

REPORT

OF THE

SPEECH

OF

CHARLES BALL, ESQ.

IN THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

ON

WEDNESDAY, MAY 21, 1800,

ON THE QUESTION OF THE UNION.

DUBLIN:

Printed by William Porter, Grafton-Street.

1800.

REPORT

SPR E C H

CHARLES DALL

ON THE QUESTION OF THE UNION

TUNING

Printed by William Brown, 17, Abchurch Lane, London, E.C. 4.

1861

REPORT, ETC.

MR. SPEAKER,

THIS subject has been already so minutely and so distinctly canvassed in all its points and bearings, that I know it is impossible for me to add a single new idea on the subject, or to throw any new lights upon the arguments that have been used by others ; but I cannot hear the question discussed, without availing myself of the opportunity it affords me of entering my solemn protest (in common with the wiser and better half of this House, and in unison with what we all know and feel to be, the unanimous sense of the nation) against *this sale and barter* of the rights and liberties of Ireland. I make this protest, Sir, on behalf of my countrymen, my constituents, and myself !

I have not the vanity to expect that what I can say will make any impression on those who support this measure—I am persuaded that no talents, however exalted ; that no exertion of integrity or diligence, can afford any successful opposition to it in

this House. The means by which support has been obtained to the measure are such as private individuals cannot contend against. Argument!—fact!—even conviction itself has lost its weight, when placed in the scale with the means to which the minister of the crown has resorted, and which, I am sorry to say, have produced a total want of shame, integrity, and honor in his adherents and accomplices—have induced a majority of this House—some to *violate their solemn engagements*; others to *overlook the sense and wishes of their constituents*; many to *outrage the warnings of their consciences*, and the *convictions of their own minds*; and—all of them to *trample on the ties that ought to bind them to their country*!! Such means, acting on such materials—it is impossible to resist. But, Sir, although at this moment all efforts, made to save our country, may fail, though she may by her trustees be betrayed and sold to a temporary slavery, the time will come, when the names of those with whom I act will be remembered with affection and gratitude, and when Ireland, in justifying her own rights, will raise a monument to their fame and glory.

But whilst the interest of Ireland are the objects of my first concern—whilst her disgrace and the overthrow of her freedom and independence are the subjects of my severest regret and lamentation; yet I cannot but look beyond the limits of my own country with very sincere anxiety and grief, when I anticipate (as connected with and flowing from this sacrifice of our rights) the inevitable and sudden downfall of the liberties and constitution of Great Britain.

Britain. It is impossible that so large a portion of the empire, as Ireland is, can be reduced to slavery, with safety to the remaining parts—and it is a miserable and short-sighted policy in the people of England, thus to gratify their fraudulent and rapacious views on the wealth of Ireland, in which, should they unhappily succeed, they will ultimately pay the heavy penalty of their own subjugation; and whilst I thus feel for the cause of liberty—not only the liberty of my own country, but also of that neighbour with which we have hitherto been so fortunately and so prosperously connected, I cannot but lament the effect with which this sacrifice will operate on the interests and the fame of that gracious Monarch, who yet reigns in the hearts of his people, *because his people are free*, who, I trust, will not be prevailed on to exchange the *willing and hearty allegiance* of a nation of freemen, for the *reluctant and enforced obedience of a horde of slaves*. It is not consistent with the affection I bear that virtuous Prince, and with the respect I entertain for his office, to state by what term the relation between the master and the slave is designated—may those nations and their Sovereign be for ever preserved from such mutual disgrace and degradation!

It is not my intention to enter at length into any detailed argument on the principle of this project, I shall chiefly confine myself to an examination of the views of those who have conspired to sell and to enslave the country, and the means on which they rely for the completion of their base and nefarious purpose; and here, Sir, I cannot but revert with
indignation

indignation and scorn to the gross ingratitude in which this measure originated.—At a time when the loyal gentry, traders, artizans, and yeomanry of Ireland, forsaking their usual comforts and habits of life, did, at the risk of every thing dear to them, rally round the footsteps of the tottering throne—at the very time when they demonstrated *the most unbounded and zealous attachment to their Sovereign, to their constitution, and to the connection with Britain*—at that moment was the minister of of that Sovereign plotting against the constitution, and exciting in the minds of his countrymen of England a spirit of fraud and rapine against the dearest rights of this ill-fated land—and when the Irish loyalists—when every man in Ireland above the level of the mob, with scarcely an exception, had vanquished the rebellion that (it now clearly appears, and that no man can be found hardy enough to deny) was fomented by the minister and his accomplices—while they were pouring forth their congratulations to their Sovereign in the person of his viceroy, and expecting to receive in return those expressions of approbation and of acknowledgment to which they were so eminently entitled;—how were they rewarded?—with ingratitude and slander. The loyal gentry and yeomanry of Ireland were to be charged with disaffection and with faction, in order to afford a pretext for bribing their Parliament—their representatives—their trustees—to sell their rights.—It is not on the conquered rabble that this baneful measure is to operate, but on the gentlemen of the land who effected that conquest—the

mass

mass of the people are the last to suffer the evils of bad government ; it is the higher and middle orders of society that first feel them—their effects will ultimately reach the people, but not till the gentry and higher classes are first degraded and destroyed.

A curious, but melancholy, object of enquiry presents itself in the inversion of public opinion on this subject. It came, at first, accompanied with all the care and precaution that unprincipled craft could contrive ;—emissaries were employed in every corner of the kingdom, furnished with delusions, misrepresentations, unfounded assertions, terrors, and allurements.—I give the conspirators credit, at least, for their ingenuity and diligence ;—their deceptions had their effect—the weak were misled, the ignorant were deluded, the timid were alarmed, and the base were corrupted—apathy, acquiescence, and, in some instances, even symptoms of approbation appeared without doors—But in this House—raised by their understandings, their information, and their habits of discussion and enquiry, above the vortex of artifice and sophistry—all their devices were unsuccessful—this House rejected the measure!—The many close and severe investigations the question underwent in Parliament, at length opened the eyes of the nation out of doors to the real nature of the project ; and that which, I fear, has seldom happened in a House of Parliament, happened here—many members were convinced in the course of the debate—many who had been deceived or deluded by the minister, and had intended to support the measure, after it had been scrutinized and exposed by a
long

