

AN
ADDRESS
TO THE
PROTESTANTS
OF
GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND
ON THE SUBJECT OF
Catholic Emancipation,
PRESENTING
FACTS AND DOCUMENTS
ILLUSTRATIVE OF THE REAL OBJECT
OF THE
IRISH ROMAN CATHOLIC LEADERS.

BY THE
REV. WILLIAM THORPE, A. B.
ONE OF THE CHAPLAINS OF BETHESDA, AND OF THE LOCK PENITENTIARY,
DUBLIN.

THE SECOND EDITION.

Dublin:

PRINTED BY GRAISBERRY AND CAMPBELL, 10, *Back-Lane*;
And sold by Keene, Archer, Milliken, Le Grange, Dugdale,
Jones, Johnston, and Parry; and in London, by
Seely, Fleet-st. and Hatchard, Piccadilly.

1814.

ADDRESS

TO THE

PROTESTANTS

OF LIVERPOOL
IN GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

ON THE SUBJECT OF

CONNECTIONS

FACTS AND DOCTRINES

ILLUSTRATIVE OF THE REAL OBJECT

ENGLISH ROMAN CATHOLIC LEADERS.

BY THE

REV. WILLIAM THOMAS, A.B.

OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, AND OF THE LIVERPOOL

DUBLIN.

THE SECOND EDITION.

DUBLIN:

PRINTED BY GARRIBY AND CAMPBELL, 10, FISH-STREET, LONDON.
AND SOLD BY GEORGE ALLEN, 15, GREGG STREET, DUBLIN.
LONG, LONDON AND LIVERPOOL; and by all the principal booksellers in the Kingdom.

TO
THE RIGHT HONOURABLE
THE EARL OF LIVERPOOL,

&c. &c. &c.

This Address,

ON A TOPIC INTERESTING TO EVERY
SUBJECT OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE,

BUT ESPECIALLY TO ONE IN THE HIGH OFFICIAL STATION
OCCUPIED BY HIS LORDSHIP,

IS RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED,

BY

HIS LORDSHIP'S

FAITHFUL HUMBLE SERVANT,

THE AUTHOR.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE
THE EARL OF LIVERPOOL
ON A TOPIC INTERESTING TO EVERY
COURT OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE
BUT ESPECIALLY TO ONE IN THE HIGH OFFICIAL STATION
OCCUPIED BY HIS LORDSHIP
IS RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED
BY
HIS LORDSHIP'S
FATHER'S HUMBLE SERVANT,
THE ADJUTOR.

PREFACE

THE following Address, drawn up amidst numerous avocations and frequent interruptions, has little or no claim to public attention, except what it derives from the importance of its subject, and the truth and accuracy of its statements.

From the numerous discussions which the question of Catholic Emancipation has undergone, it may, by some, be considered as exhausted. The Author presumes to hope that the following pages will prove this opinion to be unfounded. While the subject has been viewed through a great variety of mediums, the lights furnished by the Roman Catholics themselves, have been almost entirely disregarded. Of these the Author has endeavoured to avail himself, and thus to present such a view of this important question as the Roman Catholics must acknowledge to be faithful and just, and as will enable the country at large to form their judgment satisfactorily and correctly.

It may, probably, be objected against the Author, that a discussion of this kind is unsuitable to his character and pursuits as a clergyman. After mature consideration, he is, in his judgment and conscience, convinced that this opinion is unfounded: and such is the only answer he is disposed to give to the greater part of those who are most likely to urge this objection. But as it is not impossible that the same idea may arise in the mind of some, for whose judgment he has a respect, he would beg to submit to them the following considerations. A clergyman, it would seem, has at least as great an interest in all questions affecting the laws and constitution of the country, as any other member of the community. Besides this, the subject of Catholic Emancipation is intimately connected with the welfare of the Established Church, over which it is the duty of the clergyman to keep watch. In the discussion of the Catholic Question, the Established Church has been assailed with the utmost violence; a circumstance which calls loudly on its friends to stand forth in its defence. Further, the Author, from his peculiar situation, has had opportunities of ascertaining the views and designs of persons in this country, with respect to Emancipation, which but few possess. This is a fact well known in Ireland, and not unknown in England and Scotland. These

reasons, he trusts, will be sufficient for his justification with those for whose favourable opinion he is anxious.

As for the party whose conduct and designs are exposed in the following pages, the Author expects their hostility, and is prepared to meet it with perfect indifference. He has studiously avoided every thing personally disrespectful to them: but he has done so, not from any apprehension of the effects of their resentment, but from regard to propriety, and to what he owed to his own character.

The Author has only to add, that, in the following Address, no distinct or decided opinion is given on the question of Catholic Emancipation. He has presented facts and documents, by which others shall be enabled to form a judgment, without expressing any of his own. He considered that his opinion on the subject was of little or no consequence. Though he is still of the same mind, and feels, moreover, that it is with great diffidence he should express any judgment on a subject, concerning which the wisest and best of men have differed; yet, to obviate prejudice on either side, and because the present seems to be no time for reserve or concealment, he would beg to say, that it was formerly his opinion, that, with certain limitations and

suitable securities, the Emancipation of the Roman Catholics would be a salutary measure ; but that events have so far changed his mind, that he should consider any concession to that body, at present, as a serious misfortune to the empire.

Let the Roman Catholics of Ireland disown the men who assume to be their leaders, and disavow the principles and measures by which their cause has been disgraced. Till then they can expect nothing but alarm and opposition on the part of the Protestants of the empire, as often as their claims shall be discussed.

ADVERTISEMENT

TO THE

SECOND EDITION.

THE manner in which the public, both in England and Ireland, have received the following address, and the rapid sale it has had, several hundred copies having been sold in little more than a week, together with an encreasing demand for it, have induced the author to suffer a second edition of it to be published.

With this edition he has given an Appendix, which, although it does not present any new view of the subject, is still very important, as affording additional and recent facts which abundantly confirm his previous statements and reasonings.

The author derives peculiar pleasure from the reflection, that he has, in some degree, succeeded in the object which he had in view in this publication. It was his design to bring under the observation of the public, especially in Great Britain, the language and conduct of certain characters in this country: and at the same time to avoid every thing, which might be unnecessarily irritating,

or could justly be regarded as insulting, to the persons whose names and proceedings were to be exposed. Were it permitted him to enter into particulars, he could adduce very satisfactory evidence to prove that, in this attempt, he has not been entirely unsuccessful.

Dublin, 30th, June, 1814.

AN
ADDRESS,
&c.

FOR several years the public mind in Ireland has been agitated by the claims of its Roman Catholic inhabitants, for a full participation in the privileges of the constitution. Year after year petitions to this effect have been presented to the Legislature; and various other measures have been taken to advance the cause of what has been styled Catholic Emancipation. Every artifice has been employed to gain over the Protestants of the empire to an approbation of this measure, or at least to acquiesce in its adoption. In Ireland especially, all the means of influence which human ingenuity could devise have been resorted to for this purpose. Considering the number and activity of the agents employed, and the various principles and motives brought into action, we cannot be surprised at the success which has attended these attempts. Importuned by friends, attracted by the character of liberal, given to the advocates of Emancipation, and apprehensive of the charge of bigotry, fastened on its opposers, assailed both in public and private, might it not be expected that many of the Protestants would be induced to acquiesce in a measure, resistance to which they well knew would expose them to many inconveniences and dangers, and the adoption of which, they were told, would give peace to their country? How could the Protestant resist? On the one

hand, he saw his Roman Catholic countrymen, with whom it was his interest and desire to live in harmony, in the humble posture of suppliants; asking, not for superiority, not even for equality, but for admission to civil privileges alone; professing, at the same time, the most loyal attachment to the King and Constitution; and lavish of promises to support, with life and property, the present order of things in church and state. On the other hand, he saw some of the most distinguished characters in the Senate urging the Catholic claims, on the ground of expediency, policy, and right. Under these circumstances, what has actually occurred might have been anticipated. Petitions from Protestants, in favour of Roman Catholic emancipation, flowed from all this as a natural consequence.

The charge of weakness and credulity has been brought against the Protestants who signed or encouraged such petitions. Was it not weakness, it has been asked, to confide implicitly in the wisdom and integrity of senators, after so many examples of their being swayed by the desire of popularity, by the spirit of party, and by motives of interest, rather than by the dictates of a sound judgment and the pure love of their country? And it was childish credulity, it has been asserted, to believe the professions of the Roman Catholics, after the fatal evidence which the history, even of Ireland, furnishes of their duplicity. Be it so. But if it must be admitted that the Protestants were wrong, their fault, it must also be admitted, was one on virtue's side. It is a proof of their own candour and liberality, that they were slow to suspect others of concealment and bigotry: it was because their own intentions were pure, that they distrusted not the motives of those who so strongly urged their claim to patriotism. And, in addition to this, it cannot be denied that this good effect is likely to result from such petitions; if the Legislature shall ultimately decide against the Catholic claims, it will be impossible, with any shadow of truth or candour, to lay such decision at the door of the Protestants: the Roman Catholics shall be obliged to seek the causes of it elsewhere.

That the Roman Catholics themselves have furnished sufficient ground for the rejection of their claims; and not only so, but that they have latterly, in the persons of their accredited agents, avowed principles, and adopted a line of conduct, which render it imperative on the Protestants to give these claims the most strenuous resistance; it is the object of the present Address to the Protestants of the Empire to prove.

The Roman Catholics of the present day have assumed a new attitude, a loftier tone, and a language unknown to their predecessors. Is this denied? Let us compare the present with the past. Formerly they appeared in the posture of supplicants, thankfully acknowledging past favours, and humbly soliciting new ones. Is this their attitude at present? No; They have approached the Legislature with a menacing aspect; and, pointing to their numbers and their physical force, proclaim their past wrongs, and demand redress. Formerly they were grateful to their parliamentary friends, and respectful towards their opponents. Is it so now? No. Their advocates they repay with obloquy and contempt, and loudly proclaim their hatred of their opponents. Formerly the language of their Petition was clear and distinct, and the object of it defined and easily understood. Is this the case at present? No. In language poetical and mysterious, lofty and alarming, they make demands, the nature and extent of which it would be impossible to comprehend, were it not for the explanation afforded by the general tenour of their speeches and conduct. From these it has become apparent that their object is something beyond emancipation. Let us attend to their Petition.

PETITION OF THE ROMAN CATHOLICS OF IRELAND.

“ To the Honourable the House of Commons, in Parliament assembled.

“ We, the Roman Catholic people of Ireland, again approach the Legislature with a statement of the grievances

under which we labour, and of which we most respectfully, but, at the same time, most firmly, solicit the effectual redress. Our wrongs are so notorious and so numerous, that their minute detail is quite unnecessary, and would indeed be impossible were it deemed expedient. Ages of persecution on the one hand, and of patience on the other, sufficiently attest our sufferings and our submission. Privations have been answered only by Petition—indignities by remonstrance—injuries by forgiveness. It has been a misfortune to have suffered for the sake of our religion, but it has also been a pride to have borne the best testimony to the purity of our doctrine, by the meekness of our endurance.—Like the great Type of our adoration, we have not merely been the passive victims of unjust infliction, but we have even endeavoured to expiate the cruelty of our oppressors. We have sustained the power which spurned us—we have nerved the arm that smote us—with a gratitude always superior to our privileges, we have lavished our strength, our talent, and our treasures, and buoyed upon the prodigal effusion of our young blood, the triumphant ark of British liberty.

“We approach, then, with confidence, an enlightened Legislature. In the name of Nature we ask our rights, as men—in the name of the constitution we ask our privileges, as subjects—in the name of God we ask the sacred charter of unpersecuted piety, as Christians.

“Are securities required of us?—We offer them—the best securities a throne can have—the affections of a people. We offer faith that was never violated—hearts that were never corrupted—valour that never crouched. Every hour of peril has proved our allegiance, and every field of Europe exhibits its example.

“We abjure all temporal authority, except that of our Sovereign—we acknowledge no civil tie, save that of our constitution—and for our lavish and voluntary expenditure, we only ask a reciprocity of benefits.

“Separating, as we do, our civil rights from our spiritual duties, we earnestly desire that they may not be

confounded. We 'render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's;' but we must also 'render unto God the things that are God's.'—Our Church could not descend to claim a state authority, nor do we ask for it a state aggrandizement; its hopes, its powers, and its pretensions are of another world; and when we raise our hands to the state, our prayer is not, that the fetters may be transferred to those hands which are raised for us to heaven. We would not erect a splendid shrine even to liberty on the ruins of the temple.

"In behalf then of five millions of a brave and insulted people, we call on the Legislature to annihilate the odious bondage which bows down the mental, physical, and moral energies of Ireland; and in the name of that Gospel which excludes all distinctions, we ask freedom of conscience for the whole Christian world."

Whether the Legislature shall consider it consistent with their dignity to suffer this poetical prose, this petition on stilts, to lie on their table, time will tell. Its language should not, however, pass unnoticed. They style themselves "The Roman Catholic PEOPLE of Ireland." To this and similar modes of expression (such as, "Catholic Ireland," "The Church of Ireland," when speaking of their own church, and "The Irish people," meaning themselves), their leaders have latterly become partial. The tendency and design of such language are obvious. It sinks the Protestants into insignificance. It implies that they are so contemptible, in point of number, that the existence of such people in the country is a circumstance which may be overlooked. With the same view they swell their own numbers so enormously, as to leave scarcely any room in the country for those of another denomination. A very few years ago, they amounted, as they informed us, to three millions. Shortly after, however, they found it convenient to add a million to that number. But now they have marshalled, in the front of Parliament, no less than five millions of a BRAVE and INSULTED people. Their Petition goes

on to speak of "wrongs numerous and notorious;" of "ages of persecution;" of "privations, indignities, and injuries;" and winds up this part of the subject with the following marvellous paragraph: "Like the great Type of our adoration, we have not merely been the passive victims of unjust infliction, but we have endeavoured to expiate the cruelty of our oppressors. We have sustained the power which spurned us. We have nerved the arm which smote us. With a gratitude always superior to our privileges, we have lavished our strength, our talent, and our treasures, and buoyed upon the prodigal effusion of our young blood, the triumphant ark of British liberty." In the name of common sense, what is the meaning of all this? Is it to be considered as mere poetical ornament and redundancy; or have all these high-sounding and *stimulating* expressions been used merely to describe the grievance of some half dozen peers and commoners being excluded from the Legislature, and of the ineligibility of Roman Catholics to the higher offices of the army, navy, and law? Or is there more in this than meets the ear? Let those who understand it decide. But undoubtedly a commentary on this part of the Petition would be useful, to explain, among other things, what the ingenious author of it means by "the great Type of our adoration." The next paragraph is rather more explicit. They ask "their rights as men, their privileges as subjects, and the sacred charter of unpersecuted piety as Christians." This is abundantly comprehensive. It conveys the idea that they are the most degraded, persecuted, and miserable people on the globe: that they are absolute paupers as to every thing connected with the natural, civil, and religious privileges of man: in a word, that they have nothing, and that they seek for every thing. On reading this, we might, not unreasonably, suppose that we were at length in possession of the full extent of their grievances and of their demands. But it is no such thing. There is that to come, to which all that has gone before is nothing. "The mental, physical, and moral energies of Ireland are bowed down," it seems,

“by an odious bondage which must be annihilated.” Nay more, “The whole Christian world must have freedom of conscience:” and the Legislature is to do all this; and, let the Legislature mark it well, they are called on to do this by FIVE MILLIONS OF A BRAVE AND INSULTED PEOPLE. Why the Legislature is told, in the same breath, of the insults, numbers, and bravery of these people; what effect is looked for from such a Petition as this, whether an effect on the Legislature favourable to Emancipation, or, on the Roman Catholic part of the community, unfavourable to loyalty and subordination; what, on the very face of the Petition, appears to be the design of the Catholic Board, who have procured and adopted it; are inquiries of weighty importance, submitted to the serious consideration of the Protestants of the empire.*

From this extraordinary document let us pass to an examination of the conduct and language of the Catholic leaders. It is of the utmost consequence that full information, on this subject, should be given to the public: and yet, as it

* Such was the Petition, as adopted by the Board, and submitted by them to an aggregate meeting of the Roman Catholics, held in Dublin, on the 29th of June 1813; by which meeting the Petition, in this form, was received with unbounded applause. It has since, however, undergone some alterations. “The great Type of our adoration,” and the entire sentence of which it forms a part, have been struck out, by order of the Roman Catholic bishops, on account, as they said, of its being Deistical. They might have added, “and nonsensical.” It has also been deemed more prudent not to attempt to overawe the Legislature, by a statement, in the same paragraph, of their numbers, bravery, and insults; and, therefore, instead of five millions of a brave and *insulted* people, they introduce themselves as five millions of a brave and *loyal* people. And, in the concluding paragraph, instead of asking freedom of conscience for the whole Christian world, recollecting, perhaps, that the authority of the Legislature might not extend quite so far, they have contented themselves with asking the same favour for all the inhabitants of the British empire.

is only in those newspapers which are usually the vehicles of sedition that the acts and speeches of the Catholic Board are minutely detailed, a very large proportion of the Protestants, especially of Great Britain, remain ignorant of them. To fix the public attention upon them is a paramount duty. They disclose the views and ultimate objects of the party. If the language of their Petition be equivocal, if it furnish ground only for suspicion, we have here what must convert that suspicion into certainty; we have here facts and documents which furnish the most unequivocal and alarming proof that their views are not bounded by the narrow limits of Emancipation, but that they aim at something beyond it.

As evidence of this we shall adduce, in the first place, their endeavours to excite the popular hatred and indignation against the most distinguished characters in the state. If they have really attempted this, no thinking man can be at a loss for their motives. Such attempts were not necessary for their Emancipation, nor likely to promote it. If, therefore, they have been made, what other conclusion can be drawn but this, that the real object in view is something which the party dare not avow? Whether such attempts have been made or not, let a judgment be formed from the following documents.

The first is an extract from a speech said to have been delivered by Mr. O'Connell,* at a meeting of the Roman Catholics of Limerick.

* Mr. O'Connell is a Roman Catholic barrister, and a leading member of the Catholic Board. The speech, from which this and some of the following extracts have been taken, was published in Dublin, along with one said to have been spoken by Mr. Finlay, at an aggregate meeting of the Roman Catholics, held in Dublin. Mr. Finlay is also a barrister. It is reported he is a Protestant. His friends in the Catholic Board call him, sometimes, "the liberal Protestant;" but more frequently "the Agitator." The latter name is, of course, given to him in jest. The motto of the pamphlet which contains these speeches, is remarkable. It is, *Magnus uterque timor latronibus.*—Hor. 1 Lib. 4 Sat.

“ In the latter periods of the present reign, every administration has had a distinct principle, upon which it was formed, and which serves the historian to explain all its movements. Thus, the principle of the *Pitt* administration was to deprive the people of all share in the government, and to vest all power and authority in the Crown. In short, Pitt’s views amounted to unqualified despotism. This great object he steadily pursued through his ill-starred career. It is true, he encouraged commerce; but it was for the purpose of taxation; and he used taxation for the purposes of corruption. He assisted the merchants, as long as he could, to grow rich, and they lauded him; he bought the people with their own money, and they praised him. Each succeeding day produced some new inroad on the constitution; and the alarm which he excited, by reason of the bloody workings of the French revolution, enabled him to rule the land with uncontrolled sway. He has bequeathed to his successors the accumulated power of the Crown; a power which is so great, as to sustain the nonentities of the present Administration. The principle of Pitt’s administration was despotism: the principle of *PERCEVAL*’s administration was *peculating bigotry—bigoted speculation!* In the name of the Lord, he plundered the people. Pious and enlightened statesman! he would take their money only for the good of their souls! The principle of the present administration is still more obvious. It has unequivocally disclosed itself in all their movements. It is simple and single—it consists in *falsehood!* *Falsehood* is the bond and link which connects this Ministry in office. Some of them pretend to be our friends: *you know it is not true.* They are only our worse enemies for the hypocrisy.”

Here is a foul attack not only on the living but on the dead. To offer any vindication of the illustrious dead would be an insult on their memory. Too deeply engraven on the hearts of a grateful country are the services of these lamented statesmen, to be affected by the malignant aspersions of calumny and faction. Long as the British constitution shall be dear to Britons, long as they shall know how to appreciate splendid

talents and inflexible integrity displayed in its support, so long shall the names of PITT and PERCEVAL be loved and honoured. But there is here not only vile calumny, but such malignant and deliberate cruelty, as we might suppose human nature incapable of, but for this disgraceful proof to the contrary. This calumny was uttered almost before Mr. Perceval was cold in his grave. While his bloody corse was yet, almost before the eyes of his wretched widow, while her heart was torn with anguish, while the tears of his orphan children yet bedewed his grave, while every feeling heart beat responsive to the widow's and orphans' groan; such was the time chosen by this cold-hearted and cruel (what shall I call him? I leave it to others to give him his appropriate appellation)—such was the time he chose to assassinate the reputation, all that remained, of one, whom a murderous hand and a bloody deed had consigned to an untimely grave. The indignant reader is perhaps ready to exclaim, “Surely this cruel outrage has no parallel!” The reader is mistaken. The pamphlet before us furnishes a parallel, in the speech attributed to Mr. Finlay. He is described as having expressed himself as follows, in an aggregate meeting of the Roman Catholics, held in Dublin, within a month after Mr. Perceval's funeral.

“But two obstacles impeded its advancement (i. e. Catholic Emancipation,) which neither moral nor political causes could remove—the principles of a Minister, and the conscience of a King. The Minister said it was resisted by his reason—the King declared it was resisted by his morality. The King was religious—the bigots were obstinate. Bigotry, in this case, as in all cases, adopted the pretences of religion to counteract the purposes of religion. The bigots of the day beset the Monarch—they said to themselves, in the language of the great poet,

—The oath, the oath's the thing
In which we'll catch the conscience of the King.

In this way they succeeded in convincing the sovereign, that concession to you must be perjury to him. Thus the sem-

blance of religion, and the substance of bigotry, united to oppose the free worship of God. Against these two uncommon obstacles, moral and political causes worked in vain—in vain would reason expostulate with bigotry; in vain would it argue with religious conscientiousness. Reason could do nothing with the one or the other—secondary causes must fail to remove such obstacles—*human* causes could not remove them—*man* could not remove them—none but God could remove them. God has removed them. By the two severest visitations with which man can be afflicted, by the loss of reason and by the loss of life, these two impediments to your emancipation have been dislodged—your King no longer ranks with the rational, and the Minister of that King is now numbered with the dead. As a subject and a man, I must, in common with you all, sincerely deplore this twofold affliction; but as a moralist and a Christian, it may be permitted to infer, that these awful signs of the times may appear to the eye of the unborn historian, but as the distinct evidence of a controlling Providence; that, for the future, man's free worship of his Creator is, as it were, written by the finger of God; and that it now stands a record in heaven, that the time is past, and never can return, when any man, or any set of men, can presume to rebuke, by any system of social or civil vilification, that great majority of the Christian church which bend the knee at the name of Jesus."

Here is a *moralist* and a *Christian* for you! In the assassination of Mr. Perceval, and in the affliction of our venerable Monarch, he sees what will appear to the future historian as "the finger of God;" "distinct evidence of a controlling Providence," removing the impediments to Catholic Emancipation! It is impossible to read such language, without feeling at once astonishment and indignation at the unblushing assurance and daring impiety which dictated it. With great propriety has this speech been published in the same pamphlet with that attributed to Mr. O'Connell. Their authors, *par nobile fratrum*, should never be separated.

We have not yet done with this speech of Mr. O'Connell. It is rich in invective. He deals his blows about him at a furious rate, as the following specimens will show:

"There remains," he says, "another delusion: it is the darling deception of the Ministry—that which has reconciled the toleration of Lord Castlereagh with the intolerance of Lord Liverpool: it is that which has sanctified the connexion between both and the place-procuring, pray-mumbling Wilberforce: it consists in *sanctions* and *securities*. The Catholics may be emancipated, say the Ministers in public, but they must give *securities*. By securities, say the same Ministers, in private, to their supporting bigots, we mean nothing definite; but something that shall certainly be inconsistent with the POPISH religion. Nothing shall be a security which they can possibly concede; and we shall deceive them, and secure you, whilst we carry the air of liberality and toleration."

And again, speaking of Lord Wellesley's motion on the Catholic question, in the house of Peers, he says, "It was lost by the petty majority of *one*. It was lost by a majority not of those who listened to the absurd prosings of Lord Eldon, to the turbid and bigoted declamation of that English Chief Justice, whose sentiments so forcibly recall the memory of the Star Chamber; nor of those who were able to compare the vapid or violent folly of the one party, with the statesman-like sentiments, the profound arguments, the splendid eloquence of the Marquis Wellesley; not of those who heard the reasonings of our other illustrious advocates; but by a majority of men who acted upon preconceived opinions; or from a distance, carried into effect their bigotry, or perhaps worse propensities; who availed themselves of that absurd privilege of the peerage, which enables them to decide who have not heard, which permits to pronounce upon subjects they have not discussed, and allows a final determination to precede argument."

Were it not that calumny is no less blind and indiscriminating than cruel, holding sacred neither private worth nor

public virtue, Mr. Wilberforce would have been spared. That amiable friend of the human race, in every clime and of every complexion, that intrepid advocate of the rights of man, that patriot supporter, at once of the prerogative of the Crown and of the liberty of the people, distinguished alike for his talents, and for the mild and unassuming exercise of them—in vain shall even malignity itself seek, in his character or conduct, for the grounds of accusation. As for the imputation thrown out against him, the disreputable part of it is as notoriously false as the other part is notoriously true. Yes. It is conceded on his behalf, that he reverences religion, and practises its duties. Would to heaven that all Great Britain's legislators were such! she might then despise the threats of her foreign enemies, and, with the magnanimity which she loves to exercise, pity and forgive her factious sons.

Let us attend next to Mr. O'Gorman*. We shall find him not backward in the discharge of his duties as a member of the Catholic Board. In the Dublin Evening Post, of the 3d of July, 1813, he is described as having thus addressed an Aggregate Meeting of the Roman Catholics, held in Dublin two days before.

“ We have now for near nine years, since the enactment of that fatal measure of the Union, been petitioning what is called the Imperial Parliament for a redress of grievances. We did suppose that each succeeding discussion gained us strength, and we looked with well-founded hopes to ultimate success. That success, notwithstanding the present untoward appearance, I do not yet despair of; but have little hopes indeed of, as long as those countries are governed by so desperate, profligate, and unprincipled an Administration, as that which holds the reins of power at present.”

Here, in one sweeping clause of his speech, this gentleman (if we are to believe the Evening Post) has branded the persons to whom the Prince Regent has been pleased to

* Mr. O'Gorman is a Roman Catholic barrister, and a distinguished member of the Catholic Board.

intrust the government, as *desperate, profligate, and unprincipled*; and thus held them up, in their public character, to the scorn and detestation of the country. But this is not all. Attend to the object he had in view, in drawing this frightful picture of the Administration. It was, as he avows, to shew the people that they might despair of having their grievances redressed through the medium of such men, and that they must therefore apply elsewhere. And where are they to apply? To a foreign country and to a foreign legislature. Assuming the prerogative of the Crown, as they have since assumed that of the Parliament, the Catholic Board are to send an ambassador to the Spanish Cortes, on the subject of Catholic Emancipation. Thus, with a speech calculated to excite the popular hatred against the Government, he introduces a measure all-but treasonable. The gentleman is a lawyer, and therefore steers clear of the treason. The dignified ambassador from the Catholic Board is to demand, not foreign *aid*, but foreign *mediation*. The following is the resolution which Mr. O'Gorman proposed:

“That it be an instruction to the Catholic Board to consider of the constitutional fitness and propriety of sending an earnest and pressing memorial to the Spanish Cortes, stating to them the enslaved and depressed state of their fellow-Catholics in Ireland, with respect to their exclusion, on the score of their religion, from the benefits of the British constitution; and imploring their favourable intercession with their ally, our most gracious Sovereign.”

This proposal, which might well excite a smile, were it not for its wicked and mischievous tendency, was seconded by Mr. Bryan, and carried with “thunders of applause.” And so captivated by this proposal was Mr. Bryan (hoping, perhaps, that he might himself be appointed to the high office of Ambassador from the Board, and thus have an opportunity of exhibiting himself before the Spanish Cortes), that he posts down to Kilkenny, and, at an Aggregate

Meeting of the Roman Catholics of that county, puts from the chair the following resolution.

“That it is a wise and manly policy to proclaim our slavery to Europe, in the most distinct manner possible; and that, for this purpose, the measure of applying to the Spanish Cortes for its intercession with our Sovereign on our behalf, meet our most decided approbation. If we suffer, let England at least be put to shame.”

As we have introduced Mr. Bryan, we may take the opportunity of showing in what language he and his Aggregate Meeting at Kilkenny, have described the government of Ireland during the administration of the Duke of Richmond; a man who exercised such patience and forbearance towards the seditious malcontents among the Roman Catholics, as brought down on him the reprobation of those less moderate, and, as the event has proved, less wise than himself. They triumph in his departure from Ireland in the following resolution:

“Resolved, That we congratulate our fellow-countrymen of all ranks and classes, upon the approaching deliverance of Ireland from the tantalizing and intolerant administration of the Duke of Richmond. Ireland has never known so mischievous a system, and can never know a worse. May the merited odium which pursues him, warn his successors against trampling upon the sacred rights of petition, outraging the feelings of a good and gallant people, or ministering to the base arts of intrigue, intolerance, and injustice.”

As a full refutation of this foul slander, it need only be mentioned, that, in almost every city and county of Ireland, two or three Aggregate Meetings of the Roman Catholics have been held in each year, during the last three years of the Duke of Richmond's administration; and that, during the same period, the Catholic Committee or Board have met almost every week in the city of Dublin, for the sole purpose, as they assure us, of preparing their petitions to Parliament.

We have not yet done with Mr. Bryan. The law officers of the Crown, as was their bounden duty, prosecuted Mr. Magee, the proprietor of the Dublin Evening Post, for publishing in that paper, the libellous resolutions of the Kilkenny Aggregate Meeting. Mr. Bryan, whose signature, as chairman of the Meeting, appeared in the newspaper to these resolutions, was produced upon the trial by Magee's counsel; probably in the expectation, that listening to the dictates of honour and humanity, he would avow his own act, and thus step in between an unfortunate young man, already condemned to two years imprisonment, and to pay a fine of five hundred pounds for another libel, and any further punishment. But how foolish and presumptuous was it in Mr. Magee or his friends, to imagine that Mr. Bryan, the liberty of whose person is of such consequence to the country, could endanger that liberty on any account whatever! Did they forget of how much importance it is that Mr. Bryan should be at large, to second the motions of Mr. O'Connell, and Mr. O'Gorman, and Mr. Scully, and the other eloquent members of the Catholic Board; or, if necessary, to go on his embassy to the Spanish Cortes; or, in case of an emergency, to go as a delegate to the Prince Regent, with whom it is evident, from the freedom he has used with His Royal Highness's name, he must be on very familiar terms? Such an expectation was quite unreasonable. And therefore, when Mr. Bryan was asked by Magee's Counsel, if he had been present at the Kilkenny Meeting (as it was reasonable to conclude he had, from the resolutions bearing his signature), "Do you think (said Mr. Bryan) I am come here to criminate myself?" Mr. Bryan reasoned, no doubt, like a philosopher, from the general fitness of things. He considered that Mr. Magee had been fool enough to involve himself in the criminal act of the Kilkenny Meeting, and therefore it was only befitting that he should suffer the effects of his folly. As for humanity, how could Mr. Bryan show any towards Magee, after having expended so much on his enslaved and degraded Countrymen? and as for honour,

he proved the next day that he still possessed that; for he declared, *upon his honor*, in the Catholic Board, that he was not the *author* of the Kilkenny resolutions, but had only put them from the chair, and signed them as chairman.

Thus have we seen the Catholic leaders vilifying and abusing the great officers of the Crown, both past and present, and the leading members of the Administration, in both countries. The language in which they have described the Ministry, is calculated to impress on the public mind, that it is composed of persons destitute of common honesty; or, as Mr. O'Gorman has broadly asserted, that they are *desperate, profligate, and unprincipled*: and thus have they held up the King's government to the scorn and detestation of the people of Ireland. To palliate and excuse this conduct of the Catholic leaders, it may perhaps be urged, that they have been carried away by resentment on account of the opposition which the characters in question have given to their claims. This excuse would answer very well, had their attacks been confined to their opponents. But what will such an apology avail, if it can be proved that their abuse has been levelled equally against friends and foes? Let us examine how the matter stands.

Among the most zealous and distinguished advocates for their emancipation, we may reckon the Duke of Bedford, the Earl of Hardwicke, the Earl of Moira, the Earl of Donoughmore, and Mr. Grattan. Now let us attend to Mr. O'Connell's language concerning the Duke of Bedford and Lord Hardwicke. In his speech in the Court of King's Bench, in defence of the proprietor of the Dublin Evening Post, who had been indicted for a libel against the Duke of Richmond, he expressed himself thus:

“ You must all have seen, a short time since, an account of a public dinner in London, given by the persons styling themselves ‘Friends to Religious Liberty.’ At that dinner, at which two of the Royal Dukes were present, there were, I think, no less than four or five noblemen who had filled the office of Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. At this

dinner they were ardent in their professions of kindness towards the Catholics of Ireland, in their declarations of the obvious policy and justice of conciliation and concession, and they bore ample testimony to our sufferings and to our merits. But I appeal from their present declarations, to their past conduct. They are now full of liberality and justice to us ; yet I speak only the truth of history when I say, that, during their government of this country, no practical benefits resulted from all this wisdom and kindness of sentiment. With the single exception of Lord Fitzwilliam, not one of them ever attempted to do any good to the Catholics or to Ireland. What did the Duke of Bedford do for us ? Just nothing. Some civility, indeed, in words ; some playing on public credulity ; but in act and deed, nothing. What did Lord Hardwicke do for us ? Oh ! nothing, or rather less than nothing. His administration here, was in that respect a kind of negative quality ; it was cold, harsh, and forbidding to the Catholics."

With still less ceremony has Lord Moira been treated by Mr. O'Gorman. In an Aggregate Meeting of the Roman Catholics, held in Dublin in June 1812, at which the Earl of Fingal presided, Mr. O'Gorman (as the Freeman's Journal reports) used the following expressions with respect to Lord Moira :

" There is an illustrious Irishman in whom a lamentable *recreancy* is observable. From him we eternally withdraw our confidence with bursting hearts."

What was the crime of the Noble Lord, by which he had forfeited the confidence, and burst the hearts, of the Roman Catholics ? It was this. He had shewed respect for the feelings, and guarded the honour, of his Prince.

Mr. Grattan has grown grey in the service of the Roman Catholics. During a long political life, the powers and resources of his great mind have been devoted to their cause. With all the privileges they have obtained, he is identified : he fought the battle, and his were, confessedly, the brightest honours of the triumph. With an ardour and eloquence which the approaches of old age have not been

able to extinguish, he is still their advocate. Their respect and gratitude are the only recompense they can offer. To these he is surely entitled. Has he obtained this recompense? Let a judgment be formed by the language of Mr. O'Connell and Mr. Scully in the Catholic Board, on the 26th of June, 1813. According to the report of the Freeman's Journal, Mr. O'Connell expressed himself thus:

“ At the time Mr. Grattan was communicating with the heads of different parties in England, and with English lawyers, upon the affairs of the Irish Catholics, he refused to have any communication with the Catholic Delegates in London; and at the very time he wrote to Mr. Charles Butler to prepare a Bill for emancipating the Irish Catholics, he declined consulting a single Irish Catholic advocate. Mr. Grattan shall never again, with my consent, present a Catholic petition.”

Mr Scully appeared to be of the same mind. He said, that “ Mr. Grattan's conduct to the Delegates in London, had given general dissatisfaction. He had latterly behaved to the Catholics with a superciliousness, which was not only excessively disagreeable to the feelings of Irishmen, but extremely prejudicial to the cause.” What was Mr. Grattan's crime? It was this. He refused to be dictated to by the Roman Catholic Delegates. He disdained the idea of being the bearer of their commands to the Imperial Parliament.

Lord Donoughmore, though not guilty of a greater crime than Mr. Grattan, has received more severe chastisement. Because he refused to surrender his judgment to the lawyers of the Catholic Board, or to be a party in their violent measures; because, with the spirit becoming his rank and character, he repelled the insult, which by their presumptuous attempt to dictate, they had offered to him, and to the Legislature, he was denounced at the Board as “ ungrateful for the notice and popularity to which he had been raised on the shoulders of the Catholic question,” and his conduct reprobated in terms of such low and vulgar

abuse, as, without the appearance of disrespect to the Noble Lord, it would be impossible to repeat.

From this indiscriminate abuse of friends and foes, from their holding up to public odium the most distinguished characters in the empire, of every party, is it not reasonable to conclude, that the real object of the Catholic leaders is something very different from what is usually called emancipation? Is it possible that men of common sense could hope, by such means, to effect this measure? The Bill for their emancipation must receive the sanction of the Legislature. In order to its enactment, it is of great consequence that the members of His Majesty's Government should, at least, acquiesce in the measure; and, what very rarely happens, that the Opposition, and the different parties in both houses of Parliament, should concur with the Administration. Now look at the procedure of the Catholic leaders. To conciliate the Government, they hold it up to public odium and reprobation—as unprincipled and profligate: and to render their professed friends in the Legislature hearty in their cause, they accuse them of the foulest hypocrisy, and brand them as unworthy of confidence. What are we to think of all this? Are the Roman Catholic leaders such idiots as to pursue a course obviously calculated to defeat their own object? No:—they are men of intelligence, of talents, of sound sense; who know how to regulate their conduct according to the object they have in view; who are well skilled in adapting the means to the proposed end. If this be so, and that it is will not be denied, at least by themselves, then we must necessarily conclude, notwithstanding their professions and assurances to the contrary, that emancipation is not what they aim at, but something else, which it may not be their pleasure or their convenience to avow.

Further evidence in confirmation of this is furnished by another part of their proceedings. They embrace every opportunity of representing the English people, the nation at large, as contemptible on account of their ignorance and folly, and as execrable on account of their wickedness. In

an Aggregate Meeting held in Dublin in June 1813, Mr. Scully, after ridiculing the idea, that the Irish people wanted education, proceeded to descant on the ignorance of the English, and asserted that two thirds of the labouring poor in England could neither read nor write. At the same meeting Mr. O'Connell gave the following description of the English nation:

“ Our enemies have long duped the people of England. Indeed that was not difficult. So *dishonest* and so *besotted* a people as the English never lived. Yes, they are *dishonest* and *besotted*.—As a nation I must say, and I can prove, that they are the most profligate, and quite lost in folly.—As to English *stupidity*, it is really become proverbial.—To descend from a nation to an individual, can any thing be more beastly stupid than the conduct of this Lord Kenyon, who is now organizing Orange Lodges? Why does not the animal see, that the principle of religious exclusion might have prevented him from being a Lord?—Such is the state of England—they are ready to sanction every crime, or to credit any delusion. We enrich the *bigots* of England, and we leave our manufacturers starving: in fact, the clothing districts of England are the most bigoted parts of it. The ‘No Popery’ cry commenced in the very centre of the cloth manufactory; it commenced at Pontefract, in Yorkshire. Are there not, perhaps, hundreds that have been clothed in the fabric of these dullest of all malignant bigots? Let us teach these drawlers and dotards, that they cannot insult us with impunity.”

This is only a specimen of the language used by these gentlemen, concerning England. “Besotted” and “profligate,” are their usual designations for the people of that country.

Is this the way to obtain the suffrages of the English in favour of emancipation? No: the obvious tendency of such language is, to excite in the people of both countries mutual dislike and animosity: to disgust and irritate the English on the one hand, and on the other hand to beget in the Irish a contempt and abhorrence of the English. Do

these gentlemen imagine, that a Bill for Catholic Emancipation can receive the sanction of the Imperial Parliament, in despite of the opposition of the English people! No: they must be well aware that if once the people of England shall be aroused to express a decided disapprobation of the measure, it must necessarily be rejected by the Legislature. And what so likely to create this hostile spirit in England, as calumny and insult? The Roman Catholic leaders are too well acquainted with human nature to be ignorant of this; and, therefore, from their language and conduct, it is but natural to conclude, that emancipation is not their object.

Further, there seems to be no connexion between Catholic Emancipation, and the mode of administering justice in Ireland. How the jurisprudence of the country can be affected, one way or the other, by the state of the Roman Catholics, it is very difficult to conjecture. The Judges, to be sure, are exclusively Protestant: but jurors are taken indiscriminately from Protestants and Roman Catholics. And yet we shall find the members of the Catholic Board using their best endeavours to convince the Catholics, that they do not, nor cannot, obtain justice; that the laws are partially and oppressively administered; that it is vain to expect integrity either in Judges or Jury; and as for mercy, that they are the only people in the country, against whom the sources of it are closed.

In the Aggregate Meeting already referred to, held in Dublin in June 1813, Mr. O'Connell, after descanting largely on this subject, proposed the following resolution, which was carried unanimously:

“That, in the event of the failure of their petition for Emancipation, the Board be directed to prepare a second petition to Parliament, calling the attention of the Legislature particularly to the state of the judicial system in Ireland, and to obtain for the Irish Catholics the benefit of that principle which gives to aliens a jury of one half foreigners.”

Soon after this, on Magee's trial for publishing in the Evening Post a libel on the Duke of Richmond, Mr. O'Connell, as Magee's counsel, addressed one of the most respectable Juries the city of Dublin could furnish, in such language as this, "Would to God I had to address another Jury; would to God I had judgment and reason to address, and that I could entertain no apprehension from passion and prejudice." Indecent as this language is, it falls very far short of the expressions which he actually used; but which, in his own printed report of his speech (for, as his friend Dr. Dromgole has assured the public, he is notoriously his own reporter), he deemed it prudent to suppress. He went so far as to address the Lord Chief Justice of the King's Bench, who presided at the trial, in language, for which a Judge, less mild and less forbearing, would have committed him to the custody of the Sheriff. But the Chief Justice did better. Feeling himself invulnerable in a character of, till then, unimpeached honour and integrity, he passed by the railing of faction with the contempt it deserved.

Mr. Finlay is the echo of Mr. O'Connell, and therefore we may expect something of the same kind from him. In his speech at the Catholic Board, on a motion for presenting Mr. O'Connell with a service of plate, value one thousand pounds (a measure resorted to by Mr. O'C.'s friends to console him under the chastisement he had received from the Attorney General, on Magee's trial), he expressed himself thus:

"As to the distribution of justice, I shall be very cautious in speaking out on that subject. It appears to give particular offence. I do not wish to lose my gown; but I hope I may say this much without losing it—that a considerable prejudice exists on the subject: this prejudice is very wide spread; I wish it were removed. I do not boast of a particular strength of mind, and therefore plead guilty to the infirmity of being occasionally affected by this prejudice myself."

False and malignant as the effusions of these gentlemen may appear, they are moderate, compared with what we find on this subject, in a work, entitled "A Statement of the Penal Laws which aggrieve the Catholics of Ireland, with a Commentary."

Although this publication is anonymous, the author of it is well known. He is too proud of his production to conceal his name, though he has taken special care to protect himself from the punishment to which its seditious pages would have exposed him. He has sheltered himself behind his printer, a poor wretched man of seventy years of age. It is notorious that this work was written by a Roman Catholic barrister, who is a member of the Board. Mr. SCULLY is a Roman Catholic Barrister, and a member of the Board. He, no doubt, can tell the author's name, since he declared publicly, in the Court of King's Bench, that he would produce him, provided the Attorney General would agree to certain conditions, which he proposed.

In speaking of the administration of justice in Ireland, the author of this publication asserts, that "the Judges are appointed, not in consequence of legal ability, but of known hostility to the Catholics." He says, "To pretend that a zealous anti-Catholic Administration has omitted to fill all, or the far greater part, of the judicial vacancies, upon their own peculiar principle of hostility against Catholics and friends of Catholics, would be to hazard an assertion truly improbable in every point of view."

Having thus laid down hostility to the Catholics as the principle on which appointments to judicial situations are made, he proceeds to show the power of injuring which such situations afford.

"An English Lord Chancellor" (of Ireland), he says, "may discover that a large portion of the landed property of Ireland now belongs to Catholics. He may further observe, that their tenures are mostly derivative interests, held by virtue of leases, or agreements for leases. He may

therefore, as a zealous guardian of the Church Establishment, very conscientiously assume it to be his duty, upon principles of public policy, to favour the Protestants and repress the Catholics; and accordingly to lean towards the landlords and against the tenants."

Again; in the case of the Judges of the King's Bench, he says, "If the Crown should think proper to institute criminal proceedings against Catholic individuals, for alleged misdemeanors, breach of the peace, public libel, seditious words or acts, high treason, &c.; if a Catholic should happen to be involved in a dispute with a corporation, or justice of the peace, &c. the Court of King's Bench becomes, in all these cases, the great tribunal of judgment, and exercises a summary jurisdiction. The Judges of the Court, therefore, when actuated by the virulent spirit of the anti-Catholic code, must become the instruments of grievous and heavy oppression; they may display the most flagrant partiality. That all these foul practices do exist, we *dare not affirm*; neither shall we adduce particular instances. The pomp and bearing of judicial office lend an outward show of purity; and, from ancient times, it has been permitted to every Judge, however weak or pliant, to shield his infirmities or his vices by the exterior of gravity and decorum."

Again; at the conclusion of this part of his subject, the author says, "We feel that we have underrated the real extent of Catholic complaint against the present principle of administering justice in Ireland. Instances are innumerable, and proofs conclusive, in support of a statement far more aggravated. Verdicts have been frequently procured, wholly contradictory to evidence; reprobated even by the sitting Judge, and not to be accounted for, otherwise than upon the marked principle of religious prejudice. Catholic prisoners are brought to trial upon charges affecting their lives; the evidence failing, the Crown lawyers abandon the prosecution as untenable; the Judge directs an acquittal; and yet the jury finds a verdict of Guilty. Again, Protes-

tant prisoners are prosecuted for gross outrages against the property and persons of Catholics; for robbery and murder. The evidence is clear and connected; the Judge charges unfavourably; and yet, to the amazement of unreflecting spectators, the Jury acquits instantly. In cases where the Protestant murderer or robber has been convicted, his *Protestantism* secures his pardon. All the local soi-disant loyalists fall to work: memorials and petitions are prepared and signed; vouchers of excellent character are easily procured; even Catholics *dare* not withhold their signatures, lest they should be stigmatized as sanguinary and merciless. Thus the testimony appears unanimous, and the Lord Lieutenant readily pardons, perhaps *promotes the convict*; who, in some instances, becomes thenceforth a cherished object of favour. On the other hand, when the prisoner is a Catholic, he is generally destitute of this powerful agency and interference. His witnesses, as may be expected, are usually persons of his own condition and family. It is true, they may swear positively to an effectual and legal defence, wholly uncontradicted; but not being Protestants (i. e. *respectable*, the epithet affectedly attached to every thing Protestant) they commonly fail to meet with credit. Should he be convicted, a thousand rumours are immediately circulated to the prejudice of his general character: he is proscribed as a dangerous man, a leader of a faction: no Grand Jury interposes in his behalf; and he suffers death, publicly protesting his innocence*, fortified

* It is an extraordinary circumstance, that a very large proportion of the convicts of the Roman Catholic persuasion, who are executed in Ireland, die protesting their innocence. No matter how notorious their character, for dishonesty and outrage, may have been: no matter how fully their guilt may have been proved on their trial: at the place of execution, they almost always protest their innocence, or refuse to say any thing with respect to the crime for which they have been condemned. In general they protest their innocence. The author of this Address to the Protestants of the Empire had frequent opportunities

by the testimony of his confessor's belief of his veracity, and exciting the sympathy and regrets of the people."

To illustrate and confirm this statement, the author annexes, in a note at the bottom of the page, the following tragical case: "At the summer assizes of Kilkenny, in 1810, one Barry was convicted of a capital offence, for which he was afterwards executed. This man's case was truly tragical. He was wholly innocent; was a respectable Catholic farmer, in the county of Waterford, in good circumstances. His innocence was clearly established, in the interval between his conviction and execution; yet he was hanged, publicly avowing his innocence!!! There were some shocking circumstances attending his case, which the Duke of Richmond's Administration may yet be invited to explain to Parliament."

This is a very shocking account. It is impossible to read it without feeling pity for the unfortunate sufferer, and indignation against the Government which neglected to interpose. If it be true, that Government is awfully responsible, and will find it no easy matter to give such an

of observing this, during an attendance of three years on the prisoners in Kilmainham goal, the prison of the county of Dublin. In very many instances, prisoners, who, after their trial and conviction, had confessed their guilt to him, having been subsequently visited by their priest, from that time forward changed their story; protested their innocence, and persisted to do so to their last moments. On expressing his surprise at this, to persons more conversant with such matters than himself, it was suggested to him, that there was reason to think, that, having received absolution from the priest, the wretched criminal was instructed to consider himself as innocent. Whatever may be the *cause*, the *effect* of such protestations is very injurious. The common people, who crowd in great numbers to every execution, go away with the impression that the unfortunate sufferer was innocent; and, of course, that the laws afford no security to the innocent. Where such an impression has been made, it will be no difficult matter to persuade the party that the existing Government is not worth supporting.

explanation of it as shall prove satisfactory to the country, or honourable to itself. But if it be false, what does he deserve, who has published it to the world as matter of fact? It is false from beginning to end, with the single exception of the circumstance that Barry was convicted and executed. The documents by which the falsehood of this statement has been established, were produced by the Attorney General, on the trial of Fitzpatrick, the printer of "The Statement of the Penal Laws." Barry, it appeared, had been twice tried for two different robberies; first at the assizes at Clonmel, before Baron George. From the Judge's notes of the trial it appeared, that he had fired a pistol at, and attempted to rob a gentleman, in the open day, in the county of Tipperary; that he had been taken on the spot, being in a struggle disarmed of his pistol; that he had been directly brought before a magistrate, and committed; and that the Jury by which he had been tried, had, from a merciful principle, found him guilty only on the transportable count of the indictment; but that as he had committed another robbery in the county of Kilkenny, he was ordered to that place for trial. He was next tried at Kilkenny, convicted of the second robbery, and hanged for it. But before his trial he had confessed his guilt to Mr. Elliot, the magistrate before whom he had been originally taken. As for his religion, it appeared it was unknown till the publication of "The Statement of the Penal Laws."

Thus it seems, the whole case turns out to be the very reverse of our author's statement. Instead of being a respectable farmer, and a murdered innocent, Barry was a robber by profession, twice tried, and twice convicted. Instead of protesting his innocence, he confessed his guilt; guilt which had been fully established upon two trials, before two Judges, and by the verdict of two Juries. How is it possible all this could be unknown to the author of "The Statement of the Penal Laws?" Facts proved on two trials, in two different counties, must be so notorious, that they could not have escaped him, had he made inquiry. Either

he made inquiry, or he did not. If he did not, then what are we to think of a work, in which, in consequence of the negligence and folly of the author, notorious falsehoods are circumstantially and gravely laid down as matters of fact? and if he did make inquiry, then it would seem he has intentionally and deliberately stated a falsehood, for the treasonable purpose of alienating the Roman Catholics from His Majesty's Government.

The design of the author in these extracts, which we have taken from "The Statement of the Penal Laws," is plain and obvious. It is this: to impress on the Roman Catholics of Ireland, that a formidable conspiracy exists against their property and lives; in which not only the Government and great law officers, but also the Protestant population of the country, are parties. The Government, he asserts, are actuated in the appointment of the Judges, by a principle of hostility against the Catholics. The Judges, under the influence of the same principle, act dishonestly and corruptly, he insinuates, in the discharge of their office. The Lord Chancellor, for instance, regardless of his character and honour, and of the sacred obligation of an oath, by which he is bound impartially to administer justice, makes his high office subservient to the oppression and robbery of the Roman Catholics. The Judges of the Court of King's Bench, actuated by the virulent spirit of the anti-Catholic code, are the instruments of grievous and heavy oppression, and display the most flagrant partiality. All this, it is true, is only *insinuated*: but as an apology for not directly *affirming* it, the author candidly assures us, his only reason is, that he *dare* not. He, however, shews less apprehension when he comes to speak of Juries. Unequivocally and boldly he accuses these of the double crime of perjury and murder. He asserts that it frequently happens, when Roman Catholic prisoners are brought to trial, on charges affecting their lives, that, although the evidence fail, and the Judge order an acquittal, and the prosecuting lawyers abandon the case as untenable, yet the

Jury bring in a verdict of Guilty, and thus perjure themselves and murder the prisoners.

Such are our author's statements. Are we not borne out in asserting, that his object was to excite insurrection and rebellion? The obvious tendency of such statements is to irritate the Roman Catholics to madness; to infuriate them not only against the Government, but also against their Protestant countrymen. Even though these statements were true, the man of humanity would be slow to make them; for his heart would sicken at the horrors of civil war. What a cruel incendiary, therefore, must he be who has published them, knowing them to be false!

This is the work which the Catholic leaders speak of with unbounded applause, and hold up to the public as containing a faithful statement of their grievances. By thus adopting it, do they not make themselves parties in the guilt of its author?

We should, however, be unwilling to believe, and very far from insinuating, that the Catholic leaders make common cause with the author of this work: and yet is it not an alarming circumstance, that the language of some of them savours too much of what we have had occasion to reprobate in him? In the Aggregate Meeting of the Roman Catholics, held in Dublin last June, Mr. O'Connell is described as having delivered himself as follows:

“Associations have been formed, plots have been laid, against you; and the very persons who were at the head of them, were paid by the Government. In the year before last, twelve thousand pounds was said to have been expended in discovering treasonable societies; and nine thousand pounds in the last year. I do not know how these monies have really been laid out. But I can easily state how they would have been expended to the satisfaction of your enemies in the Government. One single village, seduced to treason by the bribes of its agents, would have been accounted the most satisfactory proof of activity and allegiance. You have, therefore, certainly, my countrymen, the strongest reasons for dissatisfaction.”

Mr. Finlay addressed the same meeting thus :

“ Wives of the peasantry, guard your husbands. The sun has set ; get then to your houses. The curfew has tolled ; put out the light. The Norman is abroad ; to bed, to bed. Hush through every cottage in the land, lest it is the clashing of the sabre, and the clattering of the cavalry. The man of blood is abroad ; let not the infant murmur. Whisper to the child, that its murmurs may be as a goal to guide the ruffian against the life of her father.”

There is, undoubtedly, an extraordinary resemblance between this language and the extracts which we have adduced from “ The Statement of the Penal Laws.” And yet these gentlemen are loud in expressing their abhorrence of revolutionary principles. Well, be it so. We shall give them full credit for sincerity and good intentions. But is it not obvious to common sense, that if, instead of being loyal and peaceable, they had happened to be disaffected and turbulent, and desirous of inflaming the public mind, such language as we have quoted would be directly calculated to answer their purpose ?

These inflammatory speeches have not been made in vain. We see the effect of them in the violent resolutions of the different county meetings : we have already adverted to the resolutions of the Kilkenny Catholic meeting. Those of the other counties are of the same description, with this difference, that rather less prudence and caution than ordinary appear in the composition of the Kilkenny resolutions ; owing, perhaps, to the presence of Mr. Bryan, whose devotedness to the sacred cause prompts him, as we have seen, to sacrifice to it every consideration, and every person, except his own safety and himself. Such a pernicious effect have these speeches of the Catholic leaders produced on the public mind, that the Roman Catholics of the county of Derry, in their late Aggregate Meeting, declared, in one of their resolutions, “ That life and property have no security, and trial by jury operates as a curse.” It really is not surprising that these people should not only say, but believe this. It is so strongly urged on them, by those who have assumed the office of their leaders,

that they are slaves; their persecuted and miserable condition is portrayed to them in such lively colours; such pathetic complaints, mixed with indignant remonstrances, are so incessantly poured into their ears; and thus their imaginations and passions have been so wrought on, that, insensible to the comforts which surround them, and the prospect of opulence which their honest industry has opened up to them, they are sometimes almost ready to believe that their condition in the country is like that of captives in a dungeon, and that they are hung round with chains, the clanking of which may be heard at every step they take.

Another circumstance, from which it may reasonably be inferred that Emancipation is not the ultimate object of the Catholic leaders, is their being engaged at present in levying contributions on the country, and thus raising a large supply of money. It will be recollected, that a measure of this kind was formerly resorted to by the United Irishmen, and that, for two or three years before the breaking out of the rebellion in 1798, large sums were collected in all the disaffected counties of Ireland. This, however, was not at all surprising. The object was avowed, for which this fund was created. It was to purchase arms and ammunition, and to defray the expense of manufacturing pikes, and other implements necessary for the warfare in which the United Irishmen were about to engage. It was on this ground the money was demanded and given. But no arms or ammunition are to be provided now; no pikes to be prepared; there is now no warfare in prospect. The only struggle in which the Catholic leaders will engage, is a constitutional one; and petitions, they assure us, are the only weapons they know how to wield. Hence arises the difficulty. Where then is the occasion for a revenue? And what is to be done with the enormous sum which is to be raised on the country? A regular plan of finance has been laid down, and in all probability is acted on at this moment throughout Ireland.

The following is the plan of finance which Mr. O'Connell, as a member of the Committee of Accounts, has submitted to the Board.

PLAN SUGGESTED FOR PAROCHIAL SUBSCRIPTION.

“ To appoint a person in each parish, to make individual application to every householder.

“ This person shall take with him, to each village or farm, a list of the householders; and should apply to each of them, to know whether he was willing to contribute TEN-PENCE, or any higher sum, towards defraying the expenses of the CATHOLIC PETITIONS.

“ Each person paying, should be marked down as paid; and the sum inserted in the margin.

“ Each person refusing, should have the words, ‘ Refused to contribute ten-pence,’ added to his name.

“ And a second application should be made to those who refuse, ‘ with an intimation that the list would be read at the chapel on the ensuing Sunday.’

“ The list should be read at the chapel, as soon as it was ascertained that no more could be collected.

“ The more wealthy persons will, of course, contribute more than ten-pence; but no sum should be received from any person, save what he can afford to give with the most perfect convenience.”

The following Circular Letter to the Roman Catholic Clergy is to be appended to the copies of the plan.

“ Sir,

“ I am directed by the Committee of Accounts to send you the above plan, and to request your attention to it. It will not be easy to carry this plan into effect, without the countenance of the Catholic clergy. But it is presumed, from their constant attention to the interests of their countrymen, that they will give this plan the support of their advice. It is also expected that you should transmit

to the Board an account of the parishes of the county in which you reside, in which this plan shall be carried into effect.

“ You cannot do a greater service to the Catholic cause, than by exerting yourself on this occasion, as the funds of the Board are quite exhausted; and it will be impossible to transmit our petition to Parliament, unless subscriptions are collected.

“ The mode of carrying this plan into effect is, of course, left with you; but it is hoped, that you will not refuse to give your zealous and active assistance.

“ I have the honour to be,

“ Your very obedient humble servant,

“ DANIEL O'CONNELL.”

If this plan be carried into execution (and it can scarcely fail, as we shall see, when we examine the measures taken to enforce it), a very large sum of money must be raised. The Roman Catholics, in their petition to Parliament, describe themselves as constituting five millions of the population of Ireland. Now, allowing four persons to every house, the number of subscribing householders will amount to one million two hundred and fifty thousand. Many of these must be very wealthy; for we are told in “ The Statement of the Penal Laws,” that a large portion of the landed property is in their hands; and we are constantly assured, that the most opulent merchants and traders are of their communion. These wealthy persons will, of course, as they are called on, contribute largely. But taking the average contribution so low as two shillings and six-pence, it will be found, on calculating, that no less a sum than one hundred and fifty-six thousand two hundred and fifty pounds will be immediately raised—and raised in such a manner as that the same sum may be obtained annually.

Let us now examine the measures to be taken to render this financial system effectual. A particular application is to be made to each householder in every parish. Of course,

at the time of making the application, the necessity of contributing must be explained; and "the grievances and heavy oppressions" by which the Roman Catholics are afflicted, must be pointed out. The cottager will be told, that he and his children are slaves, and doomed to perpetual servitude and poverty; that a conspiracy, in which the government and his Protestant neighbours are parties, has been formed against him, on account of his religion; and that his little property may be seized, and his wife, and children, and himself, thrown on the world miserable outcasts, or even murdered, without the slightest provocation, or a moment's warning. Panic-struck and bewildered, he listens to this tale of horror. He cannot doubt its truth, for it comes authenticated by his priest, under whose sanction he is called on to contribute. His priest is his oracle, his demi-god; and he has been taught from his earliest youth, that it is a damning crime to doubt any thing his priest tells him: he therefore pays his money and prepares for war.

In case, however, any householder better informed or less credulous than others, having no apprehensions either for his property or life; and knowing, by long experience, that his Protestant landlord is his benefactor, and that his Protestant neighbours, instead of being enemies, are his friends,—should prove refractory, and reject at once the tale of horror and the proposal for a contribution;—ample provision is made in the system of finance for subduing his stubborn spirit, and for levying on him, in spite of his reluctance, the tax which the Catholic Board has imposed. The words, "Refused to contribute ten-pence," are to be added to his name; and a second application is to be made to him, "with an intimation, that the list will be read in the chapel on the ensuing Sunday." After such an intimation, from the fiery spirits to whom, in every part of the country, the execution of the system of finance will be intrusted, he dare no longer resist. He is well aware that the certain consequence would be, to have his house

fired over his head; and that he should run the risk of being flogged or carded, if not murdered. In one way or another, therefore, either voluntarily or by compulsion, every Roman Catholic householder in Ireland must pay his quota of the tax.

In whatever light this measure be regarded, it must excite equal astonishment and apprehension. It is, in the first place, a daring assumption of the prerogative of Parliament. The British Constitution happily provides, that our representatives in Parliament assembled, and they only, shall impose taxes on us. But here are a set of men, in defiance of the laws, arrogating this right to themselves. The Chancellor of their Exchequer opens his budget; proposes, as his ways and means, a tax on every householder; a law to this effect is enacted by the Board; the execution of it committed to proper officers, and prompt obedience to it required, under certain pains and penalties. Monstrous as is all this, it is not however the worst. The means by which this act of the Board is to be enforced, are such as to involve every Roman Catholic cottager in the vortex of politics; nay more, to sow in his bosom the seeds of hatred and revenge against his Protestant neighbours. In fact, by this measure, the Catholic Board put one hand into the pocket of the people, and with the other unsheath the sword of civil war. But to pass over all this: granting that the measure itself, and the means employed to effect it, are both unexceptionable, still the question recurs, how and for what is the immense revenue to be expended? They pretend that it is to be applied "to defray the expenses of the Catholic petitions." But as well might they tell us, that it is to defray the expense of rebuilding the city of Moscow. It is not more disproportioned to the one object than to the other. Parchment must be provided for the petitions, and a scrivener paid for engrossing them: but one hundred pounds would be more than enough to cover every expense of this kind. To what purposes then is the residue of a sum, amounting, on the most moderate calculation, to one hundred and

fifty-six thousand two hundred and fifty pounds, to be applied? No satisfactory answer is or can be given to this question: and from the want of such answer, it is reasonably inferred that the Catholic leaders have views beyond Emancipation.

We shall be fully confirmed in this opinion, if we examine more particularly a work already referred to, "The Statement of the Penal Laws." In that publication enough is developed, of the views of the Catholic leaders, to alarm every friend of the present order of things in Ireland. It is impossible to read it attentively without feeling the fullest conviction, that its author's design is to prepare the way for the overthrow of the Protestant Church Establishment, and to have Roman Catholics substituted for Protestants, in the various offices of trust and emolument in the state. In fact, all the grievances he complains of may be resolved into this great and comprehensive one, that Roman Catholics do not enjoy the situations at present occupied by Protestants. It is of much consequence, that this, which is the real object of "The Statement of the Penal Laws," should be well understood. This publication is not, as some have considered it, a mere statement or enumeration of the offices from which the Catholics are excluded by law, and to which they should be eligible. But it is in fact and reality a statement of the offices which, in the opinion of the author, should of right be filled exclusively by Catholics. This, to be sure, is not specifically stated, in so many words, in any part of the book; but it is obviously implied throughout the whole of it. The author, indeed, at the close of his publication, disavows any such design. But, besides that the circumstance of his deeming it necessary to make such a disavowal, betrays his consciousness that this interpretation might fairly be put on his work, it should also be remembered, that the scope and object of any publication is to be collected, not from the author's professions, but from the publication itself. To that we confidently appeal for the correctness of our interpretation.

The author commences with a pompous account of the numbers and consequence of the Roman Catholics. "In every point of view," he says, "they form a truly important subject of inquiry and reflection. In numbers, they have prodigiously increased, and they are continually increasing, beyond example in any other country. Already they compose the far greater part of the trading and manufacturing interests. The agricultural class, so powerful and influential throughout Ireland, the landholders, farmers, peasantry, are almost universally Catholics. They occupy the most VALUABLE POSITIONS, whether for commercial or for MILITARY purposes; the boldest coasts, most navigable rivers, and most TENABLE PASSES; the most fertile districts, the readiest supplies of forage, the readiest means of ATTACK AND DEFENCE: numerically, they constitute full FIVE SIXTH PARTS of the Irish population; and, compared with the members of the Established Church, they are at least TEN TO ONE; a proportion rapidly advancing of late years. The open country is in their almost exclusive occupation. The gross population of Ireland is moderately estimated at five millions of inhabitants. Of this number we may, without exaggeration, state the Catholics as amounting to four millions two hundred thousand. In fine, THE CATHOLICS ARE EMPHATICALLY THE PEOPLE OF IRELAND."

Again, speaking of the occupying tenants of the land, he asserts that they consist "almost wholly of Catholics. It certainly," he says, "is not too much to affirm, that such is the fact in one hundred and ninety-nine instances out of two hundred."

Whoever knows any thing of Ireland, will, no doubt, be astonished at these statements; and will require no farther proof that the man who could venture to make them would say any thing, however false, which might answer his purpose. When the population of Ireland is estimated at five millions, it is probably under-rated. But of its population, whatever it may be, those who have the best

means of knowing the truth, and the least temptation to conceal it, represents the Roman Catholics as constituting not more than three millions. Indeed this was, till lately, their own estimate of their numbers; and that very little reliance can be placed on their present account, is evident from this circumstance, that while the author of the work now under examination describes them as amounting only to four millions two hundred thousand, they are represented in their petition to Parliament, as constituting five millions of the inhabitants of Ireland. This difference may, however, be easily accounted for. Their leaders draw so largely on their fancy, that a million is a mere trifle with them. With respect to his statement, that they are in one hundred and ninety-nine instances out of two hundred, the occupying tenants of the land, it is so gross a misrepresentation, that it is almost unnecessary to make any remark on it. It is an ascertained and undeniable fact, that there are many *country* parishes in Ireland (as for the cities, towns, and villages, he admits there are large numbers of Protestants in them), which contain from two to three thousand Protestant families. There are, in the north of Ireland, whole parishes which do not contain one Roman Catholic householder. Of this description, for instance, is the parish of Donaghadee. But we shall pass over all this; as it is not so much our design to refute the statements of this author, as to expose the view with which they are made. Can any one be at a loss for the motive by which he was actuated in making these exaggerated statements? It could not be to promote Catholic Emancipation: for all this, by alarming the Legislature and the Protestants, would be more likely to impede than advance such a measure. What then did he aim at? Obviously at this: to convince the members of his own church, that the Protestants have usurped an ascendancy in this country, which, in right and justice, should belong to the Catholics. After reading his statements, this is the conclusion to which the Catholics would naturally be led. It must appear to them,

that their exclusive title had been fully made out to the places of trust and emolument at present enjoyed by Protestants. Indeed the author, as we shall immediately see, suggests this conclusion, in several parts of his work.

Having thus displayed the numbers and consequence of the laity, he proceeds to describe the Roman Catholic hierarchy. "There are," he says, "in Ireland, four archbishops, twenty-five bishops, one thousand one hundred parish priests, eight hundred curates, and between two and three hundred regular clergy, of various orders." After this account of the clergy and laity, he complains that they have not a proportionable share (i. e. a share proportioned to their numbers and consequence, as he has described them) in national charities, legislative endowments, and pious funds, to which, he adds, they have an undoubted right. Again he says, "That the Catholics are well entitled, upon every principle of public policy and justice, to claim a share, and a large share, of the public revenue of Ireland, for the maintainance of their pastors, houses of worship, schools," &c. is a proposition pretty clear to the eye of reason.

Now let us examine what all this amounts to. Estimating the population of Ireland at five millions, of these he asserts that four millions two hundred thousand are Roman Catholics. He asserts also, that they are, in one hundred and ninety-nine instances out of two hundred, the occupying tenants of the land; that, moreover, the most opulent merchants and traders are of their communion; and further, that their clergy amount to between two and three thousand. Now, he demands, as their undoubted right, a share proportioned to the number and consequence of the Catholic clergy and laity, in the revenue of the state, in national charities, legislative endowments, and pious funds. Is not this absolutely calling for the subversion of the Protestant Establishment, and the substitution of Popery in its stead, together with a transfer to it of the funds and revenue at present appropriated to the Protestant Church? How is it possible,

without this, to give him what he demands? It is obviously impossible. If he be serious and in earnest in making these demands, he is no less so in desiring and anticipating the overthrow of the Protestant Church, and the establishment of Popery on its ruins. Indeed, that he contemplates a revolution of this kind cannot be doubted, when some other grievances, of which he complains, are taken into account. He is displeased because Roman Catholics cannot be vicars general or proctors; and because they are excluded from the prerogative, consistorial, and metropolitan courts. Now it is impossible, in the nature of things, not only that Roman Catholics could discharge the duties of these offices (involving, as they do, an accurate knowledge of, and interest in, the doctrines, ceremonies, and discipline of the Protestant Established Church), but that Roman Catholics should desire to be engaged in such services for the Established Church. If obliged to perform such services, they must regard it as a heavy grievance.* No emolument annexed to these offices could be an adequate compensation for the inconsistencies of which they must be guilty, and for the wounds which must necessarily be inflicted on their feelings and conscience. It is clear, therefore, that the real grievance is, not that Roman Catholics are ineligible to these situations, but that the situations themselves are such, that Roman Catholics cannot consistently and conscientiously discharge the duties of them: or, in other words, that Popery is not the established religion.

Again, this author complains of it as a great grievance, that Roman Catholics cannot be Provost and Fellows of Trinity College, Dublin. Trinity College is the only Protestant university in Ireland. It is the seminary where the youth of the country are prepared for the learned professions, and especially for that of the church. It is indeed

* They are eligible to the office of Churchwarden; and accordingly this eligibility is one of the grievances of which the author of "The Statement of the Penal Laws" complains.

the only school in Ireland for the education of candidates for orders in the Established Church. Now what does this author require? Does he require, that the only school in Ireland for supplying the Protestant Church with clergymen should be under the government of Roman Catholics, and that candidates for admission into the Protestant Church should be placed under the tuition of Roman Catholic professors? No; it is impossible that he should mean any such thing. We cannot suppose that a proposal, at once so foolish and so insolent, could come even from the author of "The Statement of the Penal Laws." But taking his complaints on this subject in connexion with his statement of the number and consequence of the Catholics, his meaning is obvious. It is this: that Trinity College should be, in propriety and justice, a Roman Catholic and not a Protestant university, and of course that the Provost and Fellows should be Catholics.

But he does not confine his complaints to ecclesiastical preferments. On the contrary, he extends them to all the offices of honour and profit in the state, and applies to them all the same mode of reasoning. He commences with the Peerage; and here his indignation is excited by the exclusion of Roman Catholic peers from Parliament. But this is not the worst: he is still more indignant that Catholics have not been, and are not raised to the Peerage, in the proportion of their numbers and consequence as he has described them. From the Peerage he descends to the House of Commons; and makes ample provision for supplying it with Roman Catholics, as soon as the laws which exclude them shall be repealed; for he assures us that, at this moment, there are in Ireland no less than thirty thousand Catholics, qualified by rank, fortune, character, or talent, for seats in that House. He then enumerates the following offices, to which, in addition to those already mentioned, Catholics should immediately be raised: Lord Lieutenant, Lord High Treasurer, Lords of the Treasury, Custodes Rotulorum, Governors of Counties, Privy Counsellors, Postmasters General, Chancellor of the Exchequer, Secretary of State, Vice Treasurer, Teller of the Exchequer, Keeper

of the Privy Seal, and Auditors General: to which are to be added the highest offices in the law, army, and navy.

We shall take notice of two other grievances of which this author complains, and then dismiss his work. The Catholic clergy, he says, are liable to be punished by a civil action, for excommunicating members of their own church. This is certainly true; and happy is it for the Roman Catholics themselves that such is the law. The reasons of this have been well explained by Lord Redesdale, formerly Lord Chancellor of Ireland. "Excommunication," says his Lordship, "from the Catholic Church is, in Ireland, not simply a separation from the body of the faithful; but, to all intents and purposes an interdiction *ab aqua et igne*.---No Catholic dares to administer a cup of cold water, or a crust of bread, or any other necessary sustenance, to an excommunicated person."

The author of "The Statement of the Penal Laws," flatly contradicts all this. He asserts that excommunicated persons may continue in trade, and be dealt with just as formerly; and he adds, that this punishment is never lightly inflicted, nor indeed inflicted at all, except for "crimes of gross enormity and turpitude."

To settle the difference between the Noble Lord and this author, we shall appeal to matter of fact.

The late Roman Catholic Bishop of Killala, who died suddenly, a short time ago, excommunicated a schoolmaster, for suffering the New Testament (without note or comment) to be read by his scholars. But perhaps the reading of the New Testament may appear to this author, as it did to the Bishop, "a crime of gross enormity and turpitude." We shall therefore adduce another example, which is more full, and quite decisive of the point at issue.

In an action for slander, in which Philip Boyle was plaintiff, and the Right Reverend Peter M'Loughlin, Roman Catholic Bishop of Raphoe, was defendant (the plaintiff had been excommunicated by the Bishop, and this was the ground of the action); one of the witnesses (a Roman Catholic) deposed, that he should consider himself guilty of a crime, if he associated with a person excom-

municated: and another declared, that he could have no regard for an excommunicated person, nor would he enter into any commercial dealings with him: and Baron M'Clelland, who presided at the trial, stated, that, after the evidence which had been adduced, it was absurd to contend, that the sentence of excommunication by a Roman Catholic Bishop had not the effect of banishing the delinquent from the society of Catholics; and that he did not entertain a doubt, that the sentence pronounced by the Bishop in that case, was intended by him to have the effect of excluding the plaintiff from the benefit of Catholic society.

Now what was the crime, for which the heavy sentence of excommunication had been pronounced against the plaintiff in this case? It was this: a new gallery had been erected in the Roman Catholic chapel at Ballyshannon, the pews of which the Bishop wished to dispose of to some of the more wealthy parishioners. This was resisted by the plaintiff, who appears to have been a person of some influence in the parish. The Bishop, however, carried his point: but, not satisfied with his triumph, he required the plaintiff to sign a paper of submission; and on his refusing to do so, pronounced against him the following sentence:

“ I Peter M'Loughlin, titular Bishop of Raphoe, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and of the holy Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, and of the blessed Virgin Mary, mother of God, and of all the angels and saints in heaven, do excommunicate you, Philip Boyle, until you sign this paper.” And then the candles were extinguished, and the chapel bells rung!!!

It is unnecessary to expatiate on the folly and blasphemy of such a procedure as this: but surely it fully confirms what Lord Redesdale had stated.

The only other grievance complained of by the author, to which we shall refer, is this; that Roman Catholics are disqualified from voting at parish-vestries, held for levying money to repair and rebuild parish-churches. Why is this a subject of complaint? Are the Roman Catholics dis-

pleased that they have not an opportunity of repairing parish-churches, at present in a state of decay, and of building others? Perhaps this is really the ground of their complaint. And indeed this is the more likely, since nearly all the splendid Roman Catholic chapels, built in this country within the last fifty years, have been erected on the estates of Protestants, and almost exclusively at their expense. But, alas! it is far otherwise. Neither the statements of this author, nor the more modern portion of the history of our country, will allow us to entertain this pleasing idea. Our author complains that Catholics are excluded from such vestries, because, if allowed to vote at them, they could prevent churches from being repaired or built, except where they should deem it necessary; and they could also, in that case (as he recommends it to the Legislature to do), reduce our Established Church, and fashion it after the model—of what? Of that in the island of Jamaica! And what does history say? It informs us, that, up to the year, 1725, Roman Catholics were allowed by law to vote at all vestries, whatever might be the object of them: but that, at this period, it became necessary to exclude them from vestries held for repairing or rebuilding churches. Why? The preamble of the act on this subject, passed in that year, states the reason, 12 Geo. I. ch. ix. sec. 7. “Whereas several parishes in this kingdom are, and others are likely to become, non-cures, though there are several Protestant families therein, for want of places of public worship, the parish-churches being in so great decay, that Divine Service cannot therein be performed; and the said churches cannot be rebuilt or repaired, *the Popish inhabitants of such parishes, obstructing the same, by their outvoting the Protestant inhabitants at their vestries, &c.* For the preventing therefore of Papists having it in their power to obstruct the rebuilding and repairing churches for Divine worship, be it enacted,” &c.

We have now done with “The Statement of the Penal Laws,” a work of which it may safely be pronounced, that it is a tissue of exaggerations and falsehoods, obviously

calculated, and no less obviously designed, to excite popular discontent, and to sow the seeds of rebellion and revolution in the country. From the specimens we have given of it, the Protestants of the empire will be enabled to form a judgment for themselves as to the real object of its author.

Is it not extraordinary, we must again repeat it, that such a work should be extolled in the highest terms of admiration by the Catholic leaders, and even by those of them who are most vehement in protesting their abhorrence of revolutionary principles? Such conduct, to say the least of it, warrants the conclusion, that these gentlemen aim at *something* beyond Emancipation, whatever that *something* may be. This, indeed, on some occasions, is distinctly and boldly avowed. Mr. O'Connell made such an avowal at the Aggregate Meeting of the Catholics, held in Dublin last July. His language on the occasion was rather mysterious, but certainly not less alarming on that account.

“ Desiring as I do (says he) *the repeal of the Union*, I rejoice to see how our enemies promote that object. Yes, they promote its success by their very hostility to Ireland. They delay the liberties of the Catholics; but they compensate us most amply, because they advance the restoration of Ireland. By leaving one cause of agitation, they have created, and they will embody, and give shape and form to a public mind and public spirit. Ireland lay in torpor, till roused by the call for religious liberty. She would, I fear and am convinced, relapse into apathy, if liberty of conscience were soon conceded. Let them delay emancipation but yet a little while, and they will find that they have roused the sleeping lion of Ireland to a waking activity which will not permit any further slumber till Ireland is herself again.”

We have reserved to the close of this Address the examination of a speech delivered, last December, in the Catholic Board, by Dr. Dromgole, a Roman Catholic, and a member of the Board. This gentleman, who is a physician, possesses considerable ability and information.

He is well versed in the principles, doctrines, and history of his own church—in a word, he is a genuine and zealous Roman Catholic; and while he has too much candour and firmness of mind to conceal his principles or his designs, he is so far advanced in life, as to be freed from that youthful ardour and impetuosity, under the influence of which we are so often hurried away into the expression of sentiments, which in our cooler moments we disapprove of and disavow.

The history of the speech we are about to examine is briefly this:

During the last session of Parliament, and just after Mr. Grattan had obtained leave to bring in a Bill for the relief of the Roman Catholics, the following conciliatory resolution was adopted by the Catholic Board:

“Resolved, that we heartily congratulate our fellow subjects, of every religious persuasion, in the British empire, on the late glorious and successful struggle of the friends of religious freedom in the Imperial House of Commons, from which we may confidently date the commencement of that harmony which is likely hereafter to subsist among men of all denominations of religion in this country; which must obliterate the remembrance of past injuries, and make Ireland as united as she would be unconquerable; and that, confiding in the wisdom and justice of the Imperial Parliament, that nothing will be required of us inconsistent with the integrity of our religion, no disposition towards conciliation shall be wanting on our part to aid the benevolent views of the Legislature.”

This is the resolution which was represented in the house of Commons as furnishing such unequivocal evidence of the good disposition and loyalty of the Catholic Board. It was not, however, carried without strenuous opposition from Dr. Dromgole. He protested against it at the time, and shortly after gave notice of a motion of an opposite tendency; one against concessions and securities of any kind, on the part of the Catholics. Accordingly, on the 15th of May, three weeks after the Catholic Bill had been intro-

duced into the House of Commons, he proposed his resolution to the Board, who, on that occasion, had the prudence not to adopt it. But on its second introduction, on the 11th of last December, it was carried, "amidst (as their own accounts state) clapping of hands, waving of hats, and loud and repeated cheerings."

It is as follows:

"Resolved, that we think it necessary, at this particular time, to readopt our resolution of the year 1810, that, as Irishmen and Catholics, we never can nor will consent to any interference on the part of the crown, or the servants of the Crown, in the appointment of our bishops; and that with every disposition to meet, as far as it can be done, the wishes of every part of our Parliamentary friends, and Protestant fellow-subjects, we yet feel ourselves bound to declare, that no settlement can be final or satisfactory, which has for its basis, or at all involves, any innovation or alteration, to be made by authority of Parliament, in the doctrine or discipline of the Catholic Church in Ireland. That this declaration is not lightly made, but is grounded upon the concurrence of this Board with the prelates, and in the sentiments of the Catholic body at large, as publicly and repeatedly expressed at the several meetings held, for the last three years, in every part of the kingdom."

In proposing this resolution, Dr. Dromgole delivered the speech which we are now to examine; it was published immediately after in the Dublin Evening Post (the paper to which the members of the Catholic Board send copies of their speeches), and has since been republished by the Doctor himself, with an introduction and appendix, containing a brief account of the occurrences to which it gave rise, and a vindication of his sentiments.

This speech, with its vindication, enables us to judge of the light in which the Roman Catholics of Ireland regarded Mr. Grattan's Bill for their relief, and of the reception it would have met in Ireland had it been enacted. It also, though incidentally, discloses the expectations they have

formed on the subject of Emancipation, and the demands they are prepared to make. And more especially it declares, distinctly and unequivocally, their opinion, views, and designs, with respect to the Protestant religion, and the Protestant church of Ireland.

We shall now give extracts from the Speech and Vindication, under each of these heads.

First, as to the Catholic Bill. It was represented by its advocates, as calculated to heal the divisions of the Irish people, and to give peace to the country; as conceding to the Catholic all he demanded, and preserving to the Protestant all he valued:—in a word, as giving satisfaction to the one and security to the other. To this the opponents of the measure replied, that, if the Bill were enacted, the Catholic would not be satisfied, because the Protestant Established Church was still to be upheld in Ireland; and that Church could not be safe, because, while the Catholic's hatred of it was undiminished, his power would be considerably increased. As for the proposed securities, these, they contended, were no securities at all. Amidst this diversity of opinion, there was, however, one point on which all parties seemed to agree: it was this, that the Bill granted to the Catholics all that could possibly be conceded; and, in return, required nothing which they could not, and should not, cheerfully yield.

Now let us hear Dr. Dromgole speaking the sentiments of the Irish Roman Catholics concerning this Bill.

Alluding to it in the commencement of his Speech, he says, “It was *fortunately* rejected.” A little after he describes it as “a storehouse of oaths; it seems (he says) to contain nothing else.” In “the Vindication” of his Speech (contained in the appendix to his pamphlet) he says, “A measure was about to be carried most hostile to Irish interests, and most injurious to religion. It was necessary that the Catholics should come to a distinct and explicit declaration, and show, by a public vote, that they were decidedly hostile to the enactments of this Bill.” He adds, “The country was alarmed at the danger with which it was

threatened; the expression of abhorrence for the Bill was universal." But it is in the following paragraph that he pours out the full torrent of that indignation of which he and his brethren were so full. "Were we not," says he, "reduced to the afflicting spectacle of seeing our advocates joining with ministerialists in drawing up a Bill, that, under colour of the restoration of some portion of rights, was loaded with pains and penalties bearing exclusively upon our body? A Bill so full of shameful exaction, so subversive of religion, and so injurious to general liberty, that our ancestors would have rejected it in the darkest night of the penal code; and which, I have a right to assert, if offered as articles of capitulation to those brave men, who, on the walls of Limerick, made the last stand for Irish independence, would have been replied to in no other way than from THE MOUTH OF THE CANNON."

Here is the opinion of the Roman Catholics of Ireland concerning this Bill, which was to effect such wonders;—which, without injury to the Protestant, was to confirm the loyalty of the Catholic; and, by a kind of magic influence, unite all parties in harmony and peace. Had it passed into a law, civil war, with all its horrors, would have been the probable consequence. Sooner than submit to its enactments, the Catholic Priests (we are told, in another part of this speech) would have suffered themselves to be transported as felons, or executed as murderers. How then should the laity have acted? If they had not resisted it *vi et armis*, it would have been because they possessed more prudence, but less spirit, than their ancestors.

Let no one say, this is merely Dr. Dromgole's view of the Bill. It is also that of the Catholic Board; for, besides that all its leading members have made a similar avowal, it, as a body, adopted the resolution of which this Speech was a preface and an explanation. Nay more, almost every county in Ireland, in aggregate meetings of the Roman Catholic inhabitants, has expressed and recorded the same opinion.

We shall now present a few of those passages from the Doctor's Speech and Vindication, which disclose the expectations the Roman Catholics have formed, and the demands they are prepared to make. In the commencement of his Speech, in order to show the necessity which had arisen for the proposed resolution, he says, "The question of Parliamentary interference, which we confidently hoped had slept the sleep of death, has been resuscitated." Again he says, "Look to what was called the conciliatory resolution of last summer. That resolution gives up the discipline, and only deprecates any rude interference in the doctrine, of our church. Can it be believed that any number of Irish Catholics could be brought to assent to such a resolution? This was the most mischievous and impolitic measure of the Board." And a little further on he lays down this principle, "No layman, no Protestant, but, above all, no English Parliament, as at present, or in whatever way constituted, ought to be allowed profanely to intermeddle in the administration of your church. That right belongs to ANOTHER AUTHORITY, where it was placed at the first birth of Christianity, and where only it can safely rest or be legitimately exercised." Towards the close of his Speech he thus exhorts the Board: "Let us, by the unanimous adoption of this resolution, show the people of Ireland, that all we have said or done, since the question of securities was first started, was done and said with singleness of heart.—Let us show that the anger we expressed against those of our own body, who only seemed to favour those securities, was something more than words; that our opposition to the late Bill was grounded upon principle, and upon a deep sense of the mischiefs with which it was pregnant." In the "Vindication" of his Speech, he asserts that "no oath, conveying what is called a security, can be taken by a conscientious (Catholic) clergyman." To this he adds, that "he sought not the little distinction of making a display before the Catholic Board; but his wish was, that Catholic opinion should be explicitly declared and publicly understood; by which no pretences should, if

possible, be left for parliamentary interference,—an event which, of all others, he most apprehended, as a Catholic and an Irishman. The right once admitted, by a consent to any modification or change in these oaths, all power would be at an end of limiting or controlling its exercise. With the same view it was, that, on a former occasion, he endeavoured to divert his Catholic countrymen from PLACING ANY CONFIDENCE IN PARLIAMENT, by showing them, that, in the affair in question, they were less to be confided in, than a Sanhedrim or a Divan:—a truth, of which he is most firmly convinced.”

We shall add but one extract more on this subject. It deserves particular attention. Speaking of the oaths in the proposed Catholic Bill (the Bill which the House of Commons rejected in the last session: and it should be remembered this is the Bill alluded to all along in these pages), he says, “The oath for Catholic members of Parliament, is nearly similar to the ordinary oath of allegiance” (as at present taken by Roman Catholics)—“it is drawn up in the same cautious and suspicious manner—the clauses and observations are of the same insulting and calumnious kind. But both go to a solemn pledge to support, not the succession, but the *Protestant* succession to the Crown.”

From these extracts it is quite obvious that no control or superintendence over their church or its concerns, which the Legislature may be disposed to invest in the government, will be tolerated by the Roman Catholics. No barrier must be raised against foreign influence. Neither clergy nor laity will condescend to take any oath, or give any other security, which might appear expedient or prove satisfactory to the Protestants. No; they will concede nothing. “SIMPLE REPEAL,” is their watch-word. Nor is this all. They not only reject with scorn any new oaths or securities which parliament might devise; but they are indignant, it would seem, at being obliged to take the oaths at present prescribed by the law. “Which of you,” says Dr. Dromgole, in another part of his Speech, “that recollects his feelings, when taking our present

Catholic oath of allegiance, does not think that sufficiently galling and insulting? or that can, with patience, anticipate any further multiplication of such oaths?" And again, speaking on the same subject, he says, "When oaths are mentioned, is it not a matter of surprise, that any Catholic, instead of anticipating new oaths, which, if they do nothing more, go to widen distinctions which are the bane of Ireland, should not rather speak of the repeal of this which is so insulting and so revolting? The gentlemen of the bar," he adds, "well know, that men of high and proud minds, consulting the honesty of their feelings, have hazarded the possession of their property during their lives, and given up the disposition of it after their death, rather than submit to the degradation and humiliation which it" (that is, the Catholic oath of allegiance) "is calculated to inflict." Here is a specimen of what they are prepared to demand. But they go further even than this. They absolutely go the length (as appears from one of the extracts we have given from this Speech) of expressing their indignation, that their present oath of allegiance obliges them to give a pledge to support the Protestant succession to the Crown.* Surely, if the meaning of men is to be collected from their words, those who use such

* In the edition of his Speech, which Dr. Dromgole has lately published, he has suppressed the paragraph which contained this sentiment; and in "the Vindication," he says that he had not intended that this paragraph should be published; on the contrary, that he had *erased* it, and substituted another in its stead; but that the printer of the Dublin Evening Post had, through mistake, inserted both. The Doctor, however, does not assert, that he did not deliver this sentiment in his speech before the Catholic Board. And it is perfectly clear, that his having *erased* it from the copy of his speech which he sent to the newspaper, involves the fact of his having originally written and designed it for publication. His desire to suppress it was very natural; because it exposed him to the penalty of a *præmunire*.

language, as this have views beyond what is commonly called Catholic Emancipation.

We shall now adduce a few extracts from this Speech demonstrative of the opinion and designs of the Roman Catholics, with respect to the Protestant religion, and the Protestant church of Ireland.

Reprobating the idea of giving "securities," he says, "If the Church of England trembles for its safety, it must seek it elsewhere,—we have no securities to give. That she stands in great need of securities who who can doubt, when he sees division in the camp, and observes the determined war that is carried on against her; *muros pugnatur intra et extra*; that her articles of association are despised by those that pretend to be governed by them; that Socinians, and men of strange faith, are amongst those in command; whilst, from without, she is incessantly assailed by a thousand bands of associated enthusiasts, furious tribes, religious warriors, who neither take nor give quarter? Why are not they put upon their securities?—why are not they bound over to keep the peace? To pass over others, observe the Methodists, a sort of Cossack infantry, religiously irregular, who, possessing themselves of the fields and hedges, and fighting from ruined houses and churchyards, are carrying on a desultory, but destructive warfare against her. In the mean time, the strong and republican phalanxes of Presbyterianism occupy an imposing position; and the columns of Catholicity are collecting, who challenge the possession of the Ark, and, unfurling the *auri flamme*, display its glorious motto, *ΕΙ ΤΕΤΩ ΝΙΚΩ*. But the Established Church will stand—it will surmount the storms with which it is assailed, if it be built upon a ROCK; but if its foundation be on SAND, no human power can support it. In vain shall statesmen put their heads together—in vain shall parliaments, in mockery of Omnipotence, declare that it is permanent and inviolate—in vain shall the lazy churchman cry from the sanctuary, to the watchmen on the tower, to proclaim that danger is at hand; it shall fall, for it is human, and liable to force, to

accident, and to decay: it shall fall, and nothing but the memory of the MISCHIEFS it has created shall survive. Already the marks of approaching ruin are upon it: it has had its time upon the earth, a date nearly as long as that of any other NOVELTY; and when the time of its dissolution arrives, shall Catholics be compelled, by the sacred bond of an oath, to uphold a system which they believe will be one day rejected by the whole earth? Can they be induced to swear that they should oppose even the present Protestants of England, if, ceasing to be truants, they thought fit to return to their ancient worship, and to have a CATHOLIC KING, AND A CATHOLIC PARLIAMENT."

On reading this, many will be astonished. In some, it is to be apprehended, worse feelings than astonishment will be excited: they will be kindled into indignation and resentment. But are such the emotions to which these wild ravings of fanaticism should give rise? No; pity will be the predominant feeling in the mind of every rational and truly religious man. It is prudent, however, to be on our guard against the effects of a system, the deluded votaries of which can use such language, and avow such expectations as these.

The author of this Speech exhibits himself in the three-fold character of a Divine, a General, and a Prophet. As a Divine, he pronounces on our Established Church, that it is a mischievous novelty, and has its foundation on the sand: as a General, he marshals his troops for the battle; he collects and disposes his Cossack infantry, his Republican phalanxes; and, above all, his columns of Catholicity, distinguished by the unfurled auriflamme, at once the pledge of victory, and the signal for slaughter:* and as a Prophet, he predicts the issue of the conflict in the overthrow and ruin of our church.

This would be an unsuitable occasion on which to enter the lists with Dr. Dromgole on the subject of divinity. But

* The auriflamme was a sacred banner, supposed to have been sent from heaven, and was originally used only in wars against

thus much may be said. When we find that the principles on which our church is fixed are as old as the Bible, and when we can trace the connexion between it, and the freedom, prosperity, peace, and happiness, so long enjoyed by the subjects of the British empire, in a degree unknown to the rest of the world, we conclude that the Doctor, who has described our church as a mischievous novelty, is but a bad Divine. Nor can we entertain a better opinion of his prudence as a General. He has taken the field, it would seem, too early. The Methodist Cossack infantry, and the Republican phalanxes of Presbyterianism, instead of allies, prove to be his determined enemies. Of all his mighty army, therefore, the only part on whose prowess and fidelity he can reckon, are "the columns of Catholicity;" and they, (thank Heaven!) are only *collecting*; so that he has engaged in war, without being prepared. Thus, having detected his bad generalship, and convinced that he is an unsound divine, we are encouraged to hope that he may prove, like many of his predecessors, a false prophet.

On a superficial view of this passage, it appears as if Dr. Dromgole were speaking merely of the Established Church, and not of the religion of Protestants, as contradistinguished from that of Roman Catholics; and it is evidently his desire that such an interpretation should be put on his language. Thus he hoped to gain over the Protestant Dissenters, to make common cause with him. But a more careful examination enables us to detect his real meaning. It is such as will satisfy the Dissenters, that the

the infidels. When erected, it denoted that no quarter was to be given. Philip, it is reported by some historians, displayed it at the battle of Crecy; when, in return, Edward raised up his burning dragon, the English signal for massacre. It is probable that Dr. Dromgole was not aware of these circumstances; and it is unfortunate that he did not place "the columns of Catholicity" under some other standard.

alliance he offers them is false and hollow. Attend to his language. "Already" says he, "the marks of approaching ruin are upon it. It has had its time upon the earth, a date nearly as long as that of any other novelty; and when the time of its dissolution arrives, shall Catholics be compelled, by the sacred bond of an oath, to uphold *a system which they believe will be one day rejected by the whole earth?*" This is not applicable to the Established Church, which is a system confined to the British empire. It has never been embraced by the whole earth, and therefore the whole earth never can reject it. But it is the reformed religion, the religion of Protestants, he means. It is that which has extended widely over the earth; and it is that which is to be as extensively rejected. It did not suit his purpose to give the whole truth plainly in his speech; but he has let it out since. On a subsequent occasion, he distinctly acknowledged in the Catholic Board, that it was the Protestant religion he meant. Here, then, is the true nature of the league into which the Roman Catholics desire to enter with the Dissenters: it is a league against the Reformed religion. As the first step towards its destruction in these countries, the Established Church is to be put down. Its pure doctrines and simple formularies, and above all, its provisions for the circulation and reading of the Sacred Scriptures, oppose an insurmountable barrier against Popery. In fact, it has been found by experience, that the existence of the one is incompatible with the growth of the other; and therefore our church is to be crushed, and the Dissenters, it is presumed, are ready to assist in its demolition. Little, however, did that man know of the Protestant Dissenters of these countries, who could suppose that they would lend themselves to such a measure. That large and respectable body of the people are too happy, and too well satisfied with the present order of things, to desire any change. In the full enjoyment of religious liberty, and in the secure possession of every civil privilege to which, by their loyal and peaceable conduct, they are so well entitled, instead of joining the dis-

affected and turbulent, they would, if necessary, rise en masse, to chastise their presumption, and reduce them to obedience. But even though it were the case (which it certainly is not), that the Dissenters desired the subversion of the Established Church, can it for a moment be supposed, that, for that or any other purpose, they would make common cause with the Roman Catholics? No; the bitter recollection of the miseries which Popery inflicted on their ancestors, is too deeply impressed, to admit of such a coalition; and even though this impression were effaced, they would still be deterred by the hostile spirit, which the Roman Catholics in vain endeavour to conceal under the mask of friendship. Dr. Dromgole has betrayed this spirit even in the Speech in which he courts their alliance. He describes them as "the thousand sects which nestle under the name of Protestantism, whose spurious and dubious generation scarcely retains the shape or colour of Christianity;" and he has since been driven to a distinct and unequivocal avowal of hostility. He was charged with representing the Roman Catholics and Dissenters as ready to join in an attack on the Established Church. This accusation must be met. How did he endeavour to get rid of it? By shifting his ground; by making strong professions of respect for the members of the Church, and pouring out torrents of calumny and abuse against the dissenters. Obligated to throw off the mask, he hesitated not to defame and ridicule them and their tenets. If, after all this, he be sanguine enough to expect their assistance, he must regard them as the most stupid and infatuated people on earth.

Before we conclude our review of this Speech and its Vindication, we shall adduce three more extracts from them. The first two disclose unequivocally the views of the Roman Catholics concerning the Established Church; and the last proves, beyond the possibility of controversy or doubt, that the extinction of the Protestant religion in these countries, and the substitution of Popery in its place, are events which the Roman Catholics contemplate, not

merely as probable, but as almost certain, and near at hand. These extracts are from the Vindication of the Speech, which of course was written with due caution and deliberation, and where the author had an opportunity (if so disposed) of softening down or explaining any harsh or unguarded expressions, into which, in the hurry of public speaking, he might have fallen. We shall give these extracts without any comment. They require none.

“Let no man deceive himself: as long as the Catholic is oppressed, and conceives that his political degradation is to be referred to the Church of England,—that it must co-exist with the duration of that church; so long he can have no alternative; he must unavoidably, and in spite of himself, desire to see that system changed or destroyed.”

Again he says, “This is not the only crime of which the writer” (meaning himself, Dr. Dromgole) “has been guilty. He has dared to say, with an appearance of satisfaction, that the Church of England will fall; and that nothing but the memory of the mischiefs she has created will survive. WELL, THIS IS HIS BELIEF; AND IT IS THE BELIEF OF EVERY CATHOLIC IN THE WORLD.”

The third extract, which is as follows, should be read with deep attention. “May he” (i. e. Dr. Dromgole), “not, guiltlessly, although perhaps vainly, hope, that, wearied out with the continual conflict of ten thousand jarring opinions; that, alarmed at the dangers with which the State and Establishment are continually threatened; the people of England will, themselves, become anxious for repose; and that the learned divines of her establishment, and the statesmen to whom her prosperity is committed, *availing themselves of the dispositions of the people*, may at length seek for that reconciliation, by the way of *concordat*, or otherwise, which shall open for their agitated country, a calm and a secure port, where she may quietly anchor after her long tossings, and the storms with which she has been so constantly endangered? May not this flattering vision be indulged to a Catholic, who, from the most benevolent intentions, might wish A RE-UNION ESTABLISHED

BETWEEN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, AND THE SPIRITUAL HEAD OF THE REST OF THE CHRISTIAN WORLD; a reunion which has been recommended by some of the ablest and most Christian Protestant Divines? She is nearer, perhaps, in alliance with Catholicity, than with any other, even Protestant, Church. The motives that kept up the separation are for ever removed: there is now no Catholic claimant to the crown of England: the church property is irrevocably invested in the present possessors; the parts of her discipline which are most objected to by the clergymen of the church of England, might, and would, be modified; as has been with that part of the Greek Church at present in communion with the See of Rome; and no obstacle be suffered to lie in the way of a cordial and lasting reconciliation. There does not, then, seem to be any thing very impossible in all this; or, at least nothing that is very heinous or criminal in this speculation. England was Catholic once—she became Protestant—she has changed again and again, through the varying doctrines of the reformers; and would it be so surprising, that, after having tried all, she become Catholic again? Can he suppose that any possible injury could be inflicted upon England, by a measure that would go for ever to remove her religious distinctions, restore her to unity with herself, and unity with the rest of the Christian world? The period may not, then, be so very remote, as some people imagine, WHEN ENGLAND, BEING CATHOLIC HERSELF, MAY HAVE A CATHOLIC KING AND A CATHOLIC PARLIAMENT.”

Such are the opinions and the expectations which Dr. Dromgole avowed before the Catholic Board, in the celebrated speech by which he prefaced his resolutions against securities or concessions of any kind. What impression did this speech make upon the Board? Dr. Dromgole has told us in the following words, and his account has been fully confirmed.—“If,” says he, “a conclusion is to be drawn from the favourable manner in which that speech was received, it met with the most complete concurrence. The

speaker was frequently interrupted by applause; and the resolution was passed with marks of enthusiastic approbation. The whole assembly, the galleries, and all the members of the Board, with the exception of two or three individuals, rose up together; and, with clapping of hands, waving of hats, and long-continued cheering, gave the most unequivocal proofs of their entire satisfaction."

