

General Stock", raised to implement a new charter granted by Cromwell, had been so small that for four years the Company had to put its profits into development and go without dividends.¹ The Hudson's Bay Company, from the time of its Charter certainly, and almost certainly from the time of the first syndicate adventure, had to do the same; only in its case the spell of no dividend was not four years long but fourteen.²

vii

The two goldsmith bankers, Portman and Vyner, may have left, not the sinking, but the still unprofitable ship of the Company because they had lost money to the Crown. But neither they nor any other business men showed much faith in the Company's future, as has already been seen. Not that a banker's or financier's future was very safe. Before Vyner and Portman sold out, another man of their sort came in as a £300 shareholder, John Lindsay or Lindsey, of the Angel in Lombard Street, a goldsmith who kept "running cashes", current accounts, as we say.³ He, too, lent

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 132.

² It is stated in Willson, *Great Company*, I, 64, that Prince Rupert was "paid a lump sum by the Adventurers". This is possible, though there is certainly no record of it, but it seems unlikely. The share voted gratis to the Duke of York is clearly recorded, so there is no reason why a vote to Rupert should not have been. Rupert appears to pay in like anyone else. But he may have had something in the early unminuted days.

³ A.14/1, fos. 62d.-63. F. G. H. Price, *A Handbook of London Bankers* (London, 1890-1), p. 182. The name is spelled Lindsay or Lindsey (*e.g.* in *Cal. Treas. Books*, II, xlvi) and Linsey. The spelling Lindsay suggests a Scot, but a Scottish London goldsmith would be a very rare bird in 1670, whereas a Lindsey from the Suffolk village of that name would be quite natural. If it is a Scottish name, it is the only one among the goldsmith bankers of 1670.

money to the Crown; and he received secret service money; and he took over some of the City debt.¹ He paid his £300 on February 17, 1673, and was formally received; yet on December 22 following the General Court, Rupert for once present, is inquiring "by what authority" the Committee had let "Mr. Linsey" in. No doubt admission was technically a matter for the Court. In May of the next year the Court, Rupert present again, endorses his admission because "Mr. Linsey" had "Long Since"—very long since—"paid in £300 into this Companys Stocke".² For a time thereafter he acted as Treasurer, succeeding Richard Hawkins, another post-Charter adventurer, a City "Mr.", not an "Esq.", and a vintner, who himself had succeeded the first Treasurer, Portman.³ Three Treasurers in four years suggests untidy finance. And "Linsey" proved no more stable than his goldsmith predecessors. He is not among the bankers in the *Little London Directory* of 1677, and he was bankrupt by 1679.

The list of 1673 gives a total of £8,720 stock: that of 1675 a total of £10,550. New adventurers are admitted from time to time, like Hawkins and Lindsay; and from time to time old adventurers will take another share, normally of £300. In July and August, 1674, for example, Hayes and Shaftesbury each found an additional £300, and about this time two new adventurers were admitted, Esquires, John Bence and Richard

¹ He was owed £85,832. 17s. 2d. in 1672. For secret service and the City debt see *Cal. Treas. Books*, III, 1221, 1334.

² See p. 103.

³ I am assuming that he is the Richard Hawkins, vintner, mentioned in *Cal. Treas. Books*, IV, 474.

Carew. Carew plays no important part, but Bence is put on the Committee that autumn, with Lindsay, the new Treasurer, and a strong team of the original gentleman adventurers—Rupert as Governor, Carteret succeeding Shaftesbury as Deputy, and as Committee men Griffith, Hayes, Hungerford, Kirke and Robinson, the "bufflehead". These all, below the Prince, are baronets, knights and esquires. Even Lindsay, the goldsmith, had somehow got the right to be called esquire—in 1674 that was not merely a form of address—probably by buying a manor in the country. The list is singularly unlike that of the directorate of the East India Company, mostly Turkey merchants, or of that of the Bank of England twenty years later—with Governor, Deputy and twenty-four Directors, all City men, though several have been knighted and one is even a baronet.

The only post-Charter adventurers, besides those already mentioned, who occur in the Minutes are Mr. Charles Bayly, Mr. James Foster, Mark Hildsly, Esq., Mr. Stephen Cooke, Mr. William Yonge and "Mr. Walker". Bayly appears more as an employee than as a shareholder: he was both. Foster was also an employee and shareholder. Hildsly and Yonge each held £300 but very rarely attended meetings at this time, though Yonge became active later.¹ Cooke held £50, but apparently did not attend any meetings. "Mr. Walker" is puzzling, and may be either of two men, Nehemiah or William. Nehemiah Walker had been out "in the Countrey" of Hudson Bay, and was called on in

¹ He appears in A.43/1, *passim*, as of St. Martin's in the Fields. A.1/2, *passim*, shows his later activity.

