Life in a Country Manse about 1720

IN a pocket book of homely and homemade appearance clad in a cover made doubtless from the skin of one of his own flock—ovine not human—Mr. James Laurie, the minister of Kirkmichael has noted down from the years 1711 to 1732 memoranda of his income and expenses, his bonds, his bills, drugs he used, wages he paid, crops he reaped, books he bought, bargains he made. For twenty frugal years this venerable little note-book served him, and after the lapse of 180 years it may also serve us; for it affords glimpses of the quaint quiet rural life of Scotland in the early part of the eighteenth century.

Mr. James Laurie, who had laureated in Glasgow, and was in 1711 ordained minister of Kirkmichael in Ayrshire, was son of Mr. John Laurie who after prudently evading the 'Killing Times' in Scotland by serving a presbyterian congregation in Ireland, became after the Revolution successively minister of Penpont and Auchinleck.

Kirkmichael, with a population of 700 souls, in those days was a remote parish through which ran tracks over the moors to Maybole and Ayr. There was no village then but only little clachans. There were stretches of heather and bog, in which forty years before covenanters had sought shelter from the malignant pursuers; there were pastures and lands reclaimed from the marshes, on which were grown poor grey oats and beer or barley, struggling for existence with thistles and wild mustard; there were the heather-covered hovels, in which the crofters lived in peat-reeked rooms or 'spences,' hardly divided from the 'ben' in which the cows and the poultry had a malodorous sleeping place. Here and there were the mansions of lairds which were sheltered by clumps of trees, which alone relieved the bare woodless landscape. These dwellings were mostly homely and unpretentious. Though there were one or two of more importance, such as Kirkmichael

House, near to the manse, which an old writer describes 'as desirable a dwelling in all the country having good gardens and orchards, the first in Carrick planted with peaches and apricocks.' The manse, like most of the ministers' dwellings of those days, would be thatched, with a kailyard in front, the narrow little windows half glazed, giving dim light through walls three feet thick to the low chambers and four rooms which were divided by wooden partitions. Here resided a family consisting of the minister and his wife (Mistress Ann Orr 'that was,'), sister Betty, and four boys and three girls. Three women servants and a serving man, who slept over the byre, with a herd lassie completed the household.

A stipend of £80 was not wealth beyond the dreams of avarice for the most frugal establishment. But even this income was hard to get. Some lairds are hard up, and they pay with difficulty the teinds of 'white' or silver money, or 'victual,' in oatmeal and bere; and sometimes three years pass by before the minister is fully paid up his due of meal or money. He takes horse to Dinduff, and there he gets counted out 'three golden guineas and a banknote,' but for the rest he is obliged to accept a bill, and some 'precepts.' From prosperous Sir John Ferguson of Kilkerran he gets in 1721 'nine pounds and 3 and 20 pence and four and a plack,' which is supplemented by a bill. Impecuniosity being the badge of all their tribe, some of the heritor lairds adopt the plan of giving the minister their 'precepts,' or orders on their tenants who were to pay out of their rents the proportion of stipend allocated to their farms, and these men in turn put him off sometimes with a bill. To the farmers therefore the poor minister had to apply yearly for their shares of teinds, a few bolls meal from one, some pecks from another, and there were usually some firlots wanting when brought by grudging tenants to the door. The victual stipend arrived in sacks or creels on horseback—2 bolls forming the 'load' of a horse—and was deposited in the girnal at the back of the manse, with divisions to contain malt, meal, grey oats, white oats, beer and horse corn, which might get musty or eaten by rats before it was used, so that it was better to bargain for 'white seed corn instead of meal.'

Nor were the heritors more willing to keep the manse in repair than they are to keep its owner in money. The session or minister must look after it when it goes into decay, though the window panes are broken and the casements are rotten.

To this the pocket book gives testimony, when it notes in March, 1730,—'payd William Simson 4 shillings and sixpence for the window in my room, 12 foot of glass, and mending ane old window. Gave John Goudie half a crown for the casement, item 4 shillings to John Goudie for a casement and broads to ye south window in my room and in the low chamber, item to George Montgomery four and forty pence for glass to one of the side of ye windows in the low room, and glass to the clock and setting other glass in ye rest of the windows.' All which shows there was discomfort at the manse. It is true the cost of living was not great, for the times were simple and the wants were few. Wool or grey plaiding woven by the weaver made the clothes for the minister and his boys, though he had a coat of blue broad cloth for solemn occasions; a gown of 'Musselburgh stuff' for ordinary wear satisfied the mistress of the house, made by the tailor[1] from a neighbouring clachan, and woollen petticoats and other undergarments were made at home. Judging from the memoranda, shoes seem to have been a constant requirement, and from their cheapness it is not surprising they needed often to be renewed. Shoes for the minister or his wife cost £1 4s. Scots or 2s. sterling, while those for the youngsters cost only one shilling, and they are 'soaled' for 4d. per pair. For £4 4s. Scots five pairs are made for 'the bairns'—Molly, Annie, James, John, and Nelly. It was however far more economical to get the shoemaker and his man to come to the manse and work for some days, the wages being about 4d. a day each and their meat. These were great occasions when the cobbler or tailor was expected at the manse, bringing news and gossip for the servants from Maybole. In preparation for their coming the minister set in for their use a quantity of bend leather, a pound of hemp and rosin, and there were tanned skins of his herd to use. It is noted that in August, 1716, 'James Niven and his servant wrought nine days for which I gave him 6 and 4 pence (6¼d. sterling) per day and seven pence for timber heels. They made 2 pair shoes for me, 2 for my wife, 2 to my sister Betty, 2 to Molly, one pair to Annie, 2 pair to Alexander Kennedy

[1] That there were tailors as well as weavers in some little clachans is shown by the Session books: 'Sept. 2, 1693. The Session appoints John Forgan to employ a Straiton tailor to make a coul or covering of sackcloth for the said Janet Kennedy, like unto that which they have in Straiton, there having been no such thing here for these many years it's thought none of the tailors of the parish can make it.'

[the serving man], one pair to Margaret Smith, one pair to Katrin Maclennan, one pair to Margaret Brewster the herd lassie.' Here are thirteen pairs of single soled shoes in nine days for the small sum of 4s. 9d.

Under August, 1722, we find a similar entry characteristic of bygone days. 'David Gibson with his man came on Tuesday morning and wrought till Tuesday 12 o'clock, and made a pair of slippers for myself, 2 pair cloath slippers for my wife, 2 pair shoes for Betty, a pair to Molly, Annie, and Johnnie; 2 pair to Charles [serving man], so he has got all the shoes I owe him when Martinmas is come. A pair to Janet Macgowan which is all she wants till Martinmas is come; a pair to Sarah and a pair of shoes is owing her against Martinmas, 2 pair to Margaret Macnicol which pays all her shoes, and a pair to Janet Morton.' The wages of each man being only one groat or victual a day, fifteen pairs of slippers and shoes are wondrously cheap at the money.

In the house are living and feeding three women servants as active in the byre and the field as in the kitchen, and a man who has to look after the garden and the glebe, to plough, to reap, to thresh corn, and fodder the cattle.

The women's wages were from £5 or £6 Scots (between 8s. and 10s.) the half year, and a pair of shoes or an apron, while the man has £7 Scots, a pair of shoes and a sark, and each gets 6d. as 'arles.' These 'shoon,' however, were not in constant use; barefooted the women would go about the house, barefooted they would walk to kirk or market, till they came in sight of the kirkyard or town, when they would put on the ill-fitting shoes, which were slung round their necks, and hobble into company. In winter time, when snow lay over the fields and moors, and the rude rugged roads were impassable by coach or horse, and there was a cessation of outdoor work for maid and man, the manse household was busy indoors. The serving man, after foddering the sheep and cattle, at night would be mending his shoes or double soleing his brogues. The women, with Mrs. Laurie and Mistress Betty, were engaged in making yarn and thread on the 'big wheel' and the 'little wheel,' and the spinning wheel whirred all day long, distracting the minister engaged on his sermons or Poole's Synopsis in his book-room, with constant clatter of tongues and treadles that sounded through the wooden partitions. Every now and again the pedlar would come with his tempting pack, and the weaver

seeking 'customers work,' and they buy some of the yarn or thread made in the manse; while from the weaver are bought '13 ells of Kilmarnocks 2d. happen the ell, 36 ells linen, and 27 ells bairns sarks,' and 'broad cloath 14 ells at 3 happens the yard.' It was not then beneath the dignity of ladies to sell their home-made wares, and to the laird's wife at Kilikie are sold '36 dozen ells of yarn,' and it is noted that 'my wife received from Lady Killhenzie '14 shilling for her cloath napery.' The servants are furnished with an apron or petticoat to be 'deduced' from their wages. There is also the linen to be bleached by David Mitchell, 'the bleetching of 21 coarse linnen, 8 pennies per ell being £1 10s. Scots,' and cloth to be dressed. The stuff for this home industry was easily got, for the minister has a flock to supply wool for the yarn, he has flax growing on the glebe to provide lint for the spindle.

One of the labours for the serving man was that of carting peats from the moor; but there were also coals to fetch from Keirhill heugh, which in those days when carts were unknown and unusable on the ruts and tracks of stones and mire and ditch that served as roads, were conveyed in creels on horses' backs. The meagre ill-thriven animals could only bear meagre burdens, and a 'load' was only 3 cwt., which was all they could carry. It was therefore a tedious operation to get a supply of fuel. We find in the MS. book such entries as these in the years 1722 and 1724. 'Payd John Brackenrig eleven pounds twelve pence happeny for 98 load of coals,' 'to 56 loads £5 18s.,' '44 loads £4 16s.,' and we have in mind a vision of the long weary succession of horses crawling backwards and forwards with their creels of coals, each of which is only worth 11d., and for fetching each 2 loads John or Jamie Gilbert is paid a groat.

