

A

LETTER

FROM

DIONYSIUS

To the Renowned

TRIUMVIRATE.

They are hatching some Mischief.



DUBLIN:

Printed for PETER WILSON, in Dame-street,
M DCC LIV.

LETTER

FROM

DOUGLAS

To the Renowned

TRIUMPHANTE

They were watching, some of which
you are :



NO. 111

Printed for Peter Wilson, in Dame Street,
MDCCLIV.

A

LETTER, &c.

START not at my Name, *you formidable Champions against the Patriots of IRELAND* : I have not *risen from the Dead*. Such an one might indeed *affright*, but could not *convince* you : And well for you he could not ; for Conviction, you are persuaded, would ruin you. But recollect, and you will clearly perceive, that you might ever write on at the same rate, though you were thoroughly convinced.

I AM well known in the political World : I am as much respected in the Region of party-colour'd Gentry, as the *Trunk-maker* was heretofore in the Theatre ; and, in all Places I resort, am called a *faithful Irishman* ; so that you cannot get Dishonour, by entering the Lists with me : It is some Condescension in me, in your present Circumstances, to take a Turn with either of you.

To be more particular in the Description of myself ; I am, and have been, long in the Family of the *Vindicator of the Proceeding of the Honourable House of Commons*, &c. and could I conveniently let you

into the several Branches of my Office, which arise from the Confidence my Master daily places in me, you would be tempted to give me the Name of *Scrub* instead of that of *Dionysius*.

ONE Branch of my Office, however, I must acquaint you with ; that is, to buy every Print that appears in the Street, (for herein consists my Master's Extravagance) and to peruse them all carefully, (which indeed is an ample Punishment for all my Sins) and to lay before my Master those which strike me as fit for his Inspection ; but to conceal the rest, that his Time may not be misemployed, in an Examination of Works, neither of publick nor private Use.

THIS Duty imposed upon me hath made me acquainted with *A third Letter to the Publick—An Answer to the Proceeding, &c. so far as the same relates to the Considerations, &c.—and, An Answer to Part of a Pamphlet, intitled, The Proceeding, &c. by the Author of the Observations, &c.—*which I have most faithfully with-held from the Perusal of my Master ; being very unworthy Returns for the Pains he took to *inform you*, with all others, who needed Instruction upon the Subject.

BUT it is not enough that I have acted thus : I know you will be much disappointed, if you cannot provoke my Master to write more, and to keep you employed ; you will fancy, nay, you will report, that you have given such a stunning Blow, that he cannot quickly recover his Senses. I must therefore let you know, that your Performances were too mean to be admitted into his Presence, when I, in the Anti-chamber, could effectually confute what you do not confute one another in.

It makes me very uneasy to see how differently you express yourselves about the *Vindication*, according

according to the different Effects it hath upon your *several* Passions.

THE Town generally saith, it is cool and dispassionate;—you, Mr. *Letter-writer*, say, Page 16, *That the Author is very angry*; and again, Page 17, “That he appears in an angry Mood from his first setting out, to the Conclusion of his Paper.

You, Mr. *Considerer*, say thus, Page 5, “To say nothing of his personal Invectives, which are indeed too low.”

BUT you, Mr. *Observer*, talking of the Struggle that the *Vindicator* hath made, to keep to himself and his *Associates* certain respected Titles, say, “That this hath been hitherto done, by poisoning the Minds of uninform’d People, with most indecent and ill-grounded *Invectives*. But now, *that he is brought into a cool Method of Reasoning*, the Question must be left to the Decision of unprejudiced Readers.”

I pray you to settle this Matter amongst yourselves; for it was impossible he could be *angry* and a *cool Reasoner*; that he could have *refrained from Invectives*, and have made use of *very low ones* at one and the same Instant.

THERE is a surprising Mistake in the *Triumvirate* about this Matter, which I cannot take upon me to rectify. However, this I must observe, that they all concurred, in finding Fault at one time or other, though they could not agree in the Point.

HAVING so far addressed you *jointly*, I must now take you *separately* in the order you step’d into the World.

THE LETTER-WRITER first made his Appearance in a most dreadful Fury, for the Contempt with which he had been treated; and I cannot but say, he had good Reason to be outrageous; for he was indeed treated with infinite Contempt, when he was sen-

tenced to be chaftis'd, by the *Confiderations* and *Observations*.

BUT, poor Man ! he hath, as angry Men commonly do, given my *Master* every Advantage over him he could wifh for.

HE charges, Page 15, the *Vindicator*, with faying, “ That he (the *Letter-writer*) very *precipitately* declared, that our unhappy *Disputes* have “ been, not about *Essentials*, but merely upon *Forms* “ and *Ceremonies*.

AND from thence to the End of the 16th Page, he hath moft ingenioufly laboured to prove, and at length with great Clearnefs fhewed to a Demonftration, that he did by fair Argument, and from a Concatenation of Caufes, draw this Conclusion, “ That the *Disputes* were not about *Essentials*; but “ merely upon *Forms* and *Ceremonies*.”—I muft confeß he hath fairly overthrown the Charge of *Precipitancy*; for he proved himfelf to be a very *flow* Reafoner : And fo I muft take the Liberty to leave him where I found him.

THE CONSIDERER next advanced, not one Whitlefs angry than the LETTER-WRITER ; but being conftitutionally more phlegmatick, did not fo fuddenly run himfelf off his Speed.

HE, Page 5, with great Refentment, charges my *Master*, with giving him foul Ufage, “ by blending and perplexing his Arguments, with thofe “ of others, with whom he was in no Connection ; “ and whofe Pamphlets he had not feen or heard “ of, until they were in Print.

I BELIEVE my *Master*, if he were acquainted with this Matter, would find it pretty difficult to contrive an Apology for this Author. All that ought to be faid upon the Occafion is, that the LETTER-WRITER, who appears to be a pretty Scholar, very converfant in his favourite Author ;
and

and the OBSERVATOR, who is as expert in Figures, as any *Hocus-Pocus* Doctor with *Cups and Ball*, are made his Companions. If they are ashamed of one another, who can help it? The Readers think much alike of them all.

THE CONSIDERER will see, what a Hurry the LETTER-WRITER was thrown into, by being put under the *Discipline* of his *Friends*, the CONSIDERATIONS and OBSERVATIONS; how he flung about, and endangered every Body near him, for being put into so glaring a Light; and he may see, what Pains the OBSERVATOR hath taken, Page 3, at setting out, to establish an Opinion, that he had not any Acquaintance with the CONSIDERER. If the *Vindicator* should presume to make an Apology to either, he certainly may expect, to bring the others upon his Back; and therefore must wait, until they agree amongst themselves, which deserves the Preference.

I cannot however but observe, Mr. CONSIDERER, that you vastly exceed your Brethren in *Modesty*; for where you will not pretend to say, *you are not vanquished*, you are decently silent. Thus you have fairly given up the Precedent of 1749: To be sure, you mean not more to trouble the World with an unprofitable Criticism about *Consent* and *Intention*; and you are without Doubt ashamed of that simple Observation, *that the Attorney-General made the Motion*; and of the foolish Apology, that you formerly made for his *Majesty's Servants not inserting originally the Word CONSENT*.

BUT why were you not explicit about the Objection, *that the Recital was inserted in Great-Britain*? It was not enough to be silent about this, as you knew in your Conscience that Argument was never made Use of, you should have

been honest enough effectually to Disarm the *mischievous Enemies* of this Country.

YOU have indeed relinquished all the Precedents you formerly so vehemently relied upon, for which I give you Credit. But then you must take Notice, that your Readers are hereby taught, not entirely to depend upon your peremptory Decisions.

EXPLAIN for your Readers the following Words in Page 4, 5. of your *Answer*. “ Therefore he
 “ (the CONSIDERER) must say, that the Writer
 “ of the *Vindication* betrays a Want of Candour, as
 “ well as a Diffidence in his Abilities to defend the
 “ Cause he hath engaged in, when he endeavours
 “ to stop a Search after Truth, by introducing the
 “ Name of that Body (the House of COMMONS)
 “ into the Debate, in the Manner he hath, more
 “ than once, done in the Course of his Argument.”

