met. It was often the practice for an opponent to protract an injured candidate's search for redress. However a new writ was now ordered. But Gresley had not, as was usual in such cases, been declared guilty of bribery, and thus debarred from taking any seat during the existing session of Parliament. Eventually he was elected at New Romney on 19th March, 1831.³

Until he could represent them again, Gresley asked the freemen to rally round the Honourable Arthur Trevor, who was then sitting for New Romney, which was under the control of Sir Edward Deering.⁴ Trevor was the only surviving son of the

1. D.A. 14th January, 1831. p.221.

2. Sharp MS.82. p.41. Inset n. The Durham Chronicle of 20th November reported that one of these freemen was Mr. John Bulmar Chairman of Colonel Chaytor's London Committee.

3. D.A. 11th March, 1831. p.282; Returns Members of Parliament. Vol.II. p.323.

4. Raine MS. 5. f.12.

second Viscount Dungannon in the peerage of Ireland, who was an Irish neighbour of the Londonderries and a relative of Frances Anne.¹ The young Trevor had only entered the House of Commons in 1830.² His candidature for Durham City meant that he and Gresley, in effect, exchanged constituencies, and that he, too, relied on the interest of the Marquis of Londonderry.³

Trevor lost no time in parading the main attraction of his electoral appeal. On 13th March, he referred to the likely disfranchisement of the freemen, if the Reform Bill were to succeed. He was to harp on this theme often. On the other hand, documents to which pseudonyms were appended had argued that the bringing of non-resident voters to the poll had always formed too heavy a charge on candidates' election expenses.⁴ Indeed, the Durham Chronicle of 16th July, 1831, calculated from the City of Durham Poll Book, of August, 1830, that 'about 588 non-resident freemen of Durham resided at ninety four different places, in almost every county in England, many of them at a distance of between 200 and 450 miles from the place of polling ... the aggregate distance the whole body travelled to and from the place of polling, exceeded, in the whole, 104,000 miles!' Trevor himself

1. Edith Lady Londonderry op. cit. p. 169.

2. Sharp MS. 82 p.41. Inset n.

3. Correspondence of Second Earl Grey. Box 10. File 2. 12th March, 1831. Colonel Chaytor to Grey.

4. D.A. 18th March, 1831. p.293.

when he moved in the Commons on 30th August, 1831 that non-resident freemen should be allowed to vote for the rest of their lives, put their number at as many as 700 out of a total electorate of 1200 freemen.¹

The banner of Reform was not, this time, borne by Colonel Chaytor, who, fearing he might be petitioned against 'in case of being elected to represent the City of Durham in the vacancy occasioned by Sir Roger Gresley's being declared incapable of retaining the seat', heralded the candidature of his eldest son,² and, without any demur, begged Grey himself, now Prime Minister, to do what he could for the young man. On the back of the letter from Colonel Chaytor may be seen Grey's lofty and somewhat disdainful reply: 'I am not aware that the Government has any influence there (Durham), but on this occasion I should not feel myself justified in advising any attempt to influence the approaching election.'³

Grey was equally aloof to Chaytor's further requests for financial aid, in which the Colonel was at pains to have recognised and rewarded his own constancy to the Ministry. He had shown how, only a few days previously, Londonderry had tried to induce him to stand for the County at the next election as a moderate reformer, on the promise of £5000 and full support.

1. Hansard's Parliamentary Debates. Vol.6. pp.911-12.

2. Raine MS. 5. espec. f. 14. 16th March, 1831.

3. Correspondence of Second Earl Grey. Box 10. File 2. 12th March 1831: Colonel Chaytor to Grey.

But this testimony of his devotion to Parliamentary Reform, and of his refusal to weaken the chances of either William Russell or Sir Hedworth Williamson, the Reform candidates, at the next Durham County election, failed to draw anything concrete from Grey.¹

So the Chaytors had to make do with their own resources, although these were added to by Mr. William Russell, and by the latter's uncle, Colonel Mills.² But this/^{array} and Chaytor's outline of the fruits of reduced taxation and national expenditure to be plucked from the ripened tree of the Reform Bill,³ were enough to cause Trevor to retire on 23rd March, the seventh day of voting. By this time Trevor, who had never flinched in his scathing attack on the Bill, a major issue this time, was proud to have polled as many as 470 against Chaytor's 495.⁴

The declaration of Chaytor's return⁵ was made more colourful by one Peter Watson, who 'advanced to the front of the table, and after breaking a chain which he had exhibited during the election declared the Marquis of Londonderry's yoke to be broken...'⁶ A further interesting incident had been the tragi-comic debut of the victor's brother, John Clervaux Chaytor, on the seventh day of the poll. He only received three votes.⁷ Altogether nine

-
1. Correspondence of Second Earl Grey. Box 10. File 2. 16th March, 1831. Colonel Chaytor to Grey.
 2. D.A. 25th March, 1831. Speech of Mr. J.J. Wright.
 3. Ibid. 18th March, 1831. p. 293.
 4. Ibid. 25th March, 1831. p. 301. Speech of Mr. J.J. Wright.
 5. Dur. 3/150. f. 33. Sharp MS. 82. p. 41 Inset.
 6. D.A. 25th March, 1831. p. 302.
 7. Sharp MS. 145. p. 55: Sharp MS. 82. p. 41. Inset.

hundred and sixty eight freemen had voted in this hard fought by-election,¹ The result of which the Durham Chronicle hailed as a triumph for Reform. It was doubly so for expunging temporarily Lord Londonderry's dominion over half the representation of the City of Durham.

In the General Election of 1830 there had been no variation in the representation of the County.² Such continuity, as far as it concerned Russell at any rate, had seemed unlikely a few months earlier. Lord Durham had written to Grey on 9th March: '...I have heard that Russell, the M.P. for this County, is a confirmed lunatic and under confinement - drinking having at last effected it-If this is true there will be a vacancy - should you like Howick³ to come in if the opportunity presented itself? There is literally no one qualified in South Durham, to make even the shadow of an opposition, so much so that I can not imagine who would even think of starting, even were Howick not proposed. However there is no certainty of Russell being in this state, altho' the news came to me from an authentic source. Pray don't mention it. I only wish to know your sentiments, in case I could effect a requisition to Howick, and there was no likelihood of an

-
1. D.A. 25th March, 1831. p.301. This was only nineteen fewer than the number who had polled in the preceeding election.
 2. Dur. 3/150 f.36; Sharp MS.82. p.21.
 3. Eldest son of Grey. Member of Parliament for Winchelsea 1826, and for Higham Ferrers 1830.

opposition...¹ No verification of Russell's supposed over-addiction to alcohol has been found.

But he had, in his nomination speech of 12th August, to answer complaints that he had not attended the House of Commons with sufficient regularity. He protested that he had never been absent during the hearing of any great question. According to the Durham Chronicle, he was severely harassed by asthma, which finally compelled him to leave public life.² There could definitely be no doubt as to his soundness, according to the standards of this newspaper, on Parliamentary Reform.³ Perhaps his reminder as to where his own heart lay redeemed him, and enabled him to gleam refulgently alongside Powlett. For the son of Lord Cleveland still could not, despite his having voted uniformly for the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, and for the settlement of the Catholic Question, countenance any widespread degree of Parliamentary Reform. Like his father, the Marquis of Cleveland, who had turned Tory in 1830, and was now completely alienated from Grey, Powlett had gone over to the Duke of Wellington's Government early in 1830.⁴ Lord Durham, in his letter of 17th August to Lord Grey, mentioned Powlett's declaration of loyalty to the Duke; '...I hear of none in this part of the world who profess themselves their (the Ministers')

-
1. Correspondence of the Second Earl Grey. Letters from Lord Durham to Lord Grey. January 17th, 1828 - June 18, 1832. Vol. III f.50.
 2. It must be remembered that Russell, as its chief patron, was a particular idol of the Durham Chronicle, whose first great benefactor had been Lord Durham himself.
 3. D.A. 13th August, 1830. p.46.
 4. Ibid.

supporters except Lord W. Powlett, who gave in his adhesion at the Election - his colleague Russell who happened then to be sober, told me no good would ever arise until the Duke was turned out..

As a result of this General Election, Halevy estimates that 'of the 236 members returned by constituencies where the franchise was more or less open only 79 were supporters of the Government, 16 were neutral, 141 belonged to the Opposition²'. The Treasury reckoned the position as '311 friends to 188 foes.'³

But the doom of the Government was sealed, when, after the King's Speech on 2nd November, the Duke of Wellington obstinately proclaimed that he would never propose, and would always oppose, any measure of Parliamentary Reform. Even his own colleagues, whom he had not consulted, were appalled.⁴ From the country there were many reports of refusal to pay taxes, and rumours of riots, drilling and threats of assassination. On the 15th November the Ultra Tories decided definitely to go over to Reform. The same night Peel refused to accept a Committee on the Civil List, and the Government, with whom Powlett consorted, were defeated by 29. On 16th the Duke resigned.⁵

With the second Earl Grey as Prime Minister, the new

-
1. Correspondence of Second Earl Grey. Letters from Lord Durham to Lord Grey. January 17th 1828-June 18th 1832. Vol.III. f. 56 Box 12 File 11.
 2. Halevy op.cit Vol.III.1830-41 p.4. Thus two of the 79, Powlett and, until his return was declared void, Gresley, came from the Durham constituencies.
 3. Feiling op.cit. p.379.
 4. Chester New op.cit. p.102; Feiling op. cit. pp.381-2.
 5. D.A. 28th January, 1831. pp.245-6, Speech of Lord William Powlett at the Durham County Meeting; Aspinall op.cit.Vol.III. p.472. no.1579. Note 1.

Government was formed by 19th November, with the carrying of Parliamentary Reform as its Holy Grail. Lord Durham was given the office of Lord Privy Seal, with a seat in the Cabinet. He had probably been left free of specific duties so that he could concentrate on preparing the Reform Bill,¹ which he did in secret, with Lord John Russell, Sir James Graham and Lord Duncannon, the brother of Lady Grey, from the end of November, 1830, until the closing days of February, 1831.

There is some doubt and dispute over the respective parts played by Russell and Durham in those hectic months. Russell's various motions over the years had been of a moderate kind. He had seemed to look little beyond the enfranchisement of a few great cities, and additions to the number of County Members, and to believe that no seats should disappear without compensation to the boroughs affected.² On the other hand, Lord Durham's bill of 1821 had demanded the complete abolition of rotten boroughs, without compensation. It had been more thorough in method and far sighted in intention than anything designed by Russell.

Durham still cherished all his ambitions of 1821, except for those concerning electoral districts, and the rate-paying franchise, to which he preferred one based on rentals. He was no Chairman of the Committee of Four, and was busy collecting

1. Chester New op. cit. p.109.

2. Ibid. pp.112-3. Lord John Russell's speech in the House of Commons, 28th May, 1830.

information from middle class representatives.¹ In a letter to Francis Place, received on 7th April, 1832, Colonel Grove Jones wrote: 'Lord Durham had all along taken charge of the bill which had been drawn principally by himself, and had attended to its progress with great care diligence and judgement.'²

It seems that, after a discussion on principles, Durham asked Russell to draw up a detailed plan, since he considered that such legislation must be introduced in the House of Commons. The state of public unrest persuaded Russell to prepare details of a sweeping nature, as agreed upon in the preliminary discussions of the Committee.³ It was proposed that the sixty boroughs with less than two thousand inhabitants in 1821 should lose both Members. Those forty seven with a population of under four thousand in 1821 were to retain only one representative. Twenty seven large towns were to be enfranchised, with seven of these returning two Members, and the rest one each, while there were to be eight extra Members for London. Twenty seven counties were to send two additional Members, and the Isle of Wight was granted the right to elect one representative.⁴ Chester New holds that in all these clauses there had been generous numerical changes from Russell's original draft, and that these alterations were

1. Chester New op.cit. pp.111-4.

2. B.M.Add.MS. (Place MS.) 27792 Inset f.45. Colonel Grove Jones was the chief intermediary between Lord Durham and the middle class representatives.

3. Trevelyan - Lord Grey of the Reform Bill pp.263-4; Chester New op.cit. p.117.

4. These proposals, of course, underwent some revision in the course of the Bill's lengthy passage through Parliament.

were due almost entirely to the insistence of Lord Durham.

According to the same source, 'the Committee accepted Durham's principle of a uniform £10 franchise',¹ a limit which Durham regarded as merely a milestone along the road of a general regulated extension of the vote.² Other clauses dealt with the place and length of the poll, which was to be taken in hundreds and divisions of counties, and to last no more than three days in the boroughs, and six in the counties. To combat corruption and to reduce election expenses strict regulations, such as those requiring the residence of voters in their constituencies, were to be enforced.³

Lord Durham suggested that voting should be by ballot, and that parliaments should be triennial. These were Radical objectives, and Durham considered Radical good will was essential if the Bill were to be passed. Thus, against the advice of Russell, the ballot was inserted among the recommendations of the committee; as a counterpoise, however, the uniform franchise of £10^{rental} was to be raised to one of £20.⁴ But this concession was only temporary, for the result of this see - saw struggle was the reinstatement of the £10 franchise, after Lord Grey and the rest of the Cabinet had demanded the deletion of the ballot from the Committee's Report, (while Durham's health had temporarily given way.) This was the only possible solution, for Dr. Trevelyan has

-
1. Leaseholders of £50 per annum and copyholders of £10 per annum were also given the suffrage.
 2. Russell had originally proposed the jury qualification, the £20 rental (except in Middlesex, where it was £30), for the old boroughs.
 3. Chester New op. cit. pp. 119-23.
 4. Ibid. pp. 122-4; Trevelyan - op. cit. p.271.

shown that while the King would never have accepted the ballot, the people would not have been assuaged by a twenty pounds franchise.¹

Until the Bill was introduced in the House of Commons by Lord John Russell on 1st March, there was to be the strictest secrecy among the Cabinet. To the Political Unions fell the task of holding within bounds popular enthusiasm and impatience.² This was no facile undertaking, for the country had been in a ferment throughout the proceedings of the Committee of Four, and the subsequent Cabinet discussions. Durham was no exception to this. On 7th January, a meeting of about eight hundred inhabitants³ was held in the City. The most portentous resolution, that the elective franchise was withheld from the greater portion of the population, was moved by Dr. J.R.Fenwick, who recalled that it was thirty eight years since he had first, in 1793, advocated Parliamentary Reform. He it was who at this meeting, and throughout the prolonged and often perilous voyage of the Bill, advised all Reformers, to 'adhere to general principles,' and, by leaving the exact details of Reform to the Government, to preserve a united front. This warning was often given by speakers at Durham Reform meetings throughout 1831 and 1832,⁴ and by none so imploringly or so nobly as by Fenwick himself. His timely entreaties for moderation went far to cool rising tempers in Durham as the

1. Trevelyan op. cit. p.271.
 2. Chester New op. cit. pp.129-132.
 3. My Italics.
 4. D.A. 14th January, 1831. p.220.

Reform Bill met with obstructions. At any rate throughout these anxious months there was an element of restraint in Durham, of which many other counties were comparatively deficient.

Not that most of the politicians in Durham were tepid toward Reform. Indeed, many of those who had signed requisitions for the respective City and County Reform Meetings were to be leading lights in the Durham Reform Association. A study of the names inscribed on all Durham requisitions during 1831 and 1832 reveals the power of the clamour for Reform throughout the County. This was headed by such as William Russell and his uncle, Colonel Mills fellow Member for Bletchingley, 1830-February, 1831, with Charles Tennyson. There were also R.E.D. Shafto and his son, R.D. Shafto, George Baker, Sir R.J. Eden¹ and Cuthbert Rippon, soon to be the first Member for Gateshead. From the City of Durham there was the venerable lawyer Dr. J.R. Fenwick, Edward and J. R. Shipperdson, W. Harland, and his son W.C. Harland, who was returned for his native City in 1832. W. Harland had formerly been William Hoar, Barrister, at one time Recorder of the City of Durham, and Deputy Lieutenant of the County. Among the Reformers from other towns in the County were John Allan of Blackwell, Warren Maude of Darlington, an active magistrate, and the Peases, from those ranks came one of the Members for the Southern Division of the County in 1832. From Gateshead were Charles Attwood and the youthful W.H. Brockett, and from Harperly Grange the voluble G.H. Wilkinson. No part of the County was lacking in such men. Most of these characters are more closely drawn in later pages.

1. Eldest son of Sir John Eden, Member for the County of Durham 1774-90.

Facing them with the ire and vitriol of abomination were the Marquis of Londonderry, and, (save for Chaytor's short interlude), whoever may have occupied one of the City seats under his aegis. Behind them were such other Tories as the Bishop himself and the cathedral clergy, Rowland Burdon, and even the High Sheriff, C.J.Clavering, (nephew of Sir Thomas Clavering), who was often unwilling to comply with requisitions for assemblies of the County.^{1 2} As 'moderate' Reformers there were Lord William Powlett, who, at the County Meeting on 1st February, would still not go beyond agreeing only to such Reform as embraced 'the opulent rising towns'; such as Birmingham, Manchester and Leeds, with great and growing populations, and giving further representation to certain Counties-and the Honourable H.T.Liddell, who admitted that the franchise should be considerably extended, but also resisted the idea of sweeping away the close boroughs.³

As the fateful 1st March approached all these men had their gaze fixed unwaveringly on Westminster. Lord John Russell outlined the Government proposals in a debate which lasted seven nights. On 2nd March, Lord William Powlett thanked the Ministers for the additional Members given to Durham, as the County was now to have four Members, two in each division. The City was to retain two representatives, while two Members were given to Sunderland, one to South Shields, and one to Gateshead.

1. D.C. 12th February, 1831.

2. In a letter in the Durham Chronicle, 12th February, 1831, Rippon drew attention to the fact that the High Sheriff was still a 'a Church-chosen Officer!'

3. D.A. 28th February, 1831. p.246. The Honourable H.T. Liddell was a Tory M.P. for Northumberland 1826-30, and succeeded his father (formerly Sir T.H. Liddell) as Lord Ravensworth in March, 1855— Bean op.cit. p.495.

Powlett welcomed wholeheartedly the provisions for an enlargement of the franchise, and the reduction of election expenses. But he still thought it a dangerous precedent to do away with so many boroughs at once,¹ whereas the Marquis of Cleveland, despite his inclination to Wellington and the Tories in 1830, was less critical. Although he did not approve of the Bill entirely, he admitted that it was based on just principles, and that he could not quarrel with its timing or manner of presentation.²

The crucial division on the Second Reading of the Reform Bill in the House of Commons was taken on 22nd March, 1831. 302 voted in favour, and 301 against. Among the majority were William Russell, Mr. M.A. Taylor, and, curiously enough, Lord William Powlett. Included in the 301 were Lords Castlereagh and Darlington, representing the County of Down and Saltash respectively, Sir Roger Gresley and Sir Henry Hardinge, now Member for Newport.³ This minute majority seemed to presage certain mutilation of the Bill in Committee. Lord Durham was adamant for a dissolution, on the ground that an immediate general election would strengthen the friends, and weaken the enemies of Reform.⁴

During the Easter recess the Government made some alteration in the details of the Bill. All that affected the County or City of Durham was the decision that sons of freemen born before the introduction of the Bill could vote once they were of age.⁵ On

1. D.A. 11th March, 1831. p.384.

2. D.C. 12th March, 1831.

3. Raine MS. 6.f.8; D.A. 1st April, 1831. p.309.

4. Howick MS. quoted in Chester New op.cit. pp.140-1; Lambton MS. given in full in Stuart Reid op.cit. Vol.I. pp.249-51.

B.M.(Printed.) T.1328. f.8. The Speech of Lord Durham in the House of Lords, 28th March, 1831.

5. Chester New op.cit. p.144.

19th April the Government was defeated by 8 votes, on the motion that there should be no reduction in the total number of Members in the House of Commons. Among the majority were Lords Castle-reagh and Darlington, Lord William Powlett, Sir Roger Gresley and Sir Henry Hardinge. The minority included Mr. M.A.Taylor, Mr. William Russell and Mr. W.R.C. Chaytor, son of Colonel Chaytor, and, since 23rd March, 1831, Member for the City of Durham.¹ On 22nd April parliament was dissolved.²

Prior to this dissolution there had been great political furore throughout the County of Durham, from which a spate of petitions had descended on London. Trevor, in an effort to reestablish the local political power of his patron, began on 27th April his canvass of the City of Durham. He did his utmost to arouse and play upon the emotions of the inhabitants, by warning them that 'you will no longer see your friends or relations coming among you to greet you on an occasion like this...'³ The other candidate, Mr. W.R.C.Chaytor, could not afford to ignore his challenger's strong argument about freemen's rights. But he found it hard to rebutt, despite his thesis that the freemen would gain many privileges through the Bill rather than lose any rights. He did not enumerate any of these privileges.⁴

1. D.A. 29th April, 1831. p.340.

2. Chester New op.cit. pp.145-7; Feiling op.cit.pp.388-9.

3. D.A. 29th April, 1831. p.342.

4. Ibid. 6th May, 1831. p.348.

Neither Trevor nor Chaytor need have taken this last City election of the old order so seriously, for it was a remarkably quiet affair. It was significant for the last appearance on the Durham hustings of the irrepressible Michael Angelo Taylor, who had been admitted to the Privy Council in February, 1831. Thirty one years had elapsed since he had first moved among the people of Durham. During that time he had carved out for himself an enviable parliamentary reputation for sheer courage and strength of principle, while his lively correspondence with Grey since 1809 was a measure of his political status in the eyes of that statesman.¹

Taylor had originally intended to stand yet again, but he found that his finances were too depleted for the grim battle with Londonderry and Trevor, who would leave no stone unturned to recapture one of the seats.² As Taylor's resolution began to falter his popularity among his old friends and adherents suffered a severe jolt. His long and unsparing services were forgotten amidst the irritation and anger of the moment. The Durham Chronicle screeched at 'the lamentable defection of Mr. M.A.Taylor' which 'has led to the restoration of the Marquis of Londonderry's borough power, after it appeared to have been crushed for ever...'³ Yet Parliament had not seen the last of him. Somehow his election expenses for Sudbury were paid, for

1. Correspondence of the Second Earl Grey; D.N.B.Vol.55. p.454.

2. Raine MS. 5. f.16.

3. D.C. 7th May, 1831. Taylor announced publicly his withdrawal from this Durham Election.

he sat for that place from 1832 until his death in 1834. He was then the senior-barrister and Father of the House of Commons.¹ His greatest regret was that Grey had never entrusted him with a place in the Government.² Perhaps Taylor was too free thinking and outspoken for this.

Lord William Powlett, for different reasons, also chose this time to surrender his seat. He had lost more ground and prestige in the County of Durham by having voted with the majority on 19th April, less than a month after he had walked into the Government lobby on the Second Reading of the Reform Bill. For he still thought the Reform Bill was too drastic.³ His decision was opportune, for he would almost certainly have been fallen upon by two pure and unadulterated Reformers. He could not have ridden the storm, so irresistibly was the tide for Reform running in the County.

Sir Hedworth Williamson, 'a staunch Reformer,' then agreed to stand, but only if a fund were raised to help him. To this he himself contributed one thousand pounds.⁴ He was egged on and encouraged by the newly organised Reform Associations of Durham, Darlington, Gateshead, and Stockton,⁵ while from South Shields, where the birth of such an organisation was awaited daily, it was

1. Sharp MS. 82 p.37n.; Bean op.cit. p.156.

2. Correspondence of Second Earl Grey. Box 54. File 7. 22nd September, 1831. M.A.Taylor to Grey.

3. D.A. 29th April, 1831. p.338.

4. Ibid. p.342.

5. D.C. 30 April, 1831.

reported that out of a hundred electors there, not more than ten were against Reform. From these, and from other towns freeholders were preparing to travel to Durham, at their own expense, to vote for 'any two candidates who will pledge themselves to support the Reform Bill in all its stages.' A Central Committee was to be set up in the City of Durham to supervise and coordinate these committees and exertions, so that all might heave with good heart for Reform.¹

All these Reform Associations had extolled the declared intention of William Russell to abandon his borough property at Saltash and Bletchingley, which was valued at some hundred thousandpounds.² While this young man was absent at Saltash, Colonel Mills, who had resigned in the previous February as M.P. for Bletchingley, was looking after his nephew's interests, and conducting a joint canvass with Sir Hedworth Williamson.³ At much the same time, at the County Meeting of 7th May, the Durham Reformers thanked the King for the dissolution of Parliament, submitted a Loyal Address, and discussed how they might devise a foolproof plan for the return of two County Members who could be relied upon to do their utmost for Reform.⁴ Meetings at Gateshead⁵, Sunderland⁶ and Staindrop⁷ ended likewise. In all ways

1. D.C. 30th April, 1831.

2. Raine MS. 6.f.22.29th April, 1831; D.A. 13th May, 1831, p.357. Durham County Meeting. Speech of William Russell. His uncle, Charles Tennyson had already transferred to Stamford.

3. D.A. 6th May, 1831. p.346. 5th May, 1831, R.W.Mills to the Freeholders of the County of Durham.

4. Ibid. 29th April, 1831. p.337.

5. D.C. 30th April, 1831.

6. Raine MS. 6. f.22.

7. D.C. 7th May, 1831.

the Reformers had wrested the political initiative in Durham from Lord Londonderry and his adherents.

Moreover the Reformers had a new leader in many ways after the style of Lord Durham, at least for his eloquence and anti-clericalism. Mr. Cuthbert Rippon had already animated and electrified the County Meeting of 1st February, 1831. At the later assembly of 7th May he made an even more truculent speech, warning his audience that, if the Reform Bill were lost, 'that which is now required as a boon, will be extracted as a right, amidst the dreadful horrors of anarchy and confusion!'^{1 2}

On the other hand the anti-Reformers in Durham planned to restore the seasoned and tested Sir Henry Hardinge, 'the right hand man of the Duke of Wellington';³ as a 'moderate' Reform candidate. It is probable that Bishop van Mildert had inspired this move, and set his dependents to accomplish it.⁴ In the House of Commons Hardinge had recently attacked the Reform Bill. In it his constituency at Newport, one of the Duke of Northumberland's rotten boroughs, was doomed to be disfranchised.⁵ Hence the whim of Lord Londonderry to use Sir Henry, despite their serious divergences in the past, as his trump card against the Reformers

1. Fordyce op.cit. Vol.1. p.781 note.

2. Rippon had invested in his large estates at Frosterley and elsewhere in Durham much of the fortune he had made on London Stock Exchange - Fordyce op.cit. Vol.1. p.781 note.

3. B.M. Add. MS. 27790 (Place MS.) f.30.

4. D.C. 7th May, 1831.

5. D.C. 30 April, 1831.

in the coming rubber for Durham County representation.

Hardinge had only been approached by Londonderry after Colonel Chaytor had declined the tempting offer of five thousand pounds to oppose Russell and Williamson.¹ The desperate shifts to which Londonderry had gone in trying to snatch one of the County seats from the Reformers are underlined by Russell's declaration that the Marquis, together with the clergy of the College, had spent £30,000 in this venture.² If so, the money had been wasted, for the design to plant Hardinge in one of the County seats misfired, as the General was not nominated on the day of the Election, 10th May.

Then, at 9 a.m., 'the candidates (Russell and Williamson) were met at Neville's Cross Toll bar, by an immense concourse of people, by whom the horses were taken from the carriage, and the two gentlemen, standing in the open vehicle, accompanied by Colonel Mills, were drawn in splendid procession into the town. A great number of flags and banners, with bands of music (Mr. Russell's private band being dressed in elegant new blue and white uniforms), headed the line, which was stretched out to a great length, by a train of carriages, and a numerous body of the tenantry, etc. of Mr. Russell's estates. The bells rang merrily, and the acclamations of the populace were still more loud and heart-stirring.'

-
1. D.C. 14th May, 1831. Speeches of Colonel Chaytor and Mr. W.R.C. Chaytor at the Dinner to the successful County candidates, 10th May; Correspondence of Second Earl Grey. Box 10 File 2. 12th March, 1831. Colonel Chaytor to Grey.
 2. D.C. 14th May, 1831. Speech of Mr. William Russell. 10th May, 1831.

Before the nomination of the candidates, 'a large waggon was brought on to the Court green, by a party of reformers from Sunderland, on which was placed a large boat, rigged in the fashion of a ship; its mainsail bearing a design, representing Britannia seated by the British lion, looking at a man-of-war battering the rotten boroughs with red hot shot, inscribed 'Russell's pills.'¹ Thus colour and splendour vivified and embellished the last Durham County Election of the Unreformed Parliament.

Russell and Williamson had, after all, no opposition.² In his last reported speech to his constituents, Mr. Russell declared that he had voluntarily sacrificed his powers of nomination in Bletchingley and Saltash,³ and had thereby gained something more valuable, the goodwill of the Durham County freeholders. He went on to denounce passionately and without reserve the Cathedral clergy⁴ before the 'freeholders of this once priest-ridden County! He carried this diatribe further at the Gateshead Dinner to Williamson and himself on 20th May, and invited his friends in the North, once the Reform Bill was passed, to send him petitions for a commutation of tithes and for a redistribution of income so that the glaring difference between the pittance of a curate and the

1. D.C. 14th May, 1831.

2. Dur.3/150.f.27. Sharp MS.82. p.21.

3. Similarly, the Marquis of Cleveland had been quite enthusiastic over the condemnation of his own boroughs of Camelford, Ilchester and Winchelsea under Schedule A of the Bill.

4. D.C. 14th May, 1831.

salary of a Bishop might be reduced.¹

Cuthbert Rippon's Speech at the same dinner² was another blast on the trumpet of acute anti-clericalism which was sending out some of the most resonant notes in the campaign of the Reformers in Durham. That it was sweet music to the ears of many of the freeholders is not doubted. A week later, on 28th May, Rippon was confident enough to offer himself as a prospective candidate for the representation of the Town and Parish of Gateshead.³

These and other provocations envenomed Lord Londonderry still more. His deep hatred of the Reform Bill had not been appeased by the outrages lately committed by the London mob on his stately mansion, Holderness House. He rallied the more strongly to the defence of the Durham clergy against the charges of political bias and interference, indulgence in which, the Reformers claimed, was detracting from their holiness as priests.⁴ Such was part of the uncommon garb in which the strange importance and influence of the Prince Bishop through the ages had clothed Durham political history, not least at this time.

Meanwhile the submission of the amended Reform Bill to the House of Commons had been neither straightforward nor painless.⁵ However, on 6th July, the Bill passed its Second Reading by a

1. D.C. 28th May, 1831.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid. 4th June, 1831.

4. Ibid. 25th June, 1831. Speech in the House of Lords, 15th of June; D.C. 9th July, 1831.

margin of 136.¹ Of the minority few were more vituperative in debate than Mr. Trevor, who had, on 22nd June, presented a petition against the Bill from almost all the non-resident freemen of the City of Durham.² As persistent as ever, on 30th August he moved his ineffectual amendment to retain the franchise for non-resident freemen of the old freemen boroughs.³ For most of July and August the Bill was examined and assailed in detail in Committee. The necessity of constantly being in attendance at this imposed an unendurable strain on William Russell,⁴ for whom asthma, if not also drunkenness, was the arbiter of how he spent his time.

Delaying tactics by the Tories, in the form of a debate on 6th August on whether Gateshead should return a Member, proved fruitless.⁵ The question hinged on whether Gateshead 'was a suburb to Newcastle'; as Sir Henry Hardinge alleged, or on whether its being amidst a number of manufactures, its position as a separate parish in the County, and the wealth and intelligence of its inhabitants should be the prevailing considerations. These were pressed successfully by Sir Matthew Ridley and Mr. J. Hodgson, Members for Newcastle, and by Sir Hedworth Williamson and Mr. W. R. C. Chaytor. In the division there were 264 votes in favour of the retention

-
1. D.A. 15th July, 1831. p.12.
 2. Ibid. 1st July, 1831. p.413.
 3. D.C. 3rd September, 1831.
 4. Ibid. 2nd July, 1831.
 5. Ibid. 13th August, 1831.

of Gateshead in Schedule D, and 160 against.¹ A pamphlet from the pen of one W.H.B., probably the outstanding young Gateshead Reformer, W.H.Brockett, was issued after this debate. It argued that Gateshead contributed more in assessed taxes than South Shields and Westoe, 'whose admission into Schedule D was agreed to without a division!'²

Not that the Government's worries were confined to the Commons. Lord Durham's attendance at debates was curtailed drastically by the fatal illness of his son, Charles. Moreover, the steady deterioration of his own health had adversely affected his temper. He was causing his father-in-law, the Prime Minister much disquiet by voicing agonising delusions that he had been bilked of an earldom and of a higher administrative office. This is shown by a letter of 23rd August, 1831, marked 'Confidential,' from Durham to Lord Grey. Durham, asking Grey for promotion in the peerage, reminded his father-in-law of his earlier request for this at the time of the formation of the Ministry. Durham complained unjustifiably and ungratefully, 'I found myself placed in a sinecure and condemned to idleness. I saw others younger than myself fully and honorably employed, whilst I was put on the shelf.....'

1. D.C. 5th August, 1831; B.M. (Printed.) 8135 c.1.pp.29-37.
 2. B.M. (Printed.) 8135 c.1. pp.4,6.

Then came a rehash of the excellent claims he felt he had to an earldom - the antiquity and noble connections of his family, its great influence in the County of Durham, his own estates in land and coal mines, which were surpassed by 'none either in amount or political influence.' Finally he stressed his own eventful political life and his undiminished reverence for the principles of Fox and of Grey himself. No doubt Lord Grey realised that drastic ill health and vicious personal misfortune and bereavement had been largely responsible for the unfortunate drafting of this letter.¹

But the distress it caused the Premier could hardly have been alleviated when the Bill was introduced in the House of Lords on 22nd September. From the towns of Durham came many petitions calling for its prompt and unopposed passage, while the County Courts were again the scene of a County meeting on 30th September. The pose of most speakers towards the House of Lords was quietly threatening, beneath a veneer of politeness and reserve. A petition was drawn up for presentation to their Lordships, and was delivered to the Upper Chamber on 3rd October by the Marquis of Cleveland. There were also similar petitions from the City of Durham, Gateshead, Darlington, Staindrop and Barnard Castle.

But Nemesis was at hand. On 8th October, the day after the funeral of young Charles Lambton, the Bill was rejected in the House of Lords by 199 votes to 158. The majority included the Marquis of Londonderry, Lord Ravensworth, and, with them, the

1. Correspondence of the Second Earl Grey. Letters from Lord Durham to Lord Grey. January 17, 1828 - June 18, 1832. Vol. III. f. 23.
 2. Raine MS. 6. f. 26. Durham County Meeting.

Bishop of Durham, who voted by proxy. The Marquis of Cleveland and Lord Durham voted for the Bill, the latter by proxy.¹ In the avalanche of indignation which swept the land the greatest wrath was reserved for the Bishops who, under the remorseless guidance of the forbidding Phillpotts, now of Exeter, had voted by 21 to 2 against the Bill, and for Lord Londonderry, for his outburst of 5th October, in which he recognised the Bill as conferring eternity on Whig supremacy, and annihilating his own political influence in Durham.²

The Bishop of Durham was burned in effigy at Bishop Auckland on Saturday evening, 15th October. Already the Marquis of Londonderry had been knocked unconscious by stones near the Horse Guards on 12th October.³ The excesses of mobs at Bristol, Derby, and Nottingham seemed to confirm the belief that the country was on the brink of revolution. All seemed to depend on the alliance between the Government and the Political Unions, and on the prevailing of saner counsels.

A mass meeting of the Northern Political Union was held on the Town Moor, Newcastle, on 17th October. The Durham Chronicle estimated that there were not less than eighty thousand present, composed largely of miners and other manual workers, with a large number of the middle class.⁴ The Chairman, Mr.C.Attwood, who late was beaten by Cuthbert Rippon to the nomination for Gateshead,

1. D.C. 15th October, 1831; Chester New op.cit. p.151.

2. Ibid. 7th October, 1831. p.116.

3. D.A. 21st October, 1831. pp.124-6.

4. D.C. 22nd October, 1831.

showed an aversion to premature remedies. These would only embarrass the Government. But, he added, menacingly, 'the time may come when different conduct might be necessary....'

At Sunderland, on 27th October, a large crowd was warned by Hedworth Lambton, brother of Lord Durham, that 'nothing could save the country from the horrors of civil convulsion, but the carrying of a bill embracing all the great principles of the late rejected bill...'¹ Four days later the City of Durham was the scene of the most critical Reform meeting yet held in the County. The requisition for this had been signed by two hundred individuals comprising the great bulk of the principal gentry. Reformers from most areas of the County marched in procession to the Law Courts. Among others, Mr. Russell's private band was parading the streets, where all the shops were closed, while loud peals of bells added to the setting.

A considerable number of Durham Members of Parliament, future Members, and candidates spoke. Mr. Cuthbert Rippon, like many of the orators, but with much more rhetoric and emotion, called for a constitutional change in the power of the House of Lords, as a necessary prelude to the passing of a Reform Bill. By this he obviously meant an extensive creation of new peers.

Failing such, the people should 'look up to God and themselves to be free.'² Moreover, the Bishops, he claimed, should be removed from the House of Lords. William Russell and Hedworth

1. D.C. 5th November, 1831.

2. Ibid.

Lambton were at one with Rippon in his demand for this purgation.

Behind the scenes Dr. Fenwick was trying to stir Grey to create peers, and assuring the Prime Minister that he held no brief for the impatient and provocative sayings of the Northern Political Union, who did not fully understand the Government's difficulties. But he warned that he and men of similar fibre and outlook could not ward off chaos and calamity if confidence in Lord Grey were lost. For then power would go to hotheads. Insisting that all change should be orderly and legal, Fenwick felt it essential that Reform 'should be carried by those who will govern in the spirit of Reform! Should Grey have to resign, his withdrawal must be so timed 'as not to excite....ignorance to misconstrue it!'¹ The relative forbearance, so conspicuous in the County of Durham in the months immediately preceding the winning of Reform, was to a great extent due to the discrimination, judgement and control of men like Fenwick.

In London at the end of November Lord Durham was also seeking the raising of enough men to the peerage, so that the Reform Bill might be rapidly transformed into an Act. He was alarmed at the state of feeling in the country. For he saw clearly that the public ignorance of what was happening was not conducive to the maintenance of order. On the other hand, Grey knew only too well that the King's repugnance to a wholesale

1. Correspondence of the Second Earl Grey. Box 14 File 6. 18th November, 1831. Dr. J. R. Fenwick to Earl Grey.

creation of new peers was becoming more pronounced.

While Durham had been abroad, the Government had reflected on changes in the Bill. Eventually it was decided that the new population census of 1831 should supersede that of 1821. The number of houses and the total assessed taxes, rather than a counting of heads, were to decide the classification of a borough. But the total number of members in the new House of Commons was to be as before. So certain boroughs, previously in Schedule B, were to keep both members. Also, there was to be an extra member for some of the well populated towns. Another concession was the enfranchisement of the £50 tenants-at-will. Then, of particular importance for the City of Durham, all ^{resident} freemen, by birth and servitude, in the old freemen boroughs, were to be allowed to vote.¹ Much of the credit for the winning of this concession belongs to Trevor, although in the case of non-resident freemen it was not eventually to apply.²

Lord Durham, having returned to England on 30th November, was grossly displeased with what had been done in his absence. He feared that the trust of the Radical leaders in Lord Grey would now be severely sapped. His view was that the Whigs were pledged to do all they could to secure the passing of the Bill as near as possible to its original form. He also felt that the

1. Chester New op.cit. pp.153-5.

2. See Public General Statutes 2 and 3 William IV cap.45 pp.347-8 for final position regarding freemen.

King's discretionary power to act for the public good, when the positive laws were inadequate, should be used to make the Upper Chamber more consonant with the spirit of the age.

He was not even satisfied with William IV's famous promise of 15th January, 1832, to add enough peers to carry the Bill, if such a course became necessary,¹ but was so sorely disquieted by Grey's renewed negotiations with Lord Wharncliffe's Tory 'Waverers' that he pressed for an agreed number of creations before the Bill was read for the second time in the Lords. But Durham could not move his father-in-law, who preferred to rely on the Bill overcoming this hurdle, and to call for a creation of peers only in the event of the Bill being defeated again.² Grey's proposed policy carried the day in the vital Cabinet Meeting of 11th March. There were thirteen votes in its favour, and only one against, Lord Durham standing alone. Radical Jack, whose recent personal attack on Grey, and his refusal to temporize in any way had riled his colleagues still further, would have resigned but for the entreaties of Lord Althorp, and of Russell. He consented to stay only on the understanding that the entire Cabinet would countenance the unlimited creation of peers if the Bill failed to pass the Second Reading.³

Before the Bill completed its journey through the House of Commons on the 23rd March, there had been controversies centring

-
1. Chester New op.cit. pp.155-60; Trevelyan op.cit. pp.330-2.
 2. Trevelyan op. cit. p.334; Chester New op.cit. p.164.
 3. Chester New op.cit. p.165-9; Cooper op.cit. pp.128-30.

round the County of Durham. Mr. Trevor, on 5th March, had moved that a Member be given to Stockton rather than to Gateshead. He stressed the growing commercial importance of the former town, which had a population of 7,762, and 600 houses of £10 value.¹ It is not known how far he was actuated by the nearness of Stockton to the Londonderry demesne. In committee Mr. William Russell, Mr. Hodgson and Sir Matthew White Ridley again rushed to the defence of Gateshead, and Lord John Russell refused to agree to the motion that Stockton-on-Tees displace Gateshead in Schedule D. He also resisted an attempt to unite the representation of Gateshead with that of South Shields.^{2 3} Again how coincidental was it that Gateshead was within easy reach of Lambton Castle?

Mr. Trevor fired his parting shot on 20th March. Although he admitted that the legislation then under discussion was an improvement on its predecessor, yet, under its terms, future Members would be 'but little better than the delegates of a mob.' His gloomy prognostication of a fearful revolution if the Bill were passed⁴ was emulated by Bishop van Mildert on 9th April during the Second Reading in the House of Lords. This prelate, Cassandra like, prophesied danger to the political institutions of the country if the House of Commons, after 'an infusion of

1. D.C. 10th March, 1832.

2. Ibid.

3. The Durham Chronicle, on 23rd March, gave the population of Gateshead as 15,177. This almost tallies with the figure of 15,300 given in Add. MS. 27795 (Place MS.) f.178. 794 tenants qualified for the £10 franchise.

4. D.A. 23rd March, 1832. p.303.

democracy; became the sole power in the land, subject only to the Political Unions.¹

It was this question which, not least because of a piece of fine invective from his old opponent Phillpotts, brought forth on 13th April one of Lord Durham's best performances.² He was certain that the country would not be amenable to any lesser measure of Reform than that offered in the Bill. He warned that any longer exclusion from political power of the middle class, in whose abilities and political intelligence he placed great faith, would lead to 'a political convulsion, and necessarily a destructive one...' Rather was the object of the Bill 'to give security to the Throne - contentment to the people - and permanence to all the best Institutions of the Country.' While Lord Durham could be distressingly impatient with other men's opinions in Cabinet when they did not accord with his own, such passages as these revealed genius, political vision and statesmanship of the highest order.

The division, taken that night, resulted in a majority of nine in favour of the Second Reading. Ten bishops changed sides. But the narrow margin was not a happy augury of what would happen in Committee. From the country there were further petitions to the King for the creation of peers. Veiled threats, such as the

1. D.A. 13th April, 1832.

2. B.M. (Printed) 8135 c.1. f.8. Lord Durham's Speech on the Second Reading of the Reform Bill in the House of Lords, 13th April, 1832. pp.5-11, 24-8.

non-payment of taxes, were uttered.¹ Then, on 7th May, came the defeat of the Government by thirty five votes. This was on Lord Lyndhurst's amendment in Committee that the enfranchising clauses be taken before the disfranchising ones. Among the majority were the Marquis of Londonderry and Lord Ravensworth. Against them were the Marquis of Cleveland and Lord Durham. The Bishop of Durham does not seem to have voted.²

Lord Durham pointed out in Cabinet that the conditions for the King keeping his promise of 15th January were now realised. But William IV refused to create the fifty peers stipulated by Grey, a possibility Durham had always suspected.³ On 8th May the Government offered to resign.⁴ The stark news that the Duke of Wellington might again become Prime Minister swelled the widespread anger and disgust.⁵ The only redeeming feature was that Durham, who had been proved right, was now reunited with the other Whigs.⁶

Francis Place and Joseph Parkes of Birmingham were drawing up the blue print of a revolution which would break out when Wellington assumed office. Economic pressure was to be tried first. Indeed Place and his associates hoped desperately that

1. Chester New. op.cit. pp.173-5.

2. D.A. 11th May, 1832, p.358. Londonderry's rift with Wellington had by now been somewhat bridged by their common enmity to the Reform Bill.

3. Cooper op. cit. p. 134.

4. Chester New op. cit. pp.175-6.

5. Feiling. op.cit. p.394.

6. Cooper op. cit. p. 135.

military action would never be necessary. If it were, they attached their hopes to the Political Unions, which were recruiting thousands every day.¹

Yet again self-control and avoidance of excess were the keynotes of the great Newcastle meeting attended by most of the leaders of the Northern Political Union on 15th May. Here almost the last word was spoken by Mr. Attwood, who advised the crowd to go home quietly, and not supply their enemies with welcome fodder. It is true that the inhabitants of South Shields had, on 11th May, agreed to petition the House of Commons to hold back all supplies until the passing of the Bill, and begged the King to recall Grey. A similar petition was proposed and carried unanimously at Darlington on 16th May.⁴ But these rumblings were solitary, and not in congruence with Dr. Fenwick's adept handling, as Chairman, of about one hundred and fifty friends of Reform at the Queen's Head Tavern, Durham on 17th May. Even Cuthbert Rippon left here persuaded of the good sense of Fenwick's plea for the avoidance of all provocative expressions. At the same time Fenwick advised that the Durham Reformers should resort to a County Meeting should the Duke of Wellington actually return to power.⁵

1. Chester New op.cit. pp.177-9; Feiling op.cit. p.395.

2. Local Records-Northumberland, Durham, etc. Sykes op.cit.Vol.II pp.356-8.

3. D.C. 25th May, 1832.

4. Local Records. Vol.II. p.358.

5. Ibid. p.359.

That very day news reached the County that the Duke had declared himself unable to form an administration. Lord Grey again received the royal summons.¹ Still the position was obscure. The King even then hoped to avoid creating more peers. But, to his consternation, the Whig Government ran into a full scale onslaught in the House of Lords. He therefore let it be known that he would honour his promise of 15th January.