long and acute investigation, publicly declared that they were converted—that the solidity and wisdom of the arguments urged at this side of the House, and the total dearth of argument that appeared on the other side, had changed their opinion, and that they would join in scouting a measure that had nothing to support it but unfounded assertion, misstatement, and delusion.—As the nation was emerging from the mist with which the minister had blinded her—while he perceived the effects of his artifices and frauds daily losing ground in the popular opinion—he found it necessary to redouble his efforts to induce the members of the House of Commons to *change sides*—for it is well known he never expected, nor did he ever find a man who left this side of the House *from conviction*, and a *real* change of sentiment.—The means which he resorted to, to effect this change of conduct in this House, are too notorious to require any deep investigation. I shall briefly state some of the most glaring and flagitious enormities that have been practised with this view.—Every man who refused to sell his conscience and his country was branded as a traitor; he who preferred the interests of Ireland to those of England, was called a separatist; and he who wished to abide by and preserve the constitution, which the most beneficent of Kings had conceded to us, was stigmatized as disaffected.—The minister had learned from recent example how greedy the public ear is for calumny and slander—he had seen the vizier in his divan sentence to the bow-string the glorious Founder of the Liberties of Ireland.—Unheard, unpleaded,

pleaded, unopposed—that illustrious character, to whom this nation owes her freedom and her wealth, was doomed to fall under the sentence of a close, a secret, and an unauthorized tribunal.—But, Sir, while I abhor the treachery of that base proceeding—I must do justice to the policy and cunning of the noble fabricator—plotting, as he has confessed, for seven years before against the constitution of his country, it was an obvious and necessary prelude to remove or disarm the great champion of that constitution, before he ventured on the attack. Had that more than noble gentleman fallen the victim of subornation and injustice, his noble persecutor might have exulted in the prospect of a certain and speedy conquest over that constitution, which the great, unshaken, and persevering assertor of the rights of Ireland had raised. In *his debasement* and destruction he might hope to see the genius of Ireland laid prostrate at the foot of her insulting neighbour, and his own little schemes of ambition confirmed in the *ruin of his Country*.—His machinations have not succeeded—the mists of calumny, which for a while obscured the lustre of that glorious champion of the rights of Ireland, are dispelled, and we see him, as if arising from the grave, with a courage undaunted, and a genius unequalled, defending that independence which, in the year 82, he gave his country.

Whilst those groundless charges were made to *intimidate*, the most barefaced and avowed bribery was resorted to, to *seduce*.—I ask, if it be not notorious that members who held places under the crown

were threatened with privation if they should refuse to sacrifice their country and their honor ! Will any man answer in the negative ?—Have those threats been carried into execution ? Will this be answered in the negative ?—Have the employments of men thus plundered been promised to members of this House as rewards for supporting the Union ? Will this be answered in the negative ?—Do any placemen in this House vote for the measure, *avowedly against their wishes* and their opinions, in order *to preserve their places* ? Will this question receive a negative ?—Who was the first that changed his vote in this House, and was he not bribed with an employment to do so ? Will this be answered in the negative ?—Have not places and pensions innumerable been distributed among members of Parliament, in order to buy votes for the Union ? Will any man venture to give this question a negative ?—Has any man received a sum of money for his vote ? Will any member answer this in the negative ?—Have any members of this House been found not depraved enough to brand themselves with apostacy, but not honest enough to resist temptation ; who have been *bought out*, that tools and dependants might be *bought in* ? Will this be answered in the negative ?—Has the peerage been canvassed and bribed to use the influence of wealth and rank in procuring votes in this House ? Will this be answered in the negative ?—Have certain great lords, high in office, contracted with the minister for the sale of votes in the House of Commons, by dozens and by scores ? Will this be answered in the negative ?—

Has

Has not the minority, consisting of 107, been raised to a majority, whose gross number is, perhaps, 160, by these base and dishonest means? I am sure no man will answer this in the negative.

But, Sir, this change of sentiment among the people, from acquiescence to unanimous reprobation—and in this house from rejection to adoption, accomplished in the manner I have stated, are not the only changes that have taken place in the progress of this question. The very ground-work and foundation of the arguments that were first urged in support of it, have been abandoned, and an entirely new doctrine and set of topics adopted for that purpose; so that, the arguments used in this session of Parliament by the minister, form, in fact and in conclusion, a complete refutation of every thing he advanced either as matter of statement, or of inference, in the last.—When it first came forward it was ushered in by the minister and his adherents, with the most pompous and inflated accounts of the wealth and prosperity of Ireland.—The plethoric habits of the country endangered the general welfare. Ireland must be reduced to that state of mediocrity in commerce and in wealth that should not be inconsistent with the humble and secondary rank that was allotted to her in the political scale. She had outgrown the connexion—and the British Parliament was the bed of Procrustes where she must be reduced to her proper dimensions. She was become too powerful to be governed—her strength and her resources must be therefore reduced;—for this purpose it was necessary that her wealthiest

Peers and Commoners, with their connections, and their rents and incomes, should be expatriated;—that our commerce should be regulated and controuled not merely by strangers but by rivals; and that, while we were thus robbed of the resources necessary to the support of our own little subordinate establishment, we should be called upon to contribute our full quota to the expence of that great overgrown and domineering nation, for whose use and benefit we were to be enslaved. Sir, the absurdity of such arguments as these, urged to the party that was to make the sacrifice, was too glaring to require an answer—they were well calculated to whet the ravenous appetite of English selfishness, for the plunder and robbery of Ireland; but there was not a word that came from the supporters of the measure that did not operate on every unbought Irishman as an argument against it. If Ireland had grown to a state of wealth and prosperity that excited the envy of her neighbour—if her strength had increased to a degree that raised her above the reach of British and ministerial oppression—if she was bound in fairness to contribute her proportion of supply to the exigencies of the empire—let her preserve the constitution which had given birth to that strength, and from whence that wealth have flowed—let her preserve a domestic Irish Legislature, to which alone she could with safety entrust the rate and applotment of that contribution! But, Sir, the minister placed no reliance on his own argument—he had studied the red book and counted his standing force and strength in this House—What that
standing

standing force amounts to, has been stated by a right honorable gentleman (Mr. Conolly) who has lately retired from Parliament, and is now in the act of indorsing over his county of Londonderry to an honorable gentleman, the near relative of the noble Secretary.—(I lament for that young gentleman that he has at length given way to the persuasions of his family, and has suffered his name to be enrolled with those who support this measure.)—But, Sir, what was the standing force of the minister in this House when this subject was introduced, as stated by that right hon. gentleman—*one hundred and sixteen placemen and pensioners!* Upon *that standing force* the minister relied for support, and not on *argument or reason!* He, however, found himself disappointed—the folly and wickedness of the attempt defeated its success, and with a standing force of 116 placemen and pensioners, and God knows how many expectants; with a conviction in the mind of every man, that to oppose the measure was to lose his office; and a practical lesson to all, that to support it was the road to the highest and most important stations, though the candidate should be never so incompetent—with such a phalanx of dependants—with such terrors and with such inducements—the minister *was defeated, and this House rejected the measure!!*—And let us view the character of that House of Commons, that while it was *yet unpacked and ungarbled* rejected the Union. Let us look to the state of the country at the period of its election. The rebellion (once publicly excited and then privately fomented by the noble

noble Secretary and his associates) had not yet broke out—alarming symptoms of revolutionary projects, had, however, made their appearance, and the enemies of our government, of our sovereign, and of our connection, were, no doubt, numerous and active. But as disaffection proceeded on hand, loyalty and affectionate attachment to our constitution encreased on the other. The conspirators looking to separation, and *well knowing that no intrigue or effort could so fashion this House as to make it an engine for such a purpose*—meddled not with the elections—the choice was every where left with the loyal—the disaffected stood aloof—the government candidate in almost every instance walked over the course—and yet *that House of Commons—chosen exclusively by the loyalty of the country—rejected the measure!!*

