

243
P^rson.

very creditable
for winter!

W^m Thackeray

14. January

1839.

My dear Hardinge

Frank had only stated to me in general terms that his Son had misbehaved at Eton and that he was compelled to remove him to a private Tutor's. He entered into no particulars; but I saw from his letter that he was deeply grieved, and I have never entered on the subject in my correspondence with him. I was not therefore prepared for the

and view, which your letter opens: When we
meet, we will discuss the matter. Nothing,
I am sure, has been neglected, which parental
care and sound judgment can achieve; and the
case must be almost desperate, in which
such advantages have been thrown away. These
are the wounds, which pierce the heart, and
being as by sad experience to know, that
this is not our resting place: it is a upon,
which Stanley has not neglected; and
he will bear every sorrow and every trial with
the patience of a Christian and with the
firmness of an upright man. His Enemies

will triumph in his misfortunes: but the kindness
of his Friends will more than compensate their
malignity. Your own suggestion as to the society
of your Son is a proof of this: when we meet and
when I am fully informed of the Facts of the Case,
we can consider this matter.

I agree with you in
thinking that Durham and the Ministers will
accommodate their differences, and that in the
end the Government will prevail. Either your
Laws or Buller must be surrendered as the
price of Reconciliation: in the first instance
the Protection to Agriculture will be
sacrificed as an Attonement to the "Masters".

and as a vindictive Blow on the Landed
Aristocracy, in the hope of weakening their
power: but eventually and speedily Balled
also will follow; and from the moment it
is made an open Question in the Cabinet,
with the consent of the Sovereign, the
Resistance to it is desperate; the surrender
is fatal. I was told that P. Thomson,
when he left Manchester lately, gave as
his parting injunction, "Work the Corn Laws";
and from the tone of the Government Papers
and from the Movement in the Manufacturing
districts I am almost led to believe, that in
the Speech we shall have a declaration

against the present Corn Law. If once
we are driven from this Protection, we must
come to a Free Trade; and the Change
of Landed Property, which will ensue, must
be the dislocation of the Aristocracy, and
the death-blow to every existing Check on
the rapid progress of pure Democracy.

I think, if the Corn Laws be opened in the
Speech, we must give battle in both
Houses, and abide the issue of a fearful
Conflict on unpopular Ground: but the whole
Landed Interest will be with us, and we shall
sustain the first Onset with our Forces unbroken;
whereas if we flinch, our Friends will
fall away, our Enemies will be encouraged

but by no means pacified, and at last
we shall be driven to make a stand in a
poor position and with diminished
strength. If beaten on the Address on the
Question of the Corn Laws, the Ministers will
go out with a popular cry in their favor,
which they would hope to turn to account
at a General Election: and if they
triumphed in the Commons, they would
hold the weapon, with which ^{and interest} they hope
either to subdue or to destroy the House of
Lords. Their retirement from Office on this
ground would be the signal for Corn Laws

Riots in England, backed probably by a
Catholic Sanction in Ireland; and they
richly hope that no Government could be
formed, which would encounter these
difficulties or overcome them. I know not
what the Event might be; I think it very
doubtful; but I am afraid, that delay will
not strengthen our hands, and in estimating
risks, the life of the Duke of Wellington,
which is still spared to us, must not be
forgotten. I am persuaded that in a great
Emergency of imminent danger his power to
save would be found as sure as our Enemies
have experienced his power to destroy; for what
Bossuet says of Cromwell was in the truth

In declamation of the Duke of Wellington

"Voilà un Homme, qui ne laisse rien à la
"Fortune de ce qu'il pouvait lui ôter par
"conseil et par privoquence". A Guide such
as this, and a Leader such as Peel, are able
to contend against fearful odds; but I hope
before Parliament assembles they will confer
and carefully deliberate on the most trying
and dangerous circumstances, which
British Statesmen have encountered, with
reference to domestic affairs, since the
acquisition of the House of Hanover.

I have suffered very much
from perpetual Gout, and my health is
failing. My kindest regards to Lady Emily.
Yr. obliged & attached Friend
W^m G. Earle

S. Lap Jun 21 1839

My dear Kearsage I am very
much obliged you for your
Letter

I have the 9th of November here,
and have not time to correspond
upon the state of Affairs.

Greenwood made a compilation
of the rules of the Army. This
answered to well that he thought
of making use of the rules of the
Army in the last rules; and the
S. C. gave him permission
to send their records. He will

found a good deal.
And Berkeley who though
I have given him some
Assistance; but publishing
that certain facts were not
correctly represented in their
Statement I was obliged to
scare among my own papers;
and I have given him time
by various Documents. I
don't think that any thing
will be published without
his

Dr made fullail; a the way
they will be done which my
friends ought to be alarmed at.

The War will contain the
accounts of various military
operations which are very

amusing

we have not been given
necessaries by

The War has

to Henry Parkhurst

Leicester February 22

1839

My dear Sir

I have been all day at the Charter House; and have only now returned home.

I send you an order for 53.. 3.. 0 The three pounds three are for the subscription for the Notices.

The 50s is my subscription for the other part of your next number.

I am however so tired of and disgusted with every thing

relating to the purchase of
the Press, and particularly
of the King's Press, I know,
so much of their proceedings,
and I know that they are
so little to be depended on
and that there is so little of
secrecy in any of the said
Committees, that I request that
my name may not be
entered in your lists or
proceedings.

So tell me the truth I would

not to write at all as I know
the risk which all subscribers
permanently, that of my station
in life never by becoming,
only that you mentioned the
names of some highly respec-
table individuals whom I wish

I encourage and assist.
But I wish that my request
may be attended to that my
name may not be entered
in any list; and that my
share in this transaction
shall be entirely confidential
between

You and we
Believe no less pure
and true as we believe

~~Private~~
~~Copy~~
Extract

Cape of Good Hope
Wynberg 20th March 1839

As I am somewhat anxious that those few persons in England, who have ever cared about me, - or thought well of me, - or wished well to me, should not be induced to regret the having entertained either the one or the other, of those sentiments & feelings toward me, - by a belief that any misconduct, or dereliction of duty, upon my part, has drawn upon me the treatment which I have received at the hands of the Colonial Minister, - I have had a few already published documents, collected and sewed together, without any observation or commentary, - for the satisfaction of those

I have
24 Copies
herewith sent
To

Col. Frith
H. H.

those my friends, as to the
character of my administration
of the Government of this Colony,
and the opinions thereon, of all
classes of its inhabitants -
This compilation is so short, that
it will not fatigue them in the
reading - and as I have only had
in view in its collection, the
above purpose, without the
slightest intention of any other,
and have besides especially
desired to avoid exciting any
feeling here, of an adverse ten-
dency to the measures of policy,
which have succeeded to mine;
I have carefully prevented
even a single copy's getting into
circulation in the Colony

Colony, - neither have I sent
to England any more than those
which have come to you, - Lady
D'Urban I know, sent you the
other day, by Sir John Dometon,
& by Capt Keake respectively, two
packets containing a few copies
of this pamphlet, for yourself,
for Sir Robert Harney for John
& William D'Urban, and for my
sister Mrs Blythe in Norfolk -

{ 24 Copies

and of these now sent, I will
thank you to send
1 Copy to the Duke of Wellington
1 to Lord Beresford
1 Sir John Beresford
1 to Sir Willoughby Gordon
1 to Sir Henry Hardinge
1 to Sir John Macdonald

- 1 to Sir James Kemp
- 1 to Lord Falkland
- 1 to the Bishop of Exeter
- 1 to Sir Henry Watson
- 1 to Sir Frederick Watson
- 1 to Sir Herbert Taylor
- 1 to Sir Richard Jackson
- 1 to Sir John Kirkland
- 1 to Col. Chambers 25th regt.
- 1 to Sir John Croft
- 1 to Col. Warre (Chatham)
- 1 to Capt. George Beresford
- 1 to the Hon. Mr. Pollock
- 1 to Col. Campbell 98th regt.

