

U M
V, 35

THESIS

Subject _____

Name Ruth Marshall _____

UNIVERSITY OF
MINNESOTA
LIBRARY

70M
M 357

909m

SUBJECT.

WAS THERE A CABINET COUNCIL

UNDER THE EARLIER STUARTS?

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE
SCHOOL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA BY

RUTH E. MARSHALL

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF ARTS.

MAY 1914.
UNIVERSITY OF
MINNESOTA
LIBRARY

169598

10034 A 10

Contents

Bibliography.	<u>Page</u>
I. The Nature of the Early Cabinet Council.....	1
II. The Need of the Stuarts for Advisors.....	3
III. The Decline of the Privy Council.....	5
1. Its loss of power.....	6
2. Reasons for this loss.....	11
IV. The Rise of Standing Committees.....	14
1. Membership.....	17
2. Powers.....	21
V. The Inner Counsellors of the King.....	23
1. Men working behind Committees.....	23
2. The significance of Clarendon's Council of State.....	25
3. Accounts by contemporaries of the activities of chief advisors.....	26
4. The Cabinet Council.....	33
a. Uses of the term in the seventeenth century	33
b. The term as applied to committees having fixed powers.....	35
c. The inner group of favorite ministers with indefinite and expansive powers	36
5. The choosing of the favorite counsellors.....	44
6. Conscious and unconscious reliance on them.....	45
VI. The Influence of the Habit of the Earlier Stuarts...	49

R E P O R T
of
C O M M I T T E E O N T H E S I S

THE undersigned, acting as a committee of
the Graduate School, have read the accompanying
thesis submitted by Miss Ruth Elizabeth Marshall
for the degree of Master of Arts
They approve it as a thesis meeting the require-
ments of the Graduate School of the University of
Minnesota, and recommend that it be accepted in
partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of Master of Arts

Wallace Notestein
Chairman

Eldon R. James

W. S. Davis

A. B. White
Francis Maloy Anderson

Bibliography.

Acts of the Privy Council

Editor: John Roche Dasent
32 vols. covering the reign of Queen Elizabeth
London, 1837-1907

Bacon, Sir Francis

Essays or counsels Civil or Moral
London N.D.

Baillie, Robert

The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie, 3 vols.
Editor: David Laing,
Edinburgh, 1842

This is one of the chief sources for the Scots' negotiations with the English after 1638. During the larger part of the period, Baillie was himself in England, and was a keen observer of the progress of the Scotch affairs and also of the Parliamentary uprising against the King.

The Earl of Bristol's Defence of his Negotiations in Spain.

Editor: Samuel Rawson Gardiner
In the Camden Society Miscellany, vol. VI
London, 1871

When King James tardily resolved to give up the Spanish alliance, Bristol bore the blame for most of the negotiations. The documents published here record all the arguments of Bristol's defence. In many points, this account of how negotiations were carried on hardly checks up with accounts which may reasonably be presumed to be more unbiased.

Cabala, or Mysteries of State

"Collected by a Noble Hand."
London, 1654.

If its truthfulness can be trusted, this is a remarkable collection of letters of eminent men during the reign of King James. The bulk of the letters are to or from Bacon and Buckingham.

Calendars of Domestic State Papers.

1603-10. Edited by Mary Anne Everett Green,
London, 1857

1611-18. Edited by Mary Anne Everett Green,
London, 1858

- 1619-23. Edited by Mary Anne Everett Green,
London, 1858
- 1623-5. Edited by Mary Anne Everett Green,
London, 1859
- 1625-6. Edited by John Bruce,
London, 1858
- 1629-31. Edited by John Bruce,
London, 1860
- 1631-3. Edited by John Bruce,
London, 1862
- 1633-4. Edited by John Bruce,
London, 1863
- 1634-5. Edited by John Bruce,
London, 1864
1637. Edited by John Bruce,
London, 1868
- 1637-8. Edited by John Bruce and William Douglas
Hamilton,
London, 1869
- 1638-9. Edited by John Bruce and William Douglas
Hamilton,
London, 1871
- 1639-40. Edited by William Douglas Hamilton,
London, 1877
- 1640- . Edited by William Douglas Hamilton,
London, 1880
- 1640-1. Edited by William Douglas Hamilton,
London, 1882

The value of these Calendars would be greatly enhanced, if the papers were given in full, and not in the form of summaries selected and worded according to the judgment of the editors.

Calendars of State Papers and Manuscripts Relating to English Affairs Existing in the Archives of Venice.

- 1607-10. Edited by Heratic Brown

1617-19. Edited by Allen B. Hinds,
London, 1909

1619-21. Edited by Allen B. Hinds,
London, 1910

1621-23. Edited by Allen B. Hinds,
London, 1911

1623-25. Edited by Allen B. Hinds,
London, 1912

The letters and despatches of the Venetian agents and ambassadors are fortunately translated in full. It was the custom for each Venetian ambassador, on leaving England, to write a "Relation of England." These Relations are full summaries of the country and the government as the ambassadors believed them to be, and are extremely valuable.

Clarendon, Edward, Earl of,
The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England.
6 vols.
Oxford, 1888

Volume I contains a summary of the years 1625-41, before going on with the rebellions in that year. Excellent for broad, outline facts.

Clarendon, Edward, Earl of,
The Life of Edward, Earl of Clarendon. 3 vols.
Oxford, 1759
There are few comments on the years before 1641. Edward Hyde's star, in that year, began to rise.

Clarendon, Edward, Earl of.
State Papers. 3 vols.
Oxford, 1767

Volumes I and II cover the period 1622 to 1643. From 1634, a copious collection of letters are published. The papers, ___ of WendeBank, Coke, and Arundel, among others, ___ relating to the Scotch rebellion are especially numerous and interesting.

A Complete Collection of State Trials,
2 Vols.
London, 1776

The account of the famous Somerset-Essex trial throws some light on the methods of the great favorite of King James.

Coleridge, Hartley, editor,
The Dramatic Works of Massinger and Ford,
London, N.D.

Cotton, Sir Robert
Cottoni Posthuma.
London 1679

Council Register of Charles I
Council Register of James I

Notes from these important sources taken by Mr. Wallace Notestein were fortunately available for this paper.

Court and Times of James the First.
Edited by Thomas Birch. 2 vols.
London, 1849

A collection of contemporary letters covering the entire reign of King James. The writers are not great statesmen. These letters are the more valuable, however, since comparatively few papers for this period (1603-25) are accessible.

Court and Times of Charles the First.
Edited by Williams Robert Folkestone. 2 vols.
London, 1848

In these volumes there is published a part of the Carleton-Chamberlain correspondence which is such a source for knowledge of great and trivial events during the reign of King Charles.

Debates in the House of Commons in 1625.
Edited by Samuel Rawson Gardiner in the Camden Society Publications.
London, 1873

In the introduction, Gardiner quotes frequently from contemporary material which would otherwise be inaccessible.

Documents Relating to the Proceedings against Prynne.
Edited by Samuel Rawson Gardiner, in the Camden Society Publications.
London, 1878

Eliot, Sir John.
The Political Treatise of Government and the Letter-Book of Sir John Eliot. 2 vols.
Edited by Alexander B. Grosart,
London, 1882

The letter-book covers the period 1625-42. These letters

show how closely Sir John Eliot, who was in prison in London during the larger part of the time, kept in touch with public events.

Goodman, Godfrey.

The Court of King James the First. 2 vols.
London, 1839

In Volume II Bishop Goodman made a collection of letters for 1603-25.

Gordon, Patrick.

A Short Abridgement of Britains Distemper
Aberdeen, 1844

This is an elaborate justification of Scotch covenanters and English Puritans. It is so concerned with campaigns and battles that it does not touch upon government, Scotch or English.

Hacket, John.

A Memorial Offer'd to the Great Deservings of John Williams,
London, 1692

Hardwicke, Philip Yorke, Editor,

Miscellaneous State Papers from 1601-1726. 2 vols.
London, 1778

Volume II contains illuminating papers concerning the government at London during the King's Scotch campaigns and northern parleys, 1638-41.

Heylyn, Peter.

Cyprianus Anglicus.
London, 1671

This life of Laud, although it begins in 1583, is exhaustive only after 1622. Heylyn was so extreme a partisan of Laud and his policy that his biography is highly colored.

Historical Manuscripts Commission

The Second Report of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts.

London, 1871

The appendix contains the Baker and the Wrottesley manuscripts, which are of some value for the reigns of the early Stuarts.

The Third Report of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts.

London, 1872

The Duke of Northumberland's manuscripts are entered in the appendix. The letters in volumes VI to XVI contain letters covering the years 1603-41. Many bear the signatures of the King, Coke and Northumberland. It is unfortunate that too often only a calendar of the papers is given. The appendix also contains volume I of the Bath manuscripts.

The Fourth Report of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts.
London, 1872.

The appendix contains Volume II of the Bath Manuscripts. Several letters are included which were written by Suffolk, Buckingham and Prince Charles to the King. The period covered is 1603-41.

The Fifth Report of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts.
London, 1874

In the appendix are the Denhigh manuscripts, and the de La Ware papers (c.1616-25) Letters of obscure men.

The Seventh Report of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts.
London, 1877

Appendix I contains the Frere Manuscripts relating to 1587-1693. There are a few scattered letters which are of some value for the reigns of the first Stuarts.

The Tenth Report of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts.
London, 1885

The Moray Manuscripts are included in Appendix I. There are some rather significant Winwood letters covering the reign of James I to 1617.

The Eleventh Report of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts.
London, 1887

The Appendix I contains the Skrine Manuscripts. Here are found the Salvetti letters which describe minutely conditions during the first four years of the reign of Charles I. Salvetti was a Tuscan,---one of the keenest of the foreign representatives.

The Twelfth Report of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts.
London, 1890

The Coke papers are listed in appendixes I, II, III. The mechanism and technicalities of the government of King Charles are given fully. John Coke was not, as a rule, in the King's secrets.

The Fifteenth Report of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts.
London, 1899

Appendix VIII is taken up by the Buccleuch manuscripts. Volume II of these (1605-17) contains a great body of the papers of Winwood, Secretary of State under King James. These

letters are concerned chiefly with diplomatic and foreign,
not domestic, affairs.

Hobbes, Thomas

Behemoth

In Maseres Tracts, Vols. I and II
London, 1815

This famous seventeenth century tract gives an extended
and philosophic account of the causes, events, and results
of the Civil Wars.

Laud, William

The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, William Laud.
7 vols.
Oxford, 1847-1860

Laud's diary, --all too brief, --is to be found in Volume III.

Letters and Memorials of State.

Collected by Sir Henry Sydney, Sir Philip Sydney, Earl of
Leicester, and Lord Lisle. 2 vols.
London, 1646

The latter half of Volume II covers the period 1604-41.
Letters are to be found from men like Leicester, Carleton,
Northumberland, and Coke.

Matthew, Sir Tobie

Thomas Seccombe, author of the account.
Dictionary of National Biography.

This brief biography quotes contemporary opinions about
Sir Tobie Matthew, which are otherwise inaccessible.

Narrative of the Spanish Marriage Treaty.

Editor: Samuel Rawson Gardiner In the Camden Society Publi-
cations
London, 1869

This is a collection of contemporary documents which cover
the period when the Treaty was seriously considered, 1616-23.

Parliamentary Debates in 1610.

Edited by Samuel Rawson Gardiner, in the Camden Society Publi-
cations
London, 1862

The Proceedings against William Prynne in 1634 and 1637.

Editor: Samuel Rawson Gardiner In the Camden Society Publi-
cations
London, 1877

Contemporary documents official and unofficial relating to the Frynecase.

Rushworth, John
Historical Collections of Private Passages of State. 8 vols.
London, 1721

Rushworth was the clerk of the House of Commons in 1641. His account of the Long Parliament is doubtless more reliable than that of an earlier period. He was, however, a careful collector of contemporary documents covering the entire reign of Charles I.

Speeches and Passages of this Great and Happy Parliament, from the 3rd of November 1640 to this instant June, 1641.
London, 1641

Strafford, Thomas Wentworth, Earl of.
The Earl of Strafforde's Letters and Despatches. 2 vols.
Collected by William Knowler
Dublin, 1740

The importance of these letters can hardly be overestimated. Although a few were written as early as 1618, the great body of them covers the years 1629-40, when Wentworth was a power in England. He kept up a constant correspondence, while he was in Ireland, with Weston, Laud, Windebank, and Coke. The King consulted him on all matters of importance.

Verney, Sir Ralph
Notes of Proceedings in the Long Parliament, in the Camden Society Publications.
London, 1845

Warwick, Sir Philip
Memoires of the Reign of Charles I.
London, 1701

Whitelock, Bulstrode.
Memorials of the English Affairs from the Beginning of the Reign of Charles the First to the Happy Restoration. 4 vols.
Oxford, 1853

Wilbraham, Sir Roger
Journal of Sir Roger Wilbraham,
Edited by Harold Spencer Scott.
London, 1902

Wilson, Arthur.
The History of Great Britain.
London, 1653

Covers the reign of King James.

Winwood, Sir Ralph.

Memorials of Affairs of State in the Reigns of Queen Elizabeth and King James I. 3 vols.

Edited by Edmund Sawyer.

London,

1725

A full collection is to be found here of letters to and from ambassadors abroad. Winwood was not entirely in the King's confidence, as a rule.

Wotton, Sir Henry

Reliquiae Wottonianae

London,

1685

A collection of tracts by Wotton, for years an English ambassador to Italy: essays, letters, lives of statesmen, English and Italian.

Yonge, Walter

Diary of Walter Yonge

in the Camden Society Publications.

London,

1848

Walter Yonge was only a country justice of the peace who tried to get inside information about state affairs. He kept his diary from 1606 until 1627.

Carlyle, E. I.

Committees of Council under the Earlier Stuarts.
English Historical Review, Vol. XXI, P.573.

Gardiner, Samuel Rawson.

The History of England from the Accession of James I to the
Outbreak of the Civil War. 10 Vols.

London,

1882

Maitland, F. W.

The Constitutional History of England
Cambridge

1908

Prothero, G. W.

Select Statutes and other Constitutional Documents illustrative of the Reigns of Eliz. and Jas. I.

Oxford

1898

Spedding, James.

The Life and Times of Francis Bacon. 2 vols.

Boston,

1880

There are many letters from the Bacon correspondence which
are to be found only in these volumes.

White, Albert Beebe.
The Making of the English Constitution.
New York, 1908

WAS THERE A CABINET COUNCIL UNDER THE EARLIER STUARTS?

If the age of James I and his successor saw the end of much that was old, in theories of royal power, it saw the beginning of much that was new. As the years came up toward the Civil War, there were a score of indications that Parliament was awakening to a consciousness of power. The Commons were getting ready to rule. When, a few generations later, sovereign and people were finally balanced, the latter managed to keep the proportion true largely by means of an institution carefully and slowly perfected: the Cabinet. (1) It was the King's advisory body, which was yet responsible to Parliament.

It was during the early Stuart period, - during the reigns of James I and Charles I, - that the insignificant germ which was to develop into the famous Cabinet System first came into recognized existence. (2) It was a much disguised germ indeed. In the first place, this primitive "Cabinet Council" was as simple a thing as primitive institutions are popularly supposed to be.

(1) It had not taken on its final form until the reign of William III, at the earliest.

(2) Into an existence that was at all continuous. There had been two or three suggestions of a cabinet generations before. But they were so purely accidental that no attempt was made to continue them. (See White, 279, 294, 387.)

It in no way embodied the two great principles of the completed Cabinet,- that the ministry must hold similar political views and must stand upon a parliamentary basis. No one in the early seventeenth century ever thought of the first as a principle, and only a few straggling extreme Parliamentarians dared advocate the second. (1) Theories of what ought to be were never responsible for the origin of the Cabinet. Appearing during a period in which the rights of the people in Parliament were systematically ignored, it was in no sense controlled by or responsible to the Commons. (2) It came to fulfill one simple need,- the need of the King for confidential advisors; and in the beginning it was simply a group of men which the King relied on as sovereigns had not for generations the Privy Council, and which above the heads of the Council Board discussed and deliberated and unobtrusively pointed the way in which policies of state were to move.

(1) There was only one "view" that all ministers of James and Charles had to hold: that the king was the source of all law and government.

(2) Parliament's desperate attempts to hold any Privy Councillors responsible to itself were inevitably futile, during this period. But much as Parliament feared the unchecked power of the Privy Council, it feared still more the control by a part of it. Government by Council was immeasurably preferable to government by an inner circle of counsellors. See Cottoni Post., 273-282; Maseres Tracts II, 555-6; H.M.C. Buccleuch Mss.I, 101-2.

To tell the truth, these two Stuarts found themselves badly in need of something a little more usable and trustworthy than the old Privy Council.. During the last few reigns, what the Council had lacked in wisdom and understanding the strong-minded Tudors had promptly made up. They distinctly preferred to have the lion's voice in all administrative questions; and they and their Councils , which were led by one or two moving spirits, had been almost uniformly congenial.

(1) The Stuarts were different. Everyone is quite aware that there have been known in England more able rulers than James VI of Scotland, or even the more worthy Charles I. While James I imagined himself equal to any occasion, he hated work and lazily turned much over to properly subservient councilors. (2) Charles was a far more capable ruler, but he might always be easily influenced by favorite advisors. In both cases, the result was the same. Publicly admit their lack of perfect wisdom, these Stuarts never would. Each was determined to hold all power concentrated in his own hands.

(1) When Queen Elizabeth referred her decisions to her Council to be ratified and not criticised, it was usually quite willing to acquiesce in the dictates of superior wisdom, and to advise as desired.

(2) Cal. St. P. Ven., 1621-3, 83, 433; Ct. and Times James I, II, 442.

So what they lacked in personal ability they made up in advisors, and came to rely completely on men who enabled them to rule as absolutely as they wished,- on their favorite ministerial counselors,- stout and trustworthy staffs to lean on privately, in time of stress. (1)

For several obvious reasons, the time-honored Privy Council could not measure up to the requirements of the Stuarts as to just what an advisory body of kings must be. It was relied on, but not confided in. It was a fitting and pliant instrument to carry out the royal mind, but not always to assist in deciding it. It was abundantly able to execute, but could not always be trusted to plan.

(1) It must not be supposed for a minute that James and Charles were the first to trust certain councilors above all the rest of the official advisors. Elizabeth had her Walsingham and Burghley. Kings for no one knows how many generations had had their chief men of counsel. But they had not, like these seventeenth century rulers, had their Inner Councilors. The difference between the Cabinet and the greater ministers of Elizabeth seems to have been this: what the greater ministers did, they did as a part of the Privy Council; they belonged to that body, and when the Board worked things out they led because they had greater talent for government and saw more clearly. The Cabinet Council, advising secretly apart from the Council, shaped policies, and then gave them to the rest of the Board rather to ratify than discuss. People realized that the thing had been decided beforehand.

Now, these reigns, especially that of Charles I, have been known quite generally as the period of government by Council. (1) And in a very real sense they were. The Council's activities were never more varied. Its powers increased in a dozen ways. Even while Parliaments once in a while were still being found useful, it serenely usurped many of their powers; and when they ceased, there was nothing at which it did not try its hand. Parliament tried toiled to secure at least its ancient rights. It raged at its hopeless failures. (2) The Council got into the way of calling members of Parliament to account and of popping them into prison for "speeches better becoming a Senate of Venice" than an English Parliament. (3) It dissolved the Houses

 (1) Largely because of the scarcity of Parliaments. Even James ruled ten years without one (1611-21). The Parliament of 1614 did nothing.

(2) Parliament was jealous of the Council, and the Council ignored Parliament. No self-respecting Councilor would have admitted that he was in any way responsible to the other body, or that its rights should have been respected. Often he was not a member of the other house. Parl. Deb. in 1610. Ct. and Times Jas. I, I, 176. Clar. Hist., I, 229, 259, 286. Rushw. I, 523, 642. Whitel. I, 2405, 33. Cal. St.P. Dom., 1627-8, 375; 1637-8, 462; 1611-18, 223. Cal. St.P. Ven., 1623-5, 183.

(3) Reliq. Wotton., 431-2. Cal. St. P. Dom., 1611-18, 235-6.

and "occupied itself in raising money." (1) The jurisdiction of the Star Chamber increased unchecked, until its powers were scandalous. This was in addition to the normal control by the Privy Council of all executive work.

But, in another sense, the Council's powers were declining. It was deciding less, - was becoming less deliberative. (2) It might meet and plan ways of collect-

(1) This was, of course, one of the oft-repeated grievances against the government of 1628-41. The King, when Parliament proved obstinate, used to feel "constrained to try the affections of his people by a voluntary contribution," and to order the Council to try ways and means of collection. Ibid. 1619-23, 341, "Speeches & Passages, 1641," 211.

(2) This decline in importance is noticeable long before the reign of James I. The strong Tudors had not been sovereigns of a type which builds up the independent strength and power of a co-executive and advisory body. Elizabeth's Council invariably deferred to her opinion and followed her judgment, in deciding broad policies of government. She and her Council were usually of a mind. But if they had not been, would the Council have ruled the Queen? It is true that the Stuarts were far more easily directed than their predecessors, - but only when they were approached and managed in the right way. They were the last men in the world to recognize either the Privy Council or Parliament as legal advisory bodies whose advice by right and custom must carry weight. They cared nothing for ancient established rights as such. What ones they pleased, they recognized. It was individual ministers, - men whom they liked and willed to favor by placing purely voluntary trust in their judgment, - who were able to influence the policies of James and Charles.

ing money; but the spending of it was the privilege of the few. (1) It might announce wars and ratify policies which had been settled for all practical purposes before its opinion was asked. (2) Its advice about managing Parliaments was not always requested, and even when given on invitation, was likely to be ignored. (3) It might plead in vain for the filling of vacant pieces offices of state. (4) After the famous condemnation of the Earl of Southampton in 1621, members of the Council protested that it was "published in our names who were neither present thereat nor heard one word of the same." (5) The ins and outs of the Spanish marriage negotiations, with all the attendant schemes and plans, King James carefully kept from it. (6) The Venetian ambassador to England relates in 1622 how the

(1) Cal. St.P. Dom. 1623-5, 194. H.M.C. Skyring Mss. 126, Ct. and Times Chas. I, I, 84. Rushw. I, 213.

(2) H.M.C. Coke Mss. I 257. Ibid., Skyring Mss. 25; Cal. St.Pap. Ven., 1623-5, 210-11.

(3) Ct. and Times Chas. I, I, 403-4. Spedding's "Bacon," II, 3. Cal. St.P. Dom. 1640-1, 74; 1639-40, 158.

(4) Winwood III, 421.

(5) Cabala, 61. Cal. St.P. Dom., 1619-23, 269.

(6) Cal. St.P. Ven., 1621-3, 144, 229.

famous arrest of Sir. Edward Coke, "who may be called the darling of the Parliament," was made, "although the Council....considering the delicacy and importance of the matter begged him (the king) to let it drop." (1) Its control over the navy and militia, long one of its recognized powers, no longer existed even in name. (2) Its supervision of trade and colonies fell away after 1630. (3) And when Scotland, late in that decade, was to be reduced to its proper attitude of submission, great schemes brewed somewhere in secret, while the Privy Council, said one^{of}/its members, "met daily, but to little purpose," discussing only trivial things. (4) In 1625, the lower house in Parliament besought the King to remember that formerly "All things of moment were carried by publick debate at the Coun-

(1) Cal. St. P. Ven., 1621-3, 199.

(2) Cal. St. P. Dom., 1625-8, 25, 45, 65, 69. Rushw. I, 219. Whitel. I, 3. Clar. St.P: II, 122. Cal. St.P: Dom., 1626-8, 32; 1633-4, 242.

(3) With the establishment of committees of Council for these affairs. C. R. Chas. I, X, 1; XII, 1.

(4) Cal. St.P. Dom., 1638-9, 377. Even Nicholas, that invaluable man-of-all-work, knew only by rumor what was going on. Ibid., 1637-8, 523. Cf. ibid., 339-40.

cil-Table." (1) Twenty-two years later, one of the famous Propositions of the Long Parliament decreed: "That no Public Act concerning the Affairs of the Kingdom...be esteemed valid, as proceeding from the royal authority, unless it be done by the Advice and Consent of the Major Part of the Council." (2) That public acts had not been so "done" had been the complaint of a whole

(1) Cottoni Posth., 273-282. As early as 1607-8, Sir Roger Wilbraham, that indefatigable court-diarist, comments on the initiative of the Council: "Note herein that in all deliberations of great Councils one should wait to see the wishes of the President and Secretaries who principally direct them; for they have secret instructions from the King, although sometimes they conceal it... and many things are put forth to the Council bearing one construction on the surface, for the purpose of secrecy, where the intention is, that quite a different conclusion shall be reached." Wilbraham's "Journal," 99. The King's favorite ministers did their work completely. Cf. Maitland's "Constitutional History," 200.

(2) Maseres Tracts II, 555-6. "Behemoth."

generation. (1)

(1) Men insisted that the King had been advised by "evil counsellors," not by the whole Board. One writer quotes a courtier just outside official circles as remarking: "I wonder from whence should grow so much discourse of Sir Henry Nevill to be a Secretary of State, or at the least a Privy Councillor." (H.M.C. Buccleuch Mss., 101-3) It is an interesting commentary on the declining power of the Council, and also on the advancing authority of the man whose position was still nominally so insignificant that he was termed "Mr. Secretary."

In the State Papers for 1626-8 (p.40) there is a curious entry: "Minute by Nicholas, for the Duke of Buckingham to move the Council for an order to unlade and inventory the Golden Herring, the ground being for reasons of state not fit to be published", - even in the supposedly inviolable privacy of the Council of State, to which all "grounds" were supposed to be familiar.

The Venetian ambassador to England, Lando, had something to say on its waning importance. In February 1623 he wrote to the Doge and Senators of Venice: "His (the king's) Council is a mere shadow for ordinary affairs, to toil about providing money, and to edit matters which are intended for publication." Late the same year he said: "The Council....serves for nothing but a shadow, things resolved being brought before it, not for decision, but simply for ceremony, or to raise difficulties." (Cal. St.P. Ven., 1621-3, 229, 441-3.)

But whatever functions it lost, the King was glad to leave it one. For assessments and collections the Council remained invaluable. James I and his son leaned confidently on it, - for the most part their sole financial support. Cal. St.P. Dom., 1637, XIX. H.M.C. Skrine Mss., 126. Cal. St.P. Ven., 1621-3, 189.

For the rest, as the Remonstrances of 1641 says: "Many Noble Personages were Councillors in name; but the Power and Authority remained in a few;...whose Resolutions and Determinations were brought to the Table for Countenance and Execution, and not for Debate and Deliberation, and no man could offer to oppose them without Disgrace and Hazard to himself." Rushw. IV, 443.

See also: Clar. Hist. I, 188. H.M.C. 4th Rept., 291; Bath Mss. II, 71-3. Clar. St.P. I, 94-5. Cal. St.P. Dom. 1625-6, 177. Whitel., I, 24-5. Cabala, 281-3.

There are three pretty evident reasons (laying aside the personal traits of the sovereigns themselves) for the decline of the Council's power. The nature of this body was undergoing some rather significant changes.

First, it was quite apparent to any one that it was becoming not entirely reliable. Secrets would leak out. Precautions were taken; commissions were appointed to run down the communicative culprits; (1) occasionally, when things were especially tense, the councillors were warned that proceedings were to be kept "close," (2) But, in spite of all, there was a general relaxation of tongues.

Second, - and this reason for waning power is in the nature of a corollary and explanation of the first, - the Council was growing to proportions that were truly appalling. The ambassador to Spain described the Spanish Council of 1612 in words that characterized the English body just as truly: "Councillors, Attorneys, Serjeantes, and Clarkes are grown into such numbers as they threaten

(1) Cal. St.P. Dom., 1625-6, 177.

(2) Ibid., 100; 1619-23, 494. Clar. St.P. I, 64. Ct. and Times Jas. I, II, 442. Often writers of the day note that on certain occasions the Council "met privately," and speculate on the nature of their proceedings. Wilbraham's "Journal," 91. H.M.C. Skrine Mss., 107. Ct. and Times Chas. I, II, 276.

a deluge." (1) A Privy Council of twenty-four would have been unprecedented, in the days of Elizabeth. (2) When James I came down to England in 1603, he promptly doubled that number. (3) Occasionally, he made excellent resolutions about reducing it, but he never accomplished much. (4) From all evidences, the number even under Charles I averaged far above thirty. (5) The Stuarts saw that it was an easy way to honor men,- this giving them seats at the Council Board,- and they seized the opportunity. But it was impossible that they or any one else should rely for advice and direction on so many. They had no intention of sharing choice secrets of the kingdom with any but the few whom they pleased to trust. (6)

(1) Winwood II, 380. Cornwallis to the English Council.

(2) The average number in her Council had been about eighteen. Near the end of the reign, this number was materially decreased. C.R. Eliz., XXIX, I, XII, III, IV.

(3) H.M.C. Frere Mss., 526. Cf. C.R. Jas. I, I, 1 A.

(4) Cal. St. P. Dom., 1603-10, 7. Ct. and Times Jas. I, I, 130. C.R. Jas. I, I, 1 A; II, 292.

(5) H.M.C. Buccleuch Mss., I, 267-8. C.R. Chas. I, VIII, 7; X, 13; XI, 1; IX, 9.

(6) Cal. St. P. Dom., 1611-18, 373. The 1642 Propositions, in order that the Board might govern, decreed that the number of Privy Counsellors should not exceed 25 nor be fewer than 15. They feared extremes.

The deliberate usurpation of power by these few trusted men is the third reason for the Council's decline. With James I began the much-reviled Stuart system of favorites. Now, these men were not merely favored courtiers, like the Essex of Queen Elizabeth, who was allowed to dabble in politics chiefly to serve as a cat's-paw for the Queen; and they were not supremely efficient administrators, like Lord Burghley. (1) They were both in one. James took up a man because he fancied him. Before long, it was sure to appear that the man had proved to possess latent executive ability of a remarkable sort and must needs be made over into a great minister of state. Between them, the two amiably directed the government. Charles was quite inclined to follow the example of his father, and Somerset and Buckingham, Portland, Land and the Earl of Strafford, with their minions only lesser than themselves, swelled with the pride of power, and were set no bounds in their control of affairs. (2) No bounds need be set, so long as their sole aim remained the aggrandisement of the king. What single members gained, the Council as a whole lost.

(1) Salisbury, Secretary and Lord Treasurer of James until 1612, and always first a great minister and second a personal favorite, was more truly a successor of Burghley and Leicester than any of the long line of favorites which followed him.

(2) H.M.C. Skrine Mss., 3, 95. State Trials I, 354. Reliq. Wotton., 427. Cal. St. P. Dom., 1636-7, VIII. Clar. Hist., I, 207. Wilson, 73.

Late in the reign of King James, there is one development inside the Council that is significant. Standing committees appear. Small and carefully selected, they were appointed by the king and were sure to include all the favorite and most efficient ministers. Their deliberations and resolutions at least were kept secret,- too successfully, in the opinion of those left out. In matters which were given into their hands by the King, the Privy Council had nothing to say until all had been arranged and was ready to be made public. (1) Now, all these committees (some to a greater extent than others) (2) took over affairs which had come more or less within the power of the Council. But in a still greater degree, they supplemented the sovereign. Foreign affairs had always been controlled directly by the King, through his Secretaries; and, of course, when a treaty was to be ratified, or something more tangible than the tortuous

(1) H.M.C. Bath Mss., 71-2. Of course, committees of a sort had long been in use, to relieve the Privy Council "burdened with affairs of state," or to prepare work of a routine nature for it. (See C.R.Jas. I, II, 617-18, for accounts of committees on trade, special debts, concerning strangers, and the like.) But the new type that now appeared did not work under the Council's direction. The great standing committees,- like the Foreign Committee (1623-28), the Irish Committee (1633), the Scotch Committee (1638), and the Committee for Trade (1630),- discussed and decided affairs entirely on their own initiative, while the Board ratified their decisions. Their powers were distinctly over and above those of the Privy Council.

(2) The Committees for Trade and Plantations, to the greatest extent.

courses of diplomacy was to be discussed, the Privy Council was always consulted. (1) The same thing was true in the treatment of Ireland; (2) while in the case of Scotland, King James kept affairs pertaining to that kingdom entirely to himself, away from his English Council. (3) Three of the most important of the standing committees established by the King between 1617 and 1640 were to have control respectively over foreign affairs, over the state in Ireland, and over Scotch matters which related themselves to England. (4) There is reason to believe that some of

(1) Prothero, CI.

(2) C. R. Jas. I, II, 617-18.

(3) Clar. Hist. I, 145. Cal. St.P.Dom., 1637-8, 533.

(4) C. R. Chas. I, X, 3. Cal. St.P.Dom., 1631-3, 229. Straf. I, 66; II, 185-6. Laud's Works III, 233, 282-3.

The fourth really important commission was the Committee for Trade and Plantations, - or rather the series of committees. With the establishment of these, the Privy Council parted with what had been one of its most important lines of work. C.R. Chas. I, V, 10; X, 1.

A "Foreign Committee" is first called by that name in 1632. (Ct. and Times Jas. I, II, 442. Cal. St. P.Dom., 1633-5, 156.) It probably denoted the old Spanish Committee (established in 1617) which apparently had taken over negotiations about the Palatinate. King James had made the protection of his son-in-law a condition of the match with Spain. (Cal. St.P.Ven., 1619-21, 429.)

For years, there had existed something very like a foreign committee. According to the Venetian Ambassador (Cal. St.P. Ven., 1617-19, 340), the Council was habitually absorbed in raising money, and the King scorned all business. So for a long time foreign affairs had been referred by King James to specific councilors, who kept in closer touch with ambassadors and

these committees did not have the complete control that they were supposed to have over affairs allotted to them. (1) But they served as a beginning; and a very real power, taken from Council and King, lay in the hands of these few, selected men. (2)

diplomatic negotiations than the rest of the Council. Three men, in the earlier years of James' reign, took the lead in these things: Salisbury, Northampton, and Suffolk, - the "three triumvires" who, if we may believe the complaints of lesser ministers, usurped all powers. When small, temporary commissions were appointed to instruct ambassadors, to receive foreign agents, or investigate some proposed alliance, these three were pretty sure to be included. (Winwood II, 35, 42, 60, 83, 429; III, 152-3, 453. Wilson, 91-2, 151. Ct. and Times Jas. I, I, 176.)

There is an interesting letter preserved in Winwood's State Papers. The English ambassador in Spain wrote to the Privy Council an apparently full account of his plans and accomplishments there. He enclosed a secret letter, which gave the crux of the whole matter, - what was standing in the way of success. It was addressed to Salisbury, Suffolk, and Northampton.

(1) The Spanish Committee certainly had only the shadow of power. They really had almost nothing to say, as regarded the negotiations for the marriage of the Prince and the Infanta. The reason for their lack of influence is interesting: it was because more than half of the committee members hated the idea of an inter-marriage with Spain. As the King's sole desire was to bring about the match, he turned a deaf ear to the Committee - as well as to the Council and nation, - and, with two or three like-minded ministers, - ran things his own way. Cf. Bristol's Defence, 9, 15, 25. Cal.St.P.Dom., 1611-18, 454. Span. Mar.Treaty, 134. Gardiner V, 176-8. Cal.St.P. Ven. 1621-3, 153, 209, 229.

(2) From 1617 until 1640, there were a series of committees for foreign affairs, in England. The Scotch and Irish committees were more temporary.

A comparison of the personnel of these committees shows, with curious clearness, the extent to which power was being concentrated.

The great honor of committee-membership was awarded to the favored few. Men schemed for such places of exclusiveness and trust. (1) The men on the committees were in every case the ones who really counted in the state. There is a peculiar and suggestive similarity in the various lists of members.

From 1617 to 1628, there were three important deliberative committees: the one appointed in 1617 to consider the pro and con of the proposed marriage of the English Prince and the Spanish Infanta; (2) the so-called Foreign Committee appointed in 1625; (3) and the Hybrid Council of War. (4) This was the period of Buckingham's

(1) Straf. II, 246. Council membership might be an empty honor; but committees were organized for work. In a day when half the members stayed away from Council meetings unrebuked, the following throws some light on the importance of committees: "Orders to be observed in Council.... Counsellors to be appointed on a Committee, and being absent thrice without sufficient excuse, are to be put out of that Committee by His Majesty's order." Cal. St.P.Dom. 1629-31, 376.

(2) Cal. St.P. Dom., 1611-18, 454.

(3) It is the name invariably given it by modern writers. At the time of its appointment, it was never so designated. Cal. St.P. Dom., 1625-6, 7.

(4) There were really a series of Councils of War. The earlier ones included no council-members. For the present purpose, the one of 1625 may be considered as typical. Cal. St. P. Dom., 1625-6, 328.

supremacy. He was on all three. (1) So was Conway, the Secretary of State famous for his devotion to the Duke; (2) and the Earl of Pembroke, Lord Chamberlain. (3) Lord Treasurer Ley was on the two most important. (4) Lord Brooke, Chancellor of the Exchequer, was included in all but the Spanish Committee. (5) Outside of these five ministers, no man's name occurs on more than one list. (6)

Sixteen-twenty-eight to 1635 were the years of the supremacy of Portland, Lord Treasurer. He had been a member of the old Spanish Committee, (7) was on the Council of War after 1629, (8) and in that same year headed the list of the Foreign Committee. (9)

o - - - - -

(1) Cal. St.P. Dom., 1623-5, 151; 1625-6, 7, 328.

(2) Ibid.

(3) Ibid.

(4) Cal.St.P.Dom. 1623-5, 151; 1625-6, 7. He was not on the Council of War. (See Cal.St.P.Ven. 1623-5, 343, for the "empty honors" of that Committee, in 1624)

(5) Cal. St. P. Dom. 1625-6, 7; 328.

(6) Buckingham, Ley, Conway, and Brooke, were also on one of the early committees of trade. See Cal. St.P.Dom. 1625-6, 19.

(7) Cal. St.P. Dom., 1623-5, 156

(8) Ibid., 1629-31, 158.

(9) C. R. Chas. I, II, 1. The other members were: Lord Conway, by this time President of the Council, Arundel Earl Marshal, Pembroke Lord Steward, Holland, Carlisle, and Dorchester. In 1634 Portland was a member of the Commission for Plantations. C. R. Chas. I, X, 1.

In the following years a new group arose, and filled the great places in state and council. This was the time of the greatness of Wentworth, Laud, and Hamilton, with their coterie of ministers only less great. (1) There were four great committees of the Council during this period: the Committee of Trade; (2) the Irish Committee, (3) the Scotch Committee, (4) and the Committee for Foreign Affairs. (5) The membership in each varied slightly from time to time, when old ministers would pass along and new ones come up; but in the main it was fairly constant. Not one of the four included more than ten names. (6) These were the men who were on all of them: Laud Archbishop of Canterbury, Lord Treasurer Juxon, (7) Arundel Earl Marshal, Secretary Coke and Secretary Windebank, - five out of an average of less than

(1) Rushw. III, Introduction. During this period, committees and sub-committees multiplied fast. Only four typical ones are considered here.

(2) C.R.Chas. I, X, 3, - one of a series of similar committees.

(3) Ibid.

(4) There were two Scotch Commissions, - one in 1638, the other in 1639. The personnel differed slightly; but in the main they were nearly identical. See Straf. II, 181, and Syd. Pap. II, 614-15.

(5) C.R.Chas. I, X, 3; XV 1, H.M.C. 3D Rept., App., 69.

(6) The Committee of Trade was the largest. The Scotch and Irish Committees had eight and six respectively, and the Foreign Committee never more than nine.

(7) He succeeded Portland as Lord Treasurer.

ten. Strafford, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, was a member of all but the Committee of Trade; the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Lord Cottington, of all but the Foreign Committee. The great Scotch councillor Hamilton, Comptroller (afterwards Secretary) Vane, and the Earl of Northumberland, who was the Lord Admiral, were Members of two out of four, - the Foreign and the Scotch Committees. (1) Besides these nine names, only three others appear on any list: Coventry and Dorset were members of the Committee of Trade; (2) Holland was included in the Committee for Foreign Affairs. (3)

(1) H.M.C. 3rd Rept., App. 69

(2) C. R. Chas. I, I, 3.

(3) Ibid., XV, 1. The investigation of other commissions show these same names prominent in them. When, in 1632, the Admiralty was put into commission, the commissioners were: Weston, Cottington, Coke, Windebank, Vane, Lindsey, and Dorset. The Commissioners for the Treasury in 1635 were: Windebank, Laud, Cottington, Coke, and Coventry. Cal. St.P. Dom. 1631-2, 440; 1634-5, 583; 1635-6, 234; 1637, 579.

Now it may be assumed that each committee met for its own kind of business. (1) There is nothing that points to the contrary. But if four distinct com-

(1) There is another rather suggestive line of investigation of somewhat the same nature. The complete State Papers would have to be consulted in order to follow it out. In these records will be found, at least after 1634, a note of each meeting of the Privy Council during each month, with a list of members present. The Calendars of State Papers are unfortunately content with giving only the number of people attending each meeting, and that only for a few months. In two cases, however, they are more specific. In June, 1636, of 7 Council meetings the King attended 4; Laud, Juxon, and Windebank were present at all. In May, 1636, there were fourteen members of the Board. The King was present at 6, Laud and Coventry at 13, and the Lord Treasurer Juxon at 8. These figures are at least suggestive. In the first place, it was apparently not necessary for a king, even one interested in government (as King Charles really was. See Reliq. Wot., 152) , to be present regularly at Council meetings. Trusted ministers could oversee matters. One wonders if the Council was doing much more than detailed, administrative work, during more than half its time when the King was never present. Cal.St.P.Dom., 1637, 171, 403; 1638-9, 289; 1637-8, 1481 1639-40, 300; 1640, 103; 1640-1, 408.

King James had been notably delinquent in all matters of government. He hated exertion, and was glad to leave the machinery to others. Winwood's State Papers contain illuminating records of council proceedings. Take nine, in the years 1608-10. Salisbury, Secretary and Lord Treasurer, was present at all; Northampton, Lord Priester Seal at eight; Lord Chancellor Suffolk at seven. Others, - as Worcester, Ellesmere and Sir Julius Caesar, - did not attend more than 3 or 4. Cf. Winwood III, 222, 224, 77, 79, 95, 235, 429, 442, 483. Regular attendants might exert much influence of one kind and another.

mittees, each with a special line of work, have identical members, in what vital way do they differ from a single group? It is true that they are not absolutely identical, but they are strikingly near it; predominating in each are the same few men. And when the same men are interested in the same things, one can trust human nature to the extent of inferring that, perhaps not at all in order to influence one another, they will talk instinctively. Many triumphs and mistakes in policies of state may be laid at the doors of informal gatherings of ministers, - "tobacco parliaments," as it were.

For forty years, in ways like this, (1) power was being concentrated in selected hands. Such a tendency might have continued for forty years more, and yet not prove much about the existence of a Cabinet, - the real administrative power within the recognized Council. The decline of the Privy Council, the dependence of the King on the favorites, the concentration of power in the hands of strangely identical groups called Committees of Council, - signs like these only point in the same direction, and in themselves explain little. Generally speaking, there is not much to an institution which is not recognized by contemporaries as existing. Powers could not be falling very rapidly into the hands of a favored few, policies of state

(1) See also p. 21, note 1.

could not be decided customarily by small, extra-official groups of inner ministers,- this sort of thing could not go on long, while the Chamberlains, the Carletons, the Meads, and the rest of the seventeenth century court-news-mongers habitually failed to mention it, and to speculate curiously about the "secret movers of state." Negative indications must be backed up by the more positive sort. (1)

In the first place, it began to dawn upon one that even these all-important committees and the autocratic decisions which they were in the habit of handing over to the Council for ratification, were not always as final and decisive as they were supposed to be. Their word was not quite the last on the subject. Something seemed to be working behind them. For instance, it was not to the Irish Committee, appointed largely for his benefit, that Wentworth, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, confided his plans and necessities. Two or three special ministers were selected instead. (2) Again, in 1639, young Windebank was sent on a special embassy to the continent. The Foreign Committee,

(1) It has often been said that the Foreign Committee was the ancestor of the Cabinet. After the Restoration, the Cabinet may have developed from this committee as it took on new powers. But in the period of the Early Stuarts, the Foreign Committee was for foreign affairs, never more. The members of it had, as members, no wider powers.

(2) Straf. II, 211. Cottington, Windebank and Laud were the favored three. One wonders whether they were entirely Wentworth's choice, or in part at least the King's.

having charge of such affairs, gave him due orders. Whereupon, before he left, certain ones gave him "some other private instructions more than was resolved at the Foreign Committee." (1) When the Spanish ambassador arrived in England, in 1634, to solicit ships from King Charles for his master, the King sent him to confer, not with the Foreign Committee, but with three special ministers: Portland, Cottington, and Windebank. (2) In 1640, the same proceeding occurred. But this time the Spanish agent consulted with Strafford, Northumberland, Hamilton, and Windebank. (3)

Now, what did people, - the inveterate letter-writers and annalists, - have to say about how things were brought about? They told long tales of what the committees were doing, of course. They kept, too, a sharp lookout for the outrages of favorites. But beyond this, was it the Privy Council that was held responsible for everything that was good and bad in government? Or was there

(1) H.M.C. 3rd Rept., App., 78.

(2) Clar. St. P. I, 122.

(3) Clar. St. P. II, 93. Pointing in the same direction is the fact that, while Secretary Coke was a member of the Foreign Committee, no one, not even himself, pretended that he was in the confidence of the King, as regarded foreign affairs. (Clar. St. P. I, 337. Sydney Papers II, 620.) See also: Cal. St. P. Ven., 1621-3, 266; 1623-5, 343; Ct. and Times Chas. I, I, 179. Cal. St. P. Dom., 1638-9, 151-3.

another group, more than the favorites, less than the Council, intimate with the King, that was watched with hawk eyes as it dabbled at will in diverse affairs, and advised and deliberated on a score of subjects?

I suppose it is Lord Clarendon who first led people to wonder if there might be such a group in the reign of King Charles, without whom "nothing was done that was done." Not being quite certain of their convictions, historians have fenced, have admitted the possibility, and have quoted Clarendon for what he is worth. He describes, in his "History of the Rebellion," what he calls a Committee of State, with many vernacular names and an elaborately worked-out membership. (1) And it consulted with the King on all matters of importance. Now, Clarendon had a distinct feeling for the "philosophy" of history, and for the broad sweep of events. To the general, outline facts of his times he is true; but he fitted in details according to a theory, - always a picturesque one, - of his own. Throw aside, then, the "trimmings" of this Council of State, - the names, the qualifications for membership. One question remains: where did Clarendon get the fundamental idea of his Council: that it was a group whose powers were broad as the government itself? A man does not create a theoret-

(1) Clar. Hist. I, 195-8.

ical institution which has no precedent in fact,- Clarendon least of all, whose fancy always built on a foundation of fact.

What is more, this broad truth,- that there were a few hands in which great powers were concentrated,- stands by no means unsupported. By the documents of the early seventeenth century it is corroborated twenty times. A great and varied mass of evidence points to the existence of this group of king's councillors on whom "the bulk and burden of state affairs lay."

Letters of the day are full of great plans, and the ministers without whom not a wheel of the government turned. No news was too slight to retail about these mighty ones, whose "Resolutions and Determinations were brought to the Table for Countenance and Execution, and not for Debate and Deliberation." (1) Their names are seldom mentioned, though occasionally one can infer whom the writers had in mind. It was not the men as individuals who were so eagerly watched,- not a single minister who was credited with powers so wide. It was the group, not the individual, that attracted such marked attention. By it, this body of "the King's most inward councillors," all sorts of things were done. For it each spectator seemed to have a name of his own.

 (1) Rushw. II, 443. The Remonstrance of 1641.

As early as 1604, men began to talk about certain men who were nearer the King and more influential in affairs than the rest of the Council Board. For instance, when the Catholics in England prospered to an extent that was unseemly, it was because they were favored by "such as manage the intimate councils of the king."

(1) Again, it was the "principall of his (King James') councill" who had general care of foreign ambassadors to England, consulting with them, listening to their complaints, and making them eminently diplomatic promises.

(2) But though people realized that such men as Salisbury, Northumberland, Suffolk, and later Somerset, had enormous powers, they did not trouble much. Salisbury's influence was stupendous, and Somerset's after him. (3)

But neither carried out, above its head, plans which the Council as a body opposed. Probably an Italian, writing in 1618, pretty well expressed the true conditions: "He (the King) discusses and decides many things by the advice of his favorites alone.....But he usually consults the Council upon the most important matters." (4) The

 (1) Wilson, 145, 151, 201. Winwood II, 40. After 1604.

(2) Winwood II, 269 (1606); III, 453 (1614).

(3) Cal. St. P. Ven., 1607-10, 363.

(4) Ibid., 1617-19, 389. Ambassador Foscarini to the Doge and Senate. Cf. Ibid., 1607-10, 139, 163, 172, 363, 436. H.M.W. 10th Rept., App., 101.

Council was content. It was after 1619 that the great change came. For four years, the nation thought of little else than the disasters of a possible alliance with Spain. The majority of the Council fought the scheme, and the entire nation hated it. (1) The King and a few ministers were determined to carry negotiations through by any means they could. The best means was, ignoring all protestations, to manage things with a high hand. Around the King, the Prince and Buckingham as a center, the few congenial councillors gathered. Some of the Council they sent abroad; others they turned away from the Board on some pretext. (2) Above the heads of the rest, they passed what they pleased. (3) Protests went unheeded; the Council remained in the shadow, - "to toil about providing money," was the way one man put it. The substance of power belonged to the "Spanish party," as

(1) Of Marrying Prince Charles to the Spanish Infanta. Cal. St. P. Ven., 1621-3, 153. As early as 1617, when James began to take seriously the Spanish advances, men commented that "the King carried things more secretly than ever." Cal. St. P. Dom., 1611-18, 379.

(2) Cal. St. P. Ven., 1621-3, 153. Buckingham was doubly glad to get rid of the many relatives and kinsmen of Somerset, who had filled all possible offices which his people. For to Buckingham the name of Howard was as the proverbial red rag. Lake was one of the last to fall.

(3) Ibid., 209, 229, 441-2, 460; 1623-5, 516.

people called it. (1) The King, the Prince, Buckingham, and three or four others favorable to Spain, - among whom were Conway and Carlisle, - (2) laid down the law. Then, when the Spanish marriage plan was a thing of the past, there was always something new that Buckingham and his henchmen thought the Council not capable of understanding, - an expedition against Spain, a journey of Mansfeld to the continent with troops for the Palatinate, or ^{on}manoeuvrings with France. (3) The Council found itself shut out from all such things; and the "Spanish party" and the groups that were its successors as the "inward council of the King," were the marvels of their generation. To Parliament, they were the despair. It systematically laid the blame for every outrage, neither on King nor Privy Council, but on His Majesty's "most inward counsellors," who had "got to decide many things outside the Council." (4) Parliaments were rumored, were called, and dissolved, it was said, because "some of his nearest Counsel" was "very affectionately

(1) Cal. St. P. Ven., 1621-3, 229, 441-2. The "Spanish Party" was by no means identical with the "Spanish Committee," Fully half of this group which was appointed to "consider the marriage" were, publicly or in private, opposed to it, and as a group had little more to do with the negotiations than the entire Council had.

(2) Cal. St. P. Dom., 1623-5, 156.

(3) Cal. St. P. Dom., 1625-6, 25, 45, 65, 69. Skrine Mss., 18, 159, 95. H.M.C. Coke Mss. I, 257.

(4) Rushw. I, 652; Cal. St. P. Dom., 1611-18, 19, 21.

bent that way." (1) In 1621, when Prince Charles was determined to punish his father's refractory Commons, he wrote to Buckingham that he had consulted "so many of the Council as the King trusts most." (2) As the reign of King Charles advanced, terms were used that have a shade more definite meaning. In 1632, Sir Tobie Matthew, - there was little, past or present that escaped Sir Tobie, - (3) wrote an English ambassador abroad that in spite of the strong opinion that the "Cabalists" would have received the blow and loss of power which they well deserved, they were still as strong as ever. (4) Some of the too-powerful "Cabalists" that were in Sir Tobie Matthew's mind were the Lord Treasurer Portland and Lord Cottington. (5) In 1637, one of the English ambassadors, - Sir Thomas Roe, - was entrusted with the planning of an inter-national West Indian Company to be organized by England and a few European states. He submitted his plan to the King ^{as} a ground or beginning

(1) Rushw. I, 115. H.M.C. 4th Rept., App., 292. Juxon, Coventry and Land were, in their day, among the ones to be reckoned with.

(2) Goodman II, 209. There is a distinct indication here of a rather definitely marked number.

(3) This is a contemporary French ambassador's comment on Sir Tobie Matthew: "the man of parts, active, influential, an excellent linguist; he penetrates cabinets, he insinuates himself into all kinds of affairs, and knows the purpose and temper of those who govern the Kingdom, especially of the Lord Treasurer." Rel. par M. de Fontenay ... 1634. D.N.B., Tobie Matthew.

(4) Cal. St. P. Dom., 1631-3, 398.

(5) Cf. *ibid.* 292 and 294.

for the discussing and maturation of His Majesty and his secret Council." (1) The three whose favor Roe needed for his plan were Arundel, Northumberland, and Laud. (2) In 1638 an irate Scot, berating the "secret movers of state" who were so unfair to his nation, declared that "few of his nobility dare open their mouths," while the Council "is for the most part novi homines, and principal supporters of those wasps." (3) Heylyn has a comment to make upon the "managers of state" during the same period, - a "juntillo," he calls them. "All things," he says, "being governed by a juntillo, and that juntillo by him" (the Earl of Strafford). (4)

Here, then, variously denominated, were the ministers who counted. It was not a stray favorite, working along^F, nor yet the body of the Privy Council, which men looked upon as the court of first and last resort in government. All things moved so secretly and often so

----- 0 -----

(1) Cal. St. P. Dom., 1637, 430.

(2) Ibid., 553, 358, 336.

(3) Cal. St. P. Dom., 1638, 89

(4) Heylyn, 368. The "Cyprianus Anglicus" was written after 1656.

execrably by a group of men who worked together. (1) People did not even mention individual names. They grouped them together; they were the King's "most inward councillors, the Cabalists, the Juntillo." It was the group, not the individual, that men credited with powers so vast. The Parliaments might publicly rage, and the Privy Council might privately fume, - "seriously mortified" they were, says a contemporary, - on account of the powers they had lost; ⁽²⁾ the fortunate few kept the power they gained, - the King found them invaluable. When, by inference and comparison, one gets a flashing hint here and there of the individual "cabalists," the suggestions are interesting: Buckingham, Conway, Coventry, Portland, Laud, Strafford, - there was not a committee in their day that did not include these names.

As great officers of state, - Lord Treasurers, Lord Admirals, Lord Lieutenants, and what-not, - they had much power, but not all. As members of the great, secret committees that directed so powerfully the administrative

(1) It is interesting to note, in this connection, that, after Buckingham, even single favorites did not usurp the first place with the King. Portland was a great power; but Cottington and Laud were close seconds. Laud, in turn, was no more powerful than Strafford or Hamilton. It was the three, not one of them alone, who governed the King's decisions. Later, Falkland, Culpepper and Hyde arose, as the all-powerful ministers. Even in favorites, the King evidently found safety in numbers.

(2) H. M. C. Skrine Mss., 10.

Council, their power was increased ten times. The rest they wielded because, by whatever name they were known, they were the men without whom the King's absolute authority could not stand. Together King and trusted counsellors directed all things. It was such men as these who were the germ-cabinet of the seventeenth century. People recognized that what they said "went," in Council and state.

Most interesting of all, however, from the modern point of view, are the cases when men, speaking of the all-powerful group of ministers which moved policies of state, call them the "Cabinet," or the "Cabinet Council."

Now, the term "Cabinet" - usually capitalized, after the manner of the day, - was popular, in the seventeenth century. The literature of the time is full of its uses. But it usually indicated the existence of a germ-cabinet, - the King's "inner counsellors," the "Cabalists," - about as accurately as ~~seventeenth~~ thirteenth century "parliamentum" was an early case of a true Parliament. People loved to talk about "Cabinets." And the word might mean almost anything, - anything, that is, that was private, - exclusive, as it were. No matter of what it was used, it connoted an attendant characteristic of secrecy.

Sometimes a "cabinet" was a little box, where

valuables were kept. (1) Again, people were always, by that name, talking about private rooms. (2) One contemporary dubbed the Earl of Dunbar "the Cabinet of King James' secret Counsels," - meaning, as the Venetian ambassador puts it, that he was "His Majesty's most confidential servant." (3) Or, a "Cabinet Council" might be simply a confab, or colloquy. (4) But usually both terms meant some sort of an advisory group of men. (5) Any man who was supposed to be burdened with weighty business was likely to be credited with such assisting bodies. Buckingham's and Strafford's were often talked of. The "Cab-

(1) Cal. St.P. Ven., 1607-10, 269.

(2) Verney "Notes," 37. Cal.St.P. Ven., 1621-3, 2, 11.

(3) Cal.St.P.Ven., 1607-10, 172. Dunbar was a Scotch Earl whose activities were confined largely to that kingdom.

(4) Hardwicke, St. P. II, 146.

(5) It is curious and interesting, in view of the sub-legal position which the modern cabinet holds, that the term "Cabinet Council" appears in no state documents, no royal letters, and not even in annals or letters of great ministers of state. What mere outsiders talked of as the "Cabinet Council," the councillors called a "select committee. (Clar.St.P.II, 81-2. Cal.St.P.Dom., 1639-40, 522) It was a popular name, given to groups of advisers whose devious ways were to envious outsiders matters of mystification. Most unfortunately, the Privy Counsellors were not, as a rule, especially addicted to the writing of friendly letters or the keeping of diaries. From such papers, one might receive some rather clear impressions on ways and means in governing. Most of the people whose "manuments" are preserved were mere hangers-on, in official circles, - men-about-town, of a sort, and were generally obliged to preface their remarks with "they say." They made it their business to hear every thing, but they were not in direct contact with the machinery of government.

inet Councils" of the Commons, during the Long Parliament, were supposed to have hatched all sorts of nefarious plots. (1) One poetic individual even ascribed to Nature a "Cabinet," asserting that Bacon was the "inward Secretary" of it. (2) But the Cabinet Council in the eyes of all men was the King's.

Sometimes, the Foreign Committee was so designated. (3) Again, there are many instances where the same name was given to the committee for Scotch affairs, the nature of whose proceedings was the subject for so many wild guesses in the court. The famous "Cabinet Council," or "Junto" so closely connected with the

(1) Hacket's "Williams," II, 21. Straf. I, 64, 379. Whitelock I, 100. Gordon, 30. Warwick. 174.

(2) Reliq. Wotton., 298.

(3) In 1634, the rumor was going the rounds that "one of the Cabinet had announced a union of England and the Low Countries against Spain." [Cal. St.P. Dom., 1633-5, 203. Ct. and Times Jas. I, II, 442.] See also Cal. St. P. Dom., 1633-4, 189; Massinger's "Maid of Honor," 189, for other instances where, since the work was of a nature which the Foreign Committee would naturally do, one may infer that "Cabinet Council" is used to denote that body.

Strafford trial was the Scotch Committee. (1)

But, for our purpose, the important cases are those which show the "Cabinet Council" at work at affairs which these committees or any others did not touch,- the Cabinet Council of the King's favorite advisors who were permitted to have a hand in a little of everything.

In the first place, there are several cases which can neither be accepted unreservedly, nor be entirely discarded. Men who wrote ten or fifteen years after the events they narrate often have something to say about the King's Cabinet Council which managed things generally. Bishop Goodman, in his "Court of King James" (1650-55), states that the secretaries of

 (1) Whitel. I, 92-3. Cal.St.P.Dom., 1639-40, 522. Rushw. IV, 239. Warwick, 159.

The term "Junto" is often used to denote either the Foreign or the Scotch Committees. The word probably was of Spanish origin; it first comes into use in England during the period of close connection between the two countries,- while the royal marriage was under discussion. Up to 1640, it occurs in no place where it does not refer either to the Foreign or the Scotch Committees. Writers who are not strictly contemporary like to refer to the set of councillors who controlled all affairs,- the germ-cabinet,- as the "Junto." The reason for this probably lies in the fact that while the King was at Oxford, this inner council was always so termed. Whitel. I, 101, 126. H.M.C. 4th Rept., 293. Cal.St.P. Dom., 1623-5, 156; 1635, 9, VIII; 1639-40, 320, 435. Ct. and Times Jas. I, II, 442. Ct. and Times Chas. I, II, 256. Warwick, 17. Sydney Papers II, 614, 15, 16. Prynne Documents, 74.

of state "were ever of the Cabinet Council." (1) The devoted biographer of Archbishop Laud has something to say of the Cabinet Council in 1623, the members of which, he asserts, were the only men who knew beforehand of the Prince's Spanish escapade. (2) John Hacket talks confidently of the "Cabinet men" who determined the policy of the state in 1624. (3) While in "Rushworth's Collections" for 1625 is the statement that the state of religion "had an early inspection and consultation in the Cabinet Council." (4) Now, these writers were telling, - Rushworth, at least, was careful to collect and use contemporary material, - of events that took place years before they wrote; and it is an easy thing to read into the earlier period characteristics that were well marked in a later one. On the other hand, it must be remembered that they were all writing years before the Restoration brought new institutional developments. At the most, they were only assuming an earlier existence of what they knew to be the

(1) Goodman I, 167-8. He was discussing the reign of King James.

(2) Heylyn's "Laud", 99 (publ. 1661). As a matter of fact, half the people in London had an inkling of this pending event, though everyone, like Heylyn, seemed to have pretended that it had all been a dead secret. The Spanish Committee admittedly did not know of it until after the departure of the Prince. This wise "Cabinet Council" of Heylyn's resembles the inner group of five or six advocates of Spain, who were usurping all the power, during the negotiations. (See p. 29)

(3) Hacket's "Williams," 137. (Written C. 1650)

(4) Rushw. I, 167. (publ. 1650)

custom before the execution of the King. (1)

What is more, on the point of fundamental importance, contemporaries check them up. Here is what the men who wrote things down when they happened have to contribute about that hundred-handed group which was trusted in everything.

In June of 1622, (2) the indefatigable correspondent of Dudley Carleton wrote: "A Cabinet Council is

(1) It is worth noting that not one of these men is discussing the Cabinet Council for the sake of itself. What they were interested in was the things it was doing. Going on to tell what it was doing, they take its existence for granted.

(2) The classical allusion to "cabinet counsels" is, of course, Bacon's: "The Doctrine of Italy and the Practice of France, in some King's times, hath introduced Cabinet Counsels." (Essays or Counsels, "76-7") A good many meanings have been given this sentence. This, at least, is the connection in which it is used:

1. The Privy Council, Bacon says, was not a fit group to counsel kings. Any dependence on it might weaken their authority. Moreover, it was unreliable, - not secret, nor sufficiently devoted. As an alternative of his own for this group, the King had come to rely on "Cabinet Counsels."

2. From Italy and France this example had come.

Now, Bacon may have meant that the king had come to follow advice that was given him privately, not officially by the Privy Council. But if so, why then did he emphasize the novelty of his "Cabinet Counsel"? There was nothing especially new in a stubborn king's refusing to follow the advice of his lawful counsellors, or in consulting secretly a minister or two.

What is more, in Venice, whose Italian "doctrine" the English King was adopting, there distinctly existed what went by the name of a Cabinet. It consisted of the Doge and a few responsible ministers, and superintended the government-boards of lesser importance. This group gradually took the name of a "Cabinet," from the room in which it met. (Cal. St. P. Ven., 1621-3, 1, 117, 297.)

As to the French "Cabinet Counsel," this excerpt

talked of, to which the most secret and important business may be committed" (1) Sweeping, - and vague. It is a lone sentence in the midst of running comments on all sorts of current events. (2) In September of the same year, Gondomar, the Spanish ambassador who for years had been so powerful an engine in English affairs, wrote to King James: "But that a Spaniard has been thought worthy to be a counsellor not only of your Privy Council, but also of your Inner Cabinet, that surpassesall the services I have been able to render you." It was a doubly great and honorable thing, - this member-

from an ambassador's despatch bears upon it: "I have been assured here on excellent authority that in the secret Cabinet Council they have decided to enter upon negotiations for the marriage of the King's third sister with the Prince of England." (Contarini to the Doge and Senate of Venice, Cal. St. P. Ven., 1619-21, 20)

Would it not seem that some group like this was in the mind of Sir Francis Bacon (who himself was never entirely trusted by King James) when he was describing these Cabinet Counsels which were usurping the place of the Council?

(1) Cal. St. P. Dom., 1619-23, 404.

(2) In Sir Walter Yonge's diary is the following entry for the same month: "The Prince, Marquis Buckingham, Marquis Hamilton, Earl of Arundel, Sir George Calwards, Sir H. Montague, Lord President, Sir Lionel Cranfield and ----- have a commission granted them from the King, and shall sit weekly at St. James'.....What is the substance of the commission is not yet known." The Spanish Committee is the only one recorded officially and recognized. This is quite distinct from it. Yonge's testimony, unsupported by other sources, should not be regarded too seriously.

bership in the Cabinet Council. (1)

Several letters for 1625 have something to say of the Cabinet Council of that year. Three men, writing independently, gave an account of how the King selected five ministers "as his Cabinet Council." A fourth dilated more fully upon the group, and said it was "to settle the most important affairs of state with the King." In addition, the secret commission still exists which appointed them. They were "to take into consideration certain articles concerning matters of state, and all other articles which they should thereafter receive from the King, and to report to him their advice thereon." (2) The five ministers selected were:

(1) Goodman II, 234. A passage from the bread-and-butter letter written to the King upon Gondomar's return to Spain. The Spaniard had been as powerful in the internal as he was in the foreign affairs of England. In 1622, the Venetian ambassador wrote: "The King trusts Gondomar more than any man living." He was one of the greatest in the "Spanish Party" that controlled everything. Cal. St.P.Ven., 1621-3, 294, 125, 183, 26; 1619-21, 517, 575. Cal. St.P. Dom., 1621-3, 333.

(2) Cal. St.P. Dom., 1625-6, 7, 10, 12. Ct. and Times Chas. I, I, 21. Diary of Sir Walter Yonge, 83. H.M.C. Skrine Mss., 10.

It is this Committee of Five, appointed by King Charles at the beginning of his reign, which modern historians (see, for example, Gardiner's History of England, 1603-1642, and Carlyle's "Committees under the Stuarts") seem unanimously to call the first Foreign Committee. Whether it was a committee exclusively for foreign affairs could not be settled absolutely without a careful comparison of the Council Register and the original state papers.

But there are a number of things about it which are not typical of foreign committees.

1. Men before this had been accustomed to speak of "the foreign committee." After 1622, they had given that

Ley, Buckingham, Pembroke, Conway, and Brooke.

Five years later an England ambassador had

name to the Spanish Commission. But no contemporary gives it to this group of 1635. Three called it simply "the Cabinet Council" and did not specify what its powers were. Another thought these men were selected to advise the King on all questions. The commission appointing it gives to it no specific name.

2. No trace of it as a committee exists even a month after its appointment. The foreign committees (the Spanish Commission before and the Foreign Committees later) were of long standing. By 1638 (see C.R. Chas. I, VII, 1.), there were several committees existing, each having power over a special phase of foreign work. These were ended when a Foreign Committee with inclusive powers was appointed in that year.

3. Apparently, there is no note of its appointment in the Council Register, which invariably contains records of regular committees of Council. (Cf. Carlyle's "Stuart Committees," 676, and available material from the Register.)

4. The powers that were given this group were unlike those of a committee for purely foreign work. It was to "take into consideration" certain foreign treaties and the like. It was also to advise the King about the arming of the militia and the employment of the navy,- two phases of work not ordinarily considered by foreign committees,- and about "all other articles which they should hereafter receive from the King."

What other "articles" they may or may not have received, one has no way of knowing. The committee as a committee,- its individual members had a hand in everything that went on,- is never mentioned a month after its erection. (For possible traces of its results of its advice see Cal. St.P.Dom., 1635-6, 198, 220, 255. H.M.C. Coke Mss., I, 257.)