December, 1671, to give an account of the *Wivenhoe's* cargo disposed of there.¹ The list of 1673 credits him with a holding of £150 and does not mention William. There is no stock account in Nehemiah's name in the Ledger and yet in the Book of Assignments he transfers £200 to William Walker on some unspecified day in 1674. In the 1675 list William appears, as is to be expected, but the Ledger says he had paid in £100 so early as May 5, 1670. Clearly two Walkers held stock, though there is some confusion in the records; but in the end only William. Committees met on three occasions at "Mr. Walker's house", and the house was probably that of William Walker, a goldsmith.²

A single other figure on the list of 1673 deserves a little notice, besides Charles Bayly who will receive plenty—Lady Margaret Drax,³ one of the earliest recorded woman shareholders in an English joint-stock adventure or company, though Queen Elizabeth might perhaps be so described. There is little doubt who she was, the widow of Sir James Drax "of London and Barbados", knighted in 1660, a cavalier planter of the Colleton type who served on the first Councils of Trade and of Plantations in that year.⁴

viii

The meeting of the Committee, not the Court, at "Mr. Walkers" is a reminder that, with no regular office, the Company met where it could—at the start in Vyner's house or in Robinson's quarters at the

¹ See p. 14.

² A.14/1, fo. 57d.

³ See Appendix G, pp. 224-5.

⁴ Andrews, *British Committees, Commissions and Councils of Trade and Plantations*, p. 132; Shaw, *Knights of England*, II, 225.

Tower: Vyner had got back to Lombard Street, after being burnt out in the Great Fire and driven to rooms in Broad Street.¹ Then comes a General Court at Whitehall; then a Committee at Alderman John Foorthe's house in Hackney! At this Committee the Alderman offers his rooms at the Excise Office, in Broad Street, " & for all papers bookes & accountes to bee kept there ".² His offer is gladly accepted, and for a time the Excise Office appears to be the rendezvous, though the place is not always stated. There are excursions to " Mr. Millington's ", " the Prince's Lodging's " and Whitehall. For a time the Tower is again brought into use, with a visit in July, 1673, to " My Lord Chancellors house ". Whitehall, or the Robes Chamber, Whitehall, as once specified, by no means implies that the Prince attended; though " the Prince's Lodging's " does imply that: six General Courts, that is not half of all the General Courts held out of seventy-four meetings of all sorts here minuted, is his attendance record. Other meetings are held at " Esqr. Kirkes house ", at the Fleece in Cornhill, at Mr. Hawkins's house, and again a whole series at the Excise Office.³ There, if anywhere, the Company may perhaps be said to have had its headquarters, during these years and until the Foorthes dropped out. But if we are to call this the headquarters, we must note that the Governor never set his foot in it. Broad Street was off his beat, though he did once attend at the Tower, as any Prince might.

¹ Reddaway, *Rebuilding of London after the Great Fire*, pp. 30, 294, 300; Price, *Handbook of London Bankers*, p. 182.

² See p. 14.

³ Also Exeter House, which was " My Lord Chancellors house ".

ix

In this Company of imperialist lords and gentlemen holding appointments under the Crown, with their often temporary colleagues from the world of finance, whose gains, as well as their enormous losses, came chiefly from tax-collecting and loan-subscribing; in this Company of what William Cobbett would have called "tax eaters", there were some very constant elements, and of these the most constant, and in the end one of the most important, was Sir James Hayes. Even the great the unscrupulous and active Shaftesbury disappears at the time of his political eclipse, and before—this is to his credit—there is any evidence that his activity had brought him in a penny: he took no "debentures" even. On July 17, 1679, his "whole Share remaineing" passed to "Thomas Leman of London, Gent.",¹ whether for less or more than he gave for it we do not know, but there is no reason to suppose for more. Meanwhile, before Shaftesbury's eclipse, Hayes has become Deputy Governor, in succession to Carteret, Shaftesbury himself, and Robinson of the Tower.² Deputy Governor he remains for about ten years, first under Rupert and after Rupert's death in 1682 under James, Duke of York. He is Deputy Governor when the first dividend of fifty per cent. is declared in 1684.

From what Pepys says about Rupert's distaste for business and from the way in which Pepys, on one occasion, could only get his "great letter . . . about the victualling of the fleet"³ considered in the highest

¹ A.43/1, fo. 14d.

² The gap in the Minutes, after the series here edited, leaves the date of his election uncertain: it was probably 1676.

³ Wheatley, *Diary of Samuel Pepys*, V, 416.

quarter by sending it through Hayes, we might safely have inferred that all the drudgery of organisation in the early days of the adventure and the Company would be left by the patron and Governor to his brisk and officious secretary. That is why it has been suggested that it was Hayes who did the first collecting of subscriptions. And that is what the records of the Company show. They also show this useful subordinate, the kind of man who will see to it, at first keeping somewhat in the background, then coming steadily to the front; at first an ordinary average stockholder, on the list of 1675 the holder of more than a sixth of the whole nominal stock of the Company. He unloads a little at that time, as will appear, but not it may be conjectured to his own loss; for everything recorded of him indicates the judicious contriver, the man who knows precisely what he wants and how to get it.

His attendances at business meetings are significant. At the first thirteen he is not recorded as present, though he had been one of the six who asked for a charter in 1669.¹ No doubt, however, he was one of the "greate number of the adventurers" present with the Prince at Whitehall on November 30, 1671: the Prince was not the man to conduct business without his secretary. Hayes keeps quietly in the shadow of his master. But on April 2, 1672, now able to hold his own with the greater adventurers, for since 1670 he has been a knight, he is one of four who attend an important Committee; and that Committee is the first of sixty-one Committees, Sub-Committees and Courts minuted, of which Sir James is present at no less than forty-nine.

¹ See p. xxviii: he appears also on the Instrument of Incorporation of April 18, 1670.

