

Thoughts on the present Times humbly
Submitted the consideration of his Royal Highness
The Prince of Wales.

The King of England being by the Law of the
Realm immortal, his natural death is considered as
no more than a political incapacity to govern. It
is therefore called his Demise, *demissio Regis vel*
coronae. It creates no interregnum, for the crown
descends immediately upon the next heir, who is
non Haerens ratus with an unimpeached Title. But
Lunacy & idiotism according to the Letter & spirit
of the constitution equally constitute a civil
incapacity to govern, on which account they must
constitutionally speaking be called the Demise
of the crown, as well as the Kings natural death.
The moment one or other of these unhappy situations
is proved to exist, that same moment, ^{the first apparent} is. thing.
Otherwise our constitution possesses not the perfection
it boasts & the royal dignity ceases to be perpetual,
which is against the Law. Blackstone says when
Edward the 4th in the tenth year of his reign was driven

from his throne for a few months by the house of
Lancaster, this temporary transfer of his dignity
was denominated his demise, & all process was held
to be discontinued as upon the natural death of
the King. How much more must an other disqualifica-
tion, a total derangement of every mental faculty,
every political power to rule be deemed a demise.
Will any constitutional lawyer venture to assert
the monstrous absurdity that lunacy or Idiotism
can fill the throne. No certainly. If either by
Divine dispensation, has fallen upon the head of
our King, every loyal subject, every manly heart
must deplore this sad vicissitude of fortune
in the most exalted station: but every man of common
sense who knows the constitution, must also know
at this instant when the forementioned calamity
has happened, that in his Royal Highness the
Prince of Wales resides the inherent birth-right,
the lawful & undoubted present succession to the
throne, which the law says cannot be vacant,

38380
but is made to appear so by the deplorable & univer-
sally lamented state of the late possessor, & the
criminal & audacious procrastination of his ministers.
I therefore maintain that the Prince has a right
not to the Regency, but to the crown, & if he gives up
the latter for the former, it is a magnanimous
forbearance, an act of filial piety & tenderness
which reflects the highest possible honor on
his feelings & his heart. For in fact he is no
longer a subject, but a King de jure, & should at
least be declared Regent, with every kingly power
annexed to the Dignity. In this state of the case
would not a conference on this head between people
of opposite opinions be a means of bringing about
that unanimity which should be the wish of all
in the settlement of the government, & prevent us from
indecent & mischievous altercations? These are the
unvarnished sentiments & notions of a loyal
subject & a faithful servant of the crown. His name
would give no ^{additional} weight to truth, & it might appear
presumptuous to sign it —

Thoughts on the

Regency

1709.

Thoughts on the
Regency

1709