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PART II. THE BOROUGHS

(Part I — The County — appeared in Volume 5, 1970.)

The most distinctive feature of the boroughs throughout the country was the extravagant diversity of franchises. The forty-shilling freehold qualification in the shire constituencies was uniform and rational by comparison. Also, it was said, the county franchise was far less open to manipulation by "interest" than that of the vast majority of the boroughs. But the fact that the term "freehold" was greatly extended in the wrangling over controverted elections, that counties varied tremendously in size, even though each returned two knights of the shire, and that votes were still open to pressure, all lessened the advantage in the county franchise. The territorial influence of landlords was very real for the electorate was, after all, still narrow enough. On the other hand, election results were not by any means always foregone conclusions. The Duke of Rutland united with Lord Sherrard and was successful in the Leicestershire election of November, 1701. But such aristocratic domination bred resentment among the lesser gentry and such a complete victory was never repeated and, in fact, Rutland's son lost his seat in the next election.¹

Each of the parliamentary boroughs differed from every other in the size of its electorate, which varied from a handful of people to the 9,000 of Westminster. But the variety can be reduced to three main categories, the franchise based on residence or the payment of local taxes (i.e. "scot and lot"), the ownership of specific pieces of property (i.e. "burgages") and the membership of some corporate body, provided that the important factor of the size of the electorate is always taken into consideration. Thus the franchise in the "scot and lot" boroughs was extensive but the vast majority of this type had small electorates and so were often dominated by a patron: Gatton is the favourite example, the twenty voters consistently returning the lords of the manors of Upper and Lower Gatton. The remaining such boroughs were among the most independent and least venal of all the boroughs. Most of the "pocket" boroughs were of the "burgage" type, but here again absolute control was very rare.

¹
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The corporation boroughs and the "freeman" boroughs, which are sometimes difficult to distinguish from the larger corporation boroughs, were, on the whole, the least easy to control. Even though the electorate of many was small and fixed, they could often be difficult to manipulate. The thirty-three electors of Bath were notorious for their obduracy in clinging to their independence, disregarding patronage and scorning influence. Since the rules governing the admission of freemen were rarely fixed, the franchise could easily come under the control of the corporation. One party could, after gaining control, maintain it by limiting subsequent additions, or, if the corporation was divided, attempts might be made to acquire control by enfranchising great numbers of supporters. At Boston, restrictions on the number of freemen entering the corporation were made by the imposition of a heavy fine for admission.³

The rest of the Lincolnshire boroughs were all of the "freeman" category, but by no means did the same conditions prevail in each; they show just how difficult it is to generalise about the electoral system at this time. Grimsby had only a small electorate of "about eighty" freemen, and "few boroughs in England were more hopelessly corrupt." Stamford was a "pocket" borough of the High Tory, the Earl of Exeter. The Duke of Rutland had strong interests, though by no means complete control, at Grantham, while Lincoln City was a popular constituency.³ None of the electorates of these boroughs was very large and it was generally true, though, as we have seen, it did not necessarily follow, that the fewer the number of votes, the easier the borough was to control and, consequently, that the party labels of "Whig" and "Tory" were important in boroughs with large electorates, while such names were almost meaningless in the fight for the small boroughs.

Again, family and "interest" counted for much in borough politics as in the counties. It was possible for personal "interests" to be built up by men of local standing and wealth. Clearly, people like Sir William Ellys, the long-serving member for Grantham, Thomas Lister, who represented the City, or Sir Edward Irby, the fifth generation to sit for Boston, had their own such support. Whether it was by assiduous campaigning and canvassing in the constituencies or by handsome contributions to some much-needed improvement in the area, they could maintain their interests. Such influence, however, was never completely secure and an intensely personalised interest like that of Sir William Ellys lapsed after 1713.

It has been generally assumed that three of the Lincolnshire boroughs—Stamford, Grantham and Boston—were virtually "pocket" boroughs throughout the period from the mid-seventeenth to the nineteenth century. Professor Walcott also makes the same claim,³ and indeed, to be faithful to Sir Lewis Namier, he had to do so. For the 1760's was a time when "interest" was always stable. This implies a static situation, but this was very far from being the case in Queen Anne’s reign, when basic political alignments were disrupting "interest." Not that "interest" was not important: the Duke of Rutland did indeed have a large part to play, in conjunction with Lord Brownlow, in Grantham’s affairs and so also did the Earl of Lindsey in Boston. But in the opening years of the new century, both had to face strong opposition from independent Tory men and both met with defeat. This is yet another difference between the hectic political life of the 1700’s and the stability of the 1760’s.

Only Stamford can truly be described as a "pocket" borough and this, indeed, is an example ‘par excellence’. It had been in the hands of the Cecil family since the time of William Cecil, Lord Burghley and Earl of Exeter, the chief minister of Elizabeth I. He had had the "noble palace call’d Burleigh House" built just outside Stamford, in Northamptonshire. So imposing was that House (and Defoe has left us a vivid description of it) that the town was the virtual property of the Earl of Exeter. Such a building, which can be compared with similar places, as, for example, Woodstock Manor, belonging to the Duke of Marlborough, would have been by far the largest "industry" of the town. Therefore the control which the Earls of Exeter possessed was enormous and they were "looked up to by the corporation and inhabitants as their patron(s)."³
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This apparently secure hold, however, may have been jeopardised around the turn of the century. For the fifth Earl of Exeter was not a very likeable man and was not very highly respected. Moreover, the electorate was a fairly large one, about 500; rather surprisingly so for few boroughs of equal size were so firmly controlled.4 There was, however, another important family living nearby at Uffington. With Charles Bertie and the Cecils in complete unity, as they were, there could be little danger of their influence being lost or defeated. Stamford remained securely in their possession throughout the eighteenth century.

Besides not being very well liked, the fifth Earl seems also to have played little part in political affairs. E. G. Forrester has neatly summed him up: he “always seems to have been a very important figure in High Tory affairs without ever taking the initiative in any political situation.” 5 His son and successor, too, John Cecil, the sixth Earl, was said to have been very slack in the Northamptonshire county election in 1702. 6 Indeed, the most active person by far among those who had any connection with Stamford was Charles Bertie.

Nothing is heard of his partners in the representation of the borough. The sixth Earl’s brothers, William and Charles, sat with Bertie from 1698-1705 and from 1705 respectively. It seems they did little more than give their votes to the Tory Party. Charles Bertie, on the other hand, by now a seasoned campaigner, continued right up to his death in 1711 to work for his High Church principles. His conscientiousness and upright character are admirably illustrated in the references to him as being a “good old royalist” and “honest Charles Bertie.” 7 In a letter to Robert Harley, he apologised for being absent from the House because of “a very severe fit of gout. This is the first time I am like to prove a defaulter.” He concluded that “I am got as far as this place (Huntingdon) and hope on Tuesday next to pay my duty and attendance in the House.” One wonders what Harley would have thought about this, with the ‘tack’ obviously by that time in the air. 8

Unfortunately, we have little information about his activities in Lincolnshire, if in fact he was interested at all in the county’s affairs. The close proximity of Northamptonshire meant that he would be far more interested in elections there. He seems to have been the ideal type of person to be engaged in the bitter party warfare that was being waged in that county and was always to be found at the forefront of the Tory group of peers in every election up to 1708. He was highly delighted with the alliance between the Tory candidates in the Northamptonshire county election of November 1701, which E. G. Forrester regards as a watershed in party formation. Again, in 1702, while he himself was, of course, elected without a contest, though he was pleased with the assistance which the Earl of Nottingham gave, it coming “in a very tempestuous of time to treat my mayor and aldermen with”, 9 he entered the fray in the neighbouring county and took full advantage of Government influence which had clearly been placed in the hands of the Church politicians. In 1705 also he realised that intense canvassing would be needed throughout the course of that Parliament because of the swing against his Party evidenced in the very close contest of that year. He remained throughout unwavering in support of his cause, the embodiment of High Toryism. 10