The constant attendant, the useful man, the man who will see to it and has the course of past business in mind. Not, it may be agreed, a man with a tithe of Shaftesbury's dominant genius; but one who having worked with and under that exceptional personality is ready, when things have ripened, to serve as Deputy Governor. Carteret succeeded Shaftesbury in 1674 and was re-elected in 1675.¹ By that time Hayes' voting power in the General Court was considerable. He had built up an important holding and was doing a good deal of assignment of shares. On September 14 he acquired £400 from Robinson, Robinson's total holding. On September 17 he assigned £200 of this to Sir Richard Munden, £100 to James Buck, Esq., and £100 to a certain Captain with the attractive name of Hopefor Bendall. The list of adventurers dated November 1 credits him correctly with £1,800 stock; but on November 18, he assigned a further £300 to Sir William Warren, the great timber merchant, the man who gave Samuel Pepys presents of silver plate to recommend his timber to the Admiralty. Unless Hayes' assignments were made on hard terms, there is here the making of what might be called a Hayes party on the Court well before his election as Deputy.

The Ledger, from which all these facts come,² is, it may be noted, in two parts. The first part is a Stock Ledger. The second part is a record of expenditure, of most varied kinds, and of receipts from the sales of fur, all under the names of individuals—captains' wages; payments out to "Mr. Gooseberry and Mr. Radison"; payments to a variety of tradesmen for

¹ This is noted on the 1675 list.

² A.14/1.

stores and trade goods; a payment of £20 to Richard Beane "for settling & stateing ye severall accompts in this booke"; and a frank entry by Beane of "Accompts of wages paid to severall Seamen as in the Cash booke which I know not how to charge to particular accts. nor how to give them Credit". In this section of the book the names of several of the adventurers occur. Carteret had bought a ketch, the *Discovery*, for the Company; had sold her at a loss and been paid the difference. Bayly had been paid for services rendered in the Bay. Millington's entry refers to a transaction in wine. Kirke has made a few, Portman and Lindsay as treasurers a fair number, of disbursements on behalf of the Company. Hayes's account is very different from any of these. It contains a long series of cash payments over a period of seven years, 1668-75, in fact from the time of the first adventure until June 18, 1675.¹ The total is no less than £636. 2s. 6d., and the items are most miscellaneous. He is paid for things he does and for things that he gets done—for procuring His Majesty's order for the loan of the *Eaglet*; for procuring necessary Orders in Council; for powder; for seamen; for work done at Woolwich; for having the Company's seal cut; and so on. One payment to him that has especially interested historians of the Company is "for translating a Booke of Radisons".² He is also paid in 1672 "money disbursed for Commissions &

¹ It is in A.14/1, fos. 78d.-79. See Appendix C, pp. 170-1.

² Presumably the early narratives of his travels, which are among the Pepys manuscripts in the Rawlinson Collection in the Bodleian Library, Oxford. These narratives are written in English and are printed in G. D. Scull (ed.), *Voyages of Peter Esprit Radisson* (Boston, 1885), pp. 25-247. Cf. *Minnesota History*, XVI, Fulmer Mood, "The London Background of the Radisson Problem", pp. 394 and 406.

Protections". Whoever is the Company's Treasurer, Hayes is its factotum.

The only vote anywhere in the Minutes of a fee to Sir James is one of June 3, 1674, authorising a payment of £4 to him "or Such person as hee Shall order for defrayeing the charges of writeing the instructions [for a Governor sent out to the Bay], & of his journey to Winsor to gett them Signed".¹ A number of the jobs for which he was paid are anterior to the Charter: it would be curious to know by whose authority those subsequent to it were made. Presumably by that of the Prince, to whom he had daily access. The ever-present secretary, saving trouble, with his "sign please, Your Highness" is not a fancy picture. Pepys authorises its main lines. Many of the jobs involved Hayes in expense. He may have translated Radisson's narrative; he did not cut the seal. But knowledge of the public morality of the day convinces one that some fraction of most of the items in the account stuck to his hands. Even modern morality would not boggle at a commission on jobs that took trouble and time.

Hayes was the only early investor of whom it might be said that the adventure was profitable to him. Many, including Rupert, died before the first dividend was declared. Some, like Robinson, had parted with their holdings before death. Some, including Albemarle and Griffith, left theirs to their heirs. Shaftesbury, as has been seen, seems to have made no profit at all. He and all the best of the adventurers, and those most loyal to the Company, strike one as reasonably disinterested imperialists and patrons of pioneering

¹ See p. 116.

enterprise, at the worst gamblers in exploration and empire. And it is fair to say of Hayes that he too was loyal and showed faith in the Company by his steady acquisition of its stock. He seems to have paid his first £300 with difficulty.¹ What he gave for his various "assignments" we do not know. Not par value one imagines, but no doubt something appreciable. If he resold to Captain Hopefor Bendall and the rest at a profit—again we do not know, but it is likely enough—that is a common investor's habit. Though, unlike other adventurers, he found the Company a useful source of current income in fees and perquisites, at least he put what he made back into it until it began to be a dividend-paying concern.

x

The Minutes cover a period from which no correspondence or reports from the Bay have survived, if indeed there were any. On the whole it seems probable that there were not. We learn in the Minutes of reports made in writing by captains and officials when at home; and if anything had been sent or brought from the Bay, other than the accounts which certainly were kept, it could hardly have escaped mention. Hudson Bay is seen through an official telescope set up in Broad Street, the Tower, or Whitehall, and so is not seen very distinctly. Still, casual references to ships, trade, trading points and projects for settlement, and full accounts of cargoes and trade goods tell us something; and we learn a good deal about that remarkable

¹ See p. xxii.

figure who has excited the interest of all historians of the Company, Charles Bayly, its first resident governor in Rupert Land.

