

whose views are the same with our's, but may not have Delegates at this time.

“ The minutes of this day's sitting close with a variety of motions; and amongst others the following, by Citizen —, and seconded by Citizen —, “ That a fund be raised by subscription for defraying the expence of small patriotic publications, to be distributed in the Highlands. Every publication shall bear the figure of a Highland Man in full dress, with target and broad sword, to attract the attention of Highlandmen. No publication to cost more than half a penny.”

“ By Citizen —, “ That a Committee be appointed to draw up a declaration of the natural, unalienable, and unprescriptible Rights of Man; and that the same be prefixed to an Address to the People of Great Britain.”

“ And “ That a Committee of Observation be appointed in London, to give the earliest intimation of any motion of the kind mentioned in the foregoing resolution to the different Societies.”

“ Convention-Hall, First Year of the British Convention, Nov. 29, Anno Domini 1793. Tenth Day's Sitting. Citizen — in the Chair.

“ Citizen Margarot gave in the Report of the Committee of Regulations; which was ordered to be printed, and copies to be given in to the *sections* on Monday, for their consideration.”

“ The Secretary read —'s motion for a *Committee of Observation* to be appointed in London. Citizen Margarot stated, That there was no occasion for a Committee of that nature, in London, as there were several thousands of people in that city upon the look out. It was accordingly agreed, *That the Convention should request the London Committee of Correspondence to give the earliest intelligence of what passed in Parliament.*

“ A letter from a friend, &c. which had been transmitted to A. Scott, of the Gazetteer, was read, containing patriotic sentiments, and two guineas; and Citizen Taylor presented a guinea from another Citizen, whose name he was not at liberty to mention. It was stated by the Secretary, that a citizen from London was present, who was to give 5l. 5s. to the Convention, when a collection should be made for enlightening the Highlanders. The thanks of the house were unanimously given to the before mentioned patriots for their donations.

“ Eleventh Day's Sitting, Nov. 30, 1793.

“ The Secretary read a motion, that a Committee be appointed to revise each day's minutes immediately on the rising of the Convention, for the purpose of sending them to the press, to make hereafter a daily bulletin of the same. The question being put, the motion passed unanimously.

“ Citizen

“ Citizen ——— likewise moved, That no person should be allowed the *honours of the sitting*, unless recommended by two members; which with amendments, as in the motion itself, passed unanimously.

“ The Secretary read a motion for publishing the natural, unalienable, and unprescriptible Rights of Man, which was ordered to be given to the Committee of Union.

“ It was moved, That Captain ——— should report some circumstances to the Convention; for which purpose the house resolved itself into a Committee, when he read an account of the trial and sentence of D. Holt, for re-printing the Duke of Richmond and Mr. Pitt’s Resolution for a Parliamentary Reform; after which, the Chairman being replaced, the Secretary moved, That Captain ——— should be *allowed the honours of the sitting*.

“ Citizen ——— from Strathaven, and ——— from Hamilton, requested leave of absence should be granted, and moved, that all the Delegates who had left the Convention, should receive letters to return immediately, and remain at their posts until the important business which was daily introduced into the Convention should be properly discussed.

“ A motion to fine those members who did not attend their Sections.” The order of the day was called for.

“ A motion for drawing out a scroll of a petition to parliament; which being read, *The order of the day was moved upon it.*”

“ Monday, December 2, 1793. First Year of the British Convention. Twentieth Day’s Sitting. Citizen ——— in the Chair, and Citizen ——— and ——— Assistants at the Table.”

“ Citizen Skirving insisted that all the members, both of the Convention and Primary Societies, should subscribe a solemn league and covenant.

“ Citizen Gerald pled for liberty of sentiment; and compared the people and their enemies, to the worshippers of the true God and of Baal. He afterwards read some paragraphs from the Edinburgh Herald, with suitable comments; and compared the constitution of 1688 to a dead horse. He shewed the insipidity of the title “Gentleman,” and the propriety of the term “Citizen;” remarked the impropriety of the mode of promulgating our laws, by restricting them to be sold by one printer, and published in the Saxon character, which few can read.”

“ Citizen Skirving also pled for the motion, and insisted that it was proper, on all occasions, to take the opinion of the Primary Societies; and considered *the Convention as only a Committee of the People.*”

“ Citizen Margarot pled in favour of the motion. The approbation given by the *many thousands of their constituents in London, Sheffield, Norwich, Leeds, &c.*

“ The motion being agreed to, with one dissentient voice, who afterwards acceded, Citizen — read a spirited advertisement from the Nottingham Society, inserted in a Sheffield newspaper.”

“ A motion made by Citizen —, and seconded by Citizen —, That the Convention shall pass some resolutions respecting the late unprecedented and unwarrantable infringements on the freedom of the press, particularly the arbitrary sentence of Judge Wilson against Mr. Holt, for reprinting the Duke of Richmond and Mr. Pitt's Plan of Reform.

“ Citizen — and — moved, That this Convention take under consideration whether (after the contemptible manner in which the late petitions for parliamentary reform were treated) they shall again petition for reform, or at what period they should recommend the same to their constituents. On this day 19s. 3¼d. was collected.”

“ At the Thirteenth Day's Sitting.

“ Citizen —, of Sheffield, produced a commission from the Leeds Constitutional Society, appointing him their Delegate; which was approved of by the Convention. On this day 18s. 9d. was collected.

The Minutes of the Fourteenth Day's Sitting are begun and entered thus: “ Edinburgh, November 4, 1793. Fourteenth Sitting of the British Convention.

(In the above, November is, by mistake, inserted in place of December.)

“ Mr. Margarot begged leave to bring in a motion to this effect, That the moment of the illegal dispersion of the present Convention be considered as our summons to repair to the place of meeting appointed for the Convention of Emergency by the Secret Committee; and that the same motion be considered this evening. Leave was accordingly granted.

“ The Convention then heard the only two motions on their table read, which regarded the same matter; and it being objected to, the business of these motions was to be taken up to-morrow evening; after some conversation, it was carried by a vote of the house to delay further consideration till to-morrow evening. Mr. Margarot being prepared to bring forward his motion above-mentioned, the same was taken under consideration, and was as follows:

“ Moved, That the moment of any illegal dispersion of the British Convention shall be considered as a summons to the Delegates to repair to the place of meeting appointed for the Convention.

vention of Emergency by the Secret Committee; and that the Secret Committee be instructed to proceed, without delay, to fix the place of meeting.

“ The Convention, having considered the motion fully, unanimously resolved the same, and appointed the Secret Committee to proceed as desired.

“ Resolved, that the following declaration and resolution be inserted at the end of our minutes.

“ That this Convention considering the calamitous consequences of any act of legislature, which may tend to deprive the whole or any part of the people of their undoubted right, to meet either by themselves or by delegates, to discuss any matter relative to their common interest, whether of a public or private nature, and holding the same to be totally inconsistent with the first principles and safety of society, and also subversive of our known and acknowledged constitutional liberties, do hereby declare, before God and the world, that we shall follow the wholesome example of former times, by paying no regard to any act which shall militate against the Constitution of our country, and shall continue to assemble and consider of the best means by which we can accomplish a real representation of the people, and annual election, until compelled to desist by superior force.

“ And we do resolve, that the first notice given for the introduction of a Convention Bill, or any bill of a similar tendency to that passed in Ireland in the last sessions of their Parliament;

“ Or any bill for the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, or the act for preventing wrongous imprisonment, and against undue delays in trial in North Britain;

“ Or in case of an invasion, or the admission of any foreign troops whatsoever into Great Britain or Ireland;

“ All or any one of these calamitous circumstances shall be a signal to the several delegates to repair to such place as the Secret Committee of this Convention shall appoint; and the first seven members shall have a power to declare the sittings permanent, shall constitute a Convention, and twenty-one proceed to business.

“ The Convention doth therefore resolve, that each delegate, immediately on his return home, do convene his constituents, and explain to them the necessity of electing a delegate or delegates, and of establishing a fund, without delay, against any of these emergencies, for his or their expence; and that they do instruct the said delegate or delegates to hold themselves ready to depart at one hour's warning.

“ A Delegate from Glasgow presented to the Sections, during the sittings of this Convention, a motion of the following tenor; viz, The

“ The delegate from Glasgow moves, That the Convention take into their consideration the nature and extent of a resolution adopted by their constituents, and most of the other Societies in Scotland, and afterwards ratified and approved of at the General Convention held at Edinburgh in December 1792, the import of which was, That if any member of their Society associated for the purpose of obtaining a parliamentary reform, should, while in the legal prosecution of that object, be oppressed or persecuted by the arm of power, they should not only meet with the assistance of the Society to which they belong, but also by the united efforts of all their brethren in Scotland.

“ Since the above period, however, we are sorry to say, several of our members have been persecuted, and that in a most wanton manner, and the above resolution (which if duly put in force would, we humbly apprehend, have the happy effect of emboldening those who have already come forward, and of encouraging others who have not yet taken any active part to unite their efforts in the general cause) has never yet been attended to.

“ We therefore humbly move, That the Convention take into consideration the above particulars, and consider what measures may be most conducive towards the performance of the obligation we lie under, in consequence of that resolution, and thereby shew to the world that we are not unmindful of those who have already suffered, or may in future suffer in their country's cause.

“ By Order of the Delegation,

“ Edinburgh, Oct. 30, 1793.”

Q. (*To Gurnel. A paper shown him.*) Where did you find that paper?

A. I found it in Mr. Hardy's possession.

(*Read by the Clerk of the Court.*)

“ FELLOW CITIZEN, Edinburgh, Dec. 8, 1793.

“ We desire that a copy of the inclosed papers be kept by the Society, and that another copy of them be delivered, without delay, to Citizen Martin, in order that he may proceed thereupon immediately.

“ You will already have had confused accounts of what has taken place here for the last four days; but on Tuesday next the Edinburgh Gazetteer shall (if despatch permit) give you a complete detail of every thing. The Society will thereby be able to discover that an arrival in Scotland has been productive of great advantage to the cause, and at the same time has given great alarm to our enemies. We are very much surprized at the remissness of the Society; while we are exposing our life and liberty, while we are devoting our time and our exertions to their service, while we are incurring numberless expences, and affronting dangers that would stagger the most hardy of them,

while

while we are doing all this, we are moreover obliged to remind them of it, and that supplies are now become more necessary than ever; surely the pecuniary exertions of any individual in the society, can never be compared to our endeavours: Honoured with their confidence, we find ourselves happy in being placed in the front of the battle; but let them remember that our sacrificing ourselves will be of little use, unless they afford us a proper support, and that most immediately. Not daring any longer to trust to the post, we send you all these papers in a parcel. You will be so good as to make us acquainted with their safe arrival.—Gerald wishes to get to London as soon as possible, he will communicate that which cannot be so fully expressed by letter; you may consider this as a private letter, but you may read such parts of it as you think proper to any member of the society, especially where it may be productive of good. You will see by the inclosed papers, that power has proceeded in a most arbitrary manner; almost all the prominent characters in the Convention have been, or are to be apprehended and examined.—Lord Daer will, we believe, meet with no greater favour than ourselves; we understand that there is a warrant out against him. As an account of what has happened to us would exceed the bounds of a letter, we will only just give you a sketch of it, by way of journal, referring you, as we said before, to next Tuesday's Gazetteer.

“ Thursday morning, at 7 o'clock.

“ A sheriff's officer, followed by five other men, entered our bed-room, informed us he had a warrant (which however he refused to shew) for apprehending us, and seizing our papers; we remained confined all day, at night we were examined and admitted to bail, each in the sum of 2,000 merks.”

“ Friday morning, 9 o'clock.

“ We were sent for again without a warrant, for the purpose of being present at the opening of a small trunk, containing our papers; but M. M. protesting against the illegality of the whole of the proceedings, and refusing to give up the key, the sheriff substitute and the procurator fiscal dared to proceed no farther in the business.

“ Saturday Morning, 9 o'clock.