The Earl of Rutland also had more interest in events on the periphery of Lincolnshire than he had in the county itself. And, again like the Earls of Exeter, his influence radiated out from a majestic home, “the castle or palace of Belvoir,” as Defoe described it. From there he played a part in the elections of Rutland, Leicestershire, Derbyshire and the borough of Grantham. However, though the electorate in the latter was about the same as at Stamford, his control was by no means so secure. 11

This was first seen in the elections around the turn of the century. One of the members who sat for the borough, Sir William Ellys, relied to some extent on Rutland’s support, 12 but it may be doubted whether, in fact, he was completely dependent on the Earl. For he himself was a wealthy man:- “Sir Wm. Ellys’ palace . . . . he lives like a prince’’; and he certainly used it to cultivate his own interest among the electorate. Sometimes he was found treating
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the voters to drink and on other occasions his agent was reported to be at work; clearly his canvassing went on between elections as well as in the last days before polling. Moreover, he showed some opposition to the Earl for, although Rutland objected to Sir William’s son, Richard, standing with his father, “thinking it unreasonable for 2 in a family to be Burgesses in the same place,” he determined to bring his son in “sparing neither charge nor trouble.” Rutland wanted to give the seat to Sir John Newton in both the January and November elections of 1701. In a constant stream of letters to Sir John, his agent, Robert Fysher, made it very plain that “my Lord (is) very hearty to your interest.” Especially in the latter election was Sir John urged to accept the offer of a candidacy, no fewer than five letters being delivered in the final two weeks before polling day. But, curiously, he declined to stand “having met,” as he put it, “with former disappointments.” The result was that the Ellys family was successful. However, it is probably wrong to push this clash too far for both Ellys and Rutland were staunchly Whiggish in Queen Anne’s reign. Rutland, therefore, would have acquiesced to Richard Ellys’ election and, in any case, both then and in 1702, the Earl was more involved in Leicestershire politics.

Incidentally, Professor Walcott seized upon Sir William’s marriage alliance with the Earl of Oxford and placed both Ellys himself and his son in the Junto “connexion” on the strength of this minor relationship and their mutual Whiggism. But it is much more realistic, in view of the family Nonconformist background, to look upon the Ellys’s as simple as good Whigs. Sir William had been involved in the Rye House Plot and had been a supporter of Sir Robert Carr in opposition to the third Earl of Lindsey, who regarded him as “the head of all the Presbyterians in the county”. All this occurred before his daughter was married to Oxford’s nephew. And this marriage cannot really be expected to have been the cause of Richard Ellys’ “zealous” support of the Nonconformist cause. The good, honest, solid Whiggery of the Ellys family was the basis of their voting consistently Whig, not an insignificant family tie.

It is in connection with the 1702 election that Rutland demonstrated his Whiggery in the clearest possible manner and at the outset of the new reign found himself on the wrong side of the sovereign. Piqued at the partial defeat of his interest, he refused to nominate a Tory as one of his Deputy Lieutenants in Leicestershire. This, and the fact that he absented himself from Queen Anne’s coronation, did not improve his chances of a dukedom which he had been promised by Lord Somers early in 1702. More important, his action alienated the Queen, for in a letter from Sir John Leveson-Gower, who, let it be noted, was a Tory as well as being Rutland’s son-in-law, Anne’s intentions were made apparent; “In whatever turn it (i.e. his refusal to attend the coronation) is expressed, whatever reason you give, the Queen will suspect the true one to proceed from your unwillingness to employ the gentlemen who are recommended by her to you. She is resolved not to follow the example of her predecessor in making use of a few of her subjects to oppress the rest. She will be Queen of all her subjects, and would have all the parties and distinctions of former reigns ended and buried in her. . . . Shall it be said my Lord Devonshire, my Lord Carlisle and others could forget the affronts and disappointments they had met with, in their several countries, and that my Lord Rutland alone would not?” The Earl did, however, obtain his dukedom, but it did not prevent him working for the Whigs in the 1705 election, the last in which he was actively engaged.

Richard Ellys resigned his seat to allow Rutland’s son, the Marquis of Granby, to stand. There may still have been some hard feeling but it is unlikely that there was a family contest. Rather it would seem that the Marquis had come back to his former constituency after an unsuccessful attempt to gain full control in Leicestershire and that the old partnership was now resumed.

As the Duke now began to live almost entirely away from political life, so the Marquis came to the forefront of politics and played an active part in support of the Junto. He proposed the Whig candidate for the Speakership in 1703 and was a Commissioner for the Union, in
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which the Whigs played so active a role. However, perhaps because of these activities, he was opposed in the 1710 elections and defeated on a petition as a result of the election, another indication of the decidedly weak hold which the Rutland interest had in the borough. This election also reveals a factor which is consistent with all Lincolnshire elections of this period - the strength of Toryism.

The Tory candidate was Sir John Thorold, a "tacker" who had lost Lindsey's interest in 1705 and who had had to make way for Lord Willoughby in the county in 1710. He had represented Grantham earlier in his career and had been able, because he lived quite near the town, to secure some interest there. So the natural step in 1710, with the bent of the nation in his favour, was to contest the borough again. But even in a very favourable situation it was perhaps still uncertain whether he could break the Ellys-Rutland partnership. Therefore, the "tackers" or, as Robert Harley's correspondent called them, "the rigidists," planned to ease their ally's problem by withdrawing one of their candidates in Leicestershire, one Pickering, so as to give Granby a seat there, hoping thereby that Granby would in turn withdraw from Grantham. Granby, in fact, was returned in both places, but it was the Tories who were to have the final say. They had come very close to success for the votes cast stood thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sir William Ellys</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquis of Granby</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir John Thorold</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was nothing here that would hinder a petition being successful in the present state of the House of Commons and Thorold was duly elected, using the common procedure of complaining of the ill-usage of the franchise, though it was a mere formality in 1710 and it would not really have mattered on what basis Thorold made his objection. Granby's extreme Whiggism, revealed in his failure to adopt a conciliatory attitude as the Tories had done in Leicestershire, meant defeat was certain.

The Tories continued to hold one seat at Grantham until well into the Hanoverian period and they also took advantage of Granby's preoccupation with family matters on the death of the Duke in January, 1711, to bring in Pickering in the election. The Rutland interest, then, had been badly shaken and defeated, though it was regained at the next election. It must be emphasised, nevertheless, that this was only due to the fact that Sir William Ellys' long period as M.P. for Grantham now came to an end. Sir John Brownlow, who now began to emerge as an important Whig figure, captured the seat and along with the Dukes of Rutland continued to hold it during the eighteenth century. He was connected to both the Rutland and the Lindsey families and these were the dominant ones in local affairs of the later eighteenth century, together with a fourth, the Heathcotes. Brownlow well recognised the growing importance of that family by what he did in 1715; firstly, he made way to allow John Heathcote, the son of Sir Gilbert Heathcote, one of the dominant figures in London life and trade in Queen Anne's reign, to take the Grantham seat and, secondly, he apologised profusely for the inconvenience and unpleasantness which John had had to endure during the election.

The Rutland interest in Grantham was now secure and even greater control came to be exercised in the calm after the Hanoverian Succession, a calm which contrasted so violently with the "crisis" atmosphere of the late Queen's reign. But it was by no means safe in the first decade of the new century. Sir William Ellys' position was far more certain, as evidenced by the result in 1710. Professor Walcott was not a little contradictory in his analysis of the borough for in one place he considers that the Duke of Rutland had a "strong interest approaching control," while in another the Ellys family "usually controlled both seats." Clearly neither is correct.
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The same criticism can be made with regard to Boston. Oddly enough, while Lindsey could be almost all-powerful in the county, he found it very difficult indeed to maintain control of even one of the seats at Boston and had lost any influence he previously had by 1711. By this time he had made himself extremely unpopular because of what the country gentlemen must have considered his enigmatic, chameleon-like action in political affairs.