Many of the leading Tory Lords then absented themselves from Committee.² But all was not yet over. With defeat and discomfiture on both a national and a local scale staring him in the face, the Marquis of Londonderry, whose failure to find a candidate in the County Election of 1831 was exceedingly costly to him in both money and prestige, tried to salvage what he could of power and pride. Thus he concentrated on the great inequality which he detected in the establishment of new seats at Durham. He lamented that eight of the ten proposed Members for the County of Durham were to come from Northern districts, where his great rival and political adversary was deeply entrenched. So once again Gateshead was made a casus belli,³ for on 23rd May Londonderry sought enfranchisement for Stockton at the expense of cholera stricken Gateshead, which he described as 'vile and filthy!'⁴

1. Chester New op. cit. p.180; Feiling op.cit. p.395.

2. Chester New op.cit. p.181.

3. D.A. 25th May, 1832. p.373.

4. Ibid. 1st June, 1832. p.380.

Lord Durham made an immediate and spirited reply to the Marquis of Londonderry's attacks on himself, denying that he had tried to give 'an undue influence to the Whig party' in Durham, and set up for himself 'a great political predominance in that county.' As the only basis on which to justify the conferring of the vote was that of a large population, he argued, Gateshead, Shields and Sunderland could not be omitted, even though they were very near to Lambton Castle.¹ Also South Shields had only 7,991 inhabitants, just over half those of Gateshead, which was expanding rapidly as an important manufacturing district.²

This was the last occasion on which Gateshead's right to send a representative to Westminster was questioned in either House, for it was agreed that the admission to the franchise of that town should stand part of the clause.³ It was also Lord Londonderry's final rearguard action against the Reform Bill, which passed its Third Reading in the House of Lords on 4th June without any great resistance from the Tories.⁴ Three days later it received the Royal Assent.

The accolade for the triumph of Reform falls most fittingly on the shoulders of Lord Durham, despite his often stormy relationship with his father-in-law. For Durham had not only assumed a decisive role in the preparation of the Bill, but had strained

-
1. B.M. (Printed) 8135 c 1. f.6 Speech of the Right Honourable Lord Durham, in the House of Lords, on Wednesday, the 23rd of May, 1832, pp.1-2.
 2. Ibid. pp.7-8.
 3. D.A. 1st June, 1832. p.380.
 4. Chester New op.cit. pp.181-2. The actual voting figures on this Third Reading were 100 to 20.

himself to his limits, in the face of woeful ill health and excruciating pain, to preserve it intact in its treacherous journey through Parliament. 'Grey provided the leadership, Durham the insight and driving power! 1

Much of the spirit and pertinacity with which he had pursued his self-appointed task had flowed from the undiminished confidence in him, and fondness towards him on the part of the bulk of the freeholders, and of so many of the citizens of Durham. Yet Lord Londonderry and the College were still to instigate argument as to how far Lord Durham had tried deliberately to use the Bill in order to construct a local political empire. As circumstantial evidence they pointed to the Northern Division of the County, the City of Durham and the Township of Sunderland, each with their two Members, and to Gateshead and South Shields, with one Member each - all in or within easy reach of the Lambton 'Country! But the other half of the County, through the Southern Division, they said, was to return only two Members.

There were two replies to this. First, as W.H.B. urged in his pamphlet,² the County of Durham had not been treated too indulgently. Its ten Members for a population of 207,673 in 1821 and 239,256 in 1831, could be set by the side of the eleven representatives of neighbouring Northumberland, where 198,965 and 236,959 people lived in 1821 and 1831 respectively.³ Also

1. Chester New op.cit. pp.181-2.
 2. B.M.(Printed) 8135c. 1. pp.4,6.
 3. Bean op.cit. p.1164.

there was the example of Cornwall. Here twenty boroughs, not one of which was equal to Gateshead in population, were to be represented in the Reformed Parliament. Second, Lord Durham had again and again denied all accusations of political trickery and subterfuge in the way of fiddling with population figures. Moreover he had asserted that he would never interfere in future political transactions in his native County, in which the primacy of the old political families, his own included, was to find renewed expression.

Whether Radical Jack intended to keep to this promise seems less material than the near certainty that he must have realised that his most sensible course here was to rely on the great esteem surrounding his family, to secure for them what was regarded in Durham as a fair share - one seat - of this local political primacy. For it would never have been practicable for even Radical Jack, at any time, to have set about erecting any towering edifice of obvious personal political rule in such a County as Durham. He and his family had bowed to this great fact in 1813.

CHAPTER 10.THE EFFECTS OF THE FIRST REFORM BILL ON CITY AND COUNTY

The County of Durham did not lag behind the rest of the country in the rapturous enthusiasm with which it hailed the safe arrival of the Reform Bill. In Darlington, on 9th June, it was resolved to celebrate the event by giving a public dinner to the operatives of the town. A great procession marched round the town boundaries, and through the principal streets. Bands, bells, guns and colours mesmerised and edified, and then intoxicated the onlookers.¹ Stockton, on 29th June, was the scene of one of the most splendid pageants that ever took place in the county of Durham, or perhaps in the North of England,² while at Sedgefield, on 4th July, there was a public dinner at which nearly one hundred persons partook of roast beef and plum pudding before being exhilarated by a display of fireworks.³ Further west, at Witton-le-Wear, on 3rd August, two hogsheads of ale were consumed.⁴

All this exultation and the relief and gaiety which ran through the many meetings and dinners in the County at this time was the more remarkable in that many of those who were rhapsodising so freely could not benefit from the Bill. For the franchise had only been stretched to admit an additional section of the middle classes and the more wealthy tradesmen. However, these celebrations and festivities were natural and diverting

1. Local Records-Northumberland and Durham-Sykes. Vol.1. pp.362-3.

2. D.C. 6th July, 1832.

3. Local Records - Vol.1. p.367.

4. D.C. 10th August, 1832.

preliminaries to the first General Election of the Reformed Parliament. Among the national issues to which Lord Grey and his party addressed themselves were the Church and its tithes, the further revision of the Criminal Laws, the Abolition of Slavery, the encouragement of Free Trade and Reciprocity in Shipping, and the old hobby horse of curtailing profuse expenditure. While the Whigs were on the brink of a spate of law making of a sweeping nature, the Tories or Conservatives had schooled themselves to accept gracefully, if resignedly, the medicine prescribed by the Reform Bill. But they were determined to defend such threatened interests as the Church, which at Durham was regarded as fair game by virtually every Whig candidate in the County.

As in other constituencies the registration, under the Reform Bill, of electors in the City of Durham was a lengthy and intricate business, but by 20th October the list of householders in the City entitled to the franchise had been revised. This, the Durham Chronicle reported, had culminated very much to the advantage of the Reform candidates.

The practice of objecting to potential voters was very much multiplied after the passage of the Reform Bill, and was often resorted to in the City of Durham, as in other constituencies in the County. For example Trevor's agents managed to get struck off the register 39 of 115 would-be voters for the Reform candidates, Chaytor and Harland, on the ground that their claims to the franchise were spurious. Similarly, 'the Blues'; those behind the Reform candidates, were able to veto the voting

pretensions of 28 out of 68 Householders who were partial towards Trevor.^{1 2}

For the cardinal feature of this election was the grim resolve with which the Marquis of Londonderry, with the Cathedral clergy as accessories, tried desperately to maintain his uncertain grip on one of the City seats, notwithstanding his pessimistic assessment of how the Bill would demolish his electoral capacity.³ The Durham Chronicle alleged that 'the tradesmen of the town were threatened with the loss of the College custom' if they ventured to vote against Trevor,⁴ and that '....offers of employment in the collieries, orders for goods, and other corrupt devices, are bountifully held out to such of the Blue party as may be base enough to accept these bribes....some few despicable wretches have yielded to the temptation!⁵

Such threats, bribes and promises seem less improbable than the Chronicle's caricature of Trevor himself as an arrogant and contemptuous young man who, on many instances, insulted voters during his canvass.⁶ It would have been extremely foolish for him to have behaved in this way. Perhaps more credence should be

-
1. By para. XXXII of Public General Statutes 2 and 3 William IV cap. 45.pp.347-8, freemen created since 1st March, 1831 were excluded from the vote.
 2. By *ibid.* all freemen, to be entitled to vote, must have resided six calendar months previous to the last day of July in such a year, and must be resident within seven statute miles from the place of poll. The latter requirement excluded from the franchise many of the Marquis of Londonderry's tenants.
 3. See footnote 2 above.
 4. D.C. 14th December, 1832.
 5. *Ibid.* 30th November, 1832.
 6. *Ibid.* 14th December, 1832.

given to the other side of the picture, as presented by the Durham Advertiser,^{and} by the speeches in Durham of Trevor himself, and of his proposer, Reverend Edward Davison, who had been the partisan of both Hardinge and Gresley. Trevor then appears as anxious to help local interests, and to attend to the welfare of all his constituents, whatever their political persuasions, and as having worked harmoniously with Chaytor to this end.¹

Certainly in the last Unreformed Parliament Trevor showed undoubted promise and ability. In fact he was one of the most frequent speakers there ever to have graced a Durham seat. From his maiden speech on 3rd November, 1830,² delivered in the Report on the Address, he had, by the end of May, 1832, caught the Speaker's eye over seventy five times. Over thirty of these speeches had comprised his personal contribution to the return of fire and then studied withdrawal conducted by the Tories against the Bill.³

All the more reason why Chaytor and the new candidate, W.C. Harland, were united,⁴ as Whigs and Reformers, to eject Trevor, whose utterances against the Reform Bill in Durham and at Westminster could hardly be forgotten. Harland, the son of the former freeman of the City, William Hoar, had, as early as 2nd May 1832, expressed his desire to stand for the City at the next

1. Raine MS. 5. f. 52.

2. Hansard's Parl. Debates. Vol. 1. p. 175.

3. Ibid. Vols. 1-12

4. Raine MS. 5. f. 51.

election, and had promised, if returned, to support 'every measure that appears best calculated to lead to the early abolition of Slavery, the reduction of all unnecessary expenditure and taxation, the maintenance of civil and religious liberty, and to the encouragement of all branches of industry! He knew that his having been born and bred in the City, where his family had resided for nearly fifty years, enlived his political appeal, and in his speeches he exploited this.¹ That he too had caught the fever of so many of the Whigs is proved by his observation that 'the time is come when a deep, searching, and comprehensive reform in the Church should be the object of those who have her permanent interests at heart! Finally, his candidature as a reformer was given the highest ratification when he was nominated by Mr. George Baker.²

In a contest replete with much of the pageantry and spectacle of previous elections,³ the victors, on 12th December, were Harland and Chaytor, with 440 and 404 votes respectively.⁴ Trevor, who received 383, had thus been eclipsed. However, the first defeat of a Londonderry candidate in a three cornered City of Durham fight could be attributed in no small degree to many of the tenants of the Marquis, because of their non-residence within seven miles of the poll booth, being no longer in possession of

1. D.C. 4th May, 1832. p.345.

2. Ibid. 14th December, 1832

3. Ibid.

4. Dur. 3/150. f.15.

the franchise. Still, 283 of Trevor's votes were plumpers, while Chaytor and Harland amassed only 12 and 8 of these respectively.¹ Trevor was to be returned for the City again, in 1835, by which time he had almost completed his two volumes on the 'Life and Times of William III!'²

The number of voters, both freemen and Householders, estimated in the entire constituency, was put at 806, a reduction in the electorate for which the new residential qualifications, and the consequent disappearance of the non-resident freemen must have been largely responsible. This was the number given on the lists signed by the inspecting barristers.³ In the actual election, out of a possible 806, there was a poll of 765. This was composed of 480 freemen and 285 householders.⁴ These figures must be compared with the 987 who had voted in the City election of 1830, when there had also been three candidates,⁵ and with the 968 who had stated their preferences in March, 1831, in the rivalry between W.R.C. Chaytor and Trevor.⁶ Thus the number of £10 householders who exercised their newly gained ^{privilege} ~~was~~ probably less than half that of the very numerous disfranchised non-resident freemen.

Of the three recently enfranchised towns⁷ in Durham, only at

-
1. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4034 Poll Book. City of Durham 1832.
 2. Sharp MS. 82 p.41. Inset n.; Sharp MS.145 p.55n.; D.N.B.Vol.57.
 3. D.C. 26th October, 1832.
 4. Gough Adds. Durham MS.4034. Poll Book. City of Durham 1832; Bean op.cit. p.1168.
 5. Sharp MS. 82. p.41n.
 6. B.M. (Printed.) 8133 h. 3. Poll Book.
 7. See Appendix B for details of these.

Gateshead was there no contest, and here Cuthbert Rippon was coasting along happily. From the 1st June, 1831, when, at the Black Bull Inn, he had begun to coax the potential electors of Gateshead, his being declared a Member for that prospective constituency was a foregone conclusion, should the Reform Bill become law. Yet, despite his advanced convictions over the Established Church and tithes, and his particularly savage denunciation of all who had tried to thwart the passing of the Reform Bill, Rippon, no Radical, would not have any truck with Annual Parliaments and Universal Suffrage.¹ Even the adoption of the Ballot, he considered, would be too imprudent, unless there were absolutely no alternative. Nor was he hesitant to point out that immediate abolition of slavery would be ill advised without the slaves being first prepared for their freedom by a course of instruction.² He was equally outspoken in declaiming against the Corn Laws, which he, like Radical Jack before him, felt should be modified. And he too was a landlord, and a considerable one.³

But it was not just for being trenchantly ingenuous that Rippon won such early applause that the very idea of opposition to him seemed ridiculous. He was discerning enough to make no secret of his great admiration for Lord Durham and his family,

1. D.C. 4th June, 1831.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid. 15th June, 1832.

near neighbours of Gateshead, and hardly likely to be dispassionate outlookers of electoral vagaries there. To cap his performance Rippon felt it necessary to show that, although he was a Weardale landowner, his close connections with the lead miners there had given him that industrial and commercial acumen and experience which befitted him to represent Gateshead.¹

It was becoming increasingly the practice for candidates to explain in long addresses where they stood on all manner of political issues. This change in fashion was hastened by the public submission by candidates of their opinions on Parliamentary Reform and the Bill in the years and months immediately preceding June, 1832, although its growth may be traced from the beginning of the nineteenth century. However, many candidates often avoided committing themselves irrevocably on delicate and dangerous issues.

The indenture of Rippon's return was completed on 12th December, 1832.² As in the cases of South Shields and Sunderland the Sheriff had sent a precept to the Returning Officer. The precepts were received by all three Returning Officers from the hands of the Under Sheriff on 5th December,³ when such a precept had ^{also} reached the Mayor of the City of Durham.⁴ This was two days after the Bishop's officials had been handed the writ from the Crown to the Bishop, requiring the return of ten Members, from the County, City and Boroughs of Durham, based on which a writ had

1. D.C. 15th June, 1832.

2. Dur. 3/150. f.19.

3. Ibid. ff.16,18,20.

4. Ibid. f.14.

been received from the Deputy Cursitor of the Bishop by the Under-Sheriff on behalf of the Sheriff.¹ Thus the usage and ritual which had been first in vogue after the Act of 1673 remained sacrosanct.

In pursuance of the writ Robert Ingham was returned for South Shields on 12th December.² He was the Recorder for Berwick-on-Tweed, and had been called to the bar at Lincoln's Inn in 1820. There had been three other candidates, of varied background and experience. Of these Russell Bowlby was a native of the County, and a solicitor with an extensive practice in South Shields. He had been one of the conspirators against Sir Henry Hardinge in 1828, and was considered to approve of Church Reform. There was also George Palmer, the only South Shields candidate to be described as a Tory, who had been High Sheriff of Hertfordshire in 1818, was one time Deputy Lieutenant for Essex, and Chairman of the Shipowners' Society, London. William Gowan, a magistrate and Deputy Lieutenant of the North Riding,³ had been the least known candidate, yet he had 104 votes as against 205, 108 and 2 for Ingham, Palmer and Bowlby respectively.

At Sunderland there were also four candidates - but for two seats. Reference has already been made to the economic and local issues of this election.⁴ The disposition of the candidates to the docks and the shipping interest was of great

1. Dur. 3/150. f.13.

2. Ibid. f.21.

3. Bean *op.cit.* pp.165-7.

4. See Chapter 2. pp.94-6.

moment. But none of the men who stood was able to avoid searching examination of his wider political principles. There was, for example, if the spate of pamphlets issued against him are to be believed, serious doubts as to whether Alderman Thompson was sincere over Reform. He was described by one 'Philo' as '.....a decided Tory, and opponent of Reform; who had 'turned a professed Reformer, when Reform became fashionable....'¹ Yet Thompson was definitely telling the truth when he protested that he had given the Bill his unstinted and unqualified support, had been present at every division on this, and had always trundled into the lobby of the Reformers.² Yet publicist after publicist reviled him for being a Londonderry candidate. It is of course possible that the Marquis had no choice but to entice a bona fide Reformer to accept his patronage in the contest for this constituency, in the hope that he could shackle and gag him thereafter.

For although Thompson included in his election address his desire for the repeal of the Corn Law, of all taxes on necessities and for the abolition of slavery,³ his major dilemma was how to cauterize from himself the brand of being promoted by the Marquis of Londonderry. This he found difficult. Instead he sought to divert attention to Lord Durham, whom he accused of applying the

-
1. Raine MS. 6.f.112. Thompson is described as a Conservative in Bean op.cit. p.170. Perhaps he was a 'moderate' Reformer.
 2. Hansard's Parl. Debates. Vols. 3-11. Several references; Raine MS 6. f.40. Speech at Sunderland, 16th July, 1832. For details of Thompson's career see Chapter 2. pp.
 3. Raine MS. 6.f.43.

smooth running machine of his local interest at Sunderland on behalf of his brother-in-law, Captain Barrington, one of the other candidates.¹

The Durham Chronicle, on 20th July, had referred to the reports spread by Thompson's political workers that Sunderland was to become Lord Durham's 'close borough.' It countered these smears by asserting that out of the whole electorate of Sunderland, over 2000, a mere fifty could be influenced by Lord Durham to vote as he wished, and that he would never use, let alone abuse, this power. This is certainly consonant with Durham's own avowals. It is true that there were some instances of the agents of Lord Durham having furthered the efforts of Hedworth Lambton, and Sir Hedworth Williamson in the Northern Division of the County, and ^{of} Captain Barrington at Sunderland. But there is no proof that this toil ever had the sanction, let alone direction, of Lord Durham himself. Again we are in the land of the indefinite.

Captain Barrington was not, despite being a Junior Lord of the Admiralty, indebted to his father-in-law, Grey,² for any influence or aid. Barrington seems to have been left largely on his own. He was not himself a very strong or inspiring candidate.

1. Raine MS. 6. f.111.

2. The Honourable George Barrington had married Caroline, daughter of the second Earl Grey, on 15th January, 1827.

3. Even though he was returned.

and was dilatory in his canvassing, despite being one of the first in the running. Recurrent ill health was a major factor in this negligence. His candidacy was probably not distasteful to the Tory Bishop of Durham, for Barrington had been Cursitor since 1818. Indeed, he was the great nephew of Shute Barrington, Bishop of Durham 1791-1826, and the brother of the Honourable William Keppel Barrington, High Sheriff for the County Palatine of Durham 1820-27.¹ As the Steward of all the Bishop's copyhold manors, he derived a yearly salary from the See of Durham.² He was probably swept into Parliament by a tide in which Whig and Reform ardour was combined with local affection for the Lambtons.

Barrington

The addresses of both ~~he~~ and Sir William Chaytor were brimming with platitudes, and utterly destitute of precise terms as to how the stimulants of the Whigs, such as the reduction of unnecessary taxation and the mitigation of the harshness of criminal laws, which they both advocated, were to be accomplished.

The fourth candidate, Mr. David Barclay, was lulled into a sense of false security by his marriage ties with the Williamsons who had resided in the neighbourhood for two hundred years.⁴ As was advertised in certain election squibs, Barclay had been Member for the notorious rotten borough of Penryn, from 12th June

1. The Honourable William Keppel Barrington, had married the fourth daughter of Lord Ravensworth in 1823. In 1829 he became Viscounty Barrington of Ardglass.

2. Bean, op.cit. p.174.

3. D.C. 15th June, 1832.

4. Ibid. 10th August, 1832. To the Electors of Sunderland and the Wearmouths.

1826 until 1830, and had been heavily involved in the bribery and corruption which had abounded in that Cornish constituency. Now Barclay was seeking to return to Parliament, allegedly through the influence of his brother-in-law, Sir Hedworth Williamson and his agents, which was supposedly suspended heavily over the Williamson tenants and dependents on the Monkwearmouth shore.¹ Such intimidatory practices had not been abolished by the Reform Bill, and would not lapse until the Ballot Act of 1872.

His relationship with Williamson was no advantage to Barclay. The result of the first election for the Borough of Sunderland was the return, on 12th December, of Sir William Chaytor and the Honourable Captain George Barrington with 697 and 525 votes respectively. Barclay polled 404², while Thompson was last with 392, from an electorate of 1,378. But Barrington was not long a Member for Sunderland, for he accepted the Stewardship of the Chiltern Hundreds, and a new writ was issued on 25th March, 1833.³

Thus in the City and Boroughs of Durham the Whigs had carried all before them, and were awaiting with confidence the outcome in the new Northern and Southern Divisions of the County,⁴ of which the former was distinguished chiefly for its manufactures, and

1. Raine MS. 6 f.87. 8th December, 1832. 'Investigator.'

2. Dur. 3/150. f.17; Bean op.cit. pp.170, 1168.

3. Bean op.cit. p.170.

4. Statutes at Large. Vol.XXX.p.158, para.XIV.pp.341-2. 2 and 3 William IV Cap.45.

the latter, for its agricultural complexion.¹ The new boundaries had been defined by a further Act of 1832, so that Norhamshire, Islandshire, Bedlingtonshire and Craike were no longer included electorally in the County of Durham, but transferred to the Northern Division of Northumberland, except for Craike, which was to be added to the North Riding of Yorkshire.² Of the old political County of Durham the new Northern Division approximated to the wards of Chester and Easington, with polling places at Durham itself, Sunderland, Lanchester, Whickham, Chester-le-Street and South Shields. In the Southern Division votes were to be taken at Darlington, Stockton, Bishop Auckland, Stanhope, Middleton in Teesdale, Barnard Castle and Sedgfield, all in the wards of Darlington or Stockton.³

Behind the provision of several polling places in separate parts of counties had lain Lord Durham's ambition to abolish the need for so much to be spent on the transport to and maintenance in the County town, (the sole venue of the poll,) of whole bevvies of freeholders. But he had admitted that the setting up of so many polling places would in itself be costly, if only in the payment of salaries to the poll clerks and agents required.⁴

Of the Members who had been returned for the County in May, 1831, it was obvious that Mr. Russell, probably for reasons of ill health, would not be standing again. He formally retired on

1. B.M. (Printed.) 8135c.1. f.6. pp.1-2.

2. Statutes at Large. Vol.XXX p.304.para.VI. 2 and 3 William IV cap. 64. 11th July, 1832.

3. Statutes at Large. op.cit.

4. B.M. (Printed.) 8135c.1. f.8. pp.11-21.

11th June, 1832.¹ Sir Hedworth Williamson, on the other hand, although his popularity and reputation had suffered grievously over the Sunderland Docks controversy,² had no hesitation in offering himself as a candidate for the Northern Division.³ The strident Durham Chronicle began to turn reluctantly towards him, after having vilified him previously for his pushfulness in the Docks row.⁴ They had hoped for the candidature of some other Reformer, but since no such person was even on the horizon, they threw their weight behind Williamson, rather than behind the apparently only possible alternative, Sir Henry Hardinge,⁵

Again prospects of Sir Henry returning to the political arena of Durham faded. In reply to a requisition from Sunderland, which contained signatures from Seaham, South Shields and the City of Durham,⁶ he announced on 15th August that he had already canvassed and pledged himself to stand for the new Borough of Launceston, into which his old seat of Newport had been merged. Had it come earlier, he would have accepted the invitation of these requisitionists, many of whom had actually been favourable to Parliamentary Reform.⁷

1. D.A. 15th June, 1832. p.393.

2. See Chapter 2. pp.89-94.

3. D.A. 22nd June, 1832. p.401.

4. See Chapter 2. pp.89-94.

5. D.A. 14th September, 1832.

6. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4035. pp.26-7. From the Newcastle Journal, 11th August, 1832.