I believe, whoever reads this will think the Author thereof was confoundedly frightened: But pluck up your Spirits, Mr. CONSIDERER, you have stroked the COMMONS in the preceding Paragraph,
 “ wherein you hope you have kept clear of offend-
 “ ing an important Body, for whose *Constitutional*
 “ Rights, no one can have a higher, or more just
 “ Respect.”

I wish indeed you had not distinguished these Words *Constitutional Rights* by Italicks, by which you seem to Hint, that they claim some Rights not altogether *Constitutional*; and that you reserve to yourself a Power of expounding your Words hereafter, either for or against them, as Occasion shall offer, or they shall be *up* or *down*: If they should take that into their Heads, it may go ill with you. But as your *Intention*, you say, was not to *offend* them, the best your Friends can expect is, that you
 may

may be *overlooked* ; since the COMMONS never can submit their *Rights* or *Privileges* to be discussed by *Lawyers*, or to be determined by *Judges* of inferior Courts.

BUT be so Kind as to Point out, how my *Master* could *vindicate the Commons*, without bringing the *Name of that Body into the Debate*. He hath said indeed, “ that there were sundry Pamphlets, little
 “ better than *Libels* against the *Commons*, against
 “ the *Constitution*, and against *Truth*, at a great Ex-
 “ pence, and in a Manner unusual in this Kingdom,
 “ put into the Hands of all who would accept of
 “ them, from the Capital to the remotest Corner
 “ of the Nation.”

CAN this be denied ? If you doubt it, look into *your own Considerations*, the *Observations*, the *three Letters to the Publick*, and, above all, into the curious *QUERIES* *impudently addressed to all the serious honest and well-meaning People of Ireland*. Who encouraged these Papers ? Who adopted them ? Who patronized them ? Who dispersed them ? Can *Libels* only be on one Side ? Suppose the Majority had happened to be on the other Side on the ever *Memorable* 17th of December ; would not the *Commons* have been a most respectable Body of People ? Has not the Majority been hourly *abused* by *Libellers*, from the Day on which it was fixed, that the Parliament should be prorogued, because they were not on that Side ? Has any one *Printer* or *Publisher* been yet sent to NEWGATE, for thus libelling one of the *Estates in Parliament* ?

IF their Advocates cannot punish, allow them to complain. Words will not put you into the Pillory. Do not stop their Mouths, and then say they will not tell Truth. *Truth* is worshipped by every Lover
 of

of Liberty; but it is *prophaned* in the Mouth of a Slave.

YOU have so shuffled the Words APPROPRIATION and APPLICATION, that you have fairly worn out their Meaning; yet I cannot blame you for this, because your Business was to puzzle.

THE whole Dispute arose upon a *Surplus* after the Trust was discharged; for so was the Fact, when a new Supply was demanded. It hath been shewn by the *Vindication*, that every Surplus hath been appropriated or *applied*, (take which Word you like,) to the *current* Service of the *Publick*, or to the *publick* Service, (chuse also whichsoever Expression you like best in this Place) and that therefore the *Commons* could not, without betraying the *Rights*, which were intrusted to their Care, and without totally changing, nay subverting the *regular Proceeding in Parliament*, solemnly allow, that they could not even propose the *Application* of a *Surplus*, which they had ever done, without the *previous Consent of the Crown*.

IT is possible learned Men may be able to construe Things so, as to make them unintelligible to plain natural Reason. It must be so, or there could not arise so many Difficulties in the *Scripture*; I mean in the Explanation of the *Scripture*; for there are truly none in the *Scripture*.

Now give me leave, without one Scrap of Learning more than what I have picked up accidentally, (of which I dare not make Use, lest I should misapply it, as my Betters often do;) to say, that if the History of this Affair in the *Vindication* be true, and that hath not been disputed, the Commons have an inherent Right, to apply every Surplus, after the Ends of Government are answered, within the Term for which the Supply was granted; and that therefore

therefore, all that is said about the Right of *Application* in the intermediate Time, is an Evasion of the Point in Dispute, and nothing at all to the Purpose. Therefore, Mr. CONSIDERER, give me leave without Offence, to charge you with the going beside the true Question, and making Use of your two beloved Words, APPROPRIATION and APPLICATION, as old Women mumble Charms over Children, under Pretence of curing the Worms, but in Truth, *to cheat the Parents of their Money.*

I am sure you will be astonished at my *great Knowledge* in this Matter, and be curious to know how I came by it. To gratify your Curiosity, I must inform you, that I am one of the many Politicians made by the late active Winter; and that I scorn to draw Learning from any Place but the Fountain-Head; and the Fountain-Head indeed I applied to: For very early I contracted an Acquaintance with one of the Servants, belonging to the House of *Commons*, who permitted me, in Disguise, to stand within the Door, where I learned all I know of the Matter; and I do now most heartily Wish, you had gone to the same School, for your own Improvement, and the *Quiet of the Publick.*

HOWEVER, though you have disturbed Men's Minds not a little; you have made some Amends, by exhibiting the prettiest Method of replying that ever was invented: Such an One as will excellently serve all whimsical or absurd Authors, who shall succeed you. It is so entertaining, that it cannot fail to please a Reader.

WHEN your main Argument is turned Top-sy-Turvy, then you charge your Antagonist with Equivocation, put two Meanings upon his Words, chuse that which is least obvious, but most apt for
your

your Purpose, and down you lay him at your Feet.—Excellent and Stout.

WHEN you find your Antagonist hath clearly proved, that you either knew nothing of the Matter, or wilfully concealed the Strength of the Argument, you take as much Merit to yourself, allowing there is no *very essential Difference* between you.—Truly ingenuous !

WHEN great Labour is used, to shew your Proofs from History to be False or Impertinent, and that is demonstrated ; then you make a new State of the Case, against which your Adversary could not provide ; and tell him, *he might have spared the unnecessary Pains he hath taken* : And thus you ingeniously give him a Go-by.—Very Honest !

WHEN your Adversary thinks he hath fully answered all your Objections, you at once dash his Hopes to Pieces, and destroy the Force of every thing he hath said, by looking big, and positively assuring your Readers, that *he hath attempted, but in vain, to answer*.—Wondrously modest !

FACTS are nothing in your Way. *His* you deny, by affirming the *contrary to be true*. *Your own* you establish by asserting them to be *Facts*.

PRECEDENTS, the stronger they happen to be, so much the worse for them ; for you prove, with a clearness peculiar to yourself, that they *proving too much, are good for nothing*.

THE whole you finish, by affirming in Capitals, that you are UNANSWERED, and thus the Piece is rendered compleat.

HAPPY Man ! who hath discovered so easy a Road to Fame, by being for ever invincible.

IN the third Place, I must address my self to the OBSERVATOR, *an incorrigible old Sinner*, who deals much in Facts, and obstinately, without pretending to the Cloak of Modesty, adheres to them, though they have been confuted by Friends and Foes.

INDEED, Mr. OBSERVATOR, I cannot wonder at any Thing you say; but however, for your own sake you should have a little Caution, and not point out directly to the very Spot wherein your Guilt appears in its strongest Colours. In what Part of the 35th Page of the VINDICATION, doth the Author disclaim all Pretence to the sole Right of drawing up Heads of Money-Bills, as you assert he doth, in Page 5, of your Answer. He there denies indeed, that *the sole Right of having Money-Bills take their Rise in the House of Commons*, was, as you falsely asserted, in your Observations, an Argument for throwing out the Money-Bill. He meddles not farther with the Affair. He had no Occasion to insist upon it; for it was not in Dispute: And he had acted imprudently, if he had disclaimed it, when the CONSIDERATIONS, that were published by Authority, and dispersed FOR HIS MAJESTY'S SERVICE, had expressly, Page 33, *admitted the Right of granting Money to be in the Commons*: And however jealous you may be of the Author, or he of you, you dare not dispute his Doctrine, nor has he *disavowed* it. But your Charge in this Place against the VINDICATOR is but a *Peccadillo*, compared with what is to come.

IN the Account you give, Mr. OBSERVATOR, of the Bill in 1749, Pages 6, 7, 8, you are big with Misrepresentation; but this Matter having been already fully discussed between the CONSIDERATIONS and the VINDICATION, and at length having been given up by the CONSIDERATIONS, lenly

lenly enough ; it is not worth while, to revive it at your Instance. It will be enough to fix my Finger upon the Point, in which you and your Friend, Mr. CONSIDERER, woefully disagree.—Page 8, you say, “ In Consequence whereof, (that is of “ imaginary Messages, &c.) the Words *agreeably* “ *to his Majesty’s most gracious Intentions*, were inserted, in the Heads of the Bill, as most expressive “ of his Majesty’s *previous Consent*, and of the “ Manner of obtaining thereof ; and it is *now* very “ well known, that if the Terms on which his Majesty’s *previous Consent* was given, had not been “ complied with, as it was chearfully, and in a most “ remarkable Manner, by those who applied to the “ Lord Lieutenant on this Occasion, the Bill for “ Payment of Part of the Loan-Debt, would not “ have been then passed into a Law, without “ Words being inserted either here or in *Great-Britain*, for the Support of his Majesty’s *Prerogative and Dignity*.”

Now, Mr. OBSERVATOR, attend with Patience, to see yourself brought to Shame by the CONSIDERER, with whom you dare not contend ; for he struts under the Cloak of *Power*, with which I am sure you will not strive.

PAGE 7 of the CONSIDERATIONS, the Author speaking of this very Point, saith, “ As the Occasion “ was new, it is not to be wondered at, that the Gentlemen who conducted the Affair, on this Side of “ the Water, should not be exact as to the Form “ in which his Majesty’s *Consent* ought to appear : “ And probably, they apprehended that the Return “ of a Bill for that Purpose, under the Great Seal “ of *Great Britain*, would be a sufficient Notification “ of his Majesty’s *previous Consent* to such Application. Again, Page 9, he saith, “ But as that “ Recital, (*agreeably to your Majesty’s most gracious* “ *Intentions*)

“ *Intentions*) though it seems strongly to imply his
 “ Majesty’s *previous Consent*, had not clearly and
 “ explicitly expressed the same, and not having
 “ done so, might occasion future Cavils on that
 “ Head; it is said (and I presume the Fact is
 “ well known to be true) that Objections were made
 “ to this Bill, on that Account, by those to whom
 “ it was, as usual, referred in *Great-Britain*. How
 “ it happened, that his Majesty’s *Consent* was not
 “ by them, at that Time, inserted, may I think be
 “ fairly accounted for; as the Omission on this Side,
 “ seemed to have been occasioned merely by the
 “ Novelty of the Case, without any Intention of
 “ questioning the King’s Right, &c.”

If thou hast one blush about thee, let it out,
 Mr. OBSERVATOR, at being thus exposed by thy
Fellow-Labourer.

BUT, I fear, it is too late, to call for Marks of
 Contrition. Thy OBSERVATIONS warranted a Sus-
 picion that you were mistaken in every Article;
 but thy *Defence* of those *Observations*, in a *pretended*
 ANSWER to the VINDICATION, shews clearly, that
 you cannot shelter yourself under that Apology of
 being mistaken; nay, that you scorn to be screened.
 You are grown callous, and resolved to *brazen* it
 out in the Face of the World. Thus, Page 9, you
 insist, that your Affirmation in the OBSERVATIONS,
 “ That one Argument employed for rejecting of
 “ the Bill, was raised on the Pretence of the *sole*
 “ Right of having Money-Bills take their Rise in
 “ the House of Commons, and that no Alteration
 “ should be made in those Bills, after they are pre-
 “ pared by the House”, is TRUE, *and that you never*
have an evil Design in what you write.—What
 could prompt you to persist in such a FIB, but a
 wicked Design against this Country? It is evident,
 the Tale was not calculated for this Meridian; be-
 cause

cause it is here universally known to be false. The Minority of *December 17*, to a Man, could confute you; the Author of the *CONSIDERATIONS*, (and his Authority is so far out of all Question) Page 20, declares, "He could not suppose it could be so," and in his Answer, *though he was called upon to be explicit, is sullenly silent*, which with him is a *Knocking-under*. But you have, doubtless, made a Merit of this Matter elsewhere, and chuse to hazard your Reputation, rather than to retract. Some you hope will still believe you; and therefore you will not give up, by an open Confession. But even those you must lose, when they find out, that your Friend, the *Principal Advocate* for your Party, hath given you up.

IN Page 10, you say, "that the Inference drawn by the *VINDICATOR*, Page 72, is all his own, and no way warranted by the *Observations*".

WONDROUS Effrontery! turn to Page 22 of the *Observations*, and read these Words and Figures, "The Debt of the Nation at *Lady-day 1745*, £ 258517 10 6—" and this Observation immediately following, "But it appears, that the Nation paid Interest for £ 335000."— Again: Turn to Page 23, where this Observation will stare you full in the Face, "That it was somewhat extraordinary, that an additional Loan should be made of £ 70000 at this Time, when so large a Sum of Money as 71947 was allowed to be due to the Nation (abstracted from the former Loans) after answering all the Demands on Account of the Establishments, and all other Charges whatsoever to the 25th of *March 1745*, and that it is well known that a considerable Arrear is constantly due on these Articles."

To

Do not these several *Observations* well warrant the Inference drawn by the *Vindication* for the *Observations*, Page 72. “ That it is extraordinary, that
 “ the Nation should be reported, to be in Debt but
 “ two hundred and fifty-eight thousand, five hundred and seventeen Pounds, ten Shillings and
 “ six pence ; and should, if it had a Power over
 “ the Surplus, without the PREVIOUS CONSENT of
 “ the Crown, pay at the same Time Interest for
 “ so much a greater Sum ; and not only submit
 “ to this Hardship, but also raise a farther Sum of
 “ seventy thousand Pounds at Interest.

CAN any other Meaning be put upon these OBSERVATIONS? If there can, why did not the OBSERVATOR shew his Skill, and draw another more natural, and more agreeable to his Intention. He best knew, if there was any such : And as he hath not favoured us with another, we must be content with that we have, though it unhappily exposes his *bad Heart*.

THE Method you have taken to prove, that the *Vindicator* hath mistated the Fact, when he affirmed, “ That the Troops of this Country were carried to the Assistance of *England* ; and that therefore the Difference could not be called a *saving*, &c.” is singularly merry. For you prove it, by shewing, that there were drawn out of the Kingdom, *one Regiment of Horse, two Regiments of Dragoons, and fourteen Regiments of Foot*. Indeed, you say, “ That in order to keep up our Troops to the full Complement of 12000 Men, the Regiments which remained in *Ireland*, were increased in Numbers by the Addition of private Men, and a few Officers.” Even this is not true. The *Vindicator*’s Remarks are general, upon the fluctuating Condition of the Army during the whole War ; and it cannot be forgotten, that in 1745, the Army

B was

was so small, the Foot consisting of four Regiments only of 1400 Men each, that it was thought necessary by some Gentlemen, to move in Parliament, for an Address to his Majesty, to raise 4000 Foot, for the Security of the Kingdom.

You have not denied, that instead of one Farthing of your *boasted Saving* being in the Treasury, the Nation really contracted a Debt between 1741 and 1747, of £ 38939 6 11. Your new jesuitical Expedient to impose upon your Readers, and to keep up the Credit of your Saving, is indeed a Master-piece, “ That if there had not been those “ Savings, the Debt would have been in that Time “ £437133 17 1, instead of £38939 6 11.” What, think you it was a Favour, not to lay out Money, voted for a certain Establishment, when that Establishment did not exist? A wretched Minister of State would you make indeed, if such were to be your *Œconomy*. It would be kind, if you would in your Recantation, which, if you have any Candour left, you must soon make, observe for the *Vindicator*, *That if there was not Provision made in one Session for a larger Establishment, than continued to the other Session, there could not be a Saving, even in your way of computing*; and thus you will give his Argument against you its just Force.