In the decade after the Revolution, the third Earl of Lindsey had little difficulty in maintaining his son Peregrine, brother of the fourth Earl, at Boston, but a 'Country' member, Sir William Yorke, was always elected alongside him. Peregrine lost his seat, however, in 1698 and there seems to have developed a struggle between the new members, Richard Wynn and Edmund Boulter, and Yorke and his friend, Edward Irby. Yorke's interest seems to have been fairly stable until now, but Irby had not stood since his defeat in the face of the Lindsey interest in 1685. He did, though, come in again in 1702 when he took over from his partner, and so did Bertie, but opposition from Wynn was revived again in 1705.

We have already noticed the resentment and opposition of the country gentlemen to Lindsey in the county, especially after he joined with their Whiggish enemy Rutland. They registered their displeasure once more in this election. Burrell Massingberd, for example, sent his "heartiest wishes for Mr. Winn's good success", and Wynn was duly elected along with Irby. Bertie, of course, may not have stood, but it seems highly likely that he did, for he did not stand elsewhere and, moreover, he was given a seat by Hugh Boscawen, Godolphin's nephew, at Truro some months after the general election. Incidentally, this would seem to fit into our view of Lindsey's politics and argue against Professor Walcott. For Peregrine was quite definitely a Court member, being Vice-Chamberlain from 1694-1709. Walcott, on the strength of the fact that Peregrine was a nephew of Wharton, concluded that he was in the Junto "connexion". His brother Albemarle Bertie was most certainly in that group, he being elected on Wharton's interest at Cockermouth in 1708. But similar personal relationships do not necessarily correspond to political affiliations. Peregrine was not a Juntoite supporter; rather he was a Lindseyite Court adherent.

Lindsey was able to win back a seat for his brother in 1708 and held it in 1710; but so did the Tory Wynn. Of his Toryism there can be no doubt whatsoever. A Welsh judge, he had bought property in South Lincolnshire in the early 1690's at Folkingham and by the end of the century he had, as mentioned above, began to establish an interest there, precarious perhaps at first, but he held the seat from 1705 until his death in 1719. His Toryism had rallied the old established families to his cause in opposition to the great apostate Lindsey. This he demonstrated almost immediately on entering Parliament in the division on the choice of a speaker in October, 1705, which W. A. Speck has argued, by a detailed analysis of the division list, was a Whig-Tory issue. Wynn was one of the few placemen who deliberately revolted against the Court, who relied in this Parliament on a combination of the Court and the Whigs against the Tories. "Party loyalty proved stronger than court discipline" with the rebels.

Such a political orientation would win him votes in Lincolnshire. Lindsey, on the other hand, had made himself very unpopular and this unpopularity was seen on both a local and a national level in two by-elections in 1711 and 1712. The death of Peregrine towards the end of 1711 necessitated that the seat should be filled. Lindsey nominated another of his brothers, Philip. By this time, Lindsey had dropped his Court connections in favour of Whiggery, but this did not prevent another Whig putting in a challenge. William Cotesworth, about whom we shall hear more in connection with Grimsby, was a London merchant with associations in Hull, who had contested every election in Grimsby since the turn of the century, using wealth accrued from trade to try to establish an interest. This phenomenon was seen more and more after the Revolution, with the commercial revolution which had accompanied it and the growing importance of Parliament. He is a good example of what we call the "carpet-baggers." Defeated in 1710, he took the first opportunity offered to him. Boston seemed a
likely proposition, the electorate of about 200 being small enough to offer a reasonable hope of success. He did, in fact, win the seat, after two by-elections and two petitions, only to lose it in 1713 to a Tory candidate.

Bribery, of course, played a large part in these petitions, but that will be dealt with later. What was a more important feature of the first petition, at least, was the dispute as to the exact nature of the franchise. Boston’s record in the seventeenth century had been one of constant bickerings as to the extent of the franchise and there were “many contradictory resolutions of the House of Commons respecting the right of election.” In 1628 and 1639 the Parliamentarians, prominent among whom was Sir Edward Irby’s grandfather, Sir Anthony, had resolved that the right of election belonged to the “commonalty.” The Committee of Privileges in 1661, on the other hand, stated it to be “in such freemen only as paid scot and lot.” A similar resolution was passed in connection with this election.

Interestingly enough, Cotesworth stood on a “Parliamentary” footing, probably making a bid for popularity while Lindsey wanted to maintain the select franchise. Thus Philip Bertie was declared the new member by the Committee of Privileges and Elections. But this was not the end of the matter, for a new and highly significant development followed, which revealed the hostility the Lord Great Chamberlain had incurred from the House of Commons. He was accused of bribery and the Tories dragged in against him every scrap of evidence they could. He had violated the Act against corruption in 1696, which had always been a virtual “dead letter” and, what was really ludicrous, it was said that Lords Lieutenant should not concern themselves in elections. No further evidence, surely, is needed to recognise that the House disliked Lindsey’s tergiversations as much as the Lincolnshire country gentlemen themselves. He did petition again in the second by-election, but was again defeated, curiously objecting to less of the sitting member’s votes than was needed to bring about his defeat.

From this moment, Philip Bertie simply disappears from the scene and so does the Marquis, for Boston came under the control of the local Tory interest at the end of the reign.

Wynn stood together with Henry Heron, the son and heir of a local mayor and the last male representative of the family. We have little more evidence concerning Heron’s politics. No vote by him is recorded, but in the Worsley List he is described as a Tory and we can be fairly certain that if a member is there named as a Tory then, indeed, he was a Tory. Opposition came from Cotesworth, but it seems that, in spite of petitioning against the result, his canvassing was no more than half-hearted, hoping to preserve some interest there, but concentrating his energies in Grimsby, his main interest. He was successful with the usual corrupt methods and so dropped the petition against Wynn and Heron. He may have had the assistance of Lindsey, who by this time was very much a Whig. If so, Lindsey again met defeat. It would seem, though, that the Marquis had not bothered to fight at all, for the country gentlemen had by this time a very firm grip on the borough.

Whenever Lindsey stood as an anti-Tory he met with defeat, as in 1705 and 1712, and just how unpopular his political orientation had made him is reflected in the not unknown but certainly unusual rejection of his brother by the House of Commons after being declared elected and in the preference which the House showed in having a “carpet-baggers” elected rather than an Earl. Like Rutland’s, then, Lindsey’s control was very limited in this highly fluctuating and unstable period and it was only in the calmer years of the next reigns that their control was permanent, though even then Lindsey never had possession of more than one of the seats.

The two remaining boroughs were not very much influenced by noble families and they present a great contrast between each other, for though they both had the same “freeman” franchise, they will illustrate the meaninglessness of such classifications. Grimsby was one of the classic examples of a corrupt borough and Lincoln City was one of the most popular and independent and one which can perhaps be taken to illustrate best the political complexion of the county, precisely because of its comparative independence.
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The very small electorate at Grimsby, less than sixty in 1702 and increased to "about 80" by 1705, meant that corruption would be rife. Most of the boroughs of this size were dominated by patrons and the others were "rotten" boroughs ready to sell out to the highest bidder. The freemen of Grimsby, "a very poor town of no Trade," openly solicited for a burges in London. For them, of course, financial considerations played a major role, the adept use of a vote being a regular means of livelihood. The frankly corrupt nature of the borough is nowhere better demonstrated than in the general election which took place at the very end of the seventeenth-century. This was the only election which was directly affected by national affairs or in which "party" had any semblance of meaning, except perhaps 1710, until the end of the period. This was in spite of the fact that the two members who sat there for most of the reign, Arthur Moore (an unprincipled adventurer who became a close colleague of Henry St. John and had attracted some notoriety by the end of the period) and Cotesworth, held completely divergent political viewpoints, the one a Tory, the other a Whig merchant.

