MALAY PSYCHOLOGY

By Philip Coote

Of the many races which live in the East, none is so little known to the dweller in the West as the Malay of the peninsula and archipelago bearing that name.

Possibly this is due to the fact that, until the rubber boom arrived, few knew much of Malaya, except perhaps for a passing glimpse of Singapore or Penang, neither of which are actually on the peninsula, but on islands. Vague and erroneous ideas existed about Malay pirates, but little more was known about the strange inhabitants of a wonderful country, rich in mineral and agricultural wealth.

Opinions differ as to where the truest Malay lives, for he is found in Madagascar as well as in Asia, where he is very widely distributed. With such a scattered population, it is not altogether surprising to find that racial features, customs, and language vary largely in different parts. Words differ in the various Malay States, with the result that they become entirely changed in a very short time, and to a far greater extent than they do in British county dialects. It is usual to ascribe to the Malacca Malay the purest descent and language, but this point is often argued, and both Kedah and Perak have a considerable number of supporters.

It is usual to attach to the Malay the negative quality of laziness as his salient characteristic. To a certain extent this is true, but there is generally a method in his supposed hatred of hard work.

However, if a Malay is given a piece of work to do, he does it conscientiously and to the best of his ability. He makes an excellent "boy," cook, gardener, or chauffeur, but in order to understand him and speak to him a knowledge of Malay is essential. The average Malay does not learn English, though the higher class Malays, many of whom have been educated in England, speak it well. Centuries of life in the humid heat of the Malay Archi-

pelago has taught the *orang Malayu* to do his work with a minimum of labour, and it is because he has had the sense to learn this lesson well, that some regard him as lazy. In some parts—the Padang district of Sumatra, for instance—matriarchy exists, the men being too lazy to worry about anything. The women do such little work as is done, while the men do nothing, and all property passes from mother to daughter. This is not usual, however, and is only found in isolated cases.

If the *orang puteh* (white man—*i.e.*, Englishman) wants to catch a rhinoceros which has been damaging his crops, he goes to endless trouble and expense in his endeavours to put an end to that animal's depredations. He will go to most unnecessary ends, tramping about with a gun, to bring that rhinoceros to earth, and perhaps it will take him days. He may even fail in his hunt. Not so the Malay. He has his own labour-saving method of snaring the animal, and, since it is of primary importance that the rhinoceros should be caught, and since sport is but a secondary consideration, he sets a trap.

In the vicinity of the beast's depredations he will dig a pit, big enough to hold the prey, and sufficiently deep to ensure the victim not escaping. The pit is baited and in due course the rhinoceros wanders into it. The question then arises as to how the brute shall be removed, for to lift it would be far too much like hard work, so odious to the Malay, and it is sometimes possible to raise a good sum on a live rhinoceros. In its natural anger at finding itself trapped, the rhinoceros pounds away at the floor and sides of the pit, thus loosening the earth, and raising it to the level of the ground. In the meantime the Malays have not been idle, for at their own convenience and in their own time they have erected a strong cage, made of jungle-wood, etc., over the pit in which their captive is. The prisoner is safely caged, and the next problem that arises is how to move him and his cage. This is done by passing a long, strong pole between the legs of the animal, and so steering him, with the cage, to the desired haven. This is typical of the Malay's ingenuity in avoiding unnecessary

labour, and might be amplified in a number of other ways. especially fishing.

For fifty years the *orang puteh*, and for much longer than that the Chinese, have been delving for tin, but the Malay has no desire to exploit his country's natural wealth. The British have made roads and railways, surveyed the country, and developed the land in every conceivable way, while the Malay has watched. The *orang China* has set up his *kedeis* (shops) and *godowns* (warehouses), but it is seldom that one comes across a Malay *kedei*, unless it be a dirty eating-house attached to some wayside *kampong* (hamlet). Yet the Malay cares not. He seldom enters into the busy life of the town, and prefers the jungle seclusion of his *kampong*.

Though the Malays, as a race, cannot be considered by any stretch of the imagination a progressive race, yet the upper classes are most enlightened and anxious to learn. They fully realize the benefits to be obtained from a European training, and not a few of the *raja* class have been educated at one of the English Universities, where they have had Western ideas instilled into them and the English language, which many speak fluently. At Kuala Kangsar, the Malay capital of the State of Perak, stands Malay College, a fine, imposing building, where the young Malay is educated on the lines of an English public school. It is, in fact, modelled, as far as circumstances and conditions will allow, on our great institutions, the public schools. But, if the upper class Malays have a leaning towards Europeanization, the general trend is not so. In the village schools the young Malay is taught to read and write, and he learns the Koran, but as soon as he leaves school and returns to a wholly country life all is forgotten, save, perhaps, the Koran, which the priest ensures he shall remember. Of the Malays, few have the initiative or inclination for the sterner life of a city. Let the Malay alone and he is the most conservative fellow on earth. Yet, once instil into his mind the benefits of Western civilization, and he is eager to improve himself. But perhaps the Malay is more delightful as he is. Few but the actual *raja* class can stand civilization, and the majority lose the charm of their simplicity when they start to adopt Western methods.

In remote ages Malays were Hindus; now they are Muhammadans. Few ever become Christians, so well are they looked after by their priests, and a visit to a Christian place of worship of any denomination seldom reveals a Malay among the congregation. Like most Orientals, the Malay is remarkably superstitious, and it is extraordinarily difficult to get an idea which has once been introduced to the Malay brain out again. Some seven or eight miles from Kuala Kangsar, just off the main road to Taiping, which is twenty-one miles further, there is a rough mound, surrounded by a stone kerb, in the grounds of a European planter's bungalow. It is obviously a burial-place, and legend has it that the body of some big Malay *panglima* (fighting chief), who was slain in battle on the adjacent mountains, lies there. Malays flock to this shrine all through the year, and from all parts of the country. Ramadham, the month of fasting, is the time when most pilgrimages take place, and the devout place little candles and streamers of coloured paper on the grave.

Temperamentally, the Malay is taciturn, and he is not easy to engage in a general conversation. But he is most polite. Meet a Malay on the road and he has invariably got a "*Tabek*" ("Good-day") for you. The *orang puteh* is a good friend to "Mat," the name generically applied to Malays as John is to the Chinaman, and he knows it, and moreover has the courtesy to acknowledge it. As a rule the Malay is kind to women and children, but should he run *amok* he is a veritable terror. Fortunately he seldom runs *amok* in these more enlightened days, but his passions, once aroused, are quelled with difficulty.

The Malay of to-day is not the violent, bloodthirsty piratical person he is generally depicted as in books. He likes to be left alone to his own devices and to be allowed to live peaceably and quietly. Then he is *sénang*.

FINANCIAL SECTION

THE INDIAN CURRENCY POLICY

By Sir James Wilson, K.C.S.I.

In the Asiatic Review for January, 1922, there appeared an article by me on this subject, calling attention to the changes which had taken place up to that date. The table on p. 290 shows the state of things on January 31, 1923, the calculations being based on the quotations of that date, among which were the following: In London—price of gold, 88·8 shillings per fine ounce; price of silver per ounce 925 fine, 31·4 pence; rate of exchange of the rupee, 16·5 pence. In New York—price of foreign silver, 64·8 cents per fine ounce. In Calcutta, on January 10, 1923, gold was quoted at 26·6 rupees per tola of 180 grains, and fine silver at 82·9 rupees per 100 tolas.

In the table on p. 290 I have entered as one of the dates January 31, 1920, because it was immediately after that date—namely, on February 2, 1920—that the Secretary of State made his momentous announcement that he would aim at giving the rupee a fixed value in exchange of one rupee for 11·3 grains of fine gold—that is, one-tenth of the gold content of the sovereign. The other dates in the table are exactly two years and three years after January 31, 1920.