I HAVE very little Skill in Figures, just as much as I have acquired merely to keep some minute Accounts in the Family; yet I am able, by the Aid of an undesigning Understanding, free from Art or Cunning, to detect a *new Fallacy*, surprizing only, as it was unnecessary.

To explain the Thing fully, I must first quote your *Inference*, before I examine your *Juggle*, that you may not have a Subterfuge left.

PAGE 27, you say; “ Thus I have stated the “ Supplies voted, and the Produce of the Aids “ granted

“ granted, from *Lady-day* 1739 to *Lady-day* 1749 :
 “ And it fully appears that the Produce of the Aids
 “ hath always fallen short of the Supplies. The Rea-
 “ der may perceive that there has been some Increase
 “ in the Produce of the Aids, but as this Increase
 “ did not enable them to answer the Supplies for
 “ which they were granted to the Crown ; so we
 “ may conclude that the Redundant Money in the
 “ Treasury at *Lady-day* 1749, did not arise from
 “ Exceedings in the Aids, as some would vainly
 “ imagine. We must therefore look out for some
 “ other Source of this Redundancy.”

“ THE Increase of the Hereditary Revenue has
 “ contributed thereto, and that in a treble Propor-
 “ tion, to what the Increase in the additional Du-
 “ ties has done ; but the chief Source of this Re-
 “ dundancy has been the Savings in the Civil List,
 “ and Military Establishment.

You are, I think, fairly beaten out of your *For-
 tress*, called *Savings*, and therefore I shall have no
 more Words with you upon that Subject. And in-
 deed you begun to suspect that this was not tenable,
 and therefore you provided another *Place of Force* to
 retire to ; viz. *the treble Proportion of the Increase of
 the Hereditary Revenue*. But this must also now fall into
 the Hands of the Conqueror ; as soon as it is recol-
 lected, *that the Additional Duties are given but in Aid
 of the Hereditary Revenue ; and that not a Penny of
 the Hereditary Revenue can ever be justly called a
 Redundancy, if the Publick Services call for the Appli-
 cation of any Part of the Additional Duties ; for the
 Principal must be consumed, before the Aid can be
 wanted.*

Now, to shew clearly the *honest* Manner in which
 you state the Supplies voted, and the Produce of
 the Aids granted ; and how *fairly* you prove that
 the Produce of the Aids hath always fallen Short of

the Supplies, I will examine the particular Æra of 1743, having procured the necessary Information for that Period, and that will serve for all; there being no other Variation in the several Instances, than what arises from the different Ballances.

PAGE 22, you say, the Debt of the Nation at *Lady-day* 1743 was voted, to be a Sum, not exceeding 331,440*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.* and that the Supply granted toward Payment of the said Debt, &c. was a Sum not exceeding 521906*l.* 10*s.* 6*d.* from whence you deduct 9742*l.* granted by Parliament, and then the Supply remaining is 512,164*l.* 10*s.* 6*d.*

THEN you proceed to shew how the Account for the two Years turned out.

Nett Produce of Additional Duties and Poundage	— — —	280,256	4	7
Deduct a Deficiency in the Fund for Interest	— — —	2873	15	10
And Payments made by Virtue of King's Letters, &c. not included in the Estimate for Supply	— — —	59,074	9	1
			61948	4 11
		Remains	218307	19 8
Which falls short of the Supply granted in the Year 1743 by			293856	10 10

PERH. PS

PERHAPS a fouler *Fraud* never was attempted to be imposed upon Mankind than this appears to be, even upon the Face of this Account: For herein is confessed, that there was a Fund provided for the Payment of an Interest for a certain Principal, and yet the Principal is not separated, as fairly it ought, from the Total of the Supply.