During the 1690's the Old East India Company's monopoly was threatened by interlopers in the East Indian trade, such as Sir Gilbert Heathcote, whose position had been strengthened after the Revolution due to the fact that the Old E.I.C. had been closely allied to the Crown under Charles II and James II. The Junto was opposed to the Old Company and they gave its enemies, a merchant financier syndicate, a charter as the New East India Company in 1698 in return for a £2 million Government loan. The struggle between the two companies became acute by the election of 1700-1701 when the New Company made a huge drive to return its directors and associates to Parliament, for previously the Old E.I.C. had had far more members than they. Moore, who had entered Parliament in 1695 as an unknown citizen of Grimsby, soon became involved in trade and was on the Old Board of Directors; Cotesworth was a New Company stockholder and a future director and had the backing of Lord William Powlett, brother of the Duke of Bolton, the "sixth Junto peer."

The New E.I.C., which can roughly be taken to stand for the Whigs, made significant gains in the election and Catesworth was elected. Unfortunately for him the Whigs did not have a majority and so the proceedings of the Election Committee, led by Sir Edward Seymour, had a definite Tory bias. Heathcote was turned out of London and Catesworth met the same fate. Moore was very nearly given the seat, but even the Tories could not cover up the corrupt practices in the borough. The result was that Moore, too, was found guilty of corruption. Cotesworth by this time had been committed to the Tower and no warrant was to be issued for a new writ for the borough.

The conflict between these two might have been expected to persist as they were contesting the same borough at the same time. However, both must have realised the expense which this opposition would have incurred. So we find, in the next election and afterwards, the peculiar phenomenon of two candidates irreconcilably opposed on national issues finding it easy to be in complete harmony on local affairs, that is, that they should work together. This was not unknown, of course, but unusual enough to be of some interest. They were first elected on a "joint interest" in November, 1701, when they defeated Thomas Vyner, the great nephew of Robert Vyner, Lord Mayor of London in 1675, and one of the members of the professional and business classes who were being recruited into the gentry. It seems obvious that they stood together hereafter for in all the elections we find that they polled almost the same number of votes and, moreover, though this is less convincing evidence perhaps, Cotesworth never contested an election result when he was defeated while Moore was elected and he certainly had a very wide experience of corruption and petitioning.

His tactics were the usual, orthodox ones. He came to one of the smaller boroughs completely unknown until a few days before the election and used bribery and drink to coerce the electorate. He paid off debts, held private parties and promised to lend money to the voters: all very ordinary and very useful. But he also gave his voters a special , though most
doubtful, privilege of tasting "a new Liquor," which was called "Whistle Jacket," a brew made up of a mixture of brandy and treacle. Another highly amusing remark was made in connection with a petition against him. It was commented that "when the sitting Member came down, they (i.e. the freemen) changed so of a sudden for him that" there was "reason to believe the sitting Member had infatuated them with Love-powder; though he (the witness) could not tell of what Mineral 'twas made."

In all, Cotesworth fought ten elections between 1700 and 1715, being successful in six of them. He petitioned twice and was petitioned against five times, a pretty fair record for fifteen years! But, more important, he was never able to secure a safe interest and seems, on the evidence of his failures and the resentment roused against him, among some of the freemen in the borough, for example, not to have been a very likeable character. Obviously, much more was needed than money: the electorates quickly realised that there was more to a good patron than that. So just as small squires were forced out because of the vast increase in electioneering expenses, so the mere merchants were rejected despite dissipating their wealth in their electoral efforts.

Perhaps, in part, Moore was to blame for this. Even though he partnered Cotesworth, the latter had to bear by far the greatest burden of the attacks against them. He was constantly involved in elections, except for the peaceful one of 1708, wasting his fortune. Moore was perfectly content to let him do this while he made quick profits on illicit trading and schemes conjured up by himself and St. John. Nevertheless, in spite of all Cotesworth's efforts, or perhaps because of them and the hostility they aroused, and although Lord Powlett worked for Cotesworth, Moore always managed to head his ally in the polls. Was it because of the fact that he came originally from Grimsby after leaving his native Ireland? Or was it his cunning and unscrupulous character, which made him realise that too much open treating might make his ally unpopular and so help him indirectly, especially if he kept out of the limelight as often as he could, as in 1705, for example? Certainly he was not in the least perturbed when in 1710 his partner was defeated by a Tory candidate for he wrote to Harley that "Mr. Vyner and I are elected by a great majority; I am well assured he will zealously join with me in such measures as shall be most for the public service." From this stage of his career, Moore came more and more to the forefront of national affairs and they are not concerned with borough politics. We have seen already that he completely divorced his local from his national activities. Together with Henry St. John and James Brydges, Paymaster General of the Forces Abroad, Moore had been involved in shady financial dealings at least since 1704. He did reveal his undoubted qualities in the debate on the French Commercial Treaty in 1713 when he was responsible for drafting the most important of its clauses. These proposed to give France the "most favoured nation" treatment and were intended to end the economic war which had begun in Colbert's time. But he had to face violent attacks, mainly from irate City Whigs and was the butt of the satirists and pamphleteers. Nevertheless, he was returned again for Grimsby in 1713 only for the most scandalous and disreputable revelations to be made against him in the very last Parliament of Queen Anne's reign. It was discovered that Moore had been trying to load sixty tons of goods on his own private account on one of the South Sea Company's precious direct ships. He attempted to bribe the captain of the ship, a Captain Johnson, adding that he could see no reason why Johnson "should make a dry voyage of it." The Company was satisfied of his guilt and so expelled him from his directorship on 7 July, 1714.

Not surprisingly, he met with defeat in the 1715 election, to the delight of Lady Mary Saunderson, writing to Mrs. Whichcote: "I think you (i.e. the Whigs) have done great things in Lincolnshire to turn Mr. Moore out of Grimsby." He had to contend with the formidable opposition of Robert Chaplin and Joseph Banks, two typical members of the Whig Party who were following the traditional ambition of the more wealthy members of merchant and lawyer classes of acquiring an estate and a great house to establish an "interest" in the county. But
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Moore was not pushed into complete obscurity for he defeated Robert Chaplin in the election for the High Stewardship of Grimsby in 1715 by 34 votes to 21, in spite of the fact that Chaplin's brother John had held the post until his death, which had occasioned the contest. He held office until his own death and entered Parliament again in 1720, so that one of the most formidable and interesting characters to sit as a member for Lincolnshire in Queen Anne's reign was still not finished as a political force.

Unlike Moore, the members for Lincoln City were not at all concerned with what went on at the centre, except for Thomas Lister. Indeed, the chief characteristic of the borough's politics is its almost completely isolated and local nature. Only at the very end of the reign did national affairs materially affect the electorate.

Sir Edward Hussey had represented the City as a "Country Whig" throughout the 1690's. In the last Parliament in which he sat, Queen Anne's first, there is no evidence as to his political associations and when he declined to stand in 1705, according to Harley, one can probably assume that the reason was the advent of old age. From then onwards local Tories were elected at every poll until 1715, except in 1710, when one Whig, Richard Grantham, was elected. This looks, to say the least, a little odd when the Tories were being swept to power by a tremendous wave of "popular" feeling. But it can be explained by the fact that the Tories were at this time divided.

