

## THE PORT OF LIVERPOOL IN THE '45.

By Rupert C. Jarvis, F.S.A.

Read 24 November 1945.

TWO hundred years ago—by the way, it was Dr. Johnson I think who said that round numbers are always false: well this is a round number which is correct—two hundred years ago *today*, on the 24th of November, 1745, the advance guard of the Jacobite force invading England crossed the Lancashire border and occupied Lancaster. The occupation of Liverpool seemed merely a matter of days. As an illustration of what life was like here in Liverpool at a time when occupation by an insurgent force seemed absolutely imminent, let me read an account taken from a letter dated 30th November.

In the midst of a Distraction not to be credited I have stolen a few Minutes to write to you. You need not be inform'd that our Apprehension arises from the Rebels being so near to us. Our Affairs are come to a crisis, for this Place is too rich to expect escaping a Party for Contribution or Plunder, or perhaps both. There is scarce a Woman stays in the Town, all fly to the other side of the River in Cheshire, where great numbers have been this fortnight, and their most valuable Effects are on board Ships which lie under the cannon of two Men of War lately built here, which are now in the Channel. On this Occasion Lodgings are raised prodigiously in all the Villiages on the other side of the Water that a single Room will fetch ten Shillings a Week. Nothing can equal the Horror and Fright of the People: all last Night Carts were taking goods away, Carpenters are also at work making Boxes for packing, and all Furniture is pulling down. There is hardly any shop goods left in the Town: In a Word, Liverpool is stripp'd almost entirely. The Progress the Rebels make must give the most dreadful Apprehensions to what they may do to all Friends of our happy Establishment.<sup>1</sup>

A few years ago we would doubtless have been inclined to discount a great deal of this as unwarranted exaggeration.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *St. James's Evening Post*, 3-5 December 1745. See also the *General Advertiser*.

<sup>2</sup> The account was of course exaggerated in the sense that when the Jacobites occupied or passed through a town they were found to be not nearly such savages as they had been held out to be. In point of fact their behaviour was on the whole most praiseworthy in its restraint. For contemporary details see R. C. Jarvis, "The Rebellion of 1745: The Passage Through Lancashire from Contemporary News-sheets." *Lancs. & Ches. Antiquarian Soc. Trans. LVI* (1941-2) pp. 123-151.

But since then we too have lived through some "evacuation schemes" very much the same in many of their details—except of course that we, in our more modern wisdom, have invented a new jargon. We too have seen our "evacuation" over to the Wirral; we too have experienced the prodigious rise in "uncontrolled rents" in respect of furnished accommodation in "the reception areas"; we also have noticed that just when one wants them packing cases are "in short supply," and that "shop goods" have a queer habit of disappearing from the shop windows—to turn up later "under the counter" or on "the black market." The phraseology is different, but the facts are very much the same. It is these recent experiences of ours that should enable us to get our pictures of Jacobite and Napoleonic times, for example, into sharper focus. We have now—or should have—a keener sense of the historic past and the historic present. I am reminded here of what the late Professor Turberville said in his presidential address to the Historical Association in the new year. Knowledge of Napoleon's invasion plans and of the counter measures adopted on this side may not have qualified the historian in particular to give the government in 1940 any better advice than anyone else as to Hitler's probable intentions, or the best defence measures to adopt against them.

But most certainly the historian who has lived through the crisis of 1940—more especially if he served in the Home Guard—is better able than he would have been to enter into the authentic atmosphere of 1804 . . . when volunteers for home defence existed in large numbers, but only a third of them possessed any fire-arms, and when Martello towers were being erected to guard the vulnerable south-coast beaches. What may perhaps be described as a vivid sense of the historic present is an invaluable asset to the historian.<sup>1</sup>

But this vivid sense of the historic present, and the historic past, besides being an asset, may very well be a trap also. A researcher may in certain cases be tempted to feel no longer the need for any sort of documentary corroboration. He may feel he *knows*, out of the background of his own experience, when it is a document *rings* true. And the method, if method it is, is fraught with many dangers. So, to revert to the letter from Liverpool in 1745, if we are looking for documentary confirmation of the

<sup>1</sup> A. S. Turberville. "The Transition from War to Peace." *History xxx* (March 1945) p.3.

"Distraction not to be credited" we can find it in the sober records in the state archives. I refer in particular to the manuscripts in the custody of the Board of Customs<sup>1</sup>, and in the Public Record Office, and it is these records largely that I propose to lay under contribution today, in order to sketch out some of the incidents as they occurred in the port of Liverpool at the time of the "Forty-five."

The Collector of Customs at Liverpool writes to London that he too is in "great concern & confusion." One of the officers reports that he has detained a consignment of gunpowder. Another has arrested a ship bound for some port in Scotland. A certain tide-surveyor is still absent from his revenue duties because he has been "pitch't upon" to be a captain in one of the hastily raised local defence units, and Cumberland will not yet give the order to "stand down." The Collector seeks instructions as to what exactly he is to do with the king's securities now that the Jacobites are looking like occupying Liverpool, (and even today it is still not absolutely clear what exactly *was* done to secure them, although it is recorded that they were later placed back "in the proper chest from which they were taken.") All this, I suggest, is the very stuff of history. The writers of these various letters and reports are not in any sense conscious that they are providing materials for a chapter in English history, or even for a chapter in the history of the port of Liverpool. They are just "carrying on." And therein precisely lies the value of this type of record. The writers did not, at the time they were writing, "know the answers." They are not compiling in retrospect their reminiscences of "the Forty-five." They are not writing history at all. They are *living* it. They are helping—in however modest a capacity—to hammer out history whilst it is still hot upon the anvil.