There is reason to believe, both in view of the commission that appointed it, and the fact that separate commissions were issued subsequently to direct different phases of the work on which it was asked to advise, that this committee was in no sense administrative, but purely advisory. At the beginning of the new King's reign, it, with Charles I, "settled" affairs in the way they were to go. Others might be trusted to work out the policies decided by the few.

something to say about the Englishmen who were authorities on public events. On his return to England, he wrote to the Queen of Bohemia. As regarded foreign news, he was able to give her a full account. But, coming to describe conditions in England, he had to admit that upon anything there the one who could give her the best information was Sir Henry Vane, who was "of the Cabinet, and one of those that can read whispers." (1)

In 1631 Sir John Eliot, - who would have been a great minister of state had he not been too sympathetic with the parliamentary party, - wrote the following in a news-letter to a friend outside of London: "Many things are in consideration heer at home. amongst others S^r Randall Crewe is not unthought of in the Cabinet to be restor'd againe Chiefe Justice." (2) He had already, in his "Negotium Posterorum," written an account of how Buckingham, in 1625, would have yielded to his (Eliot's) persuasions to appease the irate Parliament by parting with some of his power over fleet and subsidies, - would

(1) Cal. St. P. Dom., 1629-31, 306.

(2) Letter Book II, 196-7. Sir John Eliot was a prisoner in the Tower at the time. One has only to read his letter book to see how closely in touch he kept with current events. The Lord Treasurer wrote to Wentworth on the same subject: "We shall shortly change an Attorney, and I hope also that to the better; who it shall be is a Secret; and, for some important Reasons yet to be kept so." (Straf. Let. I, 58)

have yielded and compromised, but for the fact that "those that were about him gave it an alteration in the Cabanet." The favorite kept on in his old way. (1)

By 1637, troubles in Scotland began to brew. Though nothing had come to a head, insubordination was in the air; and King Charles was distinctly uneasy. The next year, when his policy of stern repression had been decided on, the King appointed his Scotch Committee to take entire charge of the management of affairs. But the general course, - the policy that the Government was to follow in the treatment of the rebellious Scots had been, as a news-letter of October, 1637, puts it, "arrived at by the King and his Cabinet Council." (2)

Men whom Sir Tobie Matthew called "Cabalists" another would have termed the "secret Councillors of the King," and still another "the Cabinet Council." All three would have had in mind what was essentially the same thing: - in the words of Prince Charles, "So many of the Council as the King trusts most." Cabalists or Cabinet

(1) Debates in the House of Commons, 1625, XVIII. It is quite possible that Eliot's "Cabanet" meant to him only the King's private room, and not any definitely marked group bearing that name. Be that as it may, there remains the implied existence of the King's selected confidants whose counsels were final. In one case they were exercising a power that the Privy Council had long since despaired of: the few ministers (among whom was Weston) were consulting with the King about the appointment of an officer of state.

(2) Cal. St. P. Dom., 1637, 468, VIII.

Council, they were the inner, picked confidants of the King, the ministers whose advice he trusted.

As to what the pass-word was which placed men among the trusted counsellors, one can do little more than speculate. What ever raises a man in the estimation of kings? Of the Stuarts, never popular approval. Either James or Charles would as soon have parted with his "prerogative" as have had a minister "imposed on him by Parliament." (1) First of all, the gracious patronage of favorites and ministers in power recommended men to the King. Laud, Strafford, Hamilton, and Cottington "rose by favor of Buckingham." Ley gained the Treasury through the Duke, and lost it on his death. (2) For Weston, rising in favor, desired his place. (3) The new Lord Treasurer and Cottington shared power between them. (4) Then, after Portland's day, it was Laud, who for years had been held back by his "Lady Mora," who recommended Windebank to the King, and, to the astonishment of the court, procured him a secretaryship. (5) Laud, too, was the patron of Juxon,

(1) Ct. and Times Jas. I, I, 176.

(2) Syd. Pap. II, 366, 368. Straf. I, 5. Laud's Diary, 159. Cal. St.P. Dom., 1621-3, 378; 1625-6, 228.

(3) Syd. Pap. II, 368.

(4) H. M. C. Skrine Mss., 165.

(5) Laud's Diary, 215.

who was suddenly made Lord Treasurer. (1) But though favorite ministers might recommend their friends, they could not always remove their enemies. Ministers stayed by favor of the King, and the Stuarts were loyal to those they liked. Though Windebank quarreled with Laud, he remained the chief secretary of the King, whom he adroitly encouraged to get rid of Coke. (2) Laud and Cottington were habitually opposed; yet both remained in power. (3) As for Vane and Strafford, - their mutual hatred had long been a matter of common knowledge, before the Lord Lieutenant fell. The Cabinet Council of the Stuarts was not a group imposed on them by any one. Ministers who pleased them, they loaded with power. And the man who pleased the Stuart kings was the one who devoted himself to the maintenance of their supreme position above all law.

One point more. How conscious a creation was this inner group of councillors? Did the King ever choose it deliberately, giving certain men the recognized right to be consulted in all things? On two occasions, such a thing is suggested. Each was during a period of extraordinary necessity. One is the case of 1625. (4) King Charles is-

(1) Laud's Diary, 216.

(2) Clar. St.P. I, 337.

(3) Straf. I, 298; II, 245-8.

(4) See p. 40, note 2.

sued a secret commission to five great ministers, referring to them certain questions for advice, - certain question, and "all other articles which they should hereafter receive from the King." (1) Men who knew of the appointment believed these ministers to have been given the widest possible powers in all great affairs of state. (2) They were appointed to advise in all things. The other case is in 1640. Early in August, the King went north, to oversee in person the operations against the Scots. Taking part of his Privy Council with him (Vane and Strafford among them), he left the rest in London, to direct the government there. There is a commission among the State Papers which gives them royal instructions. Secretary Windebank reported regularly to Secretary Vane in the north, and it is through Windebank's despatches that one sees who really controlled in the south. It was not the Privy Council. The Secretary called it "the committee." There is no record of the King's having commissioned it especially to oversee and guide the Council. But there it was, - an inner group at the helm. (3) Vane sent despatches down to Windebank "to be communicated with the Lords of the Committee....and so much as you shall think

(1) Cal. St. P. Dom., 1625-6, 7.

(2) H.M.C.Skrine Mss., 10. Cal. St. P. Dom., 1625-6, 10.

(3) Cal. St. P. Dom., 1640, 627f; 1640-1, 8, 23. Clar. St. P. II, 94. Hardwicke St. P. II, 172-6, 155-7.

fit with the Lords of the Council." It did everything, - schemed to raise money to send the king, planned what rivers to close and what towns to fortify, and even advised in regard to the Great Council of Peers which the King was planning. It recommended; the Council obeyed. Among those on it were: Cottington, Juxon, Arundel, and Windebanke. (1) When, in the middle of September, the rest of the Council was called north, these ministers, with Laud, were the ones commissioned by the King to remain behind in London and keep things running there. (2)

Now, both these committees were only temporary. Of the 1625 group there is no trace a month after its appointment, and the one in 1640 ended its work with the return of the King to London. Then, too, both came at a time of emergency, when the government was shaken out of its usual lines. In 1625, old affairs had to be settled, and new policies of a new king debated and decided; it was for advice on broad questions of policy, -

(1) It is only from incidental allusions to one or two members of it, that a list can be made. There is no reason to suppose that the list is anything but partial.

(2) H.M.C. 2nd Rept., App., 23. These five were all members of the Scotch Committee, and also of the so-called "Committee of the Council of War" which had been appointed to make practical arrangements for soldiers, arms, ammunition, etc. (See Cal. St.P. Dom., 1637-8, 611) Now, however, they were not appointed merely to manage affairs relating to the war with the Scots. They were given control of the southern kingdom, during the King's absence.

"to unite the two courts," one contemporary puts it,-

(1) that the committee of five ministers was selected.

In 1640, the Scotch war was tearing up both kingdoms.

With the King in the north and unknown dangers in the air, every means had to be seized to keep counsels close and decisions swift and sure. At other times, there is no trace of any such established committee. The two instances, then, may be taken for what they are worth. Interesting they certainly are. For they show how, in times of crisis, when matters must move steadily and surely, the King turned to the few whom he could trust. (2)

At other times, during the long years of normal living,- as normal, at least, as the Stuart period ever knew,- there was no such conscious appointment of inner advisors,- "these few and no more," who were to be reckoned with. In the first place, monarchs who scorned to check their power by relying on the body of legally recognized advisors,- the ancient Council of kings,- would never have imposed upon themselves a fixed, restraining hand. In the second place, no king who needed counsel ever began by establishing a set of distinct advisors,- a definite body with definite powers as a group. An instinctive turning to

(1) H. M. C. Skrine Mem., 10.

(2) The 1640 committee was a more notable thing than its predecessor. It was truly administrative,- was an energetic in execution as it was in giving advice. It directed the Privy Council. The 1625 group was appointed simply to advise with the King.

those who were to be trusted grew into a habit, the habit into a custom, and a new force had come into existence that the nation was to recognize. The Cabinet at the end of the reign of King Charles was no more than a personal habit of the King. On the part of the ministers, it was the drifting together of congenial spirits. On the side of the King, it was a voluntary turning to the few who never failed him, even in direst extremities. People recognized the power of the few whom the Council followed implicitly. It was they on whom a nation which would not hold a monarch responsible for his own mistakes, laid all the blame for two generations of mis-government. One of the great corner-stones in the Long Parliament's Remonstrance was the demand that the King consult his Privy Council as a whole, and not in part.

When the War broke, and King Charles drew back into Oxford, the old habits in life and government went on, - the old Council, and the old, inner group of ministers that the King relied on. Only the pressure of the times heightened and developed the germ-cabinet. With membership distinct and times of meeting regular, the Cabinet Council came toget^{her} daily to agree "what was to be done or attempted." (1) When Charles II came back

(1) Baillie II, 125. Clar. Life I, 89, 90, 168. Clar. St. P. II, 286, 290.

to rule in 1640, he came as the successor of the Kings and not the Protectors. Ministers who remembered well re-erected old machinery of government which the Commonwealth had discarded, but could not destroy. In later generations, the Cabinet went far. But the invaluable Cabal of Charles II, from which the entire system has always been traced, was only the earlier Stuarts' Cabinet Council regenerated.