

W. Adams to Col. Leekehan -

A.A. No. 52.

19503-4

Woburn Abbey. Tuesday
March 31st 1812.

My Dear Friend.

Ever since I came here I have intended
to send to you these inclosures: but I have
been so unremittingly engaged in Business
that I have not till now had leisure to explain
the Business. I now take time by the forelock
and to secure ag^t interruption or farther delay
I write at 7 in the Morning.

You will observe that the Note which in-
closes Lady Bishley's two letters - was a Memo^m
taken down by me from the Prince's Statement
to me - on my going through the other Papers
with His Royal Highness, on the 22^d?

I went on the same day to Lady B.
When she stated to me that respecting Lord
Fife's conversation H. R. H. recollection was
not accurate. That that conversation took

In Woburn: place

I remain -

H. Ad

place in 1792. immediately on the death
of Berkeley's death & long before the present
Lady Berkeley's acquaintance with the
Royal Highness - This seemed so marked
that I should, notwithstanding the variance
in the Prince's recollection, have without
any farther trouble to H. R. H. allowed it
to stand as in the Paper.

The other fact - regarding the introduction
of Lady B to H. R. H. is again so marked
by H. R. H.'s particular recollection that
I pushed from Lady B. with an understanding
that I was to alter that to H. R. H.'s recollection
and ~~from~~ from Her long letter you will
see ^{still} agrees to that: but unfortunately
the dates in that letter (I have underword
it to catch your eye) that they were not
at Weymouth in 1796. It would never
do

1950

do the
in 1796
but
Year
recoll
and a
Wife
Circum
since
got W
And
that
Corr
And
Copy
The
that
same
Inquis
to me

W. Adams to Col. Leeke -

A.A. No. 52.

19504

do that the Poem sh^d state that to have happened
in 1796 which from the Baskley's not having
been there could not have happened in that
Year - It is clear that according to the Poem's
recollection of one introduction, without name,
and another when Lady B. was declared the
Wife that there must have been Two - and the
Circumstance of going to Stayman the Conson-
fines it - But it must have been 1797 &
not 1796. It is material to have this cleared up:
And All this detail is to get you to ascertain
that date in order to have Lady B's papers
corrected by it. The paper may then be copied,
and what I settled with her was that one
copy with my attestation sh^d be deposited in
the Duffry Street Box - one given to her - and
that I should read it to the Ch^r. - that she
seems now to wish to have suspended -
I intend to deposit one with the Ch^r. -
So much for Lady B - Now for another
Subject

Subject, to which I have turned my thoughts
with all the earnestness that belongs to what
is interesting to you. I observe that Wynne
has given notice of a Motion for your
Appointment. I presume with a view
to discuss its Regularity as well as its
Fitness. This has led me to think a great
deal about it - and when I return to my
Books I will confer my Cogitations
by investigation - In the mean time it
will not be amiss to state to you - that
altho' the Prerogative cannot be exercised in
the appointment of new Judicial Officers it can
also be exercised - of that the Sovereign is
the Judge - and if the Salary is defrayed out
of what he proposes the Commons have
no Controul but by address - which the
Fitness of the Appointment ~~meant~~
defeat in the present instance. It is
worthy of remark - that ^{some of} the Great Ex:
centive

19505

Executive officers are all comparatively
 of Modern date - The Secretaries of State
 are so much so that they have no rank
 given to them by the Statute of Henry
 the Eighth Regulating Precedence - nor
 are they noted in that Statute -
 In Modern times, ^{the creation of} Executive positions
 both individual & Collective have
 been constantly in use - The Com.
 mission of Naval Review was
 of this Description. These matters
 pursued may be useful on the day of
 discussion, and I will pursue them
 farther, & communicate with any
 Body that you shall suggest, whom
 you may think best to use them
 in the House of Com^s - As to the
 Future of the Appointments I had the
 Honour

Annour Posible to the Power that the
Respect & Nature of the Sovereign's Bp,
do much increased since the commencement
of the King's Reign, requires a Confidential
Person of Character & Station. That the
Arrangements must either be made by
Pages, or by such a person, & there
could be no question as to the Legality
of the former. As to the Legality of
the appointment another illustration
is afforded by the very circumstance
of your being out of Part. The
of June then which renders you
incapable of sitting in Part. ^{It is}
That the Sovereign has the Power of
making new Officers.

I shall be in Town on Thursday for
the India Court, & for you on Friday.
Your Ever Most Obedt
& affec^t
W. Adam