I cannot claim that a study of these new sources will bring

<sup>1</sup> See Royal Commission on Public Records. *Second Report*. (1914) *Appendix*. Vol. ii. Part ii. pp.240 (iv) and 245. This schedule does not of course represent the present position. It is fortunate that the Commissioners of Customs & Excise had certain selections made from the outpost letter books, by the late Henry Atton, author of *The King's Customs*, (1908-10), and Mr. B. R. Leftwich, M.B.E., F.S.A., F.R.Hist. S. In the case of Liverpool I have, of course, had to rely very considerably upon these (unpublished) transcripts, and I very willingly acknowledge my debt to them. The Board's originals of the series of "General Letters" to ports were unfortunately lost in the disastrous fire of 1814, but I have been able to reconstruct the series by reference to the extant letter books at a number of ports. As regards these various records in the custody of the Board of Commissioners of Customs & Excise, I am indebted to their Honours for permission to cite from their unpublished sources.

any startling new facts to light. But such a study will serve at least to "point" an old and familiar story, and to provide perhaps an interesting footnote here and there to the general history. I shall not attempt here a continuous narrative of the port of Liverpool throughout the rising. I shall not attempt it for two reasons. First, so far as I am aware, the necessary material has not survived. What does exist is discontinuous, and requires to be pieced together. After fitting a piece or two here to a piece or two there, and looking at the picture building up in the jig-saw, one may catch a glimpse perhaps of one of the high lights, one may see a particular occurrence from an unfamiliar angle, or one may perhaps be able to reconstruct a particular incident in somewhat greater detail. But what one is *not* able to do is to trace the continuous history of the port throughout the rising. And secondly, the full day to day operation of one of the north-western ports throughout the whole period concerned has already been studied in some detail, and there would seem to be no need to duplicate in the case of Liverpool a study which has already been undertaken in respect of Whitehaven.<sup>1</sup> I shall proceed then to piece together, as well as I may be able, such odds and ends of evidence as have chanced to come down to us.

The Liverpool Collector of Customs at the time of the "Forty-five" was John Colquitt—we start off with a familiar name—one of the succession of John Colquitts, four or five or so,<sup>2</sup> who were associated with the Customs service in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. John Colquitt wrote to the Board of Commissioners in London,

I have been in great concern & confusion for some days past being under apprehension that the Rebels should have reached this place severall days since, which they might easily have done had they marched forward when they first came to Carlisle.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cumberland & Westmorland Antiquarian & Archaeological Society's *Transactions* vol. XLV, pp. 1—21.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Wardle has already mentioned three of them. (*Trans.*, vol. 95 (1943) p. 52.) There was the John Colquitt who in 1662 was Surveyor at Hull. It may have been this John Colquitt or his son who was Collector at Stockton in 1674. It was possibly the latter's son who was Surveyor at Poole in 1691, and was later appointed a Surveyor at Liverpool in 1693. This John Colquitt's son probably commenced his service at Lancaster as Deputy Comptroller in 1700 and went later to Leith as Collector to return as Collector Liverpool in 1725. He resigned in 1749 in favour of his son, likewise a John Colquitt, who continued as collector until 1773. He in his turn left even yet another Colquitt in the Customs at Liverpool, the Deputy Searcher, who however for some reason or other was named Serope.

<sup>3</sup> Collector Liverpool to Board, 19 November 1745.

This was past the middle of November. But even earlier on, that is to say after the defeat of Cope at Prestonpans (21 September), Colquitt had already been much in fear of an invasion, particularly on account of his considerable holdings of crown moneys, which at any time he might find himself unable to remit to London. "I am," he said,

pretty much alarmed here with the success of the Rebels in Scotland, and fearing if they proceed into England least they might take this Country in their Road, I have taken care to get rid of all the money I had on ye Customs having paid a few days since above £1,700 for Debentures<sup>1</sup> and the remainder which was £800 I remitted by the last post. I have now left enough to pay the officers' salaries for this quarter, and I much doubt whether I shall receive any money till things are a little better settled, for all trade and business seems to be quite laid aside.<sup>2</sup>

He referred in this letter to money "on ye Customs" because he had in addition between £500 and £600 of the Import Excise<sup>3</sup> money on hand, "and will ask the Excise Board's directions thereon."<sup>4</sup> At the end of September then he did not expect "to receive any money until things are a little more settled." But things got only more and more unsettled. Carlisle fell, and the Jacobites looked like advancing through Lancashire. Yet Colquitt, contrary to his expectation, continued to receive more money, much apparently to his own disquiet, so much so in fact that he reported in the fore part of November that during the month of October he had received almost £9,000. In fact, he now held a balance of over £2,600—£2,697 4s. 6½d. to be exact—and although, as he said, he would remit it as soon as he could procure the bills,<sup>5</sup> the difficulty was to procure a bill of exchange, for no one was very willing in a time of civil disorder to hold the actual cash. However, he was fortunate enough—or astute enough—during the second week in November to find means of remitting his balance, but in case he might be left with a substantial sum in his own hands, with the Jacobites at his very doors, he was naturally most anxious to receive directions from London as to how exactly he was to proceed. He therefore

<sup>1</sup> A debenture is an authority to repay duties in respect of goods subsequently re-exported.

<sup>2</sup> Collector Liverpool to Board, 29 September 1745.

<sup>3</sup> The reference here is to those Excise duties payable at the port of importation.

<sup>4</sup> Collector Liverpool to Board, 29 Sep. 1745.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* 8 Nov. 1745.

addressed himself to the Board. There was no doubt that the Jacobite force would move south from Carlisle. But Colquitt explained to the Board that of course he expected that "their progress will now be stopped by General Wade"—that presumably to cover himself from any charge of "alarm and despondency" as we should say these days—but *in case* the Jacobite force should come as far as Liverpool,

I humbly beg you'll please to give me your directions how I shall act for the best to secure his Majesty's Monies and Bonds that may be in my hands. I thank God at present I have noe money, but the value of the Bonds is upwards of £90,000, which gives me great uneasiness and therefore beg you will give me your directions how I shall govern myselfe upon such an emergency.<sup>1</sup>

"I have pointed two methods to the Secretary of the Board," he continued, referring to earlier correspondence, "and beg you'll direct wch of these should be exact<sup>d</sup> or any other that you may think most proper."<sup>2</sup>

The normal method by which Collectors of Customs, before the days of joint stock banking, remitted the proceeds of the revenue to the Receiver-General in London was

to enquire out some Merchant or other substantial Person who is desirous to receive Money at the Port in order to pay the like Sum in London by means of his Correspondent there,<sup>3</sup>

and to take this merchant's bill of exchange upon his London "correspondent." But even in completely settled times it was frequently difficult, not to say sometimes impossible, to obtain

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* 19 Nov. 1745.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* Same date.