Four candidates stood for the election and this in itself is good evidence of something not having gone quite right, for the independent Toryism of most of the Lincolnshire country gentleman is indisputable. Three of the candidates can be identified as Tories: Thomas Lister, Sir Thomas Meres and John Sibthorp. The evidence for the latter is slight but the valuable Worsley List cites him as being a Tory. The fourth, Grantham, was an undoubted Whig, voting for "No Peace without Spain" in the one Parliament in which he sat during the reign. He, in fact, came out top of the poll:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard Grantham</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Lister</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Sibthorp</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Thomas Meres</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures seem to reveal that Lister and Sibthorp stood together and that they were opposed to Meres, who, by standing, let in the opposition, polling just enough votes to rob the Tories of complete success. Thus Grantham took advantage of what must have seemed an unexpected opportunity. Unfortunately the reason for the split is not nearly so obvious as the split itself.

What was behind the dissension in the Tory ranks? It could not have been that either Lister or Meres, the sitting members, were dissatisfied with the other for both had good Tory records. Meres had been a "sneaker", that is, had refused to support the "tack" in 1704, but he supported Sacheverell in 1710. A possible reason could be that Lister wanted "new blood" in the Tory ranks and felt that Sir Thomas, a grand old man of 75 now, ought to make way for John Sibthorp, a much younger man. And Lister did bring Sibthorp in on what was by now a good interest.

Another possible factor in Meres' defeat is that he seems to have been an unpopular man, in part, no doubt, due to his earlier political activities. The characteristic of his earlier career was his "personal and political communotions." He was so changeable that he was untrustworthy. Thus in 1674-1675 he worked for Danby's removal and supported Exclusion, yet in 1679 he stood as the Court candidate for the Speakership. Later he was considered a friend of the Earl of Lindsey and probably because of this he polled only nine votes in the 1689 election. Thereafter he remained out of Parliament, after serving from 1660, until 1701. Sir Keith Feiling concludes rather curiously that "always mentioned as a coming man, but
never quite arriving, never a Whig but never quite a Tory, Meres survived until 1710 to represent a pre-party age and the middle school of the Restoration.” An excellent concise summing up of the man and it would serve us well if it were true; but is it true? Sacheverell was as clear a party issue as any other in the reign and Meres’ voting record would seem to preclude the possibility that Feiling was right.

The most probable solution would seem to be his age and his unpopularity and so we cannot agree with A. R. Maddison’s comment that “the sudden decline in his popularity seems strange.” He was now a sick man and although he survived to see the Hanoverian age dawn, there are frequent references in local correspondence to his illness before he finally died on 9 July, 1715. Whatever the reason for this division in 1710, the Tories were successful in winning back the seat in 1713:

| Thomas Lister    | ... | 392 |
| John Sibthorp    | ... | 304 |
| Richard Grantham | ... | 232 |

It was only with the issue of the Succession coming to the forefront of affairs that national trends began to be reflected in the City. For the first time in the eighteenth century, and probably for a long time before that, two Whigs were returned, Sir John Tyrwhitt, Sir Thomas Meres’ nephew, and Richard Grantham again, to the delight of the correspondent of George Whichcote’s wife: “I think you have done great things in Lincs. to turn . . . Mr. Lister out of Lincoln.”

In many ways, the City sums up Lincolnshire politics as a whole: the innate Toryism of the majority of the people of influence is demonstrated time and time again. Excluding Stamford and Grimsby, which can only really be discussed apart from political battles, there is a consistent and forceful strain of Toryism. It is seen in the opposition of the country gentlemen to Lindsey, especially when his Court orientation was anti-Tory, as in 1705, and when he moved to the Whigs, as in 1711-1712, and in their hostility towards Rutland in 1710. Where “influence” and “interest” were not so important, and so a much fairer indication is given of how the electorate viewed the politics of the time, the independent country gentlemen were returned again and again. The City does belie, however, the survival of Toryism, which survived in pockets throughout the country, though utterly defeated as a political force.

There were several ways in which merchants could enter Parliament and secure seats in the boroughs. Land purchase might be one of the methods, as in the case of the Heathcotes, but only the richest could aspire to it and establish themselves as landed proprietors. Some merchants might rely on an interest in some parliamentary borough with which they had formerly had associations. Arthur Moore seems to have had such an interest in Grimsby. The greater part of the merchant community sought boroughs with small electorates which might be amenable to the offer of money. This method could, however, lead to expensive election contests and fortunes gained speedily in trade could just as easily and quickly be lost in elections. William Cotesworth found this out to his cost. There is little wonder that this “carpet-bagger” soon dissipated his wealth and in fact he had to sell property to John Heathcote shortly after the accession of George I. For mere merchants like Cotesworth the rapid expansion of trade did not in the end prove very profitable.
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The Vyners were an important London family. They represented Grimsby but were not very successful in Queen Anne’s reign. The Chaplins, descendants of Sir Francis Chaplin, Lord Mayor of London in 1678, established themselves at Tathwell, near Louth. They again were not very successful in our period, John Chaplin sitting from 1702-1705. But Robert, John’s younger brother, made money especially after 1715, out of his directorship of the South Sea Company and spent £20,000 in a few months during 1719 in acquiring lands. By the time of his death in 1728 he owned extensive property in Lincolnshire and also in Somerset, Hereford and Durham.  

The correspondence of the Banks family also testifies to their importance in succeeding reigns. Joseph Banks’ rise to prominence is another admirable illustration of the sort of people the Whig leaders allied with. He began life as an attorney in Sheffield, founded a fortune by mortgage speculations and determined on settling in Lincolnshire. He established his son at Revesby in 1702. Early in his professional life he had become concerned in politics, having influential ducal clients such as Newcastle and Leeds. Newcastle had considered Banks as a possible parliamentary candidate as early as 1707; but the latter waited for a few years. He concerned himself with looking after Whig interests in Nottingham and Lincoln in the 1710 elections and did not become a member himself until 1715, when he narrowly defeated Moore at Grimsby. After 1715, his friendship with the Duke of Ancaster must have meant much to him and his importance in Walpole’s eyes may be measured by his actions in 1727 when the Whig leader found Banks a Treasury seat at Totnes.  

But the best example of a “nouveau riche” family founding a new county family is that of the Heathcotes. Rising from being the son of a Chesterfield joiner and alderman, Sir Gilbert Heathcote became a founder of the Bank of England and a director of the E.I.C. and was reputed to be the richest commoner in England, worth £200,000. By a systematic policy of land purchase, the family began to enter the ranks of the Lincolnshire and Rutland gentry. Establishing the family at Normanton, he bought from William Coatesworth and from Richard Wynn of Folkingham. He sent his son, John, to nurse the Grantham constituency from the first Parliament of George I. Some indication of the importance with which this move was regarded by local families can be gauged from a letter already cited from Sir John Brownlow to John Heathcote congratulating him on his success in the 1715 election. That the family was of national importance can be illustrated by a similar letter from Sir Robert Walpole to Sir Gilbert: “The Duke of Rutland . . . believes that Mr. Heathcote, if you go down, will certainly carry it and shall have all the assistance that His Grace can give him. There is no time to be lost, pluck up your old spirit, Honest Gill.”  

The importance and significance of these new members of local society can, however, be overemphasised. They did have powerful roles to play later on, but, at the end of Queen Anne’s reign, the influence of the independent country gentlemen remained and, indeed, continued on in the new age. Toryism in the country as a whole was “a sentimental pose, nostalgia,” quite dead as a political force. But the old resentments lingered on among those whom Sir Keith Feiling has well described as “the immemorial leaders of the shires.” The attitude which they adopted towards the new situation after their short period of success, one of disquiet and despair, is captured in a letter from Burrell Massingham to Charles Bertie. Commenting that he had been away from London for a long time, he gave as his reason that “my private County affairs employ my time and thoughts so much and the public affairs go so contrary to my wishes” that he had not the least inclination to go to the City, except to meet whom he calls the “honest gentlemen” living there.  