Money was always scarce in Scotland in those days; gold was rarely seen, silver was grudgingly used, and in transactions with tradesmen they were as much as possible paid in kind. The weaver was often paid by the minister partly in grain, some firlots of meal, and a sheep or calf skin. From the shoemaker's account is 'deduced' the sum he owes Mr. Laurie for a stirk skin, 2 cowskins and a cuddock skin valued at from 10d. or a shilling. David M'Rotchart the smith has taken off his account—'for a veal [a calf] £3, making a wheelbarrow 12s., a saith, a sned and a stroake 8s.,'—a charge for 10 pecks of meal and skins of stirks or stotts.

From the humble entries of purchases made we can construct a picture of the old Kirkmichael home life, where living was not costly and ways were simple. When the minister goes to Maybole his expenses are only 6d. Four hens are bought for 16s. Scots (1s. 4d. stg.), a dozen eggs for 2½d., a hen 2½d., a stone of cheese 3s. 4d. The purchases are on a microscopic scale, which translated from the Scots money to English represent for raisins 1d., for sugar ½d., 2 libs. of sugar 1s., for spinning yarn ½d., to stearch and ane ounce of sugar 2½d., for tobacco 3 farthings; 'for ¼ lib. soape and eggs, 5½d.; for coals, 4s. 8d.' To tobacco to coals 2d., thread 1d., to gunpowder ½d., for 4 napers at Maybole, giving my sister for eggs 3d., for egs' 1d. When the minister sets off for Ayr he is laden with orders, and comes back with his wallet and saddle bags laden with purchases. He has spent for plaiding £1 4s. Scots. The same sum to his wigmaker to mend his wig, and '£1 1s. for making my coat,' and there is 1s. 8d. sterling miscellaneously spent, 'for tobacco, horse, soape, sugar candie.' The frequent mention of 2d. for ale, 4d. for ale, represent the sums for 'drink money' given to each workman, to those who called with a message, or to those who called with a bill. There is also one article which is often bought, though in minute quantities—sugar candy, which is put in curious conjunction, such as 'for egs and sugar candie 1s. 6d.' (or 1½d.). This article was used not only for cooking, but for the making of drugs and electuaries, doubtless to relieve their loathsome tastes, and hide their more objectionable ingredients. Sugar was not needed for tea-drinking, for that custom was long of springing up; but in 1724 we find the new fashion penetrating the manses of Ayrshire, though a lb. of Bohea cost 24 shillings, and Mrs. Laurie and her family having resolved to become *à la mode*, the minister has invested in a whole set of tea-table equipage. He notes down 'the price of ye lime,'—'lime' meaning loam or earthenware.

4 large dishes for milk, - - -	£1	14	0
Milk pot, - - - - - - -	0	4	0
Tea pot, - - - - - - -	0	6	0
Dozen cups and saucers or plates, 2d. happeny p. piece, - - -	1	10	0

At the same time he buys 'a decanter 9s., 5 parringers at 2½d. a piece, 2 hand basons 12s., a lap bason 3s., and 10 plates at 2d. pr. piece,' and the cupboard is thus anew set up. It is in Edinburgh when attending the General Assembly that he finds

an opportunity of buying such additions to the household garnishing, which are sent by the carrier in his creels, with 'a letter 8d.,' 'my saddle from Edinburgh 6s. Scots.'

It is March and there are vegetables to be put in the yard at home, and from the seeds he buys we know the contents of the manse garden: 'ane ounce spinage 3s., 1 ounce beet shard 3s., ½ ounce parsley 1s., 2 drms. colliflower 8d., 2 drs. lettuce 1s., ane ounce carrots 3d., ane ounce parsnips 3d., ½ ounce cresses 1s., ½ ounce of salary 3d., 2 ounce early turnips, half ane ounce yellow turnips, 1 pound turkey beans, 1 lib. peas 6d.' Potatoes were not yet grown in the garden, and were but an expensive luxury which is noted only in one entry—'£6 for cheese and potatoes.' In front of the manse, which was bare as the treeless country, lay the kailyard, its culinary contents relieved by some flowers, and when the minister is in Edinburgh he gets seed to replenish his borders—'Africa marigold, amaranthus, sunflower, stock jelly flower, coxcomb, luppyns bleu and yellow, double holly oaks, bella donna.' With these and many other articles, Mr. James Laurie, dressed in long blue coat with ample skirts, jack boots on legs, many-curled wig and three-cornered hat on head, would leave the Grassmarket hostelry, where there was less entertainment for man than for beast, and amble homewards to Ayrshire.

These were days when the country was poor, when the people were very poor, and when beggars abounded. Passing over the roads a constant succession of sturdy sorners lived on the good nature and credulity of farmer, cottar, and laird. The alms were more ready than lavish—a handful of meal or a sup of kail. At Kirkmichael manse they made their appearance, and the minister dispensed charity, more from the poor-box than his own purse, and the supplicants departed thankful for extremely small mercies. In August, 1722, for example, are given 'to 2 poor seamen broke at Greenock 3 happens; 2 sick women 2d.; to a poor sick man with a large family of children from Kintyre a penny.' Next month is 'payd a shilling for maintaining the woman in prison'—doubtless committed to the 'theives' hole' of Ayr by the Presbytery's orders. In days when Scots ships sailed to Portugal and the Levant with their cargoes of woollen stuffs, dried salmon and salted herring, they were often pounced upon by the Tarifa pirates, who, disgusted with the miserable plunder, sold their crews into slavery in Algiers and Barbary. After sore hardships

some escaped or were bought from their Moslem masters, and arrived on their native shores in rags and hunger, bearing on their bodies the marks of brutal usage in maimed limbs and tongueless mouths. These poor wretches were the objects of special commiseration and won charity from kirk and house, though in donations which reveal more the poverty than generosity of the age. Such 'supplicants' at Kirkmichael manse were sent, if not full, at least not empty away, as the disbursements of Mr. Laurie from the session's poor-box show. 'To a poor man taken a slave in Algiers 6s.'—alias ½d. sterling; 'To a slave from Algiers, dumb, 2d.'

The stipend of Kirkmichael was small. The family was increasing, but Mr. James Laurie was a prosperous, shrewd man, eager over his grain and his cattle, his bonds and his bills. He had besides his glebe, land or 'mailings' in other parts of his parish which he stocks for grazing. In 1723 he has at Glastron '11 gimmers, 4 ews, 5 dinmonts, 13 lambs, 1 tup—all marked above the ears'; he has also there '3 queys, a stot 2 years old, 4 stirks, 1 stot white faced'; besides 'Johnnie has a ew and a ew lambe.' A groat is paid to a crofter for each beast he grazes in summer. In 1722 'It is agreed betwixt William Goudie in Glastron and the minister of Kirkmichael that he shall take charge of ye cattell, horse, nolt, and sheep, and herd them till Martinmas, and oversee the making of fold dikes and mend them when failing and assist at the hay, and to have for his pains a horse grass, and 2 cows' grass and a stirk, the house and yard, and 2 bolls meall.' There being in those days of rude agriculture no enclosures of fields, no fences, dikes or hedges, the cattle needed to be herded night and day lest they should stray on the crops of the neighbours; but when harvest was over they could wander and pasture anywhere as on common ground till Martinmas. Then there was a slaughter of sheep and oxen for the mart of salted meat, which kept families supplied with monotonous fare till June came round, while the surviving beasts were kept shut up in byres till in April they issued forth blear-eyed, starved, emaciated, tottering with weakness. No wonder in this little note-book we have entries such as this: 'June 3, 1720. Dead 6 ewes, remaining five; 2 last year's lambs dead, 6 alive.'

Here is another of those engagements with servants, duly witnessed and signed in excruciating cacography, which are interesting as relics of bygone fashions. In 1727 'there is an

agreement between John Kennedy and the minister of Kirkmichael. The said John Kennedy is to work all days of the year to me at Avonsou, and if occasion offer sometimes a day or two here which is to say he is to oversee the herd, flit the folds, weed corn, shear and bind in harvest, oversee the cattel after harvest, in winter to thresh and fodder the nolt, and oversee the sheep, and plough the land and cut down the haye and help to win it, for which I give him a house and yard, 2 cows grass and their followers, 2 ackers of land ploughed and harried, the proof for threshing.' Sometimes the wages are varied, to '2 acres of land, an aiker of croft of the 3rd crop 4 bolls and ½ meall a house and yard, 2 pair of shoes,' 'a peck of meal out of each stack for foddering cattel, and right of hoof to bring home 18 loads of coals.' Carefully is noted the produce of every stack. This one 'is proved' to 9 bolls; that has 'corn dighted 7 bolls and a half dried for meal,' and there is a fee allowed for 'proof of threshing,' of 3 pecks or '7 pecks, a forpit, and a handsell.' The price of a boll of meal was £6 13s. 4d. Scots, a boll of bere £8. A boll of corn is about £6 Scots, sometimes six merks.