Colquitt did not show—at least he did not show on paper—all the fine feeling his predecessor in office did in the affair of "the Fifteen." On that occasion Nathaniel Smith, the Collector of the day, wrote:—the Jacobites "are certainly at Lancaster on Sunday night last, and by the best acco<sup>t</sup> are not above 400 good horse manned with Gent [lemen] &c and about 200 Scrubbs, and about 700 foot meanly arm'd and Cloth'd. They are expected tonight or tomorrow at Preston, and we hope they will take the road from thence Manchester, and if not, we may expect 'em in a day or two, and must take the fate of our Neighbours. We are very happy in having a Most Zealous Mayor for KING GEORGE and we are not much afraid of 'em, and for my part I shall not be wanting to venture my life and all I have for his Majty King George, whom God Long preserve and so Good a Cause. Its said some Papist Gentry of this Country and Servants have joynd them, but not many. Yett we continue to Secure some works we have made, and planted Cannon on them, and will not be made slaves if possible." (Collector Liverpool to Board: 8 Nov. 1715.) Incidentally, it might perhaps be apposite here to note that Nathaniel Smith's fine sentiments towards the king did not seem to prevent him in any way from relieving the king of £1,800 of official money. It was upon this defalcation that John Colquitt was appointed Collector at Liverpool.

<sup>3</sup> H. Crouch. *Complete Guide to the Officers of his Majesty's Customs in the Outports.* (1732) 255. (As to which see *Cal. Treas. Bks. & Pp.* (1731-4) 447.)

such bills of exchange on London. If you will allow me to digress for a few moments I might illustrate this latter point by a couple of extracts from the Liverpool books at about this period. In 1742, for example, the Collector at Liverpool was reminded by London that he was holding a large balance of cash in his hands locally, unremitted. To this communication he replied to the effect that he had as a matter of fact remitted the previous month, but there were difficulties in remitting cash to London, and these difficulties were found very hard to overcome.

We have used our utmost endeavours to procure bills to remit the King's money, but find it at present impossible. We have by this day's post remitted £1,164 4s. 1d. which are all the bills we could possibly get in this Country, and the Collector has sent to Manchester, Rochdale, Chester and all the trading towns in this country and cannot as yet get one more bill, and how soon they may circulate again is impossible for us to give your Honours the least information, and therefore most humbly submit in what manner you'll please to order the same to be sent up,<sup>1</sup>

that is to say, in what manner the actual specie should be carried up to London. And the carriage of specie from Liverpool to London was, of course, itself a problem. In 1734 the Collector, after remitting over £3,000 explained that that represented "all the bills we can procure in this Country at present."<sup>2</sup> If he sent the remainder by carrier he would be charged ten shillings for every hundred pounds. He had over £4,000 still in his hands unremitted, and there would therefore be little more expense in sending it to London under a special guard. He could take the cash to Warrington, where there were some dragoons, and one of his own clerks, with four or five soldiers, could convey it thence to London.<sup>3</sup> He wrote the following month to say that he had in fact sent forward over £4,000 in cash under charge of one of his clerks, with four persons as a guard. He added, "We hope the same will arrive safe, for we believe we may depend upon the Integrity & Care of the Persons attending the same. But how far their *Courage* is to be rely'd on we hope there will be no occasion to prove."<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Collector Liverpool to Board. 17 October 1742.

<sup>2</sup> The scarcity of bills in this instance was said to be due to "apprehension of war which has stopped the sale of Lancashire cottons & woollens. The cotton and woollen trades circulate all the bills in this part."

<sup>3</sup> Collector Liverpool to Board. 30 November 1734.

<sup>4</sup> Same to same. 20 December 1734.

This matter of remitting to London then, which was, as we have seen, often a considerable problem even in more or less normal times, was naturally considerably more troublesome in time of civil disorder.<sup>1</sup> It is naturally to be expected that when Colquitt was facing his dilemma of what exactly to do in order to get rid of, or to secure, the crown money in his hands, with the Jacobite force so near, his mind should go back to what his predecessor in office had done in the days of "the Fifteen." If therefore he looked back in his books—as doubtless he did—it would be to find that Nathaniel Smith too—the Collector in 1715—had informed the Board that he was alarmed "by the approach of the Rebels in [these] Parts." The Board replied to the effect that apart from the matter of the money it was most important that the crown securities and the official books should be safeguarded. As regards the latter, there were the Collector's books and the Comptroller's books to be considered. Since medieval times the Collector had kept certain records and rolls, and the Comptroller a counter-record or counter-roll, hence his title.<sup>2</sup> It was therefore most important that not *both* the Collector's accounts *and* the Comptroller's accounts should fall into Jacobite hands. The Board therefore in giving their directions to Liverpool in 1715 said that

they recommend it to you in a particular manner to secure the books, bonds and other papers relating to the Collection, keeping those belonging to your self in one place and those to your Comptroller in another.<sup>3</sup>

Clearly then the Collector must take some special steps to assure the security of the actual cash in his hands, the government securities and bonds, his own books of account, and also those of the Comptroller. It is not quite clear from the records what exactly John Colquitt did in this respect. We may gather from an oblique reference that he himself and his family left his house

<sup>1</sup> With regard to holding large sums of money during the course of civil disorder, it is interesting to note the concern expressed in 1741 by a Collector who was holding £2,650 which he could find no means of remitting, "and to our great concern acct your Honrs yt there is neither Bills or Notes to be procured here. The Collector has recd an acct from ye Magistrates yt ye Officers and Soldiers who have been ye security of this place since ye last ryott have recd orders to march to Berwick next week. We are very apprehensive so soon as they are gone, nothing will be safe here, neither ye Kings Money Bonds Books or Papers but in ye utmost danger of being destroyed and made away with." (*Outport Letter Books*: Newcastle to Board, 31 July 1741.)

<sup>2</sup> Statute of 12 Ric. II. *cap.*2 refers to *customers et contrerollours*. Cf. also Crouch, *op. cit.*, pp. 3-4.

<sup>3</sup> Board to Collector Liverpool. 10 November 1715.

in Liverpool, and went with so many others over to the Wirral.<sup>1</sup> But certainly at the end of the Christmas quarter and the accounting period he had "repaired to [his] duty" and was apparently able to make up and balance his accounts, and render in due manner his monthly and quarterly returns. Incidentally, the Collector at Whitehaven, who took what money he had "under a Guard" to General Wade at Newcastle, "put up all the King's Books and Papers that [he] thought material into Boxes and sent them on board a vessel to the Isleman."<sup>2</sup> He had in consequence to excuse himself at the end of the month because of his inability to make up his account—all his books being still in the Isle of Man.<sup>3</sup> So far as Liverpool was concerned however the Collector reported at the end of the quarter, somewhat cryptically I suggest,

Pursuant to your commands of the 20th inst. I repaired to my duty and brought with me yesterday [30th Dec.] the valuable charge of bonds which are deposited in the proper chest from whence they were taken, where they will remain till they are regularly discharged.<sup>4</sup>

There was, it is to be noted, still a large amount of money on hand. So that was that.

Where exactly had the Collector taken his bonds and securities for safe custody? Although now of course it cannot be said with absolute certainty, we might perhaps look for a hint in the particular letter from Liverpool, with which I opened this paper. It says there that numbers of the inhabitants had taken their most valuable effects "on board ships which lie under the cannon of two Men of War lately built here, which are now in the Channel."<sup>5</sup> We know from an entry in the Town Records that authority was taken "to remove the Corporation Chest with the Seal, Deeds, Charters, Records, Leases, and other Books and Papers on board one of the Men of War then lying in the river."<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> There is a paragraph in *The Liverpool Chronicle* for 7 April 1827 which reads:—  
DIED. in his 88th year, James Forshaw. He was of the age of six years when the arrival of the rebels was so much dreaded in Liverpool and recollected Mr. Colquit, the Collector taking his family over into Cheshire, leaving his house in town, at the corner of Peter Lane fronting Hanover Street, in the care of his father, Henry Forshaw, whose orders from the collector were to send all the intelligence he could procure respecting the approach of the rebels.

(I am indebted to Mr. Wardle for this reference.)

<sup>2</sup> *Outport Letter Books*: Whitehaven to Board. 14 Nov. 1745.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* 30 Nov. 1745.

<sup>4</sup> Collector Liverpool to Board. 31 Dec. 1745.

<sup>5</sup> *St. James's Evening Post*. 3-5 Dec. 1745.

<sup>6</sup> J. Touzeau: *Rise & Progress of Liverpool*, (1910) i. 460.

It is very likely, I suggest, that that was the unnamed depository to which Colquitt took the Liverpool Customs valuables also. The two ships referred to in the letter I have quoted, and in the Liverpool Town Records, can be identified as H.M.S. *South Sea Castle*, and H.M.S. *Mercury* or H.M.S. *Looe*.<sup>1</sup>

The *South Sea Castle* was a "fifth rate man of war," 44 guns, 712 tons, 220-280 men, from John Okill's yard, launched on 18 August 1745. Her commander was John Amherst who was commissioned captain on 29 December preceding. The *Mercury* was "a man of war of the sixth rate," 24 guns, 504 tons, 140-160 men, from Richard Golightly's yard, launched on 13 October 1745. Her commander was William Bladewell who was commissioned captain on 17 September. Both captains were, as we learn from the Town Records, enrolled as freemen of Liverpool in October 1745. Richard Golightly had already built the *Lark* (of 44 guns) the year before, and was to build the *Deal Castle* (of 24 guns) the year following. John Okill built the *Liverpool* and *Hastings* in 1741 and the *Pearl* in 1744 (all of 44 guns). The *Looe* was a "fifth rate man of war," 44 guns, 716 tons, 220-280 men, from the yard of Gorell and Parkes, launched the day before the *South Sea Castle*.

Doubtless while Colquitt was turning over in his mind what exactly he should do with the crown valuables in his charge, he was reminded of what happened at the neighbouring port of Lancaster during the rising in 1715. He would without doubt have heard the story many times whilst he was serving at Lancaster, for Joseph Bentley, the Collector there, seemed very fond of telling it. According to his story he had had to take some remarkable steps to secure the crown moneys from the Jacobites. Joseph Bentley, who took over the duties of Collector at Lancaster in October 1700,<sup>2</sup> had previously been a land-waiter in Liverpool.<sup>3</sup> Our John Colquitt would recollect his fellow-townsmen, having himself taken oath before him at Lancaster as deputy comptroller there.<sup>4</sup> In 1715 Bentley according to his own story had "scowered off to the mountains and the fells with above 400l of the King's Money," and he took great pride in his

<sup>1</sup> See P.R.O.: State Papers: Domestic: George II: Bun. 68, No. 78, particularly with regard to safety of gunpowder.

<sup>2</sup> *Lancaster Oaths of Office Book*. 16 October 1700.

<sup>3</sup> *Cal. Treas. Bks.* (1699-1700), p. 438. He later returned to Liverpool from Lancaster.

<sup>4</sup> *Lancaster Oaths of Office Book*. 29 November 1700.

assertion that although there were two parties sent out to look for him, and a reward of £100 offered for his discovery, they were unable to find him in "the Mountains and fells," and he succeeded in keeping the King's money safe. Such at least was his own story, the story he told the following year when he got alarmed at the report "that some persons at the Treasury are endeavouring to get his place."<sup>1</sup> But the official books hint at an altogether different and less romantic version of the affair. It seems very likely that the Collector Lancaster merely took the money to Liverpool for the Collector there to look after and take the risk.<sup>2</sup>

It is interesting to note that in "the Forty-five" also other parts of the county looked towards Liverpool as a place of security and safety. But Liverpool itself was not quite so confident. The point is well illustrated, as between Lancaster and Liverpool again. It is clear that in the fore part of November, that is to say, at about the time Charles Edward was leaving Edinburgh on his march southwards, Lancaster, already apparently fearful for its safety, and not very anxious to defend itself, put all the "guns, Arms and Amunition, belonging to the town & port" aboard a sloop, and sent them off to Liverpool. At Liverpool however the sloop was directed off to the Pile of Fowdray, that is to say to Barrow-in-Furness. The account in respect of this voyage reads as follows:—

Dr. The County of Lancaster to Robert Lawson.

9th November to January 1745 [1746]. By order from the Deputy Lieutenants

To the Mayor & Bailiffs of the Corporation of Lancaster.

To charge of transportation (in order to prevent falling into the hands of the Rebels) all guns, Arms, and Amunition, belonging to the Town & port of Lancaster to Liverpoole, whereat same was tendered to Foster Cunliffe, Esq, whence he directed the Vessel to return to Pile Fowrdey, and there lay under said Arms & Amunition, till such time the Rebels were gone, afterwards to be redelivered to the Mayor & Bailiffs of Lancaster, all which was accordingly performed.....£31 10s. od.