“ Two messengers came again into our room, with Gerald; they left a summons to appear at ten o'clock, with M. M. They left nothing but a request to accompany Gerald to the office; yet, when arrived there, he found that a warrant was issued against him, for the purpose of detaining him a prisoner, while the box was opened, and the papers examined. M. M. still persisting in his refusal, the key was forced from him, the trunk was opened, the papers examined, and partly restored; the other part was kept,

kept, and a declaration drawn up, which he was required to sign, but refused, protesting against the whole of the business.—Gerald, however, signed what was drawn up in his name, and we were once more liberated; and since then, now already 24 hours, no further persecution has been commenced against us. But while we, as individuals, were thus harrassed (Thursday) the whole of the convention were equally ill used.—Many of them were taken into custody; and when the remainder met, as usual, the provost, attended by his myrmidons, went, and, after pulling ————, of Sheffield, out of the chair, ordered the convention to disperse, and informed that he would allow no such meetings in future. (Friday) the next day, the convention having agreed to meet at another place, out of the jurisdiction of the provost, we had not been long assembled, before the Sheriff, with his myrmidons, appeared among us, and commanded us to depart, after having asked whether that meeting was the British Convention, and being answered in the affirmative. He next enquired who was the president; upon which M. M. having openly asked and obtained leave of the convention, placed himself in the chair; informed the sheriff, that he, M. M. was the president of the British Convention, and that he would not break up the meeting, unless unconstitutionally forced thereunto, by the Sheriff's pulling him out of the chair; which the latter (after some little hesitation) having complied with, the ex-president (Gerald) was also put into the chair, which he would not leave but by being pulled out; adjourned the convention to the place where it was to become permanent in it's sitting; and having called upon his colleague, Gerald, for to close the meeting with prayer, the company departed peaceably, but not without various reflections on the proceedings, and those reflections not confined merely to the members of the convention, but coming also from the crowd without doors, and even from the attending constables.—The next day a proclamation was issued by the provost, forbidding all assembling within the limits of his jurisdiction.—We know not what will happen; but we venture to predict, that all this persecution will increase rather than diminish the ardour of the people for Reform. The country societies, hearing of this, are hourly pouring in fresh delegates.—Want of paper forbids my writing any more.

Adieu? Your's,
M. M."

Q. (To Mr. Gurnell. A paper shown him.) Tell us where you found that?

A. I found it at Mr. Hardy's.

(The

(The Letter read by the Clerk of the Court.)

Edinburgh, 19th of Dec. 1793, signed Maurice Margarot, and addressed to Mr. Thomas Hardy, No. 9, Piccadilly.

" FELLOW CITIZENS,

" It is impossible for us to find time to write to you as we ought; every instant we are interrupted, or rather the house is not free from visitors from an early hour, until 12 o'clock at night; and besides we have such a variety of business on our hands, that we can scarce make any progress, &c. But as Sinclair will arrive as soon in time as this letter, he will be able to give you a detail, &c.

" Excuse my entering into a detail at present. We are to acknowledge your two last letters; they came safe, but slow, being delivered five days after their date. Your first gave us a draft for twelve guineas, and the other inclosed a ten pound bank note, but they do not clear our expences. We well know how heavy the burden is on the society, and we grieve that our former state has left us little else to offer than our services.

" Since Sinclair's departure, nothing new hath occurred, except the formation of a society somewhere about the Crampion Hills. They have already made a subscription towards the Convention.

" Believe me, Fellow Citizens, Your's unto death,

" MAURICE MARGAROT."

" P. S. Pray, friend Hardy, did you some weeks back receive an inclosed letter to Prett? and did you likewise receive the parcels and paper sent you by the Charlotte, on the 10th instant? Have you done any thing with the piece of paper? Have you written to Norwich; and have they answered you? I have sent the news regularly, but have not received a single answer from them. Pray question Sinclair most particularly."

Q. *(To Macklean. A paper shewn him.)* Where did you find this?

A. This is a letter of the 10th of Jan. that I found in Mr. Adams's house.

Q. *(To Grant.)* Do you believe that to be the prisoner's handwriting?

A. Yes, I believe it is.

(Read by the Clerk of the Court.)

" CITIZEN ADAMS, Dated the 10th of Jan. 1794.

" The London Corresponding Society begs the Society of Constitutional Information, to accept of a few copies of Maurice Margarot's Indictment.

THOMAS HARDY, secretary."

" P. S. The London Corresponding Society are to have an anniversary

niversary meeting and grand dinner, at the Globe Tavern in the Strand, the 20th instant."

Q. (*To Grant. A paper shewn him.*) Look at this too; do you believe this to be his hand writing?

A. Yes, I believe it is.

(*The letter read by the Clerk of the Court.—See page 134 of this Work.*)

JAMES DAVIDSON, sworn.

Q. I believe you are a printer by business?

A. I am.

Q. Were you employed at any time to print any numbers of these papers? (*a paper shewn him.*)

A. Yes, I was.

Q. When was you employed?

A. I believe it was the 20th of February last, I think so. The prisoner brought me the copy with Thelwall; and Thelwall brought me the manuscript.

Q. Was any body with him when he came?

A. Yes, there was, but I do not recollect.

Q. Were there any more persons than one?

A. No more than one.

Q. What order did he give you respecting it?

Mr. *Erskine.* Is that evidence?

Mr. *Garrow.* We submit it is.

Mr. *Erskine.* Is it in evidence against Mr. Hardy what Mr. Thelwall does?

Mr. *Garrow.* I submit to his Lordship, it is the clearest evidence in the world. We have collected from a great variety of evidence, much printed, much written, much by papers found in the prisoner's custody at the time of his apprehension, a clear connection and conspiracy on the subject of this high treason, between the person of Thelwall and the prisoner at the bar. We submit with confidence, that all the acts against Thelwall or other persons, of their accession to the general plan of conspiracy, is clear evidence. This, therefore, as the act of Thelwall, is hardly worth discussing, for we have other evidence which brings it close to the prisoner, namely, the prisoner's paying for it; but we have a right, as we have given in proof, that Thelwall and the prisoner were parties in this conspiracy, to give any evidence of Thelwall's.

Mr. *Erskine.* There is no manner of a doubt, that as far as you can connect persons acting together towards one purpose, which perhaps constitutes the crime, you may undoubtedly involve them together, by evidence; that is not the question. I have no anxiety on the subject so far as the fact was only in consideration here, because it is a printed paper which hath been in all our hands and very well known; but it is only that the proceedings

ings may not be embarrassed in the course of them that makes me interpose. Mr. Thelwall gives a manuscript paper to this witness to be printed; what evidence was there that Mr. Hardy had any share in this? If it could be proved that Mr. Hardy paid for the printing of the paper, which is not before your Lordship, if that was before your Lordship there might be something like evidence, that he might be implicated in the guilt, if any guilt there was; yet would your Lordship fasten that crime on the prisoner at the bar? But surely even then there might be a difference in the quality of an act, as applied to both these persons; one might be much more culpable than the other; the knowing that a paper is printed is one thing, and the giving an authority to print it is another. Would the bare fact of knowing that this paper was given to a printer, prove that Mr. Hardy was guilty of that crime, supposing that paper to contain treason, which I know it does not? Of all the crimes we have heard of, treason ought to be the last that ought to be attempted to be made out on such evidence as this. How could this act, taking it to be as described by the witness, be treason? It would not be so even if the paper itself contained the most treasonable expressions: it might indeed be the misprision of treason, if it was proved that Mr. Hardy knew it; but misprision of treason was not the crime for which the prisoner at the bar was indicted; as to the paper itself, I am not anxious, I only trouble myself about the rules of justice.

Court. The resistance on one side, and insisting on the other side, is perfectly premature, the Court not knowing what the contents of the paper is; whether it is purely an act of Thelwall, or whether it may be evidence against Mr. Hardy, the Court as yet cannot decide.

Mr. Garrow. It is an instrument of the general High Treason charged in this indictment, one stage and step being the publishing a paper to incite the subjects of this country to desert their allegiance from his Majesty; it is a paper in furtherance of the general conspiracy, which we say, we have given evidence that there was a design to carry in effect, and we desire to read it. If it had been a letter of Mr. Thelwall's on private concerns, we should not have insisted on it.

Lord President. It is necessary for us, that you open that part of the paper which you say hath that tendency. (*The Lord President reads the paper.*) I see there is a passage in it which does go to that general object.

Mr. Gibbs. The arguments of the counsel for the prosecution go to this length, that though this trial be only against Mr. Hardy, yet, because one overt act in this indictment is, that

papers were published, the papers published by Mr. Thelwall are to be submitted to the Jury as Mr. Hardy's act.

Mr. Garrow. Certainly, it is necessary that the Court should be apprised of the quality of the paper, to judge whether this is what we state it to be. I now state to your Lordship a passage :

“ You may ask perhaps (after stating the grievances) by what means shall we seek redress ; we answer, that men in a state of civilized society are bound to seek redress of the grievances by the laws, as long as any redress can be obtained by the laws ; but our common Master whom we serve, whose law is a law of liberty, and whose service is perfect freedom, has taught us not to expect to gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles. We must have redress from our own laws, and not from the laws of our plunderers, enemies, and oppressors.

“ There is no redress for a nation circumstanced as we are, but in a fair, free, and full representation of the people.”

Now we alledge that the purport of this conspiracy, which is charged to be High Treason on the record, was by force to assume the powers of Legislation, and dispute the constituted authority of the country, as they are at present happily constituted here.

Now we alledge that the purpose of this conspiracy, which is charged to be High Treason, was by force to assume the powers of Legislation in despite of the constituted authority of the country, as they at present happily subsist here.

Mr. Erskine. Our objection is on Mr. Hardy ; this being given to be printed by Mr. Thelwall, your Lordship will dispose of it, as I am not in the least anxious about it.

Lord President. The paper purported to contain some resolutions of a meeting of the society, it is brought to be printed by one of the members of that society, the prisoner himself being a member of that society and the secretary also ; they being both involved in the proceedings of that society, and this being a printed paper produced by one of them, it does seem to me in the general charge of conspiracy, that this is an evidence to prove a circumstance in that conspiracy ; whether it will be so brought home to the prisoner Hardy, as he should be responsible for the guilt of publishing it, is another consideration, but it is a branch of conspiracy ; it does seem to me, therefore, that the papers should be admissible.

Mr. Garrow. (*To Davidson.*) What did Thelwall say to you when he brought you the papers ?

A. He told me to print two thousand, and then stop.

Mr. Erskine. When did he come to you ?

A. The twentieth of February.

Mr.

Mr. Erskine. Does your Lordship think that all the directions that Thelwell gave the witness is proof against Hardy?

Court. Whether it was two thousand or not, it is of no consequence, it is an act of publication of this society.

Mr. Garrow. (To Davidson.) What did you in fact do with them after you published them?

Court. It may be an assassination plot.

Mr. Erskine. Then it may apply to every member of the London Corresponding Society.

Court. It may as to the general case.

Mr. Garrow. (To Davidson.) How many did you print that day?

A. I printed two hundred that day, and went to the Globe Tavern; when I went to the Globe Tavern I met Hardy on the stairs.

Q. Did you know him before?

A. Yes.

Q. Was you a member of the society yourself?

A. I was.

Q. You was present probably at some meetings of the society?

A. Yes, sometimes.

Q. Have you ever seen Mr. Hardy there?

A. Yes.

Q. In what character did he act in the meetings?

A. He acted in character as secretary.

Q. When you carried the two hundred there that day that they were ordered, you met him on the stairs?

A. I did.

Q. What passed between you?

A. I told him I had brought two hundred copies of resolutions; he desired me to take them back again and not to distribute one of them; accordingly I did, I went home with them and returned again to the Globe Tavern to dinner.

Q. You said February, do you mean January or February?

A. I am not certain, it was the day of the meeting.

Q. At what time was it you saw Thelwall in the course of that day?

A. It was between one and two o'clock.

Q. Very well, now stay, at what time was it you carried the two hundred copies to the Globe Tavern?

A. Between four and five o'clock.

Q. You returned home with the two hundred copies by the direction of Mr. Hardy, and returned again to the Globe Tavern to dinner?

A. I did.

Q. What time was that?

A. Pretty

A. Pretty nigh six o'clock.

Q. Was you present when these resolutions were proposed in the society?

A. No, I was not.

Q. Was it not on that day that the resolutions purported to be read that you delivered them, or was it a month after?

A. I had the copy on the eighteenth, and delivered two hundred on the twentieth.

Q. Now look at the paper, and tell us whether it was January the first month in the year, or whether it was February?

A. This is the paper, I see now it is January.

Q. Is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you believe then that you received it on the eighteenth of January, and not on February?