On January 31, 1920, the value of the British paper pound sterling, as shown both by the rate of exchange with New York and by the results of the sales of gold in London with freedom to export, was nearly at its lowest, being then equivalent to 82 grains of fine gold—that is, 72 per cent. of the 113 grains contained in a sovereign—in other words, it was worth only 14s. 5d. measured in gold.

As a result of the policy adopted by the British Government, which aimed at the restoration of a free market in gold in London, and would ultimately lead to the restoration of the paper pound to the value of a sovereign, the value of the paper pound had by January 31, 1922, risen to 99·5 grains of fine gold—equivalent to 88·1 per cent. of the gold in a sovereign; and during the next twelve months there was a further improvement, until on January 31, 1923, the price of gold in London gave the paper pound the value of 108·1 grains of fine gold, which is 95·7 per cent. of the 113 grains in a sovereign—an improvement of 8·6 per cent. in the twelve months, bringing the value of the pound sterling in London, in New York, and therefore all the world over to within 5 per cent. of the value of the gold in a sovereign.

VALUE OF THE RUPEE MEASURED IN GOLD AND SILVER

	In 1913.	January 31, 1920.	January 31, 1922.	January 31, 1923.
Value of the pound sterling in grains of gold	113	82	99·5	108·1
Value of the pound sterling as a percentage of the sovereign	100	72	88·1	95·7
Value of the sovereign (113 grains of gold) in rupees—				
In London	15	11·9	17·5	15·2
In India	15	17	17·9	16·7
Value of the rupee in grains of gold—				
In London	7·5	9·6	6·5	7·4
In India	7·5	6·7	6·3	6·8
Value of the rupee in pence sterling in London	16	28	15·6	16·5
Value of the rupee in pence measured in gold in London	16	20	13·7	15·8
Value of the rupee in grains of silver—				
In London	253	149	197	233
In India	257	157	194	217*
Ratio of gold to silver—				
In New York	34	15·5	31·3	31·9
In London	34	15·7	30·5	31·4
In India	34	23·5	30·8	32·1*

* January 10, 1923.

During the war, and for some time after the armistice, India was prevented from obtaining her usual supply of gold, and demanded a great increase in the import of silver, which it could practically force the Government to import in order to maintain the inconvertibility of its paper currency. This excessive demand of India for silver, together with the demand from other countries, led to a very rapid rise in the world price of silver measured in gold, and on January 31, 1920, the price of silver in New York was 133 cents per fine ounce, as compared with the average price in 1913 of 61 cents—that is to say, on that date an ounce of gold would only command in New York 15·5 ounces of silver, whereas in 1913 it commanded 34 ounces. On the same date the quoted price of standard silver in London was 83 pence per ounce, while in 1913 the average price was 28 pence. On the same day gold sold in London at 117s. sterling per ounce, as compared with the 85s. per ounce at which it sold before the issue of the practically inconvertible paper currency; so that in London on that day the ratio between gold and silver was 15·7 to 1, or nearly the same as in New York. In India while the import of gold was severely restricted and silver was imported in immense quantities, the value of gold measured in silver or in rupees naturally rose very rapidly with little regard to the ratio between them in the world outside. Before the war the price of gold remained practically constant at about 24 rupees to the tola of 180 grains—that is, 7·5 grains to the rupee, and the price of the sovereign was 15 rupees. But in the beginning of September, 1919, gold was selling in Bombay at 32 rupees per tola (5·6 grains to the rupee), which would give the price of the 113 grains of fine gold contained in the sovereign as 20 rupees. By January 31, 1920, the price of gold in India had been brought down to 27 rupees per tola—that is, 6·7 grains to the rupee—while on the same date the rupee was quoted in London at 28 pence sterling compared to the pre-war rate of 16 pence per rupee. As

the pound sterling was then worth only 72 per cent. of a sovereign, this means that on January 31, 1920, a rupee would buy in London 9·6 grains of fine gold, while in India, owing to the restricted supply of gold, a rupee would buy only 6·7 grains, and on that date, while both in London and in New York an ounce of gold would buy only about 15·5 ounces of silver, it would in India buy 23·5 ounces.

On February 2, 1920, the Secretary of State announced that he would aim at giving the rupee a fixed value in exchange of 1 rupee for 11·3 grains of fine gold, that the sovereign would be made a legal tender in India at the ratio of 10 rupees (instead of the pre-war ratio of 15 rupees) to one sovereign, and that the import and export of gold would soon be freed from Government control. Accordingly since July 12, 1920, India has been able to obtain as much as she wants either of gold or of silver. Her demand for silver has now become normal, and as other countries also, such as China and South America, had been prevented from obtaining the gold they wanted and were now able to satisfy their requirements, and thus increase the world's effective demand for gold, while at the same time reducing its effective demand for silver, the consequence of this removal of restrictions was a rapid fall in the value of silver as measured in gold; and by January 31, 1923, both in New York, in London, and in India an ounce of gold commanded about 32 ounces of silver—or much the same as the pre-war ratio of 1 ounce of gold equal to 34 ounces of silver.

On January 31, 1922, the exchange value of the rupee in London was 15·6 pence sterling—or much the same as before the war, as compared with the 28 pence which it had reached on January 31, 1920, before the announcement of the Secretary of State's new policy. On January 31, 1923, it was 16·5 pence sterling, but as the paper pound was then worth only 95·7 per cent. of the sovereign, this means that on that date the value of the rupee, measured in

gold, in London was only 15·8 pence, as compared with 16 pence before the war. Still this is a substantial improvement on its value a year before, when, measured in gold, it was worth only 13·7 pence. On January 31, 1923, it was worth in London 7·4 grains of fine gold, as compared with 7·5 grains it was worth before the war, and as compared with the 9·6 grains it was worth in London on January 31, 1920. Thus it has nearly attained the value in international exchange as measured in gold which it possessed before the war, but is still very far short of the value of 11·3 grains of fine gold aimed at by the Secretary of State in his announcement made three years ago.

Under recent legislation the rupee is at present legal tender in India for only 10 rupees, but as anyone can get for it in the bazaar over 16 rupees, no one is likely to tender a sovereign for 10 rupees, and, for the time being, gold, even in the form of sovereigns, is out of the reckoning as regards circulation.

Notwithstanding the danger of increasing the legal tender currency, the Government of India, even before the war, on account no doubt of the profit it could secure by coining silver into rupees, each of which could be issued as a token coin equal in value to one-fifteenth of a sovereign, added greatly to the rupee coinage, and during the fourteen years ending with 1913 no fewer than 1,600 million new rupees were coined. Then when, in consequence of the restrictions on the import of gold during the war, it was found necessary, in order to maintain the convertibility of the note issue, to obtain immense quantities of silver from abroad and coin it into rupees, during the three years ending with March 31, 1919, the net coinage amounted to no less than 1,034 million rupee coins, making a gross addition to the silver currency since the beginning of the century of over 2,600 million rupee coins; and it may be estimated that there are at present in existence about 4,000 million rupee coins.

The total quantity of currency notes has at the same

time been greatly increased from 661 million rupees on March 31, 1914, to 1,742 million rupees on December 31, 1922. Apparently, then, the total amount of legal tender money, apart from gold, now in India, is about 5,706 million rupees, or about 18 rupees per head of population. The addition to the quantity of rupees and notes since 1914 has been, approximately—rupee coins 1,034 million, notes to the value of 1,081 million, total increase 2,115 million rupees.

