

CEASE  
YOUR FUNNING:  
OR,  
THE REBEL DETECTED.

---

“ Oh that mine Enemy would write a Book !”

---

SEVENTH EDITION,  
WITH A PREFACE, AND NOTES,  
BY THE AUTHOR.

---

D U B L I N :  
PRINTED BY JAMES MOORE,  
No. 45, COLLEGE-GREEN.

---

1799.

Houses of the Oireachtas



---

THE  
A U T H O R  
TO THE  
P U B L I C.

---

*Ecce iterum.*

HOR.

MY bookfeller being determined to publish a seventh edition of this work, I cannot deny myself the indulgence of what, I trust, is a pardonable vanity. The public will give me credit for my feelings upon the loss of the salutary measure of an Union; but it is no small consolation to me to reflect that I was the first who unmasked the pretended advocate, but concealed enemy, of that amiable, tho' unfortunate speculation. I am not of that temper, that the success of any undertaking can make an alteration in my sentiments of it—I stick to my friends in distress, and therefore I stick to the Union.—

*Victrix causa diis placuit, sed victa Catoni.*

Cato was magnanimous, and therefore the vanquished cause pleased him. I am magnanimous too, for indeed, gentle readers, the vanquished cause pleases me not a little.

It is the nature of man to be proud of prescience, even when he repines at the accomplishment of his own predictions. *Did not I tell you so?* is very common comfort.

*The*



*The author of Arguments for and against an Union* went on humbugging the world—I desired him to—*Cease his Funning*; but like Cassandra, I was not attended to, till the illuminations of Dublin, like the flames of Troy, illustrated the forebodings of the prophet. Even after my work appeared, several weak, or malignant men considered, or affected to consider him the serious, and me the jesting author; and though I wrote expressly to guard the public against irony, one dull plodding matter of fact writer absolutely libelled me by the name of Mr. *Funning*; but I have my triumph now; the event, unhappily for the nation, but fortunately for my character, has shewn that no man has done so much mischief to the cause as the scribe whom I detected, and in the debate which was so near being the *salvation of Ireland*, I had the satisfaction of hearing several of the infatuated one hundred and eleven members declare that they had been altogether and solely convinced by the perusal of *Arguments for and against an Union*.\* Many with whom I have calmly expostulated in private upon the frenzy of their opposition to an Union, have candidly confessed to me the cause of their seduction, and in the sincerity of their contrition have informed against the incendiary who (to use a phrase of the United Irishmen) had *put them up*. If more proofs were wanting, it is worthy of observation, that Mr. Sheridan in his vain but factious endeavours to prejudice the English House of Commons against the Union, absolutely grounded his whole argument upon what is vulgarly called Mr. Cooke's pamphlet, and though an orator of the most fertile and exuberant genius, yet the greatest part of his speech upon that occasion consisted in reading entire extracts from that rebellious production. However, thank heaven,

\* Well may I say infatuated *one hundred and eleven*. In the name of argument can there be a more conclusive demonstration that an 'Union' must be advantageous to Ireland than that 140 independent English gentlemen voted for it? Gentlemen (as Mr. Pitt says) *far removed from every prejudice and party motive which must prevail in the Parliament of Ireland*.

It is very observable, