

A SECOND
LETTERS
TO THE

Tradefmen, Farmers,

And the rest of the GOOD PEOPLE of

IRELAND.

Very proper to be read in all Families,
at this Critical Juncture.

*God save the KING, and bless the Land,
In Plenty, Joy, and Peace,
And grant henceforth that foul Debates
Twixt NOBLEMEN may cease.*

Auncient and loyal Ballad of Chevy Chase.

By L. B. Haberdasher and Citizen of Dublin.

DUBLIN:

Printed in the Year, MDCCCLIV.

[Price Three-pence.]

LETTER

TO THE

Tradesmen, Farmers,

And the rest of the Good People of

IRELAND.

Very proper to be read in all Families,
at this Critical Juncture.

God save the King, and bless the Land,
In Plenty, Joy, and Peace,
And grant Remembrance that poor Slaves
Their Necessities may cease.
Ancient and loyal Ballad of Oliver Cromwell.

By J. B. Habington, Author and Compiler of the

DUBLIN:

Printed in the Year, MDCCCLV.

[Price Three-pence.]



A LETTER

TO THE
Tradesmen, Farmers, &c.

Friends, Fellow-Citizens, and Countrymen,



HERE liveth not, throughout
HIS MAJESTY'S Dominions, a
People more LOYAL, than WE,
his Good People of IRELAND.
Nor has this OUR LOYALTY ow-
ed its Rise to the Ferment of Parties, and a Spi-
rit of Contention. It has been the Work of
Reason; the Consequence of Experience and
cool Reflection. Every Circumstance has con-
curred to lead us to it. The Remembrance of

former Calamities——a Sense of the many Blessings We enjoy, under a GOVERNMENT, to Us remarkably a GOVERNMENT of Kindness and Protection——Gratitude for the Days of Peace We have already numbered——Regard to the Peace of our Days to come——every one of these has contributed, to cherish and strengthen in our Hearts this LOYAL AFFECTION to the BEST of Princes. It has become in a manner natural to Us. And the Establishment of his Throne, and the Conservation of Our Civil Enjoyments have We wisely accounted, as inseparably interwoven the One with the Other.

It may then justly be Matter of Amazement, how this Loyal People was ever induced to believe, that a King, such as we now are blessed with, shou'd form an Attempt to the Diminution of the public Happiness; and that, in Compliance with the Humours of any Minister, He shou'd set himself to oppress those Liberties, of which he has, these so many Years, been the avowed PROTECTOR. The very Supposition implies Absurdity. And yet, You know, my Countrymen, This or something very near it must have been, if the *Inserted Clause* was big with the ruinous Consequences, We have been taught to apprehend from it.——But of all Evil Counsellors, FEAR is one of the most pernicious. It perverts the Judgment. It will shape a Bush into an armed Enemy; and cloath a Shadow with Terrors.

Terrors. It darkens even the most inviting Appearances ; and can make us start away from the Embrace of a Friend. And thus, I suspect, has it now happened to You. This same Clause, You have been told, was an hideous Monster, sent forth to destroy and devour You ; and so You have taken it for granted, and fled off, without permitting yourselves once to turn about, and consider it.

My only Purpose therefore is to conciliate and becalm. And if this my Endeavour can contribute aught towards the re-establishing Tranquillity and Confidence in the Minds of You, my Fellow-Subjects, and the bringing You back to the Culture and Advancement of the National Prosperity, I have obtained my End, and shall esteem myself abundantly rewarded.

IN my former Letter I took Notice to You, that, whatever was the Issue of the depending Contest, the licentious Freedoms, in which We indulged Ourselves with respect to Government, never cou'd admit of Justification ; and that, tho' the Cause was ever so much the Cause of Liberty, yet was it disgraced and endangered by the Method of Defence We had chosen.—This was true in the most *favourable Construction* the Case was susceptible of, Even allowing the *suspected Clause* to be really unconstitutional and unfriendly.

unfriendly.——At this Day, You shall see, how much farther the Argument may be carried. You shall see, that even this *favourable Construction* is hardly to be depended on; and that the Clause, however it may have been dressed up into a Form dreadful and affrighting, is, notwithstanding, guiltless of all mischievous Tendency, and entirely consistent with the Nature of the Constitution.

AND first let me prevail on You to consider the Words of the amended Bill, seriously and dispassionately; read them over; examine them; try what is their Import and true Value. They say not——mark that——they say not, that the King is to carry away our Money, at Will; or that he is to raise Money without Consent of Parliament: They say only, that the Surplus-Money now in the Treasury shall, as far as is necessary, be applied, towards the Discharge of the National Debt, that is, towards the Ease of His Majesty's Subjects of *Ireland*; and *this Application*, says the inserted Clause, HIS MAJESTY *has graciously Recommended, and declared, that HE wou'd consent to it.* If then the KING has not in himself a Power of applying this Surplus, or any Part of it, for any Purpose, or on any Emergency whatsoever, doubtless the inserting of these Words was improper and unconstitutional. But if, on the other Hand, there is such a Power vested in HIS MAJESTY,
for

for the more effectual Security of the Common Weal ; why, in this Case, the Words are regular, and expressive of a Right, truly belonging to Him.

Now, the KING, it is alledged, is the Public Trustee ; and the Issues of the several Duties granted by Parliament, those appropriated to particular Purposes excepted, are granted, say They who have examined the purport of Acts of this Nature, to the KING, to be administered by Him, under the General Trust, for the various Expences of Government. If it be thus, it seems to follow, that whenever the PARLIAMENT have thought it proper to grant certain Duties to the KING under the General Trust, and afterwards find it expedient to make a special Application of any Part of the Issues of those Duties, the Pleasure of the KING must first be known, and His Consent had, before they can resume a Grant already made to Him as Our COMMON TRUSTEE, and which it may be necessary, for the COMMON GOOD, to apply in a different Manner.

THE Question then is—Are these Matters so?—Parliamentary Usage, and the Reason of Things, seem to say they are. I shall consider them both. The Consequence will naturally follow.

INDEED,

INDEED, I am in great Measure prevented by the Writers of the *Considerations and Observations*. And from their Accounts evident it is, that this Clause is not that, our Fears made Us think it. But however, a Word or two more cannot be useless, where such strong Prepossessions have subsisted. And, either by insisting anew on the Arguments they have employed, or by urging other Arguments not yet made Use of, may this Procedure be placed in a Light, which, tho' not a more happy Light than that in which it has already been placed, may nevertheless have its share in removing gloomy Prejudices, and diffusing Peace and Chearfulness throughout this Land.

WHAT Grounds there appeared to be, from the Manner of Expression in the former Acts for the Discharge of the National Debt, to judge, that the COMMONS did not consider the PREVIOUS CONSENT of the CROWN as subversive of the National PROSPERITY, We are all sufficiently instructed. *Agreeably to YOUR MAJESTY's Gracious Intentions*, said the Bill of 1749. *Whereas YOUR MAJESTY has been Graciously pleased, to signify that you would Consent, and to recommend it to Us*, was the Style of That of 1751. These Forms certainly afford some kind of Argument. The very great pains taken, to elude the Force of them, are Proof sufficient of their Significancy.

THE Form, introduced in 1749, was not even imposed on the COMMONS; it was their own Choice, their own Language. True it is, as the Vindication shrewdly observes, that GRACIOUS INTENTIONS and CONSENT are different Words, nor do they signify exactly the same Thing. But then, that GRACIOUS INTENTIONS do not imply, the Pleasure of HIS MAJESTY made known, some Assurance of his Royal Approbation given, before the Bill went on, this noble Author says not. Nay, he himself tells us, that this was the very meaning of these *now obscured* Words. They were inserted, he informs Us, *Vindication* p. 7. in Consequence of the Concurrence of Lord Harrington, then our Chief Governor, *who*, says he, *having a general Knowledge of HIS MAJESTY's most gracious Intentions, to make his Subjects happy, readily concurred in so just and honourable a Scheme. And this Concurrence*, continues the Vindicator, *effectually removed all Obstacles.* OBSTACLES therefore there were in the Way of the Bill, which were not to be removed but by a Knowledge of HIS MAJESTY's *Gracious Intentions.* And take Notice, it matters not, whether HIS MAJESTY was directly applied to on the Occasion, or whether, HE was not. The CHIEF GOVERNOR, 'tis confessed, took it on him to answer for HIS MAJESTY's Intentions; and This therefore was a Declaration, as from the

KING himself, in his Name, and invested with his Authority,——The *Observations*, Answer to *Proceeding Vindicated*, p. 7, give a different Account of this Affair. But more need not be desired, than what the Vindication has thought proper to concede.