7. Ibid. pp.29-30. To the Freeholders, Copyholders and other Electors of the Northern Division.

And so Williamson was able to make a 'Triumphal and Glorious Entry into the Town of Sunderland' on 5th September, without any fears of his position collapsing before the extremely capable and politically weather beaten Hardinge.¹ But as Sir Hedworth had so recently been an outcast to so many, he was, from the length and content of his address, leaving nothing to chance. It was his hope that the Reform Bill would be revised, as he thought that many of its provisions did not go far enough. But the only defect which he actually cited was the fact that a man could still be visited with harmful consequences for voting as he wished. Williamson, however, did not demand or even suggest the institution of the ballot, although he was doubtless thinking along these lines, or deliberately but understandably trying to ingratiate himself with the electorate. Probably the latter is nearer the truth, if he had indeed been exerting his power as a landlord to help his brother-in-law at Sunderland.

At his election meetings² Williamson looked to a moderate Reform of the Church, preceded by an investigation by a Government Commission of its ills. To his mind one of the most glaring of these was the vast differences in income among the Bishops, some of whom received sums 'fit for Princes! This was a direct thrust at the Bishop of Durham. In addition Williamson wished to see the clergy paid by other means than tithes, which were particularly

1. Raine MS. 6.f.60.

2. Raine MS. 5. f.60; Raine MS. 6. f.60; D.C. 7th September, 1832

injurious to enterprise and labour.¹

The other Reform candidate, Hedworth Lambton, was more forthright and scornful in his criticism of the Church, and was to draw against him 'the whole strength of corrupt and ecclesiastical power' of the College, Durham, as his illustrious brother had done in 1820.² Lambton constantly sounded a personal and family note which must have been of enormous value to him, particularly in that half of the County. He reminded his audience at Sunderland, on 3rd September, that men of that town 'as champions of the rights of British subjects...placed the banner (of independence) in the hands of my brother, and gave to the Tories the most signal defeat they ever sustained...' No doubt the College and their allies were only further inflamed at the repeated proclamation of what must have been, to them, a painful interpretation of fairly recent political history.³ Nor could they have relished Lambton's contrived emotionalism that he felt he approximated to his brother in zeal, honesty, purpose, and 'in point of ardent attachment to those great principles which have been the distinguishing characteristics of his whole political life'.⁴

Against Williamson and Lambton there hovered Edward Braddyll who, like Gresley and Trevor before him, tried desperately to

1. Raine MS. 5. f.60.

2. D.C. 7th September, 1832.

3. Ibid.

4. Raine MS. 5. f.60.

by-pass, and then to reject the thesis that he was the creature of Lord Londonderry. This was a herculean task, (he fought a duel with Williamson over it,¹) especially as the Durham Chronicle spread gleefully the report that Braddyll had come forward as the result of a conclave held at Seaham. This held that, under the presidency of the Marquis of Londonderry himself, there had conferred Mr. Gregson, his lordship's agent, Mr. Trevor and Mr. Leybourne, Agent for the College.² Also the rumours were only too rife that his father, Colonel Braddyll, had advanced £17,000 to the Marquis of Londonderry to help him build his harbour at Seaham, and that the younger Braddyll and his partners were the largest shareholders in the Hartlepool Railway and Dock Company.³ These assumptions, whatever their accuracy or otherwise, were seized upon by those hungry literary birds of prey, the anti-Londonderry and anti-College pamphleteers. The result was that Braddyll was ^{from} ~~for~~ being endeared to a majority of the electors of the Northern Division of the County in the Sunderland area.

From the first Braddyll's campaign was a safe indulgence in the familiar shibboleths of the necessity for improvements in the penal code, the abolition of Slavery, cuts in taxes, and economy and removal of abuses in all departments of State.⁴ - an attempt to out-Whig the Whigs, without making absolute or precise

1. Raine. MS. 5 f.5; D.C. 5th October, 1832.

2. D.C. 31st August, 1832.

3. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4^o35. 5th September, 1830. A Freeholder pp.67-9.

4. D.C. 12th October, 1832.

commitments. But he had to thread his way carefully through the treacherous bogs of Reform and Church. And he had somehow to accommodate his natural desire to win popularity and votes with a modicum of docility to Londonderry and the College.

At first he kept uttering a cry for 'moderate reform', which would yet preserve intact 'all the blessings of our glorious institutions',¹ an equivocation much resorted to by Tory candidate at this time. But on 16th December, at the close of the second day's poll, he asserted that the Act embodying the Reform Bill was 'so inefficient, so incomplete, that the very first act of the new Parliament must be to reform the bill which brought it into existence!'² Many may have been alarmed by the ambiguity implicit in these words, especially since Dr. Fenwick, in proposing Sir Hedworth Williamson, had urged that every candidate who had not been in Parliament previously be asked this pertinent question, "How would you have acted upon the Reform Bill, if you had been a Member of the House of Commons when that measure was before it?" Again, Braddyll's belated recognition of abuses within the Church was probably contrasted with his 'firm and uncompromising' friendship with the Church.³

Perhaps like many Durham candidates of the early and middle nineteenth century, and later, he found that he came nearest to

1. Raine MS. 6. f.56.

2. Ibid. 5. f.62

3. Ibid. f.58. Speech on 15th December, 1832.

losing his balance when attempting the economic juggling trick with the trinity of the agricultural, commercial and manufacturing interests. He dared not over concentrate on any one of these. Thus at Sunderland, on 11th September, he wished to see 'the farmer enjoy his hard - earned profits, the landlord receive a fair rent, and the poor and labouring classes of the community cheap and wholesome bread....'¹

When the candidates for the Northern division entered the Town Hall, Durham, on 15th December, little surprise was caused by the identity of those accompanying them. Thus Sir Hedworth Williamson, proposed by Dr. Fenwick and seconded by Colonel Mills, was also attended by W.C. Harland, Member for the City, and by Edward Shipperdson. Mr. Hedworth Lambton was nominated by John Bowes, of Streatlam Castle, a candidate for the Southern Division of the County, and seconded by Mr. J. Cookson, of White Hall. With them were Mr. R.J. Lambton, Mr. W.R.C. Chaytor, Member for the City, and Addison Fenwick, Returning Officer for Sunderland. Mr. Edward Braddyll was sponsored by Mr. John Pemberton of Sherburn, a leading local Tory, and by Mr. W.T.Greenwell of Greenwell Ford. With them, significantly, was Mr. J. Watson, one of Lord Londonderry's Election Agents. His presence would seem to remove any lingering doubts as to who was one of Braddyll's main sponsors.

Braddyll, like other Tory candidates in this election, attached too much hope to the damp squib of furnishing details.

1. Raine MS. 6. f.56.

of the salaries of the Whig Cabinet Ministers, and trying to prove how inconsistent these were with the condemnation by the Whigs of exorbitant expenditure. Indeed Braddyll's attack upon the Whig boroughmongering system followed the pattern set by the distribution, as early as September, 1832, of 'Williamson and Lambton's Grey List', which had given the offices and salaries of Grey's relatives in the Government.¹

Such ~~tactics~~ ^{attacks} were not conducive to Mr. Braddyll's electoral success, as is seen by the final figures on Wednesday, 19th December, after two days of polling, although it may have won him some votes.

	<u>Lambton</u>	<u>Williamson</u>	<u>Braddyll</u>
Durham	439	357	443
Chester	558	424	258
Sunderland	598	397	512
Whickham	531	612	153
Lanchester	243	215	200
South Shields	189	177	110
	<u>2558</u>	<u>2182</u>	<u>1676</u> ²

The number of Plumpers and Split Votes is also known:

	<u>Lambton</u>	<u>Plumpers</u> <u>Williamson</u>	<u>Braddyll</u>
Durham	12	4	317
Chester	37	7	130
Sunderland	56	20	324
Whickham	7	42	65
Lanchester	18	11	135
South Shields	6	4	66
	<u>136</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>1037</u> ^x

173

1. Raine MS. 5. f.40. 'Scrutator!'

2. Dur. 3/150. f.22; D.C. 21st December, 1832; Poll Book.

	<u>Splits</u>			<u>Total Polled</u>
	<u>B. & L.</u>	<u>B. & W.</u>	<u>L. & W.</u>	
Durham	100	26	326	785
Chester	116	12	405	707
Sunderland	175	17	364	956
Whickham	21	67	503	705
Lanchester	43	22	182	411
South Shields	27	17	156	276
	<u>482</u>	<u>161</u>	<u>1936</u>	<u>3840</u> ¹

As the Durham Advertiser emphasized, Braddyll had thus 1037 plumpers, to 136 of Lambton and 88 of Williamson. The split votes between Lambton and Williamson were 1936. Yet all talk of coalition between them had been denied indignantly. The Advertiser also showed that Braddyll had exceeded Sir Thomas Clavering's number of plumpers in the 1761 County Election, which at 942, out of an electorate of 2748, had; until this 1832 contest in the Northern Division, stood as a Durham record. It was also pointed out that Lord Durham, as John George Lambton, had polled, in 1820, no more than 908 plumpers from the 2712 freeholders who had cast their votes.²

Braddyll had been strongly supported in Sunderland and in the City of Durham, the latter being the one/^{section} where he came top of the poll. Presumably the agents of the College had been on their usually efficient mettle. However, Lambton led by over a hundred

-
1. D.A. 22nd December, 1832. p.207; Bean gives the plumpers for Lambton, Williamson and Braddyll respectively as 138, 87 and 1038, and the splits, from left to right, as 481, 159, and 1937. Bean op. cit. p.102.
 2. D.A. 22nd December, 1832. p.207; See pp. 198, 362 of this work.

from the next candidate in his own territory at Chester, while Williamson's low poll for Sunderland must be attributed to his still considerable unpopularity there over the Docks.

The end of this struggle afforded another illustration that the turbulence which had punctuated so many elections to the unreformed House of Commons had certainly not been allayed by the fruition of the First Reform Bill. Indeed, both the Durham Advertiser and the Durham Chronicle complained of rowdiness on the declaration of the poll. But each blamed the ever present bullies of the other side.¹

The Durham Chronicle described, how, before the result of the election was announced in Durham, the Court was 'packed with red freemen, who were made drunk for the purpose of interrupting the proceedings....Every effort to preserve order was rendered abortive; and all the proceedings were conducted in dumb show. Some of the Tory electioneering agents were observed to be actively engaged in encouraging the drunken brutes to continue their clamour;.....'²

The plying of voters and their friends with liquor had, of course, become an art at Durham as elsewhere. Many candidates and agents had no compunction in seeing that their supporters had an abundance of this refreshment. Nor was it unknown for a

1. D.A. 22nd December, 1832. p.207

2. D.C. 28th December, 1832.

surfeit of alcohol to be administered to those in the opposite camp to render them incapable of voting.

The most disgraceful display was reserved for Sir Hedworth Williamson's victory appearance. Showers of stones were hurled at 'the blue party' by ruffians who, claimed the Durham Chronicle, had been engaged by some of Braddyll's agents. Williamson himself having narrowly missed being struck on the head, was at length persuaded to leave the open window from which he was trying to speak. But his followers, after arming themselves with stones, charged the Braddyllites, pressed them back, and then proceeded to shatter the windows of the Waterloo Hotel with their missiles.¹ Such was the free for all in which pent up feelings were able to overspill.

In the Southern Division of the County the venom of the Chronicle was expended on Robert Duncombe Shafto, aged twenty six, the eldest son of Mr. R.E.D. Shafto, and grandson of that Robert Shafto who had been so manifest in the machinations of the second Earl of Darlington. When the youthful Shafto became a candidate on 7th June, 1832, he applauded the comprehensive nature of the First Reform Bill. Indeed his address could have been devised or plagiarised by Hedworth Lambton or Williamson, so plentiful was it with typical Whig fundamentals such as 'the reduction of unnecessary expenditure!'²

1. D.C. 28th December, 1832.

2. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4035. pp.6-7. From the Durham Chronicle 1st June, 1832.

Although on 17th August Shafto's Committee, besides making these pledges, affirmed their candidate's agreement with Church Reform, including the commutation of tithes, by the 31st August. the same newspaper had begun to ask seriously whether Mr. Shafto was dissembling. It stated that he had gained the sympathy of the Tory Bishop of Durham, of all people.¹ However, on 3rd September Mr. Shafto denied this energetically, as he was to do throughout the contest, and went so far as to say that he considered the Marquis of Londonderry to be against him. He insisted that he was inimical to the abuses conspicuous in the Church, and promised that he would urge the reform of its pluralities and sinecures.²

On the following day he issued a statement in which he declared he was in favour of a fixed duty regarding the Corn Laws. But this must secure the farmer a fair price for his corn; thus wheat should never be sold at less than 8/- a bushel (64/- a quarter.) But many indirect taxes must be reduced, and the East India/^{Company} Monopoly ended. He also wished to see a Factory Act on the statute book. But none of this shook the Durham Chronicle from its quarry. It reminded Shafto of the anti-clerical and anti-aristocratic sentiments he had expressed at the great Reform Meeting at Durham the previous November, and insisted that he was

1. D.C. 31st August, 1832.

2. Ibid. 7th September, 1832. Even the Durham Chronicle later considered that Shafto had been abandoned by Londonderry. D.C. 28th December, 1832.

now the nominee of the Bishop and the Marquis of Londonderry. Throughout this contest the Chronicle was to attack Shafto the more uncompromisingly and viciously because he was, it represented a turncoat and a traitor to his former beliefs.¹

On the 19th November more divulgements were made by the Durham Chronicle. The Hunwick tenants of Mr. Matthew Bell, the former Member for Northumberland, and now candidate for the Southern Division of that County, 'are to be given to Mr. Shafto by "command"...' In fact Mr. Leybourne, a political agent of the College, was reputedly busy procuring plumpers for Shafto. For the Dean and Chapter were said to be confident that Shafto, if elected, would do nothing towards implementing, even half heartedly, his promise of support for the truncation of such anomalies in the Church as had been brought to light by Whig candidates.²

As a rejoinder Shafto and his helpers gave the names of his Central Committee, which included a number of unimpeachable Whigs and Reformers. There were R.J. Lambton, uncle of Lord Durham, J.D. Nesham of Blackwell, Edward Shipperdson of Durham, and Colonel R.W. Mills, J. Fawcett, a friend of Sir Hedworth Williamson, Sir Robert Eden,³ and Colonel Tower, the son-in-law of Mr. Baker of Elemore.⁴ It is hard to determine just how Tory or how Whig

-
1. D.C. 28th September, 1832; 5th November, 1831; 19th & 26th October, 1832. Shafto has been described as a Liberal in Bean op.cit. p.106.
 2. D.C. 9th November, 1832.
 3. Eldest son of Sir John Eden, Member for the County of Durham 1774-90, Sir Robert had devised, by will, dated 14th April, 1815 much of his property to Shafto's father. - Fordyce op.cit. Vol.1. p.577.
 4. D.C. 9th November, 1832.

Shafto was, so keen was he to run with the College hare and hunt with the Reform hounds. It was probably this being all things to all men which debilitated him as far as votes were concerned.

A younger candidate than Shafto, in fact the most youthful in any Durham election of 1832, was John Bowes of Streatlam and Gibside, who reached his majority on Tuesday, 19th June, 1832. He was the reputed son of the tenth Earl of Strathmore, who had died soon after his marriage to John's mother, which had taken place too late for the boy to be legitimised.¹ This Earl of Strathmore, elected a representative peer of Scotland in 1796, 1802, and 1807, had been created Baron Bowes, of Streatlam Castle, in the County Palatine of Durham, and of Lunedale in the County of York. His father, the ninth earl, had been the first husband of Mary Eleanor, daughter of George Bowes, Member for the County from 1727 until 1760, whose great grandson John thus was.

John Bowes had claimed the Scottish Peerage without success, but, by his father's will, had inherited the large estates of the Bowes family at Gibside, Streatlam Castle and in Yorkshire.² A very rich young man, with agricultural rents from 60,000 acres, and hopes of a handsome income from his coal trade partnership with Lord Ravensworth and others in the Grand Alliance, he had been educated at Eton and Cambridge.³

Although he was unswerving in his loyalty to the changes brought about by the Reform Bill,⁴ his nervousness as a speaker,

1. Arnold op.cit. p.164.

2. Bean op.cit. p.113; Fordyce op.cit.Vol.II. pp.54-5.

3. Arnold op.cit. pp.174-6.

4. Raine. MS.5. f.33.

and his over absorption with/^{the} professional theatre and the collection of pictures and other art treasures rendered him of little practical value to the Whigs, for his heart did not seem to be in politics. Nevertheless he was to represent the Southern Division of the County for fifteen years, and to preside over, 'in John Bowes, Esquire and Partners, one of the most affluent colliery companies in Durham.¹

For his industrial fortune was interlinked with that of the Southern Division, where the River Tees and the Stockton and Darlington Railway had accelerated the supply of imports, and the despatch of coal and other commodities from the South and South West of Durham to Stockton.²

His speeches at Barnard Castle³ and Darlington⁴ on 15th and 20th August were very similar in matter to those of Williamson and Hedworth Lambton. Also his reinforcement at Bishop Auckland on 6th September⁵ of his previous attacks upon the Church were particularly disappointing to the College and to the Durham Tories, who had hoped that he would harmonize with them.

While Bowes was lending his illustrious surname to the cause of Reform, so, Joseph Pease, junior, was working for recognition of the growing importance of commerce in the life of

1. Arnold op.cit. pp.175-7

2. Fordyce's 'History of Coal, Coke and Coal Fields' written later in the nineteenth century, credits Messrs.J.Bowes and Company with about sixteen collieries. The royalties were leased 'from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners and several landed proprietors! Ibid. p.97

3. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4035. p.32.

4. Raine MS. 5. f.35 MS. Speech of Mr. Bowes to the Electors of Darlington.

5. D.C. 7th September, 1832.

the Southern Division of the County. Pease's argument rested very strongly on how splendid his election would be for South Durham industry, commerce and agriculture. Apart from his flair for business, he was overflowing with vitality. Undoubtedly he was one of the most original candidates in the country at this time. The first Quaker to sit in the House of Commons, he was closely associated with George and Robert Stephenson in establishing at Newcastle the first large engine works in the north. He had been one of ^{the} founding fathers of the Stockton and Darlington Railway project. Later he was Treasurer of the Great North of England Railway.¹

Besides being engaged in worsted spinning, Pease and his partners were the proprietors of many coal mines. For example, Mr. William Russell granted a lease of about 4,000 acres in the western part of his estate to Messrs. Pease and Company. From this came Waterhouses Colliery. In February 1830 there began the sinking of St.Helen's, Auckland Colliery by Messrs. Joseph Pease and Partners. After 1832 most of Pease's West collieries were over a large area of the township of Crook.²

Many of Pease's eventual Election Committee were respected and well known in both local commerce and in the coal trade. The Backhouses were examples of such men. Messrs. Backhouse and Company worked and held by lease Coundon Gate Colliery, two miles

-
1. Bean op.cit. pp.119-20; Fordyce - History of Durham. Vol.1. p.480; D.C. 9th November, 1832.
 2. Fordyce - History of Coal, Coke, and Iron Fields. pp.97-8.

east of Bishop Auckland. The greater part of this lease was under the See of Durham. Black Boy, in the same area, had been opened by Jonathan Backhouse, the relation of William and James Backhouse, who were Quakers,¹ as were many of Pease's adherents.

There is little doubt that these Quaker business men, a number of them shareholders in the Stockton and Darlington Railway, had, almost on their own, been able to persuade Pease to enter politics. They were not happy about the prospect of being represented by the untried Bowes and Shafto, and were letting this be known. No doubt for private, as well as for public reasons, they preferred the sharp acumen and business habits of Mr. Pease to those whose qualifications were mainly youth and membership of landed family.² And, of course, to many of them Shafto's political views were suspect, while Pease's insistence that there must be in the House of Commons men who were conversant with the basic principles of business seemed a prime corollary of the abounding industrial wealth around them. But this was not all. Here were men other than landed gentry beating at the door. Why should merchants, businessmen and coal owners be denied places in the political sunlight for want of high ranking gentlemanly name and ancestry, or lack of close association with those who flourished such advantages? Was it right or advisable that the monopoly of

1. Fordyce - History of Coal, Coke and Iron Fields. p.98.

2. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4^o35. Various.

Durham representation by certain landed families should continue to the exclusion of men who were lesser known socially, but who were moving into the very forefront of the beavers of industrial expansion?

From the outset the Durham Chronicle welcomed the numerous overtures to Pease, on whom it smiled ecstatically. This paper applauded his speaking ability, his close acquaintance, as a merchant, with the intricacies of trade, and his familiarity with the landed, mining and commercial lore of his district, particularly since the new Parliament might have to pause long over such agricultural and economic questions. There was also his valuable experience of parliamentary tactics, to seal his testimonials.¹ This had been acquired chiefly by his appearance before Committees over the Stockton and Darlington Railway and other subjects.

on 16th August, Pease, in a message to the Electors of the Southern Division of the County of Durham, accepted the invitation of his eight hundred requisitionists.² He expounded his beliefs, as he was to continue to do in a series of thoughtful and singularly well informed addresses and speeches. He saw the Reform Bill as the beginning of the nation's revival, but only if Parliamentary representatives were prepared to encourage

-
1. Raine MS.5 f.38. Speech of Mr. Pease, at Ferryhill, 6th September 1832; Gough Adds. Durham MS.4035. p.27.
 2. D.A. 17th August, 1832.p.50; Gough Adds. Durham. MS. 4035. pp.37-8.

agriculture, manufactures and commerce alike, and 'to strive to promote the good, and root out the evils in the present system. Finally he promised he would only stand at the approaching election as 'the free and unbought representative of a free and unsold people!

Pease was able to overcome most qualms arising from his being a Quaker, so intent was he on 'the advancement of religion and morality! He also made it clear that to him Christian principles rather than expediency were the only worthy foundation of policy.¹ He then sallied forth on an ambitious and exhaustive campaign, in which he neither shirked difficult subjects nor shrouded his opinions on them in unexceptionable banalities. A study of his speeches conveys an indelible impression of a refreshingly fearless and ingenuous personality.

At Darlington on 20th August² he told an audience of farmers that his property was equally divided between commerce, manufactures and land. Both here, and at Ferryhill on 6th September, he made no secret of his sympathy for landlords and farmers. Here again he was the very opposite of equivocal and ambiguous. To him, although agriculture and commerce were inseparable, the farmer was 'the first and greatest interest of the County! on which thriving manufactures and commerce must be based.³ Pease was

1. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4035. pp. 27-8.