When the people of India have more rupees than they have an immediate use for, whether for purposes of circulation or hoarding, the rupee coins flow back into the Government Treasuries, and the quantity of silver coin and bullion held in the Currency Reserve in India has increased from 205 million rupees on March 31, 1914, to no less than 866 million rupees on December 31, 1922—more than one-fifth of all the rupee coins in existence, the increase during the past year being 126 million rupees, which affords strong evidence that the total amount of rupees and notes is at present much larger than India really requires for all purposes. It seems now clear that the Government of India made a great mistake in issuing so many rupee coins and currency notes, and that it would have been much more advantageous if they had kept down the quantity of legal tender currency, and so kept up the value of the rupee, whether measured in gold or in sterling or in commodities, and prevented the rapid rise in rupee prices in India.

The Babington-Smith Committee of 1919, on the basis of whose report the Secretary of State made his announcement of February 1920, seem to have supposed that the gold value of silver would continue at such a high rate as to support a rate of exchange of the rupee much higher than the 16 pence which had been the standard for a number of years before the war, and if they had foreseen that the price of silver and the exchange value of the rupee would fall so rapidly within the next three years, it is very improbable that they would have encouraged the Secretary of State to

aim at making the rupee worth 24 pence in gold. The warning which I submitted to the Committee in July 1919, when the price of silver was 53 pence per ounce, that by 1922 its price might be as low as 30 pence, was practically fulfilled, as on December 15 last it was quoted in London at 30·4 pence. It seems probable that there will soon be a further fall in the value of silver, whether measured in gold or in rupees or in commodities. Of the 208 million ounces which the Government of the United States have to replace in accordance with the Pittman Act, 149 million ounces have been bought, leaving a balance of 59 million ounces, which, at the rate at which purchases have recently been made, should be completed next autumn. Thereafter it is probable that the whole of the American produce will have to compete with the rest of the world production in a free market, and will be added to the world's available supply of silver. At the same time the world's demand for silver is likely to go on decreasing, and it seems probable that the price in New York, which is at present about 65 cents per fine ounce, will fall below the price of 61 cents, which was that of 1913. (It is to be remembered that so recently as 1915 its price was only 51 cents per fine ounce.) Any fall in the price of silver that may take place will increase the temptation to counterfeit rupees, and any further rise in the exchange value of the rupee coin, whether or not it is accompanied by a fall in the present price of silver, will also increase that temptation and make it more and more difficult to maintain the exchange value of the rupee.

As in the case of all inconvertible currencies, the value of the rupee, whether measured in gold or in commodities, now varies according to the relation between the demand and supply of rupees and the demand and supply of gold or of commodities. The Government of India have now stopped the coinage of more rupees and the issue of additional currency notes, but it is unlikely that the demand for rupees and notes will increase to such an extent as to lead

to a further marked improvement, unless measures are taken to reduce the present excessive quantity of rupees and notes in existence. It is impossible to imagine that, for many years to come, the rupee will rise in exchange value to the Secretary of State's figure of 11·3 grains to the rupee—that is, one-tenth of a sovereign.

A further rise in exchange value of the rupee would be favourable to the Indian finances, in so far as India has to pay external debts in gold or in sterling. It would also tend to cause a fall in prices measured in rupees in India, and would therefore be favourable to all who receive salaries or wages fixed in rupees, and to all creditors in India whose credits are fixed in terms of rupees. On the other hand, it would be unfavourable to all producers of commodities in India, and especially to the great mass of the agricultural population who have produce to sell, and to all debtors in India whose debts are fixed in rupees. The fairest and most practicable solution of the question would be to abandon the attempt to raise the value of the rupee to anything like 11·3 grains of fine gold, and to aim at the permanent re-establishment of the pre-war rate of 7·5 grains of fine gold—that is, one-fifteenth of a sovereign, or 16 pence per rupee measured in gold. The Secretary of State should announce this to be his policy, and the Government of India should pass an Act declaring that the sovereign shall again be legal tender for 15 rupees. This would prevent the gold value of the rupee from rising above one-fifteenth of a sovereign, and might lead to the reappearance of the sovereign as part of the currency in circulation in India. Even so, there would still be a danger that, owing to the enormous quantity of rupees and notes in existence, it might be difficult to keep the rupee up to its present rate in exchange of about one-fifteenth of a sovereign, and it would be advisable to take steps to make a gradual reduction in the amount of currency notes in circulation, and in the quantity of rupee coins in existence in the manner recommended in my previous article, where I have shown that

the Government of India is in possession of ample resources to enable it to make such a reduction. If this were done, there is reason to hope that the rupee would again be stabilized at its pre-war value of one-fifteenth of the gold in a sovereign, to the great advantage of India's trade and in the interests of justice as between creditors and debtors.

HISTORICAL SECTION

THE EMBASSY OF SIR WILLIAM NORRIS, BART., TO AURANGZEBE

By Harihar Das, F.R.S.L., F.R.HIST.S.

CHAPTER I

THE NORRIS FAMILY: SIR WILLIAM'S EARLY LIFE AND PARLIAMENTARY CAREER

The East India Company in the seventeenth and the earlier part of the eighteenth centuries appointed the staff for its various factories in a more or less haphazard manner, and it was inevitable that they should come from different classes of the community. A few were representatives of the old county families; many were sons or other relatives of the City merchants who, as subscribers of the Company's stock, had started the enterprise of trading with India and the East, and kept it going; while another and the most numerous class of all was recruited from the ships' supercargoes, who were easily induced to remain in India for at least a time. The result was that "the servants" of the Company, as they were called, were typical representatives of the commercial community of England, then emerging into marked prominence, and attracting to its ranks the most energetic and adventurous persons in the country. In no sense of the word could these men be called officials. They were merchants and traders alone. Their activities were concentrated in the local markets; their success or their failure was recorded in their journals and ledgers. That was the test of their merit with the Company, and of their profit for themselves. The ventures and prizes of the pursuit captured the imagination and appealed to the desires of a wide circle,

so that, speaking broadly, the Company had no difficulty in obtaining the services of men of a thoroughly respectable class, and even in the earlier years of its existence many scions of the best families were to be found in its employment.

The new English Company derived a great advantage at the beginning of its enterprise from the co-operation of a royal ambassador, so well qualified and of such a distinguished family as Sir William Norris, who was charged with the special task of pushing its interests at the Court of the Great Mogul. Indeed, the selection of such a man for the mission was a signal proof of King William's great desire to favour the new Company, for the old Company had enjoyed no such advantage since the despatch of Sir Thomas Roe on a similar errand by James I. This reason explains why it is thought appropriate to give at some length an account of the very ancient Norris family of Speke and all its ramifications, which had a very distinguished record in the public service of the country not easily to be surpassed by any other at the time with which we are dealing.

The village of Speke lies on the northern bank of the Mersey, a few miles east of Liverpool, and still remains an agricultural district. There is no village to speak of, only a few cottages near the modern church, but Speke Hall is among the famous houses of the county, being one of the best examples of "black and white" architecture remaining. The house is built round a rectangular court, and was surrounded by a broad moat. This is now drained, and filled in on the south side—*i.e.*, the side towards the river. The principal entrance is on the north side, the moat there being crossed by a stone bridge. The building is of various dates; some parts may go back to the fourteenth century, but the bulk is of the sixteenth century, and the house now is probably much the same as it was in the time of Elizabeth.*

* There is an interesting illustrated account of the house by Mr. Herbert Winstanley in vol. lxxi. of the Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire. Also in the *Country Life* for January 14 and 21, 1922. See also "Victoria History of Lancashire," vol. iii., Archibald Constable and Co., Ltd., 1907.

