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ABSTRACT

The core aim of this dissertation has been the provision of a calendar for the collection - The personal papers of Edward, third Lord Suffield. A calendar is the most in-depth and time-consuming type of finding aid, and correspondingly allows for more efficient exploitation of the subject-content of archives such as this. The calendar, together with an introduction, makes up Chapter Five.

Chapter One reviews Norfolk Record Office within local county and national contexts, with reference to its history, development, administration, evolving aims and functions, and its response to the disorientation occasioned by the fire.

Chapter Two provides the methodological context both for the set task and for discussion in Chapter Three. The unique nature of archival control is discussed, and the working of an integrated finding aid system, the instrument designed to achieve this, is explored and illustrated with reference to actual examples. Such control is based on meaningful arrangement and description of an archive, and this is examined within the framework of a British attempt at a standard, A manual of archival description [2nd edition].

Chapter Three sets the collection calendared within its own specific context, i.e. as a sub-group of a landed estate collection. The idiosyncratic archival nature of estate and family records/archives is explored, and problems raised in the archival treatment both of personal papers generally, and of the collection calendared in particular, are examined. Challenges and difficulties that arose during the calendaring process are discussed in some detail with reference to examples taken from the calendar. Finally, local and national dissemination possibilities are briefly surveyed.

Chapter Four follows recommended archival procedure and examples studied in providing background information on Lord Suffield, the collection's originator; this enhances the effectiveness of the calendar. Significant activities in which he became involved or chose to involve himself are indicated; many have direct bearing on documents generated. His succession to the title is set within a brief overview both of his ancestors and more immediate forebears, and also of Gunton Hall and Estate. Other than the biography written soon his death, this account has been based mainly on secondary sources. Much potentially valuable material was burnt or rendered inaccessible due to the destruction of Norwich Central Library. His life yet awaits a modern analysis.
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**NOTES ON ABBREVIATIONS AND REFERENCING**

**LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

The following abbreviations are used in this dissertation. On the first occasion of use in each chapter the full name is given, followed by the abbreviation in square brackets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>British Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL</td>
<td>British Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMCRO</td>
<td>Greater Manchester County Record Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANET</td>
<td>Joint Academic NETwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAD2</td>
<td>A Manual of Archival Description (2nd ed.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYCRO</td>
<td>North Yorkshire County Record Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRA</td>
<td>National Register of Archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRO</td>
<td>Norfolk Record Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPETLS</td>
<td>The Personal Papers of Edward, third Lord Suffield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRONI</td>
<td>Public Records Office of Northern Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCHM</td>
<td>Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGC</td>
<td>The Suffield of Gunton Collection [NRO refer to this as GTN]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UEA</td>
<td>University of East Anglia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTE ON BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

All references to cited titles and periodical articles listed at the end of each chapter are put within square brackets as numbers only: e.g. [23].

NOTE ON CROSS-REFERENCING

All references to chapter sections are prefixed by 'Chapter': e.g. Chapter 1.1. Similarly, all references to numbered Notes at the end of chapters are prefixed by 'Note', and all references to numbered Appendices are prefixed by 'Appendix'. If more than one type is cited, they are separated by a colon.

NOTE ON REFERENCES TO PPETLS CALENDAR ENTRIES

All references to PPETLS Calendar entries take the following form:-

   PPETLS /29/ Smith to Suffield:25.11.1830

Any bundle cited to exemplify points discussed (see Chapter 3) is similarly referred to in the form PPETLS /29/, other than in one section (Chapter 3.3.4). Since the fire prevented completion of calendaring, PPETLS entries lack identifying reference numbers. Eventually a PPETLS document will be identified in the form asset out in Chapter 3.3.5.
INTRODUCTION AND AIMS

Both external and personal factors have dictated the progress and form of this dissertation. The hoped-for opportunity in the learning process, to relate theoretical knowledge within a practical framework, (the compilation of a calendar for the collection – *The personal papers of Edward, third Lord Suffield [PPETLS]*) , i.e. hands-on experience combined with discussions with professional archivists, did not ever really materialise under normal working conditions. This was due first to earlier interruptions, and second to the destruction of Norwich Central Library by fire on 1 August 1994, causing the immediate suspension of facilities provided by Norfolk Record Office [NRO], situated in the basement of the same building [see Chapter 1.1.1]. Calendaring took longer than normal during the initial three months, and given the amount of material to process, the first stage – reading, analysing and abstracting on slips for each document – was not completed until mid-July 1994. In the event, one bundle was not calendared. Temporary loss of Norfolk Record Office, and complete loss of Norfolk Library and Information Service facilities, especially the Norfolk Studies Library, meant both immediate abandonment of any time-scale, and uncertainty as to any timely fulfilment of the primary aim of this dissertation – production of the calendar. Understandably in early August, no guarantees as to likely access to the collection in the near future could be given by my NRO supervisor, the Senior Archivist, Paul Rutledge. I was cut off from personal contact with him and all staff, who were busy coping with the emergency and manning the Microform Search Room [see Chapter 1.1.1].

I decided to concentrate on the following tasks: textbook study of archival methodology with particular reference to the treatment of landed estate papers, combined with visits to other accessible county record offices and the National Register of Archives; additional study of late 18th and early 19th history, and checking of potential sources for biographical information on Lord Suffield, and background to the Gunton and Middleton Estates. I had also decided, that in the event of the collection not being released, a viable alternative for a dissertation would be a study of the estate papers belong to *The Suffield of Gunton collection*, housed separately and therefore unaffected by the fire, and/or of those Suffield papers held in the Greater Manchester County Record Office [GMCRO /E7/Assheton Family of Middleton/Estate correspondence to and from the Lords Suffield]. Such study (as outlined above) has been incorporated into Chapters Two, Three and Four, partially written during August and September 1994, and into Appendices One, Three and Four.
Meanwhile, I was notified in late September 1994 that the boxes containing the collection had been recovered undamaged. However, family illness meant that I did not re-start work in earnest on the calendar until early January 1995. Physical working conditions in the temporary searchroom were better than in the old, and personal contacts with archivists easier. Study in the interim period did enable me to return to calendaring with both a better archival perspective and greater background knowledge, factors which helped me to re-familiarise myself with the papers. Word-processing the calendar was completed by March 1995. The original dissertation aims remain unchanged. However, Chapters Two, Three and Four do embody the result of wider reading than would have been possible in the original time-allowance.

**Aims – the aims of this dissertation are three-fold:**

1) to calendar the collection entitled *The personal papers of Edward, third Lord Suffield*, and provide ancillary information to aid exploitation.

2) to gain an overview of archival terminology, concepts and principles, and relate relevant aspects of such methodology to the above collection and its treatment.

3) to understand the working and relevance of finding-aid systems and appreciate the calendar’s rôle.

4) to study the significance of collections of landed estate papers.

Such a multi-faceted dissertation does not lend itself readily to a conclusion. Chapter One is intended to set the task, carried out at the request of a county record office, within context; Chapters Two and Three represent an attempt to answer a self-set question – "what am I doing and why?"; Chapter Four is intended to anchor the collection’s generator to his period; Chapter Five – the *PPETLS Calendar*, incorporates the primary aim, fulfilled as far as possible under the circumstances. The sum total of the experience – calendaring combined with study and research during a somewhat uncertain period – can be summarised appropriately by a quotation from Robert Louis Stevenson’s poem, *El Dorado*:

> To travel hopefully is a better thing than to arrive  
> And the true success is to labour.

Finally, it must be stated what a privilege it has been, first to have been entrusted by the County Archivist, Miss Jean Kennedy, with the task of calendaring this important county collection, second to have been given the opportunity to enter into the lives and aspirations, both of a much-respected
peer (who more than lived up to the hopes expressed for him in the poem reproduced [frontispiece to Chapter 4]), and also (albeit to a lesser extent) into those of some of his contemporaries, and third, to have been allowed to handle original documents, many very valuable.
CHAPTER ONE - CONTEXT OF WORK - NORFOLK RECORD OFFICE

1.1 Norfolk Record Office - History

Norwich Central Public Library (referred to as 'Norwich Library') was founded seven years after the passing of the 1850 Public Libraries Act. In England, these early libraries collected material of local interest as a matter of policy, and, together with the county archaeological and natural history societies formed from the 1830s onwards, were the only bodies actively involved in preserving historical documents. Norwich Library was no exception and archives were acquired and kept in the basement. In 1925, the Master of the Rolls approved it and 17 other libraries as manorial repositories \[1,2\]. In 1936, he similarly delegated custody of tithe records \[3\]. In 1933, an archivist was appointed but this post was suspended during the 1939-45 war. Norfolk as a county was fortunate in that the Norfolk Record Society, founded in 1930, functioned not only as a publishing society but was also unusually pro-active in preserving records/archives, acting as agent in the acquisition of material that would otherwise have been lost (especially in the break-up of landed estates), and doing valuable salvage work. It deposited these records in Norwich Library \[4,5\]. In 1945, the archivist returned, and gradually more staff were appointed. From 1961 to 1969, the County Borough of Gt. Yarmouth employed its own archivist, Paul Rutledge, the present Norfolk Record Office Senior Archivist. The Norfolk and Norwich Record Office took over Norwich Library's archival duties in 1963, when the present County Archivist, Miss Jean Kennedy, was appointed \[6\].

By tradition, local authority officers had for long been expected to exercise proper care of records, and the Municipal Corporations Act 1882, stipulated this for towns, and the Local Government Act 1933, for counties, specifying the clerk to the authority as responsible. Most record offices originated from these ill-defined and non-statutory powers \[7\]. Bedfordshire was the first county to set up a record office in 1913, and twelve others had followed this lead by 1939. Norfolk and Norwich Record Office was one of many post-1945 county record offices created in England and Wales, a partial remedy to problems caused before, during and after the 1914-18 war, and exacerbated by the 1939-45 war. This initiative was due to the energy of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts and the National Register of Archives, in conjunction with county committees founded by the British Records Association-Records Preservation Section \[8,9 & see also Appendix 1\]. Custody of Norfolk County Hall records was transferred in 1963 to Norfolk and Norwich Record Office, and in 1974 records kept by all other District and Urban Councils (except (due to location)
those of Lynn and West Norfolk) were also transferred. In 1974, Norfolk and Norwich Record Office was renamed Norfolk Record Office [NRO]. Under agreement since 1974, one county archivist has assumed responsibility for Lynn Borough Records and visits Lynn one day per week. Paul Rutledge also continues to spend one half-day per fortnight at Gt. Yarmouth. Occasional visits are made as required to oversee archives kept at Thetford [10]. NRO belongs to an unofficial national network of local authority repositories, and their holdings complement those of national record offices, Register Offices, national libraries, libraries, universities, museums [11], private organisations and charitably-supported bodies [12]. Norfolk and other counties are fortunate in that the county record office has so conclusively proved its worth as the most effective local government unit for the "collection and administration of local records" [13]. However, the non-mandatory basis of record office provision, based (in England and Wales) on the Local Government (Records) Act 1962, Local Government Act 1972, and London Government Act 1963, is considered very unsatisfactory by comparison with the Public Libraries and Museums Act 1964, and, together with the lack of a national archives policy and under-funding, has led to uneven regional provision [14,15,16,17,18 & Note 1].

NRO is now administered jointly by Norfolk County Council and seven District Councils, and does not operate within Norfolk Library and Information Service's administrative structure [Note 2]. Present staffing levels are as follows: full-time equivalent: - 8 professional archivists, 2 conservators, 7 record clerks: part-time: - 1 typist. The Records Committee of Norfolk County Council currently consists of representatives from the following: 1) with voting powers - County Council, District Councils, Diocese of Norwich, University of East Anglia [UEA], Norfolk Record Society: 2) without voting powers - observers. In November 1994, the Local Government Review Commissioners recommended that the existing two-tier structure (Norfolk County Council and District Councils) remain unchanged, although this has recently (March 1995) been challenged by Norwich City Council.

From 1963 to August 1994, NRO shared purpose-built premises with Norwich Central Library, occupying the basement. In 1991, due to overcrowding in the manuscript searchroom, a microform searchroom was set up in Old Shirehall to allow for 18 users to be accommodated in the former. Additional strongrooms (with environmental controls) are also located in Old Shirehall (built 1914) and the adjacent former Norfolk Gaol cells (adapted 1991). Genealogical research, based on person and place, accounts for most use (70%). Academic use, both of
NRO and the former Norfolk Studies Library, has been stimulated by the proximity of UEA, the Centre of East Anglian Studies (UEA) and Cambridge University [Appendix 1]. Under Records Committee policy charging policy is as follows: no charge:— use of archives and records: answers to requests on holdings: charge: searches [19].

1.1.1 The destruction of Norwich Central Library and its aftermath

On 1 August 1994, much of Norwich Central Library was destroyed by fire. Fire Brigade hosing saved the NRO archives because the down-pouring of water through central heating ducts cooled the strong-room. The c.2-3 million items had to be immediately removed, and soaked items (c.10% of total) were freeze-dried and then thawed at the Atomic Energy Authority Research Station, Harwell, Oxfordshire. Results to date are encouraging. The records were put into empty warehouses in central Norwich, generously and quickly made available by a local businessman, and adapted to increase security and provide environmental control. A conservation survey on documents (checking for water-damage), was immediately done to identify and prioritise those requiring treatment. Searchroom and office contents were removed relatively undamaged, and transferred to temporary premises in Old Shirehall, but the conservators' equipment was left badly damaged. A temporary search-room (with the rescued finding aids and reference works) with space for 4 users, was opened after the fire in August. The enforced rapid removal of archives meant instant loss of shelf order, and hence an urgent need to re-establish administrative control [see also Chapter 2.1]. Staff were then trained by Norfolk County Council in the use of a commercial software data-base package (Microsoft Access-Version 2.0), adapted by Norfolk County Council for input of archival location data - to enable information retrieval and/or printouts of updated shelf lists. The physical tasks of sorting through archives and computer listing of all removed items are almost finished. Since computer listing began, archives have progressively been made available, with priority given to users requiring them for legal searches, university project deadlines, and ownership.

In late 1995, NRO will move to temporary premises, again sharing with the Norfolk Library and Information Service Reference and Norfolk Studies Library. Decisions on a future (year 2000?) permanent building will be made after "a wide ranging public consultation exercise" [20] & [21].
1.2 Norfolk Record Office – holdings

In England and Wales county record offices can hold the following categories of records: Local authority and official – including County Council records and those of its defunct precessors (Quarter Sessions and Clerk of the Peace), District and Parish Councils, Poor Law Unions, enclosure awards, highway, education and hospital records, vehicle licensing, other local public records [Public Records Act 1958] – e.g. magistrates’ courts: Ecclesiastical – including Church of England diocesan records (all English county record offices) and parish records, probate records (until 1858), records of non-conformist churches [Parochial Register and Records Measure 1978]; Private – including manorial records, archives of estates and families, charities, solicitors, societies, businesses, industries, political parties, trade unions, artificial collections of antiquaries: Maps – manuscript and/or Ordnance Survey [22,23,24].

During the mediaeval and pre-industrial periods Norwich was England’s second largest city, a growing trade centre, enjoying remarkable prosperity with Norfolk, the most densely populated English county, with an economy based on wool (and weaving) and corn production. In 1158 Norwich was granted its first Charter, and, in 1194 Richard I granted another Charter allowing its citizens to elect their own reeves, i.e. self-government. Relatively little damage was inflicted on the county during civil upheavals. Norfolk was a go-ahead, innovative county, well organised in its provision of hospitals, local philanthropy and poor relief, and contemporary records have survived in quantity. Ecclesiastical records are considerable since Norfolk and Norwich each had more mediaeval parishes than other comparable administrative areas. Besides Norwich diocesan records, NRO has partial custody of those from the Diocese of Ely. The Dean and Chapter Records, dating from the foundation of Norwich Cathedral in 1090, are considered exceptional, as are the Norwich City and Yarmouth Borough collections. Also, due to the large number of former sizeable landed estates in Norfolk, NRO has a good collection of estate and family papers. The Holkham (Coke/Leicester), Houghton (Walpole/Cholmondeley) and Raynham (Townshend) Estate Archives remain under private custody, with access limited to accredited researchers [25].

CHAPTER ONE – NOTES

Note 1: Northern Ireland (NI): archives administration in Northern Ireland has been dictated by history – the creation of an independent Irish Free State and the setting-up of a devolved Government of Northern Ireland. Initially, under the Public Records Act (Northern Ireland) 1923, the Public Records Office of
Northern Ireland [PRONI] acted as a central repository for both public records (government departments, local authorities and inferior courts - present and future), but also for material of historical importance. Later, under the Public Records Act 1958, higher courts and central government departments were enabled to transfer material. Also, due to the destruction of the Public Records Office of Ireland in Dublin in 1922, PRONI decided to concentrate on collecting private records, such as those derived from landed estates, solicitors' offices and churches. In 1972, a purpose-built office was opened [26].

Scotland: no equivalents to county record offices existed before the 1974 local government re-organisation and the Scottish Record Office, operating under the Public Registers and Records (Scotland) Act 1948 and a 1962 administrative agreement, accepted on deposit local authority and non-public records. Under the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1947, larger Scottish cities set up their own archives services. The present Scottish archival network came into being under the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973, and regional councils were empowered to operate archives services, alongside district, city and burgh [27,28,29]. Scottish local government is currently undergoing re-organisation again.

Note 2: A new development in the late 1980s and 1990s has been the amalgamation of services offered by libraries, record offices/archives, countryside/tourism sections and museums under one umbrella department with consequent administrative re-structuring [30] - e.g. Lincolnshire Archives → Department of Recreational Services–Lincolnshire County Council [31]: Oxfordshire Museums and Archives → Department of Leisure and Arts–Oxfordshire County Council [32]. Departmental identities are therefore subsumed within the corporate body, a management answer to recognition of common (and sometimes overlapping and competing aims), financial constraints, and identification of consumer needs. This probably represents a reasonably acceptable compromise, preferable to the subordination of the archives services to a libraries committee, as is the case with North Yorkshire County Record Office [NYCRO][33].
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2.1 Archival control - definition and purpose

The aim of archival processing is to bring acquisitions under control and into use. Archival control implies: 1) administrative/and or physical control and 2) intellectual control. Finding aids achieve and underpin archival control, and a set of integrated finding aids is termed by Cook a finding aid system [1,2]. To quote MAD2:

"The original materials can themselves only be arranged physically in one particular order, and this should normally be the order which demonstrates ... the system which brought them into being ... users [wanting to access their informational content] need to have some way of assessing how [this] might relate to their subject enquiries. The finding aids [used to this end] allow the archives to be scanned in different and various alternative orders ... [necessary] when the originals are boxed and shelved in closed storage [3]."

Archival description sets offering alternative approaches to any one archival entity can also be termed 'representations' or 'representation files', and each serves to a varying degree as a stand-in (or surrogate) for the original [4,5 & see also Chapters 2.5.1, 2.5.2 & 5.6 (Calendar)]. Index (Latin) translated means "he who, or that which, points the way", an apt summary also of a finding aid, which serves to transform "the unusable into the usable and comprehensible" [6]. A good finding aid system must be 'all things to all men', and meet needs of both staff and users.

Administrative/physical control of archives comprises the following initial activities: reception, sorting, physical examination, preservative measures (if necessary), accessioning and custody [7]. More permanent control then needs establishing. A shelf-list, enabling staff to readily retrieve and store again correctly any archival entity, is compiled: it incorporates minimal yet vital administrative information to this end: reference code/unique identifier for each entity matched with labelled reference codes on its container (e.g. acid-free cardboard box - located in a fixed and identified shelf position): title: bulk: length of occupied shelving: physical format [8,9,10]. Intellectual control enables both staff and users to exploit the informational content of archives. This is achieved through provision of appropriate finding aids - inventories/lists, calendars and indexes, whose combined function is to enable users, whatever their needs, educational level and ability, to: 1) identify and request sought material: 2) seek inferentially and discover potentially promising material. Beyond the repository's confines, such control can also ensure wider dissemination of archival data content [11,12].
Norfolk Record Office’s administrative/physical control was therefore immediately lost after the August 1994 fire, and intellectual control rendered inoperable [see Chapter 1.1.2].

2.2 Production of a finding aid system – arrangement and description

Cook defines archival arrangement thus: "the physical operations of sorting the material: the intellectual operations of analysis: the management operations of determining levels" [13]. Sorting per se is usefully summed up by Schellenburg as "largely a process of grouping individual documents into meaningful units and of grouping such units in a meaningful relation to one another" [14]. Archivists continually affirm the uniqueness of archives: sic "each archive speaks for itself" [15]: "every archival collection has ... its own personality, its individuality, which the archivist must become acquainted with before he can proceed to its arrangement" [16]. Arrangement must therefore always take each archival entity on its own merits.

The distinctive hallmark of an archival entity is the shared derivation by its separate components of the same organic source (or generator) [17], in contrast to a heterogeneous or artificially assembled collection. Such units are consequently linked by common origin, kinship and continuity, and constitute in toto a thoroughly integrated, structurally inter-connected and functionally linked entity, or 'group' [18,19 & see Chapter 2.5.2 (Example 2)]. The group's significance always relates only to the context of creation, its "originating agency" [20], and its maintenance and management as a unit (so respecting context), in archival arrangement and description, is called the principle of provenance [21,22]. To quote Berner, "it is because human activity occurs in a socio-historical context that the configuration itself will be most faithfully reflected by keeping the papers together according to the source that created them in the first place" [23]. Provenance is paralleled in an archaeological context by meticulous recording in situ of three-dimensional distributions of groups of artefacts. A group's "sanctity ... as evidence", and its impartiality and authenticity are consequently ensured [24]. Breaking of links by dispersal of documents destroys their "status ... as records" [25]. A dependent concept, 'evidential value' is the informational content found in records, which themselves functioned as instruments in the administrative or business process, which throws light on the actual department – its origins, development and activities [26,27].
2.3 Levels of arrangement and description based on *A Manual of Archival Description* [2nd edition]

From 1985 to 1990, Michael Cook and his team attempted to develop a standard of archival description attuned to British archives, and to systematise the descriptive process, basing it on accepted levels. Two editions of *A Manual of archival description* [MAD] have been published. *MAD* is meant to serve as a flexible model or framework for any archival entity. An entity’s natural division into basic hierarchical levels has for long been recognised by archival theorists (British, American *et al*), and used as the basis of arrangement [28,29]. Such application of levels, each associated with specific units of description, has generally proved workable in the linked tasks of archival arrangement and description. Cook and his team’s contribution is seen as an attempt to collate, clarify, and formulate received archival wisdom: to provide conceptual ground rules for standardisation of archival data-elements: to facilitate automated data exchange: to enhance searching potential/capabilities of archives (manual and automated) [30].

Cook writes, "experiments have shown that there are six [hierarchically related] levels which can be fixed by empirically observed criteria ... the world of external phenomena" [31]. Each archival entity is analysed and appropriate levels identified: not all levels necessarily apply in each case. *MAD* numbers the main levels using integers 1-5, and any number of subsidiary levels can be interpolated, using decimal fractions of the relevant integer. Level numbers are only an aid to structuring arrangement and description.

**Levels based on repository management convenience/needs – levels 0 & 1**

[**Level 0: Repository**: identified by '0', this level is not used in arrangements of documents within any given repository, but only in multi-repository lists/data exchange schemes requiring repository identification]

[**Level 1: Management group** (record group : archive group): this level relates to conceptual/management groupings of related/cognate archival materials, and forms the informational basis of a repository guide aimed at all potential users: it orientates the user, and directs him/her to other finding aids, which in turn facilitate location of the records/archives. *Archives:catalogues:indexes at Ipswich* (extracts only), produced by Suffolk Record Office (Ipswich Branch), illustrates these points:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official records</th>
<th>ADA</th>
<th>Poor Law Unions</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Quarter Sessions</th>
<th>BB</th>
<th>Petty Sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Levels based on archive-creating organisations and physical characteristics (objective criteria) of archives - levels 2, 3, 4 & 5:

**Level 2**: **Group**: the largest quantity of accumulated archival material/records - an archival entity that readily lends itself to administration and description as a unit because it originates from the operations of an identifiable organisation, activity or individual person.

**Level 2**: **Sub-groups**: archives relating to activities and/or functional and administrative sub-divisions of the generator.

**Level 3**: **Class**: cohesive sets of documents demonstrating a physical, administrative or informational unity, and based on the same original compiling/filing process

**Level 4**: **Item** (file unit): physical units of archival management, used in handling, storage and retrieval

**Level 5**: **Piece** (document): the smallest indivisible unit of archival material [32,33].

### 2.3.1 Application of levels to arrangement and description

*MAD2* assigns to each level appropriate structured description fields. Each entity is given both a suitable combination of levels plus the addition of pertinent data elements selected from the above fields. The primary aim of this method of arrangement and description is to base the presentation of available information in an archival entity on a rational and consistent analysis of its content, and so demonstrate relationships between its parts [34,35]. The user enters a finding aid system at a suitable access point, and proceeds via a structured series of finding aids, each incorporating progressive levels of descriptive detail [see Chapter 2.5.1]. Thus, an inventory is designed to provide a comprehensive and holistic overview of the physical arrangement given by an archivist to an entity, and so bring out its essence and individuality [36 & see Chapter 2.5.1 & 2.5.2].

It is composed of vertical combinations of description sets from levels 1 to 4, and an index [37]. Higher level (1,2 & 3) summary descriptions provide sufficient context to enable the user to make sense of more specific descriptions at level 4: this is shown in Example 2 [Chapter 2.5.2] in which summary listing at level 4 [Chapter 2.5.2: photocopied pages: 34-35] gains relevance solely from
its relationship to the archival group as a whole, and the latter's appropriate level of description. [Chapter 2.5.2: photocopied pages: 15–21]. This is why \textit{MAD2} specifies a minimum of two levels, the higher governing and modifying the lower \cite{38}. In summary, an inventory based on class descriptions is the cornerstone of an interlinked and interlocking finding aid system \cite{39,40,41,42,43}. A calendar is composed of description sets at 'item' and 'piece' levels (4 & 5). Chronological order determines arrangement of entries – a sequence of abstracts based on original documents. Calendars vary much according to depth of abstracting and exercise of selectivity \cite{44,45 & see also Chapter 4.3.6}. An index (person/place/subject), whether an ancillary section of a single finding aid, or an integrated repository index, is an essential retrieval aid \cite{46}. Certain archives must be indexed – long series of minutes/proceedings of corporate bodies, correspondence, and self-indexing documents such as wills \cite{47}.

2.4 Conclusion

Finding aids provided in any one repository depend on the following variables: type of archives, management policy, user-needs, funding, staffing, staff skill and motivation, in-house traditions and methods, computerisation (if any). Ideally, present and anticipated user demand should dictate provision. To quote Taylor, "the archivist can only provide leads; the researcher must take over from there and do his own research, but an appropriate level of finding aid is naturally expected even if it is not always ready!" \cite{48}.

2.5 EXAMPLES

2.5.1 - \textbf{EXAMPLE 1 - Searching steps using an integrated finding aid system to trace a microfilmed document}: From: \textit{Guide no.1: List of calendars, transcripts and microfilms in the North Yorkshire County Record Office: The Orde-Powlett papers}:-

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{STEP 1} - Index - access points to ZBO - main entry
  \begin{itemize}
    \item Bolton Castle \hfill ZBO
    \item Orde-Powlett family \hfill ZBO \rightarrow main entry
    \item Bolton of Bolton Castle, Barons \hfill ZBO
  \end{itemize}

\end{itemize}

Step 2 - Inventory (\textit{MAD2 Level 2})

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{ZBO - ORDE-POWLETT FAMILY / GROUP}

\end{itemize}

e.g. Thomas Orde-Powlett, 1st Baron Bolton : papers c.1752–1809 / \textit{SUB-GROUP}
Ref. ZBO 1X 1 MIC 1162–1166 [microfilm frames-reference codes]
Step 3 – Inventory (MAD2 Levels 2.5 and 3)

---

ZBO 1X 1
Papers of Thomas Orde-Powlett, 1st Baron Bolton / SUB-GROUP
[Arrangement and description] – brief custodial history of sub-group
- arranged under subject categories in chronological sequence
[Examples of subject categories] / CLASSES:
1. Student’s books and papers
11. Ireland: letters and papers: 1784-1787 (ZBO 1X 1/11/1-43)
14. Yorkshire estate papers: 1792-1800 (ZBO 1X 1/14/1-421)

Steps 4 & 5 – Inventory (MAD2 Levels 3 & 5)

---

ZBO 1X 1/11/1
MIC 1164
11. Ireland: 1784-1787 / CLASS
1. Grant by Trinity College, Dublin to Thomas Orde of Doctorate of Law: 28 Feb 1784 / PIECE

---

ZBO 1X 1/14/1
MIC
14. Yorkshire estate papers: 1762-1806 / CLASS
1. Letter from John Anderson, Temple House, to Thomas Orde: 14 Oct 1792 / PIECE
2.5.2 EXAMPLE 2 - Extracts from an inventory showing division of an archive group into hierarchical levels (after MAD2) and their corresponding description-sets: reproduced with permission from: Lincolnshire Archives Office. Lists and indexes: 1: Poor Law union records: a list of records covering Poor Law administration for 1834-c.1930

Colour-coded key to levels

blue = level 1.5  
green = level 2.0  
brown = level 3  
red = level 4  
orange = level 5

Key to data elements

Headnote = HN  
Identity statement = Id.S

Data elements - Levels 1.5 – 4

Level 1.5 - management group descriptions - Poor Law Union Records (photocopied pages 15 & 19-21)
Headnote includes in paragraph and list modes:-
1) [code AC] administrative, legal and custodial history of the record-creating entity and its predecessors - ie. background, provenance, context, content and character of the group [MAD2: 14.3A&B]
2) [code AN] archivist's note - summary description of the structural inter-relationships, relational complexity of the group, and reasons for hierarchical division [MAD2: 14.3C]

Level 2 - Group - Caistor Poor Law Union (photocopied page 15): sub-divisions (classes) in paragraph and list modes

Level 3 - Classes - Clerk to Guardians et al. (photocopied pages 16-18): classes and sub-divisions (items) in list mode

Level 4 - Items - Minutes of the Board et al. (photocopied pages 34-35): expanded listing under classes - including: headnotes, identity statements and date-spans
PROVENANCE OF THE RECORDS

Most of the records of the Poor Law Unions have been deposited in the Lincolnshire Archives by the Welfare and Social Services Departments of the County Councils as successors to the Public Assistance Committees. Who, in their turn, had inherited Poor Law Union records in 1930. Rural District Councils have also deposited some Poor Law Union records as successors to the Rural Sanitary Authorities which were responsible to the Guardians of the Unions. Some of the Rural Sanitary Authority records may still, however, be amongst unlisted records of Rural District Council records in LA. Some items have been deposited by hospitals which inherited the records of workhouses or infirmaries when they took over the buildings. A few items have been deposited by individuals who have come into the succession of documents sometimes through inheriting them from an ancestor who was an officer in a Union.

Cross-references are given in the catalogue to items which have strayed from official custody and, therefore, have, when they have been deposited, been listed with the deposits in which they came in Lincolnshire Archives.

ARRANGEMENT OF THE LIST

The list of the records of the fifteen Lincolnshire Poor Law Unions is followed by lists of records of Unions of neighbouring counties which included Lincolnshire parishes.

The classification scheme of the Poor Law Union records held in the Lincolnshire Archives varies from the schemes of the other record offices presented here. The Lincolnshire Archives scheme is based on the Handlist to the Records of the Boards of Guardians in the County of Somerset (1969)

The following guidelines apply only to the scheme of the Lincolnshire Archives.

This list is divided first into the sixteen Poor Law Unions PL1 - PL16. (N.B. PL7 - Grimshy is arranged in accordance with the classification system of the South Humberside Area Archive Office where the records are held.)