Keep one or two for yourself if
you please, and distribute
what remains to any of my
old brother Soldiers, who may be in

No. 2.

Many in your opinion, feel
any interest about me, I trust
that these papers will speak for
themselves, so far as I am concerned,
& that my friends will find
no occasion to think the worse
of me for my conduct at the
Cape - I should willingly abstain
from dwelling upon the present,
or prospective, condition of the
Frontier Provinces of the Colony,
as directly resulting from the
Policy which has been substituted
for mine, (and it is a subject
which here I can't too properly
to speak of) both are sufficiently
lamentable; But it would be
difficult to believe, if the fact

fact were not indisputable, that
petitions setting forth such wrongs,
& distresses, upon the part of
any of Her Majesty's faithful
and loyal subjects, as those
which are justly & without
exaggeration stated in that
of Albany pages 7 to 13
(of these papers) and of
Graaprint, pages 26 to 38,-
should have procured neither
redress, nor success, nor
sympathy for the sufferers,
and that this prayer should
have been rejected by the
Secretary of State for the
Colonies & since it has

Waldenbury me! Hence the
unhappy abandonment of the
Provinces of the Eastern & North
Eastern border, by their ancient
& invaluable Inhabitants!

The last straw has at length
broken the camel's back! &
Families who have, some of them,
lived upon the Estates now
deserted, since the middle
of the last Century, - have
emigrated in a mass.

with all their children
relatives, and moveable
property, and gone to seek a
new home in the uninhabited
regions of the Interior - The
men thus driven to expatri-
ation, by an overwhelming
sense of slighted petitions

petitions - unredressed grievances,
Insecurity of person & property,
and a refusal, on the part of
Her Majesty's Government, of
either sympathy, or due pro-
tection, - may (as I can
affirm, for I have seen much
of them, & know them well)
justly vie with the Farmers
of England; in the best days
of the latter, for every good
quality, of Industry, Industry,
Temperance, Loyalty, Courage,
and an unaffected faith
in their religion - It would
be superfluous to expatiate
upon the grievous loss to the
Colony of such a race

No. 3.

race - at once, the natural
& able defenders, - the cultivators
and the taxpayers of the Country
They are lost to it however,
and, ^{as I think irreparably} for ever - As early
as the middle of 1835, I had
unreservedly, and distinctly
expressed to the Colonial
Minister, my firm conviction
that, unless certain causes
of grievances were removed,
- this expatriation would
infallibly take place,
carrying with it, the ultimate
ruin of the Frontier Provinces,
- and I hastened to adopt
such measures, as would at
once have removed those

those causes; given permanent
security to the Country, and
led to the speedy civilization
of the neighbouring Savages.
Between that period and the
end of 1836, my representations
to the Secretary of State, on
this important subject, have
been repeated, unremitting,
and urgent - These however
were fated to be alike un-
successful, with the "petition"
of Her Majesty's, unfortunate
Subjects of the Border; all
that had done was disapproved,
renounced, and abrogated,
and my prophecy of evil,

Soil, - already extensively full
filled, - is making fearful
 strides, to its final accom-
plishment. - I cannot ~~write~~^{reflect}
all this without the deepest
feelings of sorrow, - although
it is no longer any thing to
me, and I may truly say,
asto all that regards it, -

"Liberavi Animam Meam"

But this feeling has insensi-
bly led me into talking to
you about it now at much
greater length, & heaping
upon your time and patience,
for a much longer space,
than I had at all intended
when I began to write."

S. B. D. Luban

London June 29 1839 ¹⁶⁷

My Dear Darling

I have returned the
Ditz Map to General all the
papers upon the trial of
Capt. Stedman and St. Saurin,
You can get them from him
when you please

I send you my Memoir of
facts and dates.

I have made it unaltered
for you; because I have been
true of the Papers by that
received from Major Stedman

previous to my order of the 18th October 1823 ~~which~~ have
I saw you yesterday

Believe me ever yours
most sincerely W. M. Thackeray

Will you return me the
enclosed paper; as I think
it probable that as usual
somebody will take another
turn at this card; and this
Newspaper and letters is
more perfect than the former
what I shall; as I have time

seen more papers.

Traylen Manor

Farley - Sep: 11.

My dear Hardey

1834

I wish that I could
 Lady Smith with as leave
 as before Monday the 23rd.

I would gladly detain you
 much longer.

I am bewildered by
 the late changes, and do not
 understand the policy of
 them.

The flight of Arrowick was I
think intentional. He has frequently
embarrassed Lord John Russell by
his petulance, and the expression
of opposite opinions.

The Government must have
been sorry to offend and lose
Charles Wood.

The appointment of Lord
Normanby to the Home office,
is done perfectly unaccountably

Exercising, as is usual of the
House of Lords.

Result resulting is, to place
him into office which has the
Chief dispensation of the Prerogative
of Henry, so immediately after
the condemnation by the House
of Lords of said Normanby's
Exercise of that Prerogative is
an inferior Liberty -

Price close of his House
His career was unglorious
Enough - and his soaring title
ill asserted with the manner
- which he crawled out of office.

In both Houses the
Duke and Duke of Cambridge
Elderberry Lord Forester and
Lord Brooke. It is well
staying in the House.
My kind regards to Lady Emily

but I must take a new
Sheet to congratulate you on
your purchase.

Must be Cheapest thing
that is sold now a days
in a Smith Estate with a
first house upon it -

There is nothing vendible,
when there is so great a
Contract

between the Cost & the
Selling, and the purchase
Money he gets for it,

Your Purchase seems
an Eminent Example of
the Truth of my Remarks.
I wish you long life to enjoy
it with your family and
your children.

I thank the Hon. Clergy
Rugbyham shared themselves
the Task of writing and sending
me

Ever most faithfully
yours

J. H. B. B. B.

Robert B. B.

ORDER OF LORD HILL.

(From a Ministerial paper.)

Horse-Guards, Nov. 20, 1839.