THE Debt to bear Interest was a Sum of 327,590*l.* 18*s.* 11*d.* which being deducted from the Total of the Supply, there remained but 184,573*l.* 11*s.* 7*d.* for the Support of the Establishment; so that in Truth, the additional Duties, (allowing also for the Article deficient in the Fund for Interest,) produced 92,808*l.* 17*s.* 2*d.* more than they were granted for. You may out of this, if you please, deduct 59,074*l.* 9*s.* 1*d.* paid, by Virtue of King's Letters, &c. and you will find a Redundancy of 33,734*l.* 8*s.* 1*d.* belonging to the Nation, instead of a Deficiency of 293,856*l.* 10*s.* 10*d.*

WHAT could provoke you to give this additional Instance of your Disingenuity, when you had declared, Page 19, *that there was no Need to dwell longer upon the Point, since it is now finally determined, by his Majesty's ordering the Payment of the Debt out of the Money remaining in his Treasury?* Was it only to shew, that you had an inexhaustible Fund of *Misrepresentation* about you? You need not have taken the Trouble, we were all ready to acknowledge your great Abilities in that Way. Some have reasoned ill; others have failed in Exactness, as to Fact. But you have outstripp'd them all. In your whole Operation, you have not produced one tolerable Reason, or one true State of any Transaction.

IN one of the weekly Papers I observed two Lines, which I must borrow upon this Occasion.

The Wretch that often has deceiv'd ;
Though Truth he speaks, is ne'er believ'd.

THUS have I taken you to Task separately ; do not be Angry, that I put you once more together ; I doubt not but by this Time, you dislike one another ; but if each of you will but observe the Figure he cuts in the *Groupe*, he will be the easier reconciled to his Company.

IN your joint State then, let me ask you what provoked you to enter into a Controversy, that was so eminently Superior to your Capacities ? If I knew you, I could without Delay or Difficulty discover your Motives : But truly you are not amongst my Acquaintance ; and yet you must be of very low Degree. But the lowest of my Companions admires Virtue ; and honours the Man, who acts upon virtuous Principles, whether he be or be not Successful.

HAD you Property, had you Children, had you Friends, or had you from any Cause, a Love for this Kingdom, you would have contributed to have raised Friends for it, not have laboured to create Enemies ; not only to create Enemies, but to make *bitter Enemies* of the *best Friends*.

SUPPOSE the *Majority of the COMMONS* had erred ; and erred in a Point of Interest, wherein the *Crown*, or *Great-Britain*, was materially concerned, and was prejudicially affected : Would 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

that might produce Ruin ; because he or his Party were outvoted ?

If these Things be so, then have you forfeited all Title to the amiable Characters of Honesty, Goodness or Charity : For you have exposed all our Infirmities ; you have aggravated our Faults ; and you have endeavoured to rouse the Lion to Anger — And indeed it would be no great Matter, if you only were to be the Victims.

WHAT Profit could all your Writings produce, if they were the wisest upon Earth, when the Question to which they relate, is like never to arise more ? What but Disappointment, unforgiving, malicious Disappointment, could stir Men up to appeal to Persons, who could not change the Judgment, but might, through Misinformation, conceive a hurtful Opinion of those who gave it ? Consider these Things well, and reform before it be too late : It will recommend me much hereafter, if I can bring about the Repentance of three such Sinners : *Sinners*, who are at present like *Swearers*, in Danger of Damnation, for a Crime, that hath in it neither *Pleasure* or *Profit*.

PERMIT me, through you, to convey one Word to the HABERDASHER of SMALL WARE, who made his Appearance last Week. I have his Work now *under Perusal*, but have not yet determined, whether I shall or shall not lay it before my *Master*. But lest he should, in a Hurry, send Abroad more of his *Small Ware*, before I have well examined his former Cargoe, I must give him some Advice for his Conduct. Indeed, it would be well, if he drop'd all Thoughts of meddling with *Politicks*. They are not his Profession, and are above his Comprehension. But if he will not be advised in this Point, bid him not *Dimmock-like* to throw down a *Gauntlet*, which he is very sure will not be taken up.

up. I have read in a great Book of Travels, that lies in our Hall, that in *China*, the *Mandarins* are obliged daily to throw into a Chest, by a Hole in the Lid, their Observations on Publick Transactions; when the *Emperor* dies, the Chest is opened, and out of the Papers found therein, his History is composed. *A Word to the Wise.*

DIONYSIUS.

F I N I S.



Houses of the Oireachtas