

*Duplicate
See vol 20*

A
LETTER

OF

REMONSTRANCE,

TO

DENYS SCULLY, ESQ.

UPON HIS ADVICE TO HIS

CATHOLIC BRETHERN.



BY AN

IRISH LOYALIST.



Dublin

PRINTED BY GRAISBERRY AND CAMPBELL,

FOR

WILLIAM JONES, NO. 26, COLLEGE-GREEN.

1803.

Houses of the Oireachtas

LETTER
OF
REMONSTRANCE, &c.

SIR,

I OPENED your pamphlet with no small degree of interest, and with much prepossession in its favour. In an address to his Catholic brethren, professing to be “an estimate of *French invasion, of civil wars, and of slavery,*” coming from a gentleman of a liberal and dignified profession, who has, I understand, a considerable stake in the country, at a period so awful as the present, when all topics that can possibly produce animosities, heart-burnings, and irritations, should be so scrupulously avoided, I did, I confess, expect to find the pure sentiments of generous loy-

alty, unalloyed by the bitterness of religious zeal, divested of party spirit, unmixed with dangerous allusions to whatever would rouse the sad recollection of our past misfortunes, and, above all, free from every thing that could induce the slightest suspicion of the views, the motives, or the objects of the author, either for himself or for his brethren. I am sorry to say, that these expectations have been disappointed, and that your advice, excellent, I am happy to admit, in many particulars, is so replete with dangerous misrepresentations, so bold in unfounded assertions, so abundant in calumnies, (pardon the expression) of great bodies of loyal men, as well as of individuals, of the living and of the dead, of the most exalted by their stations and their virtues, unsparing even of royalty itself, that to suffer it to pass without animadversion, even at this critical period, inauspicious as it is to political discussion, would be in some measure to affix the seal of undisputed truth upon a publication, which, I do not hesitate to pronounce, a libel as unfounded

founded as it is unwise, upon a most loyal dignified and virtuous part of the Irish people. In an address from an anonymous author, you have a right, Sir, to expect that he should abstain from all personal observations; in what I shall say, I shall beg of you to consider me as observing solely upon the work, and not upon the author; with your personal motives and objects I have nothing to do, indeed it must be allowed that to a great degree they must be praiseworthy: but, as a member of a party, I shall think I have a fair right to consider you, and so you hold yourself out in almost every page, as actuated by the resentments, or to use your own stronger words, "keenly feeling and sympathizing with the sufferings of your brethren," and as stimulated by other motives than the mere preservation of our present invaluable constitution. As to myself, my situation, or my private views, unimportant as they are to you and to the public, I shall only say, that I am as independent in station, as unconnected with powerful

erful men, as uninterested in supporting political abuses or defects, and as free from the trammels of party as you profess yourself to be, I am, I confess, a Protestant, I glory in professing, and I hope I practice the tenets of a pure and tolerant religion, under whose mild influence the British constitution has acquired most of what it possesses of genuine liberty; but like yourself, I am an Irishman, living among my Catholic fellow-subjects as brethren, and happy in their full enjoyment of all the substantial benefits of our unrivalled form of government. In one respect, indeed, Sir, we materially differ; I do not, like you, look “without the least mixture of solicitude, upon the interests of England and of France, farther than as those countries affect our prosperity and independence.” I confess I look upon England and Ireland as one country, and I have ever considered them, even before the Union, as completely identified in all their interests, and my sentiments, Sir, flow from an honest and unbiassed survey of the “common interests,” not of the

Protestant

Protestant part of my fellow-subjects, but of all the inhabitants of these islands; and I look upon the great struggle in which we are engaged, as involving the independence and prosperity, not merely of your religion or of mine, but of the whole British empire, the existence of the noblest people in the world, the triumph or the fall of liberty, of civilization, and of religion itself.

With such sentiments, Sir, at such a crisis, and in such a cause, it was not without keen regret that I found in your animating address to your Catholic brethren, a mixture of such ingredients as must render its effects at least extremely doubtful, upon their untutored minds, and must surely cause much dissatisfaction among your Protestant fellow-subjects, as well as dangerous suspicions of the ultimate views of your body.

If it was wise to recur to the history of past times, to recal to recollection the "restraints privations and *real* grievances" under which the Catholics so long laboured, a topic which I should think

think had better been avoided; the delicate subject should at least have been handled with a strict adherence to moderation and impartiality. I shall not, Sir, imitating your error, enter upon that subject, a subject upon which however the wisest statesman differ: but I shall remark, that it was not fair to attribute your liberation from your former state of abasement solely to your own "wisdom and unbroken energies." It would have been more conducive to a cordial union with your Protestant brethren, as well as more agreeable to truth, to have shared the praise with the tolerant and patriotic sentiments which animated successive Irish Parliaments gradually to remove the grievances imposed upon you, at an æra of the most violent, political, as well as religious feuds that ever divided a nation. It would have been more just, if, even at this portentous moment, "the vices and errors of our former rulers are not to be extenuated;" to have given them their due share of praise, for having themselves corrected almost all the vices, and atoned for almost

most all the errors of which you had formerly a right to complain.