IN 1751, the Word CONSENT was inserted in *Great Britain*; and the Bill so amended was returned hither, and passed without a single Negative, or even so much as a single Objection against it. Now if the Admission of this Word really threatened so many dreadful Ills, is it to be believed that the Great Body of our Representatives, the Guardians of the National Liberty, would calmly and deliberately, for any Consideration whatever, have given way to it? —*They were engaged in an important Enquiry*, We are told—What Enquiry could be of Moment equal to this Affair, by which the very Being of our Constitution was to be affected?—It is a Maxim with all wise Nations, that the Punishment of even the Worst of Criminals should be less vigorously sought after, when not to be obtained without the Destruction of many Innocent Persons. And shall it be said, that here a whole People was exposed to Ruin, their Rights infringed, their Liberties set at hazard; in order that One Guilty Man, and he not capitally Guilty, should fall a Victim——that a Mortal Wound was suffered to invade the Vitals
of

of the State, in order that the cutting off of an insignificant Joint might be performed with the greater Accuracy?

LET those, who descant so violently against the Previous Consent, choose therefore what Side of the Argument they think proper. Either the Admission of this Word is destructive of our Liberties, or it is not. If it is,—Why in 1751 was it tamely complied with?—If it is not—Why in 1753 are our Fears thus excited?

BUT, Words may be twisted: Facts are of a more stubborn Nature. And FACTS there are, PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURES, which fully speak the Sense of the Commons, concerning this Trust the Crown is said to be invested with.—In *March* 1749, there was in the Treasury a Surplus of more than two hundred and twenty thousand Pounds. This Surplus was growing until the *October* following. And yet, in *October*, when the Payment of the Public Debt was taken into Consideration, there were only one hundred and twenty eight thousand five hundred Pounds applied, towards the Discharge of the Debt.—In *March* 1751, there was in the Treasury a Surplus of two hundred forty eight thousand three hundred sixty six Pounds, seventeen Shillings and four Pence. And this likewise a growing Sum. And

in *October* following, the Debt of the Nation being then no more than two hundred thirty seven thousand five hundred Pounds, yet only one hundred and twenty thousand Pounds were applied towards the Reduction of the National Debt.—It is plain, therefore, that, in 1749, there were about one hundred thousand Pounds; and, in 1751, about one hundred and forty thousand Pounds, Surplus Money, left in the Treasury. And yet, the Ballance, remaining in 1751, was more than sufficient to discharge the whole National Debt, and an Exceeding there would have been of about eleven thousand Pounds. The ordinary Expences of the Establishment were also provided for. Nor was there Cause to fear a Deficiency in the Revenue before the next Session—Why then was not the whole Debt paid off, and the Nation eased of the Burden of the Loan-Duties?—The Vindicator himself, p. 7. tells the Reason; and a better We need not desire. He tells us, that *to the Discharge of the Debt there was to go such a Part of the Surplus remaining in the Treasury, as could be spared, leaving still in the Treasury a Sufficiency, to answer any sudden Demand.* A sudden Demand therefore there might be; and such, as it was the Concern of Parliament, that there should be Money to answer it. And, Who was to be the Judge of the Importance of the Demand? Or, Who in that Case was to make the Application? The EXECUTIVE POWER, beyond Question. The
KING,

KING, to whose Administration this Surplus Money was left, in order to enable him the more effectually to provide for the Safety and Happiness of his People.

A TRUST therefore is admitted. This TRUST, it appears also, has frequently had Operation. And cumulative Evidence may be produced, repeated Proofs, Session after Session, that the Commons have examined PAYMENTS, made by Virtue of this Trust executed, without ever condemning them as unconstitutional. Out of the many Instances to this Purpose, I shall select one, to which the Vindicator himself, p. 18. has appealed ; and therefore in the mentioning of which, I shall not be accused of partial Choice.

In 1703, a Committee was appointed by the Commons to inspect the Public Accounts ; and they reported, that they had found Pensions on the Establishment granted to certain Persons, Duke of *St. Albans*, Earl of *Ranelagh*, &c. who appeared not to them to have deserved the Favours conferred on them.

Now, whatever was the View of the Vindicator in introducing this Report, it certainly never can follow from it, that the Crown has not a Right of applying Public Money. It follows indeed, that the Parliament have a Right to enquire,

quire, to what Purposes this Money has been applied, and, when these are found improper, and not tending to the Public Benefit, to censure such Misapplications, and make Representations to the Crown against them. But, will this Precedent prove that there is not a Power of Application of the Money granted by Parliament under the General Trust, vested in the Crown? It proves directly the contrary. And it even proves, that this Power may be exercised, not only in the Support of Measures of manifest Use, and immediately relative to the National Preservation, but also for Purposes of more remote Expediency. Else, why have this Committee of 1703, angry as they seem to have been, expressed themselves as they have done? Do they say that this Application of the Public Money, in reward of Faithful Services, was unconstitutional?—No—They only say, that these particular Applications, in favour of certain Persons were improper; because it did not appear that any such Faithful Services had been performed by them. If a Man invaded and with-held my Property, would it not be a strange Plea, to urge, that he spent the Fruit of his Rapine in an unbecoming Manner; that he applied it to Purposes useless and reproachful? Wou'd I not rather say, that, whatever the Purposes he applied it to, he was equally guilty, because he applied what did not belong to him? —It may be proper to observe, that the

Report

Report of this Committee was so far from being considered as a Direction to the Crown, that the Pensions thus *noted* were continued, and the Payments made thereon allowed as Legal Payments.

BUT, it is urged, the Inspection of the *Public Accounts* belongs to the COMMONS, and, according to PARLIAMENTARY USAGE, whatever *Ballance* is found, it always is credited to the Nation——All this is cheerfully admitted. May not however this Power lodged in the COMMONS, and the Right claimed for the CROWN, consist together? To them it belongs, to inspect what have been the Issues of the several Funds granted——what Payments have been made——and to what Uses——and, to report the Ballance. In Justice to the KING, and in Justice to the PEOPLE, are They called to the Discharge of this Duty; that both the Fraudulent Embezzlement, and the needless Waste of the Public Treasure, may be prevented. And the Ballance, when any is found, is credited to the Nation, because it is to be administered for the Nation's Service.

HAVE they ever therefore, regardless of Royal Prerogative, taken away this Ballance from the General National Service, and appropriated it? Have they ever declared that the KING was not to be invested with any Constitutional Trust in the Administration of it, and that
it

it should solely be applied to Purposes pointed out by Them?—If the Law of the Kingdom says this, all Contest about the Matter is at an End. But, except supported by some such Law, it is hard to conceive, how the Calling for the Accounts, or the Bringing on the Ballance to Credit, can affect the present Question. The Plea is, that the KING has the Power to apply this Money, but, at the same time, not in any other manner, than under the Constitutional Trust, so as to advance the Ease and Happiness of His People. And whenever, or by whatever particular Application, This is done, the KING, it is apprehended, has exercised a Right truly inherent in Him; and those Acts of Power are Regular and Constitutional.

THE *Form Inserted* is however a *Novel Form*. And, antecedent to the Year 1749, there is not the least trace of Words, of this or the like import, having place in any of our Money Bills. —Why, truly We never were told there was. Nay farther, I think We may say, it is absurd there should. And for this plain Reason. Because, Antecedent to the Year 1719, no Act ever passed for the special Application of Money already granted to the Crown under the General Trust. The National Debt indeed is said to have been reduced in the Years 1719, 1721, and 1723, by the Application of the Surplusses; but then these Applications, We are also informed,

ed. were made by the Crown, by virtue of the Constitutional Trust; the Parliament not directing. Heretofore then, All Bills relating to Money were Grants by Parliament of certain Duties or Aids to the Crown, for Purposes of Government or of Public Utility. And therefore that the KING shou'd previously Consent to these Bills, that He shou'd give leave to His Commons to grant him Money, wou'd be altogether subversive of our Liberties. It would imply, that all the Wealth of the Nation was the King's, with this preposterous Circumstance, that We were granting to Him, what must, in that supposition, have belonged to Him before.

BUT, says the Vindication, P. 80, 81. it appears from the Proceedings of the Parliament of *Great Britain*, that Estates vested in the Crown for Public Service may be resumed, and yet the King's previous Consent not had. And therefore, &c. Such was the Act of *Resumption of Irish Grants*, passed in the Reign of King *William*: And such the Act *for the Encouragement of Seamen*, in the Reign of his present Majesty. To this it has been already answered, that these Instances are, both of them, foreign to the present Case—In the present Case, the Question is, whether the King has a Right, In the alledged Instances, the Right was acknowledged*.

* Answer of *Cons. to Proceed. vind. p. 27.*

MAY a Person however presume to take a nearer View of these supposed Authorities?—The Act passed in 1739 gave all Captures made at Sea to the Sailors, tho' the Crown had the sole and absolute Property in every Ship and her Cargo, taken from an Enemy by any of his Majesty's Ships of War.—And the Commons moved and proceeded in this Bill, without regard to what his Majesty's Pleasure might be.—It is nevertheless affirmed, and the Fact, I apprehend, is by many known to be true, that his Majesty gave Directions to his Servants to desist from all Opposition to this Useful Bill, and not to suffer that any Consideration of his Prerogative shou'd interfere with the Public Prosperity. They desisted. And It became a Law.

THE Act for the *Resumption of the Irish Grants*, in the Reign of King *William*, is somewhat more to the Purpose. But withal, it affords a strong Proof, how hard the Author of the *Vindication* found himself pushed, when he had Recourse to a Precedent, such as this. And sorry I am, that it has been mentioned in the present Question. Because, unluckily, it happens to be a Monument of the Public Ingratitude to ONE of the Greatest Princes that ever reigned. It was devised—by avowed Enemies to his Government—and other restless Spirits of those Times, whose disappointed Ambition urged them on. These

These Men, disguising their own wicked Purposes under the fair pretence of consulting the Common Weal, fought by this means to distress and wound the Heart of this EXCELLENT PRINCE, who had bestowed the Forfeitures among his Servants, many of whom had fought by his Side, and, in conjunction with him, had exposed their Lives for the Public Liberty.

INDEED it had been well for the Noble Writer, if he had met with the Observations of a Countryman of ours, who flourished not many Years ago. The *Cork Surgeon* he called himself; and a *shrewd Arguer* he was, and wrote main well. He tells us, *Antidote* No. 5. p. 7. that, during much the greater Part of KING WILLIAM'S Reign, the Parliaments were notoriously and scandalously opposite to the Measures of that PRINCE, which prevented him from doing those great things, which he meditated, for the Security of Europe, against the Ambition of the French King. And that the Law for resuming the Irish Grants was made by That Parliament, which reduced the Army so low, as to encourage the French quickly to undertake a new War. The King indeed complied with the fiery Temper of this ill-designing Parliament. But it is generally thought, that these ungrateful Returns, for all the Toils and Dangers he had gone through in defence of the Rights of his People, sunk deep in his Mind, and contributed to the shortening of his Days.

AND now, my Countrymen, consider these several Arguments, and see, weakly as they have been here insisted on, What a Proof results from them. Three Months ago, could you have persuaded yourselves that this *much abused* Clause was capable of receiving this fair Construction? Could You have imagined, that this *strange ill-boding* Attempt had Foundation, in the Spirit of our Laws, and the Usage of Parliament?

SUCH, nevertheless, truly is the Case---And had the Purpose of this Paper only been to plead the Cause of the INSERTED WORDS, and to evince the CONSTITUTIONAL Propriety of them; full enough had now been said,-----But, Concern for the Publick Happiness demands somewhat more. It suffices not, to shew, that the Constitution admits the Clause, if at the same time You are taught to repine at the Inference---if you are instructed to believe, that, this Conclusion established, Poverty, Slavery, and Ruin, must inevitably follow.

THESE dark Thoughts become Us not, my Countrymen. Our Situation deserves them not. They are subversive of our domestick Peace: They are injurious to the Government, under which we live.---Let me therefore entreat Your Attention on this interesting Subject. And easily, I believe, will it be found, that this *suspected*

PRERO-

PREROGATIVE is not only consistent with our Liberties, but is also, in our present National Circumstances, an useful and salutary Appendage of the Constitution.

DOUBTLESS, every Prerogative and every Honour, the Crown is constitutionally possessed of, has its Reason in the public Utility. They must all of them have been established, either to give Dignity and obtain Reverence to the SUPREME ESTATE of the Realm, or that there might be an active Power always prepared, and enabled to exert itself against Dangers, instant, and that might require immediate Attention. And therefore——so far is it from being true, that a Zeal for the Supporting of the ROYAL PREROGATIVE is, in its nature, unfriendly and detrimental to the Common Liberty——the Truth is, that the *Attempting*, except in Cases of manifest Abuse, to pare away this Prerogative, and to restrain the Powers which were vested in the Crown to operate for our Conservation, is justly to be considered as a Wrong to the Community in general, and a Diminution of the *National Strength*.

IN the present Instance of *the Power of applying the Public Treasure*, this Notion of the Prerogative evidently holds good.——Among Us, the Space of eighteen Months generally intervenes between the rising of Parliament and the ensuing Session. Mean time, nevertheless, may urgent Occasions offer, Occasions not to be foreseen,

seen, and extraordinary Expences become thereby necessary. Who then shall interpose in Behalf of the Common Weal—What Possibility of Remedy is there left—if the Money in the actual Receipt of the Treasury is not subjected to a Power of Application in the Crown, for Public Services ?

EXPEDIENTS, some may tell You, maybe found on such Occasions. The Royal Word may be pledged for the Sums necessary. The Emergency will open private Purfes, and a voluntary Loan be had.———Dangerous, Uncertain Expedients !——Expedients, that must for the most part defeat the very End purposed : Because, in these Cases of Difficulty, both Secrecy and Dispatch are equally requisite.

NAY, and oftentimes of such Importance is it to be both Secret and Expeditious, that, even during the Sitting of Parliament, Notice of the Public Danger has not been given them, until the Blow was provided against.

AND that the Abundance of this public Treasure is sometimes employed for Purposes of a less urgent Nature, is no Objection. They may have a real, tho' a distant, Use. The King, for Instance, bestows Pensions : He confers Grants. Is not this Dispensing of Graces an excellent Instrument of Government, becoming the Regal Dignity, and conducive to the Common Good ?

May

May it not render Those employed in the Administration, more affectionate, more zealous ? And shall it be said, that He—the first Person in the State—the due Maintaining of whose Authority is necessary to Public Order—and who daily has Opportunity to make Tryal of the Fidelity of Numbers of his Subjects, in Affairs of War, in Affairs of Peace—shou'd be deprived of the Power of rewarding a faithful Servant ?

BUT, admitting the Power of Application to be vested in the King: *Why*, it will be asked, *is the Insertion of the previous Consent contended for ?*—Is not this a Compliment, designed merely to extend the Influence of the Crown, and devoid of all possible Good ? It's Expediency, I answer, is the same as that of the Trust vested : And the One infers the Other. For, if the Parliament may move the Application of any Sum of Money in the actual Receipt of the Treasury, without the Crown's previously consenting to it ; may not any Parliament, out of ill Temper and Love of Opposition—and from the Account of Transactions in King *William's* Reign, such Parliaments, You see, have been—may not, I say, a Parliament, like that, devise Applications, in such a Manner, and at such a Time, as must, whether complied with, or rejected, occasion to the Crown infinite Distress ? For, there may be Apprehensions of Insurrections and Troubles at home, which for the present it may be more convenient to dissemble. There may be Intimations of an intended

tended Invasion from abroad ; and these Intimations not yet proper to be disclosed. And, in these Cases, shall the Money be applied to Uses, not immediately necessary ; when the Saving of the State may depend on its being reserved ? And yet may not an artful designing Parliament propose such Purposes of Application, Purposes of such seeming Excellency, as must render the Non-compliance of the Crown of dangerous Consequence, and induce the fatal Necessity, either of laying open important Secrets, or of provoking the public Hatred ?

You see then, my Countrymen, that this dreadful Claim is no more than what your Interest demanded. It is not in order to render the Crown more powerful, that it has been established ; but in order to render Your Happiness less precarious. And should this Exertion of the Prerogative cease, it is your own Prosperity must be impaired by the Want of it.

INDEED, a bad King may misapply the Power.—And every other Power, in like Manner.—As well, on the same Principle, may we argue against all kinds of human Government : Because, in the Hands of whatever Men Power is lodged, there a Possibility of Misapplication must be admitted. The Debate therefore is not, about *Possible Abuse* of the Power claimed—an Abuse not even to be presumed at present. The only Considerations of Moment to Us, in
this

this Matter, are— Is there such a Power established?—Does this Establishment naturally tend to the National Prosperity?

THE Arguments, You see, my Countrymen, have been, plainly, honestly, set before You—What Inference follows, be You Yourselfes the Judges.—And, in Truth, there is a Call on every Member of the Community maturely to consider the Point in question, and, from Consideration, to rest in some settled Judgment concerning it. Then, probably, would our present Fears be easily dissipated. And a more chearful Opinion of our Natural Situation, and an happier Temper, might be expected soon to prevail amongst us.

