were necessarily inferior in value, because "they enter into a new climate, and perhaps change of diet; are unfit for immediate labour; unacquainted with tools or implements of work, or the manner of performing it; have everything to learn, and earn nothing."[41]

Mr. Law, arguing before the House of Lords in 1792 on behalf of the West Indian planters, complained that, just at the moment when it would have been convenient for the planter to turn his uncultivated lands to the culture of the cane and give up the exhausted soils, "he is told that he must cultivate it no longer, or at least cultivate it at an expense and under difficulties which it would be impossible for him to undergo."[42] It was precisely this new cultivation the abolitionists wished to restrain.[43]

Pitt had already proved to what extent the mortality among the newly imported slaves was mainly responsible for what excess of deaths over births there still was in the islands. As early as 1788 he had written to Wilberforce stressing the importance of ascertaining whether a large proportion of the annual imports of slaves was not devoted to bringing new land into cultivation. This was certainly the case as far as Dominica, St. Vincent and Grenada—the islands ceded by France in 1763—were concerned. The abolition of the slave trade would therefore "only prevent *further* improvements which *would have taken place*, and not break in upon the advantages at present subsisting."[44] Wilberforce advised the planters, that if they had more ground than was cultivated, they might employ it to greater advantage in cotton and cinnamon than in canes,[45] and drew a contrast between "the slow, perhaps, but sure progress of cultivation, carried on in the natural way, and the attempt to force improvements which, however flattering the prospect might appear at the outset, soon produced a load of debts and inextricable embarrassments."[46] Even Dundas, who was in reality the friend of the West Indians, admitted that the desire to increase the cultivation of the West Indian Islands was no good cause for continuing so unjust a traffic as the slave trade.[47] Governor Orde, writing of Dominica, described the situation of all the West Indian islands. He declared that Dominica must materially suffer from the abolition, more perhaps than any other colony, because the island was so little cleared; "for although I have no doubt that the number

41. Ibid., Part III. Messrs. Fuller, Long and Chisholme.
42. Add. Mss. 12433, folio 39. May 14, 1792.
43. It is possible that, in view of the superiority of French St. Domingo (see chapter 2), the question of overproduction, so much to the fore in 1807, was also in the minds of the abolitionists.
44. *Life of Wilberforce*, Vol. I, pages 162–163.
45. *Parl. Hist.*, Vol. XXIX, page 1072. April 2, 1792.
46. Ibid., pages 259–260. April 18, 1791.
47. Ibid., page 1218. Stated by Pitt, April 18, 1792.

of slaves we now have may be kept up without any additional importation, yet I much fear the increase cannot be such as will enable us much to extend the agriculture of the country."[48] In other words, imports were unnecessary to maintain the existing population.

The West Indians were fighting tooth and nail. But when it is remembered that Mr. Long, the historian of Jamaica, had urged that the cessation of imports would diminish the fear of slave risings, the new Negroes being the most intractable, the most likely to rebel against a life which seemed to some a veritable paradise for them as compared with their life in Africa;[49] when it is remembered that after St. Domingo had gone up in flames the fear of a servile war hung like a sword of Damocles over the heads of the planters in the British islands, we can see that the prosecution had a strong case.

(b) Mortality among the Seamen Engaged in the African Trade

One great argument of defenders of the slave trade was that it was the chief nursery of British seamen, which, with the fisheries and the coasting trade, contributed to British supremacy on the seas. Whatever the truth of this assertion in the days when the slave trade was an object of national importance and its utility not yet questioned, it was quite different when the campaign for abolition began.

It was to Clarkson's magnificent researches that the abolitionists were indebted for the revelation of the true facts. Bearding the lion in his den, Clarkson at much personal risk roamed the docks of Liverpool, Bristol and London, questioned seamen, examined muster rolls and collected evidence which was a terrific indictment of the effects of the slave trade, not now upon the blacks but upon the whites.

That able abolitionist, Ramsay, also enlarged on this point. The loss of seamen on the voyage was, in his opinion, so generally understood and acknowledged as to preclude the necessity of any particular inquiry.[50] His indignation at the squandering of the lives of the seamen, as a result of pushing "to a most indiscreet length" a trade which was most precarious and in general unprofitable, knew no bounds.[51] From personal experience he could say that the trade was not a nursery for seamen: "it forms not but destroys seamen. And this destruction of seamen is a strong argument for the abolition of

48. B.T. 1/5. June 13, 1792.

49. *Parl. Deb.*, Vol. VIII, page 669. Earl St. Vincent, Feb. 2, 1807.

50. *Ramsay: Ms. Vol.*, folio 7. "Observations on the condition in which African slaves are imported into the West Indies."

51. Ibid., folio 23. "Memorial on the supplying of the Navy with seamen."

it." He quoted Clarkson's figures that the annual losses amounted to at least 2,000 men, and that the proportion of deaths in the African trade to those in the Newfoundland trade was as 200 to 10, and agreed that ill-treatment and the disorders attendant on the trade permanently crippled almost all of those who engaged in it. "If, therefore," he concluded, "we have any regard to the lives of seamen, we ought to abandon a branch of trade which dissipates the men in so unprofitable a manner."[52]

Wilberforce, in a letter to Eden, condemned the slave trade as the grave rather than the nursery of seamen, and estimated the annual losses as one-fourth of the sailors engaged in it.[53] From the Liverpool and Bristol muster rolls he showed the House that on 350 slave vessels, with 12,263 seamen, there were 2,643 deaths in 12 months, whereas of 462 ships engaged in the West Indian trade, with 7,640 seamen on board, there were only 118 deaths in seven months.[54] Despite the good regulations Britain had lost over eleven per cent of her sailors in the trade.[55]

William Smith, exposing to the House of Commons what he called the numerous fallacies and mis-statements of the anti-abolitionists, easily disposed of the argument that the slave trade was responsible for introducing many "landsmen" to the mercantile marine and as a consequence to the Navy. The proportion of landsmen, from the Bristol muster rolls, little exceeded one-twelfth; in Liverpool it was only one-sixteenth.[56] According to Lord Howick, the losses among seamen in the African slave trade as compared with the West Indian trade were eight to one, and the slave trade was unique in the readiness with which men deserted it on their arrival in the West Indies for the King's ships.[57]

The Abolition Committee, replying to resolutions of the West Indian Planters and Merchants in 1789, condemned the slave trade as a national injury, in that the mortality occasioned by it was more than double that of all the other branches of commerce in the kingdom.[58] And the venerable John Newton argued that the "truly alarming" loss in the African trade, if a

52. Ibid., folio 64. "An Address on the proposed bill for the Abolition of the Slave Trade."

53. *Auckland Papers*, Add. Mss. 34427, folio 123. Nov. 23, 1787. Wilberforce also pointed out that the mortality amongst the French seamen was greater, because, their ships being larger, they were obliged to wait longer on the coast for cargoes. Ibid., folio 50. Nov. 7, 1787.

54. *Parl. Hist.*, Vol. XXIX, page 270. April 18, 1791.

55. Ibid., page 1069. April 2, 1792. Clarkson computed that five-sixths of those who sailed for Africa died.

56. Ibid., page 322. April 18, 1791.

57. *Parl. Deb.*, Vol. VIII, pages 948–949. Feb. 23, 1807.

58. *Abolition Committee's Proceedings*. Add. Mss. 21255, folio 100(v). April 14, 1789.

rapid loss of seamen deserved the attention of a maritime people, was surely of political importance.[59]

In the face of these glaring facts, which no attempt was made to refute, opponents indulged only in lame excuses. Bordering almost on the facetious, Law, before the House of Lords, excused the heavy mortality on the ground that it was not as large as the loss in the transportation of British convicts.[60] He referred to slaves only, but the Middle Passage affected whites as well, largely because of the unlimited power of the Captains, those proud men, dressed in a little brief authority, whom Fox compared to Roman Caesars. Alderman Watson argued that the West Indian trade was intimately connected with the Newfoundland fisheries, and that abolition of the slave trade would not only annihilate the marine by cutting off a great source of seamen, but would destroy the Newfoundland fisheries, "which the slaves in the West Indies supported, by consuming that part of the fish that was fit for no other consumption";[61] and Mr. Grosvenor acknowledged that "it was not an amiable trade, but neither was the trade of a butcher an amiable trade, and yet a mutton chop was, nevertheless, a good thing."[62]

(c) The Foreign Slave Trade

The importance of the slave trade to Britain in former times lay not only in supplying Negro slaves to her own colonies in the West Indies—without whom, in the words of Dr. Hochstetter, cultivation would have been analogous to a factory today without steam engines or coal—, but also in supplying the needs of foreign powers. One has only to think of the Asiento, and Chatham's boast that his conquests in Africa during the Seven Years' War had placed almost the whole of the foreign supply in British hands, to realise the justice of this statement. By 1788 the old order had changed.

The great resurgence of the British slave trade after the American war was directed mainly to the supplying of the foreign colonies. Britain, in Ramsay's words, had become the "honourable slave carriers" of her rivals,[63] and the British planters, in opposing abolition, were only contending for French and Spanish interests.[64] He attributed to this British supply for the last twenty-five years that great improvement of the French colonies which had contributed to their formidable sea power in the American war. He asked pertinently

59. *J. Newton: Thoughts on the African Slave Trade* (Liverpool, 1792), page 8.
60. Add. Mss. 12433, folio 28(v). May 14, 1792.
61. *Parl. Hist.*, Vol. XXIX, page 343. April 18, 1791.
62. Ibid., page 281.
63. *Ramsay: Ms.Vol.*, folio 23 (v). "Memorial on the supplying of the Navy with seamen."
64. Ibid., folio 67(v). For the "Morning Chronicle."

"whether a branch of trade, confessedly of some importance, but confined to two or three ports, ought at the expense of every human feeling to be put in competition with our future naval superiority; or, if it must be preserved, whether it should not be confined to the demands of our own colonies."[65] In one of the numerous anonymous pamphlets which swamped England during the whole period of this long, large-scale agitation, one writer, in defence of the slave trade and even of the foreign slave trade, estimated that of the 40,500 slaves exported from Africa by British merchants, one-eighth was lost by death, of the remainder one-eighth sold in the British islands, and the rest sold to the French and Spaniards, to the great profit of the slave merchants.[66]

One must be chary of accepting unquestionably what these contemporary pamphleteers have to say. But official documents bear striking testimony to the general truth of their statements. Among the Board of Trade papers there is a curious document entitled "Committee's Answers to Queries on the Free Ports in the West Indies."[67] According to this paper, the utility of Free Ports in the West Indies arose from the importation of various enumerated articles, above all of slaves, a trade which "from the present encouragement given by the Court of France . . . is of the utmost value to this nation, as the slaves are purchased on the coast with British manufactures and East India goods, and employs a very large proportion of our shipping." Dominica was selected as the most conveniently situated island in the West Indies for a free port, because of its position among the foreign islands, its proximity to the Spanish Main, and its abundance of good water and all the other refreshments necessary for a cargo of slaves. As regards the competition of the French planters tending to enhance the price of slaves, the Committee remarked that the British planters had the first choice, but their inability to pay cash and the long credits they asked for made it essential for the merchant to sell to foreigners for immediate returns.

The best evidence of the extent of the British slave trade to the foreign islands is afforded by the merchants themselves engaged in it. The Privy Council was told that what the French were suffering from was chiefly lack of capital. The inducements to British subjects to take up the trade were the bounty of 40 livres per ton; the premium of 160 livres per head on slaves imported into the French Windward Islands and of 230 livres per head on

65. *J. Ramsay: An Inquiry into the effects of putting a stop to the African Slave Trade* (London, 1784), page 21. (Referred to hereafter as *Ramsay: Inquiry*.)

66. *An Address to the Inhabitants in general of Great Britain and Ireland* (Liverpool, 1788), page 27.

67. B.T. 6/75. West Indies, 1786–1790. This is probably the Committee of the Privy Council for Trade itself.

those imported into the south side of St. Domingo, then being developed;[68] and thirdly, the high prices paid for Negroes in the French colonies, from 30 to 50 per cent higher than in the British islands. Of two cargoes of slaves sold in 1787, one in St. Domingo, the other in Jamaica, the first fetched £66 sterling per head on an average, the second £42. From this great encouragement the merchants prophesied that soon one-half of the British trade would be carried on by the sale of slaves to the French on the African coast, where the prices offered were nearly equal to those obtainable in the British islands, and they estimated that of the annual British export of 40,000 slaves, only one-third was wanted for the supply of the British islands: the other two-thirds were disposed of to foreigners.[69]

Corroboration can be sought from the answers given to the Privy Council by the Islands and their agents in London. Governor Parry of Barbados agreed that large numbers were exported to other countries, where a higher price could be procured, though he could not give the exact proportion, and he thought that even this additional supply was not equal to the foreign demand.[70] In Dominica about five-eighths of the imports in the four years preceding 1788 had been sold to the French, one-fourth to the Spaniards, and a few to the Dutch, and it was estimated that three-fourths of the Negroes the French had purchased had been furnished by British traders on the African coast and in the West Indies.[71] From Grenada came the same tale. According to Governor Mathew, of 11,000 slaves sold since the peace, half had been sold to foreigners, and the island legislature agreed that, since St. George had been made a free port, the French had purchased a considerable number of slaves from British traders.[72] In 1786 the merchants of Kingston had expressed in a memorial their conviction that "the export of negroes from hence to the neighbouring islands is a trade of great benefit to this island, and consequently to the mother country."[73] The Jamaica Agents examined by the Privy Council spoke to the same effect, though they hinted

68. C.O. 137/88. Proclamation of May 1789. Foreign ships were not allowed to land Negroes in other parts of St. Domingo.

69. *Report, 1789*, Part VI. Messrs. Baillie, King, Camden and Hubbert.

70. Ibid. Papers received since the date of the Report. Governor Parry's Further Answers, Aug. 18, 1788.

71. Ibid., Part V. Mr. Robinson. Governor Orde confirmed this: "About one-sixth part of the negroes, salted provisions and dry goods are used in this island, the rest are illicitly introduced into the foreign ones." B.T. 6/41: Dominica, 1772–1790. Sept. 1, 1787.

72. *Report, 1789*, Part V. Governor Mathew thought the French paid less for these slaves, "as wholesale dealers and less nice in choice."

73. B.T. 6/75. West Indies, 1786–1790. May 29, 1786.

that the sale of Negroes to the French by the British on the Guinea coast was decreasing, owing to the more extended connections the French had made.[74]

The actual figures speak no less eloquently. The imports into and exports from Dominica and Jamaica during the years 1784–1788 were as follows:—[75]

Table 1.1. Dominica

Year	*Imports*	*Exports*	*Approximate Percentage*
1784	4,998	1,925	38.5
1785	6,254	3,328	53.2
1786	8,407	5,927	70.5
1787	5,709	2,852	50.0
1788	2,185	1,749	80.1
Total	27,553	15,781	57.3

Table 1.2. Jamaica

		Exports		
Year	*Imports*	*Estimate[a] I*	*Estimate[b] II*	*Approximate Percentage[c]*
1784	15,468	4,465	4,635	28.9
1785	11,046	4,589	4,667	41.5
1786	5,645	3,643	3,764	64.6
1787	5,682	1,780	2,158	31.3
Total	37,841	14,477	15,224	38.3

a. Ibid. Two tables used in conjunction.
b. Add. Mss. 12435, folio 37(v). Jamaica Statistics.
c. Based on the lower figures. Neither set of figures is reliable for Jamaica, because of the clandestine exports to St. Domingo—*Report 1789*. Part VI.

In St. Christopher the imports for the years 1778–1788 amounted to 2,784, the exports to 1,769—percentage 63.5. In Antigua the figures varied, the export being as high as 56 per cent in 1778 (177 out of 345) and 50 per cent in 1783 (593 out of 1,164), to as low as 14 per cent in 1785 (136 out of 952).[76] Of 44,712 slaves imported into Grenada between 1784 and 1792, no less than 31,210—nearly 70 per cent—were re-exported, and, referring to

74. *Report, 1789*, Part V.
75. Ibid., Part IV.
76. *Report, 1789*. Papers received since the date of the Report.

the benefits conferred on Grenada by the Free Port Act, the Governor stated that "the supplying of the foreign colonies with slaves is another branch of this commerce, nearly equal in value to the rest."[77]

One more set of statistics may be given. They were used by Dundas in his speech in the House of Commons on April 23, 1792.[78]

Table 1.3.

	1789		*1790*		*1791*	
Island	*Imports*	*Exports*	*Imports*	*Exports*	*Imports*	*Exports*
Antigua	311	140				
Barbados	444	399	126	72	382	100
Grenada	6,490	3,040	3,900	3,142	9,283	6,000
Jamaica	9,808	2,030	14,063	1,970	15,000	3,082
St. Kitts	67	332				
St. Vincent	938	58	1,552	611	2,863	1,346

Using Dundas's figures, for Barbados we get an export for the three years of 60 per cent—571 out of 952; for Jamaica, about 18 per cent—7,082 out of 38,871; for Grenada, over 60 per cent—12,182 out of 19,673; for St. Vincent, nearly 40 per cent—2,015 out of 5,353. The Dominica figures from the Chatham Papers give the huge export of 6,137 out of 7,906—no less than 77.2 per cent.[79]

Can one wonder that Dundas, opposing Wilberforce's motion of 1792, on the ground that abolition should be "gradual, that is, that time should be allowed to the planters to purchase sufficient supplies so that they should be well stocked when abolition took place,"[80] can one wonder that Dundas,

77. *Liverpool Papers*, Add. Mss. 38228, folios 327 and 331. Mathew to Hawkesbury, Feb. 1793.

78. *Parl. Hist.*, Vol. XXIX, page 1210. There are some figures in the Chatham Papers, G.D. 8/351: West Indies, Miscellaneous Papers, 1778–1801. In the main they are the same as those of Dundas, though the Jamaica figures are:—

Table 1.4.

Year	*Imports*	*Exports*
1789	9,691	2,575
1790	14,069	1,970
1791	15,293	2,915

79. Chatham Papers, G.D. 8/351.

80. Compare *Ramsay: Inquiry*, pages 32–33. "Suppose a statute enacted that the present slave trade should cease after a period of three or six years, every planter would immediately set himself seriously to stock his plantation and to give such orders for the treatment of his slaves as would favour their health and population. This in the meantime would divert our slave trade from the improvement of the French colonies to that of our own."

so determined an enemy of abolition, moved the immediate abolition of the foreign slave trade, which, according to him, amounted in 1791 to 34,000 out of 74,000 imported?[81] The Abolition Committee wrote of the unsuccessful foreign slave trade bill that no plea of necessity, however it might be urged as far as abolition for the British islands was concerned, could be adduced in opposition.[82] A thing so disgusting, morally, as the slave trade could receive little support when it was seen, in its economic aspect, to be primarily responsible for the superiority of Britain's colonial rivals.

The key to this aspect of the British slave trade is to be found in the French demand for slaves. The period from 1784 is marked by the great development of hitherto uncultivated lands in French St. Domingo. French St. Domingo was the most fertile island in the West Indies and will be discussed in the following chapter. For the present it is sufficient to state that the French islands needed a vast number of slaves, far more than the British islands. One reason for this was, French writers suggest, the sub-tropical climate of St. Domingo,[83] in which the slaves died more rapidly than they did in the British islands. More important, however, was the fact that the slaves in St. Domingo were needed for bringing new lands into cultivation, and what the mortality among imported Negroes, particularly for new cultivation, was, we have already seen from the arguments of Wilberforce and Pitt.

The attempt to stop the foreign slave trade suffered, as everything else connected with abolition, from the reaction which set in as a result of the French war. Wilberforce's bill for the abolition of the foreign slave trade in 1794 met with no more success than Dundas's. Pitt, with a lack of enthusiasm which compares unfavourably with his zeal in 1792, argued that the foreign slave trade had actually ceased of itself, and that the motion was not so much to abolish it as to prevent its revival.[84] The foreign colonies were now nearly all British, and Pitt was probably thinking of the prevention of the foreign slave trade, if and when the colonies were restored at the end of the war.

Wilberforce's bill—and this is significant of developments which were to arise with the turn of the century—was supported by some of the West Indian planters. Already, when the question of abolition had first been mooted in England, an anonymous planter had, while defending the slave trade as absolutely necessary to the British colonies, advocated the abolition of the

81. *Parl. Hist.*, Vol. XXIX, page 1206. April 23, 1792.
82. *Abolition Committee's Proceedings*, Add. Mss. 21256, folio 86. Aug. 20, 1793.
83. *Cahiers de la Révolution Française*, No. III (Paris, 1935), page 40. *Gaston-Martin: La Doctrine Coloniale de la France en 1789*. (Referred to hereafter as *Gaston-Martin*.)
84. *Parl. Hist.*, Vol. XXX, page 1444. Feb. 7, 1794.

foreign slave trade as "prejudicial to the real interest of the nation."[85] One influential planter wrote to Wilberforce describing his bill as "a compromise which ought to attach every West Indian to you and induce them to support you in every future plan you may propose."[86] The majority of the West Indians, however, preferred to regard the continuance of the foreign slave trade as essential from its magnitude to the existence of the general trade.[87]

When the bill was sent up to the House of Lords, who were conducting an inquiry into the trade, Lord Abingdon distinguished himself as a defender of the constitution. It was an "indecent" bill. The Lower House had no right to dictate to them; "in the rejection of this bill, this will not be the first time that this country and this constitution have been saved by this House, from the rash and intemperate measures of the other."[88] It was a sure instinct which made the Jamaica Assembly state categorically in 1792: "The safety of the West Indies not only depends on the slave trade not being abolished, but on a speedy declaration of the House of Lords that they will not suffer the trade to be abolished."[89] It was significant that Dundas, in reply to Wilberforce's private appeal on behalf of the foreign slave trade bill, admitted that it was only the belief that the bill would not pass the House of Lords which reconciled him to silence,[90] and he declared openly in the House in 1795, when the question of abolishing the entire slave trade in 1796, as had been agreed in 1792, was being discussed, that he had "entertained a hope that in another place the impolicy of such a measure would be apparent, and that means would be taken to render the resolution of the Commons ineffectual."[91]

Wilberforce was not wrong when he wrote to Rev. Newton, so late as June 1804, "I fear the House of Lords!"[92] In the House of Lords there were many stalwart champions of the slave trade. The Earl of Westmorland did not hesitate to remind his peers that it was to the existence of the slave trade that they owed their seats in it,[93] and he took pride in the consideration that the slave merchants and the colonists would see that their interests were as