A. I have no doubt about it?

Q. When you returned again, was it to a public dinner or private dinner of the society?

A. A public dinner, every one paid for his ticket.

Q. Was there any Chairman at dinner, did you see any body in the chair?

A. I am not very sure, but I think Thelwall was in the chair.

Q. Was Mr. Hardy there?

A. Yes, he was.

Q. When you returned to dinner, did you carry any copies of the papers with you?

A. No, I did not.

Q. What did you do with those copies afterward?

A. Somebody was sent for them to my house.

Q. Where from?

A. The Globe Tavern.

Q. From the meeting?

A. Yes.

Q. Were they brought?

A. Yes.

Q. To the meeting?

A. Yes.

Q. These two hundred copies?

A. Yes, they were.

Q. What was done with them there?

A. I saw only one of them.

Q. Where did you see that?

A. Somebody handed it about at the meeting.

Q. How many persons might there be assembled together at that meeting?

A. I

A. I suppose there were about three hundred or thereabouts, as near as I can guess.

Q. How late did you stay?

A. Till about ten o'clock or thereabouts.

Q. Did you print any more of those papers at any time?

A. Yes.

Q. At that time?

A. I cannot be particular to the time.

Q. Were any printed in the course of that week?

A. I believe a thousand more.

Q. By whose order?

A. Mr. Thelwall's order went still on, I printed in that week one thousand, and completed it to two thousand.

Q. What did you do with them when you printed them?

A. I carried a good many of them to Mr. Hardy's.

Q. What did you do with the rest?

A. People came for some now and then.

Q. What people?

A. Some members of the London Corresponding Society.

Q. Did you deliver them as they came for them?

A. Yes; some asked for a dozen or half a dozen or so.

Q. Had you any other order?

A. Yes, I printed six thousand more.

Q. By whose order did you print the six thousand more?

A. I believe Mr. Hardy gave me the order to go on with them till I should be desired to stop.

Q. Were you ever desired to stop, and when?

A. I was desired, I believe, in the month of March, I think so.

Q. Did you go on printing them till the month of March?

A. Yes, I did, now and then occasionally, as they were wanted.

Q. How many thousand might you print in all?

A. Eight thousand.

Q. Who paid you for them?

A. They are not paid for yet.

Q. On whose credit did you do them; did any body at any time promise to pay you for them?

A. No.

Q. Had you any conversation with Mr. Hardy about being paid for them?

A. I had no farther than to put them to the credit of the society.

Q. Who desired you to do that?

A. He,

A. He, as treasurer, was accountable to see the debts of the society paid.

Q. Who was?

A. Mr. Hardy.

Q. Did you make the society debtor for them?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. Then you have not been paid yet?

A. No, I have not.

Q. Have you printed on other occasions for the society?

A. Yes, I have.

Q. Who paid you for those?

A. Mr. Hardy.

(The paper read by the Clerk of the Court.)

Dated from the Globe Tavern, Jan. 20, 1794.

See page 138 of this work.—To which were added the following.)

“ Committee Room, Jan. 23, 1794.

“ Resolved unanimously,

“ That a hundred thousand copies of the address to the people of Great Britain and Ireland, voted at the General Meeting, be printed and distributed by the society.

“ Resolved unanimously, That the following toasts, drank at the anniversary dinner of the society, be printed at the end of the address.

“ I. The Rights of Man ; and may Britons never want spirit to assert them.

“ II. The British Convention, lately held at Edinburgh ; and success to the important object it had in view.

“ III. Citizen William Skirving charged by the sentence of the Court of Justiciary, with the *honour* of being the cause of calling that Convention.

“ IV. The London Corresponding Society, and other patriotic societies of Great Britain and Ireland.

“ V. Citizen Maurice Margarot, the condemned delegate of this society ; and may his manly and patriotic conduct be rewarded by the attachment of the people.

“ Citizen Gerald then arose, and in a stream of inspiring eloquence, pronounced the just eulogium of this truly valuable citizen, so emphatically called by Citizen Aitchison, (one of the witnesses on his trial) the *Second Sidney*. He concluded with wishing we might rather die the last of British Freemen, than live the first of slaves.

“ VI. Citizen Joseph Gerald, the other delegate of this society, now under persecution ; and may his concluding sentiment be engraved upon every British heart.

“ VII. The

“ VII. The transactions at *Toulon*. May Briton’s remember them as they ought, and profit by *dear bought experience*.

“ VIII. *Citizen Hamilton Rowan*, and the other *true patriots of Ireland*; and may the authors of the *Convention-bill* find that they have committed a *bull*.

“ IX. *Citizens Muir and Palmer*—May their sentence be speedily reversed, and *Botany-Bay* be peopled with a colony of *real criminals*.

“ X. Success to the arms of *Freedom* against whomsoever directed; and confusion to *despots* with whomsoever allied.

“ XI. All that is *good* in every constitution; and may we never be superstitious enough to reverence in *any*, that which is *good for nothing*.

“ XII. *Citizen Thomas Paine*—May his virtue rise superior to calumny and suspicion, and his name still be dear to Britons.

“ XIII. *Lord Loughborough*, the *Earl of Moira*, *Sir Gilbert Elliot*, and the other apostates from liberty; and may they enjoy the profits of their apostacy *so long as they live*.

“ XIV. A speedy and honourable *peace* with the *brave republic of France*.

“ XV. The *starving manufacturers* and *neglected peasantry* of Great Britain and Ireland.

“ XVI. *Citizen John Frost*; and a speedy restoration of that health which he lost in the dungeons of *Newgate*.

“ XVII. The *virtuous* and *spirited citizens* now in confinement for matters of *opinion*; and may we shew them, by our conduct, that they are not forgotten.”

Q. Where did you see John Martin?

A. I never see him many times.

Q. Did you never see him at any meeting of that society?

A. Yes, I have.

Q. Was he there at the meeting you now have been speaking of at the *Globe Tavern*?

A. Yes, I see him there.

Q. Was Martin then a member of that society?

A. I cannot say; I saw him attend the Meeting.

Q. Did any body attend but the members on the meetings of the society?

A. Upon my word I cannot tell.

Q. Upon your oath, did you ever know of any person attending the meetings of that society, but the members of the society?

A. There might be many that did not belong to the society.

Q. Was the business that you was with Mr. Martin upon at his house, relative to the *London Corresponding Society*?

A. It was on the latter part of the toasts and sentiments, printed on the back of that paper.

Q. Be so good to let us hear what past between you and Mr. Martin?

A. I told him that I thought there were some hard words in the resolutions and in the toasts. He said it was all constitutional, and where no danger could arise from it.

Q. Was that between the 18th and 20th, or after the meeting?

A. It was the 21st, the first day after the meeting, or the second.

Jury (*to Davison*). Was there any other individuals attended this meeting but what were members; recollect your memory, and think of it, because you positively say to the contrary?

Court. Did you ever admit visitors?

A. Yes; I understood that there were tickets to be given at the bar to any body that chose to call for them, and pay for them.

Mr. Garraw. That applies to the dinner at the Globe Tavern. At the division meeting, if any body chose to go and ask for a ticket, would he obtain it without belonging to the society?

A. No, not without belonging to the society.

RICHARD WILLIAMS sworn.

Q. Do you know Mr. Thelwall?

A. Yes.

Q. Are you acquainted with his manner of writing?

A. Yes.

Q. (*a paper shown him.*) Be so good to look at this, and tell me whether you believe that to be his hand-writing?

A. I believe that signature to be his.

Mr. Erskine. I object to this evidence.

Mr. Garraw. I now propose reading a letter which was penned by Mr. Thelwall, who was one of the members of the London Corresponding Society. I will state to your Lordship the ground on which we offer it against the prisoner, Thomas Hardy. We have already proved to your Lordship, that Mr. Thelwall was not only a member of the London Corresponding Society, but that on the subject of these resolutions being passed at an anniversary meeting, he acted as an agent of that society; and I propose to read this letter of Mr. Thelwall, which I state to be a furtherance of that act of agency. It is a letter which Mr. Thelwall wrote to a friend of his, and it purports to contain several seditious songs and toasts, stated to have been sung and composed by Mr. Thelwall at that meeting (this friend of Mr. Thelwall's was not a member of this society, but a private person,) we bring this as a subordinate branch of the conspiracy which we allege, was to
bring

bring all the constituted authorities of the country into contempt, so as to mature the public mind for that grand change which was the object of the conspiracy: we contend, that an act of Mr. Thelwall's, under these circumstances, is evidence. There is another ground—it gives an account of the other affiliated societies, as being in great preparation for that grand catastrophe, which it was their object to bring about; therefore, this letter and this account are receivable evidence against the prisoner at the bar.

Mr. *Erskine*. Mr. Thelwall appears to have been an agent for the publication of this address, which turns out to be an act of the society, and to have ended in a dinner, at which those toasts were drank undoubtedly; but the difficulty with me is this, they have not yet shewn that the songs were sung at that meeting; if they had, I should not object to the songs being read. But I very much doubt whether any account of songs given by Mr. Thelwall to a third person, can be evidence against Mr. Hardy. What an agent does is one thing, and what an agent says is another thing. An expression, in which another man drives by his own declaration to any particular object, and he makes use of any particular expression to express his mind by, with regard to that object, cannot, I humbly submit to the Court, be evidence against the prisoner. Suppose for a moment that Mr. Thelwall was the agent of Mr. Hardy, what evidence was there that the contents of the letter was true? I own that, in some cases, Mr. Hardy might be bound by Mr. Thelwall's agency; but it does not occur to me, in this instance, that this can be allowed as evidence against Mr. Hardy.

Mr. *Gibbs*. We cannot have any anxiety to resist the evidence now offered; but if it is received we know not where it may end. The charge now is, whether Mr. Hardy hath compassed the King's death; and whether he hath done that act charged in the indictment as overt acts, for this design. Now with respect to that which pass'd at the meeting where Mr. Hardy was, and with respect to any thing that was done by any other person, directed and instructed by Mr. Hardy to do that thing, we admit that those things that pass'd in the society in Mr. Hardy's presence, and that which was done by the direction of Mr. Hardy, would be evidence against him.

But we object to this as a letter written by Mr. Thelwall, and which is not proved that Mr. Hardy ever knew of it, or the contents of it. I confess I cannot say to what point of the indictment this letter can be made evidence against Mr. Hardy.

In the first place, the three charges are—whether Mr. Hardy compassed the King's death; whether he committed any act, stated as the overt act; and, whether he committed them as in that design against the King's life.

I take it, that a letter written without the knowledge of Mr. Hardy, cannot be evidence of his mind with regard to compassing; with regard to the overt act, there must be proof spectral against all the prisoners in the indictment. The present charge is only, whether Mr. Hardy did any of those acts; and the declaration of any other man, either by word of mouth or by letter, cannot prove it on Mr. Hardy.

Then let us take the prosecution of the fact to be a design on the King's life, eventually; surely nothing that is said, written, or done by a third person, without the authority of Mr. Hardy, can prove that Mr. Hardy meant to produce an effect which is imputed to him, namely, the destruction of the King. It seems to me, that it is impossible to say that those letters conduce to pertain to Mr. Hardy on any of those three things that are imputed to him in the charge of the indictment, namely, the compassing the King's death; committing an overt act, or that that overt act was directed to prosecute a design against the King's life. I submit, that on neither of these three grounds is this letter, written by Mr. Thelwall, proof against Mr. Hardy; therefore it should not be received in evidence.

Lord Chief Baron Macdonald. Unto whom is the letter addressed?

A. To a person of the name of Bellamy.

Mr. Garrow. It is certainly not in my power to judge of the anxiety of my learned friends, of the consequences of producing this letter, farther than that it is expressed by what they say. I am sure they will do me the justice to believe, that I would not oppose any thing that can be fairly ascribed as argument against receiving this letter as evidence against Mr. Hardy. But we contend, that it is fit to be received in evidence, and that the facts that this letter relates was done under the agency of Mr. Hardy. But we make it evidence in another way. I am not to suppose that my learned friends can limit the acts of those that are at the bar to be done by themselves, or by their order, for we know that if A. or B. should have done one act, that shall have before have been proved to be part of the general conspiracy, to be carried into effect by various means and divers instruments; it is evidence, because it is fit to receive the act of all that are parties in the general cause, as a furtherance of the general design.

It is not required to prove in a conspiracy, because a conspirator orders horses at a particular place, that he meant to go there to hire the horses, but the fact of having done so, his accession to the general purpose of the conspiracy, is sufficient; limiting it to the subject of the conspiracy, and not extending it to the crimes of any other dye or nature. This we humbly admit before your Lordship, coming from whom it may, whether

ther from the party on trial, or from any other, in consequence of orders giving him by any one who is involved in the general conspiracy, either before or after, is admissible.

Lord President. I confess I have great doubts myself, whether it is evidence that ought to be admitted. I agree, that where several persons are concerned in a conspiracy, that all the transactions of the conspiracy by the different parties, may and ought to be given in evidence; and it is enough, if the party accused can be brought to be privy to that general conspiracy; for if he is so proved, every thing done by the general party, must also be so imputed to him. If I understand this case, it is nothing more than Mr. Thelwall's account to a private friend, of the part that he had taken respecting of these papers, and his having composed songs; and I remember another passage in it, which will be very material evidence against Thelwall, and my mind should be reserved until Thelwall's own case comes before us.