Sir,—By Lord Hill's desire, I have the honour to communicate to you his Lordship's sentiments and decision upon a case which has lately occurred in the district under your command, which has occasioned his Lordship the utmost concern, and of which the following are the facts:—

On Wednesday, the 30th ult., a meeting called "The Conservative Association" was assembled at Ashton-under-Line, at which Colonel Thomas, Major Maclean, and other officers of the 20th Regiment, as well as Captain Ainslie, of the Royal Dragoons, were present.

One of the speeches spoken upon that occasion having been reported to have contained expressions insulting and disrespectful towards Her Majesty, Colonel Thomas was required by the General Commanding-in-Chief to state whether he had heard those expressions, and if he had, whether he had expressed his disapprobation of them.

Colonel Thomas positively denies having heard those expressions (as does Captain Ainslie also for himself), but is unable to state what the expressions used by the speaker alluded to really were, or to show that their tenour was respectful towards Her Majesty.

Major Maclean, and the other officers of the 20th Regiment who were present, state that they "cannot vouch for particular expressions used by Mr. Roby on that occasion."

In reference to the above facts, it is most painful to Lord Hill to observe, that upon their own showing Colonel Thomas and the other officers in question have placed themselves in the mortifying predicament of being obliged to confess that they lent their presence to a meeting of a strong party character, at which expressions were uttered which they are unprepared to prove the propriety of towards the person of their Sovereign.

In this state of a case, on every account very distressing to him, it remains for Lord Hill but to order that you convey to Colonel Thomas, and to every other officer belonging to the forces now serving under your command who was present upon the above occasion, the expression of his Lordship's most pointed and decided displeasure, reminding them that, as military servants, they are bound to confine themselves to their military duties; and that when they thus venture to connect themselves with any party association, under any circumstances, or upon any pretence whatsoever, they incur a heavy responsibility, and expose themselves to the heaviest blame.

In Colonel Thomas's first letter to the Adjutant-General upon this unpleasant subject, he states that he was invited by this Conservative Association "as a member of Parliament." In reference to that part of the Colonel's statement, I have it specially in command to declare that, whilst Lord Hill yields to no one in respect for the privileges of a member of Parliament, his Lordship will not suffer any officer of the army to build his justification upon them, when he thinks fit to resort to a measure calculated to compromise the character and discipline of his profession.

Lord Hill thinks it scarcely necessary to add, that the prohibition to attend party meetings, in their military capacity (except when on duty and in aid of the civil authorities of the country) applies to the officers of the army at large.

His Lordship's final orders are, that you, on receipt hereof, or as soon thereafter as may be practicable, without subjecting the public service to injury or inconvenience, proceed to Ashton-under-Line, and there assemble the officers of the 20th Regiment (commanding Captain Ainslie's presence likewise), reading this letter to them, and intimating to them that his Lordship will allow no further discussion of a subject which has already been exhausted by official correspondence, upon which no new facts can be elicited, and upon which, therefore, his opinions are settled and immutable.

I have, &c.,

JOHN MACDONALD, A. G.

Major-General Sir Charles Napier, K.C.B., &c.,
Nottingham.

CORRESPONDENCE REFERRED TO IN THE ABOVE.

(From the Standard.)

Horse Guards, Nov. 3, 1839.

"Sir,—Lord Hill's attention having been attracted by a report published in the accompanying impression of *The Times* newspaper of the 2d inst., of speeches made at a meeting denominated 'a Conservative Association,' at Ashton-under-Line, on Wednesday, the 30th ult., in one of which speeches, more particularly that made by Mr. Roby, expressions most insulting and disrespectful towards the Queen are stated to have been uttered on that occasion, and that in your hearing, as well as in the hearing of other officers now employed in the northern district, I have received Lord Hill's commands to point out those expressions to you, and to desire that, on receipt hereof, you acquaint me, for his Lordship's information, whether you heard them, and, if you did, whether you expressed your disapprobation thereof upon hearing them."

"I am to add, that it is most painful to Lord Hill to know that officers of the army were present on such an occasion; but that his Lordship will refrain from passing any opinion on the case, until you shall have furnished such explanation relative thereto as you may be prepared to submit for his consideration."

"The expressions to which this letter alludes are transcribed in red ink in the margin."

"You will be pleased to return the newspaper with your answer."

"J. MACDONALD, A. G."

(Extracts referred to.)

"He trusted the Duke and Sir Robert Peel would purge the Court of that filth which stunk in the nostrils of all but those who did not know virtue from vice, purity from impurity, innocence from youth; for virgin innocence was banished from the Palace, while vice rioted rampant at the Royal board. (Cheers.)"

"He was sorry to use such words, but they were the words of truth and soberness."

"A Lady Flora Hastings was dismissed with scorn and obloquy, and fell a sacrifice, whilst a Melbourne and a Headfort (faugh!) basked in the sunshine of Royal favour. (Applause.)"

"When any one aimed a blow at the epicure Administration, down he skulked behind the embroidered petticoats and the founcings and furbelows of the ladies of the Court. (Laughter.)"

Stockport, Nov. 9, 1839.

"Sir,—I have had the honour to receive your letter of yesterday's date, calling upon me to state, for Lord Hill's information, whether I heard certain expressions quoted in the margin of that letter, as most insulting and disrespectful towards the Queen, and purporting to be an extract from a speech made by Mr. Roby, at a meeting 'denominated' a Conservative Association, at Ashton-under-Line, on the 30th ult."

"In reply I beg to state, that without pretending to be able to determine with any degree of certainty the correctness of isolated expressions extracted from reports of speeches delivered on the occasion referred to, I can with confidence assert, that the whole tenour of Mr. Roby's speech at that dinner breathed a high spirit of loyalty to the monarchy; and I beg further to add, that as no expression uttered by that gentleman conveyed to my mind that the slightest disrespect, much less insult, was offered or intended to the Queen, there appeared no ground for the expression of my disapprobation, and I had flattered myself, that my long and faithful services of upwards of one-and-forty years might have assured Lord Hill that I would not have been wanting had such an impression been received by me."

"I have to lament that the knowledge of officers having been present on such an occasion should be painful to Lord Hill. With reference to myself, I was honoured with an invitation as a member of Parliament to meet Sir F. Burdett, which I could have no hesitation in accepting."

"The prompt reply demanded has prevented me, from having any communication with the other officers, who, I understand, when I met them at the dinner, were invited as an acknowledgment on the part of the neighbouring gentry of the high sense they entertained of their services in support of the magistracy, and the protection they afforded to life and property during the Chartist disturbances, and which was conveyed in the most gratifying terms when their health was proposed."

"H. THOMAS,

Colonel Commanding the 20th Regiment."

Stockport, Nov. 16, 1839.

"Sir,—I do myself the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of yesterday's date, conveying to me Lord Hill's express desire, that in my answer to your letter of the 12th instant I shall confine myself to the simple denial or admission required of me by that communication, omitting all words, 'which, in my opinion, is a garbled report of what that gentleman did say in his speech at the Ashton dinner.'"