In 1669, Bayly is found a prisoner in the Tower in charge of its Lieutenant, Sir John Robinson. He had been sent there so far back as 1663-64, and "for seditious practises".¹ His seditious practice was in fact a militant and aggressive Quakerism. He is an extraordinary figure. Born in London,² he is first heard of, a young man, in Maryland in 1658, in touch with an extreme and "heretical" Quaker named Perrot who came into conflict with George Fox.³ With Perrot he is next found on the continent—actually at Rome, where he is imprisoned, and in France, where he is imprisoned again, for denouncing "idol priests". Returning, he "behaved extravagantly", the Quaker historian tells us, at Dover, crossed England, and was arrested at Bristol "for witnessing against the idol priests"—English ones this time.⁴ There was a special Act of Parliament against Quakers in 1662 (13 and 14 Car. II, C. 1, "for preventing the mischiefs and dangers that may arise from certain persons called Quakers"), so his arrest and detention were regular enough, even if he did not disturb the peace. Why he was passed by way of St. Albans to the Tower instead of staying in some common gaol is a puzzle. "Unless he were a person of importance", a lawyer writes, "he would scarcely be sent there";⁵ and historians of the Company have suggested

¹ *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, Charles II, 1666-67*, p. 530.

² For the evidence of this, see p. lvii, and Appendix G, p. 212.

³ W. C. Braithwaite, *The Beginnings of Quakerism* (London, 1912), p. 426.

⁴ W. C. Braithwaite, *The Second Period of Quakerism* (London, 1919), pp. 216, 238.

⁵ Professor P. H. Winfield to the author.

that he must have had Court influence. Yet there is no evidence of such influence except his own statement that he had actually spoken with the King; nor was there much time to acquire it between Maryland and Rome.

In September, 1663, he wrote to His Majesty from prison in Bristol and referred to the time when he "last spoke" with him. He had had a vision. A "whirlwind of the Lord" was coming over the nation. He urged Charles to repentance and to avoid "rioting and excess, chambering and wantonness".¹ Can it be that the cynical monarch found this rather a good jest, took an amused interest in Bayly's case, and had him put in the Tower? Charles had no personal feeling against Quakers, and in 1672 issued an amnesty to them. But Bayly had been considered and amnestied before that. Once he had been allowed out of the Tower on parole, to go to France no less—we do not know for what purpose. Returned to prison, he sent in a petition for final release just before Christmas, 1669.² He spoke of "neere six years imprisonment in the Tower", which suggests that he got there early in 1664.³ He did not even suggest that he had ceased, or might cease, to follow the Quaker way.

He had been in close touch with his gaoler, the Lieutenant, whom perhaps he had impressed as a travelled and fearless man. He was set free on conditions. He was to "betake himself to the Navigation

¹ *Cal. S.P., Dom., Charles II, 1663-64*, p. 261.

² *Acts of the Privy Council of England, Colonial Series, 1613-1680*, I, 540. His petition is of December 23. In it he mentions his French visit, "about five months since".

³ *Cal. S.P., Dom., Charles II, 1666-67*, p. 530, in the "list of prisoners in the Tower upon charity", he is said to have been placed there for "seditious practices" in 1663; but that may cover January 1- March 24, 1664, New Style.

of Hudsons Bay", as Sir John Robinson had undertaken that he should; but only provided—and it is here that historians have scented kindness towards him in high places—"Provided the Adventurers . . . will assure unto him . . . such conditions and Allowances as may be agreeable to reason and the nature of his Employment". Perhaps he had only talked Robinson round and persuaded him that he was worth it. He gets release and a career, and the Company a likely recruit. He sails, as has been noted, in the *Wivenhoe* for the adventure of 1670-71. Just about the time that he sailed, he is entered in the books of the Company as acquiring £300 stock.¹ How he got his money does not appear. It has been suggested that it was paid by him, or for him, as security for good behaviour.²

Returned from this venture of 1670-71, his name is frequent in the Minutes from November 21 onwards. On that day it is voted "That Mr. Bailey give up to Mr. Rastell [a clerk] all accountes hee hath in charge concerneing Hudsons bay, & in particular the account of the moneyes payd him at Plimouth".³ Next month he is required to "give an account to Mr. Rastel of all the *Wivenhoes* cargo disposed of in the Countrey accordeing as the same were traded for there . . . & alsoe . . . of the goods brought home". He is to produce "the originall bookes" kept in "the Countrey" and to report on some "beaver Skins very good & Large" that seem to have been mislaid.⁴ But he had come out

¹ A.14/1, fos. 58d.-59. May 31 and June 1, 1670, are the dates.

² The suggestion is that of Miss A. M. Johnson of the Hudson's Bay Company's Archives Department, to whom I am heavily indebted for advice and criticism.

³ See p. 10.