The prices at which the beasts were bought vary little year by year; but the small value set on them was due to their miserable kind—small and meagre. From William Goudie are bought 'a cow, 2 queys, and a sheep for £3 sterling. The cow 13 lib. (Scots), the queys 9 lib. a piece, the sheep 5 pounds.' From another 'ane cow 20 merk old but good mouth.' From David M'Laren 'a quey for 11 pound, another at a guinea 6 weathers 42 pence a piece,' and 'from Adam Grieve five weathers eleven groats a piece.' By selling his beasts—dead or alive—('Thos. Mactaggart owes me four pounds for ye half of ye carecass of a stot')—he increased his little fortune, and besides that he had the skins of the dead to sell, which he gave in part payment to his weaver, shoemaker, and smith. But he had need for many of these skins for himself, and he sends them to be dressed, barked or tanned by the shoemaker, and these are used when the shoemaker and his man come to work for 7 or 9 days at the manse as leather to make shoes for the family. There is £1 10s. Scots for tanning a cowskin, £1 for dressing the skin of a codoch (which is a heifer), and the hide of the pony. Nothing is wasted in the household. There was grain more than enough from his land, and also from the victual stipend that replenished his girnal. So he pays with it his tradesmen; he exchanges superfluous meal for malt for brewing, and supplies the neighbours

and cottars that call at the manse to buy portions of grain—from the laird of Killikie, who sends his men and 6 horses for 12 bolls of meal, at 8 merks the boll, to Widow Airds, who comes to buy 2 pecks. Some cot-houses he had to let to the poor. Mary Agnew gets a kiln to live in, with a yard, grass for a cow and a calf, 'for which she is to pay £7 Scots, 3 days shearing, and as many peats as a man casts in a day.'

Prosperous, the minister has more bonds than debts. The Burgh Records of Lanark show that he had in 1727 sold to the Town Council a tenement for £100, and the impecunious state of the burgh is shown by the difficulty of finding a man to become security for paying the money. Nor were the gentry abounding in funds—their rents being mostly paid 'in kind,' to raise a few pounds often drove them to their wits' ends. There was no bank from which to borrow except in Edinburgh, and when money did come in there was no secure place to place it, and it was lent to some well-to-do baker or general merchant in a town, or borrowed from a better off neighbour at 5 per cent. So it happens the laird of Dinduff, who pays his minister largely by bills and precepts and victual, is driven to give a bond to him for 3000 merks borrowed from him—a sum which seems supplied by his mother-in-law ; his brother-in-law, William Smith of Boggend, is obliged to seek his aid for sums of 100 merks now and again, for which the 5 per cent. interest is duly exacted. When one luckless gentleman is unable to pay back in silver a bond for £10, the debt is cleared by Mr. Laurie allowing him for books and brandy—'Tillotson and Barrow's *Sermons*, Howe's *Living Temple*, Walker's *Gift of Prayer and Preaching*, etc. ; also a cask of brandy containing 22 pints, 25 pence per pint [a Scots pint equal to 2 quarts English], 2 casks and a chopin of brandy at 1s. 3d., a firkine of soape at £1 1s., and a hat 9s.' By which transaction it is clear that the minister had made a very good bargain. Yet even he is forced to borrow at times, and does so from Sister Betty, a spinster evidently as shrewd at affairs as himself, who lends her money also at 5 per cent. When she goes to England, however, she needs 36 merks for her journey, and she calls up £2 7s. 'which Betty says is not payd'—reminds him of sums for muslin and wages, and 4d. owing for pins, needles, and knitting thread. There is also mention of money borrowed by him from the poor-box, for which a bond is given and the usual interest paid.

However engrossed in bullocks and bonds, in corn and

crops, the minister of Kirkmichael had interests also of a wider and more intellectual range. There were signs of learning and culture in the old manse. The shelves of the little book room were well filled, and groaned under their ponderous load of calf-bound folio and quarto. There are volumes in Latin and Hebrew, in Greek and French, as well as English—there are theology and history, and classics and plays. Clearly he was one of the new school, denounced for their profane morality by the fanatical ministers then abounding in the church. He owns only one of the saintly and grim Mr. Thomas Boston's works. There are church Fathers like Ambrose and Augustine, puritan Fathers like Owen, Reynolds, and Goodwin, Anglican divines such as Tillotson and Barrow; and foreign theologians, Turretin, Cocceius, and Calvin, lie side by side with Arminius, which displays a fairly catholic religious taste. The wanton Mr. Wycherley's plays in folio, with the portrait of the worldly handsome face under a huge flowing wig prefacing the title page, stand unblushingly in the shelves between Baxter's *Saints' Everlasting Rest* and Taylor's *Holy Living*. Nor was the worthy minister a niggard of his books: he had nothing in him of the curmudgeon spirit of the jealous bibliopolic abbé of Paris who inscribed over his library door the forbidding legend: 'Go to them that sell and buy for yourselves.' No: to neighbouring ministers and lairds less furnished than himself he lends his volumes freely, and marks in his note-books to whom he has given them, though the note, reproachful to some entries, 'I do not know who has this,' shows that his kindness was not always fairly requited. We can learn from him what was the sort of mental provender those old times fed on; the stern Sabbath reading which made the evening preluded by two prolix sermons and a lecture deplorably dull, and sent the most sound and 'awakened Christians' soundly to sleep. The Rev. Mr. Fairweather of Maybole has ridden off with the folios of Manton on St. Matthew and Hutcheson on Job behind him. Sir Adam Whitefoord has Diodatus' *Annotations*. The more worldly laird of Dinduff has borrowed *Athenian Sports*; while Sir John Ferguson of Kilkerran's son, evidently a student at Edinburgh, procures a Goldeman's *Dictionary*, Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, and *Cornelius Nepos* in English and Latin. The student son of another laird gets from his minister Homer, Buxtorf's *Hebrew Dictionary* and Puffendorf's *De Officiis*. Others have got to read Sackeverell's *Tryal*,

Vertot's *History of Sweden*, and Boyer's *French Dictionary* to consult and *Look before ye leap*. More pious-minded neighbours seek from the shelves spiritual nourishment in the shape of the godly Mr. Durham's *Heaven on Earth*, Henry on *Sobermindedness*, Reynolds' *Vanity of the Creature* and Sibbe's *Bowels of Believers Opened*,—that work of fragrant piety familiarly and elliptically known as 'Sibb's Bowels.' The physician, Dr. Stevenson from Maybole, takes away with him, after drugging the children, *Religio Medici* and, less appropriately, Catullus, Ditton on the Resurrection and *Moses' evidence of things not seen*. The minister's mother seeks repose of mind in Watson's *Art of Contentment*. It is sad that the worthy man has to look on empty spaces where a volume of Cocceius or Flavell or Augustine has been lost or never returned, making an ugly, memorable and lamentable gap in the shelves. Liberal as he was in his views and with his books, the Session Records show that he was not lax as a pastor. It is ordered that culprits at the Kirk are never to appear except in sackcloth, and 'the adulteress has there to stand for eight Sundays,' having been first examined on the principles of religion and repentance by the minister and session. In 1711 it is appointed that there is to be a diet for prayer at the manse on Monday. In the old Kirk, surrounded with ash trees (on one of which the bell hung), besides the two long services on Sabbath, there was preaching every fortnight on week days 'except during ploughing and harvest.'

To the manse of Kirkmichael troubles and ailments came now and again, which called for the aid of the doctor. Dr. Stevenson from Maybole would arrive with his saddle-bag full of concoctions and electuaries, his lancets for blood-letting, and his sand-glass for timing the pulse bulging out his ample coat skirts. This old sheep-clad pocket book is careful to record some of the invaluable recipes of the esteemed chirurgeon, which, however, give but faint notion of the preposterous pharmacopœia of the age. The ailments mentioned are mostly simple and infantile; and that is fortunate, for in those days the remedies were worse than the diseases. 'For outstricking (that is eruption) in children take a halfe muscele or mother-of-pearl shell and burn it over a pite [peat] fire till it turn quite white make it into a powder, take of it ane ounce and of the powder of slaters [wood lice] two ounces,' with other ingredients which are illegible, to be thrown into a pewter dish till they are dry. For Annie is prescribed 'a handful of

red rose leaf, ane ounce of oake, make a strong decoction into a chopin.' 'For wind in the body or to purge the wind out of the veins take of indian rhubarb ane ounce in fine powder of carvie seed; as much same of liquorice, ounce of white sugar candie. Mix it well in a closs box, take as much at a time as a twelve pence white money will hold three times a day.' Not even was the manse of Kirkmichael free from that ill to which (Scots) flesh was heir to—namely the itch, that plebeian affliction which had no respect of persons, caught from contact with a peasantry more godly than cleanly, and by intercourse at parish schools where children of the highest rank rubbed shoulders with the poorest. Dr. Stevenson prescribes for the cure of Johnnie from this ignoble complaint 'two grains of mercury in the morning, 3 at night, 3 nixt morning. Then nixt morning purge him out with ane infusion of a dram and a halfe of senna and halfe a dram of Crim. Tartar in a gill of hot water. Repeat this once again, then a decoction of woods for a moneth. If he have any outstricking [eruption] rub him with the ungentum citrinum betwixt the 2 courses'—the ungentum citrinum or 'yellow ointment' being composed of quicksilver, spirit of nitre mixed with a pound of melted hog's lard. Frequently the favourite concoctions were home made and home found, the ingredients being culled from the kailyard or marshes. When one of the family was troubled with a cough the simple remedy consisted in 'a handfull of tussilago [colt's foot], a handfull of nettles, a handfull of beir, a handfull of hoarhound, all boiled in three mutchkins of water to a chopin.' Rust of iron, seeds of wormwood, castile soap, gall of ram or bull are called into requisition to form Dr. Stevenson's precious prescriptions to cure everything from jaundice to 'sneezing.'