I consider this private letter no more than Thelwall's private declaration; and Thelwall's private declarations does not amount to any transactions done in furtherance of the plot; for it is a mere recital, a bare confession of his, of some part he had taken. It appears to me, it is not like the evidence that was before admitted, of the fact done by Thelwall, of carrying the paper to the printer, it seems to stand on a very different footing; that was a fact proved against a man which shall bind him, because he is connected with the fact, but this is evidence of no fact, and therefore cannot bind him.

Mr. Justice Buller. There are two things to be considered in cases of this sort. The first is, whether any conspiracy exists at all; and, secondly, whether the prisoner has been privy to it.

In the first place, if the conspiracy is proved, every thing that belongs to that conspiracy ought to be received in evidence. Now, if the case stood on this ground, that Thelwall, one of the conspirators, said, that their object was so and so, that would be evidence, and have been admitted in a variety of cases. In Amory and Purchase's case, it was admitted. The Attorney General says, I call the witness not to speak particularly to the prisoner, but to state what was the opinion of the mob. On cases which have happened in our own days, as of Lord George Gordon, the evidence of what different people in the mob had said, though he was not there, was admitted; and in all the cases in St. Margaret's Hill, the same thing was admitted in many instances, as shewing what was the design on foot. It is a very distinct question, whether the prisoner was to be affected by it. In that light,

as general evidence, it appears to me to be evidence. But, before it can effect the prisoner materially, it is necessary to make out another point; namely, that he consented to the extent that the other did; but when we consider the question of the general conspiracy, any thing that hath been said, may be admitted; still less any thing that was written, ought to be received as evidence.

Mr. Justice Grose. It appears to me, that this is evidence of what the parties meant; by what was done at the place where both these parties were present, both members of one society, and professedly concerned in one plan, and so it is very material to hear what either of them says respecting this plan, for there is no doubt about it, but those papers are respecting this plan; but the intention, the *animus* with which these people meant to publish these papers, must be left with the Jury. My opinion from the beginning to end is and was, that it is evidence.

Lord Chief Baron Macdonald. I heartily bring in my mind to fall in with my Brother Grose, on the definition that he has laid down, that it may be giving in as evidence, as in proof of the furtherance of the conspiracy; and, I agree, that an act done, may be given in evidence; but an act done, is different than a mere relation of an act done as given to another person. I have so great a doubt about it, that I am inclined to reject the receiving it.

Mr. Baron Hotham. I do not think it evidence to be received in this case. I consider it only as a mere relation of what hath past; which relation, if it is to affect the prisoner at the bar, must be a real fact, that happened when the prisoner was present, of which there is no evidence but what is stated in this letter, nor is there any proof that the prisoner was present.

The Lord President. After having heard what hath been said, I remain of the same mind. In the case of Lord George Gordon, the cry of the mob, at the time, was allowed to make a part of the fact of the transaction; therefore, that evidence was received. I have so great a doubt upon it, that I prefer abiding by my own opinion.

Mr. Solicitor General. I speak merely with a view to what may happen afterward.

Mr. Erskine. It is time enough when the case happens.

Mr. Garrow. I am going to offer a letter of Martin's, which I shall prove to be his hand-writing: it is a letter of Martin's to Margarot, after the dinner at the Globe Tavern, who was at that time in custody at the Tolbooth, in Edinburgh, having been apprehended as a part of that British Convention which the magistrates dispersed.

It contains a declaration of universal approbation of the conduct of those delegates who had conducted themselves so in the North; and states other circumstances, one of which is, the manner in which his Majesty had met his Parliament, as also the manner in which he is stated to be received and insulted going through the Park (I offer it as a letter wrote to incite them, and encourage them in the general conspiracy.)

Mr. *Erskine*. I apprehend that this, on no principles whatever, can be evidence. I shall not draw the Court at all in the construction of the statute of King Edward the Third at this moment. The prisoner is on his General Issue; and I shall address your Lordship, and Gentlemen of the Jury, in due season. This is an indictment for compassing and imagining the death of the King; and to prove which, there are overt acts put into the indictment, which are laid as acts done in pursuance or in accomplishment of this first intention; or, to use the language of the indictment, "to fulfil the traitorous intention, which the charge on record declares that these acts were done.

It is impossible for my learned friend to go farther than to contend, that by these overt acts they involved themselves, in order to effect a forcible subversion of government, which would finally involve in it the death of the King; and that, therefore, this is an overt act; or, in other words, relative evidence to prove the criminal intention, which is the subject matter of this indictment. But your Lordship ought to permit no other act which decyphers his mind to the Jury, any expressions of his own, any thing that he hath done but those which points directly to the purpose of this indictment; for I hope your Lordship will never cease to recollect the crime charged on the record is, compassing and imagining the King's death. Having said thus much, let us see the danger of allowing the letter of a man, who is charged equally on this record, to be one of the conspirators with the prisoner at the bar. Mr. Martin hath a bill found against him; but we, who are now counsel for the prisoner, are counsel for him, as having engaged with the other persons, now in Newgate, to accomplish this most detestable purpose, namely, to destroy the life of the King. Then, as to what this Mr. Martin wrote, it cannot even, with the principles of common sense, be considered as connected with this business, except as a member of the Corresponding Society, which, by the bye, he is not proved to be yet.

Mr. *Garrow*. Yes; Davison proved that.

Mr. *Erskine*. We will take him, for argument sake, to be a member of the Corresponding Society, it must not follow, that

that it can be given in evidence; for what I want to know is, upon what principle can you go to affect the prisoner, beyond the prosecution of direct conspiracy charged on the defendant? But then it ought to be on this wholesome ground, which we do not stand here to contradict, that it should be that that can shew or decypher the mind of the prisoner at the bar to the Jury, from whence they can collect, that he intended the death of the King, this may be evidence against him; but if what Martin says is to be brought in evidence against Mr. Hardy, then, according to that, any man in the Corresponding Society, which we could have proved had spoken contemptuously of the King, or who had reviled the King, Mr. Hardy at the same time, not speaking of the King, or reviling him, it would, I say, render that man—that innocent man, as I have a right to style him, answerable for every wicked thing that any man hath said, or any man hath written. With respect to the subject of the letter, I collect from the Attorney General yesterday, that Mr. Martin writes to Mr. Margarot, of a patten having been thrown at the King, in St. James's Park, at his return from *his parliament*, which, by the bye, is the language of the law; and if that expression is at all to be evidence, to decypher the mind of any body, it must be Mr. Martin's; if not Mr. Martin's, nobody at all. I say, that from all that hath been laid before your Lordship this day, and yesterday, the evidence amounts to this, that a great number of people have assembled, in different parts of this island, all driving to one purpose. Your *Lordship* will recollect, this does not exist in the Corresponding Societies alone, or in its members; but, for an accomplishment of this purpose, they correspond with Norwich—they correspond with Leeds—with Edinburgh—they correspond with all names of the places, that one must look into a Gazetteer to remember them all. If this letter is admitted. According to that, the declaration of every man, and not the declaration of what Mr. Hardy meant, may be evidence against Mr. Hardy; and it has not yet been stated, that the object of all our meetings was to destroy the King. But, if any intemperate man, drunk or sober, chose to make use of any contemptuous expression of the King, (I do not stand up here to vindicate them) are they to attach on the defendant? I enter my solemn protest against this being given as evidence against Mr. Hardy. I must needs do so, when I heard an expression imputed to Mr. Hardy, yesterday, by the Attorney General, which I know does not belong to him. Supposing any man of all that Society should say an intemperate and absurd thing, a criminal thing, is that to be imputed to Mr. Hardy?

Hardy? or, suppose further, a man should take off the froth of some porter, and say thus, I should like to cut off the heads of Kings; though, in the first place, should not I know what Kings he meant? But, suppose any man with whom I am connected with in the Society, established for the Reform in Parliament, use any intemperate expression, am I to be accountable? I know if the papers were laid before your *Lordship*, there might be expressions intemperate—there might be expressions illegal—there might be expressions that ought not to be used—and, as far as your Lordship could impute them expressions to me, that would be one thing. But, good God! what man would enter into society, for any one object whatever, if the language of every individual member of that society, could be used in evidence against any one of them? and I will only ask, where this is to stop? If you impute to Mr. Hardy this—if Mr. Martin is to be the decypherer of the mind of Mr. Hardy, I must also call witnesses to prove Mr. Martin's character, and his mind. If then you can go to the length of making the contemptuous declaration of Mr. Martin against the King, to fasten on Mr. Hardy, every other man, who meets on another purpose, and for another end, might even be involved. Is it meant to be gravely said here, that persons meeting together for the accomplishment of a purpose, which purpose appears by the evidence to be what I have now heard, are all to be involved in the expressions of a single man? But shall we say, that the prisoner at the bar, who stands accused of compassing the death of the King, that every thing that is done in his presence, or said in his presence, to which he may be supposed to assent, shall be imputed to him, because he is continually meeting the same persons again afterwards? If Mr. Martin had said this in the presence of Mr. Hardy, and afterward Mr. Hardy meeting with Mr. Martin, had agreed to the expressions, so far I will admit it might be said to be evidence against Mr. Hardy, but not on the ground on which they stand at present.

Mr. *Garrow*. When I shall have proof of the hand-writing, I mean to read it as a letter addressed to Margarot, the missionary of this Society.

(It was not found at Margarot's.)

Mr. *Erskine*. If it had been written to Hardy himself, it is not evidence. I cannot help any man writing to me. I really wish the Court would consider it, in order to see the extent in which this business is opened. We are now far advanced in this second day, on an indictment for compassing the King's death; and if your Lordship looks through the State Trials, from the beginning of our history to the present

time; you will find it was never necessary to have recourse to the expedient that was gone into last night; never, I say never. Once in the case of Elizabeth Cannon it was done, I am now told.

If this method of evidence is to be gone into, I protest I do not know where it is to end. If this letter of Mr. Martin's is to be read, Mr. Martin of course must be allowed to explain it, and persons must be brought to sustain him in his explanation. Shall I, in my turn, be allowed to produce letters of all that Society? Certainly not. It would be absurd and foolish to expect it; therefore, on every principle of the law, and on every principle of justice, I object to Mr. Martin's letter being read, unless it can be shewn that Mr. Hardy knew the contents of this letter. I certainly must object to any contemptuous expressions, used in this letter, being imputed to Mr. Hardy.

Mr. Gibbs. This I must say; that offering this letter, is endeavouring to bring before your Lordships precisely the same question again, what your Lordships have just determined. Your Lordships said, in the case of Lord George Gordon; it was proved the declaration of persons, when the prisoner was not present, were received, because he was present at the collection of and during the riots of those mobs, in the transactions of which it was endeavoured to implicate the prisoner; therefore, on that ground, it was admissible evidence, to shew what the object of their conspiracy was, and therefore it was received; but on what ground can this letter be received as evidence against Mr. Hardy? I understand the line drawn to be this: when a man is indicted for that which is done by a great collection of men assembled together, the declarations of the men which were so assembled together, and acting with the prisoner, in that case every act done was admissible evidence, to show what the object of that assembly was; but why was the last letter not admissible? Because it contained facts, which relation of facts, the prisoner at the bar was not consonant to. What was the contents of this letter? I asked to see it, before I stated any thing to your Lordship's. I was told it was irregular. I now understand it is only a relation of facts; which relation of facts was to excite and keep up the spirit of those people in Edinburgh.

Mr. Garrow. The letter is an incitation in the very terms.

Mr. Gibbs. I am certainly arguing under very great difficulty: therefore, I can only trust on my own recollection, what was loosely stated. It may be the intention to keep up the spirit of Mr. Margarot by the writer of it; but was that
the

the object of the prisoner at the bar ; did the prisoner at the bar mean that these facts should be so related ; the mere substance of the letter proves, that the prisoner at the bar is not at all implicated. Shall we say, that whatever the writer of that letter hath imprudently, foolishly, and rashly, and I may say, unlawfully, expressed in that letter, that that rashness and illegality is to be fixed on Mr. Hardy.

It seems to me, that this case comes directly within your Lordships decision in the last argument. In the case of Lord Gordon, part of that multitude at the time were unlawfully collected, for which unlawful collection the prisoner, among others, was charged as part of that multitude, and therefore the behaviour of the mob at the time was allowedly evidence against him. I agree, that what the prisoner says may be evidence against himself, except he can exculpate himself ; but that that should be evidence against Mr. Hardy, to which Mr. Hardy never acceded, I am sure it is against all law, and I am sure it is against all justice. Justice don't require that that which is proved to have past in the mind of one man, should fix an implication of the same guilt on another, who never either at the time or afterwards knew that the letter was written.