SOLEMN Appeal also has been made to Us. The Warmest in Opposition against the inserted Words have invited us to take Part in the Contest. And our *Voices*, have We been told, might claim Respect.—And yet, truly I fear this was meant only in a *certain* Sense: As far only as they might avail themselves of our Suffrages. For now, it seems, they retract the Concession, whene'er these *Voices* of Ours are like to go against them, *Politicks* are then *above our Comprehension*. And We are advised to desist from the vain Enquiry.

POLITICKS indeed, I wish, neither You nor I may ever be deep in. And, nevertheless, so much of *them* surely it concerns Us to know, as

D

may

may conduce to Our Allegiance and a respectful Thought of our Governors. And so much of *them*, I think, even I may hope to compass, mean as my Condition is, and poor the Provision of Learning I can boast. — Or, must it be said, that, What they of lowest Degree, the Worst-principled and most Illiterate, the very Scum of the People, were some Months ago well able to judge of; at this Day, a Citizen of *Dublin* shall not be able to comprehend.

INDEED, a late Writer, who enters the Lists under the Name of *Dionysius*, (*a*) endeavours to urge a new Objection against all Enquiries relative to this Question, as if they tended—to perpetuate Wrath, —to create Enemies to the Kingdom—to cast Reproach on a Body, which, on every account, We shou'd wish to be had in Honour.

SUPPOSE, says he, *THEY had erred: Wou'd not a Good Man throw a Veil over the Fault? Would an honest Man aggravate it? Would a Charitable Man expose innocent Millions to a Resentment, that might produce Ruin?* — May not the Argument, with at least equal Propriety, be urged against those, who have laboured to give an invidious Turn to the Inserted Clause? — Suppose the Administration had erred: Would not a Good Man throw a Veil over the Fault? Would an honest Man aggravate it? Would

(*a*) *Dionysius's* Letter, &c. p. 22.

Would a charitable Man send a Panic throughout a whole Kingdom, and dissolve that Band of Confidence between Prince and People, without which there can be neither Public Order, nor Public Happiness.

AND let me also ask, Which at this Day is most desirable--that the People should remain in the Belief, that their Rights have been attempted, and would, ere this, have been involved in Ruin, had not this Illustrious Body vindicated them—Or, that they should be taught to look towards their Sovereign with Gratitude and Affection, and every gloomy Doubt be banished?

BESIDES, may not the Honour of the Crown be asserted? and yet the Integrity of this Body stand unimpeached? Will it not be candidly presumed, that, Jealous of the Public Liberty, they looked with a suspecting Eye on every thing, that might even remotely affect it? And that an ardent Love for their Country, and a Desire of cherishing her Rights, led them on? And when their Principle of Action is placed in this fair Light, can Injury be said to be done to them?——Infallibility, they know it well, belongs not to Human Counsels. And whatever is the Claim of either Princes or Senates in the Day of their Power, the Time surely comes, when the Conduct and Decisions of both the mightiest Princes, and the wisest Senates, are subjected to Re-examination.

If any however have wrote, on this Occasion, with a View to perpetuate Wrath, and revile Characters, I am conscious of no such Design. Let every one, who has engaged in the Debate, lay his Hand to his Heart, and say, Who has this Guilt to answer for.

My warmest Wish, my only Purpose, Fellow-Citizens and Countrymen, in the present Attempt, was to compose a troubled People; to draw You off from a pernicious Contention; and, in a manner, to restore You to Your Country. If the Spirit of Patriotism be truly amongst Us, let it be exerted in *her* Service. *She* wants it all. *Her* abject Condition—Our Lands in many parts depopulated through improper Culture—Our Natives inured to Poverty and Sloth—Our Manners corrupted—The Neglect of the most useful Arts—These are Circumstances, that point out to You glorious Means, of advancing Your own Honour, and the National Happiness—of giving certain encrease both to your Private Fortunes, and the Public Wealth, And let me tell You also, this is the only Method, by which You can assure to Yourselves Liberty and Peace. And therefore by this Exertion of Spirit only can Proof be made, who is most Loyal to his KING and the best Friend to this LAND.

I am Your affectionate Well-wisher
From my House at the Sign and Countryman,
of the *Harp and Crown*, L. B.
April 3d. 1754.