"Having in my letter of the 9th inst. 'asserted with confidence that the whole tenour of Mr. Roby's speech on the occasion referred to breathed a high spirit of loyalty to the monarchy, and that no expression uttered by that gentleman conveyed to my mind that the slightest disrespect, much less insult, was offered or intended to the Queen, and that consequently there appeared no grounds for the expression of my disapprobation, which would not have been wanting if such an impression had been received by me:'"

"Having further stated in my letter of the 14th inst., 'that I did not hear the particular expressions on the occasion referred to,' and quoted in the margin of your letter of the 8th inst., which in my opinion is a garbled report of what that gentleman did say in his speech at the Ashton dinner:"

"I now beg to acquaint you, for the information of Lord Hill, that with the greatest respect and submission to the Commander-in-Chief, I have nothing further to offer in explanation—nothing to retract or omit from what I have already stated, and I stand upon my character as a soldier, and my birthright as a gentleman, which I cannot help feeling have been reflected upon by most unmerited suspicion."

"H. THOMAS,

Lieut.-Col. Commanding the 20th Regt.

"The Adjutant-General, Horse Guards."

SEATS IN CHURCHES.—A very important decision has been pronounced by Lord Moncrieff on the subject of seat-rents in the city churches, in the case of the Kirk Sessions of Edinburgh against the Magistrates. From this judgment and the explanatory note annexed, it will be seen that his Lordship is of opinion—1st, that the magistrates have no legal right or title to levy any duties or rents as the price of the occupation of the church seats, "for the purpose of increasing the general revenue or common good of the said city, or for the payment of debts contracted or expenses incurred by them in the general affairs thereof;" 2d, that they are entitled to levy such duties or rates so far as the same are necessary for the support of the fabric of the church, and for defraying the expenses of repairs and alterations, and "to provide all things necessary for the decent celebration of divine worship therein," but in so far only as such necessary purposes shall not have been otherwise provided for. It is most likely the magistrates will appeal the case to the House of Lords, should the Inner House affirm Lord Moncrieff's judgment; and, until the matter is finally settled, a large yearly amount of seat-rents must remain in abeyance, as it is at present uncertain to which of the parties it legally belongs.—*Edinburgh Advertiser*.

On the Sunday evening first after the discovery of the awful conspiracy of the Chartists, and the fearful catastrophe at Newport, we understand that Mr. R. Jones, the independent minister at Sirhowy Iron-works, delivered a most powerful discourse relative to the occasion from Isaiah ix., 13—18. After the sermon he expelled every member of his church, male and female, that he knew to have had any connexion with these outlaws.—*Merthyr Guardian*.

1 South Park

Nov 30th 1839.

Copy

My Dear Mr Donald,

I have just read your letter to Major General Sir Charles Napier, reporting Commanding Colonel Thomas Commanding 20th Regiment for attending a Conservative Association Dinner to which he states he was invited as a Member of Parliament to meet Sir F. Burdett

Now as I am a Colonel of a Regiment on full pay and therefore liable to be tried by Court Martial for Military disobedience, and I am also a Member of Parliament having duties to perform to my Constituents by giving effect to their Conservative sentiments at pub.

lic Party Meetings, whenever I may think
proper so to do, I wish to be informed whether
under the terms of your letter I do violate
my Duty and disobey Lord Hill's order by
attending Conservative Association Meetings;
or whether the words "in his Military Capacity"
admit of a construction sufficiently wide to
exonerate me from "the heavy blame and
responsibility" which in other parts of your
letter attach to Officers "who connect themselves
with any Party Associations under any circum-
stances or upon any pretences whatever". The
prohibition "applies to the Officers of the Army
at large", and as the Mutiny Act, Articles
of War, and Regulations of the Army are si-
lent on the subject, I presume to refer to
the Horse Guards for their interpretation of

The Order, having myself no doubt, that a
Colonel of a Regiment in my position is at
full liberty to attend these Party Meetings
when and where he pleases.

I am Sir
A. A.

St General

Sir John Mc Donald K C B.

Private 2

W. H. M.
3d Dec

1839

My dear Hardinge

I answer you
letter of the 30th inst (which
I received yesterday) I have
only to say that, according
to my interpretation of the
principles laid down in
my letter to Sir Charles Napier
to which you allude, they
refer to - do
Yours
Sir Jas Hardinge

not interfere with your
 duties to your constituents,
 as far as your attending
 Conventions of associations;
 but that they do, distinctly,
 and decidedly, forbid
 your doing so in your
bitting capacity as about
of a Regiment, or in any
other bitting capacity -
 I am very sorry to
 collect

from the tenor of your
letter that you do not approve
of the dictum thus laid down
by the highest military authority
for the information and
guidance of the officers of the
Army — I never had, I never
can have but one opinion
as to the utility of the course
which has been adopted
upon this occasion; and that
being the case, I think I
shall best consult you

never

and my own obtaining
from the description ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~Q, L~~
Correspondence, of a subject
upon which, judging from
your letter, I shall, most
probably have the misfortune
to find myself at issue
with you upon points upon
which I shall consider
that if not a real misfortune
to myself personally, as to the
distinction I receive at large - when
you next favour me with a
visit in this room, you may
be assured that I shall have the
greatest

Please in putting you
in possession of every feeling
and opinion of my own upon
this subject, leaving you
to deal with them as you shall
think fit - In the mean
time, believe me to be

My dear Gardiner's

Yours ever faithfully
Wm. Woodcock

3

South Park

Dec^r 4th 1839

Private

My Dear Mr Donald,

I find by your letter of yesterday's date, that your interpretation of the principles of Lord Hill's order is, that it does not forbid me from attending Conservative Associations, but that it does decidedly forbid me from doing so in any Military Capacity as a Colonel of a Regiment or in any other Military Capacity.

I must beg you to observe, I did not put the question, whether or not I should violate the Order by attending these meetings as a Colonel of a Regiment or in any other Military Capacity; for on this point I never had any doubt. What I desired to arrive at was, the practical application of a principle so broadly announced in the General Order, as to leave it doubtful how far I should transgress its spirit by attending for the future any public Meeting. I reminded you I was a Col.

one of a Regiment ~~on~~ full pay, and amenable
to Martial Law - and I stated that I had no
doubt an Officer in my position, could attend
these public Meetings as I had heretofore done;
but I quoted the words used in the Order, and
I confined my question to my own case, which
I understand, in order that I might, by your
answer, be quite sure not to embarrass Lord
Hill, or prejudice the public Service, by re-
asserting my right to attend any Party Meet-
ing, which I may be required to do, either as a
Member of Parliament, or as an English Gen-
tleman. If I had taken no notice of your
letter, and had the next week gone to a Public
Meeting, and maintained what I believe to
be my right, and that of every British Officer
and Gentleman; you, and Lord Hill, and the
Service would have had reason to complain of
such a proceeding.