Further, it should be remembered that Lord Ffrench filled the chair of the Catholic Board on that occasion. Did his Lordship interrupt the Doctor in the course of his speech? Did he rebuke him on account of the principles he laid down? Did he, for himself, or on behalf of the assembly in which he presided, protest against any part of the speech? No such thing. On the contrary, his Lordship, before he put the question on Dr. Dromgole's resolution, made a speech from the chair, in which he endeavoured to answer an argument which two or three members of the Board had urged against the resolution. His Lordship spoke to this effect: "I am particularly anxious to add my name to the list of those who think that the present question is now before a proper tribunal. It is a political question, and it belongs to you alone. Any compromise with Government is disgusting in my mind. It is right to put an eternal extinguisher on this question. Let the people," (added his Lordship, according to the report of the Dublin Evening Post) "speak for themselves against any innovation in the discipline of the Church by external powers. For my part, I will say, that I will constantly raise my voice, and *almost my hand* against it."

Dr. Dromgole has become, in consequence of this speech, the most popular man in Ireland; so Mr. Finlay stated lately in the Catholic Board; and what has since occurred proves that it is so. In a late Aggregate meeting of the Roman Catholics of the county of Kilkenny, this speech was described by a priest, "as Catholic, purely, precisely Catholic, as necessary, principled, and called for:" and on the motion of another priest a resolution was passed with loud applause, expressing in the strongest terms, their approbation of it.

Thus have we adduced facts and documents from the proceedings and recorded speeches of the leading members of the Catholic Board, for the purpose of enabling the Protestants of the empire to judge for themselves, what is the real object of this party. And be it remembered, that these men have seats in the Board, in consequence of having been selected by the different parishes of Dublin and counties of Ireland as their representatives; or, as they please to express it, in order to evade the law, as "possessing their confidence." Accordingly these members of the Board assure us, that they speak the sentiments, and express the wishes and determination, of the people. It may be asked, is this the fact? Without hesitation, and with heartfelt pleasure we answer, No. Many of the Roman Catholics most distinguished by rank, wealth, and talent, stand aloof from the Board: and some have expressed very strong disapprobation of their language and measures. And as for the great mass of the Roman Catholic community, they would be quiet, contented, and happy, if left to themselves*. At the same time, it cannot be too generally known, that the Roman Catholic Board have a party in the country, contemptible indeed in point of number, and destitute of every thing from which weight and influence are usually derived; but formidable in consequence of being actuated by a spirit of inveterate hostility against the present order of things, and from their possessing, in an eminent degree, the pernicious qualities which constitute the demagogue. Such men are to be found almost in every county and town in Ireland; the petty agitators of the neighbourhood; the orators in the public meetings. They

* It is a well known fact, that the greater part of the lower classes of the Roman Catholics do not understand what Emancipation means. The prevailing idea among them is, that it is something which will free them from tithes. Many, however, carry their expectations farther, and imagine that, when emancipated, they shall no longer be required to pay rent.

are ever on the alert. They seize every favourable opportunity to sow the seeds of discontent, to foment disturbances, to create party spirit, and to excite the different parties to acts of outrage against each other. They are thus furnished with matter of complaint and declamation against the government, at whose door they lay their own acts. In many instances celebrity is the object of these men: they are ambitious of the character of "public men, leaders, speakers, &c." For proof of the existence of such a party in favour of the Board, look at the aggregate meetings of the various counties of Ireland, held in the course of the last six months. At nineteen of these county meetings, resolutions of thanks to the Board, and in approval of their measures, were carried with acclamation: and in the greater number of the remaining counties, the Petition to Parliament, prepared by the Board, was adopted, in order, as was stated, that they might be identified with that body. Such resolutions were carried, partly, no doubt, in consequence of the personal attendance of the leading members of the Board at these meetings (for not contented with disturbing the peace of the city of Dublin, and holding their parliament there, they take the circuit of the counties); but, principally, by the instrumentality of those country agitators whom we have described.

Besides these, the Catholic Board, it is to be apprehended, have other more powerful and dangerous auxiliaries through the country. Many of the Roman Catholic clergy take a decided part in their favour. The most active persons at the late Aggregate Meeting in the county of Kilkenny, at which the resolution was carried in approval of Dr. Dromgole's speech, were priests. In the city of Cork there is a large body of loyal and most respectable Roman Catholics, who condemn the measures of the Board. But on a recent occasion, it appeared that their influence availed nothing against that of the priests. At the Aggregate Meeting held in that city last August, they were completely overpowered by the party which the priests had made in favour of the Board; and were under the necessity of retir-

ing from the meeting, which afterwards voted thanks to the Board, and to Mr. O'Connell, in particular, for his eminent services. Very lately in the City of Londonderry the conduct of a priest, at one of these aggregate meetings, was so violent, that some of his own flock were under the necessity of prosecuting him; and accordingly he was tried and convicted.* The mischief which such men may do is incalculable, as the following circumstance will very fully prove. On Friday evening, the 25th of March, being the anniversary of the Annunciation of the Virgin Mary, a priest, preaching in one of the Roman Catholic chapels of the city of Dublin, on the character of Mary, after describing her, in the usual language of such persons, as the Mother of God, and as possessing such influence with her Son, as enables her to procure the pardon of sin; and having exhorted his hearers to honor and pray to her then, and at the hour of death, exclaimed, "Would you believe it, we of the Holy Catholic Apostolic Church are the only persons in the world, who say to her, *Hail, Mary*. Can you believe it possible, that there are in this country, persons so infatuated as to insist that she has no power in heaven, no privilege there which any other penitent woman does not enjoy? *Nay more, can ye believe it, that they go so far as to call on people to stand before their erroneous tribunals, and swear all this?*" The sensation produced by this address on the vast assembly (consisting almost exclusively of the lower classes of the people), is indescribable. Examples of priests, thus breaking the public peace at aggregate meetings, and thus preaching sedition, are, it is to be hoped, rare. But taking all these things together, how melancholy is the condition of Ireland, and who can conjecture what shall be her fate!

* The Catholic Board sent Counsellor O'Gorman to Derry, to defend this priest; and, though he was convicted, passed a resolution, approving of his conduct and expressive of their confidence in him.

Is it urged, that Catholic Emancipation would prove a remedy for these evils? Mr. O'Connell denies it; and on such a subject he is good authority. Emancipation, he has intimated, is but one of a series of measures necessary for the regeneration of Ireland. The next in order, is the repeal of the Union. What is to follow he has not informed us. Is it urged, that Catholic Emancipation would deprive the agitators of their influence, and be the means of rescuing the people out of their hands? Mr. Finlay is good authority, and he denies it. In his Speech at the Aggregate Meeting of the Roman Catholics of Galway, he said, "Mr. Canning has told the House of Commons that they should grant Emancipation, in order to take the people out of our hands, in order to vex the agitators. With all my heart? I strike the bargain on that condition. Let them give you Emancipation to vex us; *and then, perhaps, some of us may find our way into that House to vex them.*"

What should be done in this momentous crisis, it is for the Legislature, in its wisdom, to determine. That prompt and decisive measures are absolutely necessary, these "Facts and Documents" most clearly evince.

Dublin, April 12, 1814.

APPENDIX.

WITHIN the last few weeks, an important Document connected with the question of Catholic Emancipation, has been presented to the public; *viz.* a Decree dated from the Palace of the Propaganda at Rome, signed J. B. Quarantotti, Vice Prefect and M. A. Galeassi, Substitute; and addressed to the Rev. Doctor Poynter of London, a Bishop and a Vicar Apostolic of the Roman Catholic Church. This Decree was sent from Rome, in consequence, as appears from the document itself, of a letter from Dr. Poynter, and another from Dr. Troy, a Roman Catholic Priest, styled Archbishop of Dublin, concerning the provisions of the Bill for Catholic Emancipation, which the House of Commons rejected in the last Sessions. The Decree orders that the Roman Catholics shall "with willingness and gratitude, receive and embrace the law which was proposed for their Emancipation last year." And in the conclusion of it, Dr. Poynter is directed to communicate it to all Bishops and Vicars Apostolic of the Empire, "in the hope, that they shall promptly and unreservedly, conform to the things which, in virtue of the power assigned" to those from whom it proceeded, have been decreed.

What the Roman Catholics are thus directed to receive and embrace willingly and gratefully, is the relief bill of last Session, which has been so strongly reprobated by the Catholic Board. But as their indignation was excited against it, principally because they conceived it to be contrary to the doctrine and discipline of their Church, we might reasonably expect that this decree, removing their

scruples and silencing their objections, would reconcile them to the measure. Let it be granted that they were conscientious in their opposition to the proposed bill; that they really conceived its provisions to be inconsistent with the supremacy of the Pope, or with any other principle of their religion. They must now be convinced of their error. They will surely acknowledge that "a Council of the most learned Dignitaries and Divines," assembled in the Palace of Propaganda, understands the Discipline of their church. They will surely acknowledge, that this Council, the highest authority at Rome in the absence of the Pope, and acting in virtue of a power assigned to it by the Pope, is competent to pronounce on such a subject. We might therefore, naturally expect from them a change of opinion and language. And, in fact, that such a change would be the immediate consequence of this Decree, was very generally expected both in England and Ireland. But has it turned out so? Are they now willing to make the concessions, and to give the securities, which the decree has pronounced to be, not merely consistent with their religion, but no more than reasonable and proper? No: so far from it, they abuse both the decree, and the authority from which it has proceeded. The Priests and the people, the Board and the Aggregate Meetings unite in an outcry against Rome, the Propaganda and Quarantotti. In every part of Ireland, the Priests have held Meetings, and entered into solemn resolutions, expressive of their indignation, against Quarantotti and the Decree. The Bishops, in full assembly, have pronounced their condemnation of the decree. And the Board, and three Aggregate Meetings, two of which were held in Dublin, and the third in Cork, have abused it in distinct resolutions.

But although the change expected has not appeared, the decree has produced a change of a different kind, which it is of great importance to mark. Formerly religious scruples, it was pretended, stood in the way of concessions on their part. The securities required were inconsistent with their religion; or at least could not be given without autho-

city from Rome. But now that these pretexts have been swept away by the decree, attend to their language. Neither conscience nor religion, they tell us, were concerned in their decision against securities. They objected to them solely on the ground of their impolicy and injustice, and from regard to the liberties of Ireland. Let the Protestants of the empire seriously reflect on all this. Let them weigh the language and conduct of the Catholic leaders, both lay and clerical, with reference to this decree from Rome. The author is much mistaken, if these transactions shall not be found to furnish additional evidence that the peaceable attainment of Emancipation, is not the ultimate object in view.

Some other events have occurred to which the public attention should be drawn.

The disturbed state of some parts of Ireland, and the appearance of a new party, called Ribbon-men, which had committed various depredations, naturally engaged the attention of the Grand Juries at the late Assizes. On investigating the causes of such disturbances, it appeared that they might be traced, for the most part, to the inflammatory Speeches of the Catholic Board. The Grand Juries, therefore, petitioned the Lord Lieutenant to suppress that pernicious and illegal assembly. This as might be expected, excited the resentment of the Catholic leaders: and accordingly they have given vent to their resentment in the following resolution, which passed unanimously at an Aggregate Meeting of the Roman Catholics held in Dublin on the 19th of May.

“ Resolved, that we have seen without surprize, or even indignation, but with great contempt, resolutions and addresses published, as from certain individuals of the Grand Juries of some counties in Ireland, containing false and base calumnies, respecting the intentions, principles, and conduct of the General Board of the Catholics of Ireland. In these calumnies we easily recognize that spirit of bigotry and oppression, which in violation of the faith of treaties and in opposition to the plain dictates of justice,

originally deprived the Catholic people of their rights ; and which spirit, now that more direct persecution is discontinued, is exhibited in the propagation of false imputations”

In what light are they to be regarded, who could adopt such a resolution as this? These persons, not only demand unconditional Emancipation, but are ready, it would seem, whenever opposed or rebuked for their violent proceedings, to call us to account for the violation of treaties, and for injustice and oppression towards them. When in the metropolis of Ireland, and at the very seat of its government such language is heard, surely the crisis must be a momentous one.

On Saturday the 4th of June, the Catholic Board was suppressed by a proclamation issued by the Lord Lieutenant and Privy Council of Ireland. On that day sennight, an Aggregate Meeting of the Roman Catholics was held in a Catholic Chapel in Dublin, at which the following resolution was proposed, and passed with unbounded applause :

“ Resolved, that in the acts of the Catholic Board, we recognize unwearied diligence, distinguished talent, and inviolate fidelity, in the performance of its arduous duties. The Catholic people have found in it a firm and legitimate organ of their opinions and feelings: their rights have been advocated, and their wrongs proclaimed with truth and earnestness. The results have been eminently beneficial: for while the friends of religious freedom have augmented in numbers, and triumphed in argument, the votaries of intolerance have been humbled, abashed, and nearly silenced. General calumnies against our moral principles have been exploded; and our opponents are now compelled to resort to the despicable substitute of personal defamation. Much has been done by the Catholic Board towards cheering and animating the Catholic people, guiding them by constitutional principles, protecting them in many instances against local oppression, checking magisterial delinquency in others, warning them seasonably against the snares of insidious foes; and with

a presiding spirit of benevolent patriotism, the wants of the native artificer and neglected manufacturer have been affectionately consulted and their interests cherished, with parental solicitude. The very existence of such a Board has frustrated the intrigues and crushed the profane speculations of such as would traffic upon a venal misrepresentation of Catholic sentiments."

This resolution is of the utmost importance. Who, even of the Catholic leaders, can now have the effrontery to assert, that the Board met *solely for the purpose of preparing petitions to Parliament*? Is there not here what amounts to an avowal that petitioning was a mere pretence? Examine the language of this resolution. In the commencement, it "recognizes in the Board, unwearied diligence, distinguished talent, and inviolate fidelity, in the performance of its arduous duties." What are the arduous duties which the Board, thus ably and faithfully performed? They are these: 1st. It was the firm and legitimate organ of the opinions and feelings of the Catholic people. 2d. It advocated their rights and proclaimed their wrongs. 3d. It cheered and cemented them. 4th. It protected them against local oppression, and checked magisterial delinquency; and 5th it consulted the interests of the native artificer, and neglected manufacturer. After such an enumeration, can there exist in any candid mind, a doubt of this being a *representative* assembly; and of its being the settled design of its members to obtrude themselves between the people of this country, and their legitimate representatives in Parliament?

At the close of this meeting the following resolution was adopted:

"Resolved, that this meeting do adjourn to the 24th Inst. to take into consideration the form of a petition to Parliament, praying that the Catholics of Ireland may, during any further continuance of the penal and disabling laws, obtain the benefit of that principle of the constitution which gives to Aliens a jury of one half foreigners."

By this resolution two objects are effected. First, provision is made for holding another Aggregate Meeting, and thus affording further opportunity to the Catholic leaders to inflame the public mind by their Speeches: and secondly, it proclaims again to the Roman Catholics of Ireland, what was intimated by a former resolution adverted to in this address, that as the laws are at present administered, they cannot expect justice; because it may happen that a jury, consisting exclusively of Protestants, shall have to decide on their lives or properties.

We have presented these additional "Facts and Documents," almost without comment, that the Protestants of the empire may form their own judgment.

Dublin, 30th June, 1814.

THE END.