⁴ See p. 14.

of the voyage with credit. Both Captain Newland and Mr. Titherley, the mate, had died and Bayly "tooke upon him the charge of the Ship". The deaths must have been on the outward voyage or in "the Countrey", for "Some goods which were caryed in private trade [captains and mates were normally allowed to trade a little on their own account] were delivered to Mr. Bailey for the use of the Adventurers".¹

The Quaker had gained experience which placed him almost on a level with "the Frenchmen". When Captain Gillam and "Mr. Radison and Mr. Goosbery" are asked to give "advise in writeing of what cargo is needful to bee provided for the next expedition", he is called in with them; and he and they, with some others, are instructed to "See all the beaver equally allotted" into parcels of about one hundred pounds each.²

Bayly's advice dealt not only with fowling pieces, kettles, knives and hatchets. He suggested that "in case the Comittee Shall not thinke fitt for any Settlement to bee made in the Countrey", a single ship would be enough. If settlement was contemplated, at least thirty men should be sent "in respecte to mortality"; and to support a settlement and the trade, beside the *Prince Rupert*, either a bigger ship than the *Wivenhoe* or the *Wivenhoe* and another small ship of thirty or forty tons should be employed. As a place for the settlement he advised "Moussebae". This advice was given in January, 1672, and generally approved in February.³

¹ See p. 15. The goods were "delivered into the handes of Mr. Bailey in the Countrey for the Companies use", see pp. 30-1, so it seems most likely that the deaths happened there.

² See p. 16.

³ See p. 22.

The *Wivenhoe*, if sent, was to carry bricks and nails to Moose Bay for the building of a fort. A small ship was to go with her and to stay "in the Country" with five-and-twenty men. Fifteen others were to navigate the *Wivenhoe* back. Bayly's good conduct and good advice were rewarded with a payment of £20 "out of the first moneyes to come in of the beaver last Sould": the same gratuity was paid to "Mr. grosselyer & Mr. Radison".¹

The small ship, a later vote explains, is "to Serve for discovery & to coast from place to place in those partes". *Prince Rupert*, the Company's ship, is to have as consort another, hired, ship of "about hir burden"—the *Wivenhoe* or a substitute.² All this time Bayly is busy with Gillam clearing up the affairs of the last voyage and preparing for the next. A twenty-five ton vessel, the *Imploy*, is bought for £131;³ and eventually—there were several changes of policy—she and the *Prince Rupert* sailed together with the "dogger" *Messenger*, Captain Morris, which replaced the *Wivenhoe* as Bayly had suggested. A dogger was a two-masted, blunt-nosed, vessel of fishing-boat type. (Hence the Dogger Bank.) She carried a square mainsail and topsail on a pole mainmast stepped about amidships. There was probably a square sail on the mizzen, and a triangular foresail, but no jib. The *Prince Rupert* was to come back in the year, "if she can possibly". Some twenty men from the ships were to remain "in the Countrey", of whom one was "Mr. Peter Romulus" (Pierre Romieux), a French-Canadian surgeon.

¹ See p. 23.

² See pp. 32, 34.

³ This was apparently the sum finally paid; see pp. 37, 39. Note that she cost about as much as thirty-one of Samuel Pepys' style of beaver hats.

The *Prince Rupert* failed to get back in 1672. She and the *Messenger* only made Plymouth in October, 1673; the *Imploy* staying in the Bay, as planned.¹ That year no ship sailed. Before the voyage of 1674, the dogger was "turned into a pinke", by being made a three-master, with "Sayles to them proportionably".² As her stern had already some of the features of a "pinke" there would be no need to alter that.

Gillam and Radisson came back on the *Prince Rupert* in 1673, but Bayly had stayed out "in the Countrey": the Minutes that record the ships' arrival also order a payment of £22. 8s. 0d. to his wife, "in parte of her husbands Salary".

In February of the next year comes a vote, without reason assigned, "that Charles Bayley the presente governour in Hudson's bay bee Sent for home".³ It is the first time he has been given a rank. As his successor is to be appointed "with expresse order for Suppressing all manner of private trade whatsoever",⁴ it seems likely that the Quaker had either traded, or let others trade, unduly.

The successor, William Lydall, was chosen for the very good reason that he "hath made many Voyages to & from Russia & Lived many yeares therein that Countrey". His stipend was to be £100 a year and he was instructed that "all manner of trade in beaver [was] to bee forbidden; & all other private trade beaver excepted to bee mannaged openly".⁵ This proviso supports the reason suggested for Bayly's recall. Final orders for a letter of recall were not issued until May—he is to

¹ See p. 36.

² See p. 90.

³ See p. 81.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ See pp. 74, 97.

hand over all trade goods, stores and papers, and to "bee assistante" to Lydall "in discovereing & preventing private trade". Always private trade. He could not come home at once, and in fact he stayed out another five years, coming back in 1679, only to die in 1680. Lydall had thrown up his post at the end of a year, and Bayly had reverted to his old position. The Company arranged for his funeral at St. Paul's, Covent Garden, because he was born in that parish.¹ A good Quaker would not have wished to be buried from a "steeple-house"; but perhaps the need for organising defence against the "Nodways", and the conduct of a trade in guns, had impaired his early principles.²

xi

The business of private trade was a perpetual worry to the Company, as it always was to the East India Company, until in the end it became a regulated institution. The Hudson Bay adventurers, waiting their fourteen years for their first dividend, were naturally exacting employers. At the second meeting here minuted, that of the organising Committee (November 7, 1671), it was resolved "that Capta. Guillam & all others employed this voyage bee examined what private trade hath bin by them or any of them in the Countrey, or by the

¹ See Appendix G, p. 212.