I therefore appealed to you for the interpretation of

your own Order - I gave no opinion on Colonel Thomas' case, because I was not in possession of all the facts and the details. I wrote the same day to one of our friends, and gave my decided opinion, that Colonel Thomas and the Officers of the 20th Regiment, being employed on Duty in the neighbourhood of Ashton under Lyne, acted improperly in attending that dinner, to which they were invited in their Military Capacity; but that Colonel Thomas, a Member of Parliament, invited as such, might have erred in judgment very naturally, after what he had recently witnessed at Portsmouth - namely the Port Admiral attending a Party Dinner, and returning thanks for the Navy in his Official character of Naval Commander on the Station; and I added that, when I was at Durham, I never would invite the Military Officers to any Election Dinner or borrow the band. I also adverted to Sir John Dalrymple's case, who in the Correspondence of which took place with the Horse Guards was never

called to an account by the General Commanding in Chief, for having attended that Meeting, where the late King was so grossly insulted; but merely for hearing and not resenting those imputed insulting expressions.

In my own case I recollect that I had frequently attended such Meetings, because it was my pleasure so to do, to give effect to my own sentiments and those of my Constituents; and particularly a large Meeting at Dinner of the Merchant Bankers &c of the City of London in 1837, whose numbers exceeded 1800 persons. I cannot pretend to say in what Capacity I was invited - the Lord did not specify it - but, as the Senior Military Officer present, I was called upon to return thanks for the Army. I recollect stating that the Officers of the Army, on the Parade, and in their Military Character, knew nothing of Politics - that, without reference to Political or Party considerations, they were to obey the Civil Authorities of the Country, be they who they might; but that, in their Individual Characters as Members of the Community

in a free Country, they had a right to express their Political sentiments as freely as any other Englishman - and I cited the Duke of Wellington, as an instance, that an Officer of the Army might be devoted in Loyalty to the Crown, and yet with energy and perfect propriety lead the Opposition in resisting the Ministers of the Sovereign - This address was reported in the public papers, and I never heard that any blame attached to me, for attending that Meeting, or in expressing my political sentiments, having been called upon to speak as the Senior Military Officer present.

Am I to understand that, if I attend a Conservative Association Meeting under similar circumstances, I am, as I maintain, perfectly justified in so doing? I took the same course at a great Westminster Conservative Meeting, and as the Senior Military Officer

returned thanks, Sir George Cockburn do-
ing the same for the Navy.

With regard to the highest Military Authority
having laid down the ~~rule~~ principle in your
letter, for the information and guidance of
the Army; I can only say that, taking as I do,
a very strong part in the House of Commons,
in maintaining the principle (sometimes
against her Majesty's present Ministers)
that the Army is under the Authority of
the Crown, and not of the House of Commons;
I am not likely to assert a privilege for the
Officers of the Army, which might weaken the
Authority of the Sovereign; but of this I am con-
fident, I should only earn the contempt of that
highest Military Authority, if, conscientiously
entertaining an important Military Opinion
differing from his, I did not freely maintain it.
And as I consider it a great Constitutional privi

less that Officers of the Army and Navy should be eligible to be returned as Members of Parliament, I shall always be very anxious, for the sake of the Army and of the Crown, that an opinion should not prevail amongst the People, that Military Men are less free and less independent Representatives than other Members of the Community.

If I understand that I should not violate the late Order by attending public Party Meetings, as I have hitherto done, I shall release you from all further discussion. If otherwise I will not fail to come to town immediately.

I am My Dear Mr Donald
Yours very sincerely
H. Hardinge

At Gen^l

Sir John McDonald K C B

to to

declare, unequivocally, and
solemnly, that I consider
my letter of the 20th 1844
to Sir Charles Napier
perfectly invulnerable —
— that I am prepared to
bear and every syllable
of its contents, and that
sooner than abandon
or retract any principle
or sentiment which it
inculcates, I would encounter
the ruin of all my worldly
concerns — I have behaved
~~as~~ far in the
department

A discipline for nearly
40 years — I have, by this
time, taught myself to
believe that I understand
what ^{discipline} discipline is — I have
had the good fortune to
discern that discipline
infinitely longer than any
man now in existence,
and whatever the consequence
may be, I shall never
suffer myself to admit
that I have applied in
misapplying its principles

—

perverting
its interests, upon this
occasion — on the
contingencies, I shall,
to my last moments, insist
and maintain, that my
humble name has never
been annexed to any
Edict that was rendered
more necessary by circumstances,
or that was calculated to
produce more benefit to
the Army — ^{than that which I am now proposing} I am not
unmindful that I am
addressing these words
to a man of the soundest
head

in firmest heart, as that
I am addressing a matter
of great importance. I have analyzed
decided the most valuable
as efficient ^{support} in the discharge
here, of always invidious,
as frequently delicate and
difficult duties, as who
will at least do justice
to both my notions and
my intentions, however he
may find himself unable
to communicate in any
professional doctrine,
even - by the hearing
with sincerest regard - faithfully
yours about Shubdrak
support the Government
approving the Army discharge at Postmark
on its similar proceeding

been attended ⁱⁿ his presence
and in his hearing unattested
by him - These are very
new doctrines, as abundant
precedents upon the records
of this and other military
departments sufficiently prove
to ^{the} King, by John Gardiner,
cast your eye over the
accompanying very recent
General Order, and you will
perceive, perceiving that Lord
Gillford's, upon pain of
being brought to trial before
a general court martial,
the

attendance of any Officer
Non-commissioned Officer or Soldier
"at any meeting or society
whatsoever, for fast purposes".

He does, in a letter
to Sir Charles, Chapin do
more than reiterate the
prohibition, except that it
goes into a detail of circumstances
rendered necessary by the
peculiar and unfortunate
occurrence at Ashton under
Lyne — But, perhaps, I shall
be told, that this severe order
applies to promiscuous, dealers &
Camp only — I surely must
be permitted to know that
was

really contemptible by the order
because it was signed by my
hand - I am, accordingly, prepared
to declare to you, that, in the
discussions which preceded the
issue of the order, and in which
I and Hannah took a part in
I and Miss Poore, various
opinions were expressed,
and a question was raised whether
it might not be necessary to go
into the specification of them,
in detail; but ~~as~~ they were
so various, that it was thought
better to comprehend them under
one head, particularly in regard
to Orange Lodge, - the principle
of officers attending political
meetings, and societies as
substantive

of Quins, was there and then full
dressed, and there was but
one opinion as to the necessity
of peremptory forbidding
that attendance — It is true
that Col: Rowan and other
officers have been reprimanded
upon this occasion, but is the
principle upon which
that reprimand has been
administered new, or untried?
I apprehend not — at least
it ought ^{not} to be considered so
in as much as it has been brought
into operation with infinite
change of effect in other instances
of which I am otherwise cognizant
— when Gen: Popetain went to
Ireland, in 1712, & commanded
here in succession to Lord
Hawkington, he carried in
his