In recalling to the recollection of your Catholic brethren the gallant achievements of their ancestors, I do not blame you for some sacrifices of historic truth, to, what you may perhaps consider, political expediency; but I must deny the expediency of branding with the epithet of **DUTCH INVADER**, the memory of the illustrious William, I must dispute the prudence as well as the truth of giving the exclusive praise of loyalty to the supporters of the tyrant James. The term *Invader* must at this time be used and construed by us all in the worst sense, as implying rapine and murder, as threatening the destruction of all that is dear and valuable in civil society. In this sense, Sir, you are not to be told that William was no invader—he was the chosen sovereign of the British nation—he was selected by that glorious people as the man best fitted by his connexion with the deposed family, and by his personal character, to

fill

fill the throne of these realms; as King of Great Britain, he was by our constitution King of Ireland also; and he landed in this country, not a *Dutch Invader*, but the *lawful Monarch of the British Islands*—not to subvert our laws or constitution, but to place them on a foundation, whereon I trust they will rest for ever. To that great prince, all loyal subjects, (Catholics, permit me to say, as well as Protestants) should look back with reverence, if they value the free constitution of these islands, the just limitations of the royal prerogative, the abolition of tyranny, and above all the power and independence of this great empire. In this sense, Sir, and not upon the single circumstance of religion, we consider the memory of William as *glorious*. We have sworn to maintain what he principally established; and you, Sir, have taken an oath to defend the succession of the throne in that line, wherein it was placed by his parliament, and to abjure that family which he assisted to expel. It is rather a strange observance of that oath, in

in an address to the spirit of a warm people, to extol as loyalty their attachment to a deposed tyrant, to stigmatize as the worst of enemies, a *Foreign Invader*, the assertor of our liberties, the scourge of France, the freely elected monarch of the British people.

What wise or useful purpose you could have in view, when you illustrate the partition of property that Bonaparte would undoubtedly make of our lands among his desperate followers, by your allusion to the days of Oliver Cromwell, I cannot conjecture. You must know, that many estates are held upon no other title, and you should have considered, that the time was ill suited, if indeed any time would be well suited, to the recollection of such subjects; and why you should select such an opportunity for venting most unprovoked and vulgar abuse upon an inoffensive, harmless, and devout class of men, the Methodists, whom you nickname Swadlers, (much as you dislike nicknames) is to me equally inexplicable. I have never understood, that the Methodists were

c

accused

accused of holding principles hostile to government; I have always heard that they inculcated a strict observance of the Christian injunction, "Render under Cefar the things which are Cefar's, and unto God the things which are God's. And I believe, that in manners, in morals, and in obedience to the laws, they need not shun a comparison with the pastors of that church to which, from your strange abuse, I suppose them to be so obnoxious.

If you found it necessary in your view of the late transactions of this country, to palliate the excesses of your Fellow-catholics, with which I do not quarrel, I cannot see the prudence, and I must deny the fairness, of loading the memory of the Rulers of that day with universal obloquy. Is it prudent, Sir, is it safe, or is it consistent with truth to assert, that in recalling Lord Fitzwilliam, faith was broken with Ireland? I speak not of the *policy* of the measure, but I say, that he who questions at this day, on such an occasion, and in such an address, the exercise of an unquestionable

unquestionable prerogative, the recal of the Lord Lieutenant, and stigmatizes it as a *breach of faith with the people*, displays more of the heated zeal of a partizan, than of steady loyalty. Your character of Lord Camden and his administration is equally partial and prejudiced. Lord Camden succeeded to the government at a most critical moment, under circumstances of extraordinary difficulty, when the recal of his predecessor was certainly highly unpopular, and when the utmost exertion of firmness and moderation, could alone secure public tranquillity. With what success he accomplished this might be conjectured from the general suffrages of warm approbation, that attended him on his departure from our shores. But the prominent features of his administration, the persevering vigilance which discovered all the secret machinations of domestic treason, the full development of the late unparalleled system of rebellion, the provident establishment of the illustrious Yeomanry, who, under Providence, saved this island from destruction; these are acts which must