Until 1714, the dominance of the Tory squires was acknowledged by friend and foe alike. Thus the few Whig families around Lincolnshire did not bother, as far as we know, to put up a candidate for the City even in 1705 and, though one was successful in 1710, it was due to freak circumstances. It was admitted too in Whiggish correspondence: Lady Mary Saunderson hoped that “many places will not be of our mind’s in Lincolnshire.”
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Only at the beginning of the Hanoverian era, when the Tory Party lay in ruins, were the Whig ranks reinforced by the advent of the "nouveaux riches" families to the county. And although the Whigs enjoyed an uninterrupted period of rule for half a century, that oligarchy was always conditional on their care not to injure the interests and rouse the prejudices of the squires and the clergy. Only gradually did they take over control with the deliberate building up of huge estates. The squires were driven out of the parliamentary boroughs and the county seats throughout the country and were replaced by magnates such as the Yarboroughs in North Lincolnshire. But before the decade of 1714 the Tory country gentlemen were by far the most important collective factor in the local political life in Lincolnshire and they remained so in isolated pockets while the Whigs monopolised power at the centre.

APPENDIX I

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

Ten division lists survive for the period 1702-1714. Of these, one is a list of the Court side in one of the divisions over the place clause in the Regency Bill in 1706, in which the issue was between Court and Country rather than Whig and Tory. In contrast to William III's reign, Court and Country, though present in Queen Anne's reign, was always subordinate to Whig and Tory. This has been published by R. Walcott in "Division Lists of the House of Commons 1689-1715" in B.H.R. (1936), pp. 30-3. Another does not directly involve Lincolnshire members - "The Division of 25 May 1711 on an amendment to the South Sea Bill" by J. G. Sperling in the Historical Journal (1961), p. 193.

The rest have been divided into what are accepted as being Whig and Tory lists. Except for two of them, they are to be found in "A Collection of White and Black Lists, or A View of those Gentlemen who have given their votes in Parliament - for and against the Protestant Religion, and Succession, and The Trade and Liberties of Their Country; ever since the Glorious Revolution to the happy accession of King George." The final two lists appear in "The Commons division on 'No Peace without Spain', 7 December 1711," by G. S. Holmes in B.H.R. (1960), pp. 233-4 and in 'The Choice of a Speaker in 1705,' by W. A. Speck in B.H.R. (1964), pp. 38-46. None of these lists are wholly reliable because they were not exactly contemporary compilations and because they were sometimes used as political weapons; the White and Black Lists, for example, were thoroughly Whiggish.

This appendix is a summary of Lincolnshire members, together with their voting records. The data has been collected from the whole range of the bibliography and from Professor Walcott's card index of over 1,200 MPs left, on microfilm, in the care of the Institute of Historical Research, Senate House, London, W.C.1.

TORY LISTS = T

1. Against agreeing with the Lords' Amendments to a Bill "For the Farther Security of the Hanover Succession" or Against the Lords' Amendments to the bill for enlarging the time for taking the oath of abjuration. (13 February, 1703).
2. For taking the Bill for Preventing Occasional Conformity to a money bill, in order to secure its passing in the House of Lords. (28 November, 1704)
3. For William Bromley as Speaker (25 October, 1705)
4. For Dr. Sacheverell (1710)
5. For the French Commerce Bill (18 June, 1713)
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WHIG LISTS = W
1. Opposed to TORY 1
2. For John Smith as Speaker (opposed to TORY 3)
3. For the Act of Naturalising Foreign Protestants (1709)
4. Opposed to TORY 4
5. For “No Peace Without Spain” (7 December, 1711)
6. Opposed to TORY 5
7. Against the expulsion of Mr. Stecle (19 March, 1714)
   (Thus, for example, Sir John Thorold voted T 1 and 3 and W 6 and 7.)

Banks, Joseph (1665-1727): of Scofton, Notts., M.P. for Grimsby 1715-1722; Attorney; bought property at Revesby in 1702; associations with the Duke of Newcastle and later with Sir Robert Walpole and Lindsey.

Bertie, Albermarle (d.s.p. 1742): of Grim Thorpe, youngest brother of the fourth Earl of Lindsey and nephew of Lord Wharton; M.P. for County 1705-1708, for Cockermouth 1708-1710 (Wharton’s interest) and for Boston 1735; Auditor of the Duchy of Cornwall; W 2 and 4; Court 1706.

Bertie, Charles (d. April, 1711): of Uffington, near Stamford, brother of the third Earl of Lindsey; M.P. for Stamford 1678-1679, 1685-1688 and 1689-1711; Danby’s Secretary; Envoy to the Baltic countries 1681-1705; Treasurer and Paymaster of the Ordnance until 1705; T 1, 2, 3 and 4.

Bertie, Charles: only son of next above; M.P. for Woodstock 1705-1708 and for Stamford 1711-1722; W 6.

Bertie, Peregrine (d. 1711): younger brother of the fourth Earl; M.P. for Boston 1695-1698, 1701-1705, 1708-1711 and for Truro 1705-1708 (Government interest); Vice-Chamberlain 1694-1709; P.C. 1700-1702; a Teller of the Exchequer 1704-1711; W. 4; Court 1706.

Bertie, Peregrine (1686-1742): Lord Willoughby of Eresby, son of the fourth Earl; M.P. for County 1708-1715; October Club member; married third daughter of Sir John Brownlow; summoned to the House of Lords in March 1715; second Duke of Ancaster 1723; T 4 and W 7.

Bolles, Sir John: of Scampton, Lincs.; Christ Church, Oxford 1683; Gray’s Inn 1688; prominent among Tories and a constant butt of the Whig pamphleteers. A remarkable incident took place at Lincoln Assizes in 1695. A prisoner asked for delay, but Bolles refused. When overruled by the judge, Bolles replied that he was an M.P. of years’ standing and understood the laws as well as the judge and that he was a better man than Lord Chief Justice Holt, who was sitting on the other side of the hall! Bolles was eventually fined £150. The disorder was so great that the Court had to adjourn. M.P. for City 1690-1702.

Boulter, Edmund: M.P. for Boston 1698-1701.

Brownlow, Sir John, Bt., (c.1690-1754): of Belton, near Grantham; first cousin of Lindsey and he had close ties with the dukes of Rutland; Viscount Tyrconnell 1718; M.P. for Grantham 1713-1715 and 1722-1741 and for the County 1715-1722; W 7.

Cecil, Charles: third son of the fifth Earl of Exeter and third cousin of Lord Nottingham; M.P. for Stamford, on the death of his brother, 1705-1722; T 3 and 4.

Cecil, William (d.s.p. 1705): of Snape, Yorks., second son of the fifth Earl of Exeter; M.P. for Stamford 1698-1705; T 1 and 2.
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Chaplin, John (1657-1714): of Tathwell, near Louth; elder brother of next below; merchant; son of Sir Francis Chaplin, Lord Mayor of London 1677-1678; M.P. for Grimsby 1690-1695 and 1702-1705; High Sheriff of Lincolnshire 1690; no recorded votes.

Chaplin, Robert (d.1728): of Tathwell; barrister and financier; South Sea Company director 1718-1721; created a Baronet in 1715.

Cotesworth, William: London merchant, with wide experience of corruption; director of the New East India Company, recommended by Lord William Powlett, Lord of the Manor of Grimsby; M.P. for Grimsby 1701-1702, 1705-1710 and 1713-1715 and for Boston 1712-1713; W 2, 3, 4, 6 and 7; Court 1706.