Mr. Solicitor General. I shall trouble your Lordship with a very few words, I trust you will think this letter unquestionably evidence of the indictment. It states, that the prisoner, with others, have conspired to compass the King's death ; and one overt act, amongst others is, that they did it by writing and publishing divers books, pamphlets, letters, &c. Now, my Lord, on every principle which hath been stated by Mr. Gibbs, it appears to me, that this is evidence ; and on the authority of the principle which he has referred to, I shall make it clearly evidence. The principle that is stated by Mr. Gibbs being, that what is declared by conspirators, whilst in action, is evidence against those that are present, as well as those that are not ; on which ground this letter is evidence.

Mr. Gibbs. I did not say the conspirators in action ; I say, where a number of men are indicted for a number of acts, and the prisoner at the bar is sometimes present and sometimes absent, that he cannot be implicated in the acts which are done in his absence.

Mr. Solicitor General. I am not very well able to distinguish between what I said and what Mr. Gibbs said ; but I take this letter to be a declaration of the conspirators in the progress of their conspiracy. The former case, which your Lordships have decided, was a letter addressed to a person which we have not shown at all to be involved in the conspiracy ; whereas this is a letter addressed by Mr. Martin (who was shown to be the

(chairman of the meeting) to Mr. Margarot, a delegate of that society to the convention at Edinburgh. It is, therefore, a conversation, by letter, between two persons which were parties in a conspiracy, if there existed such a conspiracy. For the first question is, is there proved the existence of a conspiracy? The next thing to consider is, the object of that conspiracy; and then the views of the conspirators, how far they went; and on this ground conversations of these conspirators, totally distinct from the prisoner at the bar, have constantly been given in evidence.

In the prosecution of my Lord Strafford, which was a prosecution in parliament, and where the proceedings went to a considerable length; there the evidence was given, first simply and only of the general plot, and the persons who were capable of bringing it home to Lord Strafford were not examined to that point at first, but examined only as to the general plot. In the course of their evidence they prove a discourse of several persons, with whom the Lord Strafford had no sort of communication; in which the person so conversing told the witness, that there would be a great change in England. To whom was this imputed? to none of those that were included in the impeachment, but Lord Strafford; but that was given in evidence in proof of the general conspiracy, which was then charged to exist for restoring the Roman Catholic religion in this country. The manner in which Mr. Serjeant Maynard speaks of it is this, he says, if it is a general design, or, says he, if there is a general faction of a general party in the nation, if there is a treasonable plot, one transaction in one place and another in another, yet if there be a common consent to accomplish this plot, then what others did, the act of all the persons, though many, and times and places many, and the means with which they were to accomplish them many too, were to be given in evidence. In the case of my Lord Lovatt, the same sort of doctrine was laid down, with respect to the distinction between the evidence of the general plot, and the particular evidence as affecting the individual. The manner in which the Solicitor General of that time states it, is this, it is necessary, by general evidence, to shew that there have been such plots and conspiracies, and then to affect the prisoner, to shew that he was concerned in these plots. This has been the general form of giving evidence, and no objection to these proceedings was taken in many trials which took place after the Revolution in cases of this sort; for this was said as an objection of Mr. Murray, of receiving evidence of a conspiracy, who stated some conversation of Lord Dair; and what was this but giving evidence of the conversation between two conspirators on the subject of the plot,

plot, for the purpose of shewing what was the nature, tendency, and object of the plot, and what were the views of the several persons who were concerned; and with submission to your Lordship, I say this letter is evidence. On the same ground this is evidence *de animo*, how Mr. Martin acted; I do not say it is evidence *de animo*, how Mr. Hardy acted. In regard to the general plot, some of them may have views less culpable than others; but for the Jury to determine what is the guilt of the particular persons charged, the views of the several persons concerned in the plot ought to be laid before them, and especially when it happens to be in a conversation of two of the persons engaged in the plot, as is the case with respect to this letter; then I submit to your Lordship, this is a matter which may fairly and properly be given in evidence, within the view of that determination, which your Lordship has before made; on the very foundation that this is what past from some of the persons engaged in this conspiracy, while it is in its process, and which we attribute to manifest what the conspirators had in view.

Mr. Serjeant Adair. In order to understand the subject, it is necessary to state the ground on which this evidence is offered, and I conceive that a great part of my learned friend's argument is answered by a consideration of the ground on which the evidence is offered, because I do not conceive, nor do I, for one offer the evidence to the Court on the ground that the idle expressions of Mr. Martin, respecting the King, is any evidence at all against Mr. Hardy, the prisoner at the bar; but I offer it on this ground, that a part of that letter which was offered in evidence is alledged to relate, and your Lordship will find when it is read, that it does relate to an act done by the conspirators in the party of the conspiracy, which by the indictment is imputed to the prisoner. It is a statement of one of the conspirators, who had been in the chair of a meeting which we call the conspirators, held, and alledged as held, for the furthering the views of the conspirators.

The charge against the prisoner is, that of compassing the King's death, by means of a conspiracy; to overturn the constitutional authority of the state, and the government of the country, under colour of a professed design to make a reform in parliamentary representation, and to correct abuses in one branch of the legislature; a design of which the prisoner may be wholly innocent or guilty of, as charged in this indictment; but when this conspiracy is carried on under such a pretext, how is that construction to be collected; how is that ambiguity to be removed, but by the conduct of the conspirators themselves? It is on that ground, and on that alone, that I submit to the court
this

this evidence, and we submit it to the court as shewing the furtherance of the conspirators in the design which this indictment imputes to them.

It seems to me, there cannot be any evidence more directly given to develop the mind and the intention of the conspirators, than that species of evidence which we now offer to the court. I don't say that this letter may be very material to this fact, but the principle is extensive in its application, not only on the present occasion, but on occasions which may hereafter occur, and to which this will be a precedent to posterity.

It seems to me, that the ground on which this evidence is offered to the court, is so directly within the principle of the Earl of Strafford's case, that it seems impossible, without holding that case not to be law, to reject this evidence from being offered to the court.

Mr. Bearcroft. I make no apology for troubling your Lordship in this point, because of its very great importance, and inasmuch as it is of such great and general import, I therefore feel it my duty to attempt to give my assistance in elucidating the subject the best way I can; in doing it, two things I shall avoid; I will not attempt to break in or controvert the rule already laid down by the court, as I understand it: and secondly, I will not repeat a syllable of the learned gentlemen who have gone before me, but I think I can add another observation.

When I say I will not controvert the rule laid down, I wish to state how I suppose the rule has been laid down; as I caught it, it was this, that a mere narration of simple facts that have past cannot be admissible. But when a question of evidence arises in a great extent, I have always been taught, the way to decide on the competency and admissibility of that evidence, is to consider what is the question tried, against whom is the testimony offered, what is the nature of it, and to what purpose is it produced.

I take it for granted, or else I am grossly mistaken, that the object of offering this letter, is to shew that the prisoner at the bar is guilty of high treason, in the species charged in this indictment, and that he, by means of overt acts, which amount to treason, designed to carry this scheme into execution.

Though this is an indictment for high treason, yet because the high treason is to be carried into execution, by means of a conspiracy, all that the law allows just in the admissibility of evidence in the trial of a minor case, is also law in the case of high treason.

I take it to be settled in the trial of every indictment, of conspiracies of every kind, they first charge a general conspiracy, and therefore having once established that, then you go on to shew that

that the prisoner at the bar, together with others charged in the indictment, conspired together. I desire to be understood, that this is not brought as proof for the latter, for that is the whole distinction, in my apprehension. But this paper, now offered to be proved, is admissible evidence to be laid before these Gentlemen of the Jury, on which they are to exercise their judgments, whether the men, whom we alledge were conspirators, together with the prisoner at the bar. It cannot be disputed, that some evidence of that is in the possession of the Court, and it is in the possession of the Jury; they have heard it, because it has been admitted.

When we have got thus far, the prisoner at the bar, together with Martin and Margarot, the two correspondents by letter, the two conversers in writing, are two of the persons engaged in the conspiracy with the prisoner at the bar.

What is the subject of the conspiracy as we contend, I need not state it over and over again, but, in a word or two, I understand it to be, an intention of calling a convention to overturn the government and depose the King, whereby it is obvious to every common understanding, that there must be various species of evidence to be brought before the court.

I contend, therefore, with the utmost deference to the Court, that this is not only competent evidence, for no matter how large it extends, or how short it goes, but I confess that I feel, and I am sanguine in my expectations, that it goes directly to proving the manner of the High Treason charged in the indictment. And I beg leave to advert to another part of the letter, which shews the design, the bad, the wicked, the mischievous, the traitorous and personal design against his Majesty. What I advert to, I will read from the letter; it is in these words: "The King went yesterday to meet his Parliament." Mark, "his Parliament;" there is nothing improper in the expression, very constitutional, and very decent—

Mr. *Erskine* here interrupted, and said, that that part of the letter which his learned friend had chose to read aloud, had been expressly given up within this three minutes by Mr. Serjeant Adair, as not meaning to be evidence against the prisoner.

The *Lord President*. If it was so, that Serjeant Adair had evidently admitted it in that manner, yet that could not conclude the argument.

Mr. *Erskine* asked their Lordships, whether they thought that it is consistent with the rule, which must bind them on this occasion, that in arguing the admissibility of a piece of evidence, to read the very words of the evidence, when certainly they ought only to state the general nature of it. It certainly

was

was not within the course of practice to read the very words.

The Lord President. It is very proper to open as much of the purport of it, as to let the Court know and comprehend its contents.

Mr. Erskine again contended, that in order to argue the admissibility or inadmissibility of any piece of evidence, it was not to be read by the counsel of the Crown in the hearing of the Jury. Because if the Court at length should say it was not admissible, it might lead to affect the prisoner in a manner inconsistent with the rules of law and justice.

Mr. Serjeant Adair observed, that he did state, that the part of the letter which was alluded to, was not the ground which they offered it to their Lordships, and would not be evidence against the prisoner; but he did never state, that if there was that in the letter, on the ground on which he contended, that was applicable evidence against the prisoner, that the whole of that letter should not be read; but, certainly their Lordships said, that his admission was of no weight to the Court, the Court must determine for itself.

Mr. Bearcroft then said, that he had received that interruption with the greatest patience, because it was made by a counsel for the prisoner, now on trial for his life. If it had been made in any other place, he could not but instantly have expressed his astonishment at the irregularity, because he conceived it was not only the privilege, when arguing any evidence, to state that evidence to the Court.

Mr. Erskine. I am in the judgment of the Court.

The Lord President said, that the nature of the evidence was what was necessary to be opened.

Mr. Bearcroft conceived that it would be extremely improper for him to be reading the evidence from beginning to end, under colour that it would be arguing the admissibility of it; but he conceived, that the nature of that part as pointed out as one of the main grounds for the admissibility of this letter, should be laid before their Lordships, which was from certain expressions in this letter. It was only two lines and a half; that a woman in St. James's Park, did take off her patten, and threw it with all her force against his Majesty, as he was going through the Park. He submitted, that this was important evidence, for the purpose of shewing the mischievous intention to the King; and why? because this was a letter from one conspirator to another conspirator, exulting in the transaction, enjoying it, and stating it as good news to his brother conspirator; and, on that ground, he conceived it admissible evidence.

Mr.

Mr. Bowers observed, that he should really be ashamed to trouble the Court with a word on this piece of evidence, because it did not appear of so much importance as to demand so much attention; but if the piece of evidence, under the circumstances already suggested, should not be considered as good evidence, he would attend to what their Lordships suggested to be the duty of the counsel, namely, to open the nature of the evidence, for he submitted with great deference, that they had not opened the tendency of this letter, which appeared to him to be the material and indisputable ground on which it should be received in evidence. There had already been proved against the prisoner at the bar a paper, signed by Martin, as chairman, and himself, the prisoner, as secretary, brought home by evidence; in which he therefore, the prisoner, admits Martin was chairman of that meeting. This letter, which was now proposed to be read, was dated the 22d of January 1794, This is at a period subsequent to that convention in Scotland, and it is relative to that convention, and the tendency of the letter, which he wanted to read, was a letter of Mr. Martin's (who had been so proved to be connected with Mr. Hardy) to their delegate in Scotland, who was obliged to come home, his mission being at an end, by telling him that a subscription will now be raised, which will be assistant to him, and that they thought it advisable to have another meeting here; and that is the tendency of the greatest part of the letter which they now offered to the Court; and after they had brought themselves into the situation of shewing that Mr. Hardy, the prisoner at the bar, has admitted Martin the chairman of that society, and they had given evidence to prove, that the object of that society was to create such purposes into effect by means of a convention; and he produced an instrument of a person, proved to be connected with the prisoner at the bar, in the way that Martin has been proved, to proceed in those steps, shewing what was the object of that convention; certainly he was then proving a direct act done in furtherance of that conspiracy, not by shewing a relation of any thing that was past, but by shewing a direct incitement by letter to persevere and go on, with that conduct which is to lead to the ultimate, and which was the object the society had in view.