The next division indicates the structure of the administration in each Union under which the documents accumulated. Records are, therefore, grouped under the officer whose duty it was to take custody of them and produce them when required. The exception, however, is sub-group 8 which includes all the records relating to the non-Poor Law duties devolving upon the Boards of Guardians. The Officer was not necessarily responsible for the compilation of the records in his care. The groups in this division are, therefore, as follows:-

1. CLERK TO THE GUARDIANS
2. TREASURER
3. WORKHOUSE MASTER
4. OFFICER IN CHARGE OF THE CHILDREN'S HOME
5. RELIEVING OFFICER
6. DISTRICT MEDICAL OFFICER
7. COLLECTOR OF THE GUARDIANS
8. NON-POOR LAW DUTIES DEVOLVING UPON THE BOARDS OF GUARDIANS
The record classes which are sub-divisions of these groups are as follows:

/1 CLERK TO THE GUARDIANS Level 3
  01 The Board and its officers Level 4
  02 Minutes of the Board
  03 Minutes of Committees
  04 Accounts
  05 Lunacy
  06 Statistics
  07 Case papers
  08 Out-relief
  09 Provision of workhouses and children's homes
  10 Supplies
  11 Mortgages
  12 Children
  13 Irremovability, removal, settlement
  14 Maintenance
  15 Recovery of relief
  16 Appointment of overseers
  17 Statements received for preservation
  18 Correspondence
  19 Other papers

/2 TREASURER Level 3
  01 Treasurer's books Level 4
  02 Other papers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Duties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WORKHOUSE MASTER</strong></td>
<td>01 Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02 Inmates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>03 Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04 Accounts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05 Relief to casual poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06 Correspondence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>07 Other papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OFFICER IN CHARGE OF THE CHILDREN'S HOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01 Resident children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02 Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>03 Accounts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04 Inventories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05 Other papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RELIEVING OFFICER</strong></td>
<td>01 Out-relief cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02 Accounts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>03 Diaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04 Orders on tradesmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05 Vagrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06 Forms and reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>07 Other papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISTRICT MEDICAL OFFICER</strong></td>
<td>01 Relief list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02 Other papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLLECTOR OF THE GUARDIANS</strong></td>
<td>01 Ledgers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02 Arrears</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>03 Receipts and payments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04 Other papers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NON-POOR LAW DUTIES DEVOLVING UPON THE BOARDS OF GUARDIANS

01 Registration of births, marriages and deaths
02 Vaccination
03 Assessment
04 Sanitation
05 School attendance
06 Infant life protection
07 Other papers

(N.B. For lists of registration districts relevant to this sub-group, consult White's Directory for Lincolnshire 1856 - available in the Search Room)

HOW TO ORDER DOCUMENTS

When ordering documents the reference number should be written on the requisition slip.

The reference numbers for the Poor Law Union records are made up of five parts as follows:

Management group
Overall group of the records: PL Level 1-5

Unions group
Official class
Record classes item
Individual items piece

Example
PL1/101/1 = Poor Law Union records
Boston Union
Clerk to the Guardians
The Board and its Officers
Orders, regulations, forms of and correspondence with the Central Board (Vol. 2) 1836 - 1837

N.B. N.F.P. by the reference number indicates that the document is too fragile to be produced to readers.

(18)
AC

CLOSURE PERIODS AFFECTING CERTAIN RECORDS


The Poor Law Union records concerned are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Closure period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospital/infirmary records: personal/patients' details</td>
<td>100 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission and discharge registers</td>
<td>100 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunacy papers: personal/patients' details</td>
<td>100 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Officers' records: personal/patients' details</td>
<td>100 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The records in these groups are noted in the list.

ADMINISTRATION OF POOR RELIEF BEFORE THE POOR LAW UNIONS

Prior to 1835 responsibility for the relief of the poor generally fell on the parish. Funds were raised by the poor rate levied on parishioners and the administration was carried out by the Overseers of the Poor who were parish officers established under an Act of 1557. The Justice of the Peace had oversight and issued orders affecting the administration of the Poor Law through the courts of Quarter Sessions and Petty Sessions.

Parish workhouses, or houses of industry, as they were often known, were set up in many places. There were 131 such workhouses in Lincolnshire in the year 1803.

Some parishes grouped themselves in Unions under Gilbert's Act of 1782, or in the case of Lincoln, by a private Act. The Caistor Society of Industry was formed in 1800 for 20 parishes which had increased to 53 by 1836. (Ref: LAO, DIXON 12A/5/6). A house of industry was erected for the Caistor union of parishes. The Claypole House of Industry was erected in 1817 for 20 parishes. In Lincoln, Directors of the Poor were appointed for the City and Liberties under the authority of a private Act in 1796 and a house of industry was established.

1. Parish records

Records kept by the Overseers of the Poor survive for many Lincolnshire parishes. Many of these are now kept in the Lincolnshire Archives Office among the parish or parish council records. For parish workhouses, consult the subjects card index under "workhouses".

2. Quarter Sessions and Petty Sessions records

Orders and other administrative papers can be found among the Quarter Sessions and Petty Sessions records in the Lincolnshire Archives Office. Such orders relate to removal, settlement, bastardy, maintenance and apprenticeship. Some papers have been indexed.

3. Poor Law Union records

The records of the Directors of the Poor of Lincoln were inherited by the Guardians of the Lincoln Poor Law Union. The few records which survive have been included in the list of Lincoln Poor Law Union records below.
Similarly, Newark Poor Law Union records include records of the Claypole house of industry, and are included below.

4. Private Deposits

Some documents relating to the Poor Law system before 1834 have found their way out of official custody. The researcher should, therefore, consult the general subject card index under "Poor Law" for additional references. Records concerning the Caistor house of industry can be located from the places card index under "Caistor" where many references to the Dixon deposit will be found. Note especially ref. " Dixon 17/1/1 - 16 for account books and other papers of the Caistor Society of Industry.

ADMINISTRATION OF POOR RELIEF IN THE PARISH 1834 - 1925

The independence of the parish was, of course, removed by the Poor Law (Amendment) Act 1834, but the Overseers of the Poor continued to carry out the enforcement of orders of the Justice of the Peace, rating and other duties. Thus the parish records may contain records of the Overseers until 1925 when the office was abolished.

ADMINISTRATION OF POOR RELIEF AFTER THE POOR LAW UNIONS

The Local Government Act of 1929 abolished the Poor Law Unions and set up another administrative system.

Records relating to the care of the poor after about 1930 will be found in the records of the County Councils of Holland, Kesteven and Lindsey and the County Borough Councils of Grimsby and Lincoln under the Public Assistance Committees. The following list indicates which Poor Law Unions became part of which County or County Borough Council.

HOLLAND COUNTY COUNCIL: BOSTON UNION
HOLBEACH UNION
SPALDING UNION
PETERBOROUGH UNION (Parish of Crowland, Lincs.)

KESTEVEN COUNTY COUNCIL: BOURNE UNION
GRANTHAM UNION
SLEAFORD UNION
STAMFORD UNION
NEWARK UNION (Lincolnshire parishes)

LINDSEY COUNTY COUNCIL: CAISTOR UNION
GAINSBOROUGH UNION
GLANFORD BRIGG UNION
MORNCastle UNION
LOUTH UNION
SPILSBY UNION
GOOLE UNION (Lincolnshire parishes)
THORNE UNION (Lincolnshire parishes)

LINCOLN COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL: LINCOLN UNION

GRIMSBY COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL: GRIMSBY UNION

The duties of the Guardians in their Non Poor-Law capacities were transferred as follows:

(20)
1. Registration of births, deaths and marriages to the county and county borough councils under the Local Government Act of 1929.

2. Vaccination to the county and county borough councils as public health services under the Local Government Act of 1929.

3. Assessment to the county and county borough councils under the Rating and Valuation Act of 1925.

4. Sanitation to the rural district councils under the Local Government Act of 1894.

5. School attendance: function ceased to be necessary after the Elementary Education Act of 1902 when the need for payment of school fees by the Guardians lapsed.

6. Infant Life Protection to the County and County Borough Councils under the Local Government Act of 1929.

READING LIST OF SECONDARY MATERIAL IN THE LINCOLNSHIRE ARCHIVES OFFICE

1. Archbold, John Frederick, The Poor Law. (1846, 1885 Eds.)


3. Brooke Little, James, The Poor Law Statutes. (3 vols, 1901)

4. Cooke Hurle, Norah L., A handlist of the records of the Boards of Guardians in the County of Somerset (1949)

5. Digby, Anne, The Poor Law in nineteenth-century England and Wales (Historical Association 1982)

6. Glen, William Cunningham, The Statutes in force relating to the Poor Laws ... (2 Vols. 1873)

7. North Lincolnshire Health Authority, Caistor Hospital - From House of Industry to Caistor Hospital : 1802 - 1973

8. Webb, S and B, English Local Government: English Poor Law History, (Vols 7,8,9); English Poor Law Policy (Vol 10)


10. Robert M Gutchen, Masters of Workhouses under the new Poor Law in Local Historian Vol. 16, No. 2, May 1984

In 1800 the Caistor Society of Industry was formed in accordance with Gilbert's Act 1782. 20 parishes belonged to the Union, later increasing to over 50. See Introductory Notes for location of the records of the Caistor Society of Industry.

Caistor Poor Law Union included parishes which became the parishes of the Grimsby Poor Law Union on its formation in 1890 (see PL7)

PL3/101 Id.S

CLERK TO THE GUARDIANS

Level 3

The Board and its Officers

Level 4

1. Register of officers and servants (superannuation) 1897 - 1930

Copies of Acts constituting Boards of Guardians, see DIXON 12/4/5/25,26

PL3/102 Id.S

Minutes of the Board

Level 4

1. 1836 - 1839 (draft)
2. 1839 - 1846 (draft)
3. 1846 - 1851 (draft)
4. 1848 - 1851
5. 1851 - 1853
6. 1853 - 1856
7. 1856 - 1858
8. 1858 - 1861
9. 1861 - 1863
10. 1864 - 1877
11. 1877 - 1879
12. 1879 - 1881
13. 1882 - 1884
14. 1884 - 1887
15. 1887 - 1890
16. 1890 - 1893
17. 1893 - 1896
18. 1896 - 1898
19. 1898 - 1901
20. 1901 - 1903
21. 1903 - 1906
22. 1906 - 1909
23. 1909 - 1912
24. 1912 - 1916
25. 1916 - 1919
26. 1919 - 1922
27. 1922 - 1926
28. 1926 - 1930
PL3/103 Minutes of Committees Level 4

1. Boarding-out 1878 - 1917
2. Boarding-out 1917 - 1930
3. Building and farming 1913 - 1927
4. Finance 1909 - 1929
5. House 1913 - 1930
6. Special 1902 - 1921
7. Vagrant words enclosed: circulars of Ministry of Health, Lindsey County Joint Vagrancy Committee Minutes (Printed) 1899 - 1926

PL3/104 Accounts Level 4

1. Boarding-out receipt and payment 1910 - 1929

Correspondence Correspondence relating to proposed new Union of Market Rasen, 1894, see 4BM 7/4/1

WORKHOUSE MASTER Level 3

PL3/302 Inmates Level 4

1. Bastardy Orders Register 1881 - 1906

PL3/303 Reports

1. House Committee 1916 - 1918
2. House Committee 1919 - 1921
3. House Committee 1922 - 1924
4. House Committee 1924 - 1927
5. House Committee 1927 - 1930

PL3/307 Other Papers Level 4

[See Dixon 17/1/8 Accounts of shares of parishes in property of the old corporation and their contributions to furniture and alterations of the workhouse 1838 - 1860]

MEDICAL OFFICER Level 3

Lists and reports Level 4

[Relief book, (Tealby District) 1898 - 1901, see 4BM7/4]
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3.1 Estate and family records/archives - definition and composition

In a county record office, custody is traditionally based on the dual management group (level 1 + decimal sub-divisions) - estates and family, with primary emphasis/status in arrangement given to archives relating to a family's main pre-occupation and enterprise - estate management, and secondary to those documents generated fortuitously by family members, however famous [1,2 & Note 1]. At level 2 this generic management group is sub-divided into groups, each group comprising holdings of a specific estate and family. Thus, at Norfolk Record Office [NRO], The Suffield of Gunton Collection [SGC] group, to which the sub-group, The Personal Papers of Edward Third Lord Suffield [PPETLS] belongs, is one of many 'estate and family' groups. Archival arrangement of this group type (by further sub-division), varies according to its composition and size. A group may potentially be composed of the following (sub-group - level 2 + decimal sub-divisions):- 1) estate management records "generated, maintained and used by the principle officers of the estate engaged in exploiting the land" [3], which in turn are sub-divide into classes (level 3) - e.g. policy papers of trustees: surveys, valuations and terriers: and records relating to:- letting of property to tenants and leaseholders: accounts: estate correspondence: estate employees': buying and selling of property: building development: major estate improvements - e.g. enclosures, landscaping: roads, railways and canals: boundaries: game and fisheries, shooting and sporting rights: forests, woodlands, coppices, plantations and timber: farming activities: gardens: tithe administration: maps and plans: 2) Manorial administration records: 3) Deeds of title: 4) Wills and settlements: 5) Legal case papers: 6) Household records: 7) Charity records: 8) Ecclesiastical: 9) Family and personal:- a) whole family: businesses, banking interests, histories, heraldic manuscripts et al.: b) individual family members: records relating to:- colonial, diplomatic, national, ecclesiastical, county and other local public, offices and appointments, politics, military, naval and militia activities, trade and business interests, private and leisure activities, causes, philanthropy, other specific spheres of influence dictated by place(s) of residence [4,5,6,7].

3.2 Estate and family records/archives - the group concept and its implications

By the Victorian period, landed estate management had become akin to business management, and despite the impact of the industrial revolution, the 'great' estate as a commercial unit, remained one of the largest enterprises in the
Victorian economy [8,9,10,11,12]. Its evolving management practices were therefore comparable in complexity with those of other organisations, and its archives likewise exhibit a "continuum of [hierarchical] levels" [13]. A Manual of archival description's (2nd ed.) [MAD2's] template of arrangement and description is equally capable of adaptation to this as to any other archival group. Jenkinson's definition of an group, sic "all the archives resulting from the work of an Administration which was an organic whole, complete in itself, capable of dealing independently; without can added or external authority, with every side of any business which could normally be presented to it" [14] is pre-eminently applicable. Cook's definition of a group as "the whole archive of a person, or of a set of persons who had any kind of independent collective character" [15], also specifies characteristics especially relevant to an 'estate and family archive' and its components. He adds that whereas group identification may be difficult in certain cases, this archival type is easily and unmistakably recognisable as such [16].

Until 1914, the country house was unquestionably seen as both the administrative centre of an estate and symbol of a family's wealth and prestige. Clemenson, author of English country houses and landed estates, states that "it should be recognised that an estate is a complex unity having abstract as well as physical dimensions" and defines "abstract dimensions" in terms of "temporal continuity ... [and] legal ownership and control." She quotes another author [Denman] in this context, who "coining the term 'ownership personality', has clearly described the complex relationship between estate, duration, legal and temporal ownership" [17].

However, the relatively straightforward estate/family link (original and unbroken), - e.g. Coke/Leicester family/Holkham Estate, Vane/Barnard family/Raby Estate, is by no means the norm [18 & Note 2], and can show the following deviations:- 1) A family may be long since alienated (fully or partially) from its original estates [Note 3]: 2) A family may be associated with several geographically-separated estates and a London 'town-house' [Note 4], each unit generating its own archives: 3) An estate may have passed through successive ownerships, e.g. - the Culford Estate (West Suffolk) belonged to the Bacon, Cornwallis and Cadogan families [19].

3.2.1 The group - The Suffield of Gunton collection

The hitherto intact Harbord/Suffield/Gunton Estate link [see Appendix 4] ceased
to exemplify continual unbroken 'ownership personality' from Suffield's period up to 1980, because from 1888 the Estate began to be sold-off piece-meal. The Suffield/Gunton Hall link may be considered as extant until 1980, since Gunton Hall acted until its sale as a focal point for 'archival continuity' [see Chapters 4.1-2 & 6.1 & Note 5]. The 1980s restoration has saved Gunton Hall [Appendix 5/IIA, III], and it remains much associated in local memory with the Harbord/Suffield family; family members still live at Gunton Hall, and on the former Estate; many, including Suffield, are buried in the vault of Gunton Church; several local public houses are named after the family. By contrast in Middleton, 'ownership personality' has been relatively minimal, following the rapid selling-off of Middleton Hall (demolished in 1845) and Estate (3,000 acres) by Suffield's eldest son from 1837 to 1848 [20]. Suffield/Middleton links are now reduced to one (well-hidden) memorial in Middleton Parish Church (St. Leonard's), and a revival of the name in 'Suffield Square' (including a plaque), a town-centre redevelopment [21]. The Suffield Arms public house, built in 1793, was demolished in 1990 [22].

The bulk of the estate papers, as yet unlisted, will eventually constitute the appropriately named 'archive group' - *The Suffield of Gunton Collection [SGC]*. Thus far, application of the concept 'archive group' to *SGC*, is straightforward. The Society of Archivists' manual recommends that "the parts [collections of private documents relating to a single family] received separately [i.e. from the estate office, family itself, library of a distant relative, a solicitor or accountant] should remain separate [and] the temptation to amalgamate [be resisted]" [23]. White *et al.* in their 1992 article, *Arrangement of estate records* agree with such differentiation [24], as does NRO practice [Note 6]. On this basis, those Suffield papers acquired later than 1980, and therefore not emanating directly from the former Gunton Estate muniments office, are not considered to share provenance with the main group - *SGC*, and their individual provenance is acknowledged in their designation as groups in their own right. These include the following:– 1) *Papers of the 4th and 5th Barons Suffield of Gunton Park: 1829-1914*, purchased from external sources on 27 January, 1992, and comprising family and estate papers:[NRO ref.:MC350]; 2) *Suffield will trust: 1757–1954*, received on deposit 14 June, 1993 from family solicitors, and comprising conveyances, settlements and other papers belonging to the 4th–8th Barons Suffield and the Hon. Doris Harbord:[NRO ref.:MC501].

Muller, Feith and Fruin are adamant in their contention that "an archival collection [when complete] should not be distributed among two or more archival
depositories" [25]. Nevertheless, it is common record office practice to sub-deposit records/archives relating to secondary or non-core estate/s in the appropriate local record office/s, so giving estate continuity and integrity priority over that of the owning family [Note 7]. Since the Suffield’s Middleton Estate had always been separately administered, NRO transferred custody of this ‘estate management’ sub-group to Greater Manchester County Record Office [GMCRO] [GMCRO ref.:E/7/Assheton Family of Middleton/Estate correspondence to and from the Lords Suffield]. Arguments work both ways. Dispersal causes permanent loss of evidential value – the mutual illumination of documents upon one another. In this case, it inconveniences students researching the Harbord/Suffield family, but assists those researching the Assheton family and/or Middleton. An apparently clean-cut off-loading of Middleton estate management documents therefore proves unattainable, if, at the same time, PPETLS’s own provenance as a sub-group is to be maintained [see Chapters 2.2 & 3.3.2]. Suffield deliberately manifested a benevolent supervision of the Middleton Estate, and coincidentally, Middleton affairs generally, from 1816 until his death, reinforcing it by visits and spasmodic correspondence with varied local persons [see Chapter 4.2: Appendix 6/II, VII, VIII]. The not unexpected Middleton-related documents are markedly noticeable for quality rather than quantity [Note 8]. All PPETLS Middleton material falls roughly into three of White’s ‘estate records’ categories [26]: 1) ‘deeds of title’: correspondence generated by Suffield’s ownership of Middleton Rectory advowson: 2) ‘charity records’: correspondence generated by his initiatives in connection with local educational institutions [Appendix 6/II]: 3) ‘family and personal papers’: most correspondence, notably the Harbord/Ogden sub-bundle [PPETLS /11: Appendix 6/VI, VII], rightly belongs in this category, since it represents those unofficial, more private off-shoots of that more official paternalism exercised in his capacity as landlord: i.e. letters written and received in his combined rôle of landlord and also parliamentary spokesman, confidant, respected adviser to Middleton inhabitants.

3.3 The sub-group – The personal papers of Edward, third Lord Suffield

3.3.1 Personal papers linked with a British landed estate – evaluation

Cook refers to the "kind of symbolic status in British archive practice" conferred on this archive group/sub-group [27]. This may be explained both by its unique quality as an archive group - "proprietorial and emotional ties [that bind private papers] to their owners as symbols of family and corporate entity" [28], and by its overriding value to researchers as primary source material [Note 9], exemplified by such 19th century comments as the following: "the most valuable records,
even for general history, are to be found among the records of private and personal experience" [29]. "if you want to understand the ups and downs of life, there's nothing like the parchments of an estate" [30]: 20th century praise is no less: "[these] archives ... offer the historian invaluable and unusually diverse material. Accumulated without premeditation or design ..., they portray, in most intimate detail, the everyday activities of small social groups - manor, estate or domestic circle" [31]. Cannadine, a modern historian of the aristocracy sums up the reasons why such respect is accorded it:

... until the 1870s, there was an exceptionally high correlation between wealth, status, and power, for the simple reason that they were all territorially determined and defined. Land was wealth: the most secure, reliable, and permanent asset. Land was status: its ownership conferred unique and unrivalled celebrity. And land was power: over the locality, the county, and the nation ... landowners had leisure, confidence, experience, expertise: they had time to govern: they were expected to govern ... they were also the makers of history (my underlining) [32]

3.3.2 'Personal papers' - definition and attributes

PPETLS is designated as one sub-group of the 'Family and Personal' sub-group of the primary unit, the archival group - SGC, because it was formed around the life, actions, and activities of Suffield, the source of its integrity and unity of provenance: over time, he collected, accumulated, maintained, and most likely filed it - or, to use Smiraglia's apposite word, he 'created' the collection. PPETLS documents his life and career. Smiraglia summarises this stamp of individuality:

The creator is the person or body who has caused the materials to be gathered. Thus an archival collection of correspondence might contain only letters received by the person. Obviously the letters are not by the person, but surely the collection of them is. ... Then, too, are the letters about the recipient? ... But can't a scholar learn something about a subject by perusing the correspondence received by that person? So in some sense the collection of letters is in its entirety about the recipient (my underlining) [33].

PPETLS, like other such collections, does also contain items by Suffield, for whose content, he (in bibliographic cataloguing terms) bears sole intellectual responsibility or authorship - original letters [PPETLS I/1: Appendix 6/1], draft replies [most bundles: Appendix 6/II,III], rough speech-notes [PPETLS 47/1], pamphlet [PPETLS 14/1], secretarial notes [PPETLS 22/1]. Bradsher writes: "personal papers ... share certain characteristics with more formal archives and many of the same principles of management apply ... [However] strict archival methods are not always applicable to the arrangement and description of personal papers" [34]. The collection, PPETLS is discussed within a framework of general
points made about 'personal papers', but since it represents a specific category (papers associated with a British landed estate), attention is drawn to any individual attributes.

3.3.3 The personal papers of Edward, third Lord Suffield - condition on receipt

Collections of 'personal papers' reach repositories in varying states of disorder [35,36,37,38,39], and poor physical condition, and often constitute little more "than an agglomeration of loose papers" [40]: Hurley writes, "on the whole personal papers will more often be disorderly than most other kinds of records; that is as much as can be said ... disorder [is not] a problem unique to personal papers" [41]. When retrieved from Gunton Hall Estate Office in 1980, about half of the c.9,000 documents comprising SGC were found to be in a fragile and deteriorating state, having been stored incorrectly, and their condition was immediately treated by natural means - spreading them out to dry in Gunton Church), and not by use of the thymol method in a fumigation chamber. Apart from a very few documents affected by rust (due to water in the storage chest), PPETLS sub-group was found in good condition, due to the excellent quality of the rag-fibre ingredients of contemporary paper, and its coatings: generally, iron gall inks have not cut through documents [42]. Since 1980, SGC has been kept in the environmentally-controlled strongroom at Old Shirehall [see Chapter 1.1]

3.3.4 The personal papers of Edward, third Lord Suffield - the question of 'original order'

Reiterating the views of other archivists [43], Powell writes: "with most collections there is simply no evidence which would assist the [archivist] to restore the original order, and if the collection is to be usable, he must create his own system" (my underlining) [44]. 'Personal papers' often do lack any internal structure, and in some cases, their originator may never have arranged them on a systematic basis [45]. As Hodson emphasises: "the condition of an accumulation of records when they are received into a repository varies enormously according to the attention they have been given in the past" (my underlining) [46]: a county archivist writes: "each succeeding generation and several local historians used Sir William [Chaytor's] papers and each no doubt contributed to their ordering or confusion" [47]. As also described later [Chapter 5.2], the collection - PPETLS, when first sorted by the NRO Senior Archivist, Paul Rutledge, comprised 'original' bundles tied with pink tape, in association with loose documents, the latter very likely either dislocated 'strays' emanating from the former, or else representatives of former 'original' bundles, long since
unconstituted. PPETLS was therefore received in a state of partial disarray. The archivist must "therefore decide whether the existing arrangement is significant, or useful, or useless" [48]; "the principle of original order ... frequently works ... it is not so flawed that it is totally unworkable ... it contains enough truth to muddle by [49]. It is common practice not to disturb the "original bundle" ... the bundles are clearly organic units" [50].

The integrity of PPETLS bundles was maintained, since they provided the first and most apparent clue at MAD2 'item' level (4), to any discernable 'original' or 'organic' order. Such 'original order' later proved, not unexpectedly, to be that imposed by Suffield's biographer, R.M. Bacon [see Chapters 5.2 & 5.4: Appendix 5/II]. Either Suffield himself may have destroyed private material or his widow possibly weeded the collection before releasing it to Bacon, because so very few purely personal/private letters are found in it. Again Bacon, in common with other biographers, may have destroyed material.

Bacon's scheduling denotes beyond doubt his responsibility for bundling the documents as found. His surviving 'schedules' (lists) can be checked against any one bundle's documents, many of which bear his pencilled numbering [Appendix 6/3,4]. Only twelve actual 'schedules' (calendared as 'Bacon's notes') have survived, found inserted into their appropriate bundles: otherwise, sheets of notepaper with 'schedule' number and 'used' added in his hand, are wrapped around the remainder. Bundle 45 is listed as 'Schedules 1 and 2', and it is likely Bacon checked it first, since it contains Suffield's final batch of correspondence, and possibly therefore its documents were last in the filing sequence, and so first to hand. 'Schedules' 4, 5 and 27 are out of sequence. The remaining 'scheduled' bundles (3-18) run reasonably consecutively, but date-spans do overlap considerably [see Chapter 5.6 (Calendar)]. Such arrangement presumably tied in with Bacon's mainly strict chronologically-based biography.

Four sets of bundles are given the same 'schedule' number: three ('Schedule' 7: Bundles 7, 9 and 15; 'Schedule' 9: Bundles 17 and 18; 'Schedule' 10: Bundles 20 and 21), are possibly split due to size: one ('Schedule' 12: Bundles 22 and 29), is possibly split as Bacon wished to keep Suffield's own 'organisation'-based bundle (Norfolk Cricket Club), as a separate entity. One puzzle is that the 'scheduled' sequence ends in 1834, and perhaps those bundles 'scheduled' 19-26 have either been lost, or once included documents comprising those thirteen bundles marked 'original'; only four of these have not been used in the biography. A spot-check has revealed several examples of 'stray' documents in the re-constituted bundles that could be easily correctly restored [Note 10]. It seems safe to assume that
all 'strays' once belonged in the 'scheduled' or 'original' bundles.

Assuming therefore that all bundles, (with the exception of those marked 'not original' and Bundles 1 and 48 [Note 11]), were initially constituted by Bacon, his own imposed 'original order' may therefore be considered adopted in the calendar, at the least to MAD2 'item' level (4). The following queries may now be considered:

1) Can any systematic basis of document arrangement can be ascertained within bundles?
2) If so, could this approximate to Bacon’s 'original order'?
3) Could it incorporate Suffield's 'original order'?

Bradsher writes:

as a transaction progresses, records relating to it grow naturally. Each document in a file is related to, or is in consequence of, some preceding document, or documents, and the former is explained and elaborated by the latter. Taken out of sequence ... archives tell an incomplete or inaccurate story. [51]

It is more than likely that Bacon himself, a newspaper editor of long standing, and therefore accustomed to dealing with an unending flow of documents, would have appreciated the spirit of Bradsher's comments. Selecting some representative 'original bundles', the following points can be made regarding chronologic-al order to month level [Note 12]:

1) Bundles (few) with very wide date-spans:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bundle</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>out of order</td>
<td>in order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>mainly in order</td>
<td>in order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>in order</td>
<td>in order</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Bundles (many) with smaller date-spans:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bundle</th>
<th>Months</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>mainly order</td>
<td>months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>mainly in order</td>
<td>months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>mainly in order</td>
<td>months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>out of order</td>
<td>months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>limited order</td>
<td>year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following conclusions may be drawn:

1) That the 'order' found, Hurley's "orderliness of assemblage" [52] is not too far removed from Bacon's 'original order'.
2) It may in turn relatively closely reflect Suffield's own 'original order', his principle of arrangement - basically, a workable chronological order, intermixed with some generic grouping. As Boles states, "no system of arranging personal papers other than a chronological one comes as close to life as it is experienced" (my underlining) [53].

3) A common 19th century method of arrangement, the separate filing of incoming and outgoing letters, has not been used [54].

Suffield's daily Gunton routine apparently followed a set pattern; he woke early and wrote letters, and after household prayers at 9.30am, he continued working on his papers until lunch at 1pm [55]. His treatment of his correspondence embodies this methodical approach - his "habits of tidiness" [56]. The following hallmarks are indisputably attributable to Suffield (based on recognition of his hand): his meticulous annotating of almost every incoming letter with sender's name and date reply sent (as a heading on the outside folded third) [Appendix 6/II]; his abstracts of some letters' subject content written on the exterior fold; his labelling of sub-bundles; his 'classifying' by subject of one group of documents [see Chapter 5.6 (Calendar): PPETLS /42/]. Suffield himself also probably conscientiously classified into generic groupings of functionally-related material - what Cook terms "units of convenience" [57], for his own convenience during their 'active stage', those documents found folded together ['sub-bundles': see Chapter 5.2]. Bacon kept these groupings, recognising "the significance of propinquity" [58]: they include the following:


2) Enclosures with supporting document/s

In conclusion, ascertainable 'original order', Bacon's later probably superimposed on Suffield's earlier, has been utilised in the calendar as a significant, valuable and useful framework of arrangement. With modifications [see Chapter 5.2], it meets the criterion of Boles's 'usability' - "a describable, direct method of locating documentation" [59]: it is viable, workable, adoptable and adaptable. To quote Boles again:

original order has evidential value [and it] has archival value in that it
broadens considerably the cardinal principle of provenance ... in this framework, archival order flows organically from provenance ...
Provenance requires the archivist to respect, as fully as possible, the integrity of the creator's work. Simple usability shows this respect by seeking to give full and complete access to the deepest thoughts of the creator ... it recognizes the primacy of that thought over the less interesting and occasionally incapacitating [original arrangement] of the medium ... it shows the profoundest respect for the creator" [60]

3.3.5 The Personal papers of Edward third Lord Suffied - arrangement within the group - Suffield of Gunton collection

The hierarchical arrangement envisaged for PPETLS on completion of listing SGC, is set out below with NRO reference codes: corresponding MAD2 levels are added. For PPETLS, MAD2 level 3 (class) is omitted, although similar collections of papers originating from an individual family member frequently are so arranged [61,62 & Note 13]. Respect for the uniqueness of PPETLS precludes, for reasons stated [Chapter 3.3.4], such re-structuring (at MAD2 level 3). Classifying PPETLS thus would have entailed incorporation of Suffield’s probable 'own categories' [see Chapter 3.3.4], plus an inherited one [Note 11], and additionally many new artificial or archivist-based subjective categories, dependent on bundle-dissolution, and hence destructive of ascertifiable 'original order': e.g. Dorset Affairs: Gunton Estate: Middleton Estate: Ecclesiastical Affairs: Parliamentary Candidacies: Norfolk Politics: Family Matters: Pedigrees and Family Histories: Magistracy Affairs: Financial Affairs. Many PPETLS documents with a wide-ranging subject-content would resist classification, as would those ambiguous documents which overlap the administrative and purely personal [see also Chapter 3.2.1]. As Hurley writes, "it is hard to believe that any historian with a regard for the rules of historical evidence could value the dismemberment of original items and re-sorting of the documents into artificial sequences" [63]. By contrast, classification of 'estate management records' is a more straightforward task, since the functions/activities from which they originated are "easily identifiable" [64], relatively self-contained [see Chapter 3.1], and for pragmatic administration purposes, such records are likely to be reasonably retentive of 'original order': example: estate records (Helmsley-Kirbymoorside Estate) → tillage records → tillage/cropping/ploughing books [from: North Yorkshire County Record Office: ZEW – Feversham/Duncombe Family of Duncombe Park, Helmsley].
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAD2 Level</th>
<th>NRO Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 0</td>
<td>Repository Norfolk Record Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Management Group Estates and family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Group Suffield of Gunton collection GTN/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2.5</td>
<td>Sub-group Family and personal* /3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2.75</td>
<td>Sub-sub-group Personal papers of Edward, third Lord Suffield /16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>Item Bundle /1–18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>Piece Document /1–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* [Examples of other planned sub-groups (Level 2.5) are title deeds; settlements and mortgages; manorial administration; estate management; miscellaneous: [cf.: Chapter 3.1]. Each will similarly be given its own identification number]*

As described later [Chapter 5.2], PPETLS has been calendared bundle by bundle, and the bundle will be correspondingly used as the unit of handling in storage and retrieval. A user requesting a specific document (MAD2 'piece'), will therefore submit a request slip for the appropriate bundle, citing both its unique alpha-numeric identifying code ('identifier' based on the archive's hierarchical arrangement), and also location details (box number, shelf-position). To take a hypothetical example, a user's request for Suffield's letter to Col. Sir John Wodehouse dated 10 October 1832 [PPETLS/36/], is set out as follows: GTN/3/16/36/5 + box/shelf number. Due to the fire, only bundles have been given running numbers to date. Each piece has yet to be allocated its individual pencil-written number based on its sequential position in a bundle, and these inclusive number spans will be added by NRO staff to the bundle headnotes in the calendar. It would make the calendar too long if numbers were inserted after each entry. This both facilitates retrieval and aids security. All enclosures are treated as 'pieces'. A leaf-count is also done for each 'piece'. Under NRO practice, the archivist retrieves the relevant bundle/s from the box in the strong-room, and then removes, for reasons of security and limited staff checking-time, only the smallest unit that the user really requires: i.e. whole bundles are not handed over when a user wants only a single document.
3.3.6 The Personal papers of Edward, Lord Suffield - calendaring

3.3.6.1 Calendaring 'personal papers' - introduction

As stated in MAD2, "there is a general presumption that groups or collections of letters call for considerable depth of description ... full calendars are the ideal" [65]. Calendaring entails description at 'piece' level (MAD2 level 5), or in Smiraglia's words, "exhaustive level" [66]. MAD2's definition of a calendar's scope and purpose echoes Jenkinson's prescripts: "a calendar differs from a transcript only in that common form phrases are summarized or omitted. Calendars are intended to serve as surrogates for the originals they refer to ..." [67]. The PPETLS calendar is not intended to match this standard: its main aim is to unlock the informational content of the collection, for on-site and remote users, by providing a brief overview only of each 'piece'.