for ever stamp his administration with the character of energetic wisdom. What becomes, Sir, of your reproach of weakness thrown upon this respected nobleman; and what is the Rod of Iron with which, you say, he and his advisers scourged the Irish people?—In vain shall we look to the Statute Book for the confirmation of your obloquy; acts of parliament, indeed, of necessary, but temporary restraint and rigour, were passed, acts, that affected only the traitor or the rebel, and which the wisdom of the present government, whose clemency you extol, has found it expedient to re-establish. I cannot find that iron scourge in the *laws* of that period, and you must allude to the acts of the executive government. It is the praise of that period, that state prosecutions were never conducted with more impartiality and mildness; the Attorney General during the whole of it was Lord Kilwarden, a man of the most merciful nature, of the strictest impartiality, of the proudest sense of public duty.—In the whole course of his official conduct, in the most convulsed moments, by
the

the most virulent traitors, not a murmur was ever uttered against a single official act of this truly constitutional Attorney General. The ever-memorable words which he uttered, even in the agonies of death, convey to us the ruling principle of his life; and never did a single individual suffer under his prosecution or administration of the laws without a fair trial.

As to the prosecutions of that day being wanton and expensive, I shall only add, that when a rebel treasury was opened to defend the rebel culprits; when Coigly, the traitor, or Quigly, went the circuits, the general agent of the conspirators, with a purse sufficiently weighty to cope even with the government, and to employ the most eminent lawyers for all traitors indiscriminately, the ministers that should have hesitated to exert the utmost energies of the state, to resort to the ablest legal advice and assistance, and to expend some portion of the public wealth in defence of the public cause, would, in my opinion of ministerial responsibility, have deserved to lose something more than their places.

When

When the legislature transgressed not the bounds of necessity, and when the civil power was regulated by justice and mercy, it seems rather extraordinary to say, that the people were "*ruled by a rod of iron.*"—Your reproach must be altogether unfounded, or it must allude to the military acts of discipline resorted to at a period of unexampled novelty, difficulty and danger. As to these, it would surely be more candid, when all the other acts of the executive government evince a spirit of justice and moderation, to attribute them as much to the sad necessity of the times, to an honest, though it might be, erroneous opinion, that severity would quell the dreadful spirits that were then plotting universal destruction, as to a wanton and barbarous cruelty, delighting in the severity of punishment.—This, Sir, is a topic that I should have thought it more prudent to avoid; but if the events of that period must be resorted to, are the errors of our military system, are the vices, if you will, of an incensed and devoted soldiery, to be blazoned forth with all the exaggeration

exaggeration of blind and heated zeal? Would you have your deluded countrymen believe, that every thing was vicious in their rulers, and that most of their own enormities at that period were justly provoked? That burnings, free quarters, and Orange excesses, were *all* that disgraced our national character?—Sir, the crimes of that period, buried as I should wish them in everlasting oblivion, have these distinguishing characteristics in the opposite parties; that on the one side they were accompanied by an unequivocal zeal for the preservation of our constitution, that on the other they had for their objects the destruction of that constitution, of public order, and of civil society.—Nor were the means employed more different than the objects. I defy the most bigotted partizan to point out a single instance of cowardly assassination, perpetrated or contrived by the military, the yeomanry, or the Orange body. I challenge him to produce a parallel to the cold-blooded, preconcerted murders of Doctor Hamilton, of Mr. Harman, and of the innumerable victims who fill the bloody calendar

calendar of merciless proscription, which doomed every active magistrate to inevitable death. Are the excesses of one enraged and justly provoked party, blameable, I admit them to be blazoned forth with dangerous exaggeration; and are the furious and cruel outrages of the other party to be passed by in silence, or to be extenuated almost to nothing?

A similar and perhaps more dangerous misrepresentation is given of the disastrous period of the rebellion. Throughout your pages it is generally softened into the equivocal name of *civil war*. We know, Sir, that the line of distinction between justifiable resistance and rebellion is often faint and fluctuating; that the excesses of authority, the violations of duty in the rulers the hardships, sufferings, and provocations of the governed, and the views and objects of the resisting or conspiring people, though the legal definition be still treason, will in general opinion, make a mighty difference in the nature of the crime.

crime. But that the late horrid conflict between the wretched victims of republican anarchy, and the mildest sovereign that ever filled our throne, that the most unprovoked and sanguinary rebellion, the most illegitimate in its object, the most barbarous in its means, should be termed by a lawyer, addressing the deluded sharers in the guilt, *a civil war*, is in my mind a proof, not of moderation, but of dangerous connivance at the worst of crimes. In a similar spirit, the necessary events of battle, and the cold-blooded unprovoked murders of assassins are classed in the same undistinguished rank, "*The assassinations of Wexford and Ballynamuck!*" Good God, Sir, upon what estimation of human crime do you tell your brethren, that those who fell victims to rebellion, upon the field of battle, were assassinated? That the chances of war or even military executions, inflicted on the field and at the moment, bear any sort of comparison, with the most cruel and savage murders that stain the annals even of the most uncivilized countries? That the salutary and

necessary example of punishment upon traitors, fighting in French uniforms, ordered by Lord Cornwallis himself, and the merciless murders, committed by furious bigots, upon unarmed, unoffending gentlemen, whose only crime was loyalty to their King, should in the portentous moment of a second rebellion be equally stigmatized as assassinations!

In the same spirit, not of moderation, but of tenderness, I will not say of regard towards the rebel; of hostility, I might perhaps say of malignity, towards the Irish loyalist, you speak of individual characters. The conspirators, the cold blooded dark conspirators, who framed the republican constitution, who sentenced, at least to banishment and to loss of property, their companions, their friends, their brethren, who, *after the reign of Robespierre*, when the French revolution had "*fully developed itself, when its character no longer vibrated,*" as you assert, "*between liberty and slavery,*" when the public opi-

nion

nion was decided upon the "*ferocity and folly of its partizans,*" when no honest or patriotic person had the faintest hope that "*France was engaged, not in forging its own chains, but in maintaining the cause of rational liberty:*" the conspirators, I say, who even at such a period persisted in their hellish machinations against the properties and lives of all that were good and virtuous among their countrymen, are to be held out, even to the deluded victims of their guilt, as "*men of integrity,*" whose "*private views*" are not to be accused as "*sordid or vindictive,*" and whose "*moral qualities*" are to be "*spoken of with respect.*" Sir, whatever your opinion may be of "*moral qualities,*" by whatever rules you may estimate the "*integrity*" of man, or by whatever principles you may judge of his "*private views,*" I cannot hesitate to pronounce this panegyric, at such a moment, and in such an Address, this insinuation that the views of the traitor conspirators, so far from being "*sordid or vindictive,*" were directed to the "*wealth, glory,*

and happiness of their country," to be deserving of the severest censure. Indeed your short history of that transaction, appears to me altogether of a most alarming complexion. It amounts, in truth, to this, a few Irishmen, "some of them of great talents and integrity," with "no bad private views," expecting the French would pursue the "noble line of conduct" of "producing an admirable master-piece of a free constitution," engaged upon the expectation of "ample and generous aid from France," in a scheme whose object was the "wealth, glory, and happiness of their country." But they were disappointed; the French submitted to tyranny, they did not give the Irish "*ample and generous aid,*" they suffered them to be massacred at Ballinamuck, and our "*ill-fated countrymen, our abused exiles, suspected, however unjustly, of being robbers and assassins,*" have been so ill received, "*their disappointment so bitter, that you would really pity their present feelings.*"

Sir,

Sir, if the present conspiracy should prove successful, which God avert, and you should be arraigned before the revolutionary tribunal for your present publication, how easy and how just would be your defence? Citizens! you might truly say, I did not condemn an *Irish* revolution, I did not in any line of my Address, even when the critical danger of the times might have excused the error, deprecate the establishment of an *Irish* republic by *Irish* means, I did not even question your *private views*, and I extolled your *integrity*, your *moral and intellectual qualities*; but I really thought you would not succeed: I did not expect you would get "ample and generous aid from France;" I thought you would be too weak for the struggle alone, and I dreaded the business could only end in the massacre of my poor deluded countrymen, as at Ballinamuck, and in such a reception of you, Citizens, in France, as should make us "*pity your feelings.*" But you have succeeded, and you will not surely punish me for an error in judgment, particularly as from my opi-

nion

nion of your "great integrity," of "your moral and intellectual qualities," and of the "purity of your private views," I have little doubt of your establishing "such an admirable master-piece of a free constitution," as shall secure what must be to men of your pure minds the most "splendid reward, the wealth, glory, and happiness of your country." Citizens, look into my book, and see how freely I directed the attention of my Catholic brethren to all the vices and errors of their former rulers, see how I lashed "the intemperate persons who, in Lord Camden's time undertook to rule five millions of men with a rod of iron." See how boldly I disclosed my "firm judgment" that they were the persons who had "nursed the feuds and swelled the distractions that disgrace this Isle;" and observe how delicately I insinuated that providence had interfered to "arrest the foremost of those intemperate wielders of the rod of iron in his career in this world." Observe how dexterously I magnified the inability of government to defend the country

country without our assistance; see how in the moment of peril, I talked to my ignorant brethren, of "*the code of intolerance,*" of "*the ignominious barrier that separates us from our fellow-subjects,*" how we are *nick-named*, Papists, of the "*goadng existence of a train of disabilities, forfeitures, penalties, and incapacities;*" of the "*foul play*" of not removing them; and see how I turned my eyes and those of my brethren to their "*bleeding wounds and gashes.*" Sir, I say, if your judges have preserved their moral and intellectual qualities, they must in conscience pronounce a verdict of not guilty upon this just defence.