² Tyrrell, *Doc. Rel. to the Early History of Hudson Bay*, "The History of Hudson's-Bay . . . by John Oldmixon", p. 390, he once pursued the "Nodways", but failed to "do any Execution".

mariners under them".¹ One can picture the tough New Englander fencing about this with Robinson and Portman: he was fortunate not to have to face Ashley, a terrible cross-examiner.²

Friction between Gillam and his employers can be seen setting in by a vote of January 15, 1674. Ashley, now Shaftesbury, is in the chair of the Committee and he means to stand no nonsense—"Ordred That a bill bee prepared & exhibited in Chancery in the name of this Company against Captain Guillam Captain Morris & the rest of the Seamen & others imployed in this Last voyage for discoverye of private trade."³ The smaller men were put on their oath, and wages were paid them less sums received for illicit trade in beaver. One man was "paid his wages deducting 8 lb. for 16 skins and the rest remitted except the 30 skins confest in his Oath on Capt. Morris his account wch. is to bee placed to his [Morris's] accot. accordingly".⁴ So the Captain had employed his man to trade for him and the man had blabbed. Another vote runs—"In case that William White does not testifie against Charles Reeves that he be paid his wages without any abatement".⁵ The crews and residents are testifying against one another right and left, and one sees what sort of things Bayly had failed to stop and Lydall was sent to stop if he could.

Nor is it surprising that on February 24 two new captains, Draper and Shepard,⁶ were appointed "in Commande of the two Shippes"⁷ of the year. It

¹ See p. 5.

² A. Bryant, *Samuel Pepys. The Years of Peril* (Cambridge, 1935), p. 227.

³ See p. 71.

⁴ See p. 77.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Thomas Shepard. See Appendix G, pp. 251-2.

⁷ See p. 81.

was at this same February meeting that the first decision to recall Bayly was reached. The bits of the story fit closely together, and it is the controlling, or failure to control, private trade that unites them. Shaftesbury was in the chair of nearly every meeting of the Committee about this time. That "most clear man in matters of accounts" meant to stop leaks and make the Company a paying proposition, if it were in any way possible. Some "beaver & other goodes" landed at Plymouth were to be sent to London in March, and "if my Lord Shaftesbury pleases", an official at Plymouth, Mr. Lanyon, was to be written to by him "to See that the Same bee putt in execution".¹ It cannot be doubted that his efficient Lordship saw to it that the letter was sent: he had heard from Philip Lanyon before.² At this March meeting arrangements were also made "to putt a finall issue" to the accounts of Gillam and Morris.

A week later the Committee is appointing a new surgeon for the Bay, Walter Farr, in place of Pierre Romieux, "Peter Romulus". He is to sign a three-year contract. He makes "proposalls concerneing private trade excepte for beaver". It is taken for granted that an official must have some rope, but he is warned off the beaver; and it is ordered "that whatsoever private trade Shall be allowed Shall notwithstanding bee brought into the Companyes warehouse", that is done openly. The phrase that immediately follows, "for the use of the proprietors", seems to imply that they were to get the profit, but it can hardly mean more than that they were to see the accounts.³

¹ See p. 86.

² See p. 70.

³ See p. 88.

Somehow, by this time, Morris and Gillam have squared the Committee. They are to hand over, Gillam the *Prince Rupert* and Morris the *Messenger*, with all rigging and stores to Mr. Holmes, the Company's husband; but Gillam is to have not only his full wages but also "the full of his account [of expenses]... without any defalcation for private trade", and Morris gets wages and "the ballance of his accounte... together with fifty poundes in money in full satisfaction for his beaver at Plimouth in the Companyes handes".¹ In spite of all rules, Morris, and it may be assumed Gillam also, has traded in beaver, put his stuff ashore at Plymouth, and now managed to make the Company pay him for it, though possibly not a full market price. The fight against private trade is a losing one, even with Bills in Chancery and Shaftesbury in the chair.

That is shown again in an April minute. Mr. Palmer, who had served as Bayly's second in command but was now at home, is to have his full wage as agreed "at his goeing to Sea", and it is added "that the beaver Skins & coates belonging to him bee delivered to his use, as well in respecte of his own discovereing the same himselfe, as for other good Services done for the Company".² If you own up and make yourself useful, you can get away even with beaver skins and coats. One cannot help wondering what amount of private trade Bayly had done. Perhaps Palmer informed against him. That was evidently a common practice; but the Minutes do not tell either thing.

After this it is almost ludicrous to find a General Court at Whitehall, with Rupert present, voting, on

¹ See p. 89.

² See p. 95.

May 8, "That no private trade bee allowed in any kinde of furies, & that all other private trade which may be allowed in any other comodities [And what might they be? Skins? Wampum?], Shall bee by publicke License".¹ Surgeon Farr is going out with an expectation of at least some private trade, and so no doubt are others. Even Governor Lydall, with his Russian experience of furs and the fur trade, will have his temptations, though we hear nothing of a private trade contract in his case. But if a surgeon (at £48 a year) and a second-in-command (at about that) have brought it off, or may bring it off, can a governor be expected to be content with £100 a year; and do the Committee, men experienced in commissions, douceurs, and rakes off, really expect that he will? Yet the Court goes on to instruct the two new captains to take "Strict charge . . . for discovereing any manner of privacy that may bee in the Sayd Shippes for Stoweing private trade, in order to prevente the same"²—any beads in the men's lockers or suspicious bundles, one supposes. And what about lockers in the captains' quarters?