In this session we have been assailed by a new and contradictory set of topics—but equally weak, equally futile, and equally conclusive against those who use them. We hear now of nothing but penury and want, bankruptcy and ruin! And yet we are called upon to unite with this great and wealthy neighbour—and out of our lean and withered resources to contribute our *full quota* of expence with her exuberant and overflowing prosperity. Sir, if this nation has plunged into expence beyond her means—if she has incurred the danger of bankruptcy, how has she been cajoled and entrapped into such imprudence?—With a blind zeal she has followed the footsteps of England, and with an ill-requited generosity she has supported her in her ambitious

bitious schemes of power and agrandizement—of agrandizement *that has encouraged her to demand*—and of power that *will enable her to atchieve* the ruin of Ireland. Sir, if Ireland be poor and England rich, an equal proportion of contribution must be the ruin of the poorer country ;—look to the principle by which the British minister has regulated his income-tax in England—do all pay in an equal proportion?—No—some are wholly exempt, and it is only on overgrown incomes that the tax falls with complete effect and severity. All incomes under £60 a-year are left wholly free ; because that sum is held necessary for the actual support of the individual, and he is supposed incapable of affording any portion of it to the state, and when the tax does commence it proceeds on such a scale, that inferior incomes pay but a moderate per centage, gradually increasing according to the fund that is to pay, till at a certain sum one tenth part is levied ;—this would be the only fair and equitable principle of assessing the mutual contributions of two countries unequal in their resources ;—to each should be first allowed a sum adequate to their actual individual necessities, and the contributions should be levied only on the surplus : thus, if the wealth of England be to that of Ireland as has been stated, as 15 is to 2, it should be ascertained how much was necessary to the support of the several nations, and the contributions calculated only on the residue ; so that if of her two proportions Ireland consumed one in her necessary support, and if out of her 14 proportions England was obliged to consume three, (which, though

though not, I admit, a strictly accurate estimate, is yet, I believe, a tolerably fair computation) Ireland would have a residue of one, and England a residue of twelve parts, forming a proper fund, and an equitable criterion of contribution—so that instead of 1-8th of the aggregate sum being to be raised by Ireland, she ought only to be charged at the rate of 1-13th, and even less, if the principle that has been applied to the income tax, of increasing the tax, in proportion as the taxable fund encreased, should, as is but fair, be adopted. Nay, Ireland ought to be still further considered as entitled to a reduction in her proportion of quota, in consequence not only of the injury she must sustain in her resources by sending the flower of her nobility and gentry with their fortunes out of the kingdom, but also in consideration of the great benefit to be derived to England by such a constant influx of Irish wealth. But to view this argument drawn from the supposed approach of bankruptcy, and the necessity of putting our concerns into the management of the British Parliament, in order to ward off the misfortune, into its truest point of view—let us look back to the state of this country before the year 1782, till which time the British Parliament *had* the management of our concerns, and till which time, under the blessed effects of her jealousies—her rivalry—her care and management, *this country was for centuries reduced to beggary and ruin.*

Oh but, Sir, Ireland is now in no danger of suffering from the jealousy, the rivalry, and the rapacity of England! She is to be put wholly out of the
power

power of England by enjoying *one hundred* representatives in the Imperial Parliament!—Sir, this assertion is an insult to our understandings—that one hundred votes, even if they were honest and unbought, can form any check or balance against five hundred and fifty eight!—Let me remind you, Sir, that an Englishman loves his country, and prefers her interests before that of all the world.—Does an Irishman do so? Look to the other side of the House, and the question is answered. The Englishman glories in the pride and honor of his country—the Irishman *steals* into favor with the enemies of Ireland *by degrading and enslaving her*. Besides, Sir, of our hundred Irish representatives twenty are to be bribed—we shall have twenty more expectants, and thus, with sixty honest men, (supposing the best to happen) and those reduced, in effect, by a set-off of forty traitors, to a real force of but twenty—with this miserable mockery of representation Ireland is to encounter with England in the field of regulation, arrangement, and contribution! Look into the House of Commons of England, and see what hope has Ireland that she will find champions there to oppose with any effect the inroads of British selfishness and rapacity. Of *five hundred and fifty-eight* members, (when the question was, whether Ireland should be enslaved?) there were but *thirty* found to assert the rights of nature and of justice—but thirty who were generous enough to interpose with their votes in favor of this devoted island.

If we look to the pretended motive of the conspirators who have formed this plot against the liberties

ties of Ireland, we shall there find the same absurdity and delusion that prevails throughout.—“ *It is necessary to abolish the Parliament of Ireland in order to preserve the connection*”—and all who in this House have rejected the bribes and allurements of power, and prefer the duty they owe the public to their own private emolument, are slandered as traitors! Sir, no man would deserve a patient hearing in this House who would deny that there has been, and still in some degree, perhaps, exists a serious and alarming faction, whose object is to separate this country from England—but he is a man of unblushing effrontery who will assert that any such danger is to be dreaded from this House. Let us remember the last Parliament, and say, is there any symptom of a separating disposition in the House of Commons? In the last Parliament the opposition to the minister had dwindled to eleven.—Why? Because the zeal for connection was paramount to every other political sentiment—and although in that small number there appeared a set of names the most honorable and respectable, yet they stood alone in every effort they made to oppose the minister, because the whole body of the House, excepting that small number, thought no object then worth their attention except the preservation of the connection.

Sir, there is not a nation under Heaven in which there may not be found some innovators, reformers, or traitors ready on every occasion to sacrifice the peace and happiness of their country, to visionary plans of public improvement, or to selfish views of personal ambition—*of this I see before me many examples!*

examples! But the question of separation has had a fair trial, and has received a signal, and I hope a decisive, overthrow—at least I have no fears of ever seeing that question again revived, unless it be provoked by enforcing this most unjust, oppressive, and revolting measure.—From whom, Sir, did this attempt at separation receive its defeat? From the loyalty and zeal of the gentry and yeomanry of Ireland. If in the rabble of the country, headed by a few misguided and unprincipled demagogues, multitudes entertained desperate views of revolution, and treason, and separation, more were found among the better orders—more even in numbers, but in weight, power, and energy, a stupendous majority, ready to sacrifice their lives in support of the throne and of British connection!

Let us look back, Sir, to the history of the last three years, and let us examine by the test of facts and experience the relative strength of the friends of separation, and the supporters of connection.—In the year 1796, the enemies of the empire landed an army on our shores, with a view to separate the two countries—What was the consequence?—From North to South the whole island became a scene of arms to repel the invader and to defend the connection. In 1798, after having already encouraged a domestic rebellion, which the friends of British connection in Ireland completely defeated—and that, let me observe, before the arrival of the auxiliaries from England—the same enemy again invaded:—Was this attempt more successful than the former, or were the friends to England less numerous or less

animated with zeal and valour than they had shewn themselves in the recent rebellion, or on the invasion of 96?—Were the energies and the strength of the nation found arrayed on the side of disaffection?—Were our gentry, our yeomanry, and our militia disaffected?—Was VEREKER a traitor?—Did he who risked his life against odds that baffle calculation, to support the government—did he conspire to sever the countries?—Did he, who with a handful of gallant Irishmen pressed forward to throw himself between the advancing enemy and the bosom of his country, with a rapidity, equalled only by that with which some some hon. gentlemen, who now sit before me, fled to save their miserable and worthless lives?—did he, who with his little band achieved more for the safety of Ireland in an hour, than the Viceroy was able to perform in weeks, accompanied with a numerous army, with his staff, his artillery, and his household troops—whose numbers and whose discipline in this House the nation has now to lament, as she had then to regret their inactivity and tardiness in the field?—did *he* conspire against the interest of his sovereign?—Is *he* who tendered his life for the public service—a life which Providence miraculously spared, that his glory might be complete, and that his wisdom and virtue in council might rival his valour and conduct in war?—Is he a traitor?—You, Vereker! (Here a loud cry of Order! from the Treasury Bench.) Sir, I am not surprised at the fore and morbid feeling that excites this cry of order from that right hon. bench—I am not daubing with fulsome adulation the leader of a
band

band of mercenaries in this House—I am pouring forth the honest effusions of heartfelt gratitude and esteem for that man who still labours to preserve to his country that freedom for which he has already fought and bled. You, Vereker, who with a valour that casts into shade and shame the puny efforts of those who, slow to defend the interests of the empire, are yet busy to undermine the welfare of Ireland—You, who have graced the short and now expiring history of your country with a new Thermopylæ—You are represented to the sovereign whose crown you preserved, as an enemy to his government; and your factious and treasonable motives are at this moment canvassed in his cabinet, and set in contrast with the pure and disinterested loyalty, it may be, of the member for Galway, or, perhaps, the member for Derry.

Sir, the project of Union is a departure from the system by which this country has been governed and preserved to Great Britain for 600 years—as such I object to it. In all times of turbulence, in all dangers of separation—and they have often occurred—the cure applied by the policy of England was, an Irish Parliament; and it was always successful; frequently redressing national grievances—often resisting oppression—but always correcting seditious and separating tendencies: Irish Parliaments have been for centuries the only binding link of connection between the countries.—This project is founded on the principles of that tyrant Charles II. who, when he conspired with a set of profligate ministers to overthrow the liberties of England, made this ill-fated

fated country the scene of his wicked preparations. England he knew could not be enslaved *but by an army*—an army could not be made completely useful while the *check of a Parliament was left*. In Ireland then, as in a *depot*, an army was to be stored, to be in due time employed against the liberties of England, and in the mean time the use of Parliaments in Ireland was to be laid aside!—Such were the means by which the projects of the Stuarts were to be accomplished; they were not more wicked than they were unwise—the evil recoiled on its artificers—the catastrophe that followed I need not recapitulate! Let me hear from the supporters of the present measure a single particle of the danger—of the folly—and of the depravity of this measure of Charles—that is not to be found in the project before us.—Will any man deny that the minister of England is as fond of power as any minister employed by the monarch whose misconduct produced the revolution? Will any man deny that he has departed from the principles of the constitution, as widely as the cabal or junto of the worst of the Stuarts? Will any man deny that he proposes to erect a military government in Ireland?—And who will venture to contend that the liberties of England can withstand the force by which that government is to be maintained? And to complete the analogy in all its dreadful detail, *the use of Parliaments in Ireland is to be laid aside for ever!*

The solemn compact by which his Majesty thro' his ministers, and by which the British Parliament in the year 82, secured, (as far as the faith of nations can

can be security) to this country a freedom from all future projects on our constitution, has been urged so often, and with such irresistible force, that I shall say but little on the subject. I shall only observe upon the very strange and foolish doctrine that has been resorted to, in order to prove that that arrangement was not final. A noble lord in the other House of Parliament, one who, by the bye, rose into rank and power on the shoulders of the people—that noble lord was in the confidence of the minister at the period of the settlement of 82; he was also, alas! in the confidence of the nation. That noble lord, Sir, has argued against the finality of the arrangement of 82, and to prove that it was not final, he states a *private conspiracy* formed at the time between *one* of the contracting parties and *some* of the trustees of the other. I—says the noble lord, who took so distinguished a part in behalf of Ireland in that arrangement—I can bear testimony in favour of England *that she was not then sincere*; and though I admit Ireland to have been *deceived and imposed upon*, yet I now demand on behalf of Great Britain the revisionary advantage of her deceit and treachery! True it is, none of the conspirators in the year 82 suffered the word *Union* to escape their lips—but still it was in their hearts and in their intentions, and they only waited for a favourable opportunity of carrying it into effect. Sir, the noble lord to whom I am alluding is a great Equity Judge—and I should desire to know how he will reconcile those principles of public faith, to the principles by which his decrees are regulated. I contend for it, that if such a conspiracy

racy did actually exist, (of which some men doubt,) it goes more strongly, than any other circumstance, to prove the finality of that settlement in all fair and equitable construction, because it shews that a future infraction was in the mind and views of one contracting party, but that that party well knew that the other believed and intended it to be final; and because she carefully concealed from the other her intended infringement and the quibble on which she proposed to rely—knowing that if she had her intentions, there would have been an end of the contract, and that Ireland would have abided by her then present condition, or have acquiesced in the relief, whatever it might be, that she could have acquired for herself, rather than proceed in a treaty, that left her open to a future attack of a nature so destructive as this.—And the strict silence of those who, in 82 are said to have formed this conspiracy, is a proof that they were conscious that at that period the nation would have rejected the measure with disdain—perhaps with a sentiment more serious!

From this circumstance, (the known aversion of the nation to a union in 82) a reflection naturally arises, that decidedly gives the lye to that base and malignant slander, that has thrown, on all the opposers of Union, the stigma of separation. In 82 the whole Irish nation would have spurned at Union!—But did they look for separation?—They had smarted under centuries of tyranny and injustice—But did they look for separation?—Religious feuds and animosities were unknown among them—
they

they were united in affection and kindness—they were inflamed with injury—they were armed!—Did they look for separation?—No, Sir, if they wished to separate, they might have accomplished their wish;—The English army in the country did not exceed 5000 men—the Volunteers amounted to 60,000—the example of America was before them—the assistance of Lewis, of Holland and of Spain was at their command—the armies of Britain were retiring from America without their swords—her fleets were fighting drawn battles with the fleets of Bourbon.—Did Ireland look for separation? No! she valued the connexion—because she found a way to enjoy it *without slavery*—because she was not alarmed with *terrors of Union*!—She preserved the connexion, because the connexion was not incompatible with an independent domestic legislature—was not incompatible with her wealth and prosperity!—Such, Sir, was the choice of Ireland in 82—she chose, (when she might have carved for herself,) *connexion coupled with independence*—she has thriven beyond example—experience and history have justified her wisdom.

The same noble judge, (I speak from printed accounts of the debates) has resorted to another argument in support of this measure—an argument of a nature so curious, that it is impossible to pass it by without comment.—He has alluded to the history of Denmark and Sweden.—He has bitterly inveighed against the folly of those two nations for having omitted to adopt a Legislative Union—because, says the noble Judge, had that been done,

the connexion between them would not have been dissolved, and Denmark would to this day have preserved her dominion over Sweden.—Sir, with the inhuman tyrant and his domineering subjects, from whose cruelty and rapine Gustavus rescued his country—with Christiern and with Denmark this argument might have had weight. Had the project been suggested to them, in time, they would, probably, have adopted it, and *Sweden would to this day have remained enslaved!* But, Sir, on the part of Ireland, I reject the proposal, as Sweden would have done.—I reject it, because I will not consent to an arrangement that *subjects this country to oppression* and renders *that oppression perpetual!*

If I were at a loss for argument to justify my opposition to this measure, I should be satisfied with a view of the conduct and feelings of the people of England on the subject. Among them we have seen the prospect of their renewed dominion received, with the avidity that might have been expected from a nation, that had for a while conceded to fear, a supremacy, she was about to recover by fraud. But, Sir, though the tranquillity and acquiescence with which England embraces a measure, which Ireland unanimously deprecates, might naturally excite alarm as to its real object and the consequences to be looked for from it—that alarm is heightened by another consideration, arising from the only instance in which this general complacency and satisfaction of England has been interrupted—from the only complaint that has arisen in that country against it.—Of the numerous details accompanying

accompanying this measure—among the various objects of a political, constitutional, financial and commercial nature, which this measure involves, one, only, was found to excite even a murmur or an anxiety in the breasts of the English nation. Unfortunately the noble secretary and his accomplices having no substantial materials to furnish him with argument or reasoning on behalf of the measure, in speaking on this subject, usually launched forth into turgid and bombastic boasts of the generosity of England in granting this blessing to Ireland.—He could find in his whole scheme but one article in which there appeared the remotest semblance of generosity or concession to Ireland, and of this he was determined to avail himself, with his accustomed verbiage. His theme was the *generosity* of that exalted nation! Of that people who were *as munificent as they were powerful!* As much exalted above *selfish considerations* as they were elevated above *national prejudices!* That great and wonderful people had, with a benevolence and self-denial unexampled in the history of man, conceded to us the staple and material of her own most valued manufacture, of that manufacture, which had raised her to the highest pinnacle of wealth and power—she had conceded to us a right to import her wool! But, Sir, what has been the result of all this inflated panegyric on the generosity of Britons to Ireland? A few days has furnished us with a woeful comment. The people of England heard the virtues imputed to them—they were alarmed!—They heard the praise of generosity be-

flowed upon them—they stood upon their defence!—Generosity! it was a new idea to them. In the Union with Ireland they *looked for dominion, for monopoly, for finance, for contribution!* But, to their surprise and disappointment, they were told, *they were to be generous!* Such a matter had never entered their heads or their hearts!—The table of the British Parliament was instantly loaded with petitions, praying that they might be relieved from the only article that had even the face of generosity. The representatives of the most *disinterested* and *generous people on earth* stated to their fellow members the wishes of three millions of their constituents, and the Heaven-born Minister was called upon *to revoke the boon* to Ireland!—The minister had gone too far to recall the article, but he did what equally satisfied the *most enlightened and liberal assembly on earth!* He demonstrated to them, (and in my conscience I believe it to be the only sincere statement he or his servants have ever made on the subject)—he demonstrated, that the whole was but a delusion practised on Ireland, for, that every circumstance in the situation of this country placed an insurmountable barrier against her ever being able to avail herself of the concession. The most liberal and enlightened representatives of the most generous and disinterested nation on earth were satisfied, on behalf of themselves and their constituents, by the solution of the *Heaven-born minister*, and all opposition to the grant was at an end as soon as it was found *that the grant was useless!*

In

In short, Sir, I know no argument that has been used by the authors of this measure that has not been amply refuted, but *one*;—to discover *that* argument—to *whom* it has been applied, and the *extent* to which it has operated—I refer to the red book, or Court Calendar—to the place and pension list—there, and there only, may be seen *the terms* of the Union—from them alone may be discovered the *weight* and *solidity* of those reasons that have procured it support. In fact, Sir, the gentlemen who support it do not themselves know, and are not able to assign even a plausible pretext for their conduct. Sir, the idle and contradictory topics by which the tools and dependants of the ministers attempt to justify themselves, prove that they know, in their consciences, they cannot be justified. Many days have not passed since two hon. gentlemen, members of this House, attempted to enlighten *me* on this subject; the first of them, after declaring the Union to be the greatest blessing to Ireland that any nation ever received, proceeded to state the mode in which it was to produce the advantages that were expected from it—and how was this, Sir? He admitted “that it was impossible for this country ever to become a nation of manufacture or commerce—the want of fuel—the remoteness from the seat of empire and fashion, after the Union—the established capitals and machinery of England, together with the jealousy of its people, must ever *effectually prevent Ireland from becoming a nation of manufacture and commerce*. But, to balance this evil, Mr. Pitt intended that
 she

the should be a nation of agriculture, and I might rely upon it, that in a few years this country would become *the granary of Europe.*" Sir, the words of this profound politician were still vibrating in my ear, when I met with the other hon. member, who also thought it incumbent on him to give me a lesson. But, Sir, if I had profited by the former gentleman's discourse, I was doomed to unlearn it all under the instructions of my second tutor.—His doctrine was "that the humidity of the climate, and the variable seasons of Ireland were such as must ever *render it unfit for tillage*, but that under this new order of things, we might expect, in a short time, to see every art and manufacture established, and thriving in a degree hitherto unknown in any nation—and that we should, in a very short time, under the fostering care of Mr. Pitt, *become the mart and shop of Great Britain, and of the world!*" I concluded that the opinions at least of *one* of those honourable gentlemen *had been bought*—I have searched the lists of placemen and pensioners on your table, and have found *that both were so.*

But, Sir, can we wonder that two men should differ from each other, when we find that even the same man, under strong temptations of self-interest, will differ from himself. I will, Sir, with the indulgence of the House, state what were the former opinions of some of its honourable members, upon a subject, in principle analogous, but in degree and effect widely different from the present—the propositions of 85. They will afford a very melancholy prospect

prospect of tergiversation and corruption—and if any man votes for this measure, misled by the delusive sophistry of those whose past and present conduct I am about to place in contrast, I trust it will, on the minds of such deceived and misguided men, have some salutary effect.

I shall first state a few of the opinions delivered by Mr. Orde, the secretary, who brought forward that abortive arrangement—these were his words—
 “ He advised the House to consider what the pro-
 “ positions *enabled them to do*—so far were they from
 “ *binding their posterity*—they did not even bind
 “ *themselves irrevocably*—the conditions were op-
 “ tional—Ireland had a *constant annual* option of
 “ renewing laws for duties. He wished the country
 “ always to *have the liberty of parting with the ar-*
 “ *rangement* rather than to submit to what she thought
 “ inconvenient.” The same minister, in the same speech, again speaks in terms of spirited indignation, of certain attempts made in the Parliament of Great Britain to introduce into the propositions, articles that would affect the *independence of the Irish Legislature*—and he goes on—“ I must say again
 “ and again, that it *never was*, nor *ever has been*,
 “ nor *ever could be intended* that Ireland should
 “ abandon, in any sort whatsoever, her *constitu-*
 “ *tional right* of legislating for herself, both exter-
 “ nally and internally.” Sir, a superstitious man would almost believe that the genius of Ireland, foreseeing this parasitical attack, had put these words into the mouth of the English secretary, in order to raise an authority against it.

A right

A right hon. gentleman, (Mr. Conolly) late a member of this House, but who, as I already mentioned, has withdrawn from Parliament, in order to transfer his county to an hon. gentleman, brother to the noble Secretary. That right hon. gentleman, though now a partisan of the noble lord, and one of those on whose integrity and patriotism the noble lord has affected much to rely, as affording some little shew of respectability to his party—that right hon. gentleman, *before he had acquired great accessions of wealth in England*—before he was fascinated by the spells of the noble lord, and when his *mind and understanding were more vigorous* than at present—that right hon. gentleman opposed the measure of 85! I will state some of his expressions on that occasion, because they apply almost with providential accuracy to the present question—“*The bill,*” he said, “*bartered away the constitution of Ireland—he had NO RIGHT to give his*” “consent to *ALTER or relinquish it*—nor had any” “member of that House any such right—and the” “kingdom, he was persuaded, would *never submit*” “*to such a sacrifice!*”—and that right hon. gentleman in his honest zeal for the liberty of his country, was not content with *once* entering this protest against the competence of Parliament to betray and sell the constitution; for on the same night he *again* returned to the subject, declaring a second time, “that the constitution we had ac-” “quired *no man could give up; it was a question*” “*with the people* out of doors, and the Parliament” “was not intitled to abandon it. Let Ireland enjoy” “the

“ the advantages she has under her free constitution, and *let her preserve that Constitution.*”

I shall next state the sentiments of a right hon. gentleman at that time, and I believe at all times, high in office, (Mr. Mason) who supported the measure of 85, as he does this of 1800, but whose argument on that day arraigns his conduct now; “ he desired the House to recollect, that they were “ not about to form an *indissoluble* contract, like “ *the treaty of Union* between England and Scotland, “ for the moment the act of Union passed, the “ *Parliament of Scotland was annihilated*; and if “ the articles of Union proved highly oppressive to “ the people of Scotland, they were left *without* “ *resource*, except what they should find in the “ moderation of the British Parliament, or *the* “ *hazards of a civil war*. The body of men to “ whom they would have *applied for redress*, no “ longer existed—*their Parliament was no more*, but “ the Parliament of Ireland would remain in full “ *vigour*, and would be *always* able to *reject* if they “ pleased, the *regulations of Great Britain*,” and the same right hon. gentleman, before he concluded, “ observed, “ that if England should fall into “ dotage, and grow too foolish to understand her “ real interests, it would then *be in the power*, and “ it would *become the duty* of the Parliament of Ireland to declare off.”

Sir, I conceive no better argument could be used in support of the propositions, provided their general object had been good, which I believe it was, than that which I have repeated, but my mind is

not capable of comprehending, how a more conclusive argument can be used against a Union, than what occurs from hearing these words of the right hon. Gentleman;—You are safe in the adoption of this measure, because *it is not like a treaty of Union!* You are safe in the adoption of this measure, because *your Parliament will not be annihilated!* You are safe in the adoption of this measure, because you have a *better security* left than the *moderation of the British Parliament!* You are safe in the adoption of this measure, because it cannot drive you to the hazard of a *civil war!* You are safe in the adoption of this measure, because the body of men to whom you would apply for redress, will *continue to exist!* You are safe in the adoption of this measure, because your Parliament will always be *able to reject* (if they be oppressive) the *regulations of Great Britain!*—Let that right hon. gentleman tell us—in what will our safety consist, if we shall submit to a Union?

Sir, among the champions of the Independence of Ireland on that day, we find the name of a right hon. Bart. (Sir H. Cavendish) *then* unplaced and unpensioned, *now* I believe, *both*. His language was strong; I dispute not, it was sincere; I am sure it was wise; it was as follows: “It is to be considered, whether the bill that is to be brought in, is to contain *any thing* derogatory to the *Legislative rights of England*. I cannot in this instance indulge my partiality for the present minister, for my interest as a man, *as an Irishman*, the interest and honour of the nation, call aloud
“ on

“ on me to *reject* a measure *destructive to the legisla-*
 “ *tive rights of Ireland.* I cannot suppose the
 “ House will pass this bill, but if they shall, they
 “ will have *betrayed the trust reposed in them by*
 “ *their country!* they will render themselves odious
 “ to every honest man in the kingdom, but I trust
 “ they will not *so far disgrace themselves.* The
 “ people of this kingdom have too much spirit to
 “ sit down quietly under such a law. It requires
 “ no skill, no ability, to rouse the people against
 “ the measure—they are already roused—the diffi-
 “ culty will be to appease them! It is a question
 “ so serious, and so very much affecting the rights
 “ of Ireland as an independent nation, that I *will*
 “ *not go into the consideration of it.* I should la-
 “ ment the necessity of going into the discussion of
 “ the origin of government, of the *compact* on
 “ which governments were founded; may there
 “ *never* be occasion to agitate that question—may it
 “ sleep for ever!”

Such, Sir, were the sentiments of an *unbought*
patriot in the year 1785, they are founded in pure
 and genuine liberty, and though the *man* who ut-
 tered them may change, the *principles* they contain,
 and the *truths* they vindicate, remain immutable—
these cannot be corrupted!

Another honorable gentleman (Mr. Neville)
 who, though a placeman, did once zealously op-
 pose the present measure, and who pretends to
 justify his changing sides from the instructions of
 the little corporation to which he belongs, or I
 should rather say, which belongs to him. That
 hon. gentleman, Sir, was *more fortunate* in the year

1784 than he is in 1800; he had then *no office* under the crown—his opposition *then* was uniform and unshaken—his corporation then did *not* interfere—His words too seem to have been spoken in a spirit of prophecy: “ A bill of such consequence as this
 “ should be carried *unanimously* or *not at all*. I re-
 “ commend it to the Secretary in his closet to con-
 “ sider well the *character, independence, and property*
 “ of the Minority !” How far the going over of the hon. member may have diminished the *property* of the present Minority, is not worth the enquiry—let him say would his return increase their *character* and *independence*?—If the noble Secretary may think words, coming from that hon. gentleman, not worth his attention, as such, let me conjure him to consider them well, for their intrinsic weight and value !

I now come, with sentiments of unfeigned and deep regret, to state the words of an hon. and learned doctor (Dr. Brown) on the question of 85. Sorry indeed that I am now forced to go so far back to find a contrast between his past and his present conduct. Those were his words spoken in 85, in opposition to the commercial propositions: “ While the
 “ 4th proposition—while that insult stands record-
 “ ed on the journals of Great Britain, while it tes-
 “ tifies such a disposition to invade our rights in
 “ that *haughty* nation, it is *impossible to negotiate*.
 “ England acceded to the establishment of our
 “ rights *through the emergencies of war*, and has
 “ ever since been studying to *undermine the fabric* ;
 “ *the weaker country that negotiates is lost* ! What
 have

“ have we to do with treaty, when *every thing* is in
 “ our own power ? ” — I thank that hon. and learned
 member for the unanswerable arguments he then
 and since has furnished in support of the liberties of
 my country ; how so able an advocate has been
 seduced from her side a little time may shew — I
 lament, I confess, his defection, not only on behalf
 of my country, but of human nature — a doubt of
 his political integrity had never entered my mind
 till he abjured his principles, and published the for-
 mula of his recantation. I certainly never joined in
 the general politics of that hon. and learned mem-
 ber, they appeared to me to be splenetic, inflamma-
 tory, and dangerous ; but I always thought they
 were honest ; will any man say — will the hon. mem-
 ber himself assert — that they are honest now. — He
 deserted *this side* of the House, because the *other*
side had passed laws which he thought incompatible
 with the constitution of Ireland — for that reason he
 would give them his assistance towards passing ano-
 ther law, which, by his own repeated statements,
 would wholly overthrow that constitution. The
 influence of England operating in this House, he
 complained, had invaded the rights of Ireland ; he
 would therefore convert that which was as yet but
influence into *power* — he would change the *wish* of
 England to enslave us, into *right* ; the British minis-
 ter had invaded *some* of our privileges, and, in his
 resentment, he would give them *all*. — I have no
 head to comprehend this mystery, but I will suggest
 to the hon. gentleman a mode by which he may jus-
 tify himself to a country which has raised him to
 wealth

wealth and honor—I will state the only mode left to redeem his fame and character—whether the facts attending and producing his conversion will bear him out in it or not, I do not pretend to anticipate : Let the hon. gentleman state the *terms* of his conversion—let him state what portion of the *terms* of the Union have been of his acquirement ; I do not ask the hon. doctor to confess, whether he bargained for place or pension for himself or his family—whether he has got security for a mitre, or for the presidency of our national seminary, or whether he is to exchange his gown for the judicial robe—whether he is to be set up as an example of consistency and virtue for the youth of the land, or whether the bench of Justice is to be graced with his self-denying virtue, and disinterested integrity ? I call not for the nauseous detail of corrupt negociation !—But I desire him to give an answer to this question—Did he procure terms for Ireland?—The military-law bill provoked him to join the authors of it—Did he bargain with those authors that the United Parliament was to repeal it ?—Does he not know in his conscience, that so far from its being in contemplation with the English government to relieve Ireland from its grievances and oppressions, and in particular from martial law, that the great object of the measure is to plunder this country of its wealth and its liberty, and that the means to be used are—*Military Despotism* ?

I am happy, Sir, to be also able to bring in aid of my opposition to this measure a right hon. gentleman (Mr. Corry) now at the head of the financial department

partment of this kingdom—now one of the principal instruments of the English minister—but who did once profess himself the friend and jealous advocate of the liberties and constitution of his country—The opinions of that right hon. gentleman, as long as memory remains, will be quoted as an authority against the measure which he now with so much activity endeavours to promote;—I will state the indignant language with which that right hon. gentleman (then out of place) received the project of 85, which he conceived injurious to the rights of Ireland: “To the courtesy of the country the minister is indebted for *that* passing unnoticed which deserves the name certainly of temerity, if not of audacity—the *attack on our constitution!!*—Or perhaps rather to the insignificance of the offender merging in the magnitude of the offence. The arguments used by the supporters of the bill are but pitiful evasions, to cover the nature of the business, which can never appear any other than an insidious invasion of that constitution which Great Britain has solemnly acknowledged. Let each nation (as they have laudably done in England) be *jealous of their own concerns*; and, as England takes care of her’s, so let Ireland guard her rights and interests—the principle of the measure is as *absurd as inadmissible*—two nations, *unequal* in all things, can never be *equally affected* by one and the same law.” Here, Sir, is the authority of that right hon. gentleman, *out of office*, against his conduct *at the head of the finance*—at which of those times he was most free from a corrupt

rupt bias, those who feel interested in the question may enquire. For my part, I look to the language and the fact, and care not for the man; and I do adopt his sentiments in 85 as fully and as freely as I spurn at and abhor his measure in 1800!