This account is endorsed in the following terms:—

We have considered the above Affair as Impartially as we can in proportion

<sup>1</sup> *Cal. Treas. Bks. & Pp.* (1714-19) pp. 199 & 220.

<sup>2</sup> Bentley claimed £16 13s. 4d. in respect of "three journeys to Liverpool by order of the Board and securing the King's cash from the Rebels." Cf. *Outport Letter Books: Lancaster Board to Collector.* 19 May 1716. (But cf. also *Cal. Treas. Bks. & Pp.* (1731-4) pp. 66 & 69.)

to Other Freights & do award the above Robert Lawson Fourteen Guineas for the Service of his Sloop.

Witness our hands.

Myles Berket

Wm. Butterfield.<sup>1</sup>

15th January 1745/6

Another vessel at Liverpool that got itself drawn into the matter of "the Forty-five" was the quarantine sloop *Royal William*. It will be recalled that since 1710 the due observance of a quarantine period was required by statute in the case of ships from infected or suspected ports.<sup>2</sup> The quarantine station appointed for the port of Liverpool was off Hoylake, and the sloop detailed for the service the *Royal William*, which was not a crown vessel actually, but what was known as "a contract vessel," as we shall see by a later reference. At the critical period in 1745 the *Royal William* was driven ashore at Hoylake by the weather. It will be recalled that at the end of November it was still uncertain whether the Jacobite force had in fact the intention of marching the London road, or whether they would on the contrary turn westward after crossing the Mersey through, or past, Chester into Wales.<sup>3</sup> Just at the time when the *Royal William* had run ashore her services were demanded by the Earl of Cholmondeley in his capacity of Governor of Chester Castle, Lord Lieutenant of the County,<sup>4</sup> and *Custos Rotulorum*, for the purpose of securing the county and other records from the Castle, and the military and other stores, should it be decided not to defend the place. In the meantime some effort was being made in any case to get the quarantine sloop off, if only in order to enable her to return to her ordinary duties. But having regard to the state of the weather, and the fact that no ships were in fact in quarantine in the Hoylake station at that particular time, nor any expected, it did not seem necessary to incur the additional expense to get the sloop refloated. Lord Cholmondeley however was adamant, and the *Royal William* was refloated—at some considerable expense of course—in order to be placed at the Lord Lieutenant's service. When in due course the account was rendered in respect of the service to the sloop, the Collector

<sup>1</sup> Lancashire Quarter Session Archives, County Record Office, Preston. (I am indebted to Mr. R. Sharpe France for this reference.)

<sup>2</sup> *Statutes*: 9 Anne, *cap.* 2, as strengthened by 7 Geo. I *stat.* 1 *cap.* 3.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. in this connection *London Gazette* 30 Nov.—3 Dec. 1745.

<sup>4</sup> He was Lord Lieutenant of the Counties of Flint, Carnarvon, Anglesey, Merioneth and Montgomery also.

of Customs, feeling that it was not exactly a Customs charge, instead of paying it, forwarded it to London with the following comments :—

The “ Royal William ” sloop, Captain Suttler [?Lyttler] Commander, which lay at Hoylake to oblige ships coming to this port liable to Quarantine to perform the same regularly, was drove ashore there by a violent gale of wind, when Lord Cholmondeley demanded the assistance of the said vessel for his Majesty's Service to secure the stores, records, &c. of the Castle of Chester as set forth by his certificate at the foot of the enclosed, when it was supposed that the Rebels designed to take that City in their way to Wales. The Owners of the said Sloop had been directed to get her off as soon as possible in order to have got her to her proper station to perform the service for which she was placed there, but at the time there was no ship under Quarantine nor any expected,<sup>1</sup> and as the spring tide then proved low they found it impracticable without a very extra expense, but as Lord Cholmondeley insisted upon her being launched as set forth in Lyttlers [?Suttlers] certificate on the back of ye enclosed, and which occasioned the extra expense contained in the enclosed bill, it is humbly submitted to your Honours to give Directions for the payment of the same.<sup>2</sup>

It is interesting to note that not only was this quarantine sloop got off and applied to the service the Lord Lieutenant desired, but she was later sent to Carlisle on his directions with a cargo of biscuit and shoes for the garrison there. In due course she returned to her Liverpool station, but only to be requisitioned again for two more voyages to the garrisons of Carlisle and Dumfries. As already stated, the *Royal William* was not a revenue cutter or regular crown vessel: she was what was known as a “contract vessel.” One is not altogether surprised therefore to learn in the circumstances of the case that the owners, having contracted to furnish a vessel for the quarantine service, “thought it hard” that the *Royal William* should be sent on voyages involving such risk and such wear and tear as those voyages undoubtedly did, and the owners lodged their complaint accordingly.<sup>3</sup>

Besides the matter of vessels during the course of “the Forty-five” there was also the matter of the various cargoes. For

<sup>1</sup> The only “stop” operative at the time appears to have been in respect of a “contagion amongst the Hornd Cattle” from Holland. (*Outport Letter Books: General Letter: Board to Collectors, 5 Oct. 1745*) and presumably Liverpool could anticipate no arrivals.

<sup>2</sup> Collector Liverpool to Board, 11 Jan. 1745[6].

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* 7 March 1745[6].

example, notwithstanding all the rumours in 1743 and 1744 about a Jacobite rising assisted by some attempt from abroad, Britain was in 1745 singularly unprepared to withstand any serious attack.<sup>1</sup> Particularly had she to be careful in the matter of powder. An embargo was therefore placed on the shipment of gunpowder and other military stores—even shipment coastwise. The embargo was intended to be strictly administered, and even the powder loaded for coastwise shipment for the use of the tinnerns in Cornwall was placed under stop.<sup>2</sup> In these mid-eighteenth century days of privateering and letters of marque there was of necessity a powder magazine at such a port as Liverpool. Incidentally, it may be recalled that at a time slightly later than the time we are now dealing with, namely in the September of 1746, the Corporation decided that owing to some local disorder, and having regard to the very dangerous nature of gunpowder, and the risk in carting it through the streets, vessels lying in the docks or at any pier should be prohibited to receive any gunpowder on board under a penalty of £5.<sup>3</sup> But at this time there was no such prohibition, and Pearse, Underhill & Norman's magazine could deliver to any ship. It appears that when the Duke of Cumberland was marching north to invest Carlisle he sent to Whitehaven for "6 of the great guns in the fort and all the Powder in the Magazine with a certain quantity of Ball" to meet him at Carlisle.<sup>4</sup> The guns were forwarded at once, together with what powder could be obtained locally from the merchants there. Three or four days later the Duke sent again to the Custom House at Whitehaven for "a further supply of Powder if possible." But there was no more powder in the magazine and none could be procured in the town. The Collector of Customs therefore

forthwith ordered the Tidesurveyors . . . to search all the Ships in the Harbour and bring us an Acct of what Quantities they found, wch they having accordingly done, We sent for the Masters who readily deliver'd us all they had on our promising to return them the quantitys in a little time.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> As to the generally neglected condition of the fortifications at home, see P.R.O.: State Paper Office, Domestic: Military: No. 37 f. 7.

<sup>2</sup> *Cal. Treas. Bks. & Pp.* (1742-5) 726. (29 Oct. 1745).

<sup>3</sup> Touzeau. *op. cit.* i. 464.

<sup>4</sup> *Outport Letter Books*: Whitehaven, 17 Jan. 1745[6].

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* same date.

Joseph Burrow, the Collector there, explains that he was able to make this promise to the masters of the ships concerned because a particular Whitehaven merchant, Gabriel Griffiths, although he had sent all his present stock of powder off to the duke at Carlisle, had a further forty barrels on order from Liverpool, and this forty barrels Griffiths expected by the next Liverpool ship. This was towards the end of December, 1745. The Collector at Whitehaven therefore on the strength of this promise, borrowed the ships' powder from the various vessels in the port, and this was collected up and carted off to Carlisle. The city and castle of course capitulated on 30 December. All that was necessary now to be done was merely to return to the ships the powder borrowed, and as some of them were bound for overseas the masters got very restive when the Collector, Whitehaven, was still unable to implement his promise. Joseph Burrow saw Gabriel Griffiths the merchant, and the latter explained that the 40 barrels he had been expecting were actually at Liverpool ready for shipment, but that the Customs there had refused permission to ship on account of the general embargo. This was perfectly correct. Early in October the Commissioners of Customs had brought the matter before the Lords of the Treasury,<sup>1</sup> and my Lords had ruled that the Board were to issue instructions to their officers to secure that no arms or military stores go to any port in Great Britain without a specific order of the Commissioners.<sup>2</sup> The Board therefore directed all Collectors not to grant their clearance to any such shipment "without first representing the case to the Commissioners and receiving the Board's particular Directions thereon."<sup>3</sup> It was on the strength of that "General Letter" that the Liverpool Customs placed a "stop" on the shipment of the forty barrels of gunpowder to Griffiths of Whitehaven. In the middle of January, since the matter was still held up, the Collector at Whitehaven after explaining the general circumstances of the case, petitioned the Board in the following terms:—

Honble

. . . Mr. Griffiths this Day informs us That his Correspondent [at Liverpool] has writ him that he can't have leave to ship [the forty barrels

<sup>1</sup> *Cal. Treas. Bks. & Pp.* (1742-5) p. 719. (3 Oct. 1745).

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 721 (8 Oct.)

<sup>3</sup> *Outport Letter Books*: General Letter, Board to Collectors, 10 Oct. 1745.

of powder] without yr Hons permission, and as the Masters from whom we procur'd the Powder here are uneasy, some of them being bound abroad, and as theirs was taken for his Majesty's immediate Service, and sent to his Royal Highness, and being sensible of theirs and Mr. Griffiths Loyalty and attach<sup>t</sup>. We hbly move yr Hon<sup>s</sup> to Permitt the sd 40 Barrels to be sent from Liverpool hither, under such restrictions and Security as to your Hon<sup>s</sup> may seem necessary, to enable us to perform our promise, for We can get none nearer than Newcastle and the Land Carriage will enhance the Price.<sup>1</sup>

At a very early stage in "the Forty-five" it was clear to the Board of Commissioners that a scheme for what we should now call control of shipping and export control would need to be put into operation, particularly as regards shipments to and from Scotland. At the very beginning of October they approached the Lords of the Treasury on the matter,<sup>2</sup> and obtained authority to detain all ships until satisfied.<sup>3</sup> The several ports were therefore instructed accordingly in the following terms:—

In pursuance of the Directions of the Lords Commissioners of his Majesty's Treasury signified in their Secretary's Letter of yesterday's date [9th. Oct.] you are to give Orders to the proper Officers of your Port for stopping and examining all Ships coming from or going to Scotland until you shall have given the Commissioners an Account thereof, with a Particular of their Ladings in order to be laid before the Lords of the Treasury, and received their Lordships' Directions.<sup>4</sup>

In the case of those ships which arrived at Liverpool from Scottish ports the vessels were permitted by the Lords of the Treasury to discharge, ("the Commissioners of Customs having no objections to delivery,<sup>5</sup>") but the vessels were not allowed to return to Scotland.

But in the meantime the military situation in the highlands had become very critical. The chain of forts across the highlands—often referred to as "the Chain"—Fort William, Fort Augustus and Fort George—had each been surrounded and cut off.<sup>6</sup> The passes were closed against them,<sup>7</sup> and when they sent out a small reconnaissance party for intelligence it was promptly taken

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* Whitehaven, 17 January, 1745[6].

<sup>2</sup> *Cal. Treas. Bks. & Pp.* (1742-45) p. 719. (3 Oct. 1745).

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 721. (8 Oct. 1745.)

<sup>4</sup> *Outport Letter Books*: General Letter, Board to Collectors, 10 Oct. 1745.

<sup>5</sup> *Cal. Treas. Bks. & Pp.* (1742-45) p. 725. (22 Oct. 1745).