2. Raine MS. 5. f. 36.

3. Ibid. Speech at Ferryhill, 6th September, 1832.

probably at least as aware as Shafto, and apparently much more so than Bowes, of the desire of so many of his would-be constituents for agriculture to be protected against foreign competition. Hence his continued attention to the farmer, who should be given a price of 'something like 7/- or 8/- a bushel' to enable him to cover his costs adequately, although his opponent Shafto had, nearly a month previously, quoted 8/- as his proposed minimum price of a bushel of wheat.¹

Pease's meticulous presentation of the most detailed facts and figures to illustrate his points enabled him to portray how financially handicapped the farmer was by tithes. On 29th November, in a trenchant address to the Farmers of South Durham, Pease asked if the existing tithe system was to persist, and whether leaseholders under Bishops and Deans and Chapters were 'to be always exposed to the infliction of arbitrary rents and ruinous fines!'² For Pease, like all reformers in Durham, was looking more minutely and with ill concealed exasperation at the financial practices and malpractices of a neighbouring Tory stronghold.

Not only as a Quaker, but also as a Whig, did Pease point critically at the defects of the Church. Moreover he disclaimed all wish to have communion with the minister who preferred worldly pursuits to the care of the bodies and souls of his flock. Nor, as a Quaker, did he hesitate to dissociate himself with the

1. Speech at Stockton. Reported in D.C. 28th September, 1832.

2. D.C. 7th December, 1832.

pastimes which were the regular pursuits of the country gentlemen and thus of many parliamentary candidates, of those days. Racing fox hunting, cock fighting, even balls and dinners, were execrable in his eyes, and, as they were totally alien to his principles, not to be indulged in or patronised by him for the sake of gaining votes.¹ Such self-denial, if seemingly intolerant, was indicative of the uncompromising, unflattering, determined and sincere terms in which his speeches were set. Equally typical was his painstaking staff work. In readiness for his visit to Stockton, on 26th September, he had arranged for the circulation of long addresses. These contained allusions to every subject on which he might be expected to speak, including factory reform. His proposal that the lot of the operatives should first be alleviated by the abolition of night labour was the result of his direct consultation with Sadler.²

By the time of his speech at Barnard Castle, on 5th December he was sure that intimidation was being practised by their landlords against many who would otherwise vote for him. This caused him to have second thoughts over his original dislike of the ballot.³ For it was too much to expect of the Reform Bill that it would break landlords of the habit of directing their tenants as to how they should vote. There had been talk of intimidation

1. Raine MS. 5. f.38.

2. D.C. 28th September, 1832.

3. Ibid. 14th December, 1832.

in this election for sometime, not only by great landlords, but by their agents and the lesser gentry. Cuthbert Rippon did indeed confer on his tenants freedom to vote for whom they pleased. But he let it be known that he hoped they would vote for Bowes.¹ There were rumours that the Marquis of Cleveland was restraining those of his tenantry who wished to follow Pease, and that he was ordering them to vote for Bowes and Shafto.² However, not only did the influential Durham Chronicle extol Cleveland, as well as Mr. William Russell, for allowing the tenantry on their estates to vote according to their own judgement, but later correspondence between Mr. Charles Parker, Chairman of Mr. Pease's Committee, and Mr. T. Scarth, who was acting on behalf of the Marquis of Cleveland, then seriously ill, disclosed that the Marquis was ^{al} allegedly ignorant of any element of compulsion being employed by his henchmen. If his sole agent in Teesdale had behaved improperly, in the name of the Marquis, he had done so without the latter's authority,³ according to Scarth.

On the other hand the same Mr. Parker had received a letter, dated 23rd August, from Lord Londonderry, in which that nobleman positively declared he would not support Pease, who was 'the last person in whom I should wish the voters of this division to place their political confidence! Moreover, he would make known his

-
1. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4^o35. p.44. C.Rippon to Joseph Roddam, Stanhope.
 2. D.C. 17th August, 1832. 'An Independent Elector of the Southern Division'; and Editorial.
 3. Ibid. 14th December, 1832.

opinions to his tenantry, but would not interfere with their vote or make use of agents to prejudice, terrify, or seduce! ¹ Pease's helpers felt they could lay little store by the latter promise. Meanwhile Shafto was working prodigiously to recover lost ground, particularly from the time of the nomination meeting at Darlington on 18th December. For a supposed Tory he had in his proposer and seconder, Mr. G. H. Wilkinson and Colonels Mills, respectively two trusted and experienced Reformers. ² But although he made vague promises about following the Reform Bill to its logical conclusions, he would not commit himself by elaborating on the merits of any particular measure. He did, however, join in the popular mood of anti-clericalism by calling for the abolition of pluralities, non-residence and tithes, and the provision of a more appropriate form of remuneration for clergymen. ³ This was weak and watery in contrast with the stronger mixture of harsh statements made against the Church, with special reference to that at Durham, by so many candidates in the North East in 1832.

It was Mr. Pease who attracted the most attention in Darlington on this day. This was not only due to the great number of farmers who helped to escort him from his home at Southend to the hustings, and to a characteristically incisive attack on the Church by his proposer, Cuthbert Rippon, but also because, in his own address, he objected to the union between

1. Gough Adds. Durham MS. 4^o35. pp.59-60.

2. D.C. 21st December, 1832.

3. Raine MS. 5. f.61.

Church and State. He was particularly alarmed at the multitude of livings which the Government had the power of distributing. Yet the Minister responsible for this might be a man of no regard for religion.¹ 'Almost every hand appeared raised' for Pease, when the Under Sheriff, as was his custom, called for a show of hands. There was a considerable demand for Bowes, but very few acclaimed Shafto. This was an ominous sign. However, when the Under Sheriff declared Bowes and Pease, Mr. G.H.Wilkinson insisted on a poll for Shafto.²

The voting lasted two days, Friday and Saturday, 21st and 22nd December, respectively. Pease came top of the poll, with 2273 votes. Bowes was second with 2218, and Shafto last with 1841.³ These votes were distributed as follows:

	<u>Voters.</u>	<u>Pease.</u>	<u>Bowes.</u>	<u>Shafto.</u>
Darlington	759	515	322	313
Stockton	681	440	326	267
Bishop Auckland	810	395	255	544
Stanhope	547	391	396	198
Middleton-in-Teesdale	162	34	153	100
Barnard Castle	664	342	577	172
Sedgefield	371	156	189	247
	<u>3994</u>	<u>2273</u>	<u>2218</u>	<u>1841⁴</u>

1. D. C. 21st December, 1832.

2. Ibid.

3. Dur. 3/150. f.23.

4. D.A. 22nd December, 1832, p.206; Bean op.cit. p.106. Gough Add. Durham MS.4^o 37. Poll Book.

Pease had failed disastrously at Middleton-in-Tees, where possibly, as he had feared, he was shunned and hampered by the very aristocracy, whose support in any case he was determined not to accept, even if it were offered.¹ But he more than bridged this gap by his great following in Darlington and Stockton, whose fortunes, like his own, were derived from both agriculture and industry. Bowes had done best, as expected, in Barnard Castle, which was nearest to Streatlam. He, with Pease, also polled heavily at Stanhope, where Cuthbert Rippon was held in great respect and admiration. Shafto's best performance was also nearest his home terrain, in Bishop Auckland. In plumpers Pease had 729, against 341 and 375 for Bowes and Shafto respectively.² 3 Altogether 3994 had polled in the Southern Division, and, when this is added to the 3840 of the Northern Division, a total of 7834 is achieved. This was almost three times as many as the 2712 freeholders, who voted in the last contested Durham County election of the Unreformed Parliament. That was on the unforgettable occasion of 1820. However the electorate then was probably 4000, while in 1832 for North and South it was 4267 and 4336 respectively.⁴

Pease's impact on his prospective constituents in 1832 was not dimmed with the issuing of any address full of obscure

1. D.C. 21st December, 1832.

2. Pease's Committee had done their utmost to discourage split votes on Bowes or Shafto - Gough Adds. Durham.MS.4^o35. p.53.

3. Bean.op.cit. p.1168.

4. Ibid. p.106.

trivialities and noble, trite but vague sentiments. He looked instead to the day when he should witness 'the general spread of education, the diffusion of knowledge - the increase of that piety ...which dignified humanity, supported the Christian, and exalted the character of the nation! He was still disturbed by the various ways in which persons unnamed had tried to interfere with the free exercise of the franchise.¹ Yet, as the Durham Chronicle proudly declared: 'The combined forces of the Aristocracy and the Church - coercion and artifice - big professions and pitiful compliances - all have failed to seduce the great majority of the Electors from their duty! ² One can only guess to what degree these references were aimed at the Marquis of Londonderry and others, including the clergy, and whether they were levelled at the Marquis of Cleveland at all.

Certainly, no wilful cowing of electors had prevented the return for the Southern Division of two Reformers, one of whom was a man of exceptional calibre and resolve. This result was in keeping with what had happened in the other Durham constituencies. All eight Members were therefully pledged to carrying the Reform Bill further, until other anomalies in Church and State had been removed.

Among the ten Durham Members, there was a balanced assortment of old and new parliamentary families. Resplendent were

1. D.C. 28th December, 1832.

2. Ibid.

the long remembered and honoured names of Lambton and Bowes. Then there were the two Chaytors, father and son, descendants of that baronet who had spent so much of his life in a debtor's prison. Land and property were also present in the person of Cuthbert Rippon, with his estates, and also his riches, which had cascaded chiefly from the ownership of lead mines. In addition, Barrington was the great nephew of a Bishop, the son-in-law of the Prime Minister, and the brother-in-law of probably the most renowned Durham figure of the time. Ingham was a lawyer, and Harland the son of a venerable and venerated old local Reformer. Finally, in Pease was typified the industrious and go ahead 'Captain of industry', whose very strength and appeal rested largely on his freedom from any connection with those landed families who had been preponderant in so much of this history.

For the Lambtons, the Tempests, and the Vanes had left their imprint on the second part of this period as indelibly as they had on the first. The Lambtons held a City seat in unbroken succession from 17th January, 1734 until 22nd November, 1813, the future Lord Durham having been returned for the County on 20th September, 1813. He continued to hold one of the seats until his elevation to the peerage on 18th January, 1828. Even then the direct parliamentary identification of the Lambtons with Durham did not cease, for Hedworth Lambton was returned for the Northern Division on 19th December, 1832.

With their first days as Members having fallen on 23rd April, 1742 and 21st March, 1768, respectively, the John Tempests, senior and junior, were followed in the representation of the City of Durham by Sir Henry Vane-Tempest, but on 28th February, 1800 this intimacy ended with Sir Henry's resignation. Another seven years passed before the dawn of his comparatively short spell as a Durham County Member. This lasted until his death on 1st August, 1813. His brother-in-law, the inexhaustible M.A. Taylor, after a brief acquaintance with the City of Durham from 17th March, 1800 until the summer of 1802, resumed on 18th June, 1818, and consolidated, until May, 1831, that familiarity with the freemen which had first come his way when he was a cadet of the Tempest family. Throughout this 'second term' the prejudices, provocations and apparently measureless industrial resources of his nephew by marriage appalled or

inspired the various segments of Durham political society.

For Lord Londonderry was cast in Durham after 1820 in the role of 'overmighty subject' which had been filled previously by the second Earl of Darlington. It was his lot to taste the bitter cup of defeat over the Reform Bill, and over the loss of what he considered his own seat in the City at the by-election in 1831, and, more seriously, at the General Election of 1832. It was his misfortune that his haughty and overbearing personality, the disdainful presumption with which he pursued his own interests so blatantly, and his anti-Reform axis with the Church at Durham all raised enemies against him from among landlords, freeholders and freemen alike. Above all he seemed to be using habitually his great name, connections and wealth to trespass too far on the preserves of the highly prized comparative electoral independence of the men of Durham. This was a cardinal sin in the North East.

By contrast the Vanes of Raby were more pacific and less restless in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The third Earl of Darlington, later Marquis of Cleveland, was respected and esteemed, especially by the Whigs in Durham, even after he had quarrelled with Grey over their respective attitudes towards Wellington's Government. He was held in still greater regard for the readiness with which he embraced Parliamentary Reform. Moreover, it was to his junction with 'the independent party', and not with the Church, that Oldfield¹ partially ascribed the restful

1. T.H.B. Oldfield - The Representative History of Great Britain and Ireland. Vol.III. p.425.

calm that descended over Durham politics towards the end of the eighteenth century. His Uncles Raby and Frederick had, in turn, carried forward until 1774 their family's occupation of a County seat from July, 1747. His sons, Lord Barnard and Lord William Powlett, were County Members from October 1812 until July, 1815, and from August 1815 until the spring of 1831 respectively ¹.

So the Bowes, Edens and Liddells were much more casual in their appearances at the hustings. But the Lambtons, the Tempests until 1813, (with a break between 1802 and 1807), and then after 1820 in the shape of the successive protégés of Lord Londonderry, and the Vanes, with a gap between 1774 and 1812, all subscribed to a kind of hereditary principle in parliamentary representation. This, however, could never be taken for granted. For candidates from these houses found that this principle was often qualified, and its operation kept within distinct limits, by such outbreaks of robust independence as had compelled the Lambtons to bend and retract in 1813.

Certainly in neither City nor County could it be said that an easy passage to Westminster was always and inevitably assured without unremitting attention to the wishes of the electors. The not infrequent scenes of brutality and violence in the streets of Durham, and in the Town Hall, at election times, were indications of two large and remarkably 'open' constituencies, in which the Government had no direct influence.

1. See appendices A and B. pp. 506-14.

also
Here/it was often expedient to respond fairly freely to public opinion. It was quite usual for candidates to pose as the protectors of the 'independence' of the City or County, or of the rights of the freemen or freeholders. Indulgence in such widely approved expressions was sometimes a sign that the rank and file of the country gentlemen, often with a Lambton at their helm, were viewing with great trepidation the encroachment of some great aristocrat, like the second Lord Darlington or Lord Londonderry. Hence the anxiety over any family, even the Lambtons, straddling at the same time both branches of Durham representation.

Yet the political history of City and County in the second half of this period was similar in at least one way to what had gone before. It was still all very much a matter of being represented fairly constantly by men from these county families, whether they were the Lambtons, Tempests and Vane-Tempests, and Vanes, or the Bowes, Edens, Liddells and others. This was true of the City nearly as much as it was of the County. For Lambtons, Tempests (Sir Henry Vane-Tempest for the County) and Liddells are found among the lists of both City and County members.

Of all Durham representatives from the accession of George III until the end of 1832, only eight, six for the County and two for the City, were not substantial landed gentry from families of local repute and some antiquity. Of the six, M.A. Taylor later settled in the City of Durham, and thereby rid himself of the psychological and physical

handicap of non-residence. Richard Wharton, although the grandson of a City tradesmen, found the law his first stepping stone to Government service, while Sir Henry Hardinge, the son of a West Durham clergyman, held a fine war record. Yet, of these three, Taylor owed his introduction to Durham to his kinship by marriage with the Vane-Tempests, while the other two had this family's interest behind them in 1820, and, in the case of Wharton, probably earlier. Sir Roger Gresley and the Honourable Arthur Trevor were both landed aristocrats who hailed from other parts of the country, and it is probable that neither would have made any impact on Durham, or could have even contemplated doing so, but for their being Lord Londonderry's standard bearers.

Of the others, W.C. Harland relied upon his solid roots in the City, of which his father had achieved the freedom, and on his sincerity and volubility as a Reformer. Rowland Burdon and Joseph Pease were the only two County or City members to come forward primarily as businessmen. Burdon had the backing of the gentry because he was such a tireless local benefactor and guardian of the coal trade, while although Pease 'could not accept' the support of the aristocracy, 'even if it were tended',¹ and contemned the leisure pursuits of this class, he often cited his own widespread holdings of land, and described agriculture as 'the first and greatest interest of the country'.²

1. D.C. 21st December, 1832.

2. Raine MS. f.36. Speech at Ferryhill, 6th September, 1832.

Men from county families often entered politics and the House of Commons at a very early age. Here again accepted practice in Durham was no different from the norm in other parts of the country. Many examples may be quoted. Suffice only to mention John Hedworth, George Bowes and his great-grandson John, Robert Shafto, both John Tempests, W.H. and J.G. Lambton, and many of the Vanes.

Their continued predominance, and that of their elders, in local politics, may be explained somewhat by the many occasions on which there was no resort to a poll. After 1760 there were, in the City, seven contested elections, and seven times when voting was necessary at a by-election. Among these admittedly were the tense confrontations of 1761, 1813 and 1830. But at three consecutive uncontested elections, those of 1806, 1807 and 1812, the same two men, one Whig and the other Tory, were returned. During the same period 1761-1832, a poll was taken in the County in only five instances, with the decisions of 1832 in both divisions being counted as one. The most signal electoral battle was that of 1820, notable for its polemical and political savagery.

Why was there such a dearth of contests? It is true that from 1771 to about 1806 there was little or no evidence of the Bishop or his clergy dabbling with politics. Egerton, at any rate, had drawn salutary conclusions from the lessons of 1760-2. This was also a time when the tempers of Tyne and Wear coal owners were fairly cool. Then there was this tendency towards heredity in the representation,

and the fact that the political temperature in Durham, even as far as Whigs and Tories were concerned, did not rise very appreciably, despite the French Revolution, before about 1812. It may well be, however, that we should turn the microscope of our curiosity to the inflation in election costs. Here was probably what caused contests between 1760 and 1832 to be held so irregularly, in Durham as in other counties and large boroughs.

Many prospective candidates and members gave way before this stumbling block, if only because in Durham the increase in the population, and thus of the number of electors who had to be treated, was not accompanied by any lessening of the traditional northern stubbornness and forthrightness. There had been the impossibility of finding a suitable replacement to Rowland Burdon when the prospect of his retirement from the County had first shaken the freeholders in 1801.¹ R.J.Gowland had ostensibly given up his bid for the City in 1813 for lack of cash,² while George Allan³ and M.A.Taylor⁴ had, in 1818 and 1831 respectively, felt unable to try to renew their representation of that constituency for the same reason. Allan, of course, had endured the marathon of 1813.⁵

It has already been shown how Lord Durham's survival and decisive victory in 1820 had cost him £30,000.⁶

1. See Chapter 6. p.292.

2. See Chapter 7. p.320.

3. Ibid. p.326.

4. See Chapter 9. p.426.

5. See Chapter 7. pp.317-24.

6. See Chapter 8. p.363.

Lord Londonderry also must have dug deep into his coffers on behalf of Hardinge, Gresley and Trevor in turn. He and the cathedral clergy were alleged by Mr. William Russell to have frittered away £30,000 when they tried to install Hardinge in a County seat in 1831. This was after £5,000 had been dangled by Londonderry before the startled Colonel Chaytor to the same end. ¹

For County elections could be notoriously expensive. Freeholders, like freeman, still expected candidates to pay court to them with meat and drink and other favours. ² Richard Wharton in 1820 and Sir Hedworth Williamson in 1831 ³ had both had to insist on financial aid before entering the fray. When the results of the Reform Bill were put to the test it was found that the prohibitions necessarily imposed by their relative impecuniosity on the number of possible candidates had not been dispelled by Act of Parliament. Election costs had definitely not fallen. Mr. Pease and his partners were said to have spent £12,000 a month in their campaign in 1832. Although we owe this information to the pen of an anonymous writer, ⁴ there can be no doubt as to the authenticity of John Bowes' declaration in 1841 that his election expenses in 1832 and 1841 together exceeded £30,000. ⁵ Yet in 1761 William Hugall had been in charge, for Lord Darlington, of a mere £3,280 to be spent on the county election of that year. ⁶

1. See Chapter 9. p.430.

2. See Chapter 8. p. 350

3. See Chapter 9. p.427

4. D.C. 30th November, 1832.

28th October, 'A Darlington Elector'.

5. Bean op.cit. p.106n.

6. See Chapter 5. p.205.

This steep ascent in the price of a contest led to fewer families, and groups being able to face such a prospect. So in the scrimmage for seats or its absence, the less wealthy families had to surrender all claims, or to come together in larger associations under the leadership of the wealthier. This surely goes far to explain why the Lambtons, the Tempests and Vane-Tempests, the Vanes of Raby and the Church at Durham, were the pace makers and certainly first ranking electoral magnates in the early nineteenth century. Close at their heels, and often under their protecting wings, were their young and older relatives, and their trusted lieutenants or toadies, according to one's interpretation.

Is it then just circumstantial evidence that three at least of these powers, the Lambtons, the Tempests and Vane-Tempests, and the Church at Durham were great coal owners, and that the sale of this mineral also eased the task of such as Sir Ralph Milbanke, Sir T.H. Liddell and Mr. William Russell in getting into parliament? Is the chief importance of Durham's mounting coal production the fact that it provided the wherewithal for the more fortunate owners to transform their political ambitions into achievements? Is this one of the shapes into which economics and politics dovetailed in Durham in the later half of this period?

Of these principal coal cum political powers the Church, in the person of Bishop van Mildert, became the whipping boy for blistering invective in speech after

speech from such as Radical Jack, his brother Hedworth Lambton, Cuthbert Rippon, John Bowes and Joseph Pease. The malevolence, contumely and emotionalism with which these attacks were pressed home in Durham was surely but not surprisingly exceptional, and invites further consideration of one of the most conspicuous dissimilarities between parliamentary history in Durham and in other counties. Indeed we return to the forceful and controversial presence in local affairs of the Prince Bishop of Durham and his satraps.

The period under review is one when political parsons were highly fashionable. But were not the Durham clergymen from the Bishop downwards, 'far too much concerned in secular matters, either for their own peace or for the good of religion,'¹ and did not this cause the arrows of verbal resentment fired at these clergy to be the more venomous and wounding? We have seen how parliamentary representation for the City and County Palatine was granted extremely late, because of the aloof and unyielding majesty of individual Bishops of Durham. Then bishop after bishop tried to ensure that, of the four men representing City and County, some at least should be pleasing and conformable to themselves. This habit became particularly marked when Bishop Trevor united, somewhat uncomfortably, with the second Earl of Darlington.

1. Correspondence of Second Earl Grey. Box 18. File 10 f.8. Reverend Edward Grey to Earl Grey.

True, it was the practice for the Church to absent itself from the hustings under and immediately after the prelacy of the prudent Egerton. But this was only temporary. There were at work, before 1820, strong entities which welded themselves with haste and vigour into a holy league for the speedy despatching of young Lambton's menace to them before it matured further. For they saw that complacency and inactivity would only weight the scales further in favour of such firebrand Whigs as John George Lambton, with their mania for a Reform of Parliament, and, in Durham, with their intolerance and disquieting complex towards the Church. So the Dean and Chapter rushed into the political ring as never before, fortified by their growing accumulation of property, enlarged treasury, and harsh threats as to what might befall any of their tenants and employees who dared to swerve from the chosen electoral path.

Their carriage at this time and afterwards, their consorting with Lord Londonderry and his vassal of the moment, and the doom laden prophesyings of van Mildert as to the outcome of Parliamentary Reform were neither forgotten nor forgiven by the Whigs and Reformers. Rather were the Durham Chronicle and flocks of anonymous pamphleteers able to present the Church at Durham as trying to hold back men from enjoying what politically was due to them - however garbled and distorted at times such an image may have been. This was a feud that could

not be ended easily, especially as it became obvious that had Lambton gone under in 1820 he would probably never have been able to have set the mighty issue of Parliamentary Reform before the nation. Nor would he have been able by vision and sheer force of will to have seen the Bill safely home, if he had still been in the shadows in 1831.