Calendaring is a very time-consuming and expensive activity, entailing both production of the calendar and its associated index, normally derived from the abstracts. In British record offices [68] and British professional literature, the following criteria are cited, and given the high esteem in which 'personal papers linked with a British landed estate' are held [see: Chapter 3.3.1: Appendix 1], the first point is especially relevant:

1) Research value - research potential or demand is the key factor when deciding on degree of archival control [69]. Thibodeau states: "records should be accorded the descriptive attention they deserve" [70]. Marc Bloch sums up the value of documents generated by "men in time"

there was not one of the men then alive who did not participate almost at one and the same time in multiple manifestations of human activity ... who did not have his gods ... who, if he took no part in political events, did not at least experience their consequences [71]

Significantly, the RCHM reported that for 1991/1992 its searchroom was most used by "postgraduate academic historians studying aspects of eighteenth to twentieth-century political, social and economic history" [72]. Given Suffield's varied, unusual and extensive spheres of influence in addition to his county standing, NRO management considered the collection both locally and nationally, a sufficiently substantial and important source to merit calendaring, despite its previous partial dissemination by Bacon. Archival control of PPETLS based on summary descriptions at MAD2's sub-sub-group level (2.75) and bundle (item-level 4) only, would have rendered it minimal justice: an inventory would suffice at the best as a compromise finding aid, and "depth of complexity of the
materials [would be] lost in the gross generalizations" [73].

2) **Cost-effectiveness** - Schellenburg writes: "[calendars] provide enough information about documents to enable a historian to know if any one of them is pertinent to his enquiry ... they often relieve [historians] of the necessity of consulting the originals" [74]. Users can pursue different modes of access: they can scan a potentially useful calendar, gauging what is present or missing - the overall pertinency: they can check the back-of-calendar index: they benefit in the saving of time, money, energy, and frustration, and the repository benefits in saving of staff time (and staff costs) on retrieval of irrelevant documents, and reduction in document handling [74,75,76,77,78]. Schellenburg claimed that microfilming offered a cheaper alternative [79], and as is proved at North Yorkshire County Record Office, it offers some advantages: it allows relatively quick access to a collection after its receipt; it saves wear and tear on originals: it cuts out the need for document retrieval, so saving user and staff time: it would seemingly work best when used in conjunction with a calendar and index - description of 'personal papers' at calendar level is so much more informative and time-saving than listing at inventory level, and a user could well be disadvantaged by spending inordinate time reading through microfilms without the prior benefit of scanning through a calendar and/or consulting its index.

3) **Security** - control by consecutive numbering at 'piece' level, and leaf-counting within a 'piece' ensures easier identification and checking of documents after use [80,81].

4) **Recording of an archive's content** - a) a calendar fulfils obligations to donors and depositors: b) a calendar allows maximum administrative control at 'piece' level (MAD2 level 5): e.g. for exhibitions: c) when archive groups/sub-groups are split and custody transferred to one or more repositories, calendar-production means that its/their informational content is kept for reference in each relevant repository: d) similarly, when an archive group is dismembered and sold at auction, a calendar serves as a surrogate record, and all is not lost.

#### 3.3.6.2 Calendaring - computerisation

Effective calendar exploitation, and information retrieval from archives via any finding-aid, cannot be discussed without brief reference to the flexible in-built facilities for data-storage, data-manipulation, data-retrieval (including hard-copy) and data-dissemination, inherent in a purpose-designed or adapted database management system [82]. Some information elements within the domain of
management control (conservation and security) have been omitted from the
PPETLS calendar, due to considerations of bulkiness (calendar length) and risk of
information overload: these include a unique identifier after each piece (reference
code), size, physical condition, seals and signatures: inputting these into a
relevant database field would pose no problem. Two accounts [see Bibliography:
under Brawn: Woolgar] describe the advantages of carefully chosen database
management systems for comparable collections, and show how intellectual
control of an archive's information effectively is enabled to enter another
dimension, via the facility of on-line interactive interrogation and searching. One
field in a record structure needs to be allocated for input of free-text
descriptions from each calendar abstract. These must contain suitable keywords
(specific person/place/subject), both for automatic indexing and productive and/or
complex interactive on-line searching: another field can be added to allow for the
insertion of additional index descriptors, e.g. broad general abstract concepts not
covered in the former, (possibly for later sorting into a thesaurus). Searches
can be conducted on any field or combination of fields (via a linking field), and
sets can be created: e.g. from PPETLS – a list in chronological order of the
Suffield/Melbourne scattered correspondence on the 1830 'Swing riots': a list of
all references to military and naval promotion. As described in Woolgar's
article, the different hierarchical levels of the archive group, The Wellington
papers, can be displayed, and descriptions at both bundle and individual 'piece'
level, can be retrieved [83]. Woolgar concludes: "automation ... [allows] a much
more detailed description of the archive to be compiled ... much of the checking
and significant quantities of indexing are eliminated ... the classic dilemma [of
how to sort a collection] is no longer a question of moment" [84 & Note 15].

3.3.6.3 The personal papers of Edward, third Lord Suffield – calendaring:
procedure, challenges and problems

Principles of arrangement are discussed and outlined elsewhere [see: Chapters
3.3.5 & 5.2]. Due to limited table-space in the public search-room, bundles
were opened-out only one at a time to avoid any risk of mixing bundles'
contents. (Any cross-referencing for elucidation, could be done later via slips,
and then individual documents). To minimise handling, record evidence of
'original order' (by photocopying slips in sequence), and utilise any evidential
value, 'original' bundles were calendared straight through the order as found: the
remaining 'non-original' were resorted before calendaring. Numbering of
documents in soft pencil was then to have been done under Paul Rutledge's
supervision, but this has been prevented by disruption since the fire.
Aspects of calendaring PPETLS are discussed under the following sub-headings:

1) Checking of sender's details:
   a) NAMES (and TITLES): lack of familiarity with correspondents meant much
time was spent in identifying them and checking for accuracy and completeness
using the following inter alia:-:

   i) non-peerage: Suffield's endorsements: 'Bacon's notes' [see Chapter 5.6
(Calendar)] and A memoir of the life of Edward, third Baron Suffield:
NRO's 'Selected Persons Index': White's History, gazetteer and directory of
Norfolk, and the city and county of Norwich (1836 & 1845): Norfolk
annals (Norwich Mercury digest): Dawson Turner's List of Norfolk benefices
(1847): DNB: Foster's Alumni Oxoniensis and Venn's Alumni Cantabriensis:
ii) peerage: NRO's 'Selected Person's Index': Burke's peerage and baronetage
(105th ed., 1970): The complete peerage. DNB.

   b) ADDRESSES/PLACE-NAMES: if the address was missing or illegible, the
postmark was checked (if present), and/or other letters - otherwise the
following helped:-

   i) non-peerage: NRO's 'Selected Persons Index': DNB: White's [Directory];
gazetteer: maps [Note 16]; other record offices and reference libraries:
biographies (e.g. for Rowland Hill and Elizabeth Fry).
ii) peerage: Burke's peerage and baronetage. The complete peerage. DNB.

2) Literacy and handwriting:
Suffield's correspondents (overwhelmingly men), belonged to all classes of
society, although mainly to the peerage, gentry, church, the London and
provincial middle class (Jane Austen's milieu-the bulk of the 'reading public'), and
not least, to the wealthy Dissenting establishment, which especially valued
education [85]. The mid-18th century had additionally witnessed a "cultural
explosion" [86], the huge growth of a new literate public, especially among
artisans, due to the extension of elementary education, for example the Sunday
School movement and British and Foreign School Society [87,88 & Note 17]: this
coincided with the marked influence of politically biased pamphlet and periodical
literature. The style of all Suffield's correspondents is easy to read, and almost
modern in some examples. That of upper and middle-class correspondents is
polished and uniform, exhibiting "facility, clearness and elegance" [89]: "the
[landowning] élite were a wholly literate group, committed to the written word as
a form of self-expression and social intercourse" [90]: that of lower middle- and
working-class correspondents, somewhat less so: "language was required to be
primarily useful, a clear, easy, precise means of communication" [91]. Augustan
desire for reform and standardisation of language was epitomised by the publica-
tion of Johnson's Dictionary in 1755: he and others aimed to fix words'
meanings and spelling, and stabilise grammar [92]. By the early 19th century,
"formalism permeated all classes and restrained all individuals" [93], as is evidenced by the collection, PPETLS [see Appendix 6 examples].

Lack of familiarity with correspondents' hands and palaeographic skills, meant much time was initially spent deciphering the more difficult ones, and then constructing alphabet codes of letter-forms - by using as a starting-base, both quoted letters in Bacon's biography, and words identified within context. To illustrate with some examples: 1) SUFFIELD: his hand proved one of the less legible, and its legibility worsened noticeably in the 1830s: examples - degrees = express = $\approx \approx$ [and see also Appendix 6/6,11]:

2) T.W. COKE: one of his frequent correspondents, Coke's hand with its idiosyncratic hieroglyphics, proved undecipherable in parts: example - the = $\approx$:

3) Stephen LUSHINGTON: examples - by $\approx$:

Overall, reading of most hands proved surprisingly painless due to the following reasons: 1) bundle retention and hence proximity of documents with related subject-matter [see Chapter 3.3.4]: 2) relative uniformity of style and spelling, and use of standardised formulae of expression: 3) prior knowledge and expectation gained with practice both of a document's form and content - i.e. the mind leads the eye [94]. Until c.1830, the "common quill" pen (goose/swan) [95], which had to be continually re-cut to obtain a fine point or oblique edge (depending on style), or gilded for durability, was in general use; then flexible steel pens were mass-produced, and the transition from quill quickly effected. PPETLS correspondence falls into two groups of handwriting styles: 1) 'English round hand': the relatively 'free' hand, personal, idiosyncratic and quite modern in appearance, used in the predominant group consisting of private letters [see Appendix 6]: 2) 'Secretary/formal hand': used by clerks (e.g. Home Office), more mechanical, formal and careful, similar to 'copper-plate' [96,97,98]. High postal charges - letters being taxed on distance travelled and number of sheets used - meant that some correspondents wrote again at 90 degrees over sheets already written on, or squashed up their writing [99].

3) Analysing and abstracting:
Each document is an intellectual entity, and the calendarer is responsible for providing a recognisable approximation and/or substitute in the form of a précis of its facts and ideas. Short of providing lengthy quotes, abstracts cannot convey emotion; this is clear if comparison is made between the calendar entries and corresponding letters photopied; see examples: 1) PPETLS /3/ Harbord to Suffield [2nd Ld.]:03.11.1819 and Appendix 6/3 and 2) PPETLS /9/ Suffield [2nd
Ld.] to Harbord: 20.02.1820 and Appendix 6/VI. Abstracting involves understanding of a document's informational content and evaluation of its intrinsic worth.

Effectively, the calendarer eavesdrops on a private unself-conscious communication process (sharing of messages and meanings) between document-writer and document-recipient, and in so doing, inevitably encounters perceptual barriers, compounded because he/she is not the intended recipient of the message: misinterpretation can result. A working subject-knowledge is a sine qua non. For calendaring PPETLS, prior reading of Bacon's biography [see Chapter 5.4] and other sources proved invaluable, due to the eventful period coinciding with his active life, the many issues raised, and his own diverse interests [see Bibliography]. Given the paucity of biographical material on him, such sources were also essential background-reading for the biographical outline [see Chapter 4.2], an intended ancillary user-aid.

Mention has been made of sender-identification and handwriting problems [see Chapter 4.3.6.3 (1&2)]. Another time-consuming activity was getting-to-grips with subject-matter, which not surprisingly presented varying degrees of difficulty, summarised thus: 1) complex general topics included Poor Law relief and reform recommendations, slavery, Norwich and Norfolk parliamentary elections, municipal electoral corruption [Appendix 6/V]: by contrast, an easy activity-based subject was Eton schooldays [PPETLS /1/: Appendix 6/1]: 2) involved personal issues emerged in the Harbord/Ogden [PPETLS /11/: Appendix 6/VI], Suffield/Leigh [PPETLS /38/], Suffield/Hase [PPETLS /20/] exchanges: 3) subject-content of single letters unrelated to any sequence, and referring to obscure topics was hard to identify [PPETLS /35/ Ld. Radstock to Suffield:03.1832; /38/ Lennard to Suffield:23.07.1834; /39/ Stephen to Suffield:28.02.1833.

Any calendarer brings his/her cultural baggage to the task, and this may inhibit, distort and destroy true understanding of contemporary messages. At the most obvious level, changes in word meanings - e.g. 'condescension' (agreement), 'against' (before), 'servitude' (service), 'interposition (intervention), and modern equivalents of obsolete words - e.g. 'evince', 'vicinage' [PPETLS examples], are clear from context. Gaining insight into word and phrase connotations, implicitly understood knowledge, allusions, opinions, assumptions, and attitudes, is much harder for the inexperienced: these belong to contemporary 'myth' - a culture's way of conceptualising, classifying and organising reality [100 & Note 9]: for example, to be attuned to the tone of many PPETLS letters, especially begging
letters showing deference, would be difficult without some awareness of class attitudes.

Evaluation posed the other major problem. Calendaring is subjective, and the calenderer must attempt to avoid excessive bias – "bias through selectivity [is] difficult to eliminate because assessment of importance depends on the archivist's areas of knowledge and ignorance of particular subjects" [101]. Bearing in mind both indexing requirements and simplicity of presentation, factual subjects and abstract ideas were listed in order of first appearance, with any later random references incorporated. Quotes were used if tone or emotion especially needed conveying. Personal/private correspondence raised problems, and value judgments had continually to be made on what to include or omit, especially with regard to the following: 1) topics mentioned incidentally (often as 'throwaway remarks') and more trivial topics: e.g. illness, pregnancy, presents of game, travel, pastimes and weather details: 2) weighty and/or lengthy discussions, and heartfelt outpourings (from 'cranks' in some cases) on personal matters and/or opinions: e.g. religious faith [PPETLS /8/ Gurney to Harbord:11.09.1819; /41/ Heath to Suffield:03.07.1834]; personal antipathy [PPETLS /20/ Hase to Suffield:18.01.1826], political beliefs [PPETLS /11/ Scholes to Harbord: 15.02.1821], personal misfortune [PPETLS /40/ Shergold to Suffield:16.11.1833]; 3) factually lightweight subject-content in a letter from a locally/nationally important correspondent: e.g. Elizabeth Fry [PPETLS /40/ Fry to Suffield: 09.04.1833], T. Fowell Buxton [PPETLS /17/ Buxton to Suffield:06.05.1824]. Also, correspondents range widely and without warning, so the calenderer needs to be alert to the following: 1) to the unexpected: significant information turns up in the least expected documents: a) information on the aftermath of Waterloo in letters from Suffield's (Harbord) landlord [PPETLS /4/ Harris to Harbord:08-11.1815]: b) information on the builder of Gunton saw mill in the vituperative correspondence from Hase, Suffield's former contractor [PPETLS /20/ Hase to Suffield:18.01.1826 and see also Note 16]; 2) to the realisation that document length is not necessarily indicative of informational value; thus, at least one or two pages in most of J.J. Gurney's letters effectively constitute religious tracts [PPETLS /8/ and /41/]; by contrast, the 2nd Earl Grosvenor's relatively short letters on the Shaftesbury candidacy are exceptionally dense factually [PPETLS /3/ Grosvenor to Harbord:02.1820]: 3) to any clues as to obscure, one-off and/or briefly aired subjects: 4) above all, to the need to sort out 'the wood from the trees' and find hidden gems.

3.3.6.4 The Personal papers of Edward, third Lord Suffield – eventual
dissemination of information from the calendar by the National Register of Archives and Norfolk Record Office

1. Local dissemination within the NRO:
   a) Back-of-the-calendar-index (page numbers not bundle references): i) person: all in/out county and foreign persons are listed; ii) place: all in/out county and foreign places are listed; iii) subject: each archive group is unique and this is reflected in the subject index; reasonably full, its basis is 'rule-of-thumb', known (authority list and anticipated user-interests).
   b) NRO card catalogues: i) person: this is selective and based on DNB, persons of known local and national importance, and those who have generated many records already held; ii) place: all in/out county and foreign places are listed; iii) subject: this is selective and cross-referenced. Selectivity is essential to prevent the indexes becoming unwieldy and overloaded.
   c) The National Register of Archives [NRA] will reproduce the desired number of copies of PPETLS calendar, bound or unbound – including one for the search-room and one stored with the collection in the strong-room.

2) National dissemination by the NRO and NRA:
   a) Norfolk Record Office: NRO archivists will assess the relative importance of out-county documents, and may distribute copy/copies, relevant page-extracts and/or the index to appropriate record offices.
   b) National Register of Archives: NRA will decide which, if any, copies to send to national repositories. Shortly these will be able to access NRA indexed information via a new NRA network.
   c) PPETLS will be entered into two NRA computerised indexes – the Personal Index and Subject Index:
      i) **Personal Index**: an entry has already been made for Suffield, both because he is listed in DNB, and also because some of his correspondence has already been listed in another collection: he can be accessed directly under name: *sic* – EDWARD 1781–1835/3rd Baron Suffield/Philanthropist – 1830–1835–Letters (25) to Duke of Richmond: West Sussex Record Office: NRA 850 [NRA report number]: Gordon Lennox (vol.3).
       or alternatively via the descriptive term, 'philanthropist' [ex DNB]: for more efficient retrieval, other terms will need entering: e.g. 'abolitionist', 'reformer' (access terms for Suffield’s friend, Stephen Lushington): this approach is currently therefore rather 'hit and miss'. Other Harbord/Suffield family members who have generated papers are also entered. It is impossible to predict which of Suffield’s more significant correspondents
will eventually be entered into the Personal Index. PPETLS will be evaluated on its own merits.

iii) Subject Index: this is based on the names of record-generating bodies, and can be used via 'estate papers' to access other sub-groups of the Suffield of Gunton collection.

iii) Additional NRA dissemination is outlined in Appendix One.

3) Summary: at collection (sub-group) level, PPETLS will therefore be indexed for national access, its calendar given a reference number and filed in the NRA search-room. A specific subject approach per se to its contents is a practical impossibility via NRA indexes, and any effective exploitation of subject content must depend solely on a user's being directed to the calendar and/or its index. Such direction in turn will depend on that user's prior knowledge of Suffield, his known associates and interests. Yet much may still remain unexploited. For example, how would a researcher into the employment and promotion prospects of demobbed naval lieutenants in the post 1815 period, be led to check PPETLS [102 & PPETLS /25/32/38/39]? Exploitation of PPETLS subject-content is thus bound to be only partial. To quote from Gray's Elegy written in a country churchyard, "Full many a flower is born to blush unseen / And waste its sweetness on the desert air" [xiv] [103].

CHAPTER THREE - NOTES

Note 1: National repositories, led by the British Museum's [BM] Department of Manuscripts (now British Library [BL]) had earlier begun developing independent traditions in archival arrangement, because their acquisitions, "the plums off the historical manuscripts tree", comprised archives containing a significant proportion of material generated by nationally important members of landed families. Estate management material was therefore relegated to secondary status [104]. For a long period, the BM was the only national repository that existed to maintain important collections of historical papers outside the Public Records, and it acquired large amounts of material, that now would be housed more appropriately in other national repositories, e.g. National Libraries of Scotland and Wales. Similarly, university libraries, founded prior to the setting-up of local record offices, took in many important collections of family and estate papers [105].

Note 2: The Holkham Archives at Holkham Hall, Norfolk, contains material (deeds) dating from the 12th century onwards: the archivist and estate-office staff operate an informal records management scheme for semi-current material [106].

Note 3: The Cadogan Estate (which included the Culford Estate until 1934), is now an operating company called 'Cadogan Estate Limited' and forms part of the holding company, 'Cadogan Group Limited': a staff of 35 administers the former estate's London property (90 acres around Sloane Square, Chelsea), property in UK and USA, and manufacturing and retailing businesses employing about one thousand [107]. The involvement of many families with landed property began to decline noticeably in the 1880s, due to agricultural depression, and accelerated during the 20th century, especially after the 1914-1918 and 1939-1945 wars.
Note 4: Some great London 'town-houses', such as Norfolk House, Bridgewater House and Spencer House, have acted as separate archive repositories.

Note 5: The 4th Lord Suffield, took little interest in the Gunton Estate except as a security for a life annuity, to finance an extravagant life-style: Vernon House was sold. His half-brother inherited the Estate heavily mortgaged, and spent 19 years repairing and restoring it. His similarly extravagant life-style depended on estate capital. Agricultural depression meant falling returns. Gunton Hall was partially burnt in 1882, and left largely unrestored. In 1888, he sold the Overstrand Estate at Cromer, and when his son took over management in 1904, further sales were necessary. Gunton never regained its former splendour after 1914. More sales were made in 1919 and 1939, and the acreage was reduced to c.3,000. By 1980, the house was derelict. The architect, Kit Martin and his wife, then carried out the most ambitious and spectacular country house rescue of the 1980s.

Note 6: Emmison states that archives from different sources may be subject to "editorial merging ... for the student's convenience".

Note 7: RCHM publications: Papers of British politicians and Guide to the location of collections described in the 'Reports and Calendars Series' ('Guide to sources for British history' series), list repository locations under person, and shows the extent to which once provenanced archive groups can be dispersed. Examples include: The Portland papers, deliberately deposited in five repositories during the 1950s: the loan in 1951 (followed by sale) to Cambridge University's Department of Manuscripts and University Archives of the collection, The Cholmondeley (Houghton) manuscripts: Sir Robert Walpole's archive, a sub-group of the main Cholmondeley collection at Houghton Hall, Norfolk, to assist Professor J.H. Plumb in his writing of Walpole's biography. Sale at auction is the common cause of dispersal. The RCHM actively attempts to keep collections in the United Kingdom. The papers of Zachary Macaulay, one of Suffield's abolitionist correspondents, were bought in 1952 by the Huntington Library, San Marino, California.

Note 8: An on-going historical debate is concerned with the question of the emergence of a distinctive working-class ideology, and hence class solidarity, during the 1820s. E.P. Thompson's seminal work draws on Lancashire textile town examples. PETLS documents Middleton's own emergent 'radicalism', and the relatively articulate and developed political consciousness of some 'Middleton reformers', Plumb's "political nation" before the 1830-1832 Reform campaign defeated the 'radical' movement.

Note 9: Two types of primary evidence are differentiated: 1) witting testimony: a document's informational content intended as such by its originator for communication to a recipient; 2) unwitting testimony: underlying evidence elicited by the researcher, but not so intended by the originator, since it represents facts and assumptions implicitly understood and taken for granted by sender and recipient: e.g. references to franking in PETLS/PETLS/39/Alexander to Suffield:19.12.1833; /40/ Brotherton to Suffield:04.01.1833.

Note 10: Examples of likely 'original' provenance of 'stray' documents: [•]
1) Ribblesdale to Spencer-Stanhope [Bundle 32] → [31]
2) 'Middleton inhabitants' [30] → [29]
3) Suffield to Postle [34] → [33]
4) Those documents scattered in 'non-original' bundles [2,23,26], relating to Suffield's lawsuit against Brasenose College, probably belonged together in their own sub-bundle.
Note 11: Bundle 1 is most likely a transplanted bundle from another SGC subgroup generated by Suffield's father: Bundle 48 (not calendared) consists wholly of letters enclosed with pro-slavery abolition petitions, with accompanying 'schedule' (unknown hand), and clearly kept as a unit by Suffield.

Note 12: Chronological order—days within months is very variable, ranging from 'reasonable' to 'chaotic' - only the following are in correct order: Bundles 1 and 48 [see Note 11], smaller bundles [27,45], sub-bundles and letters with few enclosures.

Note 13: See also Chapter 2.3.4.1 for categories (classes) listed for Papers of Thomas Orde-Powlett, 1st Baron Bolton. Other examples from Zetland (Dundas) Archive [NYCRO ref.ZNI]: Papers of Sir Lawrence Dundas - correspondence: 1748–1781, Scottish political and public affairs: 1756–1781: Papers of Thomas, 1st Lord Dundas - militia and volunteer papers: 1799–1814: horse and hound: 1782–1792. As the Society of Archivists points out, some archive groups clearly adapt much more readily than others to classification: e.g. 'Poor Law Union Records', due to exceptional uniformity imposed by central control over record-type [118 & see also Chapter 2.3.4.2].

Note 14: Schellenburg rightly states that "a document may relate to an activity, but it may not be the product of the activity" [119].

Note 15: Access to the Wellington and other databases at Southampton University has been available on the Joint Academic NETwork [JANET] since 1985, and now also on Internet [120].


Note 17: This information was unknown to the authors, J. Kenneth Major and George Carter [see Bibliography], and is very relevant to those now researching Gunton Park, notably Richard Harbord.
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LINES
Addressed to LORD SUFFIELD,
On his coming to Reside in Norfolk.

HAIL SUFFIELD hail! O may the trump of Fame,
Still sound those actions which endear thy name.
When Phoebus rising glorious o'er the main,
Darts warmth and vigour thro' the aerial plain;
Wide and more wide extends his dazzling ray
'Till all the sphere enjoys the genial day.
So may thy ripening virtues, far and wide
Extend thy influence over praise our pride:
Still raise the rustic's hopes, the widow's heart,
And bless East Norfolk with each useful art;
'Till all within the circle of thy sphere,
The sunny beams with grateful feelings share.
Heaven views well pleased, each worthy act and deed,
And with the heart oft' gives the means to feed
The poor and needy; to reward the wise
And chase sad anguish from the mourner's eyes;
He saw thy heart, the generous feelings fill
And only anxious to perform His will;
Saw each warm impulse animate thy soul,
Which makes the streams of human comfort roll
From man to man, thro' each terrestrial zone
Where want prevails or misery is known:
Heaven saw thy soul, and at His wise decree
The wealth of Suffield, kindly falls to thee,
His heir most honor'd; from whose liberal mind
The streams of happiness shall cheer mankind;
Preserve the County from distress and crime
And teach the virtuous, virtue's heights to climb;
Save the poor prisoner from a noxious goal
Where ages lurk and fever's rage assail
And guide the vagrant to some wise employ
Who sav'd from plunder bails thy name with joy.
These gen'rous deeds once raise'd a Howard's name
And England glories still to sound his fame:
By thee revived, the friend of human race,
A second Howard in thy acts we trace.
In thee the good Samaritan appears,
Whose wine and oil each sinking spirit cheers;
The balm of healing in our wounds you pour,
And a main'd Peasantry to health restore.
Still may the grateful bosom kindly flow,
'Till all around thy Godlike bounty know:
So as our plaudits up to Heaven aspire,
The bright celestial who thy works admire,
With one accord their golden harps shall raise,
And heavenly music carol Suffield's praise,
Whose Fame's loud trump already does proclaim
The Peer whom Britain glories now to name
The Patriot true: Philanthropist approved
Norfolk's high hope and Virtue's best beloved.
O would the Muse but grant my warm desire,
And give one spark of that poetic fire
Which glow'd of old in Maro's sparkling verse
His friend Merca's honors to rehearse:
Then should the Nanthuan lyre be heard again
And notes Virgilian swell the tuneful strain,
The strain harmonious Echo's voice prolong
Truth gild my theme and Suffield be my song:
In lays melodious should the rustic swains,
All hail thee welcome to thy wide domains!
The general chorus every voice employ
And shouting Farmers clap their hands for joy,
At thy return, to those delightful woods,
Where Dryades, Norcides of the land or floods
Still walk invisible, to guard those laws
Which riches beautifies and worth adorns;
Where never spring-gun or a man-trap more
Shall wound the widow or alarm the poor,
But thy good Genius only eaid in light
Safe as at noonday sheild thy woods at night.
Long may you live and each revolving day
Hygie'a blooms thy manly cheek display,
And night returning, when thine eyelids close
May dulcet slumbers bless thy soft repose;
New joys salute you when the shades retire
And full fruition crown each fond desire:
While thy fair Lady smiling kind and sweet
Like chaste Diana charms thy rural seat;
And lovely Babes, with beauty all divine,
Pure as white innocence extend thy line
In which anticipation loves to see,
The sterling virtues, Norfolk hail's thee.
This the warm wish which sets my soul on fire,
And my rous'd Muse to breathe it wakes the lyre
Which long has slept, and now her duty o'er
Sinks to repose, perhaps to sing no more.

North Walsham, January 24th, 1822.

PHILO.
CHAPTER FOUR - EDWARD, THIRD LORD SUFFIELD - HIS BACKGROUND AND LIFE

4.1 The Harbord/Suffield family and Gunton

Sir Charles Harbord set in motion the upward mobility of Harbords as substantial Norfolk gentry. He was a very successful career-politician, knighted in 1636, and used the perquisites of high offices, notably that of Surveyor-General to the Crown Lands for 46 years, to acquire several small Norfolk estates. He bought Stanninghall from the Roman Catholic Waldegrave family during the interregnum. He became an MP in 1660, and was a most active legislator until death [1,2].

Two sons were knighted: William who also had a distinguished political career [3], and Charles who died in the Battle of Sole Bay in 1672. Philip lived at Stanninghall, and John bought Gunton Hall in 1676 [4]. The succession passed twice to nephews. The second nephew to inherit, William Morden, an MP, was created 1st Baronet in 1745 [5]. He consolidated the estate, and employed the Norwich builder-architect, Matthew Brettingham in c.1742, to build a small neo-classical country house with associated formal parkland, later adding a chapel designed by Robert Adam [6: Appendix 5/II]. His son, Sir Harbord, Suffield's father, employed James and Samuel Wyatt as architects to extend the house. In 1780, the Park was laid out, possibly landscaped by Humphrey Repton, and lakes added [7: Appendix 5/1,IV]. Sir Harbord Harbord greatly improved the estate, and employed as agent William Marshall, a well-known agriculturalist and author. He managed, with minimal effort, to represent Norwich successfully as an 'independent' MP from 1756 to 1786, during the period of Whig ascendancy, when both the notorious city factions were quiescent, and national domestic issues at a minimum. As a supporter of Pitt's weak administration and possessor of necessary credentials, he was rewarded with a peerage in August, 1786, and thereafter supported the Tories. He served in government until his death [8,9].