So the quiet life of the old times went on. When too old for the lessons in the thatched school to which children brought their supplies of rushes for the dirty floor and peats for the fire, the boys and girls of the manse would probably go to Maybole, to take lessons from Mr. John Millan, the 'master of manners and dancing.' There are the visits to be paid to neighbouring lairds and ministers, the wife riding pillion behind her husband, the serving man following with portmanteau. Guests arrive too, for whom there is provided not merely the ale brewed at the manse, but good wine, for his accounts

show that the minister has purchased in 1720 '14 pints at 20 pence per pint,' and in 1721 'ten pints and a chopin at £10 10s. and 3 pints strong wine for £4 10s.'

There were the frequent meetings of Presbytery held at Ayr, which lasted for days, discussing and examining witnesses on some familiar scandal. In 1717 they were long engaged on the case of Mr. Fairbrother of Maybole, whose trial shows that minister and lairds would meet to drink at the Maybole inn, consuming by 8 o'clock in the morning some chopins of wine and gills of whisky. These presbyterial labours were relieved by adjournments to Mrs. Hutchison's inn. There the members sat down to their mutton and hens, which they cut with the joctelegs or clasp knives which they brought with them, and drank out of pewter mugs of beverage which was not always the simple 'twopenny,' for we find Mr. Laurie, in 1729, as his share pays for presbytery dinners 'ten pounds ten shillings and a mutchkin brandy.'

It was in this simple style of living that our ancestors fared, probably as happy as in our more expensive and luxurious days. The Kirkmichael family grew up, some to go out of the world, some to go into the world. George and James go to Glasgow college, the first to become Dr. George Laurie of Loudon, afterwards the helpful friend of Robert Burns, the other to enter the army and die Colonel Laurie, Governor of the Mosquito Shore. It was in 1764 that Mr. James Laurie died, leaving a good name and some good money behind him.

Henry Grey Graham.

The Fiscal Policy of Scotland before the Union

FOR many reasons it is a matter of regret that the economic history of Scotland before the Union is as yet unwritten, and more especially since disputants in the present controversy are adducing the 'case of Scotland' as an argument. What is amusing in such references is that this appeal is made with confidence not by one side only but *by both.* For instance Mr. Balfour and Lord Rosebery, speaking from opposite standpoints, have quoted the fiscal conditions of the Union in support of their respective contentions. The former is reported to have said in his speech at Sheffield on October 1st: 'You will find many cases in which fiscal union has been the prelude to that closer and more intimate union which is the basis of national strength. I may mention, as a Scotsman, the case of England and Scotland. If any of you will consult your history you will see that what reconciled the smaller kingdom to union with the greater kingdom was no love of the being under a British Parliament, but the sense that it was absolutely necessary for national existence, or at least for national prosperity, that England and Scotland should be fiscally one, and that that union which should stand merely, so to speak, on a fiscal basis, has grown as we all know in a manner which has welded the two peoples together in an inseparable unit which it will not be possible for any hostile force to divorce.'[1] On the other side Lord Rosebery said in his speech on October 13th: 'As regards Scotland, I know something of that country. There was no fiscal union which promoted the Union. It was exactly the

[1] Mr. Chamberlain makes the same statement as a general proposition, *e.g.* when he said in his speech on November 18th, that 'in all previous cases commercial union preceded political union.' In the Introduction to his speeches (*Imperial Union and Tariff Reform*, p. ix.) reference is made to the 'commercial union which must *precede or accompany* closer political relations.'

reverse. Scotland was starved and coerced into union by the fiscal regulations of England—meant I am bound to say with no other object but to promote that Union. But is that the same as fiscal union preceding political union'?

Here it will be found that two political leaders dispute the historical insight each of the other. Whether fiscal union preceded political union or *vice versa*, or again, whether both were conditioned by the same causes are important points in the historical antecedents of the tariff controversy. Again, is it true that 'Scotland was starved and coerced into fiscal union with England'? Was there a tariff war between the two countries before the Union, and if so who was the aggressor? Finally, what was the effect of the protective system of Scotland before the Union, and how was that system modified after 1707? All these are important questions to which answers are required before any use is made of the historical argument from the fiscal relations (or absence of relations) of the two countries at the beginning of the eighteenth century.

Before attempting to answer any of the questions stated above it is necessary to remember that the fiscal system of Scotland, as it existed immediately before the Union, was the result of numerous causes which had begun to operate long before the Union, and for a right understanding of the situation it is necessary to investigate the reasons which brought these causes into existence. In fact, Scottish commercial policy at the end of the seventeenth century was due to influences that had begun to operate nearly a hundred years before, if not earlier.

In the last years of the sixteenth century the trade of the country was in an unsatisfactory condition. Internal dissensions had impeded commercial development, and foreign trade at that period consisted largely in the importation of finished manufactures, while raw materials and the products of the less developed industries were exported.[1] Under the prevalent mercantilist ideas of the period this was considered disadvantageous, and steps were taken to effect a remedy. The clearest exposition of the policy of the time is contained in a document drawn up by John Keymor with special reference to the existing circumstances. His results might be summed up in the maxim 'to rival the Dutch in the fishing industry and the English in the cloth trade,' and this line of thought dominated Scottish commercial policy

[1] *Edinburgh Merchants in the Olden Time*, by R. Chambers, pp. 9-16.

for the remainder of the century.[1] The encouragement of the fishing trade was spasmodic and produced few results. James I. authorised a Scottish Whale Fishing and India Company, but the patent was recalled owing to the opposition of the English East India and Russia Companies, which at that time were acting in partnership. An important fishing company was incorporated in the time of Charles I. with a series of subordinate associations to work in certain districts, but the venture resulted in serious loss to the shareholders. Then in 1670 another company was formed under the title of the Royal Fishing Company of Scotland, but it retired from business after the loss of the subscribed capital of £25,000 sterling.

The attempt to make indigenous the production of cloth was prosecuted more consistently, and apparently better results were eventually obtained. As early as the time of Mary the Edinburgh Town Council spent £68 6s. 8d. in bringing a number of foreign weavers with their families to Scotland.[2] Then before Keymor wrote, in the year 1601, the Privy Council had endeavoured to supply the deficiency in skill by importing seven Flemish weavers who were to give instruction. The usefulness of this scheme was impaired by the jealousy of the important towns, which disputed so long for the honour of the presence of the foreigners that the men were not employed and were in danger of starvation.[3] It was some time before they could obtain work, and they were frequently interrupted by the jealousy of the Edinburgh incorporated trades. Eventually they settled at Bonnington, where cloth was actually produced ; and, at intervals during the remainder of the century, there are records of the industry surviving at this place.[4] Again, in 1633, the magistrates of Peebles also endeavoured to move in the direction of improved technical education.[5] It must be a matter of regret that these efforts towards the development of the skill required did not obtain a fair field for testing the value of the idea, and one of the greatest hindrances to the development of the cloth as well as that of other manufactures, until the influx of

[1] Policies of State Practised in various Kingdoms for the encrease of Trade (Edinburgh University Library—Laing MSS. Division II. No. 52) ff. 3, 22-24.

[2] *The Rhind Lectures*, by Prof. Hume Brown, on 'Trading in Queen Mary's Time.'

[3] *Domestic Annals of Scotland*, ii. p. 351.

[4] *History of Civilisation in Scotland*, iii. p. 306.

[5] *Burgh Records of Peebles*, p. 272.

Huguenots after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, was the impossibility of obtaining qualified Scottish skilled labour and the very great difficulty of tempting suitable skilled foreign or English workmen to settle in Scotland.[1]

Another hindrance to the foundation of a Scottish cloth trade consisted in the fact that the country did not produce wool of sufficiently good quality for the manufacture of fine cloth—indeed, as will be shown, even at the end of the century it was necessary to import this class of raw material. So that, besides the absence of technical skill, a complete home-grown supply of the raw material was wanting. In 1641, and again in 1645, attempts were made by legislation to atone for this latter defect. It was enacted that Spanish and foreign fine wool as well as all other raw materials, such as dyes and oil, were to be free of custom, while the owners of manufactories were given large powers over their servants with a view to encourage the introduction of skilled labour.[2] By these acts the protective policy of the seventeenth century was inaugurated, though as yet the protection was comparatively small, being confined to what might be described as a double bounty, namely the exemption of raw materials imported from custom, while the finished product received a similar concession on exportation.

A third impediment to the starting of new manufactures was the want of sufficient capital, and efforts were made by two acts passed in 1661 to attract wealthy foreigners to start industries in Scotland by promising them naturalisation. To induce Scotsmen to co-operate, facilities were given for the formation of companies through individuals having the right 'to incorporate themselves.' This provision constituted a differential advantage in Scotland, as compared with England, for in the latter country a charter of incorporation could only be obtained at considerable trouble and expense, while a company acting without a charter was liable to have its corporate existence called in question.[3]

Still the measure of protection was not complete. It is true that in the twenty years following 1661 several industries were started, but in every case additional privileges (generally indeed a monopoly) were granted. In 1681 a thorough-going protective

[1] The importance of inducing foreign skilled workers to come to *England* at this period is shown by Dr. Cunningham in his *Growth of English Industry and Commerce in Modern Times* (Edition 1903) p. 329.

[2] *Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland*, v. p. 497; vi. p. 174.