Your picture of the present condition of this island, appears to me drawn in colours equally false, and as dangerously deceitful, as that of past transactions. If the question were asked, what would be the representation most likely to impress on the minds of your Catholic brethren, a strong conviction of the advantages, the policy, the

the necessity of loyalty? I should think the just answer would be, a representation of undoubted loyalty, of warm zeal for the constitution, in the remaining classes of the people, and particularly in the higher orders; and an extenuation of every disposition among those you consider as hostile to your religion, towards intolerance or persecution. But if your picture be as true as I consider it false, your fellow Catholics must be impressed with a conviction of the weakness of the country, of the disloyalty of a great part of its pretended friends, and of the impossibility of its salvation but through their own means. Happily your assertions are as easy of refutation as they are unfounded. While a few lines, and the softest expressions are sufficient to narrate the crimes of treason and rebellion, while its murders and assassinations are confounded with military deaths and executions, above ten entire pages of your book are exclusively employed, in a most exaggerated history of the nature, the dispositions, and the crimes of the Orange-men.—I belong not to their
body,

body, I condemn all such party distinctions, and I stoop not to detect or expose your false character in other particulars; I only mean to refute your insinuations as to their *loyalty*. Sir, their numbers I understand to be great, to comprehend a large portion of the most populous districts of the North, and they certainly are among the most wealthy of the middle and lower orders of the community. Sir, if such a body of men really resemble, as you insinuate, “the rebel parliament of Charles the 1st, who afterwards brought their monarch to the scaffold, and scattered about most fervent professions of loyalty whilst they plotted revolution, and impudently issued proclamations in their king’s name, *for the purpose of levying an army against his royal life and crown.*” If they really plot “the most consummate villainy,” and if it be even probable that they meditate to “rehearfe one day the tragedy of the Cromwellian revolution, or of the London conflagration,” I confess our situation is more pregnant with danger than I have yet considered it to be.—But

happily, Sir, your well-timed apprehensions of their disloyalty, have not the remotest colour of truth, so far as we can judge from all human motives and objects, and are flatly contradicted by every fact which has taken place in these past years. For what purpose, with what means of acting, and with what prospect of success, should Orangemen engage in any disloyal conspiracy?—But a small portion of the Protestants of Ireland, who, according to your exaggerated political arithmetic, are but one-fifth of its population, comparatively speaking but a handful of men, how could they have the mad and wicked idea of conspiring in a cause where they would be certainly resisted, and as speedily defeated by the united efforts of all the Catholics, all the remaining Protestants of Ireland, and all the population of Britain?—But amidst all the prosecutions of Orange-men, prosecutions, Sir, I assert, though you pass it by in silence, carried on against them by the Irish government ever since their first formation, as firmly and impartially, where they were guilty of crimes,

as against the United Irishmen; I defy you to produce a single instance of a plot against the government of the country. To the same records I might justly appeal for the true characteristics of the opposite factions, and from the calendar of crimes and punishments I might enquire on which side was the balance of the most horrid outrages that ever disgraced humanity; but I shall abstain even after the just provocation you have given; I shall not imitate your dangerous example of blowing up what I had hoped were the *dying* embers of religious discord, and I shall decline the abundant opportunities of retorting the abuse which you have not hesitated to throw in language not the politest, upon gentlemen whose age and station at least, should have afforded them some protection.

I do not exactly understand to what class of his majesty's subjects you allude in the following passage:—"The faction whom you dread have
 "changed sides, and are become the most dis-
 "contented party in the country; they are be-

“ come the most clamorous against British con-
 “ nection, because it has clipped their monopoly ;
 “ they are incensed by the late Union, which
 “ has demolished (not our Parliament, for we had
 “ no share in it, but) their *Club-house*.” I have
 never understood the Orange-men to be particu-
 larly hostile to the Union, nor could the parlia-
 ment be called peculiarly *their* Club-house, more
 than that of the Protestants at large. I must con-
 sider the passage, connected with what immedi-
 ately follows, as to a change of men and mea-
 sures, to allude to three who were formerly in
 power, to those who possessed the monopoly, and
 to whom the Club-house belonged ; that is, in
 short, to the Protestant aristocracy and Protestant
 gentry of Ireland ; and my construction acquires
 additional force from the circumstance that, in
 the long catalogue of names upon whom you
 bestow such lavish praise, generals and statesmen,
 there is not an allusion to a single Irishman.—
 Lamentable, indeed, is the condition of this coun-
 try, if such men “ incensed by the Union, have
 “ changed sides,” and have become “ the most
 “ discontented