In 1760, he had married Mary, daughter of Sir Ralph Assheton (3rd Baronet) of Middleton Hall, Lancashire, and under the settlement, Middleton Manor and Estates came into his possession [10]. His elder son, William Assheton Harbord, led a busy life, served as MP, and was made Lord Lieutenant of Norfolk in 1808, and Vice-Admiral of Suffolk. He married the daughter of John Hobart, 2nd Earl of Buckinghamshire, and she inherited the Blickling Estate in 1793. Her sister married Castlereagh [11]. The Harbords were now a formidable Norfolk clique [Appendices 3/1,2,3,4]. After his succession to the title in 1810, Blickling continued as his main residence and Gunton was used as a hunting lodge. He made significant additions to the house, and also made improvements to the Park [12,13].
4.2 Edward, third Lord Suffield – biographical outline

Harbord underwent a conventional upbringing and education, first attending preparatory school, and then Eton from 1793-1799. He evidently coped adequately with the rigid classical curriculum, and also applied himself wholeheartedly to extra-curricula school activities, excelling especially at cricket and athletics [14: Appendix 6/1]. In 1799, he went up to Christ Church, Oxford, a college then especially dominated by peers and peers' sons [15], and graduated with an MA degree in 1802. Much of his student life was spent on the traditional 'Grand Tour', in his case confined to Denmark, Germany and Russia. In 1802, he entered Lincoln's Inn, but lacking zest for law studies, was not called to the Bar [16]. He was later to criticise his education as lacking in depth [17], and a contemporary described it as 'imperfectly conducted' and 'unfinished' [18]. From 1802 to 1806, he indulged in the usual pastimes of a rich, young aristocrat, and his life seemingly lacked much sense of direction [19]. He dutifully supported his father's ambition to acquire a family 'interest' in a Norfolk constituency, and diligently served Yarmouth as one of two 'ministerialist' MPs from 1806 to 1812 [20,21: Note 1]. This parliamentary experience heralded an awakening of political consciousness and eventual determination to distance himself from the Tory affiliations of his father and brother. By early 1811, his patience was exhausted, and despite his brother's strong opposition, he declared uncompromisingly that were he to represent another constituency, "I shall do so upon terms which will not render me amenable to any one for my political conduct" [22]. In 1808, he was sent to Portugal on minor diplomatic work by Castlereagh. On his return, he missed an opportunity to accept the post of Private Secretary to Castlereagh [23]. In September 1809, he married Georgiana, sole surviving heir of George (Venables-Vernon), 2nd Lord Vernon of Kinderton, and the generous settlement included Vernon House [Note 2]. Until 1813, when Vernon died, Harbord divided his time between his own London home and Vernon's Derbyshire seat, but then took his family to live in rented accommodation in Hampshire and Dorset to suit the wishes of the Dowager Lady Vernon, then living at Mudeford, Hampshire [24]. Harbord had been virtually excluded from his own father's will in 1810, and apparently had little money of his own [25]. Bacon writes: "from 1810 to 1816 his life may be said to have been almost barren of incident" [26], and apart from his family, hobbies and rearing game, he had little satisfactorily to occupy his energies.

After 1816, his latent sensibilities and altruism found outlet in East Dorset, and he was much respected locally for initiating relief schemes during 1819-1820 to
help the destitute [Note 3], and for his contribution to the establishment of savings banks in Dorchester, Blandford and Wimborne [27,28]. In 1818, he unsuccessfully, due to his opposition to bribery, contested a Norwich seat as a 'ministerialist' candidate[29]. His association with Joseph John Gurney of Earlham began in March 1819, when both attempted vainly to counteract ward electoral malpractices in Norwich [30: Appendix 6/V]. Gurney, an influential Quaker minister, philanthropist, prison reformer and abolitionist, belonged to the "vastly intermingled family" [31] of Gurneys, Frys, Barclays, Hanburys, Hoares, Buxtons et al., knew personally many active in the cause of slave emancipation, such as Wilberforce and Clarkson, and convened at Earlham philanthropists and politicians [Appendix 5/IX,X]. Harbord was a frequent visitor [32,33]. His dormant "liberal opinions" [34] surfaced fully when he demanded an enquiry into the 'Peterloo Massacre'. He then sided temporarily with the Whigs, although reiterating independence from party, a stance he held until death [Appendix 6/III]. In February 1820, his like-minded cousin by marriage, Robert, 2nd Earl Grosvenor, offered him the Shaftesbury seat [35: Appendix 6/IV,VI], and from 1820-1821 as an independent MP, he was noted for diligence and constant attendance [36]. He was appointed a magistrate in Norfolk in 1819 [37]. From 1820, Harbord felt sufficiently emboldened to commit his public life to specific chosen causes.

In August 1821, he took over the title and estates, moving residence to Gunton Hall [Frontispiece: Appendix 5/I,V,VI]. Family and estate responsibilities, parliamentary attendance, duties as magistrate, public duties, entertaining and social life, occupied his time. He made two very suitable and happy marriages. His first wife, who died in 1824, was comparatively well educated by her mother, dignified, devout, preferred domesticity to entertaining, and lacked enthusiasm for his political ventures [38]. He then married Emily Harriet Shirley in 1826. She undoubtedly participated in his life to a much greater extent, took a keen interest in tenants' welfare, Gunton gardens [39], and initiated Bacon's biography [40].

Suffield enjoyed assuming the rôle of a paternalistic and pro-active landlord [41], and now entered a relatively select body of landed magnates [Note 4: Appendix 3/2,3]. He devoted much time and resources to Gunton Hall, Park and Estate [Note 5]. Characteristically, he immediately allowed his tenants freedom to vote as suited them [42], reduced rents, and granted weekly interviews [43]. Bacon states that "it was amongst his most earnest desires to put his estate into such perfect order that ... his son should find he had been a good and faithful
steward" [44], and Charles, 5th Lord Suffield wrote, "the estate was almost unique as regards the housing of the tenants and the perfect order it was in generally" [45]. A steward continued to manage it, assisted by an accountant from 1829 [46]. In 1829, Suffield bought Horstead Estate [47]. By 1835, Gunton Estate contained 87 farms on 14,000 acres [48]. He rejected fixed-term leases, and kept to a system of annual tenancies. In 1829, he replaced the terms under which his farms had originally been leased, and equalised rents according to the relative capability of each farmer to pay [49]. Yields were good, but not among the highest in Norfolk. By 1840, the four-course rotation was almost universally practised at Gunton [50]. Aware of the cash value of timber, he put in belt plantations [51]. He was nationally one of the few aristocratic landlords to adopt on a large-scale the allotment system for 'cottage tenants' [52]. He upgraded to a high standard farm-houses and ancillary buildings [53,54], and built a school, bone-crushing mill for fertiliser, and canal wharf at Antingham [55]. He altered and added to Gunton [56], built Estate lodges [57], landscaped the park in 1823, and in 1825, he enclosed and stocked a large deer park [58,59]. His most personal addition was the Observatory Tower [60,61].

Since c.1816, supervision of the secondary Middleton Estate had been delegated to him [62: Note 6: Appendix 3/4]. A comment that "he frequently visited Middleton, and occasionally manifested a kind regard to the indigent of the place" [63], belittles Suffield's continual efforts on behalf of Middleton, Manchester and Lancashire interests, especially from 1816-1820 and the pre-/post-Reform Act periods. His final visit took place in February 1835. Necessarily an absentee landlord, his advice and leadership must have partially compensated for the departure of propertied gentry from Manchester and dearth of resident aristocracy in south-east Lancashire [64]. He valued the Middleton connection, and his "attachment" to it, and Middletonians respected him [65,66]. His oversight initially coincided with a five-year period during which "popular radicalism gained the degree of mass support in both London and the industrial districts of the north and Midlands" lacking since the early 19th century [67]. In 1812, a large Luddite group attacked Middleton's mill [68]. After 1815, renewed social unrest, exacerbated by national economic problems, was channelled into direct action by political agitators, a regional infrastructure of political clubs - 'Hampden' and 'Union', and a thriving radical press [69]. 1817 and 1819 were years of severe depression [70]. Samuel Bamford effectively led the relatively moderate radically-minded Middletonians from 1816 to 1820 [71]. Amos Ogden, the Middleton silk-weaver, with whom Suffield patiently corresponded, typified the self-educated
artisan, much influenced by Cartwright, Cobbett and Hunt, and one of many whose nascent political consciousness was increasingly focussed on parliamentary reform as the panacea [72: Appendix 6/VI]. In 1817, the short-lived Middleton Hampden Club took on a local co-ordinating function, and persuaded its London counterpart to present a petition to parliament demanding universal suffrage and annual parliaments [73]. Middleton opted out of the 1817 handloom weavers planned march to London [74], but Bamford led a well-disciplined Middleton contingent (including Ogden) to the 1819 Manchester meeting after which he was arrested and imprisoned [75]. This demonstration - 'Peterloo', epitomised the climax to an 1819 series of mass meetings, held to petition against political corruption, economic depression, low wages and high prices. The 'Queen Caroline affair' of 1820-1821 signified the temporary decline of mass popular radicalism [76]. Suffield refused to present the address composed by 'Middleton reformers' to Queen Caroline, in the company of Cobbett and Cartwright [77: Note 6]. He undoubtedly felt empathy with the "poor misguided [yet] intelligent Radicals" [78], whom he wished to protect from Cobbett, and with whom he willingly discussed current topics. Other documented activities in Middleton include the following: his routine duties as patron of Middleton living [79]; his support for Lancashire poor at a 1822 Norfolk County Meeting [80]; his most taxing effort on Middleton's behalf - a futile and very costly attempt between 1826 and 1832 to compel Brasenose College, Oxford to restore misappropriated funds to Middleton Free Grammar School [81: Appendix 6/II]; his founding with others of Middleton Mechanics Institute [82,83]; his personal distribution of charity to the destitute in the 1826 depression, "one of the most unprecedented periods of calamity and distress" [84]: his kindness to Ogden in allowing him a newly-built lodge, rent-free [85].

In 1818, Suffield stated that he wished to be remembered as one who had striven to abolish the slave trade, amended the Poor Laws, and conferred "permanent benefit upon that class which most needs our assistance" [86]. His reform mentality can be reasonably summarised as "a combination of philanthropic humanitarianism and rationalist ideas rooted in the Enlightenment together with a [superimposition] of evangelicism and Benthamite utilitarianism" [87]. It found expression in many spheres, especially after his elevation to the peerage. As a Norfolk magistrate active in Petty and Quarter Sessions, he participated in wide-ranging administrative and judicial duties, and was made Chairman of the Quarter Sessions [88]. The collection testifies to the following: his involvement in causes, such as the Mendicity Society, Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, Scilly Islands Committee, London University; his participation in
implementing legislation, such as Peel's 1819 Factory Act; not least, to his many acts of kindness to individuals; his good works locally - he founded an equivalent to the later Royal National Lifeboat Institution, and Norfolk Cricket Club. He considered his own class to be merely parasitical unless it served the community, and believed only the "best qualified" should lead the nation [89]. His life awaits analysis, but on the evidence available, it can be stated that he offered original insight on the questions of prisons and spring gun reform. He lived to see several major aims realised in legislation.

From 1822, Suffield consistently supported the parliamentary reform movement, mainly because he detested the Tory government's lack of accountability for its actions, especially imposition of Corn Laws, taxation, expenditure, 'Peterloo', excessive influence over MPs through patronage and pensions [90]. Never an advocate of "sweeping reform" [91], he felt strongly that only franchise extension would avert revolution [92], but how wide an extension is unclear. He did earn some reputation as a 'reformer'. He promoted the cause of unrepresented Salford and Oldham [93 & Note 8], and presented the Leicester Address after the Lords' rejection of the second Reform Bill [94]. As a believer in liberty of conscience, he supported Catholic emancipation, and the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts [95]. The collection documents radical and dissenting hostility to the established church, agriculturalists' opposition to tithes, and pluralism in action [96]. Suffield, a loyal churchman, tackled the issue of church abuses, and spoke in 1832 on the Pluralities Bill [97]. Much that he recommended was later implemented by the 1838 Pluralities Act, 1836 Established Church Act, and 1840 Ecclesiastical Duties and Revenues Act, but dissenters' hopes on church rates payment were not then fulfilled [98,99,100].

As magistrate, he supervised Poor Law administration at parochial level, in the capacity of Poor Law guardian and director of local unions and incorporations. In Norfolk, the agricultural sector mainly financed the exceptionally heavy burden of pauperism - the main contributor to the nationally-high poor rates [101]. He conscientiously studied the complex interrelationships between farmers's incomes, rents, taxation, tithes, wages costs, and poor relief payments [102]. His main concern always remained "the cause of the labouring man" [103], whom he aimed to make "useful, moral and happy" [104]. The post-1815 economic climate had a devastating effect on all rural classes, but especially on the landless agricultural labourer, chronically badly paid, under- and/or only seasonally employed, and now unable to find alternative employment in the depressed worstead industry. Suffield saw the relief system as an expensive way to perpetuating pauperism,
and especially detested the working of the Speenhamland system, adopted throughout East Anglia. He recommended what he considered as viable solutions to combat endemic pauperism: provision of parish plots of land attached to cottages, at reasonable rent to enable subsistence cultivation [105]; allotment of land with estate cottages [106]; 'home colonisation' of surplus labourers on waste lands; emigration abroad [107: Note 7]. He sat on the Lords Poor Law Committee [108]. The 1834 Poor Law Amendment Act rectified many abuses he cited.

Until 1830, Norfolk had the worst record of rural social unrest in Britain [109], with violent outbreaks occurring each year. Poverty-stricken labourers were driven to poaching, but sophisticated poaching gangs also operated. Undeclared class war existed between labourers and landowners, and the latter tightened up existing Game Laws in 1815, and made extensive use of spring guns, loaded with shot and operated by trip wires [110]. In 1825, Suffield set out indefatigably to challenge the legality of spring guns, and his and others' efforts resulted in the 1827 Spring Guns Act [111]. He likewise detested the Game Laws, and to promote amendment, spoke in the Lords and wrote a pamphlet. His efforts achieved some success in 1831 [112]. In 1830, the 'Swing' riots erupted in Norfolk, with arson, machine-breaking, and actions directed at tithe-owners [113]. Rioting did not affect the 10 villages of which he was owner or part-owner [114], but wage riots and attacks on threshing machines broke out in some Gunton Estate parishes [115]. He used estate workers and troops to defend Gunton saw mill [116: Appendix 6/9]. He persuaded his own tenant-farmers to give adequate wage increases to their labourers [117]. Suffield and his fellow magistrates sympathised with the labourers' cause, although abhorring their actions, and were criticised by Melbourne for their leniency in sentencing [118].

Suffield made himself into an acknowledged expert on prison reform. He considered that gaols "by the greatest possible degree of misery, produced the greatest possible degree of wickedness" [119]. Most contemporaries did not differentiate between "retributory, deterrent or reformatory punishment" [120]. Suffield felt that "reformation ... ought to be [the] systematic object of punishment" [121], and therefore prison design should promote this, together with good management practices, such as prisoner 'classification', strict discipline, continual inspection, moral and religious instruction, and employment [122]. He served on the Norfolk Gaol Committee, and saw practical realisation of his aims in the new gaol [Note 9], advised on the building of Norwich Gaol, and compiled
a detailed report on Aylsham Bridewell [123]. Peel's 1823 Gaol Act establishing uniformity in prison building in England and Wales, incorporated many of Suffield's recommendations, the "consummation of all my long deferred hopes" [124]. Governments now had to develop a policy on punishment. In 1835, a prison inspectorate was begun [125]. The long campaign for criminal code revision occupied him, in common with the whig humanitarians, Romilly, Mackintosh, and his friend Fowell Buxton, its main aim being simplification of the "complicated mass of statute law and its replacement by a more merciful code" [126]. From 1831-1834, he periodically spoke in the Lords on capital punishment [127].

Finally, he was noted for his involvement from 1821 in the slavery abolition campaign. He developed into a well-informed speaker, actively participated in the Anti-Slavery Society, promoted parliamentary candidates pledged to abolition [128,129], presented many hundreds of petitions, corresponded widely, and single-handedly struggled in the Lords Committee over the Slavery Abolition Bill's clauses [130]. On its passing, he stated that "it was his highest boast to have taken so honourable and effectual a part" [131].

Suffield died suddenly from a riding accident in 1835 [132].

CHAPTER FOUR - NOTES

Note 1: In the 18th century, seats were pawns in dynastic struggles between leading families. Upholding of family honour guided county political behaviour, rather than party or person [133,134]. The Townshends had dominated Yarmouth from 1715 to 1796, as had the Walpoles Lynn. Huge fortunes were needed to fight elections and prospective MPs needed county standing. Harbord's father capitalised on a partial breaking of Townshend monopoly when he put him forward [135,136].

Note 2: Vernon House: the Suffields' original house belonged to the 1683 rebuilding of Park Place after the 1666 Great Fire, a very desirable area after the king's return to St. James's Palace. Distinguished occupants included Thomas Creevey and Viscount Goderich. The headquarters of the Royal Over-Seas League now occupies a later Vernon House and the adjacent Rutland House. Suffield's clubs - Boodle's, Brook's and White's, were all situated in nearby St. James's Street [137,138].

Note 3: Harbord, while resident in Dorset, struck a county whose agricultural labourers had, since 1770, been the worst paid in England [139]. A static and unskilled class, they could not emigrate, and endured appalling hardship, poverty and misery [140].

Note 4: Norfolk was dominated by smaller gentry estates, and Gunton was one of only 11 estates covering more than 10,000 acres, a factor that qualified its owner for landed magnate rank [141,142: Appendix 3/2].
Note 5: Gunton Estate [Appendix 3/3]: aligned north-south, this lay in two distinct blocks in north-east Norfolk, covering 16 parishes. Its solid geology is composed of Tertiary Norwich and Red Crags overlying the Cretaceous Chalk series. The Pleistocene period melting of North Sea-derived glaciers caused deposition of thick layers of moraine. The northern Gunton block was larger (9 miles north-south & 5 miles west-east at its widest) than the southern (4 miles north-south & 2.5 miles west-east). The northernmost lands lay on the very hummocky Holt–Cromer moraine reaching heights of 250 ft. in Overstrand and 280 ft. in Northrepps. To the south of Northrepps, the land surface levels out and descends gradually to form a dissected plateau of 180 ft. high near Roughton, 100-120 ft. at Gunton Park, and 70-90 ft. in Felmingham. The height of the southern block decreases from c.45 ft. in the north to 15 ft. in the Bure valley. The Holt–Cromer morainic ridge soils are heavier clays, but the area to the south is made up of a mixture of coarse glacial outwash sands and gravels, over lain by a cover of loamy loess. The topsoil is a well-drained, brown-earth of almost stone-free rich, thick loam. These soils were then considered to be amongst the most productive in England [143,144: Appendix 3/1]. The Holt–Cromer ridge diverts the drainage into the River Bure basin (flowing south-east), and most of the Gunton Estate lands lay within its catchment, with only the north-east section drained by the Mundesley Beck [145]. The estate was unaffected by earlier parliamentary (pre-1801) enclosure [146], but evidence suggests both considerable rationalisation of earlier small and dispersed fields into large fields, and commons enclosure in Felmingham, Antingham, Bradfield, Roughton and Suffield [147]. Suffield's father was reputed to have been a ruthless encloser [148], but Suffield opposed further enclosure [149]. Earlier renowned for sheep, Norfolk by the early 19th century was the leading arable county, due to enclosure, suitable soils, and dissemination of innovative practices by 'improving landlords' - Townshend (Norfolk four-course rotation) and the Cokes (marling). Wheat and barley production increased greatly, encouraged by soaring grain prices during the Napoleonic wars, and then the implementation of the 1815 Corn Laws. Cattle husbandry was also increasing in importance [150,151,152,153]. Gunton Estate land-use percentages reflect the emphasis on cereal growing: 1784: arable-69%/pasture-31%; 1842: arable-81%/pasture-19% [154], and this was combined with the rearing of turnip-fed bullocks [155]. Suffield interested himself in cattle breeding [156].

Note 5: Middleton Estate: Middleton Manor and Estates were almost all transferred to Suffield's father. Middleton, situated four miles north of central Manchester, lies in the valley of the Irk at 200 ft. below plateau level. The earlier village expanded rapidly in the late 18th century on the lower flood plain. The Manchester embayment is underlain by the Lancashire coalfield, and overlain by glacial deposits to form a c.350 ft. plateau [Appendix 3/4]. High precipitation, relatively low temperatures and variable soils within Middleton parish led to mixed farming on 20-30 acre farms [156,157]. Under the Asshetons, Middleton's growth had remained static, and Lady Assheton opposed the building of cotton mills [158]. The Suffield tenure coincided with Middleton's rapid expansion, when like other Lancashire villages, its economy and society was transformed by the cotton industry [159: Appendix 3/5,6]. The 15th century Middleton Hall, rebuilt in 1805, was the Suffields' seat [160]. In 1791, a grant to hold a market was obtained by the 1st Lord Suffield, and he built a market house, warehouses and shambles [161]. Tenant-farmers had, since the 17th century, found hand-loom weaving more profitable than farming. In 1790, the first water-powered cotton spinning mill was built, and by 1795, a large calico processing works had been added [162]. By 1825, the mill (adapted for spinning and weaving) was converted to steam. By 1832, the domestic silk-weaving industry, established in 1778, had experienced a very successful revival [163,164]. Middleton's population rose from c.150 in 1775 to c.7,000 in 1831 [165], but as one of Manchester's 'cluster' of satellites, it's growth was eclipsed...
by the latter's [166: Appendix 3/5,6]. During Suffield's tenure, cotton workers formed the largest occupational group, and comprised both the majority domestic handloom weavers and the mill-based spinners and processors. The handloom weavers' decline was only starting in the late 1820s [167,168,169].

Note 6: The mutual antipathy between Suffield and Cobbett developed further. Cobbett attacked him in two issues of Political Register [170]. In January, 1823 Cobbett completely disrupted a huge Norfolk county meeting, summoned by Coke to consider causes and remedies of agricultural distress. Cobbett forced through the adoption of a radical programme unrepresentative of the views of most present, and Coke was forced to present this as the county petition to parliament. Suffield criticised Cobbett's theories, and was in turn attacked in a complete issue of Political Register [171,172].

Note 7: Suffield attempted in vain to interest Melbourne in his scheme for the provision of plots for labourers, stating that it would "make the labourers independent of the farmers, and substitute the competition of employers for the competition of employed". Wages would rise and poor rates would fall. Melbourne considered such projects would only increase the population, a measure of the hold of the ideas of Malthus and political economists on the new government [174].

Note 8: PPETLS documents the correspondence between Suffield and Joseph Brotherton of Salford, a noted local parliamentary reformer. Brotherton became the first MP for Salford in 1832, and was re-elected until his death [175,176].

Note 9: Suffield himself partially subsidised the building of the new county gaol [177]. His work, and that of his friends, J.J. Gurney, Fowell Buxton, Samuel Hoare and Elizabeth Fry, followed in the tradition of John Howard, the 18th century prison reformer [Appendix 5/X]. After the interruption caused by the Napoleonic Wars, the MPs, Romilly and Burdett, supported by Lord Holland, revived reform agitation [178]. Elizabeth Fry gained wide respect and publicity through her prison visiting, and help for women [179]. One aim, the creation of a local 'Ladies' Association' in each area, was supported by Suffield [180,181]. Crime figures for Norfolk increased by 106.5% during 1815-1820 [182], and again by 30% during 1824-1830 [183]. The decline of the 'living-in' young, single farm labourer was a contributory factor. This intensified after 1815, and had "profound repercussions on the crime rates, the state of social relations, and the level of incendiarism ... [it] was the young labourers' response to their appalling plight [184]. The proliferation of beershops was generally seen as an added incentive to crime. Suffield presented two petitions, signed by all Norfolk Quarter Sessions magistrates against the Beer Bill in April 1834, and spoke in the Lords [185]. He attracted much correspondence on beershops' perceived 'evils', especially their use as meeting places for those discussing grievances, and encouragement of drunkenness and immorality [186].
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CHAPTER FIVE

A Calendar

of the collection entitled:

The Personal Papers of
Edward, Third Lord Suffield
5.1 INTRODUCTION TO THE COLLECTION

The collection, *The personal papers of Edward, third Lord Suffield*, belongs to one sub-group (Private and personal) of the comprehensive group, *The Suffield of Gunton collection*. This latter was deposited (in stages) in Norwich Library (Charing Cross, Norwich), by the Trustees of the Gunton Estate, from the early 1940s. In 1962, it was handed over to the custody of the Norfolk and Norwich Record Office, and kept in the new environmentally controlled strongroom.

During the 1939-1945 War, due to the archivist's absence, the early deposits were badly provenanced or split up, and consequently became mingled with other collections, especially the *Blickling (Hobart, Buckinghamshire, Lothian) collection*, this latter already including material generated by the Harbord/Suffield family, due to the marriage of William Assheton, 2nd Lord Suffield, with Lady Caroline Hobart in 1792. The final receipt of material, including the collection, *The Personal papers of Edward, third Lord Suffield*, and consisting otherwise, mainly of estate administrative papers (maps, surveys, title-deeds, accounts, manorial records dating from 14th-20th century) was made in 1980, following the death of the 6th Lord Suffield's daughter, the Hon. Doris Harbord. Most of the deposit has yet to be accessioned and listed. Documents (1767-1822) relating to the Suffield estates in Middleton (formerly S.E. Lancs.) were transferred to the Greater Manchester County Record Office [GMCRO: E/7 Assheton Family of Middleton/Estate correspondence to and from the Lords Suffield]. Other related Norfolk Record Office holdings, obtained from separate sources, are the following: Papers of the 4th and 5th Barons Suffield of Gunton Park: 1829-1914 [MC 350/1-151]; Suffield Will Trust: 1757-1954 [MC 501/1-225]. The Norfolk Record Office Card Indexes can be checked as follows:- Selected Persons for Harbord and Suffield; Place for Gunton and other parishes where the family's estates lay: Selected Subjects for Suffield collection.

5.2 ARRANGEMENT OF THE CALENDAR - EXPLANATORY GUIDE

Bundles

Bundles are the storage and retrieval units, and therefore the basis of arrangement within the calendar. The majority - 'original' - are tied with pink tape, and the remainder - 'not original' - are tied with white tape. It is highly likely that Suffield's close friend and biographer, Richard Mackenzie Bacon (also editor of *Norwich Mercury* from 1816 to 1844), was responsible for the initial sorting and arranging into the 'original bundles' in c.1837, for the purposes of his biography. His own 'calendars' and notes are enclosed within some. Those marked as 'not original' were re-constituted by the archivist-in-charge from loose assorted documents found in association with the 'original' bundles when the Gunton Hall estate office was cleared.

Arrangement of bundles within the calendar

Chronological order is the basis of arrangement. Within each bundle the earliest dated document determines that bundle's location in the sequence and the bundle headnotes indicate their full date-spans to the nearest month.

Arrangement of documents within the bundle

A. General rule - documents are arranged, and their corresponding entries listed
according to the following criteria:-

1. **Date order** - fully dated documents are given priority over incompletely dated ones, the latter being filed at the end of the sequence for the relevant year.

2. **Sender** - all documents emanating from any one sender are listed chronologically under that sender, with entries separated by a semi-colon. Each sender's entries are separated from those of the next by a colon.

B. **Exceptions**

1. **Enclosures** - any enclosed document/s (of whatever date) is/are filed with their respective covering letter (whose date determines position in the sequence), and so listed.

2. **Sub-bundles** (documents folded together) are kept in this 'original' physical unit but re-arranged chronologically and so listed.

3. **Extensive files of on-going interacting correspondence relating to an identifiable subject** - entries are grouped under a headnote giving senders' and recipients' names and date spans, listed chronologically and not collated under sender.

4. Undated letters and miscellaneous documents are filed last under the category 'also including:--'

**Dating**

Each document entry is given a full date (if ascertainable) at the end of its abstract, and all enclosures are dated separately. Speculative dates are put in square brackets - [ ]. If a bundle contains documents from a relatively short time span, only the day and month are given for an entry, and inclusive years are put in bold, provided that large collocations under any one sender are not present: if so, to avoid confusion, full dates are given for each entry. Dates are derived from the following sources: 1) document itself: 2) Suffield’s own dating denoting date of receipt and/or his reply: 3) postmarks: 4) watermarks (for year - indicating earliest possible date): 5) R.M. Bacon’s biography: 6) relative order within a bundle: 6) external reference sources.

5.3 **PERSONAL AND PLACE NAMES – A GUIDE**

**NAMES - PERSONAL**

**Harbord/Suffield family**

Differentiation, necessary between the four Lords Suffield, who are correspondents and/or mentioned, is made as follows:-

- 1st and 2nd Lords Suffield - **Ld. Suffield** [1st Ld.] [2nd Ld.] or **Suffield**
- 3rd Lord Suffield - **Ld. Suffield** or **Suffield**

Before his elevation to the peerage in August, 1821, the 3rd Lord, generator of this collection, is referred to as 'The Hon. Edward Harbord' in the headnotes, and 'Harbord' in the calendar entries. His eldest son and heir, the Hon. Edward Vernon Harbord, is given full names for the first entry, and thereafter consistently referred to as 'Harbord'. Context within bundles makes identification of the relevant 'Lord Suffield' apparent.

**Other names - General rule**

Names of sender (and/or recipient) are given in full (if ascertainable) for the first entry, and for subsequent entries, initials only in most cases. Incomplete names have been checked appropriate reference sources. Other names within texts have been checked as far as possible, and added details put in [ ]. Official positions held by a sender (either relevant to the document, specifically mentioned, or important in their own right), are also added.

**Titles**

These are given for each entry, even if specific reference is not made to them by
the sender. Later elevations to the peerage and baronetcies are indicated.

**Aristocracy**

Full and later titles are given for the first entry of a correspondent, and then the generic term **Ld.** (Lord) is used for all peerage grades. Fuller details are given for Vernon and Grosvenor family members to whom Edward, 3rd Lord Suffield was closely related, and also for Norfolk peers.

**Army and Navy ranks**

The usual abbreviations are used.

**NAMES** - **PLACE**

**Addresses of the Harbord/Suffield family**

The family seat, Gunton Park, is assumed and not listed in the case of the Suffield title holder. Alternative addresses only are included. For other family members place only is given. Vernon House, Park Place, St. James's [Parish], London, Suffield's 'town house', is listed as 'Vernon Hse'.

**Norwich**

Street or parish is given if ascertainable from the document.

**Outside London**

Place names are derived from the document, with county added for first entry.

**Middleton, S.E. Lancs.**

After the first entry, this is entered only as Middleton.

**London**

Senders may give 'London', their 'town house' name, street and/or parish name as their address, and this form is followed in the entries. For all such addresses 'London' is omitted. 'London' then was used to refer to the City of London proper and to the inner suburban parishes, the urbanisation of the latter having linked the City of London and City of Westminster into a single extensive built-up area: otherwise, the parishes of Chelsea and Kensington, for example, were still regarded as villages (in Middlesex), and Blackheath and West Ham as villages in Kent and Essex respectively. Correspondents giving such addresses as 'Southwark' or 'Spitalfields', while acknowledging them as suburbs of London and parts of the metropolis, would also have seen them as localities with an independent existence. For full identification of location, an appropriate source, e.g. *The A to Z of Regency London*, 1985, Harry Margary, Lympne Castle (Kent) in association with the Guildhall Library, [ISBN 0-90345-36-X], may be consulted.

**5.4 SUFFIELD’S BIOGRAPHY: Richard Mackenzie Bacon - A memoir of the life of Edward, third Baron Suffield**

Published privately in 1838, indexed and dated by page, Bacon's work is largely based on this collection. He was given access to the papers c.1837 [see PPETLS /5/ (GTN/3/ /5/ /)]. He utilised many documents (mainly letters), reproducing them both in full or in part, and making reference to their informational content, and some bear evidence of his careful scrutiny and censoring. Those used are indicated thus: [B: p. ]. This biography has been used in several secondary sources. A copy is available in the Norfolk Studies Library.