The Lancashire family of Norris was one of great distinction, even from the days of the Plantagenets. The founder was one Hugh le Noreis (*i.e.*, Norwégian), to whom King John, before his accession to the Crown, gave the manor of Blackrod, near Bolton. The owners of Speke for over five hundred years were a junior branch of his family, not becoming extinct in the male line there until the middle of the eighteenth century. From them came another distinguished family, that of Norris of Rycote. It would be difficult to name one that produced so many remarkable servants of the State as it did during the whole of the Tudor period. Henry Norris, to go no further back, fell from his position as favourite with Henry VIII. during the proceedings against Cardinal Wolsey, to become the object of that monarch's wrath on very slight evidence of an intrigue with Anne Boleyn. No one at Court credited the charge, but some victim had to suffer for the King's plans, and Norris lost his head in the Tower in 1536. In reparation of this injustice his son Henry was soon afterwards created Baron Norris of Rycote, and long enjoyed the favour of Queen Elizabeth, who sent him as her ambassador to Paris.

This Henry was a man of discretion and peace, but his six sons were described as "a brood of spirited, martial men." They justified the appellation in many different scenes of war—in the Netherlands, for instance, and in Ireland. Of these sons the second, John, was the most successful commander the English sent to help William the Silent against the Spaniards, and his next brother, Edward, died Governor of Ostend in 1601. Queen Elizabeth used to address the latter as "Dear Ned." His great estates in Berkshire passed to his nephew William, third Baron Norris, who was created by James I. Earl of Berkshire. He had the misfortune to kill Ford Willoughby d'Eresley in a duel, and to be sent in consequence to the Tower, from which he was released on payment of a fine.

Finding himself in disgrace at Court, he retired to his seat at Rycote, in Oxon, and, brooding over his downfall, shot himself with a cross-bow.

One of the most prominent members of the original family was the Sir William Norris who was Lord of Speke in the time of Henry VIII. He took part in the invasion of Scotland in 1544, and brought back as part of his spoil some printed folios, now preserved in the Athenæum Library at Liverpool. Edward, his son and successor, is commemorated by an inscription at the Hall, as having built a portion of it. His son, Sir William, was made a Knight of the Bath by James I. at his coronation. His eldest son having died without children, he was succeeded by his second son, William, who died in 1651. This William appears to have taken no part in the Civil War, but two at least of his sons fought on the King's side. One of these was Thomas Norris, his successor, who had to compound with the victorious Parliament for his offence by a fine of £508. He appears thenceforward to have led a quiet and obscure life, but his son Thomas, who succeeded him about 1686, served as Sheriff of the County in 1696, and was Member of Parliament for Liverpool, as a Whig, in 1688 and 1689-95. We find the following account in the *History of Liverpool*, which amply testifies to the chivalry of the family: "In the reign of Edward III. in the naval expedition fitted out against France, Liverpool was required to furnish one small vessel or bark, to be manned by six mariners; the city of York at the same time was required to supply one vessel and nine men, and Portsmouth five ships and ninety-six men. Most of the other ports in England were also ordered to provide a certain number of vessels. The expedition was headed by King Edward in person, attended by his son Edward, the Black Prince, Henry, Duke of Lancaster, and a great number of the knights, barons, and esquires of the county of Lancaster. Amongst these the families of More of Bank Hall, Molyneux of Sefton, and Norris of Speke were

particularly distinguished."* It is interesting to note that the former two families were still more important in the county for their munificent gifts to the city of Liverpool. The families of Thomas Johnson and William Clayton were also well known.

Sir William Norris, Bart., second son of Thomas and Katherine Norris, was born in 1657 at Speke Hall. His parents had in all seven sons and four daughters, namely, Thomas,† William, John,‡ Henry,§ Edward,‖ Jonathan,¶

* *See* p. 46 of the "History of Liverpool" by T. Troughton. Liverpool: William Robinson, 1810.

† Thomas, M.P. for Liverpool, 1689–90, 1690–5, was sent to the Convention Parliament of 1688, and chiefly to his efforts was due the granting by William III. of the Charter of 1695, which procured great benefits for the town of Liverpool. He was a Whig, and in 1696 served as High Sheriff of Lancashire. He married Magdalene, second daughter of Sir Willoughby Aston. Thomas's only child Mary became heiress to the whole Speke property. He died at Harrogate in June, 1700.

‡ John was sent to sea, and was a man of intemperate habits. There is a certain amount of discrepancy about John Norris in the "Dictionary of National Biography." Heywood says in the "Norris Papers" of the Transactions of the Chetham Society that John was in the merchant service, but that is the only link, and apparently he came out of it, and lived in Lancashire till he died, fairly young. He also gives a few facts about this John as a spendthrift and wastrel. It is true that Sir William had a brother John, who was, according to the Heralds' Visitation of 1664 of Lancashire, aged two years on September 23, 1664, when Thomas Norris, of Speke, attested to that fact, (Sir) William being then aged six (Chetham Society, vol. lxxxviii.). The article in the D.N.B. on "Sir John Norris" is by Sir John Laughton, a great authority on the navy. He says Sir John Norris was "apparently" the third son of Thomas Norris, of Speke, but later on he says, *a brother* of Sir William Norris. We have not been able to clear up the identity or parentage of Sir John, but it is not credible that he was a son of Thomas, of Speke. If he had been, he would have become heir to the estates, and it is certain he did not. Some pedigrees—*e.g.*, Ogmerod's in vol. ii. of the Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire—say John, the brother of Sir William, died without issue, and there is no reason to doubt this. The reference given in the D.N.B. to Baines's "History of Lancashire," vol. iii., p. 754, only shows that Sir William had a brother John; but he was never knighted.

§ Henry, M.A., B.D., was a clergyman, and was educated at Brasenose College, Oxford, and became a Fellow.

‖ Edward, educated at Brasenose College, Oxford; M.A., June 1, 1689; B.M., January 19, 1691; and M.D., March 12, 1695; practised in Chester. He became a Fellow of the Royal Society in 1698. He went as secretary to his second brother in India. On his return from India, he resided for a while at Utkington, near Chester, and in 1705 married the daughter of William Cleveland, of Liverpool. He became a member of Parliament for Liverpool on February 7, 1714-15. He died on July 22, 1726, and his remains were interred in the chapel of Garston, dedicated to St. Michael.

¶ Jonathan, born at Childwall, February 1, 1667.

Richard,* Margaret, Ann, Katherine, and Elizabeth. The mother, Katherine Norris, was a remarkable woman; she was the fourth daughter of Sir Henry Garraway.† Katherine Norris seems to have been a business-like woman, strong-minded, and deeply religious. She was withal a woman of charitable disposition, who before her death made a will, dated November 13, 1705, in which she left personal gifts to her sons and daughters. Her share of the third part of the ancestral property she left to her sons Edward and Richard Norris and their heirs. She also left to Richard a meadow in Halebanck, co. Lancashire, called the Walpole and Barrow Platt. Further, she gave Edward all the household goods within the dwelling-house or Hall of Speke "which shall remain there all the time of her death," except such part thereof as shall be inserted in a schedule to her will. She was not only contented to distribute her property amongst her children, but over and above she bequeathed sums of money to the poor present at her funeral and servants of the house. Her youngest son, Richard, was made the sole executor of her will, and it was proved on February 3, 1707.

William Norris was elected eighth into Westminster School in 1672. He remained a King's Scholar until 1675, when he was the third of those elected to Cambridge. Among those who were King's Scholars at the same time as Norris were Francis Atterbury, afterwards the well-known Jacobite Dean of Westminster and Bishop of Rochester, and Lancelot Blackburne, afterwards Arch-

* Richard was Bailiff in Liverpool in 1695, became Mayor in 1700, and M.P., 1708-10. He was Sheriff of Lancashire in 1718. He was most active in Liverpool affairs, and was a close friend of Sir Thomas Johnson.