3

part a position and
to dismiss Col. Levee
Stanhope (then Capt. or
Major Gagetau) from
the valuable situation
of Asst. Quarter Master
General, and to dismiss him
further — Mr. Perceval
(then first Minister of the
Crown) insisted upon this
measure, and Lord
Holt's letter Secretary
permitted the mandate
of the ~~the~~ Govt. of calling
on Stanhope the very
morning after an
original

in Dublin and giving him
his dinner - May I am
~~to~~ sure both Lord Pitt
Mansborough and Lord Pitt
will bear me out
when I say, that one of the
chief causes, if not the
only cause of Lord Harrington's
Recall from the Command
of the forces in Ireland,
was ~~to~~ that of his allowing
one or more of his Sons
(they being in ^{retired} employment
as in uniform) to attend some
Antisocial dinner or
dinner in Dublin at which
General

Sentiments towards the
Catholics were spoken,
and in which there you
were joined — Any one who
recollects the occurrence of
which I am now alluding
can satisfy you — That,
~~sentiments~~ ~~sentiments~~ ~~sentiments~~ ~~sentiments~~ ~~sentiments~~
never uttered a strong
sentiment kind of there
~~was~~ dinner, and that a
disloyal & disrespectful
reply towards the
House was not uttered
from any other person
— Yet who shall say that
Mr. Pinckney did not exercise
a

Sound discretion in requiring
he instantaneous withdrawal
from Ireland of an ardent young
soldier full of enthusiasm
~~and~~ upon subjects fraught
with combustible when discussed
upon Irish soil - I could
address other equally analogous
predecessors had I time to state
them, and were I not afraid
of becoming tiresome to you -
For Heaven's sake, by
dear friend, do not let the
and opinion of the Army that
has taken up this subject
against me - Write to you,
positively and to the point,
but altho' it ~~is~~ is important
prevents me that you should
be so, I owe it to myself

Minute 4 Forwards
My dear Gardiner 5th Decr
1779

An unusually severe
preference of public business has
prevented any answering
your letter of the 1st - I will
return of part - I have
carefully perused that
letter, and feel justified in
assuring you, that my
official letter to Sir Charles
Hopson, which is the immediate
cause of our present
correspondence does
referential to W. H. H.
L. Henry Gardiner
H. G.

contains
the syllable that is meant
as a prohibition to you
attending any meeting
of your constituents, or
any correspondence as a
Member of Parliament or
as an English gentleman -

The prohibition contained
in the letter in question, applies
only to officers, in uniform, and
who are in charge of, or
attached to troops at the
time - You and I can have
no hesitation in concluding
that it cannot apply to any
case, in which an officer of the
Army may be invited,
his

Military Capacity & a public
Entertainment at which he
may have I represent this
profession, it being, of course,
understood, that he had
given the Entertainment,
does not previously and
publicly give it the
designation of a party
meeting or association —

It is so characterized,
or designated previously, by
opinion is, that he often
attends it in his uniform
— that is, in his military
character, violates the
principle laid down in
my said letter & I sincerely
hope

I sent my interpretation of
that principle is, that you
as an unemployed officer may
do, in this respect, whatever
you might do before the
issue of the letter, it being
also, however, understood,
that no officer of the Army
can, on account of the
circumstances of his not being
in actual employment, at
the time, as in uniform,
direct himself of responsibility
to Superior Military authority
if upon any occasion whatever
~~he should~~ display a disrespectful
conduct towards the sovereign
have

5 South Park

Dec 7th 1839

Private

My Dear Mr Donald,

I am much obliged to you for your letter of the 5th which so clearly gives me to understand that your official letter does not prohibit me "from attending any meeting of my constituents or any Conservative meeting as a Member of Parliament or as an English Gentleman". That the prohibition "applies only to Officers in Uniform who are in charge of or attached to Troops at the time".

It follows from this definition that the wearing of the Uniform would be the test by which the Horse Guards would judge whether the Officer had or had not attended in his Military Capacity.

To try the principle by a practical case, I understand that Mr Gen^l Sir Hercules Pakenham, Commanding Officer of the Portsmouth District, would have been liable to have been tried by a General Court Martial for dining in his Uniform at Mr Francis Baring's Political Dinner, at which the Port Admiral Fleming made a party speech in his Professional Capacity as Admiral of the Station.

Further, that if Sir George Murray or Sir Henry Hardinge had dined at the Conservative Meeting of Ashton under Lyne, they being Gen^l Officers and Colonels of Regiments in full pay would have been justified in attending the Meeting out of Uniform, for which Colonel Thomas having been in Uniform was

reprimanded, provided that in every case the Military Officer does not overlook any disloyal or disrespectful expressions uttered against the Sovereign.

You then advert to the Gen Order of 31st Aug 1835 in which Lord Hill declares, "that any Officer, N.C. Officer or Soldier who shall hereafter institute or countenance an Orange Lodge, or any other Meeting or Society whatever for party purposes in Barrack, Quarters, or Camp shall be brought to trial before a Gen Court Martial for disobedience of Orders," and that you know this Order was not meant to be applied to Barracks Quarters & Camp only. If so, I am sorry for it. The Carlton Club, Brooks' and the Reform Club are political Bodies composed of Peers and Commoners of all Professions avowedly associated together for party purposes. All Classes of Officers of the Army and Navy are Members of these Clubs. They are the Central Clubs on which the Conservative Associations and the Reform Associations are based. The Duke of Wellington, Colonel of her Majesty's 1st Regt of Guards, quartered in London, gives the Carlton Club his countenance. He is to be seen in Uniform at the Head of the Grenadiers, one hour, and the next at the Carlton Club, instituted and kept up for party political purposes. The same thing occurs with Col Anson from the Ordnance Office, and Col Westcote of the Guards, who at one moment are seen performing Military Off^{rs} Duties in public Departments, or on the Parade at the Horse Guards and the next moment are at Brooks', or at the Reform Club, or at any other Public Meeting, giving free vent to their political sentiments. The same thing occurs with Lt Col Wood who dismounts the Queen's Guard and having laid aside his Uniform is to be

seen at the Carlton or any other Conservative or party Meeting
he may choose to attend. Lord Cardigan, a Peer, in command of
a Regt of Lancers or Captain Forrester does the same. —
If you therefore declare that the G. O. was meant to have a
wider application than merely to Officers instituting party
Meetings or Societies for political purposes in Barracks, Quar-
ters or Camps, you must root up the Clubs in London, the
parent stocks, of which the others in the country are the inferior
branches, and attack Lord Londonderry, Sir Ronald Ferguson
and Sir de Lacy Evans. Now these party Societies consist
of Ex. Ministers of the Crown, Privy Councillors, Judges of the Law,
Field Marshals, Generals and Admirals, all of whom
more or less are giving their countenance to these party Soci-
eties. You cannot say that Officers of the Army are to ab-
stain from "connecting themselves with these party Soci-
eties" from which her Majesty has lately selected Mr McCaulley
to be her Sec^y at War and Mr Shield to be a Privy Councillor
and therefore I do not see how the plain meaning of that
Order namely that Mil^y Men should not as Mil^y Men
in their Barracks Quarters or Camps institute party Soci-
eties can be strained beyond that obvious meaning. No
order of the House of Lords can deprive any Officer of his right
to express at any public Meeting his Political sentiments
provided his sentiments are not disloyal seditious or dan-
gerous to the State or prejudicial to Mil^y Discipline. I
can understand that an Officer of the British Army
threatening to march 20,000 Volunteers to London to
coerce the Tory Peers ought to subject himself to Trial
or Dismissal — but when I read your Order I found
these phrases "that when Officers of the Army ben-