85. *Considerations on the Emancipation of Negroes and on the Abolition of the Slave Trade*, (London, 1788), pages 29–30. The author estimated that only half the imports were necessary for the British Islands.
86. *Life of Wilberforce*, Vol. II, page 49.
87. Ibid.
88. *Parl. Hist.*, Vol. XXXI, page 469. May 2, 1794.
89. C.O. 137/91. Petition of Committee of House of Assembly on the Sugar and Slave Trade, Dec. 5, 1792.
90. *Life of Wilberforce*, Vol. II, pages 49–50.
91. *Parl. Hist.*, Vol. XXXI, page 1338. Feb. 26, 1795.
92. *Life of Wilberforce*. Vol. III, page 120.
93. *Parl. Deb.*, Vol. IX, page 170. March 23, 1807.

much attended to as if they were directly represented in that House.[94] The royal Duke of Clarence, the recipient of a service of plate as the poor but honourable testimony of the gratitude of the people of Jamaica,[95] who was generally considered as representing the ideas of the Royal Family,[96] attacked Wilberforce in 1793 as either a fanatic or a hypocrite.[97] Hawkesbury, president of the Privy Council for Trade, was himself possessed of West Indian estates.[98] Tracts in defence of the slave trade were dedicated to him,[99] and he was rewarded with the freedom of the city of Liverpool for his great attention to the commercial interests of the country at large, and more particularly in gratitude for the essential services rendered to Liverpool by his great exertion in Parliament in support of the slave trade.[100] When elevated to the dignity of an earl of the kingdom, Hawkesbury took the title of Earl of Liverpool and accepted the Corporation's offer to quarter its arms with his own.[101] In such an assembly it was not surprising that the dictates of policy or even of morality made little headway, and that the idea of abolition was considered a "damned and cursed doctrine, held only by hypocrites,"[102] which first originated among "atheists, enthusiasts, jacobins, and such descriptions of persons."[103]

(d) Foreign Encroachments on the British Slave Trade

A point to be considered in connection with the re-export of slaves from the British to the foreign colonies is the danger to which even this branch of

94. Ibid., Vol. II, page 929. July 3, 1804.

95. *G. W. Bridges: The Annals of Jamaica* (London, 1828), Vol. II, page 263 (footnote).

96. Vide *Life of Wilberforce*, Vol. III, page 34—"It was truly humiliating to see, in the House of Lords, four of the Royal Family come down to vote against the poor, helpless, friendless slaves." Wilberforce to Muncaster, July 6, 1804. George III, who at one time had whispered jestingly to Wilberforce at a levée: "How go on your black clients, Mr. Wilberforce?" afterwards was a determined opponent of abolition. Ibid., Vol. I, page 343.

97. *Parl. Hist.*, Vol. XXX, page 659. April 11, 1793.

98. *Report of the Proceedings of the Committee of Sugar Refiners* (London, 1792), page 34.

99. *A Merchant to his friend on the Continent; Letters Concerning the Slave Trade* (Liverpool, n.d.). To Lord Hawkesbury, "as a patron to the trade of this country in general, and a favorer of that, the subject of these letters."

100. *Liverpool Papers*, Add. Mss. 38223, folios 170 and 175. Sept. 7 and 12, 1788. See also Hawkesbury's letter to Lord Rodney, agreeing to use the proxy entrusted to him by the latter, promising to "make the best use of it in defending the island of Jamaica and the other West India islands which his Lordship so gloriously defended against a foreign enemy on the memorable 12th April," and expressing his sorrow that only a severe fit of the gout prevented Rodney from "attending Parliament and affording his personal support to those who are in so much want of it"—Add. Mss. 38227, folio 202, Jan. 1792.

101. Ibid., Add. Mss. 38231, folio 59. Thomas Naylor, Mayor, to Hawkesbury, July 10, 1796; folio 60, Minutes of the Common Council, July 6, 1796; folio 64, Hawkesbury to Naylor, July 16, 1796.

102. Earl St. Vincent. Cit. *Klingberg*, page 127.

103. *Parl. Deb.*, Vol. VIII, page 230. Earl of Westmorland, May 16, 1806.