<sup>6</sup> Public Record Office: State Papers: Scotland: ii. Series: Bun. 25: Nos. 79, 84 & 87.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* Nos. 84, 86 & 87.

prisoner by the clansmen.<sup>1</sup> It was therefore most necessary to the government, there being no communication by land, to establish and maintain contact by sea—to “hold the Superiority of the Western Seas” as the Lord Advocate said,<sup>2</sup> to post a “ship of force” to Loch Linnhe,<sup>3</sup> to force the Narrows, and thus to break the blockade of Fort William. It was from Liverpool principally that these operations were to be directed. The Admiralty made the necessary arrangements about the ship, and the Victualling Office about the stores. Mr. Carr, the Naval Victualling Agent in Liverpool, received by express the directions as to the provisions and so forth to be shipped. But as the Collector of Customs stood instructed he was not to permit any ship whatsoever to “clear” without receiving “*the Board's particular Directions thereon.*” But the Collector thought the occasion an eminently suitable one for ignoring the Board's implicit instructions, so he granted the ship its “clearance,” allowed it to proceed, and addressed the following to the Board:—

22nd. October, 1745.

On the 18th Instant the Collector acquainted the Secretary [of the Board] with our suffering a ship to take in provisions for the garrisons of Fort William in Scotland, being ordered by directions of the Admiralty and Victualling Office which came by express to Mr. Carr, Agent Victualler, and inclosed is a Copy of the quantity of provisions shipt, for which we have granted a cocket, took bond, and cleared the ship this day, being a fair wind and the circumstances and the necessity of the case, we humbly presume will excuse us from breaking through your commands<sup>4</sup> of the 10th instant.<sup>5</sup>

Incidentally, the reference to a “cocket” (or coquet) may be of interest. It is a reference to a document known as an “exporter's general entry outwards” on which is a declaration for customs purposes of the outward cargo. After any necessary check has been imposed, the document is endorsed by the proper customs official, the old words of the endorsement, “*quo quietus est*” giving rise to the term “coquet.”<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* Nos. 84 & 86.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* No. 65.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* No. 74.

<sup>4</sup> *Outport Letter Books*: General Letter: Board to Collectors, 10 Oct. 1745.

<sup>5</sup> Collector Liverpool to Board, 22 Oct. 1745.

<sup>6</sup> Matthew Hale *De Portibus Maris*, [c. 1667] 103. In mediaeval times the term “coquet” was occasionally applied to the document thus sealed and sometimes to the seal itself, but the meaning is always clear. (Cf. *Cal. Close Rolls (Edward II)* 1313-8 p. 582 and 1318-23 pp. 44 & 249.)

After the vessel had been got away from Liverpool to break the blockade of Fort William in the Western Highlands, a further line of action suggested itself. It will be recalled that much to the amazement of the government, when arms were offered by Cope to the various chiefs and clansmen in order that they might be able to defend themselves and their estates from the advancing Jacobites, even the so-called "loyal" clans refused the proffered arms, protesting that—under the Disarming Acts<sup>1</sup>—it was not lawful for a highlander to bear arms even to defend himself, or against the king's enemies.<sup>2</sup> But now at this date—in the October and November of 1745—even if the government wished to raise the Whig clans in the form of an authorised county militia, there was no means of arming them and victualling them, as all the passes into the Western Highlands were held by the Jacobite clansmen. It was decided therefore to raise them in the form of the Argyllshire Militia<sup>3</sup> and to commission Major-General John Campbell<sup>4</sup> to command them, and to authorise him "to go to the West Highlands *by way of Liverpool* to raise eight Independent Companies."<sup>5</sup>

He was authorised furthermore to provide his provisions from Liverpool.<sup>6</sup> But General Campbell does not seem to have been quite so successful at getting the port authorities to set aside their official directions as the Navy Victualling Agent had been at an earlier stage. Perhaps it was that the Custom House thought that in the earlier case they would disregard the official regulations and report themselves to the Board for it, on the grounds that the earlier case—the storing of Fort William—was both unprecedented and urgent. But this latter case—the raising of the militia and Campbell's Independent Companies at Inverary—was clearly neither. The directions of the Lords of the Treasury specifically provided for "representing the Case to the Commissioners." Liverpool therefore saw no reason why they should grant their "coquet" in the circumstances. The ships were therefore detained. And whether Liverpool knew it or not, the port of London had taken the same attitude,<sup>7</sup> Newcastle stopped

<sup>1</sup> Statutes: I Geo. I *stat.* 2 *cap.* 54, and 11 Geo. I *cap.* 26.

<sup>2</sup> P.R.O.: S. P. Scot. ii ser: 25: Nos. 61, 67, 88 and 93.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* No. 107.

<sup>4</sup> Campbell of Mamore, later 4th Duke of Argyll.

<sup>5</sup> *Cal. Treas. Bks. & Pp.* (1742-45) pp. 727 (7 Nov.) and 730 (8 Nov.).

<sup>6</sup> P.R.O.: S.P.Scot: ii. ser: 28: Nos. 2 & 36.

<sup>7</sup> *Cal. Treas. Bks. & Pp.* (1742-45) p. 725 (22 Oct.).

a similar shipment in respect of stores for Lord Loudoun's Independent Companies<sup>1</sup> and New Highland Regiment<sup>2</sup> at Inverness, and so also had Bristol with regard to General Campbell's stores to the Western Highlands.<sup>3</sup>

The general addressed his memorial to the Lords of the Treasury, stating that he was about to set out for the Clyde and Argyllshire. "By his last letter from those parts he is informed that all species of corn and meal is very scarce and dear." As he may have frequent occasion to buy provisions<sup>4</sup> for the forces raised and to be raised in Argyll<sup>5</sup> it was his intention to stop at Liverpool, load certain ships there, and at the other Lancashire ports, with corn and meal, and take them under his convoy for Scotland. But, he protests,

the vessels now lying at Liverpool and other ports of Lancashire to load with victual are stopt by the officers of the government and revenue."<sup>6</sup>

He prayed therefore that "free leave and despatch" be given to the vessels "and to all other ships which he may employ and which shall have his certificate."<sup>7</sup> The Lords of the Treasury ruled that the Commissioners of Customs "if they have no objection" were to give orders forthwith to their officers "in the several ports in Lancashire" that the ships now detained by the customs officers there and bound for the Clyde and Argyllshire may be permitted to carry meal and victual thither "upon the General's certificate," provided the officers of customs inspect the several cargoes and certify that nothing but provisions are suffered to pass.<sup>8</sup>

The Treasury Minute Book and other records refer to "Liverpool and other ports of Lancashire" and Bristol,<sup>9</sup> and by later implication to other ports. The local documents at Liverpool have not survived: the Bristol local records were destroyed

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* p. 737 (3 Dec.).