† Sir Henry Garraway was on the Committee of the East India Company from 1614-43. He became Deputy-Governor of the Company in 1636, which he held until 1639, when he was elected Lord Mayor of London, and held that position about a year. He was knighted on May 31, 1640, and was appointed Governor of the East India Company in 1641-3. He had incurred considerable unpopularity owing to his royalist leanings and opposition to Pym and his followers. His death occurred in July, 1646. See "The Aldermen of the City of London," vol. ii., by A. B. Beaven, London, 1913.

bishop of York. He came to Westminster under the great headmaster, Dr. Richard Busby, who was headmaster from 1638 to 1695. It was Busby's proud boast that he had educated most of the Bishops at the time of his death, and among his famous pupils had been Sir Christopher Wren, John Locke, John Dryden, Bishop Trelawny (one of the seven Bishops), Matthew Prior, Charles Montague, Lord Halifax, and very many others. Dr. Busby perhaps did more than anyone else to found the Public School system as we know it to-day, and to induce the great families to send their sons to Public Schools rather than to educate them by private tutors. He is remembered as the great flogging headmaster, but he was loved by his boys even while they feared him. After finishing his career at Westminster, William was admitted into Trinity College, Cambridge, on June 25, 1675, under Mr. Boteler (alias Butler) as tutor; matriculated in 1675; was elected scholar in 1676. William Norris was somewhat of a poet, and as an undergraduate in 1677 contributed a poem in Greek to the volume of poems, entitled *Epithalamium*, addressed by the University of Cambridge to Charles II. on the marriage of Wiliam Henry, Prince of Orange, with Princess Mary of England. We quote the poem with a translation:

Ἥρα τὶς, εὐπατέρεια κόρη, τεὸν αἶνον ἀείδειν,
Ἣ δύναται θαλάμους, ὦ χαριεσσα, τεούς;
Ἥρα τις εὐγενέος δύναται τὰ γενέθλια παιδὸς
Καὶ χάριτας γλυκεροῖς ὄμμασ' ἐφεζομενάς;
Οὐ δέχεται λεπτὴ τὰ μεμιγμένα χαρματ' ἀοιδὴ,
Δισσῷ τ' οἰδαλέην κύματι γηθοσύνην.*

W. NORRIS: *Coll. Trin.*

He graduated B.A. in 1678; was admitted a minor Fellow of Trinity College on October 3, 1681, and M.A. in 1682. He became a major Fellow on July 7, 1682.

* "High-born maid, can any worthily sing thy praise
Or thy nuptials, O beauteous one?
Can any duly render the hereditary gifts of the noble youth
And the graces dwelling in his charming eyes?
No feeble song is fitting for these mingled joys,
Delight full-swelling with a double wave."

He drew his fellowship dividends up to Christmas, 1690. He held no college office, but acted as tutor to one man (viz., John Taylor), admitted in 1687. William Norris was one of the delegates appointed by the Regent House in 1687 on the question of James II. being petitioned to revoke his mandate for a degree to Francis, the Roman Catholic. On February 9, 1686-87, came a letter of James II. ordering the University to admit one Alban Francis, Benedictine, to the degree of Master of Arts without administering any oaths, the King dispensing with the observance of the statutes on this occasion. The Vice-Chancellor wrote to the Chancellor (the Duke of Albemarle) to ask whether the King could be induced to revoke the mandate; the Duke in reply said a petition from the University might have some effect. At a congregation of the Senate of the University on February 21, it was resolved to send Dr. Smoult, Professor of Casuistical Divinity, on behalf of the "Non-Regent" house, and Mr. Norris, Fellow of Trinity College, on behalf of the Regents. (At that time the Senate was divided into two "houses"—the Non-Regents or seniors, and the Regents or juniors.) They were to say that the Senate thought the admission of Mr. Francis without the usual oaths to be illegal and unsafe, and wished the King to be petitioned about it. A second royal mandate was received (read March 11). The Senate proceeded as before. On April 9 the Vice-Chancellor and Senate (by deputies) were summoned to appear before the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. The Vice-Chancellor and eight deputies (including Dr. Smoult, but not William Norris) appeared accordingly before Lord Chancellor Jeffreys and other Commissioners. On May 7 judgment was given that an act of great disobedience to the King's commands had been committed, and therefore the Vice-Chancellor was deprived of his office.*

William Norris also wrote a poem while at Cambridge

* See "The Cambridge Case," London, 1689. (British Museum, in a volume of "Law Tracts," No. 24).

on the elevation of Princess Mary to the throne in 1689, in a volume called "Musæ Cantabrigienses"—poems addressed to William III. and Mary by members of the University of Cambridge, on the Revolution. The poem is ambitious, and even endeavours to claim William as a genuine Englishman!

> "Et tamen Herôem servandis gentibus ortum
> Anglia, cui merito rerum dedit esse potenti,
> Vindicat atque suâ jactat de stirpe creatum,
> Maternâ de stirpe suum; Dis namque secundis
> Tallem illum Auriaco Patri tulit Anglica Mater.
> Hinc animi, hinc virtus, & claris dextra factis.
> Nec tu carminibus, Regina, silebere nostris,
> Una Viro digna illustri sceptrisque Britannis.
> Formosae Leges consuerunt ponere mundo
> Praecipue magnorum animis regnare virorum."

William Norris married on December 13, 1689, Elizabeth Pollexfen, of St. Clement Danes, widow of Nicholas Pollexfen, and previously of Isaac Meynell, son of Godfrey Meynell, of Willington, co. Derby. She was a daughter of Alderman W. Reade, of London. By the first husband she had a daughter, Eliza, who married (1) Robert Hale, and (2) the Hon. Robert Cecil. By Nicholas Pollexfen she had a son of that name. Lady Norris was a woman of fashion, although illiterate, and connected with the Lord Ranelagh, whom the Tories so long attempted to drive from office.

William was admitted a Freeman of Liverpool on November 7, 1694.

[EDITORIAL NOTE.—Mr. Das has been engaged for some time in collecting materials for writing an account of the Embassy of Sir William Norris, Bart., to Aurangzebe, the Great Mogul; and the above article is an outcome of his researches. A fuller account of the Embassy will be published later.]

(*To be continued.*)

HISTORICAL SECTION

THE EMBASSY OF SIR WILLIAM NORRIS, BART., TO AURANGZEBE

By Harihar Das, f.r.s.l., f.r.hist.s.

CHAPTER I (*Continued*)

In the following letter William Norris mentions that Lord Rivers sails to join the army in Flanders, but is driven back by a storm. The nation expects news of an attack on the French lines.

London,
June 8th, 1695.

Hon^rd^ Sir,

The enclosd [missing] came to my hands yesterday soe I tooke the first opportunity of sendinge it to you though I had nothinge of moment to incert with it. My Lord Rivers & the Commanders that went with him I hope are gott safe in Flanders by this time though they mett with a storm & contrary [MS. "contratry"] winds in their passage which forcd them back to Shernesse & were all separated from their Convoy. Wee are now in daily expectation to heare from the Army that the King has Forcd the Lines, for he is fully resolvd on the attempt & I hope itt will be with successe: I suppose you have been joy fully receivd att Leverpoole before this; I mean by those whom you have been assistant to in regaininge their libertys. I perceive by the list that Brother Dick & his Landlord are down for Bayliffs though I doubt not but will execute their office very cordially: pray give my humble service to all our good Freinds there next time you goe: I hope this will find you safe & hearty after your journey. I was to wait on my Lord Macclesfield this morninge to know when he designed for Lancashire but his honour was not stirringe & desird me to come to morrow. Pray give my Duty to Mother & Love to sisters my wife gives her humble service & Nick hopes you will not forgett him nor his service to the young Lady I heare

Sam Legay is come to town but have not seen him yet I am Honoured Sir

Your affectionate Brother &
humble servant
WM NORRIS.

pray remember me heartily to your good neighbours Alderman Percivall and Mr. Cooke.

Addressed: These

To Thomas Norris Esq[r]
Att Speake Hall neare
Leverpoole
In
Lancashire.

Frank.