The Lord President. I understand this letter not to come to that.

Mr. Bowers. Observed it would be stronger if applied to Margarot, if it had come to his hands, but it is evidence of the intent of this Mr. Martin to encourage the party who appears to be intended, to be addressed in this letter. For any letter

written to anybody, whether he was one of the conspirators or not, from a conspirator that shall have been connected with the prisoner at the bar, is general evidence in this cause, and the purport of this letter, be it directed to whom it may, being to excite them to this measure, and to forward this measure is not a recital of what is past, but it is a direct incitement to go on in that which we are able to prove, it did therefore with great submission to the court, not appear to him that why they should now, when they had already established an intimate connection between the prisoner at the bar and a member of the society, whom they had proved to be joined to him in acts done, in direct furtherance of the main design, why this should not now be evidence against the prisoner at the bar, he submitted that in this stage of the cause it was evidence that ought to be received.

Mr. Law now rose, stating that he should trouble their Lordships with a few remarks, and they should be in as narrow a compass as possible, particularly on the ground on which he meant to take the argument, had been anticipated from what has fallen from *Mr. Bower*. With regard to the question whether any piece of evidence is admissible or not, there were three things to be considered. In the first place, the relation of him who writes, secondly, of him who may receive it, and thirdly, the person who is meant to be affected by that letter. There are all three proved that they are members engaged in a conspiracy to subvert the government of these kingdoms; having laid that general ground, he submitted to their Lordships, that it was the custom in the ordinary course of proceedings, to give detached pieces of evidence, any one act of which may be conducive to the general end, and if proved to attach on the prisoner, is so far evidence against him. What is the act done in its general ground, he thought it was included in that overt act mentioned in the indictment, that they have written and caused to be written, sundry books, pamphlets, letters, instructions, to excite and stir up his majesty's subject to the attainment of this object, which object is the subversion of the government, and the deposing of the King; he contended that this letter was a furtherance of this object to encourage *Margarot* to persevere, and for this end he tells him the friends of the society were increasing, their numbers increasing, their prospect of success increasing, that being stated as an object, and the object of the letter, the only question is whether a letter of such a context, confirming a predication of incitement to this object be admissible, and if it be of the nature that we have stated, I conceive there be no doubt of its admissibility.

Mr. Erskine replied, that he considered this debate, in the
stage

Stage in which we were now arrived in it, as a refinement in the history of a Court of Justice. Standing here the second day, he appealed to their Lordships whether he and his colleagues, who were counsel for the prisoner, had not been very ready in the reception of evidence, having troubled their Lordships with no argument, or asked hardly even a single question of any witnesses. He conceived that their Lordships would see that they should have made no sort of objection to this letter if it contained no more than what his learned friend Mr. Garrow opened to the Court, because, if it should turn out not to be evidence against his client, his Lordship would have to tell the Jury to do what it was impossible they could do, because human nature cannot discharge out of their minds a recollection of what they have heard. His learned friend did not open the generality of the tendency of that part of the letter. How was he to know what was in the letter? and therefore, for what he knew, it may be an unpublished letter in Mr. Margarot's possession, and on no principle of the law any evidence at all. He should be unfit to stand here as a counsel to object to its being read if it contained nothing more than all the papers on which the Jury had consumed two days of their precious lives in this Court. At least, Mr. Serjeant Adair said, that which he could not object to—He stated, with that sense that belonged to him, and with the humanity that will ever accompany that sense, that there was nothing in it except the technicality of evidence, and that the Judge must say the Jury ought not to hear. Up rises the next counsel, and he makes no observations on any other part of the letter, but he fastens on that very part of the letter, and proposes to read that which the council before him admitted was no evidence against his client. He then had their Lordships judgment for the foundation of their objection; but after he was possessed of their Lordships judgment, still the learned counsel went on, and read the very words which he objected against the reading; and having done, he says, he receives the interruption with all the gentleness that belongs to him. This is no trifling matter; he begged leave to say that he stood there for the life of an innocent man, and that he stood there for the law and constitution of England, and he would never suffer any thing while he stood there that was not consonant to both. He said, he agreed with the Solicitor General with what he says with regard to Lord Lovatt's case, so far as it relates to act, and if this had been an act done by Margarot and Martin; then he should say that the act done would be evidence against the prisoner; but what he objected to, that a letter should be produced as evidence which never found its way to Mr. Margarot. If his client was

to be affected by the writing of that letter there was only one thing that he was anxious about. Supposing this letter to be evidence, a paper may be part evidence and part not. If part is evidence and part not, that part which is evidence should be read, and that part which is not evidence should not be read. If there is any part of the paper evidence, part of it may be admissible evidence, and part not. You permit part of an interrogatory to be read in a court of equity, but you will not permit the other. All he objected to in it is the relation of an old woman throwing her patten at his Majesty going through St. James's Park; there was something in it so perfectly ridiculous that it could not be supposed to affect a man that is standing on his trial for his life; and not only so, but it appeared to him to be establishing a dangerous precedent to have things read which did not regard the prisoner at the bar nor the cause before the Court.

Lord President. I agree with Mr. Bearcroft, that he has stated truly what the true nature of this question is, whether if this was merely a trial for a conspiracy, this would be evidence against one of the parties in that conspiracy; because the question whether this prisoner is to be reached on the specific charge against him, is undoubtedly a question whether he is to be reached by that medium, and after the medium is once established, that question arises which I will say no more of. At present it is perfectly clear in the case of a conspirator, the general evidence of the thing conspired is given in evidence, and then the parties present brought before a Court of Justice, is to be effected with his share in it.

The question now is, whether a paper under the hand of a person which is proved to be one of the conspirators, is to be received in evidence. I take it as this case stands, it is not a letter sent to Mr. Margarot, therefore, it may be a paper which may be written privily by Martin, and it may never have gone out of his hands. The question is, whether under these circumstances such a paper is to be admitted in evidence in a case against another person who now stands at the bar. I confess it does not appear to me sufficiently distinguishable from the last case, which we have just now determined, to satisfy my mind that it ought to be received in evidence.

It is undoubtedly true, that the general plot is to be proved by proving the transactions of others, to which the party may or may not be immediately a party; but I conceive this is no more than a mere acknowledgment of the parties, which may be evidence against him that makes the declaration.

For instance, there is a conspiracy charged, suppose a witness
was

was to stand at the bar, and say, that the four persons charged were the prisoners, Martin, Thelwall, and Margarot, or any other parties? Suppose he was to say, that I heard Thelwall say that he was engaged in such a conspiracy, he heard Martin say that he was engaged in such a conspiracy, or that he heard Margarot say that he was present at such a conspiracy, my present apprehension is, that it would be exceeding good evidence against the persons who said it, to prove that they were concerned, but it would be no evidence at all against a third person.

If in the case of Lord Strafford's, a man proved that he had heard A. B. C. converse together on the subject of the conspiracy, that is proof that three persons conspired, and therefore the conversation together is proof that they conspired, but not evidence of the parties acknowledgment only as it could be brought home to them. I have already taken notice in regard to this personal acknowledgment, the having taken a share, or the having meant to incite, is sufficient; for that is the nature of this letter, and would be a very proper evidence, if the prisoner at the bar was to be affected by it. In an indictment for a conspiracy there may be given general evidence, but when a person is indicted by himself there can be no evidence against him, but what proves the existence of the facts with which he is charged in regular evidence. If it happens that a matter of fact should be established against A. does it also become evidence against B. on the circumstance of B's. being connected with A. that is very different to the present case; I always consider that nothing of this sort can be made evidence against individuals, but what comes out of their own mouths, and not what comes out of the mouth of one who is not even an agent of the party, as is the case with the letter, and therefore I think cannot be received.

Lord Chief Baron. In the last question that was before the Court, I confined my judgment at that time to the exact case, namely, the bare relation of an act to a perfect stranger in that conspiracy, as no more than an admission, that may possibly regard himself who wrote it, but cannot regard any of his co-conspirators; but I confess there appears to me a material distinction in this case; this is a paper which is addressed by one of the several conspirators to another of those conspirators, and it is introduced as subservient to the proof of the general nature and tendency of that conspiracy, which is endeavoured to be alleged against the prisoner and others; it seems to me that one of the conspirators addressing a paper to another conspirator, having relation to that conspiracy (and which is not
merely

merely a bare description to a stranger) is an act complete in that conspiracy, although it may never reach that person to whom it is intended. It is a complete act in one, though the thing did not reach the other, and I think it may be read.

Mr. Baron Hotham. I remain in the opinion that I gave in the last case, that that letter ought not to be suffered to be read, that letter I consider as a very different letter from this, that was inclosing some songs supposed to be sung at a meeting, sent to an indifferent person. This letter has been written by a man who has been proved Chairman of a meeting at the Globe Tavern, on that day it is proved to be written, though not received; written to Margarot, who has been proved to be the Delegate sent by that meeting into Scotland, and it is stated to contain matters respecting his particular mission at Edinburgh; it is stated to contain matters of incitement and encouragement to proceed in the cause in which he is engaged, namely, in the cause in which he is engaged by the procurement, by the consent, and by the direction of that meeting in London, and that meeting in London has been proved to be composed of the prisoner at the bar, the writer of the letter, his correspondent to whom it was intended to be sent, and others: therefore, I do consider this as strong evidence to shew that one of that meeting, and blended together as it were with the prisoner at the bar, did send such a letter, having in it an excitement and encouragement to their own delegates to proceed in the business in which they were particularly sent, and for which they were both so commissioned, and I think it ought to be admitted as evidence to prove the sense of these conspirators.

Mr. Justice Buller. The case to which I alluded to just now, was Lord William Russell's case, where my Lord Howell goes very large into the evidence, and he there speaks of a conversation with Lord Shaftesbury, in which he mentioned that above ten thousand Irish boys were to follow him whenever he held up his finger, and when the Chief Justice sums up, he repeats these words as evidence of the insurrection, but not to affect the prisoner. In considering the charge whether there has been a conspiracy to effect the life of the King, it is necessary first to shew that there is a conspiracy on foot, and then you go on to prove whether or no was acting a part in this conspiracy. Now it seems to me, if you suppose that such a combination had existed, how in the nature of things can it be made out, but by declarations, expressions, and conversations of those that are parties to it, and the way in which my brother considered it was a material one; suppose an equivocal expression is used, shall not we enquire how they understood it; the first question is to
enquire

enquire whether or no there was a conspiracy; then it becomes another question, whether the prisoner is affected by it or not, and he may object finally, that the subject was not so explained to him, nor he so understand it. But the question is now not on the fact of the evidence, but whether it ought or ought not to be received, and inasmuch as it goes to prove the existence of the conspiracy it must be received.

Mr. Justice Grose. I am quite of opinion with my brethren who think that this evidence must be received for the purpose of shewing a conspiracy, and what the nature of that conspiracy was. An address has been already produced, the contents of which address was, that Mr. Martin was the Chairman, and the prisoner, secretary, and that there was correspondence between the prisoner, Margarot, and Martin, and Martin and Margarot, then is it not very material for us to shew the nature of the conspiracy? what one conspirator wrote to another respecting these very acts in the course of the transactions relative to this very plan? and when it is said that this is merely a confession or writing, I think it is more, because we know very well, that *scribere est agere* writing is an act, and such an act to shew there was a plan of a conspiracy, and may shew for what intention and purpose that plan was laid down.

JOHN WALKER sworn.

Q. I believe you are an attorney?

A. Yes, I am, Sir.

Q. Are you acquainted with Mr. John Martin?

A. I am.

Q. Are you acquainted with his character and hand-writing?

A. I am.

Q. Be so good to look at that letter (*a letter shewn him*), and tell me whether in your judgment the whole of it is his hand-writing, particularly the signature: do you believe that to be Mr. Martin's hand-writing?

A. I do.

Q. Look at the superscription.

A. I believe that to be his hand-writing.

(*The letter read by the Clerk of the Court.*)

Dated Richmond-buildings, Jan. 22, 1794, signed John Martin. Addressed to Citizen John Margarot, Tolbooth, Edinburgh.