<sup>2</sup> P.R.O.: S.P.Dom.Mil. 16 pp. 1-4; Mil. Entry Book: 188: 132; W. O. Corres: Out-Letters. Sec-at-War: 45. ff. 367-71; & Estab. Regrs: 286.

<sup>3</sup> *Cal. Treas. Bks. & Pp.* (1742-45) p. 732 (15 Nov.).

<sup>4</sup> As to provisioning Fort William and Argyll from sea, see P.R.O.: S. P. Scot: ii ser: 28: No. 31.

<sup>5</sup> The "forces raised" were the "Additional" or recruiting Companies of Lord John Murray's ("Old") Highland Regiment, the 43rd (later the 42nd) Foot, The Black Watch. (P.R.O.: W. O. Out-Letters: Sec-at-War: 39. f. 242 and 40. f. 345.) sent from Perthshire to Inverary in the August. (P.R.O.: S. P. Scot: ii ser: 25: No. 79.) The "forces to be raised" were the Argyll Militia. (P.R.O.: S. P. Scot: ii ser: 25: No. 107.)

<sup>6</sup> *Cal. Treas. Bks. & Pp.* (1742-45) pp. 731-2 (14 & 15 Nov.)

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

in the Chartist riots of 1831: the relative documents at headquarters in the Custom House, London, were lost in the fire of 1814. I have therefore long been puzzled as to which exactly were the other ports referred to. I have at one time and another visited most of the western ports and have searched for evidence of the shipment of grain and military stores, either in association with Liverpool, or coastwise to Liverpool for transhipment to Fort William. My efforts were recently rewarded at the somewhat unlikely ports of Barnstaple and Neyland. The Barnstaple records are at Bristol and the Neyland at Neyland in Pembrokeshire. The items in the Barnstaple books are especially interesting—apart from the report that “the Mobb has risen in this Town to prevent the Shipping of Corn”,<sup>1</sup> “though the Price of Wheat last Market Day did not exceed 4s. 6d. p. Bushell, nor this Day 4s. 3d.”<sup>2</sup>—because they contain the text of the “Certificate by the General” referred to above, addressed, “To the Principall Officers of his Majesty’s Customs in the Ports of Liverpoole, Bristol, and any other or others whom it may concern”.<sup>3</sup> The Neyland records refer to the shipment of corn in general, and in particular to the ship *Peggy*, Samuel Ferris, master, at “Anchor in the Dale Road in order to load Wheat and other Grain for Liverpool”. Neyland reported on 16 December that they “had not suffered the Master to take on board any part of ye Lading”, but placed the ship under detention.<sup>4</sup> The Board on the 21st December called for the coast despatches and any other evidence that the grain was in fact for Liverpool, as distinct from some Irish port for later transhipment to the Jacobites.<sup>5</sup> The papers were forwarded to the Board on 4 January, but the vessel was not permitted to continue loading nor to depart for Liverpool until 11 February. Neyland was to allow the master “to load on board the said vessel and permit him to proceed to Liverpool accordingly, upon the Master making oath that he will not sail to any other Port.”<sup>6</sup> The picture we have then is of quantities of grain and military stores being collected from various ports along the western seaboard and concentrated upon Liverpool, to

<sup>1</sup> Barnstaple to Board, 18 April, 1746.

<sup>2</sup> Same to same, 25 April, 1746.

<sup>3</sup> Same to same, 18 April, 1746.

<sup>4</sup> Board to Neyland, 21 December, 1745.

<sup>5</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 11 February, 1745 [6].

be transhipped for the relief and support of the forces and forts in Scotland.<sup>1</sup>

It is no part of my present purpose to recount the story of the siege of Fort William in the March of 1746—of how the narrow seas were kept open by the sloops *Serpent* and *Baltimore*,<sup>2</sup> of the attack on the Narrows of Carron, of how the Fort started with “a tolerable quantity of meal,” “a small parcel of malt” from the brewery, and five or six last of seized salt herring that chanced to be lying at the Custom House; but throughout the siege, when the ways over the mountains were closed, the place was victualled by sea. Fort George had fallen. Fort Augustus had fallen. Ruthven-in-Badenoch, Bernera, and Inversnaid, had fallen. But Cumberland was determined that of all the forts and posts in the highlands Fort William at least should be held.<sup>3</sup> An interesting, and indeed an exciting version of the story is to be found in the Public Record Office in the form of a diary giving a day to day account of siege from within the beleaguered garrison.<sup>4</sup> This diary found itself in due course in the columns of the official *London Gazette*,<sup>5</sup> from which it was copied,<sup>6</sup> and has frequently been reproduced.<sup>7</sup> The clansmen closed round on the 4th, 5th, and 6th March, but during the whole of the siege the Loch was kept open to the sea. The siege was raised on 3 April, for the Jacobites withdrew their forces then—to Culloden. During the course of February six ships at least are known to have cleared from Liverpool under the concession of the Board, mostly carrying provisions. In addition, other ships were loading oatmeal and other goods for the supply “of the Army and Country.” Thus the embargo on goods shipped from English ports to Scotland was lifted so far as concerned “Provisions and other Necessities for the Army” and “the Country,” and it was reported from Liverpool in the February, just before the blockade of Fort William became a more active siege, that “vast quantities of

<sup>1</sup> As to choice of port, see P.R.O.: State Papers: Domestic: Military: Bun. 16: No. 273.

<sup>2</sup> The *Serpent* was a sloop of 275 tons, 60 men, and 14 guns. The *Baltimore* was a sloop of 251 tons, 80–100 men, and 14 carriage and 14 swivel guns.

<sup>3</sup> P.R.O.: S. P. Scot: ii. ser: 28: No. 47 and 29: No. 31.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* 30: Nos. 2 & 17.

<sup>5</sup> 2 April, 1746.

<sup>6</sup> *Gentleman's Magazine* xvi (Apl. 1746) pp. 205–7; and *Scots Magazine* viii. (Apl. 1746), pp. 181–2.

<sup>7</sup> E. G. Marchant, *History of the Present Rebellion*, (1746) pp. 356–63.

goods are brought here for Scotland."<sup>1</sup> Although the details of the siege have been embodied in many of the histories of the "Forty-five" I do not remember any reference to the part taken in it by the port of Liverpool.

<sup>1</sup> Collector Liverpool to Board. 21 Feb. 1745 [6].