**5.5 INDEX**

A back-of-the-calendar index - person-place-subject - is provided, with page (not bundle) references to entries. Only selected entries are reproduced in the main NRO card index catalogues.
1/1- Letters from the Hon. Edward Harbord (at Eton) to his father, Lord Suffield [1st Ld.] (at Gunton House, Norfolk and Albermarle St.) dated March 1794-July-1796

Re school life, Dr. Langford, Dame Tyrell, sisters Louisa and 'Kitty' [Catherine?], "I am well and have not been flogged yet" [B: p.5]; re brother [The Hon. William Assheton Harbord] and wife, Windsor Fair, school life, threatened with a "tickling [by] Doctor", family and animals; re school life, his "tickling", now called an "Etonian", Gunton pike fishing, "old John Booth", health; re father's coming visit to Eton, arrangements for family; re tutor (Evans), Dr. Langford, brother William, her "Ladyship [being] brought to bed"; re [subject?], drama activities, fellow pupil "pig Pelham", caricature of Pitt and Fox as pigs, "poor old Totty" [?], [subject?] [B: p.6]; re his behaviour, Mrs. Bishop and cats, Totty, new lodging; re mother's letter, present of game, lodging, tutor, new form, Dr. Heath, new rooms finished at Gunton; re his Dame, Kitty, Mrs. Blackman, bonfire night and fireworks, holidays; re efforts to "win remove", breaking-up, Vause, writer's love poetry; re promotion to Upper Remove (4th form), school life, writer flogging boys; re journey via (Thetford) to Eton, horses, worry over robbery; re family illnesses, floods, present of game, gift of hares to Dame, F. Lamb and William Howard, high jumping; re family affairs, studies, school life; safe return "without being robbed yesterday", soldiers in Hyde Park, Vause and floggings; re mumps, 'Montem', arrangements for family; re mumps, food, tutor, comparison of steel and quill pens [B: pp.8-9]; re mumps, 'Montem', arrangements, tutor, recovery from mumps; re 'Montem' [B: p.10]; re 'Montem' [B: p.11]; re father's gout, annoyance with headmaster (Heath), 'Montem' arrangements [B: p.11]; re father's gift of watch, family (only ladies) at 'Montem', extra fagging; re dental problems; re shooting of brother (Ld. Charles) by Ld. Frederick Townshend, tooth, Harbord's brother and his wife; re "[winning of] remove", "not robbed", busy roads, cricket, "Mr. Townshend's business", watch; re school life, 5th form, cricket, Norfolk floods, swimming lessons, Pelham, Ld. Brooke, [William] Howard and brother, tooth, Sir George Chad's visit; re invitation to father to stay, Hinde looking after Harbord, cricket, Pelham, boating, swimming; re Hinde, swimming, cricket match against Westminster, rowing, Evans [B: pp.11-12]; re holidays, Eton-Westminster cricket match, tutor's letter to father; re threat of expulsion for Etonians attending cricket match, writer to tell story in chaise, aftermath of boys' actions, looking forward to Gunton fishing, "old Totty".

1 original bundle

2/1- Letters to and from the Hon. Edward Harbord / 3rd Lord Suffield (including draft replies) and other writings by him dated March 1807-1828

From: Harbord to Ld. Suffield [1st Ld.] re Commons committee decision [on election of self and Stephen Lushington], victory, personal political views, his voting plans, position regarding brother William, enclosed committee list (not encl.). 13 March 1807: Suffield's reply to Harbord (at Lincolns Inn) advising him on his behaviour as Yarmouth MP, Yarmouth politics, Commons committee

3/1 - Letters to and from the Hon. Edward Harbord (including draft replies) dated May 1807-Feb 1820

From: Suffield [1st Ld.] (Guntton Park) to Harbord (at Lincoln's Inn) re earlier petition of [William] Jacob and [Abbott] Upcher against election of Harbord and Lushington, concern over Yarmouth election expenses, financial problems, ailments, government, family news. 18 May 1807: Edmund Lacon and other signatories (Yarmouth, Norfolk) giving 'Pledge of Support' for Harbord in connection with petition against his election as Yarmouth MP. 19 Jan 1808: Harbord to Suffield [2nd Ld.] re likely dissolution of parliament, intention to resign Yarmouth seat. 1 Jan 1811: Suffield re Harbord's resignation. 7 Jan 1811: Harbord's reply (at Guntton Park) re his astonished reaction to brother's letter [on subject of Harbord's speech on Receiver-Generalship], latter misinterpreted it, dismissal of Ld. Petre. 21 Jan 1811: Suffield (Guntton Park) re Harbord's intention to resign [Yarmouth seat], Ld. Charles Townshend's wish to stand, asks Harbord to re-consider in view of expenses incurred and family interests. 2 Oct 1811 [B: p.45]: Harbord's reply (in wife's hand) re candidacy, considers Suffield family had good return on sums expended, wants political independence from family. 7 Oct 1811 [B: pp.45-6]: Suffield's reply re candidacy and Harbord's attitude to his decision. 13 Oct 1811: re enjoyment of Guntton, entrance alteration, shooting, thanks to Harbord for [anti-poaching device?], approves Harbord's candidacy for Tories. 25 Jan 1818 [B: pp.54-5]; (Guntton) re candidacy and interest expressed in Harbord by [Charles] Harvey and [Henry] Francis. 22 March 1818 [B: p.55]: (at Newmarket, W. Suffolk) re Harbord's speech at County Meeting, very hurt that Harbord has sided with political enemies of self and late father. 2 Nov 1819 [B: p.91]: Harbord's reply (at Richmond, Surrey) confirming own political independence, non-allegiance to Whigs, defence of right to speak out [on Peterloo]. 3 Nov 1819 [B: pp.91-3]: Ld. Grosvenor [Robert, 2nd Earl later 1st Marquess of Westminster] (Grosvenor Hse.) to Harbord (Henbury Hse.) re dissolution of parliament, health of George 111. 6 Feb; re offer of Shaftesbury [Dorset] seat, "I think I can venture to offer it you with no exjence or trouble than that of presenting yourself there occasion

1 original bundle

4/1 - Letters to and from the Hon. Edward Harbord (including draft replies) dated August 1810-December 1817

From: [J] Erskine (London) re reference for coachman, William Benham, seeking stable job. 16 Nov 1810: Harbord (at Hill St.) to [?] Churchill (Grosvenor St.) re attendance at Fisheries Bill Committee and unwillingness to support Churchill on this, Ld. Walpole also opposed. 7 April 1811: Churchill's reply re misunderstanding by Harbord, not being asked to support cause that he (Harbord) does not support, mentions Ld. Walpole. 7 April 1811; re Fisheries Bill, Harbord opposed?. 8 April 1811: Suffield [2nd Ld.] re Mrs. Harbord's birthday, executors' meeting re father's will. 12 Dec 1811; (at Blickling, Norfolk) expressing need for family affairs to go to Chancery and for executors' meeting. 13 Jan 1812; re Sir George Chad and executors' meeting, Chancery. 19 Jan 1812; re Bill to build navigable canal from Wayford Bridge to Antingham, committee, benefits, canal's extension to Antingham, new home. 14 March 1812: Sir George Chad (Thursford Hall, Norfolk) to Harbord (Coulsdon's Hotel, Bond St.) re writer's being granted power of attorney by Suffield for sale of stock, complications, hopes Harbord will enter Commons, family matters. 22 Feb 1812 [B: p. 41]; re illness of Harbord's son "little Edward" [?], writer's supposed resentment of Suffield retracted. 22 Feb 1812: Thomas Lockwood (Dan y Graig, Swansca) to Harbord (Came Hse., Dorchester, Dorset) re Briton Ferry Estate and late Ld. Vernon's (George, 2nd Ld.) leases. 8 Jan 1813: W. Churchill (Agent-Wimborne, E. Dorset) to Harbord (at Came Hse) re West Lodge, Bloxworth, Hants. and hunting. 3 Jan 1814; re Harbord's declining West Lodge as tenant, "we are all anxious to keep you among us", cold weather. 14 Jan 1814: Harbord (Vernon Hse) to Ld. Orford [Horatio, 3rd Ld. Walpole of Wolterton, 5th Ld. Walpole of Walpole, 2nd Earl of Orford 11] re tenancy of Ilsington House, son ill, staying in London. 20 Feb 1814: S. Humphreys (Chester) to Harbord (Vernon Hse.) re claims of John Robotham on property. March 1814: Richard Prichard (Langham Parsonage, Norfolk) to Harbord (Vernon Hse.) re Oxford University parliamentary candidate, Ld. Vernon's patronage, mentions [?] Wyndham (neighbour), application for [?] Bathurst] (not incumbent). 3 June 1814: H.A. Broughton (Solicitor-Marlborough St.) to Harbord (at Albion Hse., Ramsgate, Kent) re Ld. Vernon's estate, Harbord executor, including copy letter from Henry Smith (Gwernllwynchwith, [W.Glam.]) (10 Aug). 22 Aug 1814; re [Sir Samuel] Romilly "retained", Harbord's counsel for life. 11 May 1815; re court case, Ld. Ellenborough's support of Harbord's cause [?], likely result in favour of leases, tenants' test case, Mr. Justice Bailey, 31 Oct 1816: Printed circular from Col. Sir John Wodehouse (Grand Jury Chamber) to Harbord (at Ramsgate) re proposal to erect statue to Nelson. Oct 1814: sub-bundle:- 1) Ld. Jersey [5th Earl] to C.B. Wollaston re title deeds of Briton Ferry Estate (June 1814): 2) Jersey (Berkeley St.) to Harbord re Harbord's possible purchase of Briton Ferry Estate: 3) Harbord's reply (Vernon Hse.) rejecting offer: 4) Jersey's reply (at Newmarket, W. Suffolk) re Briton Ferry Estate: 23-25 April 1815: J.G. Harris to Harbord (Uddens Hse., Ringwood, Hants.) re Uddens cellar
wine and cost, writer's appointment as Deputy Judge Advocate to the Forces; (at Army Headquarters, Paris) re Harbord's renting of Uddens, events in France; re wine, Paris balls given by Duke [of Wellington] and Lady Castlereagh, review of English Army and French National Guard, King's Tuileries speech, other Paris events; re wine accounts and wine shares, Marshall Ney, Treaty of Chaumont, King and Ministry: Aug–Nov 1815: A. Buckton (London) to Harbord (Uddens Hse.) re repair of seal. 7 Aug 1815: James White (Ringwood) to Harbord [Uddens Hse.] re Harbord's laboratory experiments and problems; re writer's invention for blowing fires in iron foundries and enclosing diagram: Aug 1815: William Hawes (Strand) to Harbord (Mudeford, Christchurch, Hants.) re cost of game-keepers' bugles, request for game. 3 Oct 1815: The Rev. Edward T.S. Hornby (Warrington, S.W. Lancs.) to Harbord (at Blickling) re his recommending the Rev. Joshua Horton (sic) [Horchoyd, Yorks.?] to Middleton living in gift of [Dowager] Lady Suffield, request for Harbord's support, Horton family, Harbord's former kindness to writer. Jan 1816: Ld. Ilchester [3rd Earl] (Melbury Park, Dorset) re writer's buying Portland sheep for Harbord. 11 Sept 1816: H. Baring (Ringwood) to Harbord (Henbury Hse.) re shooting wager. 17 Dec 1816: Robert Evans (Everton, S.W. Lancs.) to Harbord (Henbury Hse.) re writer's wife's death, pupils sent home due to typhus, question of Harbord's "renewing parliamentary interest". 29 Dec 1817: also including: Dr. Edward Jenner to [H] Collins (copy letter) re smallpox vaccination. 25 Aug 1810: Pamphlet on Cowes Yacht Club, list of names incl. C.A. Pelham. 1814: Leaflet on 'Game Preserves Scheme' sent to Suffield [2nd Ld.]. April 1816: Leaflet entitled Dunkin's patent angrometer. n.d.

1 original bundle marked "1810 to 1817 no.6 examined and scheduled by R.M. Bacon"

5/1— 1 letter to the Hon. Edward Harbord dated 1817 and R.M. Bacon's notes [c.1837]


1 original bundle marked "No.27 used"

6/1— Letters to and from the Hon. Edward Harbord (including draft replies) dated Feb–Dec 1818

From: James Frampton (Moreton, Dorchester) re rules of Savings Bank. 24 Feb: The Rev. John Thomas Horton–sic [Haughton] (Rector–Middleton) to Harbord (Henbury Hse.) re death of [the Rev. Robert] Walker, request for recommendation to living. 1 March: William Castleman (Wimborne) to Harbord (Vernon Hse.) re enclosed resolutions concerning Wimborne Savings Bank [SB], mentions Ld. Shaftesbury (18 March) and enclosing 1) resolutions and list of committee members and 2) list of subscribers. 18 March: C.I. Hoare (Blandford) E. Dorset) to Harbord (Vernon Hse.) re Blandford SB and tracts [A word to the wise ...] supplied by Harbord in Dorset towns and its distribution to farmers for reading to servants, A word to the wise ... mentioned. 27 March [B: p.51]: Edward Barrett (Actuary–Blandford) to Harbord (Vernon Hse.) re Blandford SB and 6 June: A. Stuart (Blandford) re Blandford SB. 22 April: [Edmund] Newton (London Lane, Norwich) to Harbord (Henbury Hse.) re [subject?], [Thomas] Bach. 14 July: William Churchill to Harbord (Mudeford) re writer's tenant's behaviour over game, social news, health, suitable gun for Harbord. 4 Sept: [Jeremiah] Ives (Town Close, Norwich) re [Blandford] SB, benefits to poor, Norwich Savings Bank. 15 Sept: Harbord (Henbury Hse) to Ld. Sidmouth [1st Viscount] (Home Office) re mutilation of cattle, suggests reward
for and pardon of accomplice. 18 Dec [B: p.53]: [Henry] Hobhouse's reply (Permanent Under Secretary-Home Office) in acknowledgement expressing approval of suggestion. 19 Dec: Harbord's reply re crime details, reward. 20 Dec [B: p.53]: Hobhouse's reply re crime. 22 Dec: also including:- Eighth report of the Sunday School Society for Ireland for year ending April 22 1818. Bacon's notes marked "no.5 schedule 1818 and 1819".

1 original bundle marked "used"

7/1 - Letters to and from the Hon. Edward Harbord (including draft replies) and related correspondence dated Jan 1819-March 1820

Harbord—Draft of Wimborne SB rules. 1 Jan 1819: From: The Hon. Louisa Harbord (Richmond, Surrey) to Harbord (Henbury Hse.) re her annuity, family affairs, fog, Harbord's children, informational content in Suffield's [2nd Ld.] letter re annuity, latter's ill health [Harbord's sister]. 2 Jan 1819: Correspondence between Henry Francis, Joseph John Gurney and Harbord enclosed together:sub-bundle:- 1) Francis (Norwich) to Harbord (Vernon Hse.) re Norwich friends looking forward to seeing Harbord, Thomas Bach, [Jeremiah?] Ives, Robert Hawkes, imminent meetings, Harbord's wife and child [The Hon. Alfred Assheton Harbord] "doing well". 12 Feb 1819 [B: p.106]; 2) re [?], [?] Johnson, calendar of Castle prisoners, Norwich Gaol list, Norwich Gaol building, Scilly Islands committee. 10 March 1819 [B. p.106]: 3) Gurney (Earlham) inviting Harbord and Francis to dine at Earlham. 12 March 1819: 4) Harbord's reply declining, also re topics for mutual discussion between self, Francis and Gurney. n.d.: Francis to Harbord (Vernon Hse.) re list of prisoners (obverse), offences, sentence from Bridewell keeper. 8 April 1819; re prisoner numbers in County and City gaols, Poor Laws, new County Gaol and [Philip] Barnes's plans, committee's approval, Barnes help for Wodehouse's "cause" in county, reciprocity called for, Barnes and Harbord to meet. 13 April 1819; re bankruptcy of committee member due to speculation, "work on the Hill", Barnes. 24 April 1819; to Harbord (Mudeford) re possibility of setting up Mendicity Society branch in Norwich, quotes J.J. Gurney's letter: 28 July 1819: William Tooke (Bedford Row) re enclosed and distribution, Poor Laws (30 March 1819) and enclosing William Jones's circular—Society for superceding the necessity of climbing boys, by encouraging a new method of sweeping chimneys and for improving the condition of children and others employed by chimney-sweepers (1816): sub-bundle:- 1) Robert Hawkes (Norwich) to Harbord (Vernon Hse.) re letter enclosed (2) and its writer [James Fulcher], "a staunch friend to our cause", Castle Chaplain's seeking help from Harbord for 2 prisoners, writer's opposition. 3 April 1819: 2) James Fulcher (London) to Hawkes re need for Harbord's help in obtaining post for son at Somerset House, Treasury or a "mercantile house": 28 March 1819: Edmund Wodehouse (Breccles, Norfolk) re Game Laws, spring guns, injury to woman on Gunton estate. March 1819: William Simpson (St. Giles St., Norwich) to Harbord (Vernon Hse.) re [County Gaol] Committee, propriety of Barnes's conduct, plan, [William] Wilkins' prison plan, estimates. 1 April 1820: re Committee report. 15 April 1820; re Harbord's appointment to County Gaol Committee, Committee aims-gaol enlargement, "classification" and inspection of prisoners, architects and submission of plans. 24 April 1819 [B p.106]: re Committee and Harbord's suggestions. 9 May 1819 [B: pp.126-9]: Philip Barnes (All Saints, [Norwich?]) to Harbord (Vernon Hse.) re County Gaol plans (not encl.), adapt castle or new site?. April 22 1819: Summary of proposition from Messrs. Thomas and Storey to Bowles re Shaftesbury election, mentions Ld. Rosebery's tenants and agent—[Charles] Bowles. 18 Feb 1820: [Abraham] Moore (Salisbury, Wilts.) to Harbord (Henbury) re election, need for Harbord to bring "qualification" being the "landlord's candidate". 5 March 1820: J.E. Gordon (Duke St. [?]) re Harbord's letter, Bill [?], need for frank. March 1820: The Rev. Charles Heath (Bailie
[House-Sturminster Marshall Parsonage, Wimborne) to Harbord (Vernon Hse.)
re new school house in [Corfe Mullen] 25 May 1820; re enlargement of [Corfe
Mullen] Church, [William] Churchill (landlord) and (?) Willett, church attendance,
conversion of meeting-house into a poor house, gratitude to Harbord. 17 June
1820 [Curate-Corfe Mullen, E. Dorset c.1819-22 and later Rector-Guntun,
Hanworth and Suffield, Norfolk 1828-1864]: William West (Shaftesbury) to
Harbord (London) re corn laws, suggests alleviation of rents burden, tax
reduction on "agriculturalists". 30 May 1820: The Rev. James John Hornby
(Rector-Winwick, Warrington) to Harbord (Vernon Hse.) re brother [The Rev.
E.T.S. Hornby?]. Harbord's interest in "refuge" in Lancs., writer's unintended
offence to Lady Grosvenor due to necessity to invite Ld. Wilton be a a vice­
president [Rector-Northrepps, Norfolk 1806-1813]. 16 June 1820: Harbord
(Vernon Hse.) to Lady Anne Hamilton re willingness to present address to Queen
Caroline on behalf of Shaftesbury inhabitants. 11 July 1820: 2 statements re
Blandford Savings Bank. July 1820: D. Gillingham (Mayor-Shaftesbury) to
Harbord (London) re presentation of petition to Queen Caroline. 5 Oct 1820:
4 documents (accounts and receipts) and covering letter from the Superintendent
of Male Refuge (Hoxton, Middx.) to Harbord (Vernon Hse.). 1820: also includ­
ing: Thomas Starkie (Inner Temple) to [Edward
Boole Wilbraham MP [later 1st
Ld. Skelmersdale] (Portland Place) re printed circular on Lancaster Castle Prison.
24 June 1820: Address delivered in the Exchange Room in Manchester to a
general meeting convened by the Borough Reeve and Constables on Wednesday,
December 11, 1811 for the purpose of taking into consideration the expediency
of founding schools on the plan of Dr. [The Rev. Andrew] Be/
re history of education, local situation, evaluation of systems.
8/1- Letters to and from the Hon. Edward Harbord (including draft replies)
dated March-Nov 1819

Correspondence (mainly re electioneering) between 1) Joseph John Gurney and 2)
Henry Francis and Harbord (at Park Place-March / Henbury and Mudeford-Sept)
dated March-Nov 1819 and enclosed together-sub-bundle: Harbord to
Gurney re Norwich Council ward elections and corruption, General Elections,
mentions Lushington and Samuel Hoare. 20 March [B: pp.71-2]: Gurney's reply
(Earlham Hall, Norfolk) re ward election-corrupt electioneering practices and
similarity with General Elections, joint party action needed, bribery legality?,
mentions Joseph Gurney [uncle], Lushington and Hoare, Scilly Islands. 22 March
[B: pp.72-3]: Harbord's reply re electioneering practices, possible preventive
measures - joint party action, London Scilly Islands Commitee, Ld. Exmouth,
fishing employment. 23 March: Gurney's reply re his general agreement with
Harbord's letter on capital punishment. 23 March: Harbord re electioneering
practices, plan of action, mentions [Samuel] Gurney [J.J. Gurney's brother],
Lushington, Hoare, understanding with Gurney family, joint declaration, Francis,
praises [F.E.] Gordon, Criminal Code revision committee meeting. 27 March:
Gurney (at Hunstanton, Norfolk) re writer's activities, Francis and signatories to
joint party declaration, further action, Mendicity meeting, local gentry, religious
thoughts, Ld. Rosebery, Holkham marriage [Eliza Grace Coke to Henry Venables
Vernon?], George [Charles] Vernon and wife attending, Harbord's mixing busin­
ess with pleasure. 16 Aug [B: pp.79-80]: Gurney (Norwich) re Priscilla's [his
sister] illness, opposition to joint party declaration, prison discipline, Harbord
and wife's impending visit, thoughts on life and religion. 11 Sept [B: pp.80-1]:
Gurney (Earlham Hall) re Harbord's visit, agreement on Peterloo, thoughts on
politics, Norwich [County] meeting, Peterloo, why non-attendance, "radicals ... 
extremely mischievous"-circulation of tracts amongst poor, Medusa-"Tom Paine
is innocence compared with it", anticipates lack of support for Harbord by Norwich Tories, Harbord's "whiggism", promise of own support, religious thoughts. 23 Sept; Gurney (Norwich) re Francis, electioneering problems, Harbord's family and baby's good health, girls "so finely", praise for Harbord, thoughts on religion and life, recent County Meeting and Harbord's conduct, resulting problems, enclosures (not. encl.), praises Harbord, Tory Alderman [Thomas] Thurtell's approval of Harbord's politics, Bible Society. 9 Nov: Francis (Norwich) re corrupt electioneering practices and problems in eradication. 27 March: Harbord's reply re joint party co-operation as solution, election reform postponement, Mendicity and Scilly Islands Committees, prison visiting, prisoners' offences—information needed, Duke of York's debts. 29 March [B: pp.77-8]: Francis re Harbord's speech on Peterloo at County Meeting and consequences—loss of Tory party support, parties' attitudes to Harbord [illegible section]. 27 Nov [B: pp.95-6]: Col. Sir John Wodehouse (Witton Park, Norfolk) re Norfolk Declaration. 8 Nov [B: p.88].

9/1— Letters to and from the Hon. Edward Harbord (including draft reply) dated April 1819—Nov 1820

From: sub-bundle:— 1) Harbord (Vernon Hse.) to [?] Clive re Harbord's wish to receive Lt. Sidmouth concerning James Belcham, prisoner condemned to death. 5 April 1819: 2) J.J. Gurney (Norwich) to Harbord (Vernon Hse.) re Belcham, writer's faith, praise of Harbord, questionable efficacy of capital punishment, execution, Scilly Islands. 10 April 1819: 3) re Aylsham Bridewell improvements and Harbord's efforts, turnkey, electioneering "man-buying", Robert Harvey's death, criticism of [Henry?] Francis and [William?] Foster (party before principles), sister's (Louisa Hoare) illness, Gurney's book-publishing problems, fisheries. 18 Jan 1820 [B: p.116]: Joseph Geldart (Norwich) to Harbord (Vernon Hse.) re writer's application for consulship at Odessa, previous opposition to Harbord but a "reluctant opponent". 9 July 1819: William Simpson (Town Clerk and Treasurer of County—Norwich) to Harbord (Mudeford) re building of gaol and financial estimates, Marsham Elwin and Col. Wodehouse. 31 July 1819: Lt. Grosvenor (Eaton Hall, Cheshire) re agreement with Harbord on unspecified subjects [Peterloo?], marriage of son [Richard, Viscount Belgrave, later 2nd Marquess of Westminster], mentions Lt. and Lady. Stafford, Lt. Gower, Wrexham Races. 6 Oct 1819: Suffield (2nd Lt.) (at Gunton) re Harbord's intention to stand for Shaftesbury—"you are fortunate in finding a place, where no questions are asked as to political principles and no money required". 20 Feb 1820: Sir Robert J. Buxton (Shadwell Lodge, Brettenham, Norfolk) re Harbord's letter via newspaper, County Gaol, County rate, distress of tenantry. 6 Nov 1820 [B: pp.127-8]: William Blake (Swanton Abbot, Norfolk) re Aylsham Bridewell, prisoners, work, discharge and "classification" (of debtors). 24 Nov 1820: also including:— printed copy of Norfolk Declaration signed by Lt. Suffield [2nd Lt. in capacity of Lord Lieutenant], 4th Earl of Orford, T.T. Berney, C.H. Wodehouse, J.T. Mott, Thomas Cubitt, Hamond Alpe, re their refusal to support proposed County Meeting to protest against Peterloo massacre, with written amendments by Harbord. 25 Oct 1819: Bacon's notes marked "no.7 schedule 1819—1820".

1 bundle (not original)

10/1— Letters to the Hon. Edward Harbord dated Sept—Dec 1819

From: Seth William Stevenson (Norwich) to Harbord (Mudeford) re Harbord's letter on prison discipline printed in Norfolk Chronicle. 3 Sept: John Twigg (Norwich Courier Office, London) to Harbord (Vernon Hse.) re reporting of
County Meeting. 5 Nov: Edmund Newton (Norwich) acknowledging authorship of letter in Norwich paper on Harbord's speech (delivered 29 Oct). 5 Nov: W.B. Cooke (Wheatley, Doncaster, Yorks., W.R.) to Harbord (Henbury Hse.) re resignation as Colonel of the 3rd West York Militia due to "Manchester business" [Peterloo], its "cruelty and illegality", Harbord's information on the poor. (5 Dec) and enclosing copy letter to Ld. Lascelles. 5 Dec: Sir Henry Beevor (Norwich) to Harbord (Henbury Hse.) expressing gratitude for unspecified favour. 15 Dec.

1 original bundle

11/1- Letters to and from the Hon. Edward Harbord (including draft replies) dated Oct 1820-May 1821

From: sub-bundle:- 1) Harbord to Stephen Lushington re decision to disassociate self from Cobbett and Cartwright, seeks advice: 2) 'Inhabitants of Middleton' to Harbord (Vernon Hse.) re Harbord's recent visit to Middleton, his concern for its welfare, request for Lushington, Harbord, Cobbett and Cartwright to deliver petition to Queen, Cobbett's rôle in averting "outright rebellion", Middleton's loyalty. 1 Oct 1820 and enclosing petition (19 Sept 1820): 3) [unsigned] to Harbord (Vernon Hse.) requesting him to solicit persons listed. 4 Oct 1820: 4) Harbord's reply re Middleton address (petition), Lushington engaged for Queen, Cobbett's role in averting "outright rebellion", Middleton's loyalty. I Oct 1820 and enclosing petition (19 Sept 1820):

Correspondence between Harbord (Henbury Hse. and Vernon Hse.) and Amos Ogden (Fielding Row, Middleton) dated Nov 1820-Feb 1821 [B: pp.130-131]:

Ogden to Harbord re Harbord's letter of 9 Nov [1820] (missing), regret about Cobbett's access to Harbord's letters, disagreement with Harbord on Cobbett, Ogden's views on Cobbett, aristocracy, poor, local authorities, parl. corruption, corn laws, Combination Acts, Bank of England, commodity prices, Cartwright "venerable father of reform", choice of Cobbett and Cartwright to represent Middleton's deputation to Queen Caroline, saddened that Harbord ("Ld. Suffield") refuses to be a representative, Cobbett's comments on Harbord's Shaftesbury seat, Ogden's view that "independent gentlemen like you can improve House", Middleton people's wish for radical reform, hope that Harbord on their side, weavers present prospects—good, "provision prices"—low. 30 Nov 1820 [B: p. 130]: Harbord re letter had earlier sent to Ogden, opinions expressed related to Cobbett not Cartwright, differences between Harbord and Cobbett over reform, criticism of Cobbett's methods, refutation of Cobbett's charges over alleged buying of Shaftesbury seat, prison reform, criminal code, police, Poor Laws, "my radicalism"—public knowledge since 1818 Norwich Meeting, reform process—likely to be slow. 9 Dec 1820 [B: pp.100,130]: re explanation of reform principles puzzling to Ogden, aims, present "bad government", education reform necessary to end society's evils, Cobbett's Political register, agricultural problems, warning to Ogden—"be peaceable and finally reasonable in your desires". 9 Jan 1821:

Ogden re criminal code pamphlet, Cobbett and Political register, reform and benefits—"intolerable hardships ... endured", aristocracy, silk trade, farmers, "Peel's bill" [Peel's Act 1819/Peel (2nd Bt.)—Chairman of cash payments committee], Commons' seats abuses. 9 Jan 1821: Harbord re return of letters (only meant for Ogden and friends), anxiety about first letter's contents being voted upon. 16 Jan 1821; re annoyance over unnecessary public exposure, non-return of letters, Commons—proper forum for debate (2 copy letters). 30 Jan 1821: Ogden's reply re Harbord's letters [dates given] not shown to committee, annoyance at Harbord's letter (16 Jan) requesting return, reform, need for aristocracy to act, Middleton trade—good, people—must "regain their lost rights". 6 Feb: Harbord re reform, regrets mistake as wrote hastily and ideas made public, anxiety. 8 Feb 1821; re letters, Cobbett, "reform ... that it may be advanced speedily, effectively, temperally, wisely and beneficially for all ranks of society". 12 Feb 1821; acknowledges return of all but one of letters, horror of contents
Correspondence between Harbord and James Scholes (Stakehill, Thornham, nr. Middleton, S. E. Lancs.) dated Feb-undated 1821 and enclosed together: sub-bundle- 1) Scholes re Address to Queen, choice of Cobbett and Cartwright, Ogden overruled, Ld. Grosvenor's speech pending her trial, Stakehill leasehold farmers, [Theophilus] Smith, evils in church and state, Biblical quotes and parallels, Queen and persecution, National Debt, parliamentary reform, [Peterloo events], population growth and Malthus, Political register, "Peel's bill" [Peel's Act 1819] paper note circulation, his becoming "firm radical" following Peterloo meeting, Scholes's family-tenants for 100 years of Harbord's family [Asshetons and Suffields]. 15 Feb 1821: 2) Harbord's reply (Vemon Hse.) re Scholes' comments on Ld. Grosvenor, satisfaction at Middleton reformers opinion of self, Criminal Code, prison discipline-his main on-going concern. 20 Feb 1821: 3) Scholes re Harbord's walking in "so exalted a sphere", inclusion of Cobbett and Cartwright in presentation of address to Queen, praise of their work, Harbord's support of Middleton reformers. n.d.: Nicholas Whitworth (Manchester) to Harbord (Vernon Hse.) re enclosed petition for Harbord (addressed "Ld. Suffield") to forward to [John Cam] Hobhouse, Peterloo massacre and wounded, writer's figures of killed and wounded. 5 May 1821: William Butterworth (Thornham, Middleton) re enclosed petition for Harbord to present [on Peterloo], and request for copies be given to Lushington and [Sir Francis] Burdett, with added note by Amos Ogden. 11 May 1821.