“discontented men in the country.” But I deny the fact. I defy you to any proof of the dangerous calumny; and I assert, that his Majesty has not in all his dominions, a body of subjects more loyally attached to his person and government, more firmly devoted to the constitution and the inseparable union of the two islands, than the very men whose opposition was strongest to the Union, whose interests were most affected by it, and whose complaints were most loudly uttered. Compare, Sir, their privations with those of your body; look to the difference of their conduct and then answer; with what assurance you can assert in the same pages, that you belong to “a faithful and loyal class of people, who have never lost their dignity or their temper with their fortunes,” and that the Protestant aristocracy, *or any portion of them*, “have changed sides, or become most clamorous against British connection.”

Sir, the Protestant aristocracy lost in one moment some of their proudest privileges, near two hundred noblemen were deprived of their hereditary

ditary seats in the legislature, two hundred commons lost theirs also, and the whole body lost the substantial power of legislating for their country; how widely different was this from your privations? In the first place, you (that is the present generation) never possessed those privileges, and in the next, the number excluded was but a handful, three or four lords, and perhaps fifteen or twenty gentlemen of sufficient landed fortune to be entitled to sit in the House of Commons. What has been then the conduct of these two descriptions of men? The Union, vigorously as it was opposed, has been peaceably acquiesced in. Has all the discontent, all the chagrin, all the *substantial* loss it has occasioned, produced a single act of treason, of sedition, or violence throughout the whole island?—No, Sir, a virtuous and loyal class of men, deeply as they suffered, never for an instant forgot their duty to their king and country; they never were “cajoled or goaded into rebellion,” they do not require any faint and flimsy palliation of treason,

but

but they have nobly buried in oblivion the memory of the past, and uncajoled, and unpurchased, they rally round the throne, resolved to perish or to preserve that British connexion, against which, I assert, no class of men, and no individual but United Irishmen are "clamorous." Do they in their offers of service, in their resolutions or addresses, constantly recur to past injuries, do they turn their eyes to the "*still bleeding wounds and gashes of their country,*" do they insult even the ashes of the impotent dead with unrelenting malignity, do they dare to ridicule with indecent mockery their monarch's conscientious observance of his oath, or do they teach their followers to look with anxiety to the death of that monarch as the æra of relief from magnified grievances? Sir, I hope and trust our present rulers, convinced, as they must be, of the unshaken loyalty of the men I allude to, will not resist the counsels of our enlightened countrymen, I hope they will pay some attention to the *tried loyalty*, to the dear-bought experience, of Irish gentlemen. I do

do not believe that the men who assisted the counsels of Lord Camden are “unemployed or unnoticed by our present excellent rulers;” and while I join in the well-deserved praise bestowed on Lord Hardwicke, I am satisfied he would reject your panegyric with scorn, when accompanied by the malignant insinuation, that his predecessors in power “had harrassed your brethren, “by wanton and expensive state prosecutions,” “had goaded them by insolent speeches,” “had frightened them from their houses, by tortures, “house-burnings, or other outrages on their persons or properties,” and had employed “*the absurd tyranny of torture.*”

With equal confidence I expect, that the manly spirit of Lord Redefdale would recoil from your encomium, when made the vehicle of abuse as unnecessary as it is ungenerous, upon his predecessor. Whatever were the defects of that nobleman, his bold and resolute spirit never forsook him in the hour of severest trial, he was a firm friend

friend to the imperial connexion of these countries, he was an impartial and indefatigable judge, and in private life he was honest, generous, and undisguised, open in his enmities, warm in his friendships, the kind protector of his tenantry and dependants, just in all his dealings, and with every means of aggrandisement in his power, far above the sordid acquisition of place or emolument for himself, or his family.

It gives me infinite pain to observe that, mixed with the sound advice to your brethren, to prefer the hope "of attaining in a constitutional manner from the good sense of the gentry, the legislature and the clergy," the remaining objects of their desires, "to the encountering of civil wars, or the wading through slaughter," in their pursuit, your representation of your remaining grievances is so overcharged, the necessity of their removal so strongly insisted on, the injustice of the refusal so emphatically declared, that a loyal and peaceable acquiescence in the final determi-

nation of the legislature must be more the result of a cool comparison of the danger of resistance with the negative advantage of submission, than of the imperative duty on all the King's subjects to obey the laws of the land. As to the *exactions* of the parson, you must be aware that you speak not the language of the law, when you complain of the enforcement of that to which the parson has as just a legal right as you have to your estate, and that, however the parson may in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, obtain less than his strict right, he can in no instance obtain more.—When you speak of the “foul stigma of unmerited suspicion, which the penal code casts upon your gentry and your whole body,” you should have apprized your Catholic reader, that that code has been repealed by Protestant parliaments, in every instance, except those which are deemed necessary to the maintenance of a state religion, to that union of political and religious pre-eminence in the supreme power, which has been adopted as a maxim of policy by almost