True to connect themselves with any party Association
under any Circumstances or upon any pretence what
soever they incur a heavy responsibility & expose them
selves to the heaviest blame" & that "This prohibition
to attend party meetings applies to the Officers of the
Army at large" without one single word in the G. O.
declaring the fact that these Officers had all attended in
their Uniforms, then I think it became me as a Gen
Officer anxious to maintain the discipline of the Army
and my own rights wch no Gen Order can take away
to ask for the interpretation of the words which they
have quoted the gravamen of the Charge against these
Officers being that they had attended a Party Meeting
of the same character & description as those wch
I have attended & may be required to morrow to attend of an

I am much gratified that your explanations do
not compel me to bring the question to a public issue
Rely upon it I should have done so in the manner
the least likely to be disagreeable or embarrassing to
you & to Lord Hill I do tentively concur with you
that Officers ^{when they are in charge of Troops in the case of the 20th Regt} attending these Meetings in Uniform do
act improperly & subject themselves to be tried for dis-
obedience of Orders, I shall not prolong a discussion wch
must be inconvenient to you but again express my obliga-
tions to you for the friendly manner in wch you have car-
ried on the Correspondence — I am

H.H.

Up to this hour I know nothing of the sentiments of any other
Officer upon the subject — As to Leicester Stanhope his removal
from the Staff under the circumstances you describe
was most proper and justifiable

Private 6 JPM

My dear Hardinge

9th Dec

1839

I cannot help thinking
it hard that what I stated respecting
the general order of August 1835,
should be misconstrued by you -
- That order does, undoubtedly
express provisions for Camp and
quarters only - but I still maintain
that its purpose had in view the
prevention and discouragement
of attending party meetings, generally
in an Military capacity, in
which capacity we must appear
in uniform, if we appear
at all - Now you will have it
that the General Officer Commanding
at Dartmouth, was subject
himself to a ^{high} parent's control if he
attended an election dinner -
R. H. Noble at
Special Supper Hardinge

Not placed in uniform - I
doubt that there is any thing
in the letter to Sir John Hope
that provides, so bearing in
punishment for such a case

Election dinners are, I fancy,
very often composed of various
parties, and may, as regards party
character, be innocent; but still
they, in most cases, partake too
much of party feeling & he sits
places for the officers of the
Army to appear at in uniform,
and I have no hesitation therefore
in expressing my opinion, that
(looking to both the spirit and
the letter of the important document
in question), the refusal of his
Commanding at Portsmouth
to allow of any infringement upon
both by connecting himself
with

any Election devisor in his
uniformed & whitet in charge
of a sitting District, nor have
I doubt that Sir Hill would
in such a case peremptory
order him not to repeat an
error which, in point of
example might produce mischief

I hope you will do me
the justice to bear in mind that
I do not, on this, or on any other
occasion undertake to frame
or discuss regulations, for the
guidance of officers in their
political capacity, and to define
the precise amount of responsibility
which may attach to the various
shades of cases, that may arise,
in which the officer has to discharge
his duties, as a member of Parliament
to his Constituents, or to his
associates

as a member of this art that
Club - I must again, and
once for all, ask leave to
spare you that your correspondence
with me upon this subject,
has given me great pain, because
until it was commenced
upon your part I thought
it utterly impossible that however
political views through the
medium of the public press
might really, or feignedly,
make the letter of Sir Charles
Napier a subject for speculative
opinion ~~to be made~~
any intelligent friend could charge
it upon me as a document
unintelligible to him - My belief
is that its contents are fully understood
by every soldier and civilian that the
doctrine which Lord Hill lays down in it
will do infinite good in the Army
and that it were ~~as well~~ as well to disseminate
any article as to leave its opinions at what I call
what you may meet, they chose in their papers
with a - I must therefore I am

7

South Park

Dec 11. 1839.

Private

My Dear McDonald,

I only received your letter of the 9th this morning. I must at once advert to the expression used by you at the close of it. You think it "utterly impossible" that however political Rivals thro' the Medium of the Public Press might really or feignedly make your Official letter a subject for speculative opinion, any Mil^y friend would charge it upon you as a document unintelligible to him. My belief is that its contents are fully understood by every Soldier & Civilian & that the doctrine which I lay down in it will do infinite good" &c

I must repeat the assurance in my last letter, that up to this hour, I know nothing of the opinions of any other Officer, nor of the opinions of any Persons who have written in the Public Press. But these expressions of yours require that I should vindicate the dulness of my apprehension from the charge of being the only Officer who has found your letter to be unintelligible.

I feel very sincerely & strongly that that letter is calculated to do great mischief to the Discipline of the Army and likely to be a source of great public embarrassment in carrying those principles impartially into practical application. May I hope, if you could do so, I do not think you would achieve a desirable victory over the privileges which the Officers of the

of the Army have hitherto exercised in common with their British Gentlemen, & which in a Constitutional point of view it is essential they should preserve. When Officers in Command of Armed men are freely admitted to the Honors & Power of the Senate, they are less likely to use the Armed Force against the Liberties of their Country — but it would be a mockery to their Constituents and to themselves to declare that the occasions on which they may be permitted to express their Political opinions shall be regulated by Gen Orders, issued from time to time by the Horse Guard. I should think myself a dishonest Representative, if I thus consented to sit in Fetters. I therefore object most decidedly to the attempt made to lay down the abstract principles and doctrines by which the conduct of Mil^y Officers relating to their Civil Rights & Privileges in a free Country are to be defined and limited by Horse Guard's Orders.

The Gen Order very broadly lays down the principle that the Officers of the Army at large are not to connect themselves with Party Meetings — — If the Order had been confined to the case of the Officers of the 20th Reg^t accepting as a Mil^y Body an invitation to a Party Dinner & there attending in their Professional Capacity by wearing their Mil^y Dress, I should probably never have addressed you. But when the Horse G^d go out of their way, to threaten Officers "with the heaviest blame if they connect themselves in their Mil^y Capacity with Party Meetings", I must consider that mode of dealing with the case then before them a very objectionable one, & as the Gen Order affected me on a Question on which the Mutiny Act & Regulations of the Army are silent I thought it my duty to appeal to you for an interpretation. I have never sought to make your