[3] *Ibid.*, vii. pp. 255, 261.

system was evolved. By acts of the Privy Council and of Parliament in that year certain commodities deemed superfluous were forbidden either to be imported or worn. To encourage home manufactures the importation of a large number of manufactured goods, such as linen, cambric, calico, and generally all stuffs made of linen or cotton or wool (excepting arras carpets), was also forbidden. Moreover, raw materials produced in Scotland —as for instance lint and yarn—might not be exported. In addition, as in former acts, foreign raw materials required were exempted from custom and all other public dues. Manufactured goods exported were freed from duties for nineteen years after the foundation of a given manufacture, and finally the capital invested was declared not to be subject to public or private taxes for ever.[1]

Thus the protective system, that had started with modest remissions of duties in 1641, had grown by 1681 to an extreme beyond which it was impossible to go. At the present day a protective duty of 100 per cent. *ad valorem* is looked upon as excessive, but in 1681 Scottish policy had developed something much more hostile to the foreigner. The home manufacturer was absolutely protected against foreign competition. Then, as far as it lay in the power of the government, his cost of production should have been low, since not only did the prohibition of the export of lint and yarn tend to make his raw material artificially cheap, but he was exempt from all home taxes. Indeed, cases are recorded in which the excise on drink consumed by the workmen was remitted!

In view of the prominence given to the 'infant industries' argument in favour of Protection, the effect of the Scottish protective system is of more than passing interest. Fortunately, since the minutes of one of the companies founded under the Act of 1681 have recently been discovered, the history of the system can be traced step by step. In this respect the materials for Scottish industrial history are more copious than those for the same time in England, for this is the only case in which the records of a *manufacturing* company of the seventeenth century are known to exist.[2] This company was founded in 1681 to manufacture cloth, and its works were situated near Haddington, at a place then called Newmills, but now known

[1] *Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland*, viii. pp. 348, 349.

[2] This MS. will shortly be published by the 'Scottish History Society.'

as Amisfield. The earlier entries in these minutes show the great difficulty experienced by the directors (who were then called 'managers') in obtaining competent workmen and the plant that they needed. In 1683 there were 29 looms at work and soon afterwards 10 more were ordered, which would bring the output up to 12,000 ells a year.[1] In spite of all the advantages that the undertaking enjoyed, and although no profit had as yet been made, the price of Scottish cloth was considerably higher than that produced elsewhere. This fact emerges in a somewhat interesting manner. The government had decided to adopt a military uniform in order 'to distinguish sojers from other skulking and vagabond persons.'[2] It was found that cloth made by the Newmills company could not be sold as cheaply as that imported from England even after the officer or official to whose hands the transaction was committed had had a profit. Accordingly the Privy Council, only a few years after its own proclamation, set the bad example of permitting certain persons to import English cloth for certain specified purposes. Now, it invariably produces a bad impression for a government to make exceptions from its own legislation in its own favour. That such a course should be adopted advertised the fact that English cloth could be delivered more cheaply in Scotland than the home product. But the contention of the government should have been that a temporary sacrifice was necessary to encourage the infant industry; and therefore the State, to be consistent, should have set the example in making this sacrifice. However, when the government made exceptions it was only to be expected that unauthorised persons followed the example set them, with the result that by 1685 the smuggling of English and foreign cloth had become common. Even a shareholder in the company was convicted of importing and selling the prohibited commodity, and it was ordered that his cloth should be burnt by the hangman and his stock in the company forfeited.[3]

The company now appealed to the Privy Council, and in

[1] *A Representation of the Advantages that would arise to this Kingdom by the erecting and improving Manufactories . . . with . . . an account of the manufactory at Newmilnes*, . . . Edinburgh, 1683 (Advocates Library), p. 18. MS. 'Book for the Managers of the Manufactory's Weekly Sederunts' (Edinburgh Univ. Library), f. 27.

[2] Records of the Privy Council quoted by Chambers, *Domestic Annals of Scotland*, ii. p. 419.

[3] *Chronological Notes of Scottish Affairs*, by Lord Fountainhall, p. 91.

1685 it received further privileges, amongst which was the power to force persons to declare on oath whence they had any given parcel of cloth, as well as the objectionable privilege of forcible entry into private dwellings and of breaking open doors or chests in search of imported cloth.[1] In the following year these grants were confirmed by a 'King's Letter' and proclamation on behalf of the company.

The means by which these privileges were obtained throw some light on the ethical standard of the times. In most cases the company found it necessary to purchase the good offices of powerful persons, and the minutes record the consideration money with the same naïveté that the Court Books of the East India Company describe the nature and amount of the 'gratifications' that were found necessary from time to time. What strikes one in reading the minutes of the Newmills Company is the small sums for which such services could be obtained. In fact the managers maintained good relations with the government by a kind of truck system under which they gave 'presents,' generally in kind. Sometimes it was a length of cloth, sometimes a pair of silk stockings. On larger occasions payments in money were made, as for instance one official received five guineas 'for the great care and pains he had taken' in procuring the first act of the Privy Council in 1685.[2] The following summary of a resolution speaks for itself—it was represented to the managers that the King's Advocate draws those libels against 'transgressors' (*i.e.* persons who smuggled foreign cloth) wrong because he is not 'informed,' and the meeting decided that a deputation should inform him, at the same time giving him 10 dollars for himself, and his men 2 dollars, and that the company should take care to 'indulge' him in time to come[3] —evidently the period during which an indulgence could be considered current had been greatly reduced between the Middle Ages and the seventeenth century.

The support of the Privy Council seems to have brought prosperity to the company from 1686 to the Revolution, for considerable orders for the supply of army clothing were obtained. But in the disorganisation of government from 1688 to 1690, the control of the customs was relaxed, and foreign and English cloth

[1] Acts of the Privy Council, 1685, ff. 137, 138, 158.

[2] Book for the Managers of the Manufactory's Weekly Sederunts, f. 117.

[3] *Ibid.*, f. 179.

was again imported. This lapse from the policy of protection was sanctioned by an act of 1690, which granted the magistrates of Edinburgh an impost of 12s. [Scots] per ell on all imported cloth.[1] As against this relaxation of the prohibition of the act of 1681, the company obtained parliamentary sanction of the principle laid down by the Privy Council in 1685 that the army should be clothed in cloth of Scottish manufacture.[2] It was in this state that the law remained until after the formation of the Darien Company. The latter event was conditioned by economic as well as by political causes, and to estimate the importance of these it is necessary to glance briefly at the development of other industries after the passing of the act of 1681.

Between 1681 and 1690 very few new industries were started. Not only was there some suspicion of the ministry of James II., but the difficulties in obtaining capital and skilled labour remained. After the Revolution an immense impetus was given to Scottish industry, indeed there were more companies that secured the 'privilege of a manufacture' under the act of 1681, from 1690 to 1695 (but more especially in the three years 1693, 1694, and 1695) than in the remaining years between 1681 and the Union. Several causes contributed to this industrial activity. The influx of Huguenots to England had overflowed into Scotland, and thus the deficiency in skilled labour was remedied. It happened too that just at this time there was an extensive promotion of industrial companies in England, and many men of enterprise found Scotland a promising field for investment in view of its comparatively undeveloped industrial condition and the facilities given by the law for the formation of companies, as well as the many privileges and immunities granted to capitalists. This activity was shown by the foundation of a number of new cloth and glass works, an important linen company, known as the Scots Linen Manufacture[3] (1693), also silk, baize, stocking, sail-cloth, rope, cordage, pottery, gun-powder, leather, and various iron works were established. The abrupt cessation in the launching of new ventures from 1696 is remarkable. The cause is to be found partly in the collapse of the boom in English manufacturing companies' shares, but still more in the lock-up of capital by the

[1] *Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland*, ix. p. 206. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 319.

[3] Some account of this company will be found in an article on 'The King's and Queen's Corporation for the Linen Manufacture in Ireland' in *The Journal of the Proceedings of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland*, xxxi. Pt. 4 (Dec., 1901).

'Company trading to Africa and the Indies,' better known as the Darien Company, which was founded in 1695. This ill-fated undertaking was in fact the key-stone of the whole edifice of Scottish commercial policy. It was the logical outcome of the act of 1681; for, once Scotland prohibited the manufactures of other countries, the retaliation of those countries had to be faced. Therefore, just when Scotland was reaching the ideal that her statesmen had aimed at—namely, the establishment of diversified manufactures under the protection of a series of prohibitions of competitive foreign products, it began to be seen that this advance had been made at the sacrifice of most foreign markets. Now, in the cloth trade the raw material could not be exported under the act of 1681, thus the government had incurred an obligation to find some market for this raw material after it had been manufactured in Scotland. But owing to the policy of prohibitions the markets of all developed countries were closed to Scottish finished goods, and so the policy of protection must either be given up or else a new market found. According to the ideas of the time, the latter alternative might be adopted by the creation of Scottish colonies—and it was this chain of facts that constitutes the true inwardness of the Darien scheme.

It would be interesting to speculate as to what would have happened had the scheme for the colonisation of New Caledonia proved successsful. But, altogether apart from the opposition of the English government, the scheme (though remarkably well conceived)[1] was foredoomed to failure. The proposed company was intended to be a rival to existing Dutch and English organisations, and therefore the governments of those countries could not be expected, with the limited political ideas of the age, to sanction the investment of capital in the new enterprise by their subjects. Thus the Darien Company was dependent on the capital it could raise at home, and no more than £400,000 sterling of stock was taken up. Further the directors could not call up more than 42½ per cent. of the amount subscribed, so that they were forced to attempt the almost impossible task of founding a Scottish colonial empire on a capital of under

[1] The original form of the Darien scheme as conceived by William Paterson was one of the greatest commercial ideas of the seventeenth century. It was to make the isthmus of Panama an *entrepôt* for the exchange of Western and Eastern commodities, to which all nations might freely resort. When Paterson lost influence in the Company (before the first expedition had started) the freedom of trade was dropped out of the scheme, and the idea was rather to form a plantation than to establish an *entrepôt*.

£170,000, which was only obtainable in small sums and with considerable difficulty. Now the London East India Company at this date had a capital of £1,488,000, and in 1698 a second company was incorporated with a capital of two millions.[1] Besides, there was the Royal African Company, which in 1697 had a nominal capital of over a million.[2] So that the Scottish company essayed the almost impossible task of wresting trade and territory from powerful organisations whose combined capitals were more than thirty times as great as that which the Darien Company could collect from its shareholders.

Moreover, even the modest capital of £170,000 called up by the Darien Company was considerably in excess of the resources of the country available for investment at the time. There are data which enable an estimate to be formed of the capital sunk in the manufactures established from 1681 to 1695, and the total amount (an appreciable part of which came from England) was certainly under £200,000. Thus having provided part of this sum, Scotland had to find further resources of about the same amount, in order to make an outlet for the products of the first series of investments. There is little doubt that in the enthusiasm of the early days of the colonial idea, people subscribed for much more stock than they could pay calls upon. In other words, the country pledged not only most of its floating capital, but also much of its available credit on the success of the Darien scheme. This course was magnificently bold, but it left no way of recuperation in the event of failure, and what was tragic in the situation was that only by a miracle could failure have been escaped.

Thus the Scottish protective system culminated in the Darien scheme, and with the collapse of that scheme the extreme policy of 1681 was doomed. In the last years of the seventeenth century, when the country was in a depressed condition owing to a loss of capital it could not afford, coupled with a series of bad harvests, there was a temporary reaction towards a complete protection of the cloth trade. This movement appears to have been conditioned by hostility against England, and by the desire to exact reprisals for the treatment of the Darien Company by the English government. The cloth companies presented several petitions to the Privy Council stating that there

[1] *Charters granted to the East India Company*, i. pp. 140-157, 189.

[2] 'The Constitution and Finance of the Royal African Company' in *American Historical Review*, viii. p. 257.

was laxity in the administration of the laws prohibiting English cloth, and praying the Act of 1681 should be enforced.[1] Accordingly, in 1699 the exportation of woollen yarn was prohibited again by the Privy Council,[2] and in 1701 an Act was passed confirming the previous prohibitions of the importing or wearing of foreign cloth.[3]

The legislation of 1701 represents the completion of the return to the extreme of protectionism, and a reaction was inevitable. Very few foreign markets were open to Scottish cloth, there was now no prospect of a new colonial trade being opened, and so the price of wool was depressed. There were gloomy pictures presented to Parliament of skins and wool rotting for want of a foreign market, and other evidence tends to confirm the conclusion that Scotland produced more wool than could be consumed at home.[4] Thus the woolmasters had a good case for the repeal of the prohibition of the export of wool, and two years afterwards (*i.e.* in 1703) they were able to secure an advantage in their parliamentary contest with the cloth manufacturers, by obtaining permission to export skins with *the wool on them* from three specified ports. In 1704 the woolmasters promoted an act, which if passed, would have removed all restrictions on the export of wool. The cloth manufacturers protested vigorously. In fact the protection given them had created a series of vested interests which were now imperilled. They urged before Parliament that 'on the faith of former laws, which were even but temporary, they erected manufactories at great charge, and now to bring in an act which entirely overturns them seems to be a hardship the like whereof has been unprecedented.'[5] In spite of this opposition, the general crumbling away of the Scottish protective system precluded the continuance of encouragement in this form for the manufacturers, and an act was finally passed permitting the exporting of wool, while at the same time the prohibition of foreign cloth was continued.[6]

[1] Parliamentary Papers, 8th Oct., 1696 (General Register House)—'Petition of the Woollen Manufactory at Newmills anent the import of foreign cloth'; Par. Papers, 1698, Minutes Committee of Trade; *Acts of Par.*, x. p. 67.

[2] Par. Papers (1701), 'Exporting of wool.' [3] *Acts of Par.*, xi. p. 190.

[4] Par. Papers (1701), 'Reasons against allowing the export of wool.'

[5] Par. Papers (1704)—Trade and Commerce—'The Petition of the Manufacturers of this Kingdom against the Permission to export wool,' *Acts of Par.*, xi. p. 177.

[6] *Acts of Par.*, xi. p. 190.

This legislation was a serious blow to the owners of cloth-works, and was characterised as such by Defoe.[1] But the truth was that the country could no longer stand the original protective system, and to escape bankruptcy it was necessary for the government to relax the weight that had been pressing so long on the non-manufacturing industries for the sake of the fostering of manufactures.

The state of the country in the opening years of the eighteenth century would have been less precarious than it was had the nation only to face an impaired state of the credit of its capitalists. But underlying this and connected with it were two chains of events, arising out of the protective legislation of 1681, which threatened the relations between England and Scotland. As yet no details have been given of the retaliation of other countries against Scotland after the prohibitions of 1681 and 1685. England at this time was a great cloth-producing country, and its government resented what appeared to it to be the arbitrary closing of the nearest market. The means of retaliation were ready to the hand of English statesmen, for Scotland had opened up a considerable export trade to England, as early as the beginning of the seventeenth century, in linens.[2] On Scotland prohibiting English cloth England prohibited Scottish linens. It is said there were from 10,000 to 12,000 persons employed in the linen trade, and the diminution of the output produced much discontent. But at the end of the seventeenth century men who had a grievance did more than grumble. The packmen who carried linen to England continued, in spite of officials, to force their way southwards across the border, and unless the English reprisals were to become a dead letter more drastic measures had to be sought. The border officers took the law into their own hands and treated the Scots packmen as malefactors, imprisoning some and whipping others.[3] Surely this is an eloquent comment on the conciliatory effect of retaliation.

Worse troubles were still to come. The Darien scheme had been Scotland's crowning act of protection against England. The first news of the failure of the earlier expeditions had aroused much bad feeling amongst the people, and it seemed an irony of fate that, after the enterprise was a complete failure, the last acts

[1] *History of the Union*, p. 123.

[2] *The Weavers' Craft*, by D. Thomson, Paisley, 1903, p. 81.

[3] Privy Council Records, quoted by Chambers, *Domestic Annals*, ii. p. 421; *Warden's Linen Trade*, p. 428.

of the company should still further embitter the relations between the two countries. The English East India Company[1] had seized the ship *Annandale* belonging to the Darien Company, which had put into the Thames. On the *Worcester*, an English East India ship (which was erroneously reported to belong to the English company), putting into the Forth, the government was urged to retaliate. It abstained from doing so, and after certain events had inflamed the minds of the Edinburgh populace, some private persons seized the captain and part of the crew of the English ship. Charges of piracy and murder were made against them, and in March, 1705, all the accused except one were condemned to death. The indignation excited by this verdict in England may be imagined. The Queen interposed, and the carrying out of the sentence was postponed, but the excitement of the people was so great that the Scottish authorities feared to annul the conviction, and two of the condemned men were executed in April.[2] It was afterwards clearly established that the men who suffered had not been guilty of the murder attributed to them, so that in this matter there was ground for the hostile feeling that had been aroused in England. Thus in 1705 the direct and indirect effects of commercial retaliation had greatly embittered the relations of the two countries. When there were added the political grievances of Scotland since the union of the Crowns, it will be recognised that the situation was very serious. In London very gloomy views were taken of the outlook towards the end of 1706. These are clearly reflected by the fluctuations of Bank of England stock, which had varied from 138¾ to 126 in 1703, from 133½ to 115 in 1704, from 120¼ to 87 in 1705, falling in 1706 from 91 to 76¼. The latter price (which is the lowest recorded for the stock in the early years of the eighteenth century) was quoted at the end of October and during the first days of November. In fact, the year 1706 is the only one (up to 1720) in which the price of the fully paid stock never touched par. On the passing of the Act of Union there was an immediate rise, and in 1707 the price was as high as 119.

[1] There were at this date *two* East India Companies. The oldest, founded in 1600, was generally known as the 'Old' or 'London' Company. Its full title was the 'Governor and Company of Merchants of London trading into the East Indies.' The second company was incorporated in 1698 as the 'English Company trading to the East Indies,' and was popularly described as the 'New' or 'English' Company. It is the latter undertaking which is mentioned above.

[2] *The Union of England and Scotland*, by James MacKinnon, 1896, pp. 191-197.

The reader will be inclined to ask whether the facts detailed above as to the fiscal relations of England and Scotland have any bearing on the present controversy. It should be noted that the argument from historical events at one period to a different period can only be accepted with some qualifications. There was protection in Scotland of a pronouncedly retaliatory character, and all that can be concluded from the failure of that system (for it was a failure, as will be shown below) is that it affords a presumption against the trial of a similar policy in other circumstances. If, further, the non-success of retaliation recurs in varied conditions, that presumption will be greatly strengthened.

Therefore, to complete the investigation of the Scottish protective system before the Union, it remains to estimate the fruits of that system. The fine cloth trade received the chief attention of the government, and there is information relating to no less than ten works established under the Act of 1681. Three of these were founded from 1681 to 1683, four from 1695 to 1700, and the remainder after 1700. Now, the majority of those had a sufficient time to develop from being infant industries, and if 'the infant industries' argument were valid in this case, it is to be expected that these should, after protection of the most stringent kind varying from 26 years to 7 years, have been sufficiently strong to face the competition of English cloth. This, however, was not so; all these undertakings, with the exception of two, were wound up soon after the Union. Further, the two remaining gave up the production of fine cloth, and contented themselves with the making of the coarser fabrics. Were the Newmills minutes not in existence it would be difficult to suggest the reason that Scotland at the end of the seventeenth century could not produce fine cloth to advantage. The secret lay in the want of raw material—not that Scotland had not wool in abundance—but that the country at that time did not produce the finer quality of wool required for the best grades of cloth. The Newmills company classified cloth as being of three qualities—the first was made of Spanish wool, the second of foreign and home wool mixed, and the third only of home wool.[1] Thus one of the conditions that would have helped to make the

[1] According to a resolution of June 28th, 1682, the master of the manufactory was directed 'befor he make any cloths of the coursest of the wool that he acquaint the managers with itt and get their advice whether to sell itt or make itt into cloth'; and on December 15th the managers ordered that the coarse wool should be sold and not made into cloth.

manufacture successful was absent, and with the high freights and uncertainty of sea transit at the time the industry could not exist apart from Protection.

Further to foster this artificial trade, Scotland sacrificed another branch of manufacture for which the country had at this time great natural advantages—namely, the linen trade. Before the building up of the extreme system of protection and prohibitions, there had been a large export trade in linen. As already shown, on the prohibition of foreign cloth, England retaliated by shutting out Scottish linen. Thus from 1681 to the Union the linen trade was depressed, and it was only afterwards that it again advanced. Had the government not been determined to rival England it would have been wiser to have suffered the nation to develop the linen industry (for which the country had great natural advantages) and, at the same time, the way might have been paved for a subsequent improvement of the cloth trade by first producing a better class of wool. As it was, the slower process of development was thrown aside in favour of one that appeared faster, with the unfortunate results of the Darien enterprise and the consequent strained relations between Scotland and England. Therefore a careful investigation of the tendencies of the time has shown that Scottish protection in the seventeenth century failed in achieving the object desired, while the retaliation it involved nearly produced a war between the two countries now so closely united.

Such events are far from bearing out the reading of history proposed by Mr. Balfour in the quotation with which this article opens. In the first place there was no customs union existing before the Union of 1707, in fact so far is this from being true that in the early years of the eighteenth century there was a fiscal war between the two countries; and, instead of there being free trade, the series of prohibited commodities tended towards there being no trade at all from England to Scotland and *vice versa*. Therefore it is in no sense true that *in time* fiscal preceded political union.[1] It may be that Mr. Balfour intended to convey the idea that the main cause of the union was commercial rather than political, or in somewhat scholastic language fiscal 'preceded'

[1] It may be added that Mr. Balfour ignores the efforts towards a political Union before 1707. In this connection it is only necessary to refer to the proposals of 1547, the Commission of 1604, the united Parliament during the Commonwealth, the Commission of 1670 (which accepted political, but refused to admit fiscal union), and finally the overtures in the reign of James II.

political union *in the logical order*. If this be his meaning it is to be remembered that, as already shown, while the foundation of the Darien Company was originally due to industrial conditions, the existence of that company soon involved political issues of the greatest magnitude. Thus, commercial and political causes became blended together, and any attempt to assign a quantum of importance to each would be a matter of great difficulty. Besides to establish Mr. Balfour's position it should be proved that the two countries had been gradually drawing closer in their commercial relations, whereas on the contrary they had been becoming more and more antagonistic. Therefore since a union was possible under such circumstances, it follows that there must have been an underlying community of political interest, which is to be found in the necessity of making good the revolution settlement, and to maintain the position of England and Scotland together as against France.

Again it may be that Mr. Balfour means that, although the fiscal and political union came into existence together, the people of Scotland accepted the former more readily than the latter. This again is a misapprehension of what actually happened. For a considerable period after the Union there was very great dissatisfaction with the fiscal side of the bargain, so that it cannot be said the latter was accepted and recognised with less friction than the former. Thus on the whole it cannot be established that 'fiscal union was the prelude to political union' in the case of Scotland either before or after 1707.

Nor can one assent to Lord Rosebery's picturesque description of the cause of the Union, namely that 'Scotland was starved and coerced into it by England.' Probably the reference here is to the effect of the English Navigation Acts in the last quarter of the seventeenth century. But it must be admitted that, however hardly these laws may have pressed on Scotland, the demand for the admission of Scottish shipping to the English colonies was premature. These colonies and dependencies had been founded by English capital and English enterprise. Besides, the age was one dominated by the idea of the 'exploitation of colonies,' and, just because there was such exploitation, each fiscally independent country jealously guarded the monopoly of it. In fact, once Scotland had entered on a policy of extreme protection, more especially after 1661, it is probable, while admission to the English colonies would have been desired, there would have been very great opposition to the opening of the

Scottish market for free importation of English commodities. It was necessary that once a protective policy had been adopted it should work itself out to its logical outcome.

It might indeed be said that Scotland, feeling herself, as the people believed, unfairly or hardly treated by England, was justified in vindicating herself by reprisals. From this point of view, Scotland's side of the tariff war with England constitutes one of those episodes which for their daring makes her military history of so much interest. During the period between the middle of the seventeenth century and the Union, Scotland with comparatively meagre available capital resources endeavoured to overtake England in manufacturing. Now, as far as this ideal involved the development of the country it was most praiseworthy, and as already shown the early progress of the linen trade is a case in which the policy would have yielded happy results. Under normal circumstances England was disposed to give encouragement to industries that did not compete directly with her own in Scotland and Ireland. For instance, in a King's and Queen's Letter addressed to the Irish government on July 7th, 1698, it was stated that the linen trade was profitable both to Ireland and England, and that steps should be taken to encourage it in the former country.[1] Probably similar concessions would have been accorded to Scotland (as was done, indeed, after the Union) had it not been for the tariff war between the two countries. As it was, when Scotland went further and endeavoured to exclude most English manufactures, the policy became one of aggression. The country was too little developed and its capital resources were too small to make the issue successful. While England suffered considerably, Scotland suffered very greatly. Just as in a military contest between two nations, the penalty of defeat is to be incorporated into one state together with the conquering country, so in this case after the tariff war, Scotland, suffering from financial exhaustion, had to become commercially one with England. If for no other reason the capital provided by the Equivalent was needed to give the country a fresh start, and it required many years to repair the damage done to Scottish trade from 1681 to 1707.

In view of these facts there was no continuous English policy 'to force Scotland into a union with England.' On the con-

[1] State Papers, Public Record Office, Dublin—King's and Queen's Letters—under July 7th, 1698.

trary, in so far as Scotland endeavoured to exclude the products of well-established English industries, the effect of this policy together with the resulting retaliation was that Scotland virtually, from the commercial point of view, 'starved and coerced *herself*' into such a position that a political union was the best way of escape from a situation that was a very difficult one. Thus it may happen that between nations, as between undertakings in the same country, competition often ends in combination.

W. R. Scott.

Scottish Officers in Sweden

THE history of the connection between Scotland and Sweden during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is still to be written, and when a competent historian undertakes the task his work will not languish for lack of materials.

The influx of Scots to Sweden began after the troubles following upon the renunciation of the Danish yoke, when Gustavus Wasa firmly established his new dynasty on the throne, and the connection between Sweden and Scotland no doubt became closer when Gustavus' son, Erik XIV., courted the hand of Mary Queen of Scots, then the newly widowed Queen of France, first for himself and then—as he found it injured his contemporaneous suit of Elizabeth of England—for Duke John, his brother.

When John had, in 1568, succeeded in deposing his brother Erik and had gained the throne of Sweden for himself with the title of King John III., he professed himself full of friendship and regard for the Scottish nation. We are told that he could 'speik and onderstand guid Inglis'; we find Sir Andrew Keith of Forssa, a Scotsman very high in his credit, 'in sik favour and estaitt as nar hes ony stranger in this cuntrie been in the lyk,'[1] and it was he who employed, in 1573, the first body of Scottish mercenaries in Sweden whose conduct scarcely redounded greatly to Scottish fame.

In that year a Scoto-French adventurer, Carolus de Mornay, brought over to Sweden 3000 Scots whom he had enrolled to serve in the army of Sweden in Esthonia against the Russians, but Mornay seems to have been not only an adventurer but also a secret agent (he had been a favourite) of the deposed King Erik, and his force, while professedly enrolled under John III., were really conspiring to dethrone him, and restore the kingdom to his brother.

[1] *Register of the Privy Council Addenda*, pp. 344, 7.

The chief Scots under Mornay were Archibald Ruthven of Forteviot, a brother of Lord Ruthven, the Lord Treasurer,[1] who had been specially recommended to the King of Sweden by the Regent Mar in 1572—only one year before—and Gilbert Balfour of Westray,[2] a noted intriguer. Balfour had had many vicissitudes. At one time the creature and then the enemy of Bothwell, he had been implicated also in the murders of Cardinal Betoun and Darnley, and was one of those whom Knox characterised as 'Men without God.' Mornay and the Scots leaders began soon after their arrival to conspire to release Erik, and they made a secret compact to seize the person of King John when he and his courtiers were to be engaged in watching the Scots perform their national sword dance. The plot failed owing to the timidity of the leaders at the critical moment, and the regiment of Scots was drafted off to Leiffland. The conspiracy was discovered a year later when the Scots became embroiled with the German mercenaries, who betrayed them to the King. Mornay was summarily beheaded, while the Scottish leaders were placed in durance in the hope that certain 'treasure' they were believed to have secreted would be discovered.