most every government of Europe. When you speak of land-tax for religious purposes, you should recollect, that that very land-tax always forms an ingredient in the market price of land, and that its repeal would only enhance that price in a proportionate degree; and you should likewise have recollected in candour, that the parish cess is in truth but a trivial tax, and that the annual fund, to which I suppose you allude, (the first fruits) is in truth but very inadequate to the purpose, is also derived from the unquestionable property of the crown, and is far inferior to the liberal annual allowance allotted by parliament to a Catholic college. But above all, when you speak of your exclusion from the situations of sheriff, under-sheriff, and all corporate offices, your experience as a lawyer must surely have enabled you to add, that any apprehension therefrom of "hazard to your property and to the administration of justice" is altogether chimerical.

But I feel real pleasure in being able to bestow unmixed and cordial praise on that part of your

Address in which you direct the attention of your poorer countrymen to the substantial blessings they enjoy, where you strip of its overcharged colouring their supposed poverty and distress, and in energetic language warn them of the designs of the factious demagogues who would lead them to their own ruin. The fact cannot be controverted, that there is not a single advantage enjoyed by their fellow subjects of Britain, which they do not possess the means of acquiring to its fullest extent; the same system of laws, administered by the same impartial tribunals, the same freedom of commerce, the same mild and equitable government, perfect security in their lives and properties, except so far as they are outraged by their own unprovoked excesses; all these substantial blessings are secured to them and their posterity by the invincible power of these united kingdoms, which they are now called upon to aid in its resistance against the most sanguinary and insatiable robbers that providence hath ever permitted to afflict the nations of the earth. Your forcible

forcible and just appeal to your deluded brethren on this topic, and the faithful picture you have drawn of the miseries which must inevitably follow from the success of the Corsican tyrant, I hope and trust will have a salutary effect on their minds.

I shall now, Sir, take my leave of you with making a very few remarks on that part of your work, wherein you strongly insist on the necessity of removing the remaining distinctions between you and the Protestants. The time is ill fitted to any lengthened discussion of a subject, which, to my understanding, is one of the very last importance; but still it is necessary to make some observation on a topic on which you have so much insisted, and which from the title to the last page of your Address, you seem to consider as involving a truth so evident and so undeniable as to require assertion only, and not argument, in its behalf. Without entering upon the subject at large, much less pronouncing a decisive opinion

upon

upon it, I shall make a few remarks that I think ought to have weight at this time. The restraints still continued upon the Catholics are merely of a political nature, and have no other effect nor object but his exclusion from any share in the government of the state. This must be admitted. Now, Archdeacon Paley, whom you have quoted, admits and proves that such exclusion is perfectly legitimate, when the excluded party, from the political consequences of their religious tenets, may hold opinions destructive to the existing government. Such was the ground upon which the penal laws were justified, when the family of Stuart still pretended to our throne, and attachment to their cause was considered *loyalty* by the Irish Catholics, as you still seem to think it was. This attachment to the deposed family, the devotion of an ignorant, turbulent people to a priesthood, nurtured and educated in a foreign country, the most hostile to British power; the dependance of that priesthood upon a hierarchy itself dependant upon a Pope, the avowed supporter of
the

the pretender, who considered the Catholic princes his children, and entitled to his utmost aid against their heretical enemies; all these circumstances establish the wisdom of excluding the Catholics from political power, while such mighty causes should continue to operate.

The cause of the pretender, it must be admitted, is no more; but unquestionably the readiness with which your religion in particular, enlisted under the banners of French democracy—the still continued chain of connexion between a foreign pope and the lowest of the people, unbroken in all its links of hierarchy and priesthood—the complete subjection of the pope to the will of Bonaparte, must continue the suspicion of your people being still subject to an influence highly dangerous to the state. It is in vain to say, that the power of the pope is declined, that the people disregard the pope; the people must be influenced by their priests, the priests are appointed by the bishops, and the bishops acknowledge

no

no other spiritual head but the pope. This, Sir, affords an argument against your admission to any share of political power, which does not exist against any other religion, an argument founded not on your speculative religious opinions, but on a political influence which we know was formerly exercised, and which should be altogether extinct before we run the risk of experiment.