Letter a subject of speculative opinion, nor did I ever expect you to frame a Gen Order "which might define the precise amount of responsibility which may attach to the various shades of Cases that may arise." But this is what has been attempted, instead of limiting your Mil^y Doctrine of the Case before you. And it is evident how great must be the difficulty in practically carrying your principle into effect when you state you cannot define the various shades of Cases which may occur: for what is the result of your defus of your own Order? You declare in your last Letter as well as in your former that the Mil^y Capacity is to be traced by the fact of the Officer appearing in Uniform of which fact not one word is said in the Order. But I must be allowed to observe ^{that} that test is not infallible. If they had gone to the dinner in Brown Coats wd they not have violated Mil^y propriety in spirit but in a less ostensible degree? if the color of the Coat made the attendance innocent or culpable the Order surely wd have alluded to it. It wd have been a very simple & conclusive test & wd have been intelligible. It is evident this is your test, for in your former Letter you say if an Officer accepts an Invitation to a Party Meeting & attends in Uniform he disobeys the Hills Order - & yet Maj Gen Pakenham Commanding the Portsmouth District going to an Election Dinner wd "only closely infringe upon the spirit & letter of the Order". I will not enter upon what must be a matter of opinion, whether the attendance of Officers at an Election Dinner or at a Conservative Dinner is more prejudicial to Mil^y Discipline altho' this must form a part of your Consideration when you apply your Doctrine - but the Gen^l of a district attending in Uniform in his own Garrison surely is a stronger Case than that of some Reg^t Officers accepting the Invitation of a Social Association of Gentlemen in their neighbourhood. However let us take the Case of a Gen Officer going to a Public entertainment in Uniform knowing it to be a Party Meeting

with you say wd be disobedience of Orders — I recollect Al-
derman Cpeland when Id Mayor of London ^{upon} when Sir Rob Peel
was out of Office in 1835 giving a Dinner as a mark of his respect
to our great Conservative Leader — The Opposition Peers & Common-
ers were invited — It was a Party Meeting — The Duke of Wellin-
ton, Sir H Hardinge & other Gen Officers attended in Uniform.
Sir Rob Peel attended in the Dress of an Ex-Minister — His
late Majesty's Privy Councillors attended in their Court Dresses
with by Royal Permission they are allowed to wear out of Of-
fice — Could it be tolerated that the D. of Wellington shd be
reprimanded whilst Sir R Peel shd be passed over as guilt-
less of any act requiring Public Animadversion?

Again the Id Mayor Sir John Kay gave a great Party
Dinner to celebrate the carrying of the Reform Bill — Whig
& Radical Gen Officers attended that Party Meeting in Uni-
form — May take the Case of the Id High Constable of the
Tower — Have we not seen that Illustrious Man within the
District of the Tower over which he exercises Mil^y Authority
in every thing regarding its safety appearing in the City at Party
Public Dinners in Uniform in the Public Hall of those Com-
panies who profess Conservative Politics? I think I might
bring home the Case to my respected friend Id Hill himself
I admit in 9 Cases of 10 the Uniform may constitute the
proof required. But you will perceive into what a labyrinth
of difficulty the promulgation of Political offences committed
by Mil^y Men is likely to lead when issued in the shape of a G. Order

I hope no expression has escaped me which ought to give you
pain — I am not aware of any — If this subject comes to a Pub-
lic Discussion I must take my line — I shall not ~~choose~~ ^{select} it
but I cannot shrink from it & as regards yourself you ought
not to be annoyed that I entertain a very strong opinion
unfortunately differing from yours, give you frankly &

and freely my opinion instead of secretly putting your
Order to pieces or publicly animadverting upon the
impolicy of its tone or expressions.

I can only assure you and Lord Hill that in thus
expressing my dissent I trust I can maintain
and give utterance of my own opinions without losing
sight of that Professional Respect and Personal Regard
which I have always very sincerely felt and which is
in no degree diminished because I differ ^{from} with you
in a point of discipline, so intermixed with politi-
cal considerations as to render it one of great difficult-
ty and delicacy — However not to detain you any
longer believe me — — — H. H.

Observe the Order against Orange Lodges in 1835 was
issued after the House of Commons had passed strong
Resolutions for putting them down, approved
by a Message from the Crown —

Confidential N.P. ²¹⁵ ~~Whitaker~~
My dear Warden's ^{Raylan Man}
Dec. 17. 1839

If I had had should I see
I show you a letter which I wrote
to him about a week since, you
will find that I expressed
opinions with respect to his
Maddox's ^{Letter} ~~letter~~ in exact
conformity with those which you
have conveyed to him.

I said that he had laid
down a principle vastly more
comprehensive than the one
with which he had ideal,

and a promise that it was
utterly impossible to maintain,
unless he meant to insist upon
it, that a Captain on half-pay
should not attend the Election
dinner which might be given to
celebrate or to perpetuate the
Return of his father or his
brother.

That I thought Lord Melb had
a perfect right to call upon
Col. Thomas Delate, whether
he heard expressions

disloyal or offensive to the
Sovereign - and to rebuke
Col. Thomas, if he did hear such
without remonstrating or leaving the
Room - may see that I thought
Sudwell had a right to
advise Col. Thomas being in
Command of a Regiment - stationed
in an excited and inflammable
district, to abstain from attending
any meeting of a party Character
in that district.

But that having a special
case ideal with, I thought the
people of absurdity to take the
opportunity of that special case.
to lay down doctrines perfectly
beyond the mark, and to lay
them down, without qualifications
and exceptions, which must be
made unless military men are
to be mere machines without
an opinion on public affairs -
I noted also, that

And still very properly called
upon the officer to admit or
deny whether he heard certain
expressions (expressions which had
been an offence I would not have
heard without remembrance).

They deny that they did hear
them - and then after this
denial which of course is made
afterwards, they are told
that "they have placed themselves
in the mortifying predicament

of having lost their presence
in a meeting at which expressions
have uttered which they are
unprepared to prove the
propriety of towards their
Sovereign.

What abundance to call
upon men to prove the propriety
of expressions which they did
not hear -

Lord Althorpe have
said I do not believe in
denial - or I do believe it,
but having put the question
of them, I see no middle course
between accepting or rejecting
the denial -

The mode of dealing
with the ^{Case} question, seems to me
I have been a very simple one.

and the Letter to General
Lapier, to have been the most
bungling seeking of difficulties
that can be conceived.

Your letters are perfectly
conclusive -

What can Sir J. Hardwicke
mean by maintaining that
a General order prohibiting
the institution or countenance
of Party meetings

"in Barracks Quarters or
Camp" - was meant to
include party meetings out
of Barracks Quarters or Camp -

The plainest language
has no meaning - if this be so,
and it would be a hard
Rule demand strict obedience
to orders - which must

He had the man who reads
them.

I wonder whether any Court
Martial would convict
for disobedience of orders - on
such a circumstance as that given
by Macdonald & the order of his
31st Aug. 1835 - Impossible.

The Duke of Wellington has
a very strong feeling against
getting Lord Pitt into any
difficult account of his
conduct -

I think I could perfectly
agree with the plan
proposed. I have no
business to

whenever is the matter -

Therefore Consider Her Letter
Very quite private.

Laugh with you as to
the indications of a coming
Storm. Can by sea Hardly

Just fact by your

Robert

With send you Paper, to my
Porter - who had deliver them a
Whale