Dymoke, Lewis (d.1760): of Scrivelsby, S. Lincs., Hereditary Champion of England and Lord of the Feudal Barony of Scrivelsby; M.P. for County of Lincoln 1702-1705 and 1710-1713; T 1 and 2 and W 6.

Ellys, Richard (1688?-1742): of Nocton; son of next below and his sister married the Earl of Oxford's nephew; theological writer; became a Greek and Hebrew scholar in Holland; M.P. for Grantham 1701-1705; W 1.

Ellys, Sir William, Bt.: of Nocton; married daughter of John Hampden and was involved in the Rye House Plot of 1683, aimed at seizing King Charles II; M.P. for Grantham in thirteen Parliaments 1678-1713; W 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6.


Heathcote, John: of Normanton, Rutland; son of Sir Gilbert Heathcote, an important London merchant; became M.P. for Grantham in 1715.

Heron, Henry: of Cressey Hall, Boston; M.P. for Boston 1713-1722; no recorded votes; Tory in Worsley List.

Hickman, Sir Willoughby, Bt., of Gainsborough; M.P. for East Retford 1698-1706 and for the County 1713 until his death in 1720; Teller for the Tories in 1703; T 1, 2 and 3.

Hussey, Sir Edward, Bt., of Bourne; M.P. for City 1689-1700 and 1701-1705; Country Whig.

Irby, Sir Edward, Bt., of Moulton, Holland, and Boston; created a Baronet in 1704; M.P. for Boston 1702-1708; W 2.

Lister, Thomas (c.1657-1718): of Coleby Hall, Lincoln; Sheriff of Lincolnshire 1695; granted small pension by William III; Equerry to the Duke of Somerset as Master of the Horse 1707-1712; M.P. for City 1705-1715; T 3, 4 and 5.

Manners, John (1675-1721): Marquis of Granby and eldest son of the ninth Earl of Rutland; newpew of the Earl of Oxford; styled "Lord Roos" until his father received a dukedom in 1703; Lord Lieutenant of Rutland 1712-1715; Commissioner for the Union with Scotland in 1707; prominent Juniciote; M.P. for Derby in 1701, for Leicestershire 1701-1702, Grantham 1705-1710 and Leicestershire 1710-1711, when he became the second Duke; W 2; Court. 1706

Meres, Sir Thomas, Bt. (1635-1715): of Lincoln and Bloomsbury; County Magistrate; "Country" opposition 1674-1678, but Court candidate for the Speakership in 1679; Excise Commissioner 1679-1684; proposed a bill in 1683 to compel all foreigners to adopt English liturgy. T 1, 3 and 4.

Monson, William (b.c. 1655 d.s.p. 1727): of S. Carlton, near Lincoln; M.P. for City 1695-1698, for Heytesbury 1702-1708, for Hertford 1708-1710 and for Aldborough 1715-1722.

Moore, Arthur (1666-1730): of Grimsby and Fetcham, Surrey; Irish adventurer; married daughter of a wealthy London doctor; financial crony of Henry St. John and James Brydges, Paymaster General of the Forces Abroad; Manager of East Indian Trade 1702; director of South Sea Company; Comptroller of Army Accounts 1704; one of the Lords Commissioners of Trade and Plantations 1710-1714; High Steward of Grimsby 1714-1730; M.P. for Grimsby 1695-1700 and November, 1701-1715; T 1 and 4, W 2 and Court. 1706.
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Rolt, Edward: of Sacombe Park, Herts., Tory merchant; M.P. for St. Mawes 1713-1715 and for Grantham 1715-1722; described in Worsley List as "un Tory qui pourroit souvent voter avec les Whigs."

Sibthorp, John (1669-1718): of Lincoln and Laneham, Notts., first in a long line of representatives of that family; M.P. for City 1713-1715; Tory in Worsley List.

Thorold, Sir John, Bt. (b.c. 1663 d.s.p. 1717): of Cranwell, Marston and Syston Park, near Grantham; M.P. for Grantham 1685-1687 and 1697-1698; for County 1701-1705 and for Grantham 1710-1715; T 1 and 3 and W 6 and 7.

Tyrwhitt, Sir John: of Stainfield, near Lincoln; nephew of Sir Thomas Meres; became M.P. for City in 1715; Whig.

Vyner, Robert: of Gantby; great nephew of Sir Robert Vyner, Lord Mayor of London 1675; M.P. for Grimsby 1710-1713; no recorded votes; Tory; unsuccessfully opposed Arthur Moore at Grimsby in 1721 as a Whig; M.P. for County 1724-1761.

Whichcote, George: of Harpswell, near Gainsborough; married Katherine, daughter of Sir Thomas Meres; M.P. for County 1705-1710; W 2, 3 and 4; Court 1706.

Wynn, Richard: of Beddwell Park, Herts., and of Folkingham, S. Lincs., from 1692; Inner Temple 1682; Placeman until 1706; M.P. for Boston 1698-1700 and 1705-1719; T 3 and 4.

Yorke, Sir William: of Burton; M.P. for Boston 1679-1681, 1689-1698 and 1701-1702; Country Whig.

APPENDIX II

ELECTION RESULTS

Lincoln County

30 May, 1705
George Whichcote 2,492
Albemarle Bertie 2,373
Lewis Dymoke 1,990
Sir John Thorold 1,742

11 October, 1710
Lewis Dymoke 3,147
Lord Willoughby 2,977
George Whichcote 1,333

Lincoln City

18 October, 1710
Richard Grantham 289
Thomas Lister 268
John Sibthorp 264
Sir Thomas Meres 72

16 September, 1713
Thomas Lister 392
John Sibthorp 304
Richard Grantham 232

Grantham

6 October, 1710
Sir William Ellys 205
*Marquis of Granby 176
†Sir John Thorold 175
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**Boston**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 December, 1711</td>
<td>William Cotesworth</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Philip Bertie</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 April, 1712</td>
<td>William Cotesworth</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Philip Bertie</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 August, 1713</td>
<td>Richard Wynn</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henry Heron</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†William Cotesworth</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grimsby**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 July, 1702</td>
<td>John Chaplin</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arthur Moore</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Cotesworth</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 May, 1705</td>
<td>Arthur Moore</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*William Cotesworth</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†John Chaplin</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 October, 1710</td>
<td>Robert Vyner</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arthur Moore</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Cotesworth</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 September, 1713</td>
<td>*Arthur Moore</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*William Cotesworth</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Sir James Clark</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matthew Boucherett</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 January, 1715</td>
<td>*Robert Chaplin</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Joseph Banks</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arthur Moore</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†William Cotesworth</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stamford**

"Pocket" borough of the Earls of Exeter.