1 original bundle

12/1– Letters to and from the Hon. Edward Harbord / 3rd Lord Suffield (including draft replies) and related correspondence dated Feb 1821- Dec 1823

Cubitt (Ipswich) re Aylsham Bridewell and plan of alterations, tread wheel system of prison discipline. 13 March 1822: Suffield (Lower Grosvenor St.) to W. Hase [spelled Haze] [Saxthorpe, Aylsham] re device for employment of prisoners. 12 May 1822: sub-bundle:- 1) Edwin Thrackston (Scilly Islands) to F.E. Gordon re needed to establish fishing industry in Ireland, Scilly Islands [Sc.Is.] situation, enclosure (not encl.). 21 May 1822: 2) Thrackston to Suffield re Gordon’s letter, committee meeting. 21 May 1822: Thrackston (at Bristol) to Suffield re naval promotion problems, Sc.Is.’s economic problems, Sc.Is. Committee. 10 Oct 1823: Suffield’s endorsement of circular – W. Wither’s (Holt) printed Statement on Tithe. On the increase of the relative value of tithe ... 23 May 1822: William Tooke (Grays Inn) re enclosed, Mendicity Society. Suffield’s illness, chimney sweeps (17 July 1822) and enclosing H. Bodkin (Mendicity Office) re gratitude for support. 1 July: sub-bundle:- 1) S. Hoare (London) re building of gaol, [A.R.] Barclay and gaol location, annoyance to Suffield, writer’s wife Louisa’s visit to Earlham—“bitter and sweet mixed in that cup”. 17 July 1822: 2) re prison committee. Barclay’s objections, writer’s opinion of Nicholas Vansittart [Chancellor of the Exchequer], [Thomas Powell] Buxton, Suffield’s health. 23 July 1822: 3) A.R. Barclay and Abraham Rawlinson to [Marsham] Elwin re new gaol plans, Suffield’s health. 20 July 1822: T.W. Coke (Holkham Hall) re his missing Suffield, present of buck and enclosing Coke’s order for delivery of buck. 7 Aug 1822, re meeting, [subject?], support for Suffield’s proposal [to set up Norfolk General Committee for the Better Preservation of Lives from Shipwreck?] 12 Nov 1823: Ld. Dalhousie [9th Earl] (Brechin Castle, Angus) re wish to promote Society [?], hopes Suffield will visit Scotland. 10 Sept 1822: sub-bundle:- 1) P. Barnes to C. Brown (King St., Norwich) re existing Gaol and Bridewell estimate, cost of new site. 18 Sept 1822: 2) Brown to Suffield re new Gaol site, decision, mentions Charles Harvey, R.M. Bacon. 26 Sept 1822: William Crawford (St. Mary at Hill) re The Inquirer, articles on Poor Laws, asks Suffield to approach H. Bodkin. 9 Nov 1822: L.B. Allen re Police Bill [1821], salaries. 7 Dec 1822: Suffield to Sir Jacob Astley (later 16th Ld. Hastings) re refusal to grant Astley’s request that he preserve foxes at Gunton. 6 July 1823: Ld. Belgrave [Richard, Viscount Belgrave (later 2nd Marquess of Westminster)] (Eaton Hall, Cheshire) re guardianship of Suffield’s children. 12 July 1823: The Rev. W.M. Bradford (Hall Place, Beaconsfield, S. Bucks.) re Harbord’s (sic Edward’s) progress at school and enclosing itemised half–yearly account for his education [the Hon. Edward Vernon Harbord later 4th Ld. Suffield]. 28 July 1823: William Cooke (Brome Hall, Norfolk) re deaths of Dowager Lady Suffield and Lady Vernon. July 1823: [T.?] Gray’s (Norwich) itemised inventory (by room) of furnishings and furniture ordered for Gunton House. July 1823: Freeman’s (Swan Lane, Norwich) re cleaning of pictures for Lady Suffield, incl. a “Sir Joshua”. Aug 1823: Correspondence enclosed together and labelled Prison Discipline. sub-bundle- 1) John Glasse (Burnham, Norfolk) re Suffield’s efforts concerning prison discipline and requesting help for Newgate prisoner. 21 Aug 1823: 2) J. Postle (Colney) re Wymondham Bridewell, Suffield’s and Elwins’s recommendations being acted upon. 3 Oct 1823: 3) Suffield to S. Hoare (Lombard St.) re enclosed notes on whippings prisoners. n.d.; 4) Suffield’s notes on 4 Geo 4 cap. 64. Adam Taylor (Orford Hill, Norwich) re imprisonment for debt of John Bacon of Ingworth (8 Sept 1823) enclosing copy of Court of Exchequer Schedule of the Pipe Roll for Nihilfed Debts in Norfolk: Cromer and Mundesley Life Boat Committee—suggestions of J.J. Gurney (10 Sept 1823) and enclosed 1) Committee accounts and expenses (1821-1823): 2) Note re finances of Cromer life boat: William Hase re device and tables for submission to Committee for Saving Seamen in Distress re device. 1 Oct 1823: George Jarvis (Aylsham) requesting to Suffield to become President of local branch of British and Foreign Bible Society. 27 Oct 1823: Col. Sir John Wodehouse (Necton, Norfolk) expressing support for proposal [to set up Norfolk General Committee for the Better Preservation of Lives from Shipwreck?] 12 Nov 1823: The Rev. Joseph Selkirk (Ashworth, Rochdale, S.E. Lancs.) re solemnisation of marriages in Ashworth
chapel (Middleton parish). 9 Dec 1823: also including:— Printed circular (annotated) re Shaftesbury Mendicity Society. 1 Oct 1821: Printed circular re formation of United Universities Club, signed [George] Lamb. 29 Aug 1821: John Channon (Secretary—Union Club, London) to Suffield re club’s formation. 29 Aug 1821: Circular letter re membership (1 Sept 1821) with enclosed prospectus: Note re Suffield’s subscription for Asylum for Deaf and Dumb. 8 Nov 1822: Coloured map of gardens at St. Giles’ Gates, Norwich labelled by Suffield Plan of ground for new prison Norwich: Nov 1822: Itemised list of game killed at Holkham. 1822: Lady Cardigan re Suffield’s purchase of house in Arlington St., subject to Ld. Tavistock’s lease. n.d.: 1 original bundle marked "no.8 examined and scheduled by R.M.Bacon"

13/1— Letters to and from Lord Suffield (including draft replies) dated Feb 1821—Dec 1822

From: Suffield to [Wilson Committee] re fund for Sir Robert Wilson [dismissed from Army following Peterloo massacre]. 25 Feb 1821 [B: pp.131–2]: T.W. Coke (Holkham Hall) re Suffield’s pamphlet [on tenancy, agricultural problems], County Meeting, visit of Duke of Sussex to Holkham, invitation to Suffield. 29 Dec 1821 [B: pp.150–1]: re County Meeting, agricultural distress: 3 Jan 1822: ‘Philo’ (Nth. Walsham) to Suffield (Jordans Hotel, St. James St.) re enclosed poem (16 Feb) and enclosing Lines addressed to Lord Suffield on his coming to reside in Norfolk (24 Jan 1822): John Buckley (Middleton) re Suffield’s speech at County Meeting on 12 Jan 1822 on Peterloo, parliamentary reform, Commons—"that mass of corruption", landed classes’ increased support for reform, Middleton ‘reformers’ effectively ‘radicals’, writer’s partial approval of Whig reformers, Suffield’s recent visit to Middleton, Suffield compared with local gentry. 11 Feb [B: pp.159–160] and Suffield’s reply (Vernon Hse.) expressing gratitude. 15 Feb 1822: Ld. Dacre [Thomas Brand, 20th Ld.] (The Hoo, [Welwyn, Herts.]) re holding of Suffield’s proxy, writer’s health. 16 Feb 1822 [B: pp.158–9]: Suffield to ‘The High Sheriff’ [Sir Richard Paul Jodrell?] re County Meeting to discuss parliamentary reform, opinions, his non-attendance. 5 May 1822: Suffield (at Lower Grosvenor St., London) to Shaftesbury [Borough] expressing gratitude for gift of snuff box (not Suffield’s hand). 9 May 1822: Sir Thomas B. Beevor (Hargham, Norfolk) re County Meeting, determination to introduce reform question, criticism of Tories’ tactics. 18 Dec 1822. [B: p.170].

1 bundle (not original)

14/1— Letters to and from Lord Suffield (including draft replies) dated Aug–Sept 1821

Enclosed together:— from: 1) Henry Bathurst (Archdeacon of Norwich–North Creake, Burnham, Norfolk) re benefits from Suffield’s elevation to peerage (5 Aug) and 2) Suffield’s reply (Henbury Hse.) in acknowledgement, awareness of new responsibility. 30 Aug: Suffield (Henbury Hse.) to Col. Sir John Wodehouse resigning command of 1st Regiment of East Norfolk Local Militia Rifle Corps, also re refusal to take military post under present government. 25 Aug [B: pp. 141–2]: [James] Scholes (Stakehill) to Suffield (Henbury Hse.) re widow’s request for help to obtain son’s discharge from regiment. 4 Sept: Charles Bowles (Recorder—Shaftesbury) to Suffield (Henbury Hse.) incl. covering letter mentioning Aldermen [J] Bennett and Hannen and and Address from Shaftesbury inhabitants expressing gratitude. 8 Sept [B: pp.146–7] and Suffield’s reply expressing gratitude for Address and inviting Deputies to dinner. 9 Sept: John Jones (Shaftesbury) re meeting and Address by Bowles, disapproval of Bennett, Hannen and Gillingham of Ld. Grosvenor’s “interest at your election”, Queen’s
supporters' refusal to sign Address. 8 Sept [B: pp.144-5]: T.W. Coke (Holkham Hall) re Suffield's wish to be appointed Chairman of the Quarter Sessions. 29 Sept [B: p.149].

1 bundle (not original)

15/1—

Letters to Lord Suffield dated Sept 1821–Aug 1823

From: Col. Sir John Wodehouse (Kimberley Hall, Norfolk) re Suffield's resignation from 1st Regiment-East Norfolk Militia. 5 Sept: James Sharpe (North Walsham, Norfolk) re payment of wages to agricultural labourers on Sundays and resulting problems, shops et al. that stay open, wants magistrates to fine shopkeepers. 11 Oct: 1821: A.W. Hall (Southwark, Surrey) re Sir Robert Wilson's dismissal from Army, seeks Suffield's support for fund. 23 Feb: George Chetwynd (Gt. George St., Westminster) re Vagrant Bill and Game Laws, seeks Suffield's support. 14 March 1822: F. Howard (Ottery St. Mary, Devon) re repeal of Bread Act. August 1823: Ld. Liverpool [2nd Earl] re possible further action on [subject?]-ie sending Suffield's papers on to Bd. of Customs?.

9 May: Suffield (Lower Grosvenor St.) to Dowager Lady Suffield re her rejection of Suffield as a residence, furniture sale to go ahead. 20 May [B: pp.185-6]: Edward Taylor (Norwich) re next County Meeting, Suffield's earlier speech on "agricultural distress", writer's criticism of exclusion of parliamentary reform as subject for discussion, considers other counties got priorities right, looks to Suffield for leadership. 18 Dec [B: pp.166-170]: Thomas Starling Norgate [Editor-East Anglian] (Hethersett, Norfolk) re County Meeting- parliamentary reform, pledge not to introduce subject, majority gave way, asks Suffield to bypass Committee discussion and to propose his resolution on reform. 23 Dec: S. Lushington re Suffield's query, Glebe Exchange and consolidating of Gunton Rectory and Hanworth Vicarage, interpretation of Act (55 G3 cap.147). 1822:

1822: Robert Peel [later Sir Robert] (Home Office) re Prison Act and Thetford Assizes (unsigned). 11 Aug: R.M. Bacon (Costessey, Norfolk) covering letter and enclosing newspaper article (8 Oct) re ecclesiastical court: 1823: also including:— R. Buckton (Ashstead, Birmingham) re road repairing, pebble breaking machine and specifications. n.d.: Bacon's notes marked "no.7 schedule 1821, 1823 & 1822".

1 original bundle marked "used"

16/1—

Letters to and from the Hon. Edward Harbord / 3rd Lord Suffield dated 1807, Oct 1821–Aug 1823 and Jan–Dec 1832

abolition of slavery, Ld. Goderich, colonial authorities' attitude in ignoring British government in treatment of freeborn, lack of religious teaching and education for them, need to notify Lords committee. 16 May: Henry Crosley (Camberwell, Surrey) re employment of slaves, Anti-Slavery Society committee, wants Suffield's patronage for enclosed (1 June) enclosing Crosley's *Observations on the production of sugar by free labour*. Henry Dover (at Christchurch) re [Norfolk] Quarter Sessions (Criminal Court). 20 June: John Baker (Mundesley, Norfolk) to Suffield (Vernon Hse.) re county politics review, Norwich yeomanry committee meeting to choose candidate, mentions E. Lombe, [Richard Hanbury] Gurney, [E.G.] Keppel's letter and expenses problem re E. Norfolk candidacy, Tory opposition expected, need for money, mentions others to be asked—William Beecham (sic) [Beauchamp-Proctor], William [Howe] Windham and William L. Bulwer, excludes [John?] Weyland unpopular as voted against Reform Bill, worry over Suffield's possible support for Weyland would "divide interest" and strengthen "the old Tory faction". 24 June; re Weyland, county politics, canvassing in Hundred, Windham, Reform Bill, Tories, confidence concerning Hundreds of Tunstead, Happing, and own [North Erpingham?]. 22 July: The Rev. Edward Edwards (Marsden Parsonage, Huddersfield, Yorks., W.R.) re achievements at Marsden, seeks offer of vacancy at Middleton [S.E. Lancs.] or Aldborough [Norfolk] due to wife's health. 6 July: William Frere (at Malta) re writer's turn as Chairman of Norfolk Sessions postponed, mentions Copeman, Weyland, [Henry] Dover, congratulates Suffield on Norwich Assize Bill, opposition. 27 July: Edward Buller (Dilhorn Hall, Cheadle, Staffs.) requesting support for N. Staffs. candidacy, supports parliamentary reform and present government. 4 Aug: Sir John Peter Boileau (at Tunbridge Wells, Kent [Ketteringham Hall, Norfolk]) re writer's cousin, Edward Buller's candidacy—member of old Whig family, writer's Holkham visit, full employment of local poor, effect of Poor Law administration, worry over young Tory candidate's inexperience (8 Aug) and enclosing Suffield's reply re Gunton visit, Lady Suffield's pregnancy [Emily], illness of Coke and wife. 23 Aug: Edward Cole (Norwich) requesting Suffield's patronage of Norfolk and Norwich National School Society. 8 Aug: C. Bowles (Shaftesbury) re Bill to repeal Acts relating to bribery and corrupt practices in election of MPs—needs speedy implementation, Penrhyn [Edward G.D. Penrhyn-Shaftesbury MP, later Ld. Pennant] and opponents' actions, [subject?], public and beer houses evils. 12 Aug: Joseph Brotherton (Salford, nr. Manchester) re writer's support for candidacy of J.W. Wood with Ld. Molyneux for S. Lancs. constituency, writer's own candidacy for Salford and support. 16 Aug: T.W. Coke (Holkham Hall) re [?]. 26 Oct; re [?]. (11 Nov) and enclosing Sir James E. Graham (1st Ld. of the Admiralty) to Coke re Norfolk Marines Association and Lt. Harmer (Graham's hand and marked "private"). 9 Nov: sub-bundle:—1) Suffield to [?] re O'Reilly's case, House of Lords Slavery Committee, colonial witnesses and perjury, Suffield's evidence [B: pp.390-1]: 2) re O'Reilly case: 3) R.M. Bacon (Costessey) re O'Reilly's speech; 4) Bacon re O'Reilly: Nov 1832: Peter Clare (Manchester) re letter received from Joseph Brotherton concerning problems over William Burge and Oldham candidacy, Joseph Sturge and letter from James Cropper of Liverpool, George Thompson to lecture at Oldham, writer's many arrangements and activities in support of abolition—"Holy Cause", Theophilus Smith [Agent/Steward—Middleton Hall], Oldham votes "engaged", James Stephen's entering contest. 1 Dec; re meeting with Theophilus Smith, Burge, estimated voting figures for Cobbett and [John] Fielden, B.A. Bright and Burge, Stephen too late, anti-slavery meeting, George Thompson's speech, Burge and slavery. 4 Dec: Elizabeth Fry (at Northrepps Hall, Norfolk) re enclosed tracts of Society for Preventing the Punishment of Death, Report of British Society of Ladies for the Reformation of Female Prisoners to Lady Suffield, hopes Lady Suffield will become patron of committee for visiting Wymondham prisoners, her gifts of Biblical books to Suffield's children, respect for his views. 21 Dec: 1832 also including 6 other miscellaneous enclosures:—1-4) Notes re oats by Suffield: 5) Ld. Castleragh [Viscount, later 2nd Marquess of
Londonderry (Downing St.) to Edward Harbord re letter Harbord also wrote to Huskisson, electioneering, problems of Harbord standing with Lushington as Yarmouth candidates, Lushington-"not a friend to government" (Sec. of State-War & Colonies). 1807: B: p.30: 6 Marked list of 49 MPs: William Crawford (Southampton) to S. Hoare re American methods of punishing prisoners, crime increase, English prison conditions, Criminal Law reform, capital punishment. 23 June 1832: 2 letters (labelled Election Matters by Suffield) from R.M. Bacon (Costessey) to Suffield (Vernon Hse.) (illegible). 1) dated 17 July 1832 and 2) n.d.

I original bundle marked "no.4 examined and scheduled 1832 by R.M. Bacon"

17/1 - Letters to and from Lord Suffield (including draft replies) and associated correspondence dated Jan 1822-Dec 1825

From: H. Sefton (Stockport, nr. Manchester) re writer's invention of a "steam vessel of war" and requesting financial aid. 6 Jan: 1822: Correspondence from Lt. Edwin Thrackston R.N. (St. Mary's, Scilly Isles) to Suffield dated Jan-May 1823: re Scilly Islands (Sc.is.) fisheries, funding ending, distress, writer's employment, co-operative fishing scheme with Ireland?, suggestions, writer's brother's death due to long service in East and West Indies, Suffield's kindness to writer's brother [B: pp.113-4]; re need for Sc.is. fisheries to be administered on a national basis, re-iteration of potential in Irish link; (at Greek St., Soho) expressing thanks for Suffield's letter.

Printed circular re "Greek Cause", list of names. 8 March: enclosed together: 1) F.S. Barlee (County Gaol, Ipswich, E. Suffolk) re marital problems, action taken; 2) re receipt of Suffield's letter, considers he is misinformed, she persecuted and her rights unprotected; 3) The Rev. Thomas Methold (Cranstey, Kettering, Northants.) re Mrs. Barlee's case. April-May 1823: William Keer Brown (Crettingham, nr. Framlingham, E. Suffolk) re enclosed and setting up of Ipswich sub-committee on 24 Feb. (11 March) and enclosing 1) John Bowring (Greek Committee Room, Crown and Anchor Inn, Strand) re setting up of Norfolk Branch sub-committee, Suffield (offered self as Honorary Secretary), sufferings of Greeks. 4 March: 2) Printed circular (8 March) re Greek Cause with list of names: George Charles Vernon [later 4th Ld. Vernon] (at Malta) re help from Spanish Committee for 3 Spaniards. 20 March: W. Thorold (Gt. Nelson, Wymondham, Norfolk) to Edmond Wodehouse MP (London) re "improved reel", Norfolk General Committee of the National Association for the Better Preservation of Lives from Shipwreck, mentions Col. Petre, Wheatley and Lt. Rust. 3 May: [Sir?] Thomas Fowell Buxton (Spitalfields, Stepney, Middx.) re horse, [?] Bond, J.J. Gurney's praise of Lady Suffield-"he speaks unspeakable things". 6 May: Colonel Sir John Wodehouse (Witton Hall) re Wheatley's Cup, subscriptions, Lady Suffield's health, [W.] Thorold's letter and Wheatley. 10 Aug: R. Plumtre (Norwich) re Henry Cooper's premature death, and help for family. 25 Oct: James Butterworth (Coldhurst, Oldham, S.E. Lancs.) re writer's book about Ashton-Under-Lyme [S.E. Lancs.] and resulting financial problems, Earl of Stamford and dedication. 2 Nov: enclosed together: 1) William a' Beckett re resolutions passed at general meeting of subscribers to North Walsham and Dilham Canal [NW & DCAct (4 Nov 1824) and enclosing committee meeting proceedings signed by chairman, John Butterworth: 2) Suffield to [?]

Deymes (Nth. Walsham) re acquisition of shares in NW & DC. 28 Oct 1824: Ld. Belgrave (Eaton Hall) re Gunton shooting-"best shooting in that feathered county", requests help in choice of game-keeper, Eaton-much improved, mentions Gen. Grosvenor, parents, Knowsley shooting, Wiltons, Robert (son); re employment terms for new gamekeeper procured by Suffield, his acting on father's behalf, Eaton's game. Nov-Dec: Armine Wodehouse (Barnham Broom, Wymondham) re enclosed from natural son of Henry Hobart, solicitor requests support from Suffield (16 Nov) and enclosing Hobart's letter (Bethel St.,
Norwich) requesting introduction to Suffield, assumes Suffield will carry Bill for
enclosure of Roughton Heath unopposed, with added note by Suffield emphasising
total opposition. 13 Nov: Barclay Mounteney (Newman St.) re Norfolk family
link, biography of Napoleon, mentions Ld. Holland. 24 Dec: Henry Wood MP
(South Audley St.) re enclosed circular (31 Dec) and enclosing printed appeal
circular—Meeting of the friends of the liberty of the press and its faithful
advocates (24 Dec) endorsed with Suffield’s draft reply: 1824: enclosed
together:- 1) John H. Freese (Old Broad St.) re enclosed and likely benefits,
unscrupulous bread makers, wants Suffield as president and enclosing Prospectus
of Metropolitan Flour and Bread Company re bread manufacture: 2) Suffield’s
reply re need for time to consider project: 3) Freese re decision not to establish
company: Jan: enclosed together:- 1) Suffield to Ld. Lauderdale (Admiral of the
Red) expressing gratitude for help given to Mr. Playford (Northrepps), comments
on latter, Suffield to inform local Committee of Shipwreck Association, mentions
Lt. Gen. Sir Herbert Taylor, Duke of York; 2) expressing gratitude for his
putting forward his own recommendations on Playford’s behalf, and to Duke of
York: 3) Robert W. Playford (Northrepps) expressing gratitude to Suffield:
March—April: 4) Henry Playford (Northrepps) re desired promotion of son,
Robert to Lt., 24th Regt., Kilkenny. Nov 29 1825: Sir Richard Birnie (Police
Magistrate—The Public Office, Bow St.) re personal disassociation with Equitable
Loan Company. 3 May: The Rev. James Archer (Middleton School) re school
Regulations Bill, American economic threat, tax burden, corn prices. June:
Charles Godfrey Mundy (Burton Hall, Loughborough, Leics.) re Suffield and
mutual friendship, family matters. 30 June: David Holt (Chorlton New Mills,
Manchester) re employees’ age structure in his factory (i.e. over and under 16),
Suffield’s inspection of cotton factories, writer’s [quaker] opinions on cotton
industry. 6 Aug: George Murray (Ancoats Hall, Manchester) re Suffield’s
request for information on age structure of employees in cotton mill. 15 Aug:
J. Brotherton (Salford) re quaker mill owners. Crewdson, Phillips and Nathan
Gough’s breaking law, working conditions of children, Suffield’s vote in obtaining
Act [1819 Cotton Mills Act] enclosing extract from Manchester Gazetted dated 17
Aug 1825 re Act. 12 Sept: enclosed together:- 1) George Everitt (Paston,
Norfolk) re writer and a Mr. Purdy’s (of Paston) accidental trespassing on
Suffield’s land, mentions Col. [?] Petre: 2) Suffield’s reply re acknowledgement:
Nov: S. W. Stevenson [Editor—Norwich Chronicle] re present of game, printing
of Suffield’s letter. 26 Nov: John W. Dowson (St. George’s, Norwich) re
Suffield’s membership of Norwich Mechanical Institution. 6 Dec: 1825: also
including:- Printed circular re subscription payable to The Refuge for the
Destitute, Preston, Lancs. Jan 1823: Printed circular re The Society for
Promoting Christian Knowledge. April 1823: John Mayhew (Aylsham Hse. of
Correction/Bridewell) to [his parents] re lessons learned and warning to others
(prisoner). 1824.
1 original bundle marked “no. 9 scheduled and examined by R.M. Bacon”

18/1— Letters to and from Lord Suffield (including draft reply) dated Jan
1823-Dec 1825

From: The High Sheriff [Sir Edmund Bacon?] re Hundred Meeting held at
Cromer and resolution signed by Suffield regarding writer’s alleged
“mismanagement” of County Meeting, writer’s own version, regret that County
Meeting not supported, opinion of Archdeacon Bathurst on Hundred Meetings,
refutes Suffield’s criticisms, uproar at meeting at St. Andrew’s Hall—petition
carried, considers it much easier for Suffield to control a Hundred Meeting,
criticises Suffield’s remarks that Norfolk property of no value as tenants unable
to pay rent, so spreading theory of “provincial if not national bankruptcy”,
thinks Suffield inconsistent as criticises Cobbett on same grounds. 27 Jan: The Rev. Theophilus Girdlestone (Baconsthorpe, Norfolk) re enclosed received from John Gay of Rainthorpe [Rainthorpe Hall, Tasburgh], found amongst Gay's father's papers. (25 April 1823) and enclosing will of Robert Harbord [Suffield's uncle] (14 April 1770), itemising bequests to family members and others incl. Sir George Chad: enclosed together:- 1) H. Fleming (London) requesting permission to "adopt" Suffield's title as a "frank" for new publication, (former Yarmouth elector) and 2) Suffield's reply allowing conditional use of his name in case he disagrees with content, setting out conditions on this, especially publication's advocacy of parliamentary reform: 3) Fleming re Weekly Express and Bell's Weekly Messenger and enclosing 1st number of Weekly Express (14 May), a "liberal" newspaper: April-May: 1823: John Nussey (London) expressing sympathy on Lady Suffield's death. 20 Sept 1824: George C. Vernon (at Hebburn Hall, Gateshead, N. Durham) re guardianship of children, son George's marriage [to Isabella Caroline Ellison, daughter of Cuthbert Ellison MP (Hebburn)], sentencing of criminals. 2 Nov: The Rev. Dixon Hoste (Tittleshall, Rougham, Norfolk) re writer's disapproval of men from Dereham Parish who applied for relief to Suffield, considers each magistrate should mind own district. 13 Nov [B: pp. 218-9]: 1824: Charles Tennyson [later Tennyson d'Eyncourt] MP [Park St.?] re Spring Guns Bill. 30 June: re Suffields letter, failure of Bill in Commons, writer's opposition to Bill "as it stood". 30 June: John Wilks (London) expressing gratitude for Suffield's support for Equitable Loan Bank Company (enclosing board meeting account), for Bill to help company and for Suffield's overall parliamentary record: June: W. Hase (Saxthorpe) re financial losses, decision to do no further work for Suffield, i.e.-Vernon House veranda (20 Sept 1825) and Suffield's reply (at Cromer) re Hase's breaking of contract on labour agreement. 22 Sept: Samuel Bamford (Middleton) re evaluation of books in Mechanics' Institute library. 20 Dec: 1825: also including:- Bacon's notes marked "no.9 schedule 1823 to 1825".

19/1- Letters of condolence to Lord Suffield on Lady Suffield's death (23 Sept 1824) dated Sept-Oct 1824


1 bundle (not original)

20/1- Letters to and from Lord Suffield (including draft replies) and associated correspondence dated July-1825-Dec 1826

Enclosed together:- from: 1) J.W. Dowson (Norwich) to R.M. Bacon (Costessey) re proposal-annuity payable to family of I.G. Burke, his release from partnership in firm, Burke & Kinnebrook: 2) Bacon's reply re I.G. Burke: 3) J. Barwell (Norwich) re acting as security for Burke's annuity and Miss Rose Bacon's legacy: Dec 1825-Jan 1826:

Correspondence between William Hase (Saxthorpe) and Suffield dated Sept 1825-Jan 1826: Hase re Suffield's letter of 22 Sept [1825], his treatment by Suffield, terms of payment, writer-builder of Gunton sawmill, considers it "superlative", gangway problem, mentions Booth, requests payment for work done (18 Jan 1826) and enclosing H.A. Broughton (Solicitor-Gt. Marlborough St.) to Hase
copy letter re work agreement. 28 July 1825: Hase re his treatment by Suffield, Overstrand work, requests interview. Jan 29 1826: 

The Rev. J. Brown (Norwich) re conviction of boy aged 10, background, mentions Temple Frere. 23 Jan 1826: re Refuge for the Destitute, convicts due for transportation, relations of prison chaplain with inmates, prison discipline. 27 Jan 1826: John Patteson (Norwich) re question of a copy by a Mr. Gooch of 1st Ld. Suffield's portrait hanging in St. Andrew's Hall. 12 Feb 1826: Philip Hardwick (Rupert Sq.) to H.A. Broughton copy letter re re-valuation of Vernon House. 20 March 1826: Charles James Blomfield (Bishop of Chester-London) re Middleton Church and churchyard. 25 May 1826: Edmund Wodehouse (Norwich) re enclosed, destitute state of Nth. Walsham attorney (Chalker), allegedly wronged by tenant of Suffield's at Frettenham (10 Sept) and enclosing J. Robinson (Blackheath, Kent) to Wodehouse re same. 6 Sept 1826: H.L. Smith (Southam, Warwickshire) re enclosed, medical care of sick poor (21 Sept) and enclosing report of committee meeting of Southam Eye and Ear Infirmary (6 July 1826): Royal National Institution for the Preservation of Lives from Shipwreck - printed circular re life boats. 13 Nov 1826: Samuel Bamford (Middleton) re Middleton Mechanics Institute (MMI) library and vetting of titles by Suffield, [Theophilus] Smith's allowing Bamford to select and take home pictures. 15 Nov 1826: Suffield's reply re Bamford's letter, Suffield's annoyance over financial state of MMI, wishes to withdraw support. 20 Nov 1826: J. Postle (Colney) re County Meeting called to discuss superintending of District Surveyors of Highways, commutation of statute labour for money, "county business" conducted behind "closed doors", hopes Lords Suffield and Albermarle will present petition to Lords, writer has named Suffield as Chairman of 'Committee on Closed Doors', list of names. 20 Nov 1826: Ld. Lynedoch [1st Ld.] (Cosgrave Priory, Stony Stratford, Bucks.) re enclosed letter from steward of Annandale [Scotland] estates about white polled cattle, [subject?]. (25 Nov 1826) and enclosing Sir William Hope to Suffield re cattle breed—probably extinct, Suffield's letter forwarded to estate Factor, attempt to obtain cattle. 24 March 1826: sub-bundle:- 1) Suffield to Capt. Southey re his claim on wrecked boat at Cromer: 2) Southey (Gimmingham House) re forwarding of Suffield's letter to Customs in London: Nov 1826: sub-bundle:- 1) R.M. Dean (Chairman—Board of Customs) re Suffield's involvement as Lord of the Manor with boat seizure, account of boat, unnamed so Crown's right dominates: 2) Ld. Liverpool (Prime Minister—P.M.'s Office) referring to (1), assumes Suffield has no wish to claim boat under circumstances: 3) Suffield's reply re his own misunderstanding: Dec 1826: Edward [Hedley] re prison rules, treatment of prisoners, ['?] Johnson (prison governor), 21 Dec 1826: Nathaniel Bolinbroke (Alderman—Norwich) expressing gratitude for game, also re cooling in relations between [William] Smith MP and [R.H.] Gurney before June 1826 parliamentary election, Blue & Whites' behaviour, Whigs' indebtedness to Smith, affirms own voting integrity, Gurney's gifts of game, but regrets none received from Coke after years of support from writer, Ld. Albermarle's generosity. 23 Dec 1826.