The Committee, as in duty bound, is endorsing the Court vote just before the ships of the '74 venture sail: May 25, 1674, "that the Seamen & all others bee obliged from any trade in all kinde of furies".³ The ships were in fact not cleared from Gravesend until the first week in June: there is no record that the captains reported the absence of "any manner of privacy . . . for Stoweing private trade"; and that is the last that these Minutes tell us on the matter.

¹ See p. 103.

² Ibid.

³ See p. 110.

After all it was Gillam who sailed, not Draper; and he was once more in charge of the *Prince Rupert*. Why the changes were made we do not know. On May 27 Draper is voted £20 more "in consideration of Service done"—he had already had £20¹—clearly as a paying-off fee; and on May 29 money is being voted to Gillam as a "Comander".² Shepard had been given the *Prince Rupert* in March, but now he is transferred to the *Shaftesbury*, which there is every reason to think was only the *Messenger* with a new name to match the new rig.³

xii

Especially in these later Minutes, but to some extent scattered through all, there is information of interest not merely to the student of Hudson Bay history or of early joint-stock-company enterprise, but to the economic and social historian of England. We learn, for example, what and what amount of provisions were considered necessary for so many men for sixteen months, so many for seven, and so many more for three. The allowance of beer is three quarts per man per day. Besides beer, considerable quantities of "mault" are shipped, for beer on the homeward voyage, it would seem. The other provisions are bread, flour, beef, pork, "currans & other fruit", pease, butter and cheese

¹ See pp. 105, 112.

² See p. 113.

³ There is no record of the building or hiring of the *Shaftesbury*, and the tradesmen's accounts for supplies ordered for the 1674 voyage taken in conjunction with references in the Minutes to her and the *Messenger*, suggest that the two ships were really one. There was some thought that the ships might sight the little *Employ* homeward bound (see pp. lv-vi, 111), but actually she stayed out in the Bay.

—some for the voyage and some for the residents in the Bay. With these are sent brandy, vinegar, oatmeal, onions, salt and that lime juice which made the Yankee in later years call the English seaman and the English immigrant generally, a “limey”.¹ Add to that “two quarter cask of Port wine”²—it is interesting to find the men of 1674 shipping this as their luxury drink—and £10 a piece, a substantial sum when a highly-skilled man’s wage was 15*s.* 0*d.* a week, to the captains for fresh provisions, and you get a reasonably varied, and as the quantities show, a certainly ample, sea diet. With luck, it could be supplemented by fishing. No doubt the pick of the fresh food, with the port and probably the brandy, would be reserved for captains, mates, governors and higher officials: but it is stated expressly that the “currans & other fruit” were part of the men’s ration.

We can work out also a complete scale of pay, from the official and the surgeon down to the male domestic servant. These rates of pay are, of course, comparable not with the skilled mason’s 15*s.* 0*d.* a week, say £35 a year, for a mason cannot count on fifty-two full weeks’ work, but with those of people “in service” who are housed and fed. The housing, on ship or at the Bay, was no doubt rough, but the feeding, as has been seen, appears to have been—barring accidents—ample. A governor gets £100 a year and all found, a surgeon £48. The ship’s carpenter may be given £4. 10*s.* 0*d.* a month “if not to bee had under”,³ the boatswain £3. 10*s.* 0*d.*, the gunner £2. 10*s.* 0*d.*, and able seamen up to £1. 16*s.* 0*d.* These are serving rates: seamen might

¹ See pp. 98-101.

² See p. 113.

³ See p. 102.

be out of a ship, and before she sailed they only had half-pay; so rates cannot be multiplied by twelve to get annual earnings. One can only say that a boatswain's month was worth 10s. 0d. less than a resident surgeon's, and 10s. 0d. more than a ship's surgeon, who is paid at £3. Mates get £4. 10s. 0d. or £5, according to quality.

There is also a valuable list of pay rates for craftsmen and others who have agreed to stay three years "in the Countrey". A smith, a cooper, a cook, and a bricklayer each get £20 a year; a tailor and a sawyer get £15; and Robert Palmer, the Governor's servant, gets £12. These all appear on the same list as Walter Farr, the surgeon, with his £48. A surgeon is four times and a governor eight-and-a-half times as good as a governor's man.¹

The bricklayer may seem out of place, until one notes that on this voyage of 1674, the *Prince Rupert* and the *Shaftesbury* took out 5,000 bricks and 1,000 tiles.² For a very long time bricks moved across the Atlantic. They served conveniently as ballast, and there are houses still standing on the American side whose bricks were burnt in England or Holland. Bayly had talked of sending bricks on an earlier voyage, but it seems that the 1674 cargo was in fact the first.

It is not possible to translate the salary and wage rates into some modern equivalent by applying a simple multiplier. The relative costs of things vary so bewilderingly. A well-dressed man like Mr. Pepys might spend as much in sterling on his clothes as a corresponding man would to-day. Even "duffel" cloth for

¹ See pp. 108-9.