“ I dare say you think I have forgot you, from my not having written to you; but you know my sentiments so well that it was unnecessary for me. With regard to Lord Edward, I have not been able to get any thing like a settlement. To-morrow is the first day of term, when I shall rule the Sheriffs to return the writ, &c.

“ We

“ We were yesterday at Chalk Farm ; the newspaper says we were five hundred, but we were nearer two thousand, and we were tolerably bold. Your conduct received universal approbation. Those who opposed the subscription at first are now putting their hands to the bottom of their pockets, and swear by G—d you shall be supported.

“ Have you read my Letter to Lord Lauderdale ? Are you inclined to try a writ of error ? What do you think of my countrymen ? I firmly believe the law is the only science of which they know nothing, &c.

“ Yesterday the King went to meet his Parliament, and I am told that a woman, moved and seduced by the instigation of the devil, did take off her patten, and throw it with all her force against his Majesty. God save the King, (or, as Gerald says, —.)

“ The society is increasing rapidly both in spirit and number, and the rich now begin to come among us, and sit down amongst honest men in their leathern aprons, &c.

“ Postscript. Citizen Gay says more than I dare write.”

Q. (*To Mr. Gurnell—a letter shown him.*) You found this in Mr. Hardy's house ?

A. Yes, I did. (*Read by the Clerk of the Court.*) It is a letter from Margaret to the prisoner.

Dated Tolbooth, 24 Jan. 1794. Addressed to Mr. Thomas Hardy, No. 9, Piccadilly, London.

“ DEAR HARDY,

“ I have just received your letter, dated, by mistake I suppose, the 19th, giving me an account of the dinner at Ramsay, and giving me a 10l bank note. I wish the society may not forget me altogether ; but however, should they, I am determined to pursue the same kind of conduct, even if I pursue it alone. But however, the Sheffield society has behaved far different from our own towards their delegate. If you publish my trial it may be necessary to place my handsome figure in the front. If so, Mrs. Margaret can furnish you with the miniature, &c.

“ Do you not see that the mob would be the better for losing a little blood ; it would have a great effect on the public mind ? &c.

“ I must again observe, that the Sheffield people seem more in earnest than the Londoners. I ask for the money because I am in arrears here more than the society have sent me.

“ Since my last we have had an additional padlock put on our door, and the Captain of the Tolbooth is not trusted with the keys at night, but carries them to the Magistrates, and calls for them in the morning.

“ Here

“ Here they make no dinners but yet they might, it appears that worthy Skirving was not noticed in your cups. The Scotch lads were more kind than the L. C. S.

“ Has Martin done any thing for me ?

“ The Duke of Portland, though he joins Ministry, ought to pay the bill for his brother Lord Edward Bentley.

“ Armed associations are, I perceive, now set on foot by the rich. Why should not the poor do the same ? In London you garnish your axe, and like lambs content yourselves with bleeding. Pray let me hear from you soon.

“ Your’s, M. M.”

Q. (*To Gurnell—a paper shewn him.*) Did you find that paper in your hand at Hardy’s ?

A. I did. (*Read by the Clerk of the Court.*) It is a letter of the Bristol Constitutional Society.

Dated Bristol, the 28th of January, 1794, signed J. Lawrence, Secretary, and addressed to Thomas Hardy.

“ FELLOW CITIZENS,

“ I am again authorized to write to you, signifying the gratitude of our society for your second epistle, which came to my hands the 3d instant. After reading its contents, I collected as many of our friends as I conveniently could that evening—we read—we blushed—we took courage ;—we did more, for we resolved on re-assembling, as we had appointed prior to the determination we announced in our last. We intend publishing an address or, something declaratory of our sentiments, with all convenient speed ;—as soon as this is effected, we shall send a copy or copies to you. From the Courier and Evening Gazette we have had information of the trial of Mr. Margarot, and his sentence to fourteen years transportation. We are by no means at a loss in forming a judgment of the noble cause in which he with others are embarked, *nor would we be frightened at such sentences.* You see, citizens, your second epistle has quickened our courage, and vivified our patriotism, and roused us to resolution ; *and more, our number is now considerably increased*—perhaps your third epistle may do greater things still ;—we are sensible ’tis a noble—’tis a virtuous—’tis a godlike and immortal cause in which we are now mutually embarked ; and though for parts our effort can be but a feeble one, yet the cause we espouse is mighty—is energetic.—It will finally prevail and prosper : It is our firm opinion, could we but arouse them, that patriots would become nearly the majority of our city. We expected to have had the dozen of the Englishmen’s rights, which you mentioned in your first epistle—hope you will send them speedily.

“ We are, fellow citizens, yours sincerely,

“ The Bristol Society for Constitutional Information, &c.”

H h

Q. (*To*

Q. (*To Edward Lauzun—a paper shewn him.*) Where did you find this paper?

A. At Mr. Hardy's.

(*Read by the Clerk of the Court.*)

“CITIZENS!

“The critical moment is arrived, and Britons must either assert with zeal and firmness their claims to liberty, or yield without resistance to the chains that ministerial usurpation is forging for them. Will you co-operate with us in the only peaceable measure that now presents itself with any prospect of success? We need not intimate to you that, notwithstanding the unparalleled audacity of a corrupt and overbearing faction, which at present tramples on the rights and liberties of the people, our meetings cannot in England be interrupted without the previous adoption of a Convention Bill: a measure it is our duty to anticipate, that the ties of union may be more firmly drawn, and the sentiments and views of the different societies throughout the nation be compared, while it is yet in our power, so as to guide and direct the future operations of the friends of freedom. Rouse then to one exertion more; and let us shew our consciousness of this important truth—“If we are to be beaten down with threats, prosecutions, and illegal sentences, we are unworthy—we are incapable of liberty.”—We must, however, be expeditious. Hessians and Austrians are already among us; and, if we tamely submit, a cloud of these armed barbarians may shortly be poured in upon us. Let us form, then, another British Convention. We have a central situation in our view, which we believe would be most convenient for the whole island; but which we forbear to mention, (entreating your confidence in this particular) till we have the answer of the societies with which we are in correspondence. Let us have your answer, then by the 20th, at farthest, earlier if possible, whether you approve of the measure, and how many delegates you can send, with the number also, if possible, of your societies.

“We remain yours,

“in civic affection,

“The LONDON CORRESPONDING SOCIETY.

“T. HARDY, Secretary.

“For the management of this business we have appointed a Secret Committee: you will judge how far it is necessary for you to do the same.”

Q. (*To Alexander Grant—a paper shewn him*) Tell me whether you believe this to be the prisoner's hand writing?

A. I do believe it.

(*Read*

(Read by the Clerk of the Court)

Dated, London, March 12th 1794, signed Thomas Hardy.

“CITIZEN BUCKELL,

“I have just time to inform you that I see our worthy delegate, Margarot, on board the *Surprize* at Spithead. He is conscious of having broken the law in this country, but only doing his duty as every good Citizen is bound to do, for promoting the happiness of his fellow creatures, by opposing every measure and every means, that wantonly oppose all laws human and divine; he has that conclusion in his own breast, however the enemies of mankind are punishing him as an evil doer; but according to human appearance, the reign of the boast of civil and ecclesiastical power, is almost at an end. Thanks to the Supreme Ruler of the universe, for his great goodness hitherto, and the bright prospect before us. I delivered the 20l. you gave me for his use into his hands, it was very seasonable.

“This moment I have received a letter from Muir, informing me that the convoy hoisted her signal for sailing.

“I saw the captain, he appears to be a very good kind of man, and bears a very good character. I hope you will excuse me entering into detail any further, for I have not another minute to spare. If any friend you can trust can come to town I will give him a full account, what think you of a convention? Farewell

“THOMAS HARDY.”

Q. (*To Gurnell—a paper shewn him*) Did you find that letter in Mr. Hardy's possession?

A. Yes.

(Read by the Clerk of the Court)

Dated 9th of April, 1794, signed, Alexander Mitchell, Secretary. Addressed to Mr. Thomas, Hardy, Shoemaker, No. 9, Piccadilly, London.

“FELLOW CITIZENS,

“The society at Strathaven received your letter sometime ago respecting another British Convention to be held in England, and finding it would be inconvenient for them to send a delegate for themselves alone, the cause being much oppressed by prosecution, &c.

“You will therefore forward your order to us, when and where the convention is to meet, with any other instructions you may think necessary. We shall instruct our delegate with the number and strength of our society. We remain yours in the cause of liberty, for the United Society,

“ALEXANDER MITCHELL, Secretary.”

Direct to Alexander Mitchell, Strathaven.

Q. (*To Gurnell,—a paper shewn him*) Where did you find that paper?

A. At Mr. Hardy's.

(*Read by the Clerk of the Court.*)

Dated from Newcastle, April 14, 1794. Addressed to Mr. Hardy, No. 9, or 19, Piccadilly, London.

"By desire of a number of friends, to a radical reform in the constitution here, I make free to trouble you. We live in a place where an aristocrat magistracy endeavours to stop the genial and benign spirit of national liberty from spreading, notwithstanding a very great number are found here that dare assert the natural and unalienable rights of man, and bear their testimony against the tyrannical encroachments of assumed power on those rights; a good number have formed themselves into societies, and meet weekly, admitting *none but known friends*; and have assumed no name but that of newspaper companies; these were in great spirits while the British Convention continued to sit; but after their suppression a damp was cast on the whole.—Subscriptions were ready to be sent off the very night they were suppressed, and the Gazetteer stopped, which has since been remitted to London, for the use of the persecuted worthies, Muir and Palmer.—Being charmed with your masterly and bold approbation of the conduct of your delegates and noble martyrs for truth, Margaret and Gerald, and find your name signed secretary to the Corresponding Society, we wish to copy your example; and beg, if you think us worth your notice, give us your views and intentions as soon as convenient, which, I hope, will be a means to stimulate and increase our numbers. Lest this should not come to you, as I have an uncertain direction, I forbear troubling you more at present, in hopes of being favoured with your future correspondence.—Farewel, hoping the Hydra of tyranny and imposition shall soon fall under the guillotine of truth and reason.

"Your's, with all due respect, &c.

"CITIZENS."

Q. (*To Garnett—a paper shown him*) Did you find that in the possession of the prisoner?

A. I did.

(*Read by the Clerk of the Court.*)

London, May the 11th, 1794. Signed, Thomas Hardy, Secretary.

"CITIZEN,

"It is with pleasure the London Corresponding Society hear that a society, on a similar plan, and with the same patriotic objects in view, is likely to be established at Newcastle upon Tyne.—If ever a crisis arrived that required the exertions of the people to stop the torrent of corruption, infamy and despotism, that seems likely to overwhelm them, it is the present—
in

in God's name then, let us use these exertions.—We are called upon by every thing that is dear to us, as men and as christians. The cause of truth and liberty must finally be omnipotent; therefore, doubt not that the *glorious reign of liberty and equality will ere long be established, and modern governments, with every appendage of wickedness and corruption, will flee in time from their genial influence, as beasts of prey to their dens of rapine and darkness from the rising Sun.* The London Corresponding Society have beheld with indignation *the rapid advances of despotism in Britain, and are ready cordially to unite with every other society in the three kingdoms, who have for their object a full and effectual representation of the people; they therefore have deputed six of their members to meet six members of the society for Constitutional Information, to form a committee of correspondence and co-operation; this committee meets regularly twice a week, at No. 2, Beaufort-Buildings, Strand, where any member delegated by your society will meet with every information required.*—We inclose you a few of our resolutions, entered into at our general meeting on the 14th of April, which will be sufficiently explanatory of our sentiments and views. *We heartily unite with you in wishing that the hydra of tyranny and despotism may soon fall under the guillotine of truth and reason.*

“ FRIENDS.”

Q. (To Gurnell—a paper shewn him) Did you find that paper at Mr. Hardy's house?

A. I did.

(Read by the Clerk of the Court.)

Dated Bristol, April 24. Signed John Cockburn, directed to Thomas Hardy.