But if the experiment were even perfectly safe, the Government and the Parliament will probably think much consideration due to the feelings, or, if you will, the prejudices, of the Irish Protestants; and I even think, that if the tranquillity and prosperity of your country be preferable, in your mind, to the aggrandizement of your religion, you would yourself deprecate the urging of claims, which, I fear, would inevitably produce evils at this moment of the most serious consequence. The residence of men of property on their estates, their authority in enforcing the laws, their example, encouragement and protection, are surely among
the

the most efficacious means of producing and preserving public tranquillity. Sir, I leave it to yourself to judge if the bulk of the Protestant gentry believe (however erroneously) that the throwing open the Parliament, the Bench, the Corporations, and the Magistracy, to Catholics, would at length subvert the Protestant Church in Ireland; I ask you seriously, do you think that a single Protestant gentleman, who held that opinion, would continue to reside amongst us? I have myself little doubt, that in a very few years their estates would be altogether deserted, and either fall to Catholic purchasers, or be left to the management of hired agents.

These, I doubt not, are weighty considerations with government, and I trust, that in order to gratify the ambition (Sir, I blame not the ambition) of your aristocracy, comparatively insignificant in numbers and fortune, they will not banish from their estates that great body of Protestant gentry, who, I must

G

say,

say, have been the great prop and stay of Irish loyalty and British connection.

These are claims which have, in my opinion, but little to do with the tranquillity of Ireland; they affect in no degree the interests of the lower classes; and in my conscience I believe, they never enter their thoughts, except when unwisely or wickedly suggested to them by interested or factious men.

But the real means of ensuring and promoting public peace, of calming and civilizing a turbulent people, of rendering Ireland what, alas, it has never yet been! the abode of industry, content and security, appear to me to consist in a firm execution of the laws, a strong, energetic, and ever-watchful government, not easily lulled into security by hollow professions of attachment, a due encouragement to, and confidence in, that loyalty which never yet has deceived, an attention to the real wants of an ignorant peasantry, whose miserable depravity
arises

arises chiefly from the neglect of education, that has ever made them the ready instruments of rebellion; and above all, such protection and support to the gentry of Ireland, as shall render their abode on their estates at first secure, and I hope, at length delightful. They are the great links of connection between prince and people. In vain shall we have laws, if we have no magistrates to enforce their execution. In vain shall we look for a magistrate, if, while his property and life are at the daily hazard of destruction, his feelings are to be outraged, his necessary struggles in his own defence to be branded and stigmatized, and excesses, "*into which he is goaded,*" to be the subject of the loudest accusation, undeserving of excuse or palliation.

I am happy to observe symptoms of attention to these paramount objects; the loyal Yeomanry of Ireland, the armed property of the country, are strengthened and multiplied, honoured, cherished and encouraged, by the wis-

dom of our present Government. Traitors and rebels are diligently sought for, and their crimes strictly, though calmly, investigated and punished. These laudable efforts I trust will not be relaxed. The strong, but merciful arm of power, I trust, will be exerted, till, in the remotest corner of the land, the most loyal subject can repose in perfect security; till the empire of the laws, (pardon the French expression) shall be universally triumphant. Had this steady course of vigilant, energetic, and impartial government been persevered in, we should not now have to ask, after the lapse of two centuries, the question repeated by Sir John Davis from Edmund Spencer, "Why this kingdom, whereof our kings of England have borne the title of Sovereign Lords for four hundred (now six hundred) and odd years, (a period of time wherein great monarchies have risen from barbarism to civility, and fallen again to ruin) was not in all that space of time thoroughly subdued and reduced to obedience to the Crown of England? and why the manners
of

of the mere Irish are so little altered since the days of King Henry the Second?"

The means of producing that perfect subjection, and that salutary alteration of manners, have been ably pointed out by those two eminent men, but have never yet been steadily pursued for a sufficient length of time, fully to accomplish the end. It must, however, be admitted, that much was done by Elizabeth, by James the First, and in the course of the late century, by that *Club Parliament*, of which you seem to cherish so ungrateful a remembrance. That parliament tried almost to its fullest extent the effects of your conciliatory system, by repealing every statute (in my opinion most wisely) that bore with real hardships on your religion. It happens, however, unfortunately for the experiment, that the island has been a scene of savage anarchy and bloodshed almost ever since. I believe we had better resort to the maxims of our cautious forefathers, than to the specious sophistry of modern

modern

modern philanthropists; I believe the wholesome regimen of Elizabeth, improved as it has been by the liberal experience of home-bred physicians in the course of two centuries, is better adapted to our "hectic and diseased state," than the vaunted nostrums of modern empirics. And I think that a steady inflexible support of our established constitution in church and state, will be the surest means of extending over, and perpetuating in this island, the blessings of undisturbed tranquillity, of civil liberty, and of all their invaluable attendants—wealth, industry, and moral and religious virtue.

AN IRISH LOYALIST.

FINIS.