William Norris and Joseph Maudit were active defendants of a suit between the cheesemongers and the Corporation of Liverpool in 1695 which is alluded to in the following letter:

LONDON,
June 29th [1695].

HON[RD] SIR,

I have been soe much out of order for these ten days that I could but just write a line to my Brother Dick last weeke & send him enclosd your note for 30 guin[eas]: I received the 40 guinnys very safe I suppose he has either . . .* your note or sent it to you: Mr. Braddon was with me this morninge who came directly from the Secretarys office & told me he expected to have the Charter returnd from Flanders by Tuesday next & then doubts not but to dispatch it in a fortnight if the petition of the Cheese mongers proves no obstruction: I fancy he is in some want of supplys in carryinge the businesse on for he borrowed 30[lb] of me last weeke (but this only to your selfe) Mr. Mauditt came to take his leave of me this weeke & was to sett forwards for Leverpoole yesterday in the Chester Coach. I shall stay in Town till Mrs Cecill is well again after her Lying in which will be A month att least if I can doe you any service in this or any other matter I shall be most ready Wee have no forreign post scince Tuesday soe consequently no news & are very quiett

* The word here is indecipherable.

att home pray give my Duty to my mother Love to sisters & humble service to all friends & acquaintance[s]

I am Hon^rd^ Sir
Your affectionate Brother &
humble Servant
WM NORRIS

Addressed: These

To Thomas Norris Esq^r^
Att Speake Hall
neare Leverpoole
In Lancashire

Endorsed by Thomas Norris: "Wm N for 40 guein."

William Norris also worked to secure the Charter granted to the town in September that year. "These Charters were very far from giving universal satisfaction amongst the burgesses. They did not create any system of municipal representation analogous to the Parliamentary system of the country; but rendered the town council self-elected, leaving only a nominal control to the burgesses, in common hall assembled."* At this time the name of Liverpool was becoming increasingly famed as a place of business facilities. It is at this period, the reign of William III., that the commercial prosperity of the town may be said to rise, for these years saw the inauguration of several enterprises calculated to further the progress and importance of the town, which "began more rapidly to advance in size, population, and commerce." Most of William Norris's contemporaries in Liverpool were influential men, "amongst whom are divers eminent merchants and tradesmen, whose trade and traffic, especially into the West Indies, makes it famous, its situation affording in great plenty, and at reasonable rates than in most parts of England, such exported commodities as are proper for the West Indies."†

He has business with Sir F. Child, and sends Thomas

* See pp. 337-9 of the "History of the Commerce and Town of Liverpool," by Thomas Baines.

† See p. 301 of the Fox Bourne's "English Merchants."

Norris the details of his account: Admiral Rooke is reported off Ushant. He also mentions the Venetian Ambassador's visit to the House of Commons.

LONDON,
Apr. 23rd, 1696.

HON^RD SIR,

I received yours & went accordingly to Sir Francis Child & received of him the 100^lb you sent me a bill for I likewise examind him as you [d]esird how accounts stood betwixt you which he showd me in his booke 1000^lb he stood indebted to you of which he had dischargd by 2 bills both paid to me 200^lb soe that 800^lb remains due to you of which I suppose you have given my mother Bills for 500^lb soe that accordinge to your own account 300^lb will remain due to you when my mother is paid. The enclosd [missing] will give you the best accounts of the late Tryalls and wee have little news else stirringe but that wee had the good news just now of Admirall Rookes safe arrivall 20 leages of Ushant soe that to our great Consolation (for wee have been under some apprehentions) wee may expect him as the wind stands tomorrow morninge. The Venetian Ambassadour sent to desire the favour off seeinge the house of Commons to day whilst wee were sittinge & accordingly came with 10 noble venetians to attend him where he satt [do] wn for halfe an houre in the Gallery & wee very mute & as grave [as] the Senate att venice could be: pray give my Duty to mother Respects [t] o your Lady Love and service to Sisters. I am Honoured Sir

Your most affectionate Brother
& devoted servant
WM NORRIS.

Addressed: These
To Thomas Norris Esq^r
Att Speake neare
Leverpoole
Lancashire.

Frank
WM NORRIS.

Endorsed: "W Norris of his Receit of 200^l & Sir F Childs Account." This in Thomas Norris's hand.

William Norris succeeded his eldest brother Thomas as Member of Parliament for Liverpool on November 1, 1695. He was a Whig, and in 1696 spoke in favour of the bill of

attainder brought against Sir John Fenwick, the Jacobite, for his share in the recent plot for assassinating William III. Bills of attainder being an odious method of getting rid of an adversary without due trial, the debates on this bill were long and exciting, although little doubt was felt as to Fenwick's guilt. Norris was fully conscious of the importance of the occasion: the life of a man, the preservation of the King and Government and the power of Parliaments, he pointed out, had all to be considered. He believed the accused to be guilty of treason, and of other crimes almost equal to treason, but having evaded trial in Westminster Hall the House of Commons must deal with him. To quote precedents was, he thought, "a little dry"—had he been an opponent of the bill he would no doubt have expressed himself differently—but referred to an attainder by Parliament in the time of Richard II.; and then passed on to his main argument: "that we are the Commons of England in Parliament assembled; and if so, sir, we have a discretionary power to do whatsoever we see is for the good of the kingdom; and if we are to be circumscribed by the rules of Westminster Hall, and we are to do nothing but what they would do, to what purpose do we sit here; if we are entrusted with this power, and may exert it, I think here is a fit occasion for you to exert this authority." Possibly he thought this was rather strong doctrine for a Whig, for after remarking on what he thought the inconsistency of some who had advocated the Bill of Exclusion in the time of Charles II. but opposed the present bill, he passed on to discuss the guilt of Sir John. He believed Captain Porter to be a good witness, for Fenwick's party "would have given a great reward to have taken him off." Goodman, who had been persuaded to keep out of the way, was no doubt equally good; consequently he regarded the accused as "a rotten member" of the body politic, almost past cure, who must be cut off for the preservation of the whole. If this were not done, others would trifle with a power that could not effectually exert itself, and would

learn to despise it. He would accordingly vote for the bill, as desiring to make it a warning and precedent for the future: "Because it may happen in future ages, that ministers of State and persons concerned in the government may be faulty, . . . and as the law stands now, he is but a bungling politician that can't ruin the government, and yet not come within the bill of treason to be hanged for it." This view prevailed; the bill passed the Commons by 189 to 156, and the Lords by 68 to 61, and Fenwick was beheaded on Tower Hill on January 28, 1696–7.*

Sir William mentions in the following letter how the English and Irish Papists tried to bribe Porter in the Fenwick trial and the sequel which followed the dramatic attempt. He also alludes to the King's arrival in Holland and Lord Capel's death.

LONDON,
May ye 9th, 1696.

THO^{S} NORRIS Esq^{E}
SPEAKE.

HON^{D} SIR,

I received yours, but have not yet heard any thing of Mr. Done. When he comes to Town, I shall observe your orders in every point. I have already discovered my Lord Macclesfield, who designs to present it to the Lords Justices, who are the same, to a man, they were last year. The King is long ere this got over into Holland, the Wind having been fair now, though for a Day or two he was retarded and blown back by contrary winds. We have not much News stirring, but shall expect great matters from Flanders this Summer, for the French, as well as we, design to make their utmost efforts this campaign. There is an express came from Ireland to Day, which brings word of the Lord Lieutenant's, my L^{d} Capel's, death. I suppose we shall have a new one constituted very speedily, and it is my private opinion, (but I have no further ground for it,) that my L^{d} Wharton, the Comptroller, will succeed to the place. There has been a wretched attempt made lately by some English and Irish Papists to Bribe off Porter from being an evidence with a Sum of Money, to

* See pp. 1083-5, vol. v., of the Cobbett's "Parliamentary History of England," printed by T. C. Hansard, London; also Henry Hallam's "Constitutional History of England," vol. iii., p. 177.

be given here, and a large annuity promis'd him if he would go over into France. He took 300 Guineas in earnest, and declared the whole matter to the Secretary of State. I have sent you enclosed Villers's receipt for six pounds I paid him for a Champaign Perriwig for you. We are in a little distress about payments of Money, which I hope will be easier ere long. Pray give my Duty to Mother, respects to your Lady, love and Service to Sisters.