At last, however, the Swedes lost patience with Balfour, who was impatient of his bonds and eager to escape from prison, 'yit he of new committing huredom in our castell . . . and syn did pretend to heff stolen away, did forfaltt his lyff, and thairfore we causit executt him,'[3] which was done in August, 1576.[4] Ruthven was more lucky, as he was spared on the intercession of the King of Scotland. Sir Andrew Keith, the King's Scottish favourite, had a low opinion of him, saying that though they had 'giffen him his lyff' yet 'as to wagis he has deservit nane he wan us nather Castell, toun, nor battall,' and had yet received 'Four and thrattie thusand dollouris.' King John alleged that he had 'ressaveit rathir damnage and hurt be ye armes of Scotes' in Leiffland 'for the q^{lk} cawss ye sayid King thinkis ye sauld be absoluit of all sowmes of money he is awand' to Ruthven and his followers, and Ruthven's fervent protests against this decision are in the British Museum.[5] The

[1] *Register of the Privy Council Addenda*, pp. 344, 7. He is styled by Sir Andrew Keith 'Maister of Ruthven' also.

[2] Schiern's *Life of Bothwell*, p. 300 *n.* [3] *Reg. Privy Council Add.*, p. 345.

[4] Testament in the Commissariot of Edinburgh.

[5] Addit. MSS. 38,531, ff. 133-150.

indignant Keith calls another of the Scottish conspirators, Gawane Elphinstone, 'ane craftie willane,' and says that his compatriot's evil doings have brought grey locks into his hair 'althocht I be jung.'

This exhibition of Scottish faith does not seem to have disenchanted the Swedes. The power of Sir Andrew Keith was always employed for the good of his fellow-countrymen, 'yit knowis God,' he writes, 'quhat I heff done for thame and dois daylie and maist for luiff of my natiff cuntrie,' and they continued to pour into Sweden, and into Denmark also, although the two countries were often at war; and multitudes were worthily placed in places of high trust in the army of Sweden, where their descendants form no inconsiderable portion of the nobility of the country.

Always at war with Denmark, or the maritime provinces of Russia, Sweden was greedy for soldiers, and not always particular how they came into her service. Sweden willingly bought and employed the wretched Irish who were deported in thousands to make way for the Scottish Plantations of Ulster, though a very small moiety escaped this fate by being landed by shipwreck in Scotland, where the starving men were forced to commit many depredations, and, not content with them, 'the wearis' of Sweden necessitated levies of an unlawful kind being made in Scotland also. In 1609 we find Colonel William Stewart of Egilshay,[1] brother to the Earl of Orkney, and appointing his 'trustie frend,' Captain John Horie[2] (Ury), 'in whose approved value and experience in warrs I have a speciall confidence,' his Lieutenant Colonel. In 1611 in the war against Denmark, General Rutherford, his Lieutenant Learmonth, Captain Greig, and Greig who commanded the artillery, were employed with a regiment of eight or nine companies, and in 1612 one Samuel Khebron[3] (Hepburn ?) commanded a regiment of Scots in Sweden which included Sir Patrick Ruthven, who eventually, after a long career of war, died as Earl of Forth and Brentford.

But all these levies did not leave Scotland without protest. King James VI., whose desire was to be *Rex Pacificus* of the

[1] He was a natural son of Robert, Earl of Orkney, and was in 1600 accused of the 'schamefull and cruell murther of —— Bellenden his first spouse' (*Reg. Privy Council*, viii., xciv.). A William Stuart raised another company of footmen in 1611 'to his great losse' (Mitchell's *Scottish Expedition to Norway in* 1612).

[2] *Ruthven Correspondence* (Roxburghe Club), p. 151.

[3] *Ruthven Correspondence*, vi. *n* 3.

north, found that his subjects were being, without his consent, employed in Sweden against his brother-in-law the King of Denmark, and he issued a series of angry letters to his Privy Council that he 'misliked some dulness of theirs,' and commanded them to stop the levies on account of the serious trouble the recruiting agents were giving by impressing men, 'quhilk being ane abuse intollerable and not hard of in a free kingdome,'[1] and inducing justices to hand over to them condemned criminals. And so real did his indignation show itself that in 1612 Captain Andrew Ramsay, a brother of the King's favourite, Sir John Ramsay, and his recruiting agents were tried for kidnapping and impressing men to serve in Sweden, laid under heavy bail, their ships searched and the captives they contained released. It was during this time that, knowing the King's command, a body of some few hundreds of Scots, levied by Andrew Ramsay, left Caithness secretly under the command of his brother, Colonel Alexander Ramsay, Captain Ramsay, Captain Hay, and Captain George Sinclair, landed on the coast of Norway, intending to march through it to Sweden, but were trapped, and stoned or shot down by the Norwegian bönder from the mountain heights of Romsdal and Gudbrandsal in August, 1612, and only a few escaped with their lives. Their leader, Alexander Ramsay, was sent back to his country, and he and his surviving companions forgiven, while Andrew Ramsay, on whom the blame of the expedition fell, went into hiding. At length being traced by fighting a duel in England with Sir Robert Kerr of Ancrum, whom he accused of informing the King of his design of 'gathering men in Scotland,' he was examined and banished, 'which next unto death,' wrote the King, 'is the highest punishment we could inflict.'

Another Scot now filled the position of Sir Andrew Keith. This was Sir James Spens of Wormiston, in Fife, who had originally gone to Sweden to discuss a project of marriage between the young Prince Gustavus Adolphus and his master's daughter, the Lady Elizabeth Stuart, who afterwards became 'The Winter Queen.' He entered the service of Sweden, and took kindly to the land of his adoption, and was often employed sometimes as Ambassador from Britain to Sweden and sometimes from Sweden to Britain, and during his time we find the appearance of many Fifeshire names in the Swedish ranks—showing

[1] *Register of the Privy Council*, cited in Mitchell's *Scottish Expedition to Norway*, pp. 160-172.

that he was regarded as a protector and promoter of the interests of his kith and kin.

In 1623 the treachery of Robert Stuart in the Swedish service had a far-reaching effect. He was another brother of the attainted Earl of Orkney, and is elsewhere styled Sir Robert Stuart of Middleton.[1] From the Swedish army he went over to the Catholic side, joining Sigismund, King of Poland, who was perennially attempting to recover his lost kingdom of Sweden for himself and the Papacy, and he undertook to levy for the Polish service 8000 Scots.

Gustavus Adolphus at once took fire. Representing the Protestant interest, he wrote on 23rd September, 1623, to the Scottish Privy Council informing them of the treachery, pointing out the likely danger to the Protestant cause, and implored King James to allow him to levy troops in Scotland instead. He sent his 'faithful friend,' Sir James Spens, to urge his request, and he was successful in persuading the King to grant it. James VI. agreed, and issued a warrant, which was confirmed by the Privy Council on 30th March, 1624,[2] allowing and empowering James Spens, junior, the son of the Envoy, to levy as many as 1200 men for service in Sweden.

But this did not wholly satisfy the need of the Swedish King; the Catholic League drove him again to apply to recruit his armies by fresh levies, and King Charles I. after his accession became, though not without deliberation, his ally. Charles I. in all issued during his reign six warrants to permit the King of Sweden to levy men to carry on war against the Emperor, and if his officers and agents were at all successful in obtaining them, as many as 12,600 Scots must have entered the Swedish army. Into long details of the Thirty Years' War we need not enter here; but it may be as well to point out that, besides the forces raised directly for Sweden, Gustavus took over the Reay Regiment and the Scots Regiment in the service of Denmark as well. His Scottish regiments included every rank of Scots: nobles, the landed gentlemen and their dependents, 'pressed

[1] King James VI. in a letter to —— Stallenge commends the suit of Sir Robert Stuart, brother of the Earl of Orkney, in 1604 to Elizabeth, daughter of the late Christopher Kenne, his ward. As late as 1650, there is among the 'many sollicitors' for the King of Scotland in Sweden a Sir Robert Stuart, 'sometime prisoner here and broke out of Whitehall' (*Cal. State Papers—Domestic*, vii. No. 26-A. *Ruthven Correspondence*, ii.).

[2] *Register of the Privy Council*, vol. xiii. p. 478.

men,' a class which comprised many unfortunates of every class, from musicians,[1] whose presence was found necessary, down to 'sturdy rogues' and 'beggaris.' These when caught were guarded with great 'fascherie' and conveyed to the transports and 'schippit in als gryt heast as possibly can be' with their voluntary companions, and all dispatched to spend their lives in the service of a foreign power in the German wars; but whatever was the reason of their enlistment, they left a long and honourable list of names among the many foreigners whom Sweden has adopted, ennobled, and taken to herself.

A. FRANCIS STEUART.

[1] These musicians for the German wars are interesting. Lord Ogilvy writes in 1627 to Lord Nithsdale that he sends an Irishman, 'a clachocher,' 'quha pleyis verie weill,' and William Porter, 'quha pleyis excellentlie upon the recorder and will be ane fyne pifferer to this compenie,' one too, who 'pleis weill upon the wirgenelis' and a 'ressonable fyne drumer' (*The Book of Caerlaverock*, vol. ii. p. 91).