The unique nature of the Church at Durham, its opulence and the still formidable number of appointments to key offices at its command, were constantly stressed. Nor were local lampoonists, often hiding behind anonymity, the only illuminaries. We have, for example, the declaration of Bishop Shute Barrington himself, on his public entry into the County on 4th August, 1791:

'I am too well aware how much the civil and ecclesiastical interests of this palatinate and diocese depend on the peculiar powers vested in the arduous station which I have the honour to hold....' This was in reply to the welcoming speech of Dr. Sharp, the Sub-Dean. ¹ Then there was the extract from Cobbett's Register, ² included in the Durham Chronicle of 12th October, 1832. This stated that the Bishop 'is a sort of sovereign prince here.' It went on to describe something of his pomp, detailing his Court of Registry, and 'all manner of offices such as belong to royal dominion and revenue.' There were also allusions to the Dean and Chapter, with their royalties from coal and lead mines, and their rents from land.

1. Gentlemen's Magazine Vol. 61 July-December, 1791. pp. 695-6.

2. 6th October, 1832.

For the economic and financial foundations of the Church at Durham, ever more stable and healthy, were, to the minds of the Radical Jacks, the other great clerical cancer in their midst. Sykes, in his study of Church and State in the eighteenth century,¹ has shown that while the net income of the See of Canterbury, based upon an average of three years ending in 1831, was estimated at £19,182, that of Durham at £19,066, was very little behind. This contrasted eloquently with £13,929 for London, £12,629 for York and £11,151 for Winchester, all over a similar period. Little wonder that the writer of an article on Van Mildert, 'the last Bishop of Durham to exercise the palatine dignities,' tells us that 'his income was princely.'²

That the See of Durham was so handsomely endowed and fructified must be traced very largely to the more painstaking and observant financial husbandry which began, at the latest, in the time of Bishop Egerton. His episcopacy had, for instance, seen an increase in fines paid by lessees, while the movement towards short-term leases may be discerned under his predecessor, Richard Trevor. These trends had continued under the fairly long reign of Shute Barrington 1791 - 1826, and were supplemented by much the same kinds of financial asperity under the Dean and Chapter.³

1. Sykes op.cit. p.409, quoting Report of Ecclesiastical Commission appointed to enquire into the ecclesiastical revenues of England and Wales, issued 1835.

2. D.N.B. Vol.58. pp.133-4.

3. Hughes op.cit. pp.322-9.

Witness how Lord Londonderry handed over £44,266:12:10d to the Dean and Chapter for the renewal of his Rainton coal lease in 1831.¹ Yet all this attention to pecuniary fundamentals only left the Church more open to the incursions of those to whom it was a worldly wolf lurking in the clothing of a saintly sheep.

Much of the anti-clericalism of Radical Jack and so many of the Durham Members and candidates in the eighteen twenties and thirties stemmed from their insight into, and often their personal experience or knowledge of, the more exacting insistence on their rights as landlords by these clergymen and their advisers. For the resentment and wrath evoked by their grasping methods provided the Lambtons and other lay scorpions with the poison for their constant flow of stinging allusions to the clergy.

Thus the interplay of politics, religion and industry and commerce never receded far from the stage of parliamentary representation in Durham. This was also a period and a part of England in which great industrial empires were built and expanded, production figures persistently overtaken, and the crop of monetary plenty reaped and added to ever more rapidly by a gentlemanly and usually landed few. No wonder many local issues often arose from such men and their native townspeople endeavouring to improve their resources, frequently in competition with one another. No wonder Members of Parliament and candidates took sides over these issues,

1. See Chapter 2, p. 77; D.C. 23rd July, 1831.

as over the political and time hallowed Church in their midst, to which also none could be blind or indifferent.

Yet, these local issues notwithstanding, here, as elsewhere, men of family wanted to get into Parliament primarily for the sake of being there. They did not relish being left out of the five hundred and more choice places of the political world. Admittedly peculiarities of Durham that have already been noticed were merged into the nature of that parliamentary representation. Candidates came to dwell more emphatically on their thorough knowledge of Durham's agricultural, commercial and landed interests, their residence and stake in that County, and in some cases on their own business training and acumen. So outsiders were openly discouraged and practically non-existent.

Not only were seats in the balance, but so were those positions at the top of the pyramid of local society, of which seats were the very lifeblood. Also, membership of the Commons was indispensable for any effective defence of the coal trade from within, and for a prompt start in those intrigues among themselves to which so many coal owners resorted. Here are the two faces of Durham representation. The Lambtons and the Tempests, and so many of their kind, were not only thriving industrialists, but also, and perhaps chiefly, influential and often prosperous country gentlemen, with natural parliamentary ambitions, and with their fortunes firmly

invested in their landed estates. Yet again these fortunes had often been derived from the coal trade, which was thus the foster parent of those landed estates, which, in turn were the hallmark of success in industry. So the strands of the web may be followed further, but always in circular fashion.

Surely we cannot doubt that these gentlemen delighted in being of Parliament, so long as they could afford it, and so long as they did not have to spend heavily too frequently to brush off electoral challenges. There have from Tudor days been countless fascinations to attract aspirants to Westminster. The eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries afforded no exception to this. And why should the Durham men, any less than those from Northumberland, Yorkshire, Devon or Cornwall, not enjoy being in London at the time of Parliament? There were great men to wait on, people to meet and gossip with, news to be collected from all parts, digested and retailed by letter and word of mouth for the benefit of one's family, friends and cronies in the North East. Even the most infrequent attender of debate among the Durham Members - and many must have run close for this distinction - could not have been immune from the alluring pleasures and opportunities of life in the very political and social centre of the kingdom.

Many of the representatives of this northern county and its political core, the large and 'open' urban constituency of Durham, were representatives in

name only, as far as what they said or did at Westminster was concerned. On the other hand, there was Radical Jack Lambton, incomparable on a towering peak by himself; there was Charles Talbot, the Lord High Chancellor, the first Lord Darlington,--as he became, a Lord of the Treasury, and his scarcely less well known son, with his close affiliations with the Duke of Newcastle and others. We may also distinguish Richard Wharton, Joint Secretary of the Treasury, M.A. Taylor, a most alert and active parliamentarian, and Sir Henry Hardinge, soldier and administrator. To none of these Members, to neither the lesser known, retiring, home loving, but stout and independent squires, nor to those who chiselled for themselves further afield enviable reputations, not even to Lambton of the Reform Bill were the hearts and votes of the sturdy Durham electors given indiscriminately, irrevocably and unreservedly. Perhaps this also is a vital signpost to an understanding of the varied landscape of Durham politics from and before the County Election of 1675 to and beyond the first fulfilment of Parliamentary Reform in 1832.

APPENDIX A.MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT FOR THE CITY OF DURHAM 1678 - 1832.

Year 1654. Anthony Smith.

Year 1656. Anthony Smith.

27th March, 1678. Sir Ralph Cole, Baronet and John Parkhurst - Cole polled 408; Parkhurst 379 and William Tempest 391, John Turner 187 and William Christian 171. 838 freemen polled.

20th February, 1679. Sir Ralph Cole, Baronet and William Tempest - Tempest polled 571, Cole 515 and William Blakiston 436.

10th September, 1679. William Blakiston and Sir Richard Lloyd - Blakiston polled 514, Lloyd 506 and William Tempest 504.

10th February, 1681. Sir Richard Lloyd and William Tempest.

12th March, 1685. Sir Richard Lloyd and the Honourable Charles Montague.

11th January, 1689. George Morland and Henry Liddell - Morland polled 599, Liddell 407 and William Tempest 278.

3rd March, 1690. William Tempest and George Morland.

30th October, 1695. The Honourable Charles Montague and Henry Liddell.

28th July, 1698. The Honourable Charles Montague and Thomas Conyers - Montague polled 673, Conyers 424 and Henry Liddell 408.

13th January, 1701. The Honourable Charles Montague and Thomas Conyers - Montague polled 590, Conyers 401 and Tempest 300.

1st December, 1701. The Honourable Charles Montague and Sir Henry Belasyse.

24th July, 1702. Sir Henry Belasyse and Thomas Conyers.

14th May, 1705. Sir Henry Belasyse and Thomas Conyers - Belasyse polled 129, Conyers 148 and George Sheffield 73.

10th May, 1708. Thomas Conyers and James Nicholson.

12th October, 1710. Thomas Conyers and Sir Henry Belasyse.

Sir Henry Belasyse was appointed a Commissioner for the affairs of Spain, and, on

15th February, 1712, a new writ was issued. After a short contest Robert Shafto was returned, on 3rd May. Anthony Hall, candidate.

3rd September, 1713. Thomas Conyers and George Baker.

25th January, 1715. Thomas Conyers and George Baker.

27th March, 1722. Charles Talbot and Thomas Conyers - Talbot polled 860, Conyers 654 and James Montague 563.

Mr. Talbot was appointed Solicitor-General, and a new writ was issued on

23rd April, 1726. On 2nd May following he was again returned.

18th August, 1727. Charles Talbot and Robert Shafto - Mr. Shafto died on 21st December, 1728. A new writ was issued on 15th January following. His brother John was elected on 29th January, 1729. 1133 freemen voted - Shafto polled 577, Henry Lambton 553, Mr. Cradock 2, and Sir Thomas Hanmer 1. On the appointment of Charles Talbot to the office of Lord High Chancellor on 29th November, 1733, a new writ was issued on 17th January, 1734, and, on 25th January, Henry Lambton was elected.

29th April, 1734. John Shafto and Henry Lambton.

8th May, 1741. John Shafto and Henry Lambton.

Mr. Shafto died in London, 3rd April, 1742. A new writ was issued on 5th April, and on 23rd April, John Tempest, Senior was elected.

30th June, 1747. Henry Lambton and John Tempest, Senior - Lambton polled 737, Tempest 581 and Robert Wharton 538.

15th April, 1754. John Tempest, Senior and Henry Lambton.

6th April, 1761. John Tempest, senior and Henry Lambton. 1050 freemen voted, being an increase of 212 since the election of 1678. - Tempest polled 705, Lambton 546 and Ralph Gowland 526. Mr. Lambton died suddenly on 26th June, 1761, and the writ was issued on 28th November.

12th December, 1761. Gowland 775 (including 215 recently made honorary freeman) Major General John Lambton 752. Upon a petition by Major General Lambton, the House of Commons on Tuesday, 11th May, 1762, resolved that the 215 made or pretended to be made had no right to vote, and that Major General Lambton was duly elected on a division of the House, 88 against 72. The number of legal freemen who voted was 1312, the greatest number ever polled in Durham.

21st March, 1768. John Lambton and John Tempest, junior.

14th October, 1774. John Tempest, junior and John Lambton - Tempest polled 386, Lambton 325 and Mark Milbanke 248.

11th September, 1780. John Lambton and John Tempest, junior.

3rd April, 1784. John Lambton and John Tempest, junior. General Lambton retired from Parliament in January, 1787, and was succeeded on 9th March by William Henry Lambton.

21st June, 1790. John Tempest, junior, and William Henry Lambton.

Mr. Tempest died on 12th August, 1794, and on 17th October Sir Henry Vane Tempest, Baronet, was returned.

1st June, 1796. William Henry Lambton and Sir Henry Vane Tempest, Baronet.

Mr. Lambton died at Pisa on 30th November, 1797. A new writ was issued on 28th December. On 8th January, 1798, Ralph John Lambton was returned. On 28th February, 1800, Sir Henry Vane Tempest resigned the representation of the City. On 17th March, 1800, Michael Angelo Taylor was returned - Taylor polled 464, Matthew Russell, Vice-Lieutenant of the County, 360 and George Baker 7. 831 freemen polled.

24th July, 1802. Ralph John Lambton and Richard Wharton - Lambton polled 530, Wharton 517 and Michael Angelo Taylor 498. 983 freemen polled, of whom 409 recorded single votes or plumpers for Wharton. A petition charging Mr. Wharton with bribery and corruption was presented by some of the electors on 7th December, 1802, and renewed on 23rd November, 1803. A committee was appointed to examine

this on 8th February, 1804, and on 20th his election was declared void.

- 4th March, 1804. Robert Eden Duncombe Shafto was elected - Shafto polled 385, Francis Tweddell 289 and Charles Spearman 13.
- 7th November, 1806. Ralph John Lambton and Richard Wharton.
- 14th May, 1807. Ralph John Lambton and Richard Wharton.
- 7th October, 1812. Ralph John Lambton and Richard Wharton.

Mr. Lambton accepted the Chiltern Hundreds on 22nd November, 1813. On 10th December, George Allan, M.A., F.S.A., Deputy Lieutenant of the County was elected. Allan polled 440, George Baker 360.

- 18th June, 1818. Michael Angelo Taylor and Richard Wharton - Taylor polled 437, Wharton 347 and George Allan 27.
- 8th March, 1820. Michael Angelo Taylor and Sir Henry Hardinge, K.C.B. Sir Henry Hardinge having been appointed Clerk of the Ordnance, a new writ was issued on 25th March, and he was returned on 4th April, 1823. Hardinge polled 249 and Hedworth Lambton 66.
- 9th June, 1826. Michael Angelo Taylor and Sir Henry Hardinge, K.C.B. Sir Henry Hardinge resigned his office in April 1827, and, having been re-appointed to it, a new writ was issued on 29th January, 1828. He was returned on 6th February, 1828 - Hardinge polled 289 and Alexander Robertson 76.
Sir Henry Hardinge having been appointed Secretary at War, again vacated his seat. A new writ was issued on 30th May, 1828, and he was returned on 9th June.
- 5th August, 1830. Michael Angelo Taylor and Sir Roger Gresley - Taylor polled 546, Gresley 486 and William Chaytor 436. A petition was presented against the return of Sir Roger Gresley, and a committee decided on 8th March, 1831, that he was not duly elected. A new writ was issued on the same day, and on 23rd March, William Richard Carter Chaytor was returned - Chaytor polled 495, The Honourable Arthur Trevor 470 and John Clervaux Chaytor 3.
- 2nd May, 1831. William Richard Carter Chaytor and the Honourable Arthur Trevor.

The election of Members for the City of Durham was then affected by the First Reform Bill, (2 Will.4. cap.45), passed 7th June, 1832, and the Boundary Act, (2 and 3 Will.4. cap.64)

12th December, 1832. William Charles Harland and
 William Richard Carter Chaytor - Harland polled 440,
 Chaytor 404 and the Honourable Arthur Trevor 383.
 There were 765 voters, of whom 480 were freemen.

1 2

-
1. P.R.O. Dur.3/149-150.
 P.R.O. Returns of Members of Parliament.
 Sharp MS.82. pp.22-41.
 Surtees op.cit. Vol.1. Appendix No.11. pp. CL-CL1.
 Fordyce op.cit. Vol.1. pp.346-350.
 Bean op.cit. pp.128-139.
 2. For uncontested elections, the date on which the
 indentures were signed is given. In the cases of
 contested elections the last day of the poll is cited.

APPENDIX-B.MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT FOR THE COUNTY OF DURHAM 1675 - 1832.

- Year 1653. Henry Dawson.
- Year 1654. Colonel Robert Lilburne and George Lilburne.
- 20th August, 1656.. Thomas Lilburne and James Claxering.
- 23rd June, 1675. John Tempest and Thomas Vane - Tempest polled 1034, Vane 856 and Sir James Claxering, Baronet, 747. 1446 voted. Mr. Vane died of smallpox on 25th June. A new writ was issued on 14th October, and on 25th October, 1675, Christopher Vane was returned.
- 24th February, 1679. Sir Robert Eden, Baronet, and John Tempest. - Eden polled 1338, Tempest 1173 and Christopher Vane 921.
- 25th August, 1679. William Bowes and Thomas Featherstonhaugh - Bowes polled 1048, Featherstonhaugh 979, Christopher Vane 803 and Sir Mark Milbanke, Baronet, 671.
- 21st February, 1681. William Bowes and Thomas Featherstonhaugh - Bowes polled 1186, Featherstonhaugh 978 and Christopher Vane 681.
- 16th March, 1685. Robert Byerley and William Lambton.
- 11th January, 1689. Robert Byerley and William Lambton.
- 10th March, 1690. Sir Robert Eden, Baronet, and William Lambton.
- 11th November, 1695. Sir William Bowes and William Lambton.
- 3rd August, 1698. Sir Robert Eden, Baronet and Lionel Vane - Eden polled 1371, Vane 967 and William Lambton 804.
- 15th January, 1701. Lionel Vane and William Lambton.
- 3rd December, 1701. Lionel Vane and William Lambton.
- 29th July, 1702. Sir Robert Eden, Baronet and Sir William Bowes.
- 16th May, 1705. Sir Robert Eden, Baronet, and Sir William Bowes. Sir William Bowes died on 7th February, 1707, and was succeeded by John Tempest on 5th March.

- 12th May, 1708. Sir Robert Eden, Baronet, and the Honourable William Vane.
- 11th October, 1710. Sir Robert Eden, Baronet, and William Lambton.
- 9th September, 1713. John Eden and John Hedworth.
- 7th February, 1715. John Eden and John Hedworth.
- 4th April, 1722. Sir John Eden, Baronet and John Hedworth - Eden polled 1342, Hedworth 1204, William Lord Vane 1060 and Ralph Robinson 80.
- 23rd August, 1727. John Hedworth and George Bowes.
- 7th May, 1734. John Hedworth and George Bowes.
- 13th May, 1741. John Hedworth and George Bowes - Mr. Hedworth died in his chariot on 31st May, 1747. No writ was issued, the Parliament being dissolved soon afterwards.
- 1st July, 1747. George Bowes and the Honourable Henry Vane. Mr. Vane having accepted the office of one of the Lords of the Treasury, a new writ was issued on 21st April, 1749, and he was returned on the 3rd May. On the death of his father he was called to the House of Lords as Lord Barnard, on 27th April, 1753. A new writ was issued on 4th May, 1753, and on 19th May, the Honourable Henry Vane was returned. He, in turn, became Viscount Barnard, on 5th April, 1754, when his father was made Earl of Darlington.
- 24th April, 1754. Henry Lord Viscount Barnard and George Bowes. Lord Barnard succeeded to the peerage on the death of his father on 6th March, 1758. A new writ was issued on 10th, and on 22nd March, the Honourable Raby Vane was returned.
- Mr. Bowes died on 17th September, 1760. The new writ was issued on 20th November, and on 13th December, Robert Shafto was returned - Shafto polled 1434 and Sir Thomas Clavering, Baronet, 545.
- 10th April, 1761. Robert Shafto and the Honourable Frederick Vane - Shafto polled 1589, Vane 1553 and Sir Thomas Clavering, Baronet 1382, of which 942 were single votes. 2748 freeholders polled.
- 23rd March, 1768. The Honourable Frederick Vane and Sir Thomas Clavering, Baronet.

- 12th October, 1774. Sir Thomas Clavering, Baronet, and Sir John Eden, Baronet.
- 18th September, 1780. Sir Thomas Clavering, Baronet and Sir John Eden, Baronet.
- 14th April, 1784. Sir Thomas Clavering, Baronet and Sir John Eden, Baronet.
- 8th July, 1790. Rowland Burdon and Ralph Milbanke - Burdon polled 2073, Milbanke 1799 and Sir John Eden, Baronet 1696. 3407 freeholders polled.
- 7th June, 1796. Rowland Burdon and Sir Ralph Milbanke, Baronet.
- 26th July, 1802. Rowland Burdon and Sir Ralph Milbanke, Baronet.
- 10th November, 1806. Sir Ralph Milbanke, Baronet and Sir Thomas Henry Liddell.
- 25th May, 1807. Sir Ralph Milbanke, Baronet, and Sir Henry Vane Tempest, Baronet - Milbanke polled 574, Tempest 563 and Cuthbert Ellison 396.
- 14th October, 1812. Sir Henry Vane Tempest, Baronet, and Henry Viscount Barnard.
- Sir Henry Vane Tempest died on 1st August, 1813. On 20th September, John George Lambton was returned.
- In July, 1815, Lord Barnard retired from Parliament. On 1st August, the Honourable William John Frederick Vane Powlett was returned.
- 24th June, 1818. John George Lambton and the Honourable William John Frederick Vane Powlett.
- 18th March, 1820. John George Lambton and the Honourable William John Frederick Vane Powlett - Lambton polled 1731, Powlett 1137 and Richard Wharton 874. 2712 freeholders polled.
- 15th June, 1826. John George Lambton and the Honourable William John Frederick Vane Powlett.

Mr. Lambton having been created a peer, on January 18th, 1828, by the style and title of Baron Durham of the City of Durham, and of Lambton Castle, in the County of Durham, a new writ was issued on 29th January, and he was succeeded on 13th February by William Russell.

12th August, 1830. Lord William Powlett and William Russell.

10th May, 1831. William Russell and Sir Hedworth Williamson, Baronet.

Two additional representatives were given to the County of Durham by the First Reform Bill (2 Will. 4. cap. 45), and by the Act (2 and 3 Will. 4, cap. 64) it was formed into two divisions.

19th December, 1832. Northern Division. Hedworth Lambton and Sir Hedworth Williamson, Baronet - Lambton polled 2558, Williamson 2182 and Edward Richard Gale Braddyll 1676. The total number of electors polled was 3840.

22nd December, 1832. Southern Division. Joseph Pease, junior and John Bowes. - Pease polled 2273, Bowes 2218 and Robert Duncombe Shafto 1841. The total number of electors polled was 3994.¹

1. For authorities see footnote 1 on next page. See also footnote 2.

RESULTS IN ELECTORAL BOROUGHES
CREATED BY THE FIRST REFORM BILL

Gateshead.

12th December, 1832. Cuthbert Rippon.

South Shields.

12th December, 1832. Robert Ingham - Ingham polled 205.
 George Palmer 108. William Gowan 104 and
 Russell Bowlby 2.

Sunderland.

12th December, 1832. Sir William Chaytor and the
 Honourable Captain George Barrington - Chaytor
 polled 697, Barrington 525, Mr. David Barclay 404
 and Alderman Thompson 392. The total number
 polled was 1378. 1 2

-
1. P.R.O. Dur.3/149-150.
 P.R.O. Returns of Members of Parliament.
 Sharp MS.82. pp.7-21.
 Surtees op.cit. Vol.1. Appendix. No.11. pp.CXLIX-CL.
 Fordyce op.cit. Vol.1. pp.150-3.
 Bean op.cit. pp.97-102.
 2. For uncontested elections the date on which the
 indentures were signed is given. In the cases of
 contested elections, the last day of the poll is
 cited.

APPENDIX C.BISHOPS OF DURHAM 1660-1832.

John Cosin	1660 - 72
Nathaniel Crewe	1674 - 1721
William Talbot	1721 - 30
Edward Chandler	1730 - 50
Joseph Butler	1750 - 2
Richard Trevor	1752 - 71
John Egerton	1771 - 87
Thomas Thurlow	1787 - 91
Hon. Shute Barrington	1791 - 1826
William van Mildert	1826 - (36)

APPENDIX D.AN ACT TO ENABLE THE COUNTY PALATINE OF DURHAM TO SEND KNIGHTS AND BURGESSES TO SERVE IN PARLIAMENT.

Whereas the Inhabitants of the County Palatine of Durham have not hitherto had the Liberty and Privilege of electing and sending any Knights and Burgesses to the High Court of Parliament, although the Inhabitants of the said County Palatine are liable to all Payments, Rates and Subsidies granted by Parliament, equally with the Inhabitants of other Counties, Cities and Boroughs in this Kingdom, who have their Knights and Burgesses in the Parliament, and are therefore concerned equally with others the Inhabitants of this Kingdom, to have Knights and Burgesses in the said High Court of Parliament of their own Election, to represent the Condition of their County, as the Inhabitants of other Counties, Cities and Boroughs of this Kingdom have.