“ FELLOW-CITIZEN,

“ You may be sensible, from our last communication, that in the infancy of our patriotic efforts we had many difficulties to overcome, and many strong prejudices to combat.—We laid open to you our real situation; we told you our determination to address the public, and assured you of our unalterable perseverance in the glorious cause of freedom — This perseverance, however, and these exertions of an individual society, can but little avail, if the societies in the different parts of the kingdom are in themselves disunited, or do not aid and assist each other, agreeable to the principles of philanthropy and *fraternity* which they so warmly profess. Under this idea, we conceive ourselves treated with a degree of *incivism*, by your society not answering our last letters; the reasons may be good.—At present we are candid enough to confess, that the circumstance does not appear to us in the most favourable point of view. Our address, of which we send you a few copies, we find to have a
good

good effect, and is likely to beget us the assistance of many friends, while our enemies acknowledge there is something very fair and reasonable in the production.—This is an absolute victory; and we have reason to congratulate ourselves on the prospect of success it opens to us. With a mixture of pain and pleasure, we saw an account of your last general meeting; we lament that the *strong hand of despotism* should so often interfere to prevent the assertion of the rights of the people, while we rejoice in your manly constitutional perseverance, and *applaud and approve your resolution of forming another general Convention*: Our *increasing numbers* give us every reasonable hope of soon being able more *effectually to co-operate with you*; while, for the reasons formerly stated, we cannot yet make a positive promise on that head. We hope for an immediate answer.—Favour us with your opinion of our address, and transmit a sketch of your plan respecting the general Convention.

“ By order of the Committee of delegates appointed by the
“ Bristol Constitutional Society.”

Q. (*To Gurnell—a paper shown him*) Where did you find that letter?

A. At Mr. Hardy's house.

(*The letter read by the Clerk of the Court.*)

From the Norwich Society. Dated April 29, 1794, addressed
“ CITIZEN HARDY,

“ It is with great satisfaction we view the manly conduct of you and your colleagues, especially when, surrounded as you are, by a domineering aristocracy, who, notwithstanding their great bluster, are but chicken-hearted;—Witness our Norfolk Quixottes, who, after being completely foiled at their county meeting, were determined to subscribe to support an armed aristocracy: But, pray, tell it not in the metropolis, that a noble Marquis subscribed no more than 200l. and another high-pensioned Lord but 100l. an Alderman and leader, and very fierce for Church and King, the enormous sum of 20l.—These are the men who are ready to spend their lives and fortunes;—but enough of such privileged beings! We should be glad to know whether the friends of the people consent to a convention, and whether they will take an active part.

“ Please to accept of a few of our bills. We should esteem it a favour that you would send us a few of your late declarations.

“ P. S. Many of our friends are fully convinced of the necessity, legality, and rationality of a convention. But, Query—whether the time be expedient?

“ JAS. BIGGS, Chairman,
“ J. SAINT, Secretary.”

Direct to J. B. jun. seedsman, Magdalen-street.

Q. (*To*

Q. (To Gurnell—a paper shewn him) Where did you meet with that?

A. I found it in Mr. Hardy's house.

(Read by the Clerk of the Court.)

Dated April 12th, 1794. Signed Joseph Powell, and addressed to Mr. Hardy. No. 9, Piccadilly, London.

“ SIR,

“ I have repeatedly seen your name in the newspaper, as secretary to a certain institution, called the London Corresponding Society; but from my enquiries in the country, I have not been able to acquire any of the rules of the society, nor the precise purposes for which it is to be established. I have therefore troubled you with this letter, desiring you to inform me with the object the society has in view, and the means they use to obtain it.

“ I am, yours,

“ JOSEPH POWELL.”

“ Address to Joseph Powell, surveyor, the Sun-tavern, Hereford.”

Q. (To Gurnell—a paper shewn him) Where did you find that?—look at that.

A. At Mr. Hardy's house?

(Read by the Clerk of the Court as follows.) It is without a date, indorsed, an answer to Hereford.

“ In answer to your letter, dated the 12th, I have to inform you, that the London Corresponding Society have not only the glorious design of decreasing the power of a monster, whose hideous features need only be exposed to render it an object of universal terror and detestation, and to expose vice, to paint virtue in its true colours, to acquaint our fellow-citizens with their dearest rights—the rights of man; and by a brotherly union, give them an opportunity to demand those rights; those are the means we use, and we doubt not, but in executing these means, we are doing our duty to God and our country, &c.

“ We invite you and your fellow-citizens to join with us in the same glorious cause.”

Mr. Garrow. Here is a letter from Sheffield I am going to read, found in the possession of Thelwall, who is charged as being an agent in this conspiracy, and addressed to the prisoner at the bar.

Mr. Erskine. Though this might go to prove the conspiracy, as it is called, I cannot see how it can affect the prisoner. How does it appear that it was the same Sheffield society with which this society corresponded; is it the same hand writing?

Mr. Garrow. I said it purported to be a letter from a society in Sheffield, written by order of the society, addressed to Hardy,
and

and found in the possession of Thelwall; if it is objected to, I will not press it.

Mr. Erskine. We do object to it.

Lord Chief Justice. I think this letter is in a different situation from the other; it is a letter written from a society addressed to the prisoner, and found in the hands of a person who appears to be involved in the guilt of the prisoner.

WILLIAM TIMMS sworn—examined by Mr. GARROW.

Q. Are you one of his Majesty's messengers?

A. Yes, I am.

Q. Did you seize any papers in the house of Thelwall?

A. Yes; some few that were on his person.

Q. You put your name to those you seized?

A. Yes.

Q. See if that is one?

A. Yes; that is one.

(The paper read by the Clerk of the Court.)

Sheffield, May 11th, 1794.

"FRIEND AND FELLOW-CITIZEN,

"The friends of peace and reform in Halifax having held a general public meeting in the open air, on Monday April 21st, 1794, at which were many friends from Leeds, Wakefield, Huddersfield, Bradford, and the adjacent neighbourhood, the friends of freedom, after the meeting, agreed to hold a general meeting of delegates at Bristol, in order to consider on the measures to be adopted by them preparatory to a *General Convention*. After which our worthy friend, citizen _____ of Halifax, being ordered to Sheffield to get the proceedings of the meeting printed, and consult with us upon the subject, they were advised by us to defer at present the meeting of delegates, *until further information from you on that subject*. I was therefore ordered, at our last committee meeting, to write to you, requesting the favour of as early intelligence as possible on that important business. We are not in the least intimidated in Sheffield, as we can call and hold a public meeting whenever circumstances renders the same necessary; besides, in the house where I reside, we have a large commodious room, where the society can peaceably meet in rotation.

"By order of the Committee,

"WILLIAM BROOMHEAD, Secretary."

Q. *(To Scott—a paper shown him.)* Was this paper found in the house of Mr. Skirving?

A. Yes.

(Read by the Clerk of the Court.)

Dated Edinburgh, Oct. 30, 1793, signed John Gartley.

"The delegation from Glasgow moves, That the Convention

tion

tion take into their consideration the nature and extent of a resolution adopted by their constituents, and by most of the other societies in Scotland, and afterwards ratified and approved of at the General Convention held at Edinburgh in December 1792, the import of which was, That if any member of their society associated for the purpose of obtaining a parliamentary reform, should, while in the legal prosecution of that object, be oppressed or persecuted by the *arm of power*, they should not only *meet with the assistance of the society to which they belong, but also by the united efforts of all their brethren in Scotland.*

“ Since the above period, however, we are sorry to say, several of our members have been *persecuted*, and that in a most wanton manner, and the above resolution (which if duly put in force would, we humbly apprehend, have the happy effect of emboldening those who have already come forward, and of encouraging others who have not yet taken any active part to unite their efforts in the general cause) has never yet been attended to.

“ We therefore humbly move, that the Convention take into consideration the above particulars, and consider what measures may be most *conducive towards the performance of the obligation we lie under, in consequence of that resolution, and thereby shew to the world that we are not unmindful of those that may suffer in their country's cause.*

“ JOHN GARTLEY.”

Q. (To Lauzun—a paper shewn him.) Is that one of the papers that you received at Mr. Hardy's house?

A. Yes, it is.

Mr. Garrow. This is a paper found in the possession of the prisoner, dated 15th June, 1792, signed D. Adams, Secretary to the Society for Constitutional Information, in answer to a letter of the 10th inst. from the London Corresponding Society to the London Constitutional Society, to adopt six of their members; addressed to the Chairman of the London Corresponding Society.

(Read by the Clerk of the Court.)

“ At a meeting held on Friday the 15th of June, 1792, it was ordered, That the Secretary be desired to inform the Secretary of the London Corresponding Society, that this society received their proposal with pleasure, and are willing to admit such six of the members whom they shall nominate, to be associated members of this society.”

Q. (To Grant—a paper shewn him.) Do you believe that to be Mr. Hardy's hand-writing?

A. I believe it is?

Mr. Garrow. This is a letter of the prisoner to the Chairman of the Society for Constitutional Information of July
I i the

the 6th, which makes the connection between the two societies.

(Read by the Clerk of the Court.)

Dated July 6, 1792, signed Thomas Hardy.

“ SIR,

“ In the name of the London Corresponding Society, I have to return thanks to the Society for Constitutional Information, for their present of two hundred copies of their resolutions respecting the King’s proclamation; as also for the two hundred copies of Mr. Paine’s Letter, &c. likewise Mr. Paine’s Letter to Mr. Secretary Dundas: by care in the distribution of them, those six hundred papers shall be seen by as many thousand persons.

“ We find ourselves highly favoured by your readiness to admit six of our members among you; I am directed to forward to you the following six names, as the persons chosen by our society for that honourable purpose; our sense of the favour so conferred will be best expressed by their close attendance at your instructive meetings, and constant endeavours to forward the so beneficial and so much wanted reform of parliamentary representation.

“ I am, Sir, with great respect,

“ Your very humble servant,

July 6, 1792.

“ THOMAS HARDY, Secretary.”

“ The following are the names chosen by our society: Thomas Hardy, Maurice Margarot, John Richter, Mr. Littlejohn, Mr. Grant, and William Gow.”

DANIEL ADAMS sworn.—Examined by Mr. BOWER.

Q. I think you acted as Secretary to the Constitutional Society?

A. Yes.

Q. Is that the book in which your proceedings were entered?

A. Yes.

Q. Are the entries of the proceedings of the society regularly made in these books?

A. Yes.

(Some extracts from it read by the Clerk of the Court.)

“ July 17, 1792. At a meeting held at the Crown and Anchor Tavern, in the Strand, present, John Martin in the chair, the following six gentlemen, recommended in the London Corresponding Society to be associated with this society, were unanimously elected.

“ July 20th. At a meeting of the Society for Constitutional Information, held at the Crown and Anchor Tavern, in the Strand, present, Mr. Frost in the chair, Mr. J. H. Tooke, Mr. Semple, Mr. Bonney, Mr. Edwards, Mr. Rickman, Mr. Hull,

Hull, Mr. Sharp, Mr. Parkinson, Dr. Kentish, Mr. Sturch, Mr. Constable, Mr. G. Williams, Mr. W. Rennington, Captain Harwood, Mr. Bush, Mr. Bush, jun. Mr. Chopping, Mr. Bakewell, Mr. Hird, Lord Semple, Mr. Jenny, Mr. Balmano, Mr. Fitzgerald, Mr. Adams, Mr. J. Williams, Mr. Chetwind, Mr. Bailey, Col. Keating, Mr. Aspinal, Mr. Gow, Mr. Hardy, Mr. Grant, Mr. Moore, Mr. John Martin, Capt. Perry, Rev. Dr. Towers.

(The Clerk reads) “ 20th July, 1792. At a meeting of the society for Constitutional Information, held at the Crown and Anchor Tavern, Strand, Mr. Frost in the chair, a committee were appointed to take into consideration Mr. Paine’s letter, wherein he offered the society 1000l. in trust, to be distributed by them.”

Q. *(To Adams.)* Were these entries in the book made at the time of meeting?

A. They were.

Q. Were the minutes of the former meeting ever read as part of the business of the society?

A. The minutes of the last meeting were generally read the next meeting.

Q. Were these books liable to the inspection of the members of the society?

A. During the sitting of the society there on the table.

Q. For the inspection of the members?

A. As they thought proper.

(The Clerk reads) “ At a meeting held at the Crown and Anchor Tavern in the Strand, Friday, July 27, 1792. Present, Mr. Chopping in the Chair, Mr. G. Williams, Mr. Hardy, Mr. Gow, Captain Perry, Mr. Sinclair, Mr. Geddes, Mr. Aspinal, Mr. Gerald, Mr. Littlejohn, Mr. Wood, Mr. Sutton, Mr. Moore, Mr. John Martin, Lord Semple.

“ The committee appointed to take Mr. Paine’s letter of the 4th instant in consideration, had to consider the manner in which the society should communicate their determination of his offer of a thousand pounds in trust to the society as they should think proper.

“ Resolved, That it is the opinion of this Committee, that the offer of Mr. Paine be respectfully declined.

“ Resolved, That this be transmitted to Mr. Paine, in the following manner,

“ SIR,

“ I am directed by the society of Constitutional Information to return you their sincere thanks, in proposing them to become trustees for a thousand pounds, which has been produced from