I am, &c.,
WM NORRIS.*

William Norris's mother and sister postpone their journey north owing to rain meanwhile they move to Hatton Garden to be nearer the coach, should the weather improve. The writer prepares his own house for their reception if they abandon their journey. He has to attend a christening at Littleton, where his wife acts as god-mother. A rumour of peace delights him owing to the financial straits of the country. The King's return to England was hourly expected.

LONDON,
8br 6th, 1696.

HONRD SIR,

I remov'd from Chelsea last weeke att which time my Mother & Sister upon earnest sollicitation went to my Lady Strouds in Hatton Garden to be nearer the Coach which they had taken the beginninge of the weeke with intention to have sett forward towards Lancashire the 5th instant, & accordingly last Fryday sent their goods and cloathes all away by the carrier but their havinge faln great quantitys of rain for these 2 days made my Mother and Sister very apprehensive of the waters beinge out and soe rather chose to loose their earnest than run the hazard of drowninge or overturninge: I am almost of opinion if the weather continues bad a weeke longer they will not venter on a Northern journey this Winter I am makinge all the hast I can to have our new house in readynesse to be att my Mother and Sisters service if they thinke of Stayinge it is large enough I thinke just to furnish them

* This letter is missing from the original collection of "Norris Papers." It must have existed one time, otherwise it could never have been printe in the Chetham Society Publication of the "Norris Papers." See vo of the Chetham Society's "Norris Papers," edited by Thomas Heyw

with conveniencys & I shall be glad of their good company this Winter. I had a messenger come to day from Mr. Woods of Littleton to summon me to a gossipinge his eldest daughter is newly brought to bed & my wife is to make the child a Christian I shall not stay above 2 days from London & if you please to favour me with a letter before the parliament meetes it will find me if directed for me att my house upon the Terras att St. James's neare Westminster. The King is expected hourly & if the badnesse of the Weather & the wind veeringe a little southerly has not turnd him back I beleive he will land before I reach Littleton. Wee are as much in the darke as to peace as wee were A moneth agoe if it is honourable & secure it will be a great blessinge att this juncture for it will puzle a more politick Nodle than mine to find out ways and meanes to carry on the Warr for consideringe the Land Bank faild and other funds prove deficient there will be att least 3 millions to make good of the last yeare & how that will be found & enough to carry on the service of the next yeare is difficult to imagin in this great scarcity of money: And when all is said if wee have not a peace wee are ruind to all intents and purposes as far as the French Kinge and K. James can ruin us if wee doe not still prosecute the warr [*sic*] I should be very glad you would please to impart what notions you have about it how it is possible to be done, & yet done it must be or ten times worse than want of money will be the consequence: My most humble Service to the Lady & I wish her a happy minute I am Sir

Your most affectionate Brother &
humble Servant
Wm Norris.

Addressed: These

To Thomas Norris Esq^r^
High Sheriff of Lancashire,
att Speake neare
Leverpoole.

Frank
Wm Norris.

HISTORICAL SECTION

THE EMBASSY OF SIR WILLIAM NORRIS, BART., TO AURANGZEBE

By Harihar Das, B.Litt. (Oxon.), f.r.hist.s.

CHAPTER I (*Continued*)

In July, 1698, Parliament was dissolved and a fresh one was summoned for August. William Norris and William Clayton, one of the principal local merchants, were returned as members for Liverpool. Another dissolution took place in December, 1700. Picton, in his *Memorials of Liverpool*, is in error in his account of the election.* The old members were returned again, but not without opposition. Sir Cleave More, Baronet, the head of the oldest Liverpool family, was one of the opposing candidates, and did not accept his defeat patiently. He sent in a petition to the new Parliament, alleging that Richard Norris, the Mayor, had made use of "indirect practices" to secure the election of his brother Sir William, then absent in India. It was, for example, said that he threatened the ruin of many of the electors if they voted for the petitioner; refused several who wished to vote for him, as disqualified, while admitting others who, though not qualified, voted for Sir William Norris; and he refused an inspection of the poll to petitioner's friends. He, therefore, asserted that Sir William had not obtained a majority of legal votes. He had also been advised that Sir William was not eligible as member, having been two years absent in the East Indies and not likely to return during that parliament. A petition to the same effect was sent up by a number of the freemen (electors). The petitions were duly referred to the Committee of Privileges and Elections, but before any decision

* See vol. i., p. 148.

was made, Parliament was again dissolved. Sir William Norris was not put forward this time, William Clayton and Thomas Johnson being elected, apparently without opposition.*

In January, 1699, the members for the borough (Norris and Clayton) were desired to procure an Act of Parliament to make Liverpool a parish of itself, quite separate from Walton, to erect a church, etc., and the Act was passed.†

William Norris was made a baronet on December 3, 1698, to give him some pre-eminence suitable to his mission in India. The title became extinct on October 10, 1702. The King after reciting his care for Ireland and specially for the prosperity of Ulster, including due provision of troops for its protection from enemies or sedition, and reciting how James I. had instituted the order of Baronets as a dignity suitable for those who assisted in this matter in a special degree, declares that he regards as worthy of this honour his beloved and faithful William Norris of Speake in Lancashire, Esquire, whom he is sending as ambassador to the Mogul Emperor (ad Mogolum Imperatorem), and has created him a baronet, being worthy by his family, patrimony, position and good conduct, and in particular by maintaining thirty foot soldiers in our army in Ireland for three years.‡ (The patent goes on to recite the descent of the dignity to heirs male, precedence, and other formal matters.) He is to be made a knight immediately after the Letters Patent are ready.§

A farewell letter written before his departure as ambassador to the Indies announces that he has been offered a baronetcy, but had hesitated; having no children, he had been allowed to name a successor to his title: and

* See Journals of the House of Commons, vol. xiii.

† See pp. 342-3 of the Touzeau's "Rise and Progress of Liverpool."

‡ The words about paying soldiers for Ireland are only part of the regular formula, and mean only that he paid a considerable sum into the Exchequer.

§ Patent Roll 3398. 10 William III., Part I., No. 13. See also p. 176, vol. IV., 1665-1707 of G. E. Cockayne's "Complete Baronetage." William Pollard and Co., Ltd., Exeter, 1904. The above is an abstract of the Letters Patent creating the baronetcy.

should have wished to name Thomas Norris. But the piracy of Captain Kidd necessitating his immediate departure, he had not been able to delay his answer, and had listened to the advice of his brothers, who thought Thomas would not appreciate the honour. He has accepted it for himself.

LONDON,
Nov. 29th, 1698.