1 original bundle marked "no.10 examined and scheduled by R.M. Bacon"

21/1— Letters to Lord Suffield and related correspondence dated Jan—Dec 1826

From: Ld. Belgrave (Eaton Hall) re newborn son, "healthy brat", speech regarding "nomination" of him [Hugh Lupus Grosvenor, later 1st Duke of Westminster], christening of Wilton's child [writer's younger brother, Thomas, 2nd Earl of Wilton], chosen by Suffield for [?]. Jan 6: Robert W. Jearrad re proposed design and layout of villas in Cromer valley, mentions sketch (not encl.) 24 June [B: p.242]: sub-bundle:- 1) Printed letter from J. Postle (Colney) to Norfolk Agricultural Society re poor state of roads, need for district surveyors rather than unpaid parish surveyors, financial implications, petition and presentation of Bill: 2) Postle re 'open courts'. legality of "closed doors". Nov 3;
re 'Open Door Committee' (Chairman-Suffield) set up to examine conducting of county business behind 'closed doors'. (Dec 4) and enclosing handwritten list of committee members: C. Tennyson MP re Spring Guns Bill, Speaker's behaviour, unfairness as writer ("father" of Bill) not allowed to speak in its favour, "bloody people", suggests Suffield introduce Bill into Lords, wish to publish names of Bill's opposers. (n.d.) and enclosing list of Bill's opposers at Division (20 April) [B: pp.240-1]: also including:— Bacon's notes marked "no. 10 schedule 1826".
1 original bundle marked "used"

22/1- 5 documents re Norfolk Cricket Club dated 1826

Leaflet re proposal to establish Norfolk Cricket Club (NCC) with added names (Suffield's hand): Minutes of meeting held at Rampant Horse Inn, Norwich re NCC, members, rules, resolutions and subscriptions (Suffield's hand). 15 July 1826: Printed NCC Rules and Suffield's list of members: Philip Gurdon to Suffield re 1) possible members & 2) NCC Rules. 10 July: Handwritten NCC Rules (unsigned). n.d.. 1 original bundle marked "no.12"

23/1- Letters to and from Lord Suffield (including draft reply) and associated correspondence dated April-Dec 1826 and July 1830

1 bundle (not original)

24/1- Letters to Lord Suffield dated July 1827-Nov 1830

25/1— Letters to and from Lord Suffield (including draft replies) dated Jan–Dec 1827

1 bundle (not original)

26/1— Letters to and from Lord Suffield (including draft replies) Dec 1827–Dec 1828

From: James White (Plymouth, S. Devon) re slavery petition, enclosed letter, Columbia situation [post 1824 independence] (29 Dec) and enclosing copy of letter re slavery in Columbia. Dec: 1827: Ld. Dacre (The Hoo) re opinions on state of political parties, Whigs, 1827 Coalition, tendencies to absolute power of Crown, ["Lady C."?], support for Wellington's administration, shares Suffield's opinions; re government, 1827 events, lack of trust in politicians, confusion, Suffield—his proxy, opinions on Wellington and opposition, ultra Tories—"they say that Ld. Eldon is outrageous". Jan-Feb: sub-bundle:— 1) The Rev. J.T. Haughton (Middleton) re setting up in Middleton of Bible Society (MBS), comparison with Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (SPCK), Suffield's visits to Middleton. 11 Jan [B: pp.266–7]: 2) Sufffield's reply re his opinion on MBS and SPCK (not Suffield's hand). Jan 14 [B: pp.267–8]: Suffield (Vernon Hse.) to Alfred Mallalieu re Bill relating to Friendly Societies, originators—Ld. Dacre and T.P. Courtenay, tribute to Dacre. 19 April: Sir Francis Freeling (Secretary—General Post Office [GPO]) re Suffield's visit to GPO. 10 May [B: p.273]: Suffield to Alfred Maitland re Maitland's dismissal as Nth. Walsham postmaster. 13 May [B: pp.273–4]: William Harvey (Police Commissioner—Manchester Town Hall) re Police Bill. 18 July [B: p.275]: H.A. Broughton (Solicitor–Gt. Marlborough St.) re appropriation of funds by Brasenose College, Oxford from Middleton School. 18 Aug [B: pp. 275–6]: T.W. Coke (Holkham Hall) re visit of Duke and Duchess of Clarence to Holkham, inability to attend Norwich meeting on 17 Oct, 'open court' (admission of reporters), asks Suffield to act for him. 3 Oct
[B: p.276]: Suffield's reply re decision to postpone motion, inability to act on subject of 'open court' while Chairman of Magistrates (not Suffield's hand). Oct 4

1 bundle (not original)

27/1—Letters to Lord Suffield from his architect, Robert W. Jearrad dated Feb—July 1828

Letters from Jearrad (architect of the Observatory Tower at Gunton Park) to Suffield about the Tower: re conversion of veranda, mentions [W.S.] Gilpin and discussions on Park Lodge and Tower, Deer Cote and its roof, Tower dimensions and structure, fee for working drawings. 21 Feb: re Tower and Lodge, Gilpin's acting as go-between, Jearrad's alterations and suggestions for Suffield's approval—"I have kept it simple that it may be well done ... and bold in its character ... that it may not be unworthy in so noble a domain", veranda. March; (Bedford St.) re designs, Suffield's instructions concerning 'The Lodges', Jearrad's suggestions, bricks, Jearrad's leaving for Duke of Portland's. 13 March; (at Welbeck) re Suffield's letter of 15 March, directions for [?] Vince (builder) concerning alterations, bricks, Lodges. 19 March; re Tower cupola decorations, criticises Vince for slowness. 29 July.

1 original bundle

28/1—Letters to and from Lord Suffield dated April 1828-Feb 1829 and Nov 1831

From: [?] Martin (Norwich) re Suffield's private banking affairs, writer's opinion on shares in Stockton and Darlington Railway (27 April) and enclosing:—1) Account re building of Nth. Walsham and Dilham Canal. 21 Feb: 2) Printed circular re Real del Monte Mining Company. March 1828: Correspondence relating to Lt. Edwin Thrackston R.N. dated May-Aug 1828—Suffield (Vernon Hse.) to Capt. R.C. Spencer re Thrackston's case, Suffield's child's illness: 2) Spencer (Admiralty) re Thrackston's application: Thrackston (at Ostend) re his bad treatment by Ld. Melville and copy of Spencer's letter to self (16 May), re deafness in connection with application for command post: Spencer re Thrackston's appointment to command of a "King's cutter", deafness: Thrackston (at Ostend) re possible naval appointment, Suffield's baby's health, Suffield's support; (at Bruges) re appointment, mentions Spencer and William, 1st Duke of Clarence [First Ld. of the Admiralty, later William IV]: Jonathan Matchett (Lakenham, Norfolk) expressing gratitude for game, also re enclosed (not encl.), Manual of prayers and hymns. 23 Oct: Edward Lombe (at Wimbledon, Surrey [Melton Hall, Wymondham]) re Suffield's abstract "respecting motion for 'open court'". 4 Nov: T.S. Norgate (Hethersett, Norfolk) re hope for Suffield's support for writer's son, 'open court'. 4 Nov: J. Brotherton inviting Suffield to attend prizegiving of Manchester Mechanics Institution. (14 Nov) [MMI] and enclosing newspaper extract re MMI. (8 May 1828): Ld. King [Peter, 7th Ld. of Öckham] re bet on Suffield's building [?], health of friend at Windsor". 14 Nov: H. Capper (Whitehall) expressing for game, also re crime decrease for 1828. 15 Nov: Zachariah Allnut (Henley, Oxon.) re problem of "industrious" poor, provision of plots of land, Ld. Cardigan's efforts, population problems. 6 Dec: Thomas Foxley (Unsworth Lodge, Bury, S.E. Lancs.) express-
ing extreme regret at missing meeting with Suffield at Middleton Hall, mentions [Theophilus] Smith, Haughton, Sir Thomas Egerton, Lady Assheton, "Miss Harbord", also re boyhood memories of Middleton. 28 April [1828]. 1828: Henry F. Smith (Land Agent-Gunton Park) to Suffield (Vemon Hse.) re local school, Thorpe [Market], tenants, estate matters (21 Feb 1829) and enclosing map-Southrepps to Trunch road (south to lower street): 1829: H. Townsend (College of Arms) re Suffield's pedigree. 27 Jan 1831; Suffield's flag, quarterings, pedigree. 4 Nov 1831: 1831: also including: - Extract copied by Suffield from *Jamaica Courant* (18 April 1828) re West Indian planters' boycott of firm, Hanbury, Buxton and Company, criticism of T.F. Buxton.

1 original bundle marked "1828 no.13 scheduled and examined by R.M. Bacon"

29/1– Letters to and from Lord Suffield (including draft reply) dated Jan 1829-Dec 1830

From Edward Groves (Committee Secretary--Dublin) re adoption of enclosed printed resolution (20 Jan) on Catholic Emancipation, need for support (5 Jan) and enclosing same: J.P. Jones (Nth. Bovey Rectory, Exeter) re benefits of 'open court', Norfolk attempt, mentions Coke (26 Jan) and enclosing petition to magistrates re [exclusion of freeholders and occupiers of land in Devon from discussions on County business, Quarter Sessions, need for 'open court' (not incumbent): James Fletcher (Church Warden-Middleton) to Suffield (Vemon Hse.) enclosing Address (not encl.) on the Rev. [James] Archer's appointment as Middleton Rector [30 Jan 1829]. Feb [B: p.279]: Suffield (Vemon Hse.) to [Middleton Inhabitants] re their Address on Archer's appointment. 12 Feb: R.M. Bacon (Costessey) re religious vows, Catholic Emancipation Bill and writer's support, mutual agreement between Suffield and himself-"the accord of our thoughts", mentions William Husenbeth. 22 March: sub-bundle:- 1) Dr. T. Hay (Christ Church, Oxford) re admission of Harbord (Edward V.) as gentleman commoner, Eton report, mentions [the Rev. Dr. Richard] Durnford; 2) re Harbord's Oxford admission and rank. April-May: 1829: Duke of Richmond [5th Duke] re committee, the Rev. (?) Wells to give evidence, Kent farm. 10 Jan; (9 Cavendish Sq.) re enclosure (not encl.). 19 Dec: John Richardson (Aylsham) re Poor Laws. 17 Oct 1830 [B: p.315]: H.F. Smith (Gunton Park) to Suffield (Vemon Hse.) re local breaking of threshing machines, threat to saw mills, mentions Buxton, Southrepps mob who want tithe reduction, Archdeacon Glover [Private Chaplain to Duke of Sussex/friend of T.W. Coke]. 25 Nov 1830 [B: p.327]: George Pelllow (Dean of Norwich–Shire Hall) re cases of arms and ammunition received from Harwich, mentions Col. Somerset, Col. Sir John Wodehouse, Ld. Melbourne, danger in sending them on to Gunton due to "disturbed state of the county". 1 Dec 1830 [B: p.330]: 1830: also including:- Bacon's notes marked "1829-1830 no.12 schedule".

1 original bundle marked "used"

30/1– Letters to and from Lord Suffield (including draft replies) dated Jan 1829-Nov 1829 and Nov 1830


31/1- Letters to Lord Suffield dated Aug 1829-Dec 1830

From: Samuel Bamford (Middleton) re destruction of property belonging to Spitalfields silk weavers by workers, lists advantages of industry's removal to Middleton. 6 Aug: John Spencer Stanhope (Holkham) re enclosed letter from Ld. Ribblesdale (not encl.), negotiations with same, writer's wife's pregnancy; re enclosed letter from Ld. Ribblesdale concerning wild cattle [B: p.286] and enclosing Ld. Ribbesdale [2nd Ld.] (Parlington Park, Yorks., W.R.) to Stanhope re Suffield's white cattle, cross breeding, colour [B: p.286]: Nov-Dec: T.H. Batcheler (Gt. Yarmouth) re Suffield's purchase of Horstead Estate. 21 Nov [B: p.285]: 1829: J.P. Jones (Nth. Bovey Rectory, Exeter) to Suffield re 'open courts' and press reporting, benefits. 21 Jan: William Tooke (Russell Sq.) re Suffield's financial contributions to charities, Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, Suffield's "enforced residence in the country due to agricultural disturbances", previous good relations between landlords and tenants, Mendicity Society activities, comments on parochial charity and its misapplication, Houseless Society, Asylums-activities, Irish percentage of needy, chimney sweeps, mentions Agar Ellis MP as main supporter, "London University ... proceeds slowly but surely", liberal public apathetic to it, especially dissenters and Catholics, their ingratitude, writer's nephew's death. 23 Feb: Edmund Wodehouse MP (St. James's Square) re his Bill to rate owners of small houses instead of occupiers, Poor Rates, wages of agricultural labourers, wages and relief, wages and prices, lessons from French Revolution, farm produce prices. 5 March: Ld. Dacre re health, attending Lords, Forgery Bill, proxies no use in committee. 27 June: (at Chesterfield St.) re notification to Suffield if needs to attend ?, mentions Peel, Regency discussions. 30 June: re his voting against Thetford Bill, Address of Grand Jury, thoughts on political scene, need for Duke of Wellington to include in ranks "men of business and discretion", view on Commons division on settlement of civil list, mentions Brougham, William IV, wants rams from Coke. July: Ld. Albermarle (Quidenham Hall) re suitable course of action and readiness, gratitude for Suffield's help over son [Edward George Keppel]. Aug 10: re general agreement between himself and Suffield except on Edmund Wodehouse,

Correspondence from Ld. Melbourne [2nd Viscount-Home Sec.] to Suffield on agricultural protests dated Nov-Dec 1830:- Melbourne (Home Office) agreeing with what Suffield proposes but need to take care what does with arms, "I have a good deal exceeded my power" but considered emergency required it, "for God's sake be careful with them" (marked "secret and confidential" and written in Ld. Melbourne's hand). 28 Nov; re arms, reprimand, Suffield not to distribute them amongst magistrates, advises giving them to Militia Depot (marked "private" and in Melbourne's hand). 29 Nov; re sending of arms and ammunition from Harwich to Norwich, mentions Dean of Norwich. 2 Dec. [B: p.330]; expresses gratitude to Suffield for efforts to promote peace. 3 Dec; re Suffield's letter, penalties on those refusing to be sworn in as special constables, farmers' actions, considers Suffield's proposal to discontinue use of saw mills represents capitulation. 5 Dec; expressing approval of Suffield's measures in restoring peace and arresting machine breakers (6 Dec 1830) and enclosing printed circular-Instructions for heads of sections, swearing-in of special constables and riot procedure and conduct; re special constables and law enforcement. 9 Dec:

Col. Sir John Wodehouse (Norwich) re agricultural disturbances, appointment of Special Constables, thanks Suffield for his services. 6 Dec; (Witton) re arms ordered, conduct of Felmingham labourers, "distressing business", meeting of Smallburgh hundreds. 11 Dec; re Thetford question, Address sent to Ld. Chancellor (his predecessor in agreement), mentions Lushington, Ld. Brougham. 26 Dec: William Howe Windham (Felbrigg, Norfolk) re frequent non-agreement on magisterial issues between self and Suffield, expects mutual agreement on need to suppress 'Aliens' lodging at Cromer, efforts to catch incendiaries and put them in Walsingham Gaol (especially John Brown and 2 black accomplices), need for parish constables to search premises 3 times daily for suspicious characters. 21 Dec: [John] Weyland (Woodrising, Attleborough, Norfolk) re trials of rioters and "ordinary prisoners" at next Quarter Sessions, time pressures, proposals, employment of agricultural labourers, allotments to cottagers. 27 Dec; also including:- [Thomas] Thornton (Gt. Surrey St.) to R.M. Bacon re Suffield's plan, allotting of estate land to cottagers, writer's review of agricultural schemes for benefit of poor, list of questions concerning land, rents, quality et al.. 10 Dec: 1830: also including:- Facsimile statement by Ld. Brougham and other shareholders of London University (incl. Suffield) following a supplemental issue of shares to provide additional accomodation (n.d.) and enclosing copy letter from Brougham. 23 July 1829: Bacon's list marked "schedule no.14".

1 original bundle marked "used"

32/1- Letters to and from Lord Suffield (including draft replies) Feb-Dec 1830

From: The Rev. J. Brown (Norwich) re poaching and its cause, prisoner's accounts, receivers' network. 1 Feb; re present state of prison discipline, problems caused by accommodating influx of rioters, writer's talks with rioters,
criticism of farmers' attitudes and actions—"at bottom of all the mischief" and against "peasantry" and "landlords", rents and tithes. Thoresby (Lincs.) living. 14 Dec: Ld. Daere (Chesterfield St.) re Suffield’s address to Quarter Sessions, condition of poor, agricultural distress, parish allotments [B: p.308]; re Suffield's charge, writer's illness, George IV and "Mrs. Kent" [B: pp.308-9]: March-May: James Temple (Bradfield, Norfolk) expressing gratitude to Suffield for help with Antingham School. 13 April: enclosed together: 1) G. Mason (Committee Secretary—Norfolk Foxhunting Club—East Dereham, Norfolk) re possible membership of Suffield [B: p.311]: 2) Suffield's reply re preservation of foxes in Gunton area, reasons for opposition [B: p.311]: April: Sir George Walpole (Larlingford, Norfolk) re Suffield's "charge" [to March Quarter Sessions], Poor Law. 6 June [B: p.309]: H. Townsend (College of Arms) re arms to be flown on yacht, Suffield's armorial bearings. 17 June: John Fleming [?] re Suffield's "charge", writer's Bill on agricultural distress in Commons, old fellow Etonians, allotments for poor. 25 June: Edmund Wodehouse (Thorpe, Norfolk) re candidacy of Sir William Folkes [spelled Folkes], 28 July [B: p.313]: Suffield to T.W. Coke re Swanton Mills bridge, Aylsham to Dereham Turnpike, third County newspaper, why opposed, next meeting of parliament and its interference with shooting. 8 Sept: Ld. Ribblesdale (Gisburn Park, Yorks., W.R.) to J. Spencer Stanhope re possibility of cattle-cross with Suffield's cattle. 14 Nov [B: p.286]: Ld. Melbourne (Home Office) re Suffield's letter, approval of action taken, Suffield's responsibility for arms issued by Ordnance Dept.. 6 Dec [B: p.332]: G. Pellew re rioting of agricultural labourers, gratitude to Suffield, garrison, arms, locations of trouble. 8 Dec [B: pp.331-2]: Printed circular (29 Nov) signed by William Postle re wages, reduction of rents, tithes and Suffield's reply to Postle (King's Arms, Nth. Walsham) re enclosure, agricultural labourers' wages, tenants' rents. 13 Dec [B: p.333].

1 bundle (not original)

33/1—Letters to and from Lord Suffield (including draft replies) dated Jan–Dec 1831

Brewin (Leicester) re letter published in *Leicester Chronicle* about Suffield's kindness to Leicester people [Suffield presented Leicester Address to William IV], Birmingham Political Union and proposed formation of Leicester Political Union, counteract influence of [Henry] Hunt and Cobbett, unpopularity of Leicester Corporation, need for platform (organisation) for reform supporters to work within, confidence in government, anxiety due to rejection of Second Reform Bill, comments on Ld. Grey. 29 Oct [B: pp.364-5]: T.W. Coke (Holkham Hall) re Suffield entertaining company by speaking in Holkham drawing room, conduct of "Bench of Bishops" [2nd Reform Bill rejection], effect on County, game. 14 Oct; expresses approval of Suffield's handling of Norfolk Meeting [on reform], writer absent, [subject obscure]. 7 Dec: Admiral Sir William Beauchamp-Proctor (Langley Park, Norfolk) re proposed County Meeting on reform issue, writer's support for it, admits lack of public speaking ability, letting Anthony Hudson (banker) use his name. 4 Nov [B: p.365]: Ld. Brougham (Ld. Chancellor-London) re Magna Cressingham [Norfolk] living, "of very considerable value". Dec: also including:— Bacon's notes marked "1831 no.15 schedule".

1 original bundle marked "used"

34/1— Letters to and from Lord Suffield (including draft reply) dated Feb–Nov 1831

From: The Rev. J. Brown (Norwich Castle) re information given by prisoner on local crimes, gang, Thetford Assizes and transporting of prisoners, escape plan; re prisoner's evidence sent to Ld. Melbourne, feels incendiaries better kept in separate "classes" at Norwich, Swanton [Norfolk] fires; re prosecution of gang; re question of prisoners' removal to Thetford, escape plan: Feb–March: Samuel Fleming (Regent Sq.) to Suffield (at Holkham Hall) requesting financial help, (brother of Suffield's companion on European travels), also re circumstances—teacher, poverty, aged over 60, unable to find work. 7 Nov: Suffield to W. Postle re [Nth. Walsham] petition against tithes. 2 Feb [B: pp.338–9]: Suffield to Ld. Melbourne re poverty of agricultural labourers, mentions Ld. Salisbury and Ld. Kenyon as likely to accuse government of delaying, "Home Colonisation", emigration. 8 June [B: pp.344–5]: also including:— Proceedings of Anti-Slavery Society meeting (13 April 1831) with Suffield as Chairman (Suffield's hand).

1 bundle (not original)

35/1— Letters to and from Lord Suffield (including draft replies) and associated correspondence dated Feb 1831–Nov 1832

From: John Stracey (Sprowston, Norfolk) re Assizes removal from Thetford to Norwich, Ld.Tenterden's opposition; re Assizes removal, mentions Ld. Tenterden and Peel; re Assizes removal, prisoners-travel problems, witnesses, Thetford. Feb–March: Ld. Tenterden [1st Ld.] (Chancery Lane) to Suffield (Hse. of Lords) re enclosed letter (not encl.) from Ld. Justice [Gardner]. 11 March: Theophilus Smith (Middleton Hall) re Address on Middleton School enclosed (not encl.), Suffield's liability to expense due to decision of Master of the Rolls, therefore Smith attempting reduction of estate expenditure: 28 Dec: 1831: J. Miller (Durham) expressing agreement with Suffield on pluralities, mentions Bishop of London. 31 March: Ld. Radstock [2nd Ld.] re Suffield's amendments on pluralities, [subject?]. March [B: pp.371–2]: Richard Potter (Manchester) re meeting held at which opposition expressed to government's plan for education in Ireland but unrepresentative of local opinion, Suffield's help over Manchester petition on Reform Bill, considers Suffield must tell Lords truth about above meeting, Ld. Kenyon's presenting petition on pluralities. 2 April: Baron Rubenske re personal family distress in Prussia, Prince Hardenberg, difficulties, Church and State separation, Pluralities Bill, Bishop of Durham. 9 April: Sir
John Newport (Jermyn St.) re Pluralities Bill. 16 April: E.G. Keppel (Hertford St.) re [East Norfolk] candidacy and intention to stand, a "thorough Reformer" and pro-abolition, lameness. 7 June; (at Bransbury, N. Hants.) re candidacy withdrawal due to electioneering expense. (18 June) and enclosing R.T. Elwin (Norwich) to Keppel (copy letter) re selection committee [(A.) Hudson, (E) Lombe, [T.S.] Norgate, [?] Brightwell), possible candidacy of Keppel (the favourite), likely yeomanry support, expenses—"no half measures will do as the Tories will strain every nerve" (16 June); (at Hertford St.) re candidacy withdrawal intention. 20 June; (at Dover) re decision not to resign since presence (in Norfolk) not required. 7 Aug: W.H. Windham re candidacy, uncertainty re Keppel, declaration in support of abolition and "independent" support to Ld. Grey; re mutual meeting at Brookes, candidacy: June—July; enclosed together:— 1) Printed circular distributed by Ld. Molyneux [later 3rd Earl of Sefton] (Croxteth Hall, S.W. Lancs.) addressed to electors of South Lancs.. 9 July: 2) Suffield (Vernon Hse.) to Molyneux re election, supports Molyneux provided he advocates immediate emancipation of slaves. 15 July: Molyneux's reply (Arlington St.) to Suffield re circular, emancipation. July 20: T.S. Norgate (Hethersett) re dismissal of Aldborough [Norfolk] curate—Spurrel [Patron—Suffield]. 29 Oct: Suffield's reply re East Anglian [Editor—Norgate], Suffield considered church reformer in parliament, Pluralities Bill, refutes allegations. Oct 30. The Rev. Robert Charles William Wilkinson (Middleton) re rector's death [James Archer], writer's curacy, Middleton affairs, Grammar School. 19 Nov [B: p.279] and enclosing copy letter A.T. Gilbert (Principal—Brasenose College, Oxford) to the Rev. J.C. Wigram (Secretary—National Society for the Education of the Poor) re Suffield's appeal to Lords against Master of Rolls decision on Brasenose College, Society's application refused. 6 July: also including:— Invitation to peers wishing to attend coronation of William IV from the Earl Marshal. 4 Aug 1831 Vote of thanks from Court of Mayoralty (hand-written by Norwich Town Clerk) to Robert Grant MP and Suffield for ensuring passing of Bill for the removal of the Lent Assizes from Thetford to Norwich. 20 June 1832: Certificate re Suffield's resignation as a Chairman of Norfolk Quarter Sessions, gratitude. 17 Oct 1832: [?](Huntingdon) re gaol delivery of prisoners at Norwich, ringleaders at large. 10 March 1831: [correspondent?] re [Samuel?] Bamford's application. 17 Dec 1831: Bacon's notes marked "no.16 schedule".

I original bundle marked "used"

36/1- Letters to and draft replies from Lord Suffield dated April—Dec 1832


1 bundle (not original)

37/1- Letters to and draft reply from Lord Suffield Aug—Dec 1832

From: Charles Richard Sumner (Bishop of Winchester—at Newport, Isle of
Letters to and draft replies from Lord Suffield and associated documents dated March 1823 and Oct 1832–Nov 1834

2 sets of correspondence and printed documents from John Hull (Hillingdon, Uxbridge, Middx.) to Suffield and folded together:—


- Ld. Grey (Prime Minister—Downing St.) re hoped-for attendance of Suffield at discussion following King’s Address at new parliamentary session. 11 Jan 1833:

- F. Gardner [Wells, Norfolk?] re Wells petition on Lord’s Day observance and Sunday trading. 25 Feb 1833: R. Greville (Edinburgh) re Edinburgh Anti-Slavery Committee petition, signed by 21,291. 27 Feb 1833:

- Documents and correspondence relating to Capt. E.R.P. Mainwaring R.N. (Coast Guard) dated April 1833–Aug 1834 and enclosed together:— sub-bundle:— 1) Printed statement issued at Cromer re Henry Sandford and action taken against him by Mainwaring following resolutions signed by Herbert J. Johnson and others: 2) Mainwaring (Mundesley) to Suffield re accusation and personal service record, possible action against Johnson and enclosing copy of testimonial by Duke of Clarence (later William IV) re Mainwaring’s family, his naval promotion problem: 3) Suffield’s reply re accusation:

- T. Edwards (London) re slavery. 5 June 1833: J.H. Howard (Chairman—West Indies Planters and Merchants—Cheltenham) re slavery issues, mentions Hon. Edward Stanley and Ld. Lyndhurst. 25 June 1833:

- Correspondence between Suffield and Lt. Jehosophat Leigh R.N. (Winterton, Norfolk/Chief Officer—Winterton Coast Guard) re Leigh’s career, lack of promotion and enlisting Suffield’s support dated April 1833–July 1834:— Report by Capt. William Black, R.N., Winterton C.G. re rescue of crew of ‘Crawford Davison’, wrecked on Happisburgh (Hasbro’) Sands on 19 March 1823. 23 March 1823: Leigh (Winterton) to Suffield (Vemon Hse.—22 & 24 April) — 20 April 1833; 24 April 1833; 24 April 1833; 1 May 1833; Leigh to [?] Cook (Secretary—Norfolk Shipwreck Society—Norwich) re “beachmen”, coastguard station, personal details, saving of crew from ‘Annabella’ and ‘Henry’ in Autumn, 1830. 23 July 1833; J.J. Gurney (Norwich) to Suffield re Leigh, asks Suffield to “urge the poor man’s suit ... true and inveterate Quaker as I am”, misgivings re naval matters, adds “my impression is that we are sailing into port in the Slave Question” (endorsed by Suffield). 27 July 1833: Leigh to Suffield re enclosure of Graham’s letter (17 Feb 1831) (not encl. but copied by Suffield on reverse), achievements and sacrifices, naval career summary, bravery, patronage of Prime Minister’s brother, Sir Henry Grey, claims to be most decorated naval lieutenant. 12 Aug 1833; 20 Sept 1833; 2 April 1834: re Royal Humane Society dinner and presentation, wearing of “5 splendid decorations ... Nelson style”. 16 April 1834: Sir James Graham (First Ld. of the Admiralty) to Suffield re Leigh. 16 April 1834: Leigh (at Lambeth) to Suffield re wish to be presented at levee, intention to wear medals and be noticed, enjoy honour. 25 April 1834: re gift for Suffield, Graham’s neglect, writer’s mental state, levee and meeting with King,
Graham and [?] Harmer (MP). 4 May 1834; covering note by Leigh. n.d.; Leigh to Suffield (at Cavendish Sq.) re need for Suffield to make case a matter of urgency, ascertain Graham's intentions. 5 July 1834. Thomas C. Hansard (Paternoster Row) re copies of Suffield's speeches on Burglary Bill. 30 Aug 1833: Correspondence from William Hamilton (Plymouth) to Suffield re West Indies agriculture and personal details dated Sept-Oct 1833: re Abolition, expresses gratitude to Suffield concerning Bill, negroes' and planters' interests, alternative crops to sugar, quotes Duke of Bedford re supervision of Bill's enactment, requests Suffield's support, time spent in St. Kitts Nevis, mentions St. Lucia conditions, wheat samples (not encl.); re pita cultivation and enclosing sample, Jamaican planters unco-operative, cf. hemp; crops, desire for appointment as Special Justice in W.I. to do agricultural research, pessimism about chances due to identification with "negroes' cause", quotes from Duke of Bedford, Suffield unwilling to help and enclosing 2 copies of circular headed Oxalis crenata, re rejection by Colonial Office of application due to mistrust, W.I. agriculture: The Rev. Joseph Ivimey (member-Anti-Slavery Society-Devonshire St.) requesting help in building "Sunday and Lancasterian school" to mark Abolition (2 Nov 1833) and enclosing:- 1) front elevation and subscription list: 2) writer's sermon published in The Pulpit. 29 Sept 1833: John McCoy (Howard Society-Dublin) re enclosed, hope for Suffield's support and his efforts to reform Criminal Code (25 Jan) and enclosing report of Howard Society for the improvement of prisons in Ireland and the mitigation of the punishment of death. 20 Jan 1834: Secretaries—Society for the Reward of Boatmen and other others, who risk their lives for the preservation of their fellow creatures from shipwreck or drowning (Walworth) circular letter re enclosed prospectus (25 Jan) and enclosing same: John Keate (Eton) re request to Suffield to oppose proposed Windsor railway line, re enclosed (not encl.). 20 Feb 1834: John Murray (Glasgow) re Glasgow Emancipation Society, George Thompson's trip to American, slaves elsewhere, enclosure, seeks Suffield's advice and enclosing Address to William 1V from Society. Feb 1834: Committee of Lord's Day Society re enclosed petition (not encl.) (11 June 1834) and enclosing 2 printed copies of Ld. Wynford's Lord's Day Bill: Edmund R. Lacom (Ormesby, Norfolk) re Yarmouth Races, Harbord [Edward V.] as steward. 10 July 1834: H. Lloyd (Charterhouse Sq.) re slavery aspects, Antigua, society report enclosed (not encl.). 19 July 1834: Thomas Barrett Lennard MP re Ld. Brougham's promise, Bill postponement "delays the reform for a year" [Municipal Reform Act?]. 23 July 1834: E.J. Lloyd (Manchester) re enclosed Address (not encl.) by [?] Wood in event of dissolution of parliament, [subject?]. 13 Dec 1834. Ld. Molyneux (Croxteth Hall) re candidacy for S. Lanks, hopes for Suffield's support, activities of "conservatives", regrets postponement of retirement. 14 Dec 1834: also including:—[J] Martin to R.M. Bacon itemising election expenses. 29 Nov 1834 [B: p.482]: Printed report—Derbyshire General Infirmary. 30 Oct 1834: Mendicity Society Office (London) incl. correspondence and documents detailing 2 cases of destitution with Suffield's account. Feb 1834: Printed report—Lancashire County Refuge for the Destitute. [1834].

1 original bundle marked "no.3 examined and scheduled" 39/1—
Letters to and draft replies from Lord Suffield dated Dec 1832—Dec 1833 and related documents

From: Suffield to the Rev. C. Heath re tithe case brought by Heath (not Suffield's hand). 31 Dec 1832: S. W. Stevenson (Mayor—Norwich) re Assembly Room celebrations on election of Keppel and Windham, praise for Harbord as chairman. 29 Dec 1832: William Tooke MP (Russell Sq.) re Truro campaign, slavery abolition, requests support for Climbing Boys (chimney sweeps) Bill. 3 Jan [B: p.469]; re North London Hospital, University junior school, request for tickets to King's opening of Lords Session, Chimney Sweep Bill. 24 Dec; re —
Chimney Sweep Bill, enclosed letter (not encl.), Whigs. 30 Dec: Henry M. Waller (Foulsham, Norfolk) re invitation to Suffield to attend unveiling of Coke's portrait at Corn Exchange, approval of Harbord's speech at election dinner of [E.G.] Keppel and [W.H.] Windham. 13 Jan: Zachary Macaulay re analysis of Commons evidence on [slavery?], committee meeting. 15 Jan: Sir George Washington Stephen (Coleman St.) re dissatisfaction with Ld. Melbourne and government, slavery, Suffield's earlier advice to support government, 25 Jan; re Duke of Richmond and complaints re Stephen's writings, "O'Connellising", re-appointment of committee [slavery?] 7 Feb; re petition [subject?], writer's travelling to south coast to enjoy "watering places", mentions T.F. Buxton, "feverish" atmosphere [slavery]. 28 Feb; re writer's amendment to Bill, criticism of The Times and press in general, "petty jealousies of the scribbling race", Suffield's ill health, mentions Buxton, Gunton. 26 Sept; re enclosed pamphlet [on Poor Law?] (not encl.), Bucks. estate problems, earlier work as collector of evidence Queen Caroline on Continent. 22 Nov; re Suffield's pamphlet, ideas on Poor Law reform (maintenance of children). 7 Dec: Rowland Hill (Bruce Castle [School], Tottenham, Middx.) re meeting of Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, enclosed pamphlet (not encl.), poor, general comments. 23 Feb: [Washington Bustead?] (Tralee, Ireland) re petition enclosed (not encl.) [subject?], writer feels wronged—therefore leaving Ireland. 6 March: William S. Phillips (Liverpool) re Suffield's presenting petition on penal code, petition on flogging. 23 March [B: p.422]: Prince Adam Czartoryski (Grosvenor Sq.) covering letter re enclosed, mentions Buckton (10 April) and enclosing 3 documents on problems of Poles (esp. exiles) and Poland: Edward Ash (Norwich) to Suffolk (Vernon Hse.) re anti-slavery cause, proposed meeting to be presided over by Harbord, propriety of actions of Norwich Branch (22 April) and transcript included of letter from Dr. John Crisp (Norwich) re anti-slavery meeting at Norwich (22 April): Berkeley Westropp (Secretary—Royal Humane Society) re Lt. Jehosophat Leigh and his bravery. 2 May: W. Withers (Holt) re book on acacia tree; re forestry: May—Dec: John Webber (Tiverton, Devon) re tithes, church reform—"overgrown establishment". 9 May: C.E. Branfill (Upminster Hall, Romford, Essex) covering letter re tithes, landowners' problems re estimations, corn prices fluctuations (13 May) and enclosing writer's printed letter (27 April 1833) addressed to Ld. Althorpe MP on latter's measure for commutation of tithes in England: Thomas Beaumont (Bradford, Yorks, W.R.) re petition (not encl.) from Bradford doctors, slavery, considers Buxton and Committee a disappointment, praises Suffield. 13 June: Joseph Ridley (Hexham, Northumberland) to Suffolk (Hse. of Lords) re choice of Lords to present petition (not encl.), voluntary churches, praise for Suffield on slavery cause, petition. 20 June: Thomas Parkin (Dudley, Worcs.) re Suffield's participation in Separatists' Affirmation Bill, problems re oath taking and conscience, need to widen provisions of Bill, mentions Duke of Sussex. 13 Aug: J. Brotherton MP (Hse. of Commons) re Factory Bill and writer's alterations [MP—Salford]. 20 Aug: 8 page printed document issued by Committee of the Society for Diffusing Information on the Subject of Capital Punishment (p.iv re introduction of Bill in Lords by Suffield). 21 Aug: John T. Barry (London) re sentencing of Mary Wright and enclosing editorial from The True Sun (5 Aug 1833) re capital punishment and Wright's case at Norwich. 20 Sept: William Alexander (Gt. Yarmouth) re use of Suffield's frank. 19 Dec: also including:- 3 printed circulars re Wilberforce family and Wilberforce fund. Aug & Dec 1833: Unsigned note re Antigua court case. n.d.: Biblical text.

