

the power of rewarding their troops is limited extremely. A Septennial Bill has been since brought into the House,¹³ a thing destructive to that country, and no way honourable to the Crown, but yet popular. His Excellency it seems concluded the Justices would throw it out for their own sakes as this Parliament is of their modelling, so he allowed his new Minister¹⁴ and Mr Perry¹⁵ to take the popular side whilst Mr Hamilton declared to everybody his indifference about it.¹⁶ The Lords Justices, seeing through this artifice, resolved not to support¹⁷ it against the inclinations of Government, and directed all their friends to divide with those employed by Government, by which means the Bill had an easy passage.¹⁸ There is however one clause still depending,¹⁹ and his Lordship has taken the alarm; new measures are now to be taken²⁰ to do with a bad grace what might

13. On 28 Oct., by Dr Charles Lucas, when the heads of the bill were read and committed (*Journals of the House of Commons . . . Ireland*, xii. 169). Under the existing law the Irish Parliament was elected only at the beginning of each reign.

14. John Hely Hutchinson. His support was only lukewarm, however, for he was teller for the ayes on a motion of 3 Dec. to attach a qualification clause to the bill that would destroy its appeal, and teller for the nays in a division on 9 Dec. that prevented the bill from being laid before the Lord Lieutenant by the Speaker accompanied by the whole House (*ibid.* xii. 548, 565-6; J. A. Froude, *The English in Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, 1872-4, ii. 8-9).

15. Edmond Sexton Pery (1719-1806), cr. (1785) Vct Pery; Speaker of the Irish House of Commons 1771-85. At this time he usually opposed the vice-regal government, and it is doubtful whether any lord lieutenant had much influence on his conduct.

16. Halifax and Hamilton did not commit themselves on the Septennial Bill because they had no instructions from England and did not know the government's attitude; see Froude, *op. cit.* ii. 8, and Redington, *op. cit.* 84.

17. *Sic* in MS, but Hertford must mean 'oppose.'

18. Hertford means the passage of the heads of the bill through committee, where they were discussed on 7 Nov., 3 Dec., and 8 Dec. They were not re-

ported back to the House until 9 Dec. and then there was no division on the heads themselves, though there was on the method of presenting them to the Lord Lieutenant (*Journals of the House of Commons . . . Ireland*, xii. 288, 548, 564, 565-6). The next sentence in the letter shows that Hertford had not yet learned of the final passage.

19. A qualification clause, making possession of an estate of £600 a year necessary for holding a county seat, and one of £300 a year for a borough, had been referred to the committee on the heads of the bill after a 69-62 division on 3 Dec. (*ibid.* xii. 548). The government and the Lords Justices supported the clause in hopes that the heavy condition of eligibility would cause rejection of the bill (Redington, *op. cit.* 85-6, 87, 89-90; Froude, *op. cit.* ii. 8).

20. Probably an attempt to stop the bill in the Irish Privy Council before it was referred to England, but the initiative in these was taken by the Lords Justices rather than by Halifax. The bill was eventually invalidated in England because of a blunder in the drafting that made it unworkable, and nothing further was heard of it in the present session of the Irish Parliament, except for a resolution 27 April 1762 denying reports that the bill would have been rejected even had it been returned from England with no material changes (Froude, *op. cit.* ii. 9-10; *Journals of the House of Commons . . . Ireland*, xii. 913).