HONR[D] S[R],

It will be now but a very few days before I shall embarke in order to my voyage, soe lay hold of oportunitys of takinge leave of my Freindes by degrees not havinge the hapynesse satisfaction or Time to take my leave any other way then by letter, & have soe much businesse on my hands that I have but very little command of that Time I have left soe least I should be disappointed of bidinge you farewell if I deferrd it longer I take this oportunity of wishinge you & your Lady all the hapynesse this World can afford & return my hearty thankes for all your favours:

The Lords Justices on Saturday last wholly unknown to me were pleased to passe a complement, & much bejoynd (*i.e.* beyond) either my Ambition or expectation, & contrary to my desire surprizd me with a peice of Honour I little dreamt of: & had signd an order for a patent for a Baronet before ever they soe much as intimated their intentions, as soone as they made me acquainted with it by their Secretary I waited on them all to return my thankes for the greate honour they designd me but sincerly begd they would excuse me from it, they were please[d] to say my character as the King's Embassadour extraordinary requird it, & that this was the only single Instance of any Badge of Honour conferrd for these severall yeares by the Lords Justices & beinge soe & the only one that would be bestowd they did this out of a particulare Respect & hopd I would take it as such, & accept of it, & were soe farr farther obliginge that they offerd me to have it incerted in the patent in case I dyd without Issue to have the honour goe where I would nominate but gave me but from Saturday to Munday to apoint how I would have it entayld because all expedition is usd to have me gon with all speed upon account of some pyracys that have lately been committed upon the Mogulls ships by one Captain Kidd an English man: It was in my thoughts forthwith to have namd you & your Heires but durst not venter on my own Leade without farther consultation with Brother Harry and

Brother Doctour by whom I was resolvd to be concluded in this point to act most suitable to your inclinations & upon weighinge circumstances they were of opinion that you might thinke it a Loade upon your posterity as what would occasion greater Retinue & expence & soe forbore to have you incerted: I must confesse in my own particulare had I ever A son livinge, or att present in any liklyhood, I would by no meanes have been persuaded to accept of it but scince in all probability it will cease with me & I could not handsomely avoid it being soe pressd to it as a particulare instance of honour & their favour & beinge Knighted must unavoidably have hapned, I thought it would be a badge of greater honour to our Family to have the bloody Hand then otherwise, consideringe it was bestowd not only without my seeking but contrary to my Inclination: If the patent could have been stopt till I could have heard from you it should, but havinge both my Brothers opinion not ventringe to rely on my own I hope wee have done as you desird: The winds have been contrary a longe time and kept the Kinge in Holland soe that parliament which by apointment mett to day was farther prorougd to the 6th instant I am not resolvd yett whether I shall carry the patent when it has passd the broade seale with me or send it down to you to be reservd if I dy for no dishoounarable marke to posterity Deare Sir I have nothinge more to add but my best Respects and sincere Love & service to your Lady & your selfe wishing you all health & hapynesse & if it be Gods will a happy meetinge I am

Your most Affectionate Brother
Faithfull Friend & very
humble Servant Wm Norris.

As to my annuity you may please to pay it to my wife & if it please God I should Dy & you make any payment in your own wronge she will refund it: as soone as she knows it:

And soe once more I take my leave
& Adieu

This letter is endorsed in Thomas Norris's hand:

"Sir Wm Norris letter ordering to pay the £20 per annum his Annuaty to his lady whilest he is at the Indes."

PEDIGREE.*

Sir William Norris, Kt., aged 23 in 1524; d. 1568.

Edward, aged 28 in 1568; d. 1606.

Sir William, K.B., died 1630. A recusant.

William, d. 1651. A recusant.

- Edward, a royalist, d. 1644 or 1645.
  - Edward, d. young.
- Thomas, aged 46 in 1664. A royalist; d. 6th July, 1686. m. Katherine, dau. of Sir Henry Garraway.
  - Thomas, aged 11 in 1664; d. 1700.
    - Mary, who succeeded to the Speke estates after the death of her Uncle Richard in 1730.
  - Sir William, Bart., aged 6 in 1664; d. 1702.
  - John. Henry, d. 1702. Edward, M.D., d. 1726.
  - Jonathan, born at Childwall, 1667. Richard, born 25th August, 1670; d. 18th August, 1730 (the writer or recipient of most of the Norris letters).
  - Margaret. Ann. Katherine. Elizabeth.
- William. Christopher. James.
- Margaret.

CHAPTER II

HIS MAJESTY'S COMMISSION TO SIR WILLIAM NORRIS TO BE HIS AMBASSADOR TO THE GREAT MOGUL

SIR WILLIAM'S commission as Ambassador was dated at Kensington, January 1, 1698. The King expressed his desire to establish "a friendly and good understanding" with the Great Mogul and other Princes of India, so that his subjects trading there might have some benefit from it. Sir William therefore had full power not only to negotiate but to "agree and conclude" with those Princes and their ministers all things necessary for the good understanding desired and for obtaining such "Capitulations, Priviledges

* See also the pedigree of Edward Baine's Lancashire Croston edition, vol. iv.

and Immunities" for British traders as might conduce to their safety and profitable trading in India. All the agreements so made by Sir William would be ratified by the King:

"William the Third by the grace of God King of England Scotland France and Ireland Defender of the faith, To all to whome these present Letters shall come, Whereas Wee have determined to send an Ambassador to the greate Mogul and other Princes in India for the establishing a friendly and good understanding with the said Princes and for promoteing the advantage and benefitt of our Subjects tradeing to those parts, Know you That Wee reposing speciall Trust and confidence in the fidelity and prudence of our Trusty and wellbeloued S^r^ William Norris Bart have nominated constituted and appointed and doe hereby nominate constitute and appoint him to be our said Ambassador Commissioner and Porcurator, Giving and granting to him full power and authority to conferr negotiate and treate in our name with the said Mogul and other Princes in India and their respective Ministers and Servants and to agree and conclude with them all such Matters and things as shall be necessary and convenient for establishing and confirming the said friendship and good understanding with the Princes aforesaid, and for procuring for our Subjects such Capitulations, Priviledges and Immunities and Settlements in their severall Dominions as may conduce to their Security, and advantageous carrying on of their Trade and Comerce in those parts, and to doe and execute all other things which doe belong and appertain to the said S^r^ W^m^ Norris as our Ambassador, Commissioner and Procurator, Promising by these Presents, and giving our Royall Word that Wee will ratify confirm and approve the same, and that Wee will truly perform All such things as shall be Stipulated and agreed by him on our Part in the Matters aforesaid.

Given at Our Palace at Kensington the First Day of January, One Thousand Six hundred ninety Eight In the Tenth year of our Reigne, Under our Hand and our greate Seale of England.

W^M^ R."

The instructions given to Sir William Norris on his appointment were dated December 31, 1698. He and his suite were to embark immediately on the ships provided

by the King, which ships would convey them to a suitable port in the Mogul's dominions, and then be employed in suppressing the pirates who infested the Indian Seas. He was, after landing, to proceed as quickly as possible to the Mogul's Court, taking care to inform himself as to the procedure there observed, and "on all occasions to preserve the honor and dignity" of his character as Ambassador.

(*To be continued.*)

"THE CHILDREN."

By Arthur Vincent.

This story is born of retrospect. It is also a story virtually without a moral. There may be food for reflection in Rogers' faith in simple people, also his forecast of the Marri tribe's behaviour in the late war may be of use to the people who have to handle them during the next international drama. With those exceptions, however, the tale may be set down at once as quite useless in this calculating, hard-hearted, devil-take-the-hindmost age.

Still, in all the celestial joy of our splendid post-war millennium, when the "war to end war" has brought us a cornucopia of strife, political dissension, crushing taxes, and world-wide unrest, there be some of us who care at times to retrocede awhile from such Olympian bliss, and to meditate for a few stolen moments upon the fairness of all things in that peace which we knew and loved before the old world toppled to pieces in 1914.

In just such a frame of mind, latterly, I threw the day's issue of the "shriek" Press into the fire, retired to the quietness of my study, and sought solace in poring over the dog-eared old maps and diary which recalled so strongly and so vividly the events of a few all too brief days eight long years ago. I found that it pleased me to remember, it may please others. Let them judge.

In September, 1914, long before India saw aught of the true dimensions of the struggle upon which we had embarked, I had at my disposal some three weeks' leave. The medical profession forbade, point blank, my active participation in the war, albeit that was, as of a quondam soldier, where my heart was. Ever since August 5 I had chafed at my position. Almost daily I saw the coming and going of troops, many of my closest friends were already on the