2. Wherefore, may it please your Majesty, that it may be enacted, and be it enacted by the King's most excellent Majesty, by and with the Advice and Assent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and the Commons in this present Parliament assembled, and by the Authority of the same. That from time to time, and at all times from and after the end of this present Session of Parliament, the said County Palatine of Durham may have two Knights for the

same County, and the City of Durham two Citizens to be Burgesses for the same City, for ever hereafter to serve in the High Court of Parliament.

3. To be elected and chosen by virtue of your Majesty's writ to be awarded by the Lord Chancellor or the Lord Keeper of the Great Seal of England, for the time being, in that behalf to the Lord Bishop of Durham, or his Temporal Chancellor of the said County of Durham, and a Precept to be thereupon grounded and made by the Lord Bishop of Durham or his Temporal Chancellor for the time being, to the Sheriff of the said County for the time being.

4. And the same Election from time to time to be made in manner and form following, that is to say, the Elections of the Knights to serve for the said County Palatine from time to time hereafter, to be made by the greater number of Freeholders of the said County Palatine of Durham, which from time to time shall be present at such Elections, accordingly as is used in other Counties in this Your Majesty's Kingdom.

5. And that the Election of the said Burgesses from time to time to serve in the High Court of Parliament, for the City of Durham, to be made from time to time by the major part of the Mayor, Alderman and Freeman of the said City of Durham, which from time to time shall be present at such Elections.

6. Which said Knights and Burgesses, and every of them so

elected or chosen, shall be returned by the said Sheriff into the Chancery of England, in due form, and upon the like pains as be ordained for his Sheriff, or Sheriffs of any other County of this Kingdom, to make his or their Returns in like cases.

7. And that the said knights and Burgesses, and every of them so Elected and Returned, shall be by Authority of this present Act, Knights and Burgesses of the High Court of Parliament, to all Intents and Purposes, and have and use the like Voice, Authority and Places therein, to all Intents and Purposes, as any other the Knights and Burgesses of the said High Court of Parliament have, use and enjoy, and likewise shall and may by virtue of this present Act, take, have, use and enjoy all such and the like Liberties, Advantages, Dignities and Privileges concerning the said Court of Parliament, to all Intents, Constructions and Purposes as any other the Knights and Burgesses of the said High Court of Parliament have taken, had, used or enjoyed, or shall, may or ought thereafter to have, take, or enjoy.

By virtue of this Statute, his Majesty dissolving the Parliament which passed the same and calling another the same Year, his Writs to the Lord Bishop and his Sheriff deserve to succeed. ¹

1. Hunter MS.37.

THIS DOCUMENT SHOULD ALSO BE CONSIDERED:

THE RIGHT OF REPRESENTATIVES IN PARLIAMENT GRANTED TO YE
COUNTY PALATINE AND CITY OF DURHAM.

Several Proposals had often been made to Bp. Cosin and his officers at Durham to procure his Consent to a Bill to enable the County and City to elect representatives to serve them in Parliament. And tho they offered the Right of Nominating one of the Knights and one Burgess to be vested in the Bishop and his Successors to be enacted by that Bill, yet the proposing Party were never unanimous, so reputed by the Bishop not to be sincere. And tho the Freeholders and Citizens presented their Petitions for that Reason, the Bishop and his Officers published so strong arguments against their Allegations in Favour of a Bill that the Attempt was defeated, during the life of that learned Prelate.

After whose Death the See of Durham continued in the King's hands above three years during which vacation the following Bill passed into a Law in the twenty fifth year of King Charles II R.Dm.1673. ¹

1. Hunter MS.37.

APPENDIX E.

THE EIGHTY-EIGHT WHO VOTED IN FAVOUR OF THE PETITIONER AT
THE HEARING OF THE PETITION OF MAJOR-GENERAL JOHN LAMBTON
4th - 11th MAY, 1762.

Given in the order in which they appear in the list from the Baker - Baker Papers in the Prior's Kitchen, Durham. Constituencies ascertained from Returns of Members of Parliament 1213-1874.

Major-General A'Court (Heytesbury)
Sir George Armitage, Bart. (York)
Mr. Edward Bacon (Norwich)
Mr. William Bagot (Stafford county)
Mr. William Beckford (City of London)

or

Mr. Julines Beckford (Salisbury) 1
Sir Walter Blackett, Bart. (Newcastle-on-Tyne)
Mr. William Blackstone (Hindon)
Mr. Richard Wilbraham Bootle (Chester)
Mr. Francis Buller (West Looe)
Mr. Peter Burrell (Launceston)
Mr. Nicholson Calvert (Tewkesbury)
John Proby, Baron of Carysfort, in the Kingdom
of Ireland. (Huntingdon County)
Sir Kenrick Clayton, Bart. (Bletchingly)
Mr. Richard Clive (Montgomery Borough)

or

Mr. Robert Clive (Shrewsbury) 2
Sir William Codrington, Bart. (Tewkesbury)
Mr. George Cooke (Middlesex)
Mr. Velters Cornwall (Hereford County)
Sir Francis Delaval, K.B. (Andover)
Mr. William Dowdeswell (Worcester County)
Mr. William Drake (Agmondesham)
Mr. Archibald Edmonstone (Dumbarton)
Mr. Thomas Foley (Droitwich)
Mr. Philip or Mr. Zachary Philip Fonnereau 3
(both Aldeburgh)

or

Mr. Thomas Fonnereau (Sudbury)
Mr. Thomas Hill (Shrewsbury)
Mr. Jacob Houblon (Hertford County)
Mr. Alexander Hume (Southwark)
Mr. Abraham Hume (Tregony)
Mr. John Jefferies (Clifton Holdness (Dartmouth))
Mr. Robert Jones (Huntingdon Borough)

1. Voting list in Baker-Baker Papers from which this Appendix is compiled does not give the christian names or initials of Mr. Beckford.
2. Ibid. re. Mr. Clive.
3. Ibid. re. Mr. Fonnereau.

or

or

1. Ibid. re. Mr. Morgan.

THE EIGHTY-EIGHT CONTINUED

Mr. John Paterson (Ludgershall)
 Mr. George Prescott (Stockbridge)
 Mr. Herbert Mackworth the Elder (Cardiff)
 Mr. Richard Price (Beaumaris)
 Mr. Henry Pye (Berkshire)
 Mr. John Rushout (Evesham)
 Mr. Thomas Watson (Berwick-on-Tweed)
 Mr. Thomas Whichcote (Lincoln County)
 Mr. Charles Whitworth (Bletchingley)
 Mr. Thomas Duncombe (Morpeth)
 Mr. Nathaniel Ryder (Tiverton)
 Mr. William Willy (Devizes)
 Sir William Owen, Bart. (Pembroke Borough)
 Mr. Thomas Pitt the Younger (Old Sarum)
 Mr. Harbord Harbord (Norwich)
 Mr. Charles Fitzroy Scudamore (Hereford City)
 Mr. George Forster Tuffnell (Beverley)
 Mr. Henry Crabb Boulton (Worcester City)
 Mr. Laurence Sullivan (Taunton)
 Charles Cornwallis, commonly called Lord Viscount
 Brome (Eye)

TELLERS

George Brodrick, Viscount Middleton in the Kingdom
 of Ireland (New Shoreham)
 Mr. Matthew Ridley (Newcastle-on-Tyne) 1

Mr. Thomas Staunton (Ipswich)
Sir William Meredith, Bart. (Liverpool)
Sir Ellis Cunliffe, Bart. (Liverpool)
Mr. Richard Rigby (Tavistock)
Lord Robert Sutton (Nottingham County)
Mr. John Manners (Newark-on-Trent)
Lord Robert Manners (Kingston-on-Hull)
Sir George Montgomery Metham (Kingston-on-Hull)
Mr. Thomas Coates, Vice Admiral of the White
(Great Bedwin)

Mr. Peter Dennis (Hedon)
Mr. William de Grey (Newport, Cornwall)
Mr. James Hewitt (Coventry)
Mr. George Onslow (Guildford)

Mr. George Onslow (Surrey) ¹
 Mr. Isaac Martin Rebow (Colchester)
 Mr. Timothy Caswell (Hertford Borough)
 Sir William Baker, Alderman of London (Plympton)
 Mr. Henry Bankes (Corfe Castle)
 John Bateman, commonly called Lord Viscount
 Bateman, of the Kingdom of Ireland
 (New Woodstock)

Mr. John Boscawen (Truro)
Mr. James Brudenell (Hastings)
Mr. George Bridges Brudenell (Stamford)
Mr. Robert Brudenell (Marlborough)
(only two of the above Brudenells voted) 2
Sir Robert Burdett, Bart. (Tamworth)
Mr. William Matthew Burt (Great Marlow)
Mr. Thomas Coventry (Bridport)
Mr. Peregrine Cust (Bishop's Castle)
Mr. William Gerard Hamilton (Pontefract)
Mr. Capel Hanbury (Monmouth County)
Mr. John Mostyn (Malton)
Mr. Raby Vane (Carlisle)
Mr. Charles Jenkinson (Cockermouth)

1. No indication from document in Baker-Baker Papers of which Mr. Onslow this is.
2. Not clear which two Brudenells voted.

THE SEVENTY-TWO CONTINUED

Mr. Anthony Keck (New Woodstock)
 Mr. Edwin Lascelles (York County)
 Mr. Edward Lascelles (Northallerton)
 Mr. Daniel Lascelles (Northallerton)
 (Two Lascelles - one beginning with Ed. - voted) ¹
 Sir William Maynard, Bart. (Essex County)
 Mr. Hugo Meynell (Lichfield)
 Sir Ralph Milbanke, Bart. (Richmond, York)
 Mr. Francis Reynolds (Lancaster Borough)
 Mr. Thomas Robinson (Christchurch Twinham)
 Captain John Ress, R.N. (Lanark, Peebles, Selkirk,
 Linlithgow District of Burghs)
 Mr. John Tucker (Weymouth and Melcombe Regis)
 Mr. John Upton the Younger (Westmorland)
 Mr. James West (St. Albans)
 Mr. Andrew Wilkinson (Aldborough)
 Mr. William Woodley (Great Bedwin)
 Mr. Thomas Worsley (Orford)
 Mr. Robert Shafto (Durham County)
 Mr. Jennison Shafto (Leominster)
 General John Waldegrave (Newcastle-under-Lyme)
 Mr. Brice Fisher (Boroughbridge)
 Sir Charles Frederick, C.B. (Queenborough)
 Mr. John Dickson the Younger (Peeblesshire)
 John James Perceval, commonly called Lord Viscount
 Perceval (Bridgewater)
 Mr. Andrew Fletcher the Younger (Haddingtonshire)
 Sir John Griffin Griffin, K.B. (Andover)
 Mr. George Augustus Selwyn (Gloucester)
 Mr. John Wilkes (Aylesbury)
 Mr. John Richmond Webb (Bossiney) or
 Mr. Philip Cartaret Webb (Haslemere) ²
 Mr. Thomas More Molyneux (Haslemere)
 George Bussy Villiers, commonly called Lord Villiers
 (Tamworth)
 Mr. Charles Boone (Castle Rising)
 William Hall, Viscount Gage in the Kingdom of
 Ireland (Seaford)
 John Stewart, commonly called Lord Garlies (Morpeth)
 Mr. Soame Jenyns (Cambridge Borough)
 Mr. Robert Henley Ongley (Bedford County)
 Mr. Henry Shiffner (Minehead)
 Mr. John Evelyn (Helston)

-
1. Again, not certain which two Lascelles voted.
 Obscurity prevails again because of the absence of
 Christian names or initials.
 2. Uncertain which Webb this is.

THE SEVENTY-TWO CONTINUED

Sir William Beauchamp Procter, Bart.K.B.,
(Middlesex)
Mr.Samuel Touchet (Shaftesbury)
John Lord Pollington, Baron of Longford, in
the Kingdom of Ireland (New Shoreham)
Mr.Simon Lutterell (Wigan)
Sir Samuel Fludyer, Bart. (Chippenham)
George Sackville, commonly called Lord George
Sackville (East Grinstead)

TELLERS

Frederick Campell, commonly called Lord Frederick
Campbell (Renfrew, Rutherglen, Glasgow,
Dumbarton District of Burghs)
Mr.Frederick Vane (Durham County) 1

1. Returns of Members of Parliament.

BIBLIOGRAPHY1. MANUSCRIPT SOURCESA. THE PRIOR'S KITCHEN, DURHAM.a. Records.City of Durham Records.

City of Durham Corporation Election Book 1746-1770.

City of Durham Corporation Order Book 1757-1763.

City of Durham Guild Books.Barbers' Company.

Orders, Constitutions and Minutes 1680-1799.

Order Book, 1798-1805.

Blacksmiths' Company.

Minute Book 1770-1839

Account Book 1710-1831

Drapers' and Tailors' Company.

Orders and Minutes 1770-1818.

Mercers' Company.

Minute Books 1709-1782

Minute Books 1782-1905

Account Book 1750-1818

Baker-Baker Collection. (In process of arrangement).Baker-Baker Papers.

Memorable Events 1746-1775.

Lists of Freeholds and Returns 1760-1

Freeholds and Returns for Easington Ward 1760-8

The County of Durham 1761 - Election Songs

Election Songs and Newspaper Cuttings 1761

Durham City and County Elections 1761-2. Poll Books.

Election Cuttings, Broad sides and Songs, City of Durham 1753-87.

Lists of Freeman, Charities and City Boundaries

Various Affidavits Filed in the King's Bench - The Mushroom Trial 1766.

Newspaper Cuttings: Election Addresses from the Candidates for the City and County of Durham 1806-1807.

Grey of Howick Collection. (In process of arrangement).

Correspondence of the Second Earl Grey

Letters from Lord Durham to Lord Grey (to 1832).

b. Manuscripts (Dean and Chapter Collections.)Hunter Collection.

- MS. 12 Miscellaneous.
 24 Dispute between Bishop Cosin and the Gentry of the County with respect of Parliamentary Representation.
 37 Act to enable the County of Durham to send Knights and Burgesses.
 Writs and Indentures.

Sharp Collection.

- MS. 1 Poll. County Election 1761.
 21 1679 Election in the City of Durham.
 Corporation Books and Poll Books.
 36 Collection of Lists of how M.P.'s voted.
 42 Hartlepool.
 57 Durham Elections.
 61 Grand Jury List 1693-1833.
 61 A Grand Jury List 1725-1838.
 70 Miscellaneous.
 72 Spearman to G. Bowes M.P. 1728.
 Gilbert Spearman's Inquiry.
 73 Extracts Journal of the House of Commons to 1697.
 82 Sir Cuthbert Sharp: Knights and Burgesses 1784 Election in the County of Durham
 Newspapers, Journals, Lists and Addresses.
 92 Six Poll Books: City of Durham 1761, 1774, 1800, 1802, 1804, 1813.
 94 1761 Election in the City of Durham.
 117 Sunderland and the Slave Trade 1823.
 121 1761 Election in the City of Durham.
 124 Canvass Book of George Bowes 1739.
 125 Freeholders' Lists.
 134 Canvass Book Durham County Election 1732.
 142 Canvass Book 1739 original.
 142 A London Freemen 1800.
 144 Durham City Election 1813. Poll Book.
 145 Lists of Knights and Burgesses, County and City.
 150 Rebellion of 1745.
 161 Coal Trade re. Bowes.
 162 Volume of Accounts Allan Election 1813.
 165 Canvassing Book 1732.

Randall Collection.

- MS. 5 Struggle between Bishop Cosin and the Gentlemen of the County.
 Copy Indentures Parliament 1656.

- Quarter Sessions, Durham, 3rd October, 1666.
 Petition on Parliamentary Representation.
 Indenture Parliament 1696
 Burgesses City 1678
 MS.13 List Knights 1653-1774
 Burgesses 1654-1774

Raine Collection.

- MS. 5 Durham County Election Addresses
 1826 and 1830, 1831 and 1832, including Poll
 Book 1674.
 6 1830 and 1831.
 7 Miscellaneous.
 18 1729 Election in the City of Durham
 19 1760 Election in the County of Durham
 20 1761 Election in the City of Durham
 21 1761 Election in the City of Durham
 1761 Election in the County of Durham
 25 1681 Freehold Book
 92 Election City of Durham 1800.
 93 Election City of Durham 1813.
 94 Election City of Durham 1818.
 95 Election City of Durham 1820.
 96 Election City of Durham 1823.

Allan Collection.

- MS. 7 Pretended Freemen 1761
 Copy Indenture Election Two Knights 1656
 Resolutions to Quarter Sessions 1666
 Grey's Debates in Parliament 1668
 17 History of Knights of the County of Durham
 Gilbert Spearman's Inquiry
 18 List of Members of Parliament
 19 Printed Proceedings in Parliament 1666, 1667,
 and 1668 with Members and Polling to 1774.

c. Additional Manuscripts (Dean and Chapter:)

Accounts regarding City Election 1807.

d. Muniments of Dean and Chapter.

Dean and Chapter Audit Book No.10. 1814-32.

B. Durham University Library.

Durham City and County Elections 1650-1831.

C. Public Record Office.

Durham 3/149. Writs and Indentures of Return of Durham Members of Parliament 1722-1790.
 Durham 3/150. Writs and Indentures of Return of Durham Members of Parliament 1794-1835.
 Durham 3/215. Account Book Election City of Durham 1761.

Home Office 40. Correspondence on Disturbances 1812-1855.

Home Office 41. Disturbances. Entry Books 1816-1871

Home Office 42. Domestic. Correspondence George III 1782-1820.

Home Office 43. Domestic. Entry Books 1782-1880.

D. Bodleian Library.Gough Additions, Durham Manuscripts.

4° 1 Documents related to the Struggle for Representation before 1675

4° 4 General Election Knights of the Shire, March 1820. Poll Book.

4°24 Election City of Durham, August 1830. Poll Book and Proceedings.

4°25 Election City of Durham, December 1813. Speeches, Handbills, etc.

4°30 Election City of Durham, July 1802. Poll Book.

4°32 Election City of Durham, December, 1813. Poll Book.

4°33 Election City of Durham, March, 1831. Poll Book.

4°34 Election City of Durham, December, 1832. Poll Book.

4°35 Elections City of Durham and Northern and Southern Divisions of the County of Durham, 1832. Addresses and Speeches of Candidates.

4°37 Election Southern Division of the County of Durham, December 1832. Poll Book.

4°70) Addresses and Squibs in the Contested Election

4°71) for Members of Parliament, County of Durham 1820.

8°35 Addresses, poems, songs etc. Elections County and City of Durham 1801-2.

8°37 Election City of Durham, March 1800. Poll Book.

E. British Museum.

Lansdowne Manuscripts 66 No. 87.
a. Additional Manuscripts.

Newcastle Manuscripts.

- 32711 Election City of Durham 1747
- 32911 Correspondence between the
- 32912 Duke of Newcastle,
- 32913 Lord Mansfield,
- 32916 the Earl of Darlington,
- 32929 Lord Ravensworth and
- 32932 the Bishop of Durham,
- 32988 mostly regarding the Elections
- 33061 City and County of Durham 1760-2.

and especially

Newcastle Papers.

- 32925 Major-General John Lambton to the Duke of Newcastle
- 32938 Vol. CCL. lll regarding Division in the House of Commons, 11th May, 1762.

Bowes Manuscripts.

- 40747 Correspondence with respect
- 40748 to the Bowes Family, especially George Bowes, and Durham Elections.

Place Manuscripts.

- 27789 Narrative of Political Events
- 27790 in England, 1830-32.
- 27792 Narrative of the progress of
- 27793 the Reform Bill
- 27794 26th March - 7th June,
- 27795 1832.

b. Reading Room and North Library.

- 1850 d 26 Lambton, Peace and Liberty. Two verse lampoons supporting J.G. Lambton's Candidature Election County of Durham 1820.
- 8133 h 3 Proceedings and Addresses Election City of Durham 1830. Poll Book.
- Election Northern Division County of Durham. December, 1832. Poll Book.
- 8135 a 13 Papers Election City of Durham, March, 1800.
- 8135 a 34 Proceedings Durham County Meeting, 1st June, 1807..

2. Printed Sources.

a. The Publications of the Surtees Society.

Vol.CX1. Records of the Committees for Compounding etc.
1643-1660 (1905)

b. Journals of the House of Commons.

Vol. 1	8th November, 1547	-	2nd March, 1629.
Vol. 2	13th April, 1640	-	14th March, 1642.
Vol. 3	15th March, 1642	-	24th December, 1644.
Vol. 4	25th December, 1644	-	4th December, 1646.
Vol. 5	5th December, 1646	-	1st September, 1648.
Vol. 6	2nd September, 1648	-	14th August, 1651.
Vol. 7	15th August, 1651	-	16th March, 1659.
Vol. 8	25th April, 1600	-	29th July, 1667.
Vol. 9	10th October, 1667	-	28th April, 1687.
Vol. 10	26th December, 1688	-	26th October, 1693.
Vol. 11	7th November, 1693	-	23rd November, 1697.
Vol. 17	7th December, 1711	-	1st August, 1714.
Vol. 18	1st August, 1714	-	15th September, 1718.
Vol. 20	9th October, 1722	-	15th May, 1727.
Vol. 21	15th June, 1727	-	5th December, 1732.
Vol. 22	16th January, 1733	-	8th December, 1737.
Vol. 23	24th January, 1738	-	25th April, 1741.
Vol. 25	17th October, 1745	-	22nd November, 1750.
Vol. 28	1st December, 1757	-	19th March, 1761.
Vol. 29	3rd November, 1761	-	30th October, 1764.
Vol. 74	4th August, 1818	-	2nd November, 1819.
Vol. 76	23rd January, 1821	-	3rd January, 1822.
Vol. 78	4th February, 1823	-	25th November, 1823.
Vol. 79	3rd February, 1824	-	6th January, 1825.
Vol. 80	3rd February, 1825	-	5th January, 1826.
Vol. 83	29th January - 18th December, 1828.		
Vol. 84	5th February	-	10th December, 1829.
Vol. 85	4th February, 1830	-	23rd July, 1830.
Vol. 86	Part 1. 14th September, 1830 - 22nd April, 1831.		
	Part 11. 14th June, 1831 - 22nd November, 1831.		
Vol. 87	6th December, 1831	-	16th October, 1832.

c. Journals of the House of Lords.

Vol. 11 1660-66
Vol. 12 1666-75

d. Publications of the Public Record Office.

Calendar of State Papers, Domestic.

Edward VI. Mary, Elizabeth and James I.

Edited by R. Lemon (Vols 1 and 2) and Mrs. Everett
Green (Vols. 3 to 12)

Vol.	1.	1547-1580	(1856)
Vol.	11.	1581-1590	(1865)
Vol.	111.	1591-1594	(1867)
Vol.	1V.	1595-1597	(1869)
Vol.	V.	1598-1601	(1869)
Vol.	VI.	1601-1603	with Addenda 1547-1565 (1870)
Vol.	VII.	Addenda 1566-1579	(1871)
Vol.	VIII.	1603-1610	(1857)
Vol.	IX.	1611-1618	(1858)
Vol.	X.	1619-1623	(1858)
Vol.	XI.	1623-1625	with Addenda 1603-1625 (1859)
Vol.	XII.	Addenda 1580-1625	

Charles I. Edited by John Bruce (Vols.1 to 13).
W.D. Hamilton (Vols.13 to 23) and Mrs.
S.C. Lomas (Vol.23)

Vol.	1.	1625-1626	(1858)
Vol.	11.	1627-1628	(1858)
Vol.	111.	1628-1629	(1859)
Vol.	1V.	1629-1631	(1860)
Vol.	V.	1631-1633	(1862)
Vol.	VI.	1633-1634	(1863)
Vol.	VII.	1634-1635	(1864)
Vol.	VIII.	1635	(1865)
Vol.	IX.	1635-1636	(1866)
Vol.	X.	1636-1637	(1867)
Vol.	XI.	1637	(1868)
Vol.	XII.	1637-1638	(1869)
Vol.	XIII.	1638-1639	(1871)
Vol.	XIV.	1639	(1873)
Vol.	XV.	1639-1640	(1874)
Vol.	XVI.	1640	(1880)
Vol.	XVII.	1640-1641	(1882)
Vol.	XVIII.	1641-1643	(1887)
Vol.	XIX.	1644	(1888)
Vol.	XX.	1644-1645	(1890)
Vol.	XXI.	1645-1647	(1892)
Vol.	XXII.	1648-1649	(1893)
Vol.	XXIII.	Addenda, March, 1625 - January 1649	(1897)

The Commonwealth. Edited by Mrs. Everett Green.