² See p. 106.

the Indians was not at all cheap (3*s.* 2*d.* a yard).¹ The average price of wheat in England during the seventies of the seventeenth century was a good deal higher in sterling than it was in 1914—4*s.* 2*d.* a quarter against 3*s.* 11*d.*—a fact not generally realised. The making of it, or of rye or barley, into bread was a cheaper process than it became in the twentieth century—lower labour costs and so on—but that did not mean a ridiculously cheap loaf. Meat, if not too good, was cheap, and cheese was 3*d.* a pound; but butter was 6*d.* Beer was dirt cheap. Sugar was very dear by modern standards, and tea or coffee were novel and most expensive luxuries. Tobacco was very dear. It is doubtful whether, in respect of its power of buying necessities and minor luxuries, the skilled London mason's 15*s.* 0*d.* wage, the rough mason's 9*s.* 0*d.* to 10*s.* 0*d.*, or the unskilled labourer's 6*s.* 0*d.* or 7*s.* 0*d.* should be multiplied by much more than two, at most by three, for purpose of comparison with, say, 1914.² At sea or at the Bay comparison fails. You ate what the Company provided or the country could be made to produce. Your cash wage you presumably either saved or drank, so far as drink was to be had. There was rum enough in New England, but it can hardly have got through to the Bay yet. And we hear of the Company's men there, when the beer was used up, taking to water.³

¹ See p. 124, n. 1.

² The wages and prices here quoted are from J. E. T. Rogers, *A History of Agriculture and Prices in England, from the year after the Oxford Parliament, 1259, to the commencement of the Continental War, 1793* (Oxford, 1866-1902), *passim*.

³ Tyrrell, *Doc. Rel. to the Early History of Hudson Bay*, "The History of Hudson's-Bay . . . by John Oldmixon", p. 388.

The trade and general cargo of the last minuted adventure of 1674 is interesting. The list of May 16 contains no hatchets or kettles; but we know that hatchets had been ordered and delivered, and that there had been enquiries about kettles; so probably consignments of both were shipped.¹ There is a big item of "gunns"—three hundred from six different gunsmiths, with "wormes" and "bandes" for guns to match, and two "gunn Sticks" (ramrods) for each gun. There are six thousand flints and twelve dozen of powder horns. The rest of the trade goods are mainly Indian luxuries—glass beads, red caps, "penniston" caps,² duffel cloth, fifteen gross of tobacco pipes, two gross of small looking glasses, four gross of ivory combs and two gross of box-wood combs. A thousand pounds of tobacco will be both for trade and consumption, it may be assumed, and so perhaps will be the netting twine, fishing lines and "Wooddenware of Severall Sortes"—a hogshhead full. Forty suits of clothes are for the seamen's use, and so probably is the black, brown, and blue thread. Wheat, rye, barley and oats are for seed corn. With them are to go "Such Sortes of garden Seedes as the governour Shall advise".

Last comes a list which has nothing to do with trade—a bible, a common prayer book, a book of the homilies, six pewter dishes, twelve pewter plates, twelve "alchimye" spoons, presumably spoons made to look like gold or silver which in fact were neither, and six

¹ See pp. 89-90.

² Some type with a local name—Penistone in Yorkshire: cf. cambric, arras, worsted.

pewter porringers. This is evidently the new Governor's household equipment.

xiv

The London end of the business appears by this time to be in decent order, thanks one cannot help supposing to Shaftesbury's chairmanship, and in spite of the lack of a permanent office. Meeting in December, '73, "at Mr. Hawkins house", the Committee decides to appoint a husband "for manning the affayres of the Company": he is to land the stores from the *Messenger* and keep an account of them.¹ Next week a Mr. Robert Holmes is appointed husband and ordered to "take care of the Stores & other thinges belonging to both the Shippes now come home, & give account thereof to the Comittee".² He is employed in the checking of tradesmen's bills, in paying dependents of the Company's servants overseas, and in inquiries about their private trade and about disputes arising from it. It is to him that Gillam and Morris are instructed to hand over the ships intact with their rigging and stores, and it is he who delivers them to the proposed new captains. He gets "patternes of brasse kettles & the Lowest prices, as well ready made up, as unmade up",³ and he interviews and deals with those six gunmakers who supplied the three hundred guns for the '74 venture. In that connection there is an order "that no gunns or other goods bee hereafter provided but by the husbände as hee Shall be directed by ye Comittee".⁴ In June he is

¹ See p. 60.

³ See p. 90.

² See p. 62.

⁴ See p. 88.

getting bills of lading for everything signed by their "Comanders" put on board the two ships, which bills are to be delivered to the Governor; and he is last heard of on June 29 "alleageing that Some billes [of expenditure] may yet bee brought in which hee knoweth not of".¹ Arrangements are made for meeting these if they appear and so this useful and business-like Mr. Holmes, for the present, passes out of our sight.

The Company which employs him to supervise its outward and inward shipments has not yet paid a dividend, but it has at least curbed that private trading by its servants which cuts into profits, and has put its meetings and books on to a business-like footing. It owns ships and establishments in the Bay, and there is an organised market in London for its beaver. Such is the achievement of that blended courtier's curiosity, imperialist's enthusiasm, and common business shrewdness in the direction of the Company during its earliest years which this first volume of its Minutes reveals.

¹ See p. 121.