1 original bundle marked "no.17 examined and scheduled by R.M. Bacon"

1 bundle (not original)

41/1- Letters to and from Lord Suffield dated Jan–Dec 1834


praises Suffield’s earlier support for writer, opinion on Henry Goulbourn [former Chief Secretary for Ireland]. 19 Dec; re anticipated electioneering corruption that Harbord likely to meet, opinion of Tories, the Rev. Dr. [Philip] Hunt [Aylsham incumbent]. 22 Dec: [pp.486-7]: H.M. Burroughes (Salisbury Place) re enclosures (not encl.), Beer House Bill, Norwich execution, the Rev. J. Brown: 12 May: also including:—Bacon’s notes marked “1834 no.18 schedule”.

I bundle (not original)

42/1- Letters to Lord Suffield dated March–July 1834 entitled by him Letters on petitions and parliamentary business 1834 (petitions not enclosed unless indicated)

From: Henry Hanbury (Blackfriars Rd.) re petition (Southwark Borough Baptist Denominations) on disestablishment and enclosing same. 7 March: R.E. Hankinson (Norwich) re petitions on “Sunday observance”, influential signatories, Sunday trading—“an act of open profanation”. 10 April: John Bane (Aylsham) re petition from Aylsham “dissenters”. 14 April: William P. Bartlett (Nicholas Lane, Tombland, Norwich) re petition, dissenters’ grievances, comments on disestablishment—last resort only. 14 April: re petition, objects to church rates as also paying for own ministers, quotes figures (dissenters). 16 April: Francis Edward Arden (Gresham, Norfolk) re petition on Sunday observance, beerhouses’ and public houses’ opening hours [Beer Act 1830], apologises for petition written on paper not parchment. (14 April) and enclosing same: Robert Bird (Taplow, Maidenhead, Berks.) to Suffield (London) re beer house problem, mentions Ld. Brougham, “mischief and gambling” near church, farmers (church wardens) frightened to act due to incendiaries, absent Rector, [parish] constables ineffective as probably customers. 19 April: W.F. Poile ([King’s] Lynn, Norfolk) to Suffield (Hse. of Lords) re petition from Lynn Baptist Church on compulsory payment of church rates—“violation of conscience”. 21 April: I.G. Wigg (Lyme Regis, S. Dorset) re anticipation of support for dissenters from Suffield, petition and Suffield’s objections to last paragraph, church rates, dissenters’ church attendance and contrast with Anglicans. 21 April: Thomas Collins (Somers Town, Middx.) re papers, [Portugal?], supporters incl. Gurneys (Lynn banks) and Birkbeck. 22 April: Thomas H. Bastard (Magistrate–Charlton, Blandford Forum) re Suffield’s help over Blandford Savings Bank, beer shops, “curse on the country”, Beer Act, recommendations, immorality, crime. 24 April: William Slater (Hebden Bridge, Yorks., W.R.) to Suffield (Hse. of Lords) re dissenters’ claims, church reform, petition of local Wesleyan Methodists. 24 April: Francis Lloyd (High Bailiff and Magistrate–Birmingham) re beer shops, crime. 24 April: Thomas Rust (Cologate, Norwich) re beer shops and petition of Norfolk Magistrates. 25 April: Peter Duncan (Wesleyan Minister–Birmingham) re disestablishment, refusal to present unauthorised Birmingham petition since it does not represent views of Wesleyan Methodists (although presented in their name), abolition of slavery, praise of Suffield. 26 April: re Earl Grey and refusal to present Birmingham petition, writer anti–disestablishment. 2 May: J.H. Steward (East Carleton, Norfolk) re enclosed list of recommendations re beer houses and enclosing same. 26 April: Robert Grundy (Bury, S.E. Lancs.) re petition against Beer Bill, evils, law inadequacy, licence. 29 April: William Paxon (Grays Inn Terrace) re petition from “Congregation of Protestant Dissenters” (Little Wild Street Chapel), anti-slavery campaign and request for whip used by Suffield in Lords Committee “with good effect”, mentions Sir George Stephen. 30 April: John Richardson (Heydon, Norfolk) to Suffield (at Cavendish Sq.) re Eynsford Hundred wish for malt tax repeal, beerhouses, Poor Law Amendment Bill. 30 April: to Suffield (at Cavendish Sq.) re Poor Laws, Ld. Orford. 9 May: re [Poor Law Amendment] Bill, mentions R.M. Bacon and Norwich Mercury, Eynsford Hundred petition, “the little Lord” [Ld. Orford?], South Erpingham hundred. 12 May: W. Withers (Holt) re Ld. Calthorpe, detrimental economic

1 original bundle

43/1— Letters to Lord Suffield dated July-Dec 1834


1 original bundle marked "used"

44/1— Letters to and draft reply from Lord Suffield dated Jan-Feb 1835


1 bundle (not original)

45/1— Letters to Lord Suffield dated Jan–June 1835

From: Richard Else (Bath, Somerset) re incendiarism and preventive measures
proposed (18 Feb) and enclosing his circular re scheme to catch incendiaries. 21 Jan: Samuel Rees (Nth. Walsham) to Suffield (Vernon Hse.) re Nth. Walsham Horticultural Society. 27 June: also including: Suffield's speech and notes re Refuge for the Destitute. 20 April: Suffield's notes re Tower Hamlets petition. n.d.: also including: Bacon's notes marked "Schedule no.1 and Schedule no.2". 1 original bundle marked "used"

46/1- Letters to and from Lord Suffield (including draft replies) dated March-April 1835

From: The Rev. R.C.W. Wilkinson (Middleton) re adult school, rules, equipment. 5 March and including [?] list of school requirements headed 'AA': Suffield to Wilkinson re adult school (not Suffield's hand). 30 March: Wilkinson re adult school and enclosing rules (3 copies, 1 in Suffield's hand). 6 and 21 April: A. Ogden (Middleton) re establishment of adult school at Middleton. 15 March: G. Chapman (Norwich) re Hale and his trial. 5 March: Richard Denham (Heaton House, [S.E. Lancs.]) re Gunton water supply, water ram. 18 April: James Easton (Southwark) to Suffield (Vernon Hse.) re same and enclosing brochure on his patent ram: enclosed together: Theophilus Smith (Middleton Hall) re enclosed list of building leases and lease of corn mill: and also including: 1) Gunton Hall expenditure. 1 July 1833-1 July 1834: 2) Summary account with Messrs. Drummonds. 1 Jan to 15 May 1835: 3) Gunton Park receipts and expenditure. Half-year ending 1 July 1835: 4) Account with Gurneys' Bank showing rents, tithes, timber et. al. 1 Nov 1834 to 1 Feb 1835: 5) Statement showing savings in letting of Vernon House: also including: Receipt for subscription to Mirror of Parliament: Draft and appeal circular for proposed church at Tonge (nr. Manchester) with list of local subscribers. 1835. 1 original bundle

47/1- Speech notes of the Hon. Edward Harbord / 3rd Lord Suffield dated 1820-1834

Dated speeches (chronological order)

1. Notes respecting new County Jail - given to Prison Committee - re state of prisons 2 Sept 1820. [B: p.126].
2. Notes ... speech on presenting petition ... Manchester sufferers - re 'Peterloo', criticism of authorities' actions, abuse of law. 1821.
3 [Presentation of Norfolk County Petition] - re distress in England, pro-reform sentiments, taxes on commodities, "the very first time of sitting and of rising in the House of Lords". 15 Feb 1822. (no heading, paragraphed notes). [B: pp.161-4].
4. Notes for my first speech in the House of Lords on presenting the Norfolk petition the day on which I took my seat in that House. 15 Feb 1822. (fuller notes than no.3).

SPRING GUNS BILLS (nos.5-9)
5. [Notes for second reading of Spring Guns Bill]. 1825 [B: pp.211-18].
6. Newspaper extracts re Suffield's speech on Spring Guns Bill. (with written corrections).
7. [Notes re question of gardens and woods] with newspaper extract. 1827 [B: pp.253-6].
8. [Notes re presentation of case]. (with underlining of text) [B: pp.211-8].

GAME LAWS. (nos.10-11)
10. Notes for speech on Bill for alteration of Game Laws. 2 May 1828
11. Speech on Game Laws. (fuller notes than no.10).
12. *Bible meeting* - Norwich - British and foreign Bible society. 9 Sept 1829 (paragraphed brief notes).


15. *Notes for speech* - County Meeting. 19 Nov 1831. re reform bill and his personal commitment to reform. (includes summary) [B: pp.365–70].

SLAVERY (nos.16–17)


18. *Notes for speech on Eynesford Hundred Petition*. 12 May 1834. re agricultural distress..

Undated speeches


20. [Speech notes on police duties] re recommendations for more effective policing, better pay.

21. [Speech notes on Poor Law Amendment Bill] [1834] (paragraphed).

22. *Poor Bill* [1834] (rough notes).


24. [Speech notes for presenting of petition on jurors' oath?] re problem of perjury due to severity of penal code, need for reform (incomplete or missing notes).

25 *Speech on moving a proviso against the flogging of females* (full text).

26. [Speech notes relating to an unspecified institution].

27. [Speech notes on slavery] (paragraphed notes).

28. *Motion of mine in the Lords : a humble address* re appointments to former slave colonies.
APPENDIX ONE

THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS AND THE NATIONAL REGISTER OF ARCHIVES

In 1938 the Public Records Office was founded, and official records were put under unified control. The existence of private manuscript collections had long been known, and a lawyer, George Harris, who had produced a calendar for a collection of family papers in the 1840s, determined to promote a scheme to unlock the research potential of other extant collections. His plan was adopted by the Master of the Rolls, and resulted in the establishment of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts [RCHM] in 1869, set up to locate, list and report nationally on privately owned collections: thus, the first attempt to conduct a national survey and disseminate information [1]. The RCHM's work progressed by stages. Between 1870 and 1884 it surveyed 424 collections, many of outstanding national importance; in 1883, it began the Reports and calendars series, but the 1914-1918 war and resulting funding cutbacks affected this project; in 1926 it re-emphasised its aim to implement a national survey of surviving records [2,3]. Disbandment of landed estates, owner-migration and dismemberment of collections due to sales, gave added urgency to this aim. The RCHM now began its advisory rôle. During the inter-war period, further financial stringency and absence of voluntary help, meant that a national survey proved impossible to implement. Following the outbreak of war in 1939, the RCHM publishing programme ceased, and again archives were at risk for reasons listed above [4,5]. Meanwhile, an unofficial but like-minded organisation, the British Records Association, (founded in 1932 by owners, custodians and users of archives), suggested its own plan in 1943 for post-war custody and regulation of historical manuscripts and archives, including the setting-up of a national register. The RCHM set up a committee to examine this proposal, and the outcome was the establishment of the National Register of Archives (NRA) in 1945 as a branch of the RCHM [6]. From the mid-1950s, the RCHM was again able to re-continue its work of discovery, rescue, inspection, arrangement and listing. In 1959, a new Royal Warrant widened its terms of reference, especially its advisory rôle [7].

Initially, the NRA put emphasis on recording local collections not reported by the RCHM - those emanating from local record offices and reported by its networks of county volunteers [8,9]. The RCHM's past work had been limited to investigating selected collections of national importance. In 1959, the NRA's work was integrated within that of the RCHM [10]. The NRA's scope was
widened and it now lists from the following: private archives, RCHM reports, national libraries, university, public and other libraries, museums, specialist institutions, firms, North American and Australasian repositories [11,12]. It aims to achieve national intellectual control, and its indexes serve as a preliminary finding aid, guiding users to source material and/or detailed finding aids. By 1993, 35,500 'reports' had been shelved and reference-coded [13], representing over 70% (1990) of the national total [14]. In 1970, the 'Personal Index' was automated, and retrospective conversion (using a purpose-designed relational database) of the original indexes was completed during 1991-1992 [15]. National and international dissemination of NRA databases by networking and CD Roms is the current aim [16,17].

Dissemination is the RCHM's second main function [18]: its publications include the following: Reports and calendars series (almost complete): Prime Ministers' papers series; Guide to sources for British history; Guide to principal collections of family and estate papers in the United Kingdom: parts 1 and 2 (in progress); Annual review: 1988-; Accessions to repositories and reports added to the National Register of Archives: 1982-: Reports of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts.
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# APPENDIX TWO

## TABLE SHOWING THE INCREASING USE MADE OF THE NORFOLK RECORD OFFICE SINCE ITS FIRST YEAR IN 1974

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Revised Revenue Estimates Net Expenditure</th>
<th>No. of Visitors P.T.E. Excluding Postal and Telephone Use</th>
<th>Documents Issued</th>
<th>Photo-copies Supplied</th>
<th>Lectures and Exhibitions</th>
<th>Issues per Staff Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1974/75</td>
<td>£50,830</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>3,291*</td>
<td>26,018</td>
<td>1,269</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975/76</td>
<td>£64,709</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>4,144*</td>
<td>30,201</td>
<td>1,437</td>
<td>8,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976/77</td>
<td>£73,030</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>4,580*</td>
<td>36,713</td>
<td>1,607</td>
<td>9,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977/78</td>
<td>£80,400</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>7,063</td>
<td>38,500</td>
<td>2,013</td>
<td>10,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978/79 **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979/80</td>
<td>£94,170</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>7,895</td>
<td>41,967</td>
<td>2,428</td>
<td>6,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980/81</td>
<td>£115,920</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>8,358</td>
<td>45,865</td>
<td>3,013</td>
<td>8,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981/82</td>
<td>£133,930</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>8,352</td>
<td>50,571</td>
<td>3,454</td>
<td>8,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982/83</td>
<td>£141,980</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>8,837</td>
<td>51,420</td>
<td>3,850</td>
<td>7,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983/84</td>
<td>£148,670</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>8,854</td>
<td>54,391</td>
<td>4,008</td>
<td>5,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984/85</td>
<td>£160,310</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>8,849</td>
<td>53,391</td>
<td>4,209</td>
<td>7,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985/86</td>
<td>£164,670</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>8,905</td>
<td>53,182</td>
<td>4,565</td>
<td>8,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986/87</td>
<td>£167,450</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>8,940</td>
<td>51,474</td>
<td>5,418</td>
<td>9,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987/88</td>
<td>£204,230</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>9,830</td>
<td>53,721</td>
<td>5,903</td>
<td>10,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988/89</td>
<td>£209,430</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>8,953</td>
<td>51,600</td>
<td>5,461</td>
<td>9,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989/90</td>
<td>£234,160</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>8,723</td>
<td>50,700</td>
<td>5,876</td>
<td>9,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990/91</td>
<td>£289,900</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>8,977</td>
<td>52,460</td>
<td>5,335</td>
<td>7,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991/92</td>
<td>£317,430</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>12,205</td>
<td>32,342</td>
<td>5,307</td>
<td>7,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992/93</td>
<td>£358,110</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>12,618</td>
<td>31,663</td>
<td>5,104</td>
<td>8,887</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY**


(1) : One month only.

* : Probably under registered.

** : No figures supplied for this year.

Table reproduced with permission of Norfolk Record Office.
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MAPS

Figures

1. Gunton Park in relation to the sub-regions of Norfolk


3. Gunton Park Estate land – 1784-1842

4. The location of Middleton in relation to South Lancashire

5. Middleton and the Manchester cluster – 1775

6. Middleton and the Manchester cluster – 1821
FIG 1. GUNTON PARK IN RELATION TO THE SUB-REGIONS OF NORFOLK
FIG. 2. GREAT ESTATES IN THE 19TH CENTURY.

- Holkham Estate (43,000 acres) Coke family, later Earls of Leicester
- Raynham Estate (15-18,000 acres) Lord, later Viscount Townshend
- Houghton Estate (15-18,000 acres) Walpole family, later Lord Cholmondeley
- Melton Constable Estate (12-14,000 acres) Astley family
- Long Sutton Estate (12-14,000 acres) later Lord Hastings
- Wotton Estate (12-14,000 acres) Walpole family, later Lord Oxford
- Marlingford & Blythburgh Estate (12-14,000 acres) Evans-Lombe family
- Stow Bardolph Estate (11-12,000 acres) The Hare family
- Gunton Estate (11-12,000 acres) The Harbord family, later Lord Suffield

- Merton Estate (11-12,000 acres) The De Grey family, later Lord Walsingham
- West Acre Estate (10-11,000 acres) The Hammond family
- Kimberley Estate (10-11,000 acres) The Woodhouse family, later Earls of Kimberley
- Land in estates 5-10,000 acres
FIGURE 3
GUNTON PARK ESTATE LAND-1784-1842

- - - - - - - Estate land recorded only in 1784
- - - - - - - Estate land recorded in 1784 & 1842

Modern parish boundaries
• Settlement
North Walsham & Dilham Canal

0----1----2 Miles
Fig. 4 - Location of Middleton in relation to S. Lancashire

Fig. 5 - Middleton and the Manchester cluster - 1775
FIGURE 6 - MIDDLETON AND THE MANCHESTER CLUSTER- 1821
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### PLATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLATE I</th>
<th>Gunton Hall and Gunton Park - c. late 1820s [from R.M. Bacon. <em>A memoir of the life of Edward, third Baron Suffield</em>]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLATE II A</td>
<td>Gunton Hall - August 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLATE II B</td>
<td>Gunton Hall - Suffield Coat of Arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLATE II</td>
<td>Gunton Park - August 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLATE IV</td>
<td>Gunton Park - St. Andrew's Church - August 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLATE V</td>
<td>Edward, third Lord Suffield [© National Portrait Gallery–Archive Engravings Collection]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLATE VI</td>
<td>Edward, third Lord Suffield [© Paul Mellon Centre–Photo Archive]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLATE VII I</td>
<td>Thomas William Coke, later 1st Earl of Leicester of Holkham [from A.W.M. Stirling. <em>Coke of Norfolk and his friends</em>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLATE IX</td>
<td>Joseph John Gurney [from David Swift. <em>Joseph John Gurney: banker, reformer and quaker</em>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLATE X</td>
<td>Elizabeth Gurney Fry at Newgate: the gentlemen in the group (from left to right) include Samuel Gurney, Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton, Joseph John Gurney and Dr. Ryder, Bishop of Gloucester - 1816 [from David Swift. <em>Joseph John Gurney: banker, reformer and quaker</em>]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gunton Park c. late 1820s
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REPRODUCTIONS OF LETTERS FROM THE COLLECTION: THE PERSONAL PAPERS OF EDWARD, THIRD LORD SUFFIELD [NRO/GTN/-] © NRO

I /1/ Edward Harbord to Suffield [1st Ld.]*

II /2/ James Seeker and other signatories to Suffield: [1828]

III /3/ Harbord to Suffield [2nd Ld.] : 03.11.1819*

IV /3/ Ld. Grosvenor to Harbord: 07.02.1820*

V /9/ Joseph J. Gurney to Harbord: 18.01.1820*

VI /9/ Suffield [2nd Ld.] to Harbord: 20.02.1820

VII /11/ Amos Ogden to Harbord: 09.01.1821*

VIII /11/ Harbord to Amos Ogden: 09.09.1821*

IX /31/ Ld. Melbourne to Suffield: 28.11.1830

* extracts only
LETTER I

about my going into the water, as I do really oppose that. I never go in without proper people attending, & the people always go in to my depth in any part except in writing about the flood facing, so they are in. The Westminster boys are going to play me at bricking, next week at Shrewsbury, there will be the Westminster the game of stone, and I think rather of Westminster. The masters know nothing about it, nor are they intended to do so, I believe till it is over, so I suppose the stone boys think they come back will be rewarded with a comfortable reasonable & proper present of tobacco, together with a few thousand lines of some book to translate to every boy or whatever please for Bricks, to which more likely the Weekeebee will submit as, supposing that they will not be conquered. I think the Weekeebee will can now overcome, the Westminster boys in any thing. To give you a specimen of Westminster seeing, may that so you think, in your letter the other day, against wind, a stream, two miles an hour & a quarter. But I hope will not think that I am engaged the least in the water matters, for the I am very fond of the water, my great amusement now is books, I am writing for the holidays my new boat at home, to exercise my skill in that art, which I suppose you one is not to be equalled.
LETTER II

My Lord, We, the undersigned inhabitants of the town of Plladion and the neighborhood, take the liberty of addressing to your Lordship the deep respect we feel on the late unexpected decision of the Master of the Grove, respecting the Grammar School in this place—a decision which is materially to affect the interests & well-being of the many students, whose case has involved on your Lordship so heavy an expense:

We also beg, most respectfully, to tender to your Lordship our thanks for the very kind exertions made by your Lordship in this matter, during the line of many years, against the really dangerous Corporation of Bramore College Oxford.

We are, My Lord,

Your Lordship's

[Signatures]
LETTER III

E. Suffield
& Co.

Richmond
Nov. 3, 1899
No. 3

My dear brother,

Dad I not heard from you today I should have written to acknowledge an assurance of which I was guilty in taking leave of you. I feel a sight to have exposure to you as I did to L. L. my son of the very kind mention you gave me to my family at Blockling, you & L. L. both made me as comfortable as possible & a very much cordially thank you for your attention to me.

I deeply regret that any public conduct should cause you any sensation however transient, but as your represent the identity offering myself with your political opinions.
LETTER III

As the most offensive part of my proceedings, a little heat passionately inflamed may prevent any lasting impression of an unpleasant nature. After all this pain I took to distinguish myself from the party to which you allude, it is a little unlucky that you who would perhaps more than any other person lament such an alliance, should be the only one with whom my efforts the only one by whom I am misunderstood. Having been unceasing. In spite of my public declaration that I hold no connexion with the Whigs, and I to be identified with them because they happen to agree in opinion with me. Why must it be supposed that I adopt the sentiments of L. & R.L. and I then so incapable of
LETTER II

forming an opinion, that, if I entertain one on a subject of more than ordinary
importance, I must be charged with borrowing it from others. So on the other hand, if by
accident, I should have formed an opinion of my own, and I to abandon that opinion
merely because I find your political opponents have adopted the same. Can any
thing be so unreasonable as to suspect that I am to preserve silence upon a matter of
great public importance merely because

say that every man should study

in the conduct it involving

yourself. You should recollect, though

I did not declare it in public that I believe

your political friends have adopted a line

of policy which if pursued must inevita-

tly terminate in revolution. You should

recollect that I think it essential to the safety

of our constitution, of our liberty, of our
LETTER III

property & perhaps one ever, that a particular party should be checked in those frantic cases of substituting weight for right, that the poor defended people in the mean time should be led to repose confidence in their legitimate rulers men of rank, of wealth & of education & not be left by the respectable part of the community to derive consolation in their distress from the statement learnt as the York Caricle. I do not pretend to infallibility of judgment. I may be wrong, but if your judgment infallible & may not you be in error. If I am not capable of forming a right opinion at 30. years of age I should be glad to know when my ending of perception is to arrive, if two thirds of a family are awared by court favour the other is to be deprived from aworing his
unbiased opinion on that very account, or because the political opinions of that family happen to coincide with him in a particular instance - how is the truth to be spoken? The fact is that ministers are bolstered up on all sides by what I consider illegitimate influence - a man, & becomes so that account of such a man at the present incumbent upon every man to disregard private & party feelings in the declaration of his honest sentiments. You are left capable independent conduct of such declarations, & thinking as I do, I fear I barely did my duty on the occasion of which you complain. As to my father's part, I have only to remind you that for 20 years he was politically & personally too true a friend, I looked on his picture while I spoke - why did I not appeal to that record of his unflinced conduct in parliament? (the words at the foot of the picture) because I
LETTER III

remembered in case there is need for it.

Stating your weight, I trust that you are

The change; I should find some difficulty perhaps in finding the contrary. You speak of my acci-

funds in that expiation. I shall make no comment

means had your time quite cool; you

utter my own, of

that, not seeking to your recollection a

letter which I wrote in reply to your from your

surgery, or to become a candidate for

I then suggested to you the possibility

my understanding; political sentiment.

your answer, so I shall not distress you

the issue of your own decision. Your

reply I confided in friends, and I have

described it occasionally referred

to the letter in which I conveyed this answer. You will

find I believe an accurate report of my official

in this work last folio Chronicle.

would not have used it; I feel that this was on

my part undeserved. Hearing you of my past

present report at causing your annoyance in the

discharge of a public duty; trusting that you

will give me credit for caution in the expression

of my sentiments upon solemn reflection. I shall.


LETTER IV

\[ No. 12 \]

I do not think my name is the one mentioned. Please let me know if you are a brother or a friend of mine or any other person coming from me. I am quite on edge in the sense as to my existence, there being a rumor about of election or influence derived from family friends. I have time to do no harm by this part, but I have intended to make as much as is necessary. I know the details to give you a sufficient idea of the matter of that only as much as necessary unless given. I should say that you could be more to take
LETTER V

[Illustration: ...]

For now, brother dear,
your words are kind.
Your love is very real.

I am going to write, my dear friends,
a very short letter and a very great hurry, chiefly to say
that Sunday last, when I
had great pleasure in visiting the Bedwell.
I found the people more greatly employed
than at the small of one in shoemaking.
Another was engaged in cariying on one side
was doing nothing; a very old man, a
silent and thoughtful of actions, was lying in bed
reading his bible. The cell as appeared to
be severely afflicted with a little feverish
book. I thought it might be some
pleasure to thee, to hear that thy efforts have
been so successful. It made me feel that
very much may be affected by an individual
LETTER V

in his situation? I really devoted to his duty in life, because avenging on himself necessity to act in the spirit of the Gospel, which is 'God to God in the highest, indifferent peace and good will to men.' I do believe this to be the case; it may the Christian motive become more of more powerful until this, until every other convulsive be entirely & finally subdued!

I should add to my story, that there is some corn for the mule to find, then it is capable of finding; so that there is no lack whatever of the means of employing.

I was much pleased with the humble (Mr. Rawd) who appears to devote himself completely to the freemen, teach them to read, make shoes, &c. He tells me that he has only 10p. 4 weeks, that has promised an advance in case of good conduct. The fact testifies
LETTER V

To his Lordship. Strenuously, I am here a married man, really think he ought to have more. Should be quite glad at his being a little encouraged.

We have had a sad scene here in our long ward! Also the vanity of profession, when the day of trial comes! A contest for alderman with the death of...Robey. Francis & Foster the different candidates. Public looks forward some days before hand, a man going without expense or ceremony.

Really believe from all that I now that Francis' friends set the example, it carried six or much larger expectation of the lines. The latter escape themselves with the del principle of retaliation. I completely destroy my confidence in any individuals who part object is party. As to think there is now any hope that the system will be stopped, there is nearly the complete, R.
LETTER V

...inevitable defeat of one or other of the two parties, in the war.

My sister, too, is laid up at home, being ordered to keep her sofa by the seaside. I hope she is doing well.

The present difficulty of turning out a book is really as much as I can bear. I am just now engaged in submitting my works to the close criticism of a very clever, distinctly learned man. I believe the book will weather this storm, but not without bestowing upon its unfortunate author some additional months of very hard labor. This is the subject upon which I am just now most particularly interested.

I am much pleased to hear of the fishing prospects, from which they will afford them well. I consider them well worthy of attention, and have no doubt of their effecting great things.

I hope I shall take further liberty to express that heaven alone we are permitted to effect.
LETTER VI

2

Sharon Feb. 3rd.

1828

Dear Edward,

Thank you for letting me know your intention of standing for Sheffisbury. I hope you will succeed as you seem to wish it. You are fortunate in finding a place, where no question was asked as to Political principles, and no money required. My friends and family send their respects. 

Yours truly,

[Signature]
LETTER VII

This consolation from these reflections I have honestly and sincerely discharged my duty, not only to my equals in this district but also to my inferiors whenever an opportunity as offered itself, and while I am spoilt, it is my duty, it is my duty, to set the small example of a true gentleman, inventing the cabaretesque violence, the absurd and unchivalrous measures of administration are bringing upon this nation...
LETTER VII

calent of 23 per cent. will take place before the per-
sent year terminates, in which case I am sure the pres-
cent tax will be imposed as the balances will be paid, and
subsequent taxation will be found unsupportable, and then
annulment is too late, for some attempt will be made.

Is this about the charge which has been so long
indulged for by the reformers? I hardly need refer
thereto, nor is it necessary to take the trouble
which I have so much desire to take the trouble
of inserting. It will be remembered in the Reform's act
the present constitution of the House of Commons
is such that I should desire to see independent
men take a seat therein by the purchase
of a borough, and, if they can secure some legal
standing, meet them of contending with them.

Middleton, Jan. 31st, Penn.

Your Obse. Servant,

Amos Ogden.
W. Henry

If you consider the paragraph in my last letter which you allude to as the definition of my principles of reform, I am not surprised at your being puzzled by it. It was intended to be an exact definition, but it was written hastily and imperfectly. I must confess to regret any difficulty incurred. I am obliged to you for affording me the opportunity of explanation. I am very willing to accord my friendly disposition to a reform in part, generally, to a particular scheme of it. I have been from time to time impressed by the government of a republic, as the democracy is said to have been in the past. I am much deterred, I would retreat to it all its proper share of influence and power. Now, in order to do this, I would make the House of Commons the real organ of the people. In this way I think it could avoid the present check to abuse, it would.
LETTER VII

I would under probable adoption of such measures of improvement as might be passed, in nine and a half years, a system of
unrestricted free land and five years of improvement. I think the House of Commons ought to be reformed to an extent which would
accomplish this, might be made an elected organ of the people, without introducing any experimental novelty into our constitution; so far I think
some of the objects mentioned in my last letter attainable by this means. If attained, the first
demand of the people would be satisfied.

If more than this be attempted by reform you have no rational ground to repeat many
the country labours under; though all of the
greater magnitudes, the greater part of which
are caused by bad government, either might
be remedied gradually by reform, but always...
LETTER VII

declared to arise from immorality, vice, and
dishonesty. The desire of repose and security,
indeed, is in us all; but the desire of that
public safety may arise from the necessity
of bad government. It is true; but the root of this
is in our own evil nature which is to corrupt only
by ourselves. Education was really intended as a
means to be a better mode of accomplishing this
object, to reform our "nature." The dissemination
of knowledge must tend to civilize mankind,
it will be the means of separating men with
times, and towards God, and towards their neigh-
bors, and to give a larger range of those duties are
required. It would not be long before they would
see, that in the place of that deep exchange of their
duties there entered a more religious love and
happiness here for it. After so closely linked. You will not
enjoy perhaps how I would proceed to make
the doctrine spread, the oxygen of the people.
Letter II

158

L. Melbourne
20. March 1932

Private

[Handwritten text in a messy handwriting, making it difficult to transcribe accurately.]
Resurcs v.r. - Harford, Md., to London.
With this - yours faithfully.

[Signature]
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