I have nearly done, Sir, with this disgusting review of public tergiversation and prostitution of sentiment—one example more, out of many, I shall give in the person of a gallant colonel and commissioner of revenue, (Colonel Coote) who represents a county that is unanimous in its opposition to the measure, but who keeps his places and supports it. His words in 85 were these:—"He thought every
 " man ought to preserve the *constitution* and inde-
 " pendent legislature they then possessed without
 " violation, and hand them down to posterity without
 " encroachment. He would *never* hesitate in re-
 " fusing his support to a principle that *tended to*
 " shake the legislative rights of Ireland. If they
 " were to deliver over into *other hands* their Legis-
 " lature, it would be no easy matter to recover it." Will that hon. and gallant colonel now assert that by the Union we shall preserve the constitution and independent legislature we possessed in 85—that the Union does not *tend* to shake the legislative rights of Ireland—and that if we thus deliver over into other hands our legislature, we shall ever be able to recover it again.

Such, Sir, in the year 85, were the sentiments delivered by many of the gentlemen on whose support the noble Secretary now relies for the completion of a measure so contradictory of their former conduct and opinions; and if there be any man with
 whom

whom their examples have weight upon this occasion, I conjure him to reflect upon this gross inconsistency, and to judge whether in a few years hence, those very men may not change their present for their former opinions, or perhaps adopt some new ones utterly incompatible with both.

I shall detain the House with but a single observation on the prospects before us.—I have said something of the times past, and something of the present time—let me call your attention to the time to come.—The people are dissatisfied with this measure—when I speak of The People, Sir, I speak not of placemen or pensioners, nor of those cankers of the wealth of Ireland, our absentee proprietors; neither do I mean that body, many of whom have for the meanest bribe been hired to sign addresses for the Union—who have crowded round the wheels of a great man's chariot in his progress, extending one hand to receive the pitiful shilling, and the other to make the wretched mark that was to betray the nation to slavery; I speak, Sir, of the loyalists, the resident gentry, the merchants, and yeomanry—who have supported the crown on the head of the King, and have preserved this country to England—they know the arts of venality and corruption by which it is carried—they know the objects of its authors—and they anticipate with fear and abhorrence its consequences—they behold in it nothing but disgrace and unqualified dependence! Let us look around among the nations of the world, and see whether it has ever happened that a nation not altogether unenlightened, not deficient in courage, abounding in population, with every thing from

nature necessary to its support and welfare, has long submitted to the yoke of slavery;—can eight millions of people, themselves too borne down with public debt and intolerable taxes, continue long to domineer over five millions, over whom nature has given them *no superiority*, over whom they can claim no other title except this—*the slaves are ours, we bought them*—BOUGHT THEM FROM THEIR OWN TRUSTEES!—France, by a more honorable, and even a more legitimate title, the right of conquest, lately acquired the sovereignty of Holland.—Was she able to hold it?—No, Great Britain instantly took up arms, and avowed the *enfranchisement of Holland* to be the object of the war.—France has restored to the Dutch nation, that, of which she had robbed them, the *right of self-government*, because if she had continued to withhold it, against the will of the people, however insignificant their territory, and however small their numbers, their emancipation, with the assistance of Great Britain, was inevitable. New principles of policy had been adopted in the councils of France; the presumptuous sentiment which had formed the plan of *enslaving the rest of the world*, that herself might alone be free, had been exploded—she with a timely wisdom restored to Holland in peace, what Holland, with the help of England, would shortly have acquired by war—*her domestic Legislature*; the object of Great Britain was defeated—Holland *as an ally* gives more strength to France than she ever could derive from her *as a slave!* and the fleets and armies of England were received on the shores of the Texel, not as friends offering freedom and independence,

but

but as invaders interfering in the domestic concerns of a stranger nation, and disturbing an alliance to which the people were devoted, *because it did not violate their natural rights*. England was received in Holland as Ireland received France—with *resistance* and *defeat*, and from the same motive—the desire to preserve a connection that left her in possession of freedom! Sir, whether this interference of one nation in the concerns of others be justifiable by the laws of nature, I will not argue, but it has been practised in all ages, and in every quarter of the globe, and to the end of time it will be practised, as long as ambition and envy are the character of courts and princes, for the object is, not to relieve the slave, but to humble the rival tyrant. England gave freedom to the provinces enslaved by Spain—France delivered America from the yoke of England—she has lately availed herself of imaginary grievances, and partial and temporary discontents in Ireland—she has failed, because the *grievances were imaginary*, the discontents *but* temporary and partial, because Ireland was the friend and *ally* of England—because she was her equal in freedom—because her gentry and their connections, her merchants, mechanics, and artisans were devoted to their constitution!—But after we shall be betrayed into slavery, if—instead of the fair and free alliance now subsisting—England shall have purchased the power to domineer over and oppress this country; if an expensive military establishment, encreasing with her injustice and our discontents, (and does the history of the world furnish an instance of any nation possessing power, and free from the vice of tyranny)

tyranny)—if great hostile combinations against her, occasioned by her own ambition, or the envy of others :—if the turbulence of pride and prosperity, fermenting in her own bosom, and the prospect of liberty animating the enslaved people of this island ; if common misfortune, and a fellowship in disgrace and destruction, uniting the hearts and the hands of Irishmen ;—if stratagem, force, or prosperous adventure landing a foreign army on our shores ;—if such things—and are they not all in the course of human events to be looked for—if such things should happen, what is to become of the dominion of England over Ireland—what is to become of the connection ?

Let England then lay aside this wicked and insidious plot, formed against the liberties of a faithful and friendly nation.—If she must be again a tyrant, let her look among strangers and enemies for slaves ; let her conquer with the power of her fleets and armies—but let her not entrap those whom she ought to protect, nor buy, with our own wealth, the freedom of a nation, which, in wise policy, ought to be as dear to her as her own.—Our connection, with more or less of freedom or controul, as accident or good or bad councils prevailed, but *always with a domestic legislature* in Ireland, has now lasted for six hundred years !—Let us but continue to enjoy our present independence, and every wise and honest voice in Ireland will say of that connection—ESTO PERPETUA !

FINIS.