Vol.	1.	1649-1650	(1875)
Vol.	II.	1650-	(1875)
Vol.	III.	1651	(1877)
Vol.	IV.	1651-1652	(1878)
Vol.	V.	1652-1653	(1879)
Vol.	VI.	1653-1654	(1880)
Vol.	VII.	1654	(1881)
Vol.	VIII.	1655	(1882)
Vol.	IX.	1655-1656	(1882)
Vol.	X.	1656-1657	(1883)
Vol.	XI.	1657-1658	(1884)
Vol.	XII.	1658-1659	(1885)
Vol.	XIII.	1659-1660	(1886)

Committee for Advance of Money, 1642-1656.
Edited by Mrs. Everett Green.

Part	1.	Prerace. List of Records, General Proceedings, Cases (1888)
Part	II.	Cases, continued (1888)
Part	III.	Cases, continued. Addenda, Errata, Warrants, Index (1888)

Committee for Compounding with Delinquents, etc. 1643-1660.
Edited by Mrs. Everett Green.

Part	1.	General Proceedings	(1889)
Part	II.	Cases, 1643-1646	(1890)
Part	III.	Cases, 1647-June, 1650	(1892)
Part	IV.	Cases, July, 1650-Dec. 1653	(1892)
Part	V.	Cases, January, 1654 - December, 1659. With Introduction. Addenda and Index	(1893)

Charles II. Edited by Mrs. Everett Green (Vols. 1 to 10).
F.H.B. Daniell, M.A. (Vols. 11 to 24), and F.H.B. Daniell, M.A.
and F. Bickley (Vols. 25 to 28).

Vol.	1.	1660-1661	(1860)
Vol.	II.	1661-1662	(1861)
Vol.	III.	1663-1664	(1862)
Vol.	IV.	1664-1665	(1863)
Vol.	V.	1665-1666	(1864)
Vol.	VI.	1666-1667	(1864)
Vol.	VII.	1667	(1866)
Vol.	VIII.	Nov. 1667 - Sept. 1668	(1894)
Vol.	IX.	Oct. 1668 - Dec. 1669	(1894)
Vol.	X.	1670 With Addenda, 1660-1670	(1895)
Vol.	XI.	Jan. - Nov. 1671	(1895)
Vol.	XII.	Dec. 1671 - May, 17, 1672	(1897)
Vol.	XIII.	May 18 - Sept. 30, 1672	(1899)

Vol. XLV.	Oct., 1672 - Feb. 1673	(1901)
Vol. XV.	March - Oct., 1673	(1902)
Vol. XVI.	Nov., 1673 - Feb., 1675	(1904)
Vol. XVII.	March, 1675 - Feb., 1676	(1907)
Vol. XVII.	March, 1676 - Feb., 1677	(1909)
Vol. XIX.	March, 1677 - Feb., 1678	(1911)
Vol. XX.	March - Dec., 1678; with Addenda, 1674-1679	(1913)
Vol. XXI.	Jan. 1, 1679 - Aug. 31, 1680	(1915)
Vol. XXI.	Sept. 1, 1680 - Dec. 31, 1681	(1921)
Vol. XXI.	Jan. 1, - Dec. 31, 1682	(1932)
Vol. XXI.	Jan. 1, - June 30, 1683	(1933)
Vol. XXV.	July 1, - Sept. 30, 1683	(1934)
Vol. XXVI.	Oct. 1, 1683 - April 30, 1684	(1938)
Vol. XXVII.	May 1, 1684 - Feb. 5, 1685	(1938)
Vol. XXVIII.	Addenda, 1660 - 1685	(1947)

William III. Edited by W.J.Hardy, M.A., F.S.A.
(Vols 1 to 8), and E.Bateson (Vols.9 to 11).

Vol. 1.	Feb. 13, 1689 - April, 1690	(1896)
Vol. 11.	May, 1690 - Oct., 1691	(1898)
Vol. 111.	Nov., 1691 - End of 1692	(1901)
Vol. 1V.	1693	(1904)
Vol. V.	Jan., 1694 - June, 1695	(1906)
Vol. VI.	July - Dec., 1695, and Addenda, 1689-1695	(1908)
Vol. VII.	Jan., 1 - Dec., 31, 1696	(1913)
Vol. VIII.	Jan., 1 - Dec., 31, 1697	(1928)
Vol. IX.	Jan., 1 - Dec., 31, 1698	(1933)
Vol. X.	Jan., 1, 1699 - March 31, 1700	(1937)
Vol. XI.	April 1, 1700 - March 8, 1702	(1937)

Anne. Edited by R.P.Mahaffy, B.A.

Vol. 1.	1702-1703	(1916)
Vol. 11.	1703-1704	(1925)

Home Office Papers, George III. Edited by J.Redington,
(Vols. 1 and 2), and R.A.Roberts (Vols.3 and 4)

Vol. 1.	Oct., 25, 1760 - 1765	(1878)
Vol. 11.	1766-1769	(1879)
Vol. 111.	1770-1772	(1881)
Vol. 1V.	1773-1775	(1899)

e. Publications of the Record Commissioners, etc.

8. Statutes of the Realm. Edited by A.Lunders, Sir T.E.Tomlins, J.F.France, W.E.Taunton, J.Raithby, J.Caley, and W.Elliott. 11 Vols.

f. Historical Manuscript Commission Reports.

- Lansdowne Manuscripts 66. No.87. (Errata, see p.531)
 No.33 Lonsdale Manuscripts
 No.29 Portland Manuscripts Vol.IV.

g. Miscellaneous.

- Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum 1642-1660
 Edited by C.H.Firth and R.S.Rait. 3 Volumes (1911)
 A collection of the Public General Statutes passed
 in the 2nd and 3rd Years of the Reign of William IV. (1832)
 Returns of Members of Parliament 1213-1874. 2 Volumes
 (1878-9)
 The Book of Dignities - J.Hadyn (1851)

h. Reading Room and North Library, British Museum.

- 807 ff. 20,21. Right Hon.Sir Henry Cavendish, Bart.
 Debates. Sir Henry Cavendish's Debates
 of the House of Commons (1841) during
 the thirteenth Parliament of Great
 Britain, commonly called the
 Unreported Parliament.
- 809 e 9 House of Commons Debates in Year 1774
 on Government of Quebec Bill (1839)
 drawn up from the notes of.....Sir
 Henry Cavendish, etc.

Miscellaneous Related to Durham Elections.

- 1205 b 8 Speech of J.G.Lambton against the
 Alien Bill of 1818.
 British Eloquence of the Nineteenth
 Century.
 Political Oratory. First Series (1855)
- T.1328 The Speech of Lord Durham in the
 House of Lords, 28th March, 1831, on
 the Reform Bill (1831)
- 8132 ee 14 A letter to J.G.Lambton containing
 Strictures on his Plan of Parliamentary
 Reform (1821)

- 8135 a 13 City Election 1800 - A Collection of Papers re. Election of a Member for the City of Durham, 1st March, 1800.
- 8135 e 1 Speech of Lord Durham in the House of Lords on the enfranchisement of Gateshead. Speech of Lord Durham on the Second Reading of the Reform Bill in the House of Lords (1832)
- 8135 e 1 An Answer to a letter, Addressed to the Reverend Henry Phillpotts by a Freeholder of the County.
A Reply to the Layman's Answer to a Letter addressed to the Reverend Henry Phillpotts. Remarks on an Article in the Edinburgh Review No.64 by H. Phillpotts. Some Observations as to the Propriety of an Enquiry into the Late Proceedings at Manchester (1818)
- 8135 e 2 A Letter to the Reverend H. Phillpotts
also 8135 e 70 A Letter to the Freeholders of Durham on the Proceedings of the County Meeting, 21st October, 1819.
Speech as it ought to have been spoken by Mr. Lambton at the Durham County Meeting, 21st October, 1819. Announcing the first number of the Durham Chronicle (1819)
- 8135 e 4 Tracts 1820-21.
also P.P. 3557 w Mr. Lambton's Speech in the House of Commons, on Tuesday 17th April, 1821 (1821)

i. Dictionary of National Biography. Various Volumes.

j. Annual Register.

Vol.	XXIX	1787	(1789)
Vol.	XXXIV	1792	(1798)
Vol.	XXXV	1793	(1806)
Vol.	XXXVI	1794	(1808)
Vol.	XXXVII	1795	(1810)
Vol.	XXXVIII	1796	(1813)
Vol.	XXXIX	1797	(1807)
Vol.	XL	1799	(1813)
Vol.	XLI	1800	(1810)

Vol.	XLIII	1801	
Vol.	LIII	1811	(1812)
Vol.	LVII	1815	(1816)
Vol.	LX	1818	(1819)
Vol.	LXI	1819	(1820)

k. Gentlemen's Magazine. Various Volumes, especially
No.61 July - December 1791 (1791)

1. British Museum. Newspaper Library.

Newcastle Chronicle.

1768
 1770-1772
 1773-1774
 1775-1776
 1783-1786
 1787-1789
 1790-1792
 1793-1795
 1796-1798
 1799-1801
 1802-1804
 1805-1807
 1808-1810
 1811-1813
 1814-1816
 1817-1819
 1820-1822

Newcastle Courant.

1773-1774
 1778-1780
 1781-1784
 1790
 1792
 1797-1799
 1803
 1805-1807
 1819-1820

Durham Chronicle.

1st November, 1823 - December, 1823
 1827-1830

Durham County Advertiser.

21st August, 1819 - 1st November, 1823
 November, 1823 - December, 1827
 1828-1830 (from 9th July, 1830, known
 as Durham Advertiser.)

Durham Advertiser and Durham Chronicle,
 each 1831
 1832

State Paper Room, British Museum.

Debates of the House of Commons 1667-1694.
Collected by the Honourable Anchtell Grey.

Vol. 3	1675	(1769)
Vol. 4	1675-77	(1769)
Vol. 5	1677-8	(1769)
Vol. 6	1678	(1769)
Vol. 7	1678-80	(1769)
Vol. 8	1680-5	(1769)
Vol. 9	1688-9	(1769)
Vol. 10	1689-94	(1769)

House of Commons, History and Proceedings from
Restoration to Present Time.

Vol. 1	1660-80	(1742)
Vol. 2	1680-95	(1742)
Vol. 3	1695-1706	(1742)
Vol. 4	1706-13	(1742)
Vol. 5	1713-14	(1742)
Vol. 13	1741-42	(1743)
Vol. 14	1742-43	(1744)

House of Commons, History and Proceedings from
Queen Anne to Present Time.

Vol. 1	1714-27	(1741)
Vol. 2	1727-33	(1741)
Vol. 3	1733-4	(1741)
Vol. 4	1734-7	(1742)
Vol. 5	1737-9	(1742)
Vol. 6	1739-40	(1742)
Vol. 7	1740-1	(1742)

House of Commons, Debates and Proceedings.

Vol. 1	1743-4	(1766)
Vol. 11	1744-6	(1766)
Vol. 111	1746-9	(1770)
Vol. 1V	1749-51	(1770)
Vol. V	1751-60	(1770)
Vol. VI	1774	(1775)

Parliamentary History, Debates and Proceedings of both Houses etc. from 1743-74.

Vol. 1	1743-5	(1792)
Vol. 2	1745-50	(1792)
Vol. 3	1751-61	(1792)
Vol. 4	1761-68	(1792)
Vol. 5	1768-71	(1792)
Vol. 6	1771-3	(1792)
Vol. 7	1774	(1792)

Cobbett's Parliamentary History of England from the Norman Conquest, in 1066, to the Year 1803.

Vol. 4	1660-1688	(1808)
Vol. 5	1668-1702	(1809)
Vol. 6	1702-1714	(1810)
Vol. 7	1714-1722	(1811)
Vol. 8	1722-1733	(1811)
Vol. 9	1733-1737	(1811)

The Parliamentary History of England from the Earliest Period to the Year 1803.

Vol. 10	1737-1739	(1812)
Vol. 11	1739-1741	(1812)
Vol. 12	1741-1743	(1812)
Vol. 13	1743-1747	(1812)
Vol. 14	1747-1753	(1813)
Vol. 15	1753-1765	(1813)
Vol. 16	1765-1771	(1813)
Vol. 17	1771-1774	(1813)
Vol. 18	1774-1777	(1813)
Vol. 19	1777-1778	(1814)
Vol. 20	1778-1780	(1814)
Vol. 21	1780-1781	(1814)
Vol. 22	1781-1782	(1814)

Vol.	23	1782-1783	(1814)
Vol.	24	1783-1785	(1815)
Vol.	25	1785-1786	(1815)
Vol.	26	1786-1788	(1816)
Vol.	27	1788-1789	(1816)
Vol.	28	1789-1791	(1816)
Vol.	29	1791-1792	(1817)
Vol.	30	1792-1794	(1817)
Vol.	31	1794-1795	(1818)
Vol.	32	1795-1797	(1818)
Vol.	33	1797-1798	(1818)
Vol.	34	1798-1800	(1819)
Vol.	35	1800-1801	(1819)
Vol.	36	1801-1803	(1820)

Cobbett's Parliamentary Debates.

Vol.	1	1803-4	(1804)
Vol.	2	1804	(1804)
Vol.	3	15th January-12th March, 1805	(1805)
Vol.	4	13th March-14th May, 1805	(1805)
Vol.	5	15th May-12th July, 1805	(1805)
Vol.	6	21st January-6th May, 1806	(1806)
Vol.	7	6th May-23rd July, 1806	(1806)
Vol.	8	1806-7	(1807)
Vol.	9	1807	(1807)
Vol.	10	21st January-8th April, 1808	(1808)
Vol.	11	11th April-4th July, 1808	(1808)
Vol.	12	1809	(1809)

Parliamentary Debates from 1803 to the Present Time
T.C.Hansard.

Vol.	1	1803-4	(1812)
Vol.	2	1804	(1812)
Vol.	3	1805	(1805)
Vol.	4	1805	(1812)

Parliamentary Debates from the year 1803 to the
Present Time. Published under Superintendence of
T.C.Hansard.

Vol.	1	1803-4	(1812)
Vol.	2	1804	(1812)
Vol.	3	15th January-12th May 1805	(1812)
Vol.	4	13th March-14th May, 1805	(1812)
Vol.	5	15th May-12th July, 1805	(1812)
Vol.	6	21st January-6th May, 1806	(1812)

Vol. 7	6th May-23rd July, 1806	(1812)
Vol. 8	1806-7	(1812)
Vol. 9	1807	(1812)
Vol. 10	21st January-8th April, 1808	(1812)
Vol. 11	11th April-4th July, 1808	(1812)
Vol. 12	19th January-7th March, 1809	(1812)
Vol. 13	8th March-13th March, 1809	(1812)
Vol. 14	11th April-21st June, 1809	(1812)
Vol. 15	23rd January-1st March, 1810	(1812)
Vol. 16	2nd March-17th May, 1810	(1812)
Vol. 17	18th May-21st June, 1810	(1812)
Vol. 18	1st November, 1810 - 28th February, 1811	(1812)
Vol. 19	22nd February-10th May, 1811	(1812)
Vol. 20	13th May-24th July, 1811	(1812)
Vol. 21	7th January-16th March, 1812	(1812)
Vol. 22	17th March-4th May, 1812	(1812)
Vol. 23	5th May-13th July, 1812	(1812)
Vol. 24	1812-13	(1812)
Vol. 25	11th March-10th May, 1813	(1813)
Vol. 26	11th May-22nd July, 1813	(1813)
Vol. 27	1813-14	(1814)
Vol. 28	7th June-30th July, 1814	(1814)
Vol. 29	1814-15	(1815)
Vol. 30	6th March-1st May, 1815	(1815)
Vol. 31	2nd May-12th July, 1815	(1815)
Vol. 32	1st February-6th March, 1816	(1816)
Vol. 33	7th March-25th April, 1816	(1816)
Vol. 34	26th April-2nd July, 1816	(1816)
Vol. 35	28th January-25th April, 1817	(1817)
Vol. 36	28th April-12th July, 1817	(1817)
Vol. 37	27th January-13th April, 1818	(1818)
Vol. 38	13th April-10th June, 1818	(1818)
Vol. 39	14th January-30th April, 1819	(1819)
Vol. 40	3rd May-13th July, 1819	
Vol. 41	1819-20	(1820)

The Parliamentary Debates. New Series. Under
Superintendence.. T.C. Hansard.

Vol. 1	21st April-26th June, 1820	(1820)
Vol. 2	27th June-7th September, 1820	(1820)
Vol. 3	8th September-23rd November, 1820	(1820)
Vol. 4	23rd January-2nd April, 1821	(1821)
Vol. 5	3rd April-11th July, 1821	(1821)
Vol. 6	5th February-22nd April, 1822	(1822)
Vol. 7	24th April-5th August, 1822	(1823)
Vol. 8	4th February-13th April, 1823	(1823)
Vol. 9	1st May-19th July, 1823	(1824)

Vol. 10	3rd February-29th March, 1824	(1824)
Vol. 11	30th March-25th June, 1824	(1825)
Vol. 12	3rd February-18th April, 1825	(1825)
Vol. 13	19th April-6th July, 1825	(1826)
Vol. 14	2nd February-17th March, 1826	(1826)
Vol. 15	20th March-31st March, 1826	(1827)
Vol. 16	1826-7	(1827)
Vol. 17	1827	(1828)
Vol. 18	29th January-22nd April, 1828	(1828)
Vol. 19	22nd April-28th July, 1828	(1829)
Vol. 20	6th February-13th March, 1829	(1829)
Vol. 21	31st March-24th June, 1829	(1829)
Vol. 22	4th February-8th March, 1830	(1830)
Vol. 23	9th March-7th April, 1830	(1830)
Vol. 24	8th April-4th June, 1830	(1830)
Vol. 25	7th June-23rd July, 1830	(1830)

Hansard's Parliamentary Debates. 3rd Series.
Commencing with the Accession of William IV.

Vol. 1	26th October-20th December, 1830	(1831)
Vol. 2	1830-1	(1831)
Vol. 3	4th March-22nd April, 1831	(1831)
Vol. 4	14th June-18th July, 1831	(1831)
Vol. 5	18th July-13th August, 1831	(1831)
Vol. 6	15th August-13th September, 1831	(1832)
Vol. 7	14th September-5th October, 1831	(1832)
Vol. 8	5th-20th October, 1831	(1832)
Vol. 9	1831-2	(1832)
Vol. 10	7th February-8th March, 1832	(1832)
Vol. 11	9th March-6th April, 1832	(1832)
Vol. 12	9th April-23rd May, 1832	(1832)
Vol. 13	24th May-3rd July, 1832	(1833)
Vol. 14	3rd July-16th August, 1832	(1833)

3. Modern Works.

Arnold, R.A.	-	The Unhappy Countess	(1957)
Artz, F.B.	-	Reaction and Revolution	(1934)
Aspinall, A.	-	1814-32	
Bean, W.W.	-	The Letters of King George IV	1812-30
	-	History of Parliamentary Representation in the Six Northern Counties of England	3 VOLUMES (1932)
		1603-1886	(1890)

- Cooper, Leonard - Radical Jack (1959)
- Eden,
Sir Timothy - Durham - County Books.
2 Volumes (1952)
- Elton, G.R. - England under the Tudors (1954)
- Feiling,
Sir Keith - A History of the Tory Party
1640-1714 (1924)
- The Second Tory Party
1714-1832 (1938)
- Fordyce, W. - The History and Antiquities
of the County Palatine of
Durham. 2 Volumes (1857)
- A History of Coal, Coke and
Iron Fields (1860)
- Halevy, E. - A History of the English
People in the Nineteenth
Century.
- II. The Liberal Awakening
1815-30 (1923)
- III. The Triumph of Reform
1830-41 (1923)
- Henning, B.D. - Parliamentary Diary of Sir
Edward Dering 1670-3 (1940)
- Hughes,
Professor
Edwards. - North Country Life in the
Eighteenth Century -
The North East 1700-50 (1952)
North Country Life in the
Eighteenth Century,
included in History 1940.
- Hutchinson, W. - The History and Antiquities
of the County Palatine of
Durham. 3 Volumes - (1785-1794)
- Jucker, N.S. - Studies in Modern History -
The Jenkinson Papers
1760-66 (1949)
- Keeler, M.F. - The Long Parliament 1640-1 (1954)

- Keir,
Sir Lindsay - The Constitutional History
of Modern Britain 1485-1937 (1943)
- Lapsley, G.T. - The County Palatine of Durham (1931)
- Edith, Lady
Londonderry - Frances Anne (1958)
- Mackenzie, Kenneth - The English Parliament (1959)
- Natier, Sir Lewis - England in the Age of the
American Revolution (1930)
- The Structure of Politics at the
Accession of George III.
2 Volumes (1929)
and 1 Volume (1958)
- Neale, Sir John E. - The Elizabethan House of
Commons. (1954)
- Nef, J.U. - The Rise of the British Coal
Industry. 2 Volumes. (1932)
- New, Chester W. - Lord Durham (1929)
- Oldfield, T.H.B. - The Representative History of
Great Britain and Ireland. Vol. 3. (1816)
- Plumb, J.H. - England in the Eighteenth Century (1950)
- Pollard, A.F. - Evolution of Parliament (1926)
- Porritt, E. and
A.G. - The Unreformed House of Commons,
Parliamentary representation
before 1832. 2 Volumes (1909)
- Reid, Stuart J. - Life and Letters of the First
Earl of Durham. 2 Volumes. (1906)
- Scammell, G.V. - Hugh du Puiset, Bishop of Durham (1956)
- Surtees, Robert - The History and Antiquities of
the County Palatine of Durham.
With Longstaffe Additions.
4 Volumes. (1816)
- Sykes, John - Local Records, or, Historical
Register of Remarkable Events -
Northumberland. Durham etc.
Volumes 1 and 2 (1866)
- Sykes, Reverend
Norman - Church and State in England
in the XVIIIth Century (1934)

- Taylor, A.J. - The Third Marquis of Londonderry and the North East Coal Trade - Durham University Journal - 1955-6
- Trevelyan, O.M.,
Dr. G.M. - British History in the Nineteenth Century and After (1937)
England under the Stuarts (1916)
Lord Grey of the Reform Bill (1920)
- Trevor-Roper, H - The Bishopric of Durham and the Capitalist Reformation - Durham University Journal - March, 1946
Victoria History of the County of Durham - 3 Volumes. Edited William Page (1905-28)
- Whiting, C.E. - The Bishopric of Durham in the Days of Bishop Crewe - Durham University Journal, June, 1938.
Lord Crewe, Bishop of Durham (1940)
- Williams, D.J. - Capitalist Combination in the Coal Industry (1924)
- Woodward, E.L. - The Age of Reform 1815-70. (1938)