* These members had petitions brought against them.
† The petitioners.
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Notes
2 The fine for admission was raised from £5 in 1689, to £20 in 1700 and to £50 by 1719; P. Thompson, Boston (1856) p. 451; J. H. Plumb, Sir Robert Walpole, vol. I, p. 51.
6 John Cecil, fifth Earl of Exeter, Lord of the Manor and Castle of Stamford and High Steward of the borough; b.1648 and d. 29 August, 1700; Defoe II, p. 108; Oldfield II, p. 215.
7 John Cecil, the sixth Earl; M.P. for Rutland 1695-1700; Recorder of Stamford 1697; succeeded his father on 29 March, 1701; Lord Lieutenant of Rutland 1712; married daughter of Sir John Brownlow in September, 1699; 1674-1721; E. G. Forrester, Northamptonshire Elections and Electioneering 1695-1832 (1841), pp. 22 and 26.
9 British Museum Add. Ms. 29588 f.106, 23 July, 1702, Charles Bertie to the Earl of Nottingham. The election had been held on 21 July.
11 Defoe II, p. 103; Oldfield gives an electorate figure of 400, indicative perhaps of the control Rutland had gained over the borough by the end of the eighteenth century; the figure was higher in Queen Anne's reign, as Appendix II shows.
12 H.M.C. Rutland, II, p. 165, 17 April, 1700, Sir William Ellys to the Earl of Rutland.
13 H.M.C. Portland, III, p. 536; Lincolnshire Archives Office, Monson 7/12/3, April, 1700; Robert Fysher to Sir John Newton: “Sir William Ellys’ man Dryborough was here and made many votes.”
14 Th. 7/12/107, 18 November, 1701, same to same: “William Ellys’ friends made votes by drinking.”
15 Th. 7/12/115, 18 May, 1700; Humphrey Newton to Sir John Newton: “Sir William Ellys puts very strong pressure on .. .” sparing neither charge nor trouble.
16 L.A.O. Mon. 7/13/113; the five letters are to be found in 7/12/106, 7, 8, 9 and 10 and are dated 15, 18, 20, 24 and 26 November, 1701; the election was held on 29 November; see also Th. 7/14/94, 22 November, 1701, Sir John Newton to the Earl of Rutland.
18 H.M.C. Rutland, II, p. viii and pp. 171-3, 26 December, 1702, Sir John Leveson-Gower to the Earl of Rutland, who was created first Duke in March, 1703. Peregrine Bertie, Vice-Chamberlain of the Queen's Household, urged Rutland not to neglect the opportunity of obtaining a dukedom by absenting himself from Queen Anne's coronation; H.M.C., Rutland, II, p. 170.
19 H.M.C. Rutland, II, p. 183, 24 October, 1703, the Marchioness of Granby to her father-in-law, the Duke of Rutland.
20 H.M.C. Portland, IV, p. 572, 21 August, 1710, Robert Monckton to Harley. Monckton, a Commissioner of Trade and Plantations, was an old friend of Harley; see also Feiling, p. 472.
23 L.A.O. Ancaster 9/1/1, 19 February, 1715, Sir John Brownlow to John Heathcote: “I am very glad to hear by Sir Gilbert your Father, that you are safely arrived in London. You now enjoy a satisfaction which, I believe, you never knew the value of before so much as you do now, that of Peace and Quietness. The most noisy and busy part of the City is a solitude if compared to the Turmoil and confusion you have lately been troubled with at Grantham. I return you many thanks for your kindness in coming. I am sorry you met with so much difficulty, but the glory of conquering such a perverse generation will, I hope, make some amends. Among the many Lies, and idle stories raised about you, there is a very pleasant invention of Mr. King’s, who gave out that he had indeed heard of Sir Gilbert Heathcote, but as for you he wondered who you was, and being answered that you was his son, that cannot be, he says, for I am very confident that Sir Gilbert never had any. I trouble you with this stuff to make you laugh at the poor shifts they were forced to use to carry on their Interest. I hope Mr. Raper is well after all his fatigue here, and that both you and he will excuse all the Rudeness you met with and the great trouble you was put to. I desire he would accept my humble service. These things may be occasion of Mirth now since they have turned chiefly to the confusion of the chief promoters of all the disturbance. I am sorry your stay here was so unpleasant, and that it was not in my power to make it otherwise. I hope, by God you will see done in Parliament, or some other way, amends will be made you for what you have gone through here.” The vast bulk of the Heathcote Papers are, of course, post-1715 and they amply demonstrate the leading role the family played in Lincolnshire during the Whig Oligarchy.
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27. L.A.O. Massingberd 20/53, 7 April, 1705, Burrell to Sir William Massingberd; Official Returns of the House of Commons (1878); Boscowen was elected for Truro and the county of Cornwall, so he gave the former seat to Peregrine, in November, 1705.
29. Lincolnshire Archivists Reports 13, p. 23.
31. Journals of the House of Commons, XVII, 8 December, 1711. Philip was the third of five brothers, sons of the third Earl - the fourth Earl, Peregrine, Philip, Noreys and Albermarle. Noreys appears to have remained apart from political life. Philip was made Auditor of the Duchy of Cornwall on 26 September, 1692; d.s.p. on 15 April, 1728.
32. C.J., XVII, pp. 25-6, 14 January, 1712 and XVIII, p. 193, 17 April, 1712.
34. C.J., XVIII, pp. 145, 193 and 251, 3 June, 1712.
36. C.J., XVII, p. 480, 3 March, 1713 and p. 528, 1 April, 1713.
37. Willis MS 51 f.95; C.J., XIII, p. 329, 13 February, 1701.
38. L.A.O. Mon 7/14/80, 12 November, 1695, John Newton to his father; Walcott's article in E.H.R. (1956), p. 228; Willis MS 51 f.95; C.J., XIII, pp. 382-3, 7 March, 1701; Lord William Pownlester was Lord of the Manor of Grimsby and was one of the most prominent Lieutenants in the Commons. He later recommended Cotesworth for a directorship of the New E.L.C. His brother, the Duke of Bolton, was a Hampshire landowner, a Commissioner for the Union and was made Governor of the Isle of Wight in 1708.
40. C.J., XIII, p. 652, 5 January, 1702; Lincoln Record Society, XLV, p.v.; see Appendix II. Close voting is inevitable, of course, in a small constituency, but the pattern of these figures, except perhaps in 1701, reveals an undoubted unity of interest.
41. C.J., XIII, p. 329, 13 February, 1701 and XVII, pp. 144-5, 20 March, 1712. Cotesworth's "name was never heard of there until he was actually on the road thither."
42. C.J., XV, p. 17, 12 November, 1705. Cotesworth was petitioned against every time he was elected, evidence of his unpopularity - twice in 1701, 1705, twice in 1712 and in 1713.
43. H.M.C. Portland, IV, p. 606, 6 October, 1710; his comment was a little exaggerated - see Appendix II; Robert Vyner is a curious character - he stood with Moore as a Tory in 1710, but later stood against the A. Weston, Lincolnshire Notes and Queries, XXII, p. 4.
44. Lack of space precludes a more detailed treatment of Moore's activities.
45. Felling, p. 289.
46. The political bent of the majority of the Lincoln electorate may have been the reason for William Monson, who lived near the City, going elsewhere to find a seat. Incidentally, he is a classic example of the difficulties Professor Walcott encountered in his rigid application of the Namierite view to the politics of Queen Anne's reign. In searching for a personal relationship with a prominent politician which would fit with his voting record, Walcott wrote down this:—
47. Court Halifax? Pelham Montagu? Junto Cowper?
48. Meres was "at all times at the head of all opposition to your Majesty's service." Quoted by J. W. F. Hill, pp. 184 and 192; Felling, p. 147.
49. Lines, N. and Q., XI, p. 80; L.A.O. Asw 10/19/3, 11 and 25, undated except for the last, 9 July, 1715. These are "Mrs. Draper's Letters," she being the mistress of the school in Westminster at which George Whiccot's daughters were pupils. John Sibthorpe himself was an ill man and he died within a year of his election, in 1715; see A. R. Maddison, The Sibthorpe Family, "The Sibthorpe Family," (1896) p. 23.
50. L.A.O. Asw 10/22/10, 23 February, 1715, Lady Mary Saunderson to Mrs. Whichcote.
52. Lincolnshire Archivists Reports 15, p. 23.
54. L.R.S. XLV, pp. xiii-xvii and 9, letter 12, 28 September, 1710, Joseph Banks to Rev. William Steer: Banks was "very busy (with) the ensuing elections . . . . I must be both at Nottingham and Lincoln on those occasions (where we shall have hard strugling)."
56. Walcott, E.H.R. (1956), p. 228; see article on Sir Gilbert in D.N.B.; see note 21; the letter quoted is from L.A.O. Anc 9/1/2, 22 March, 1721.
58. L.A.O. Asw. 10/22/5, 28 January, no year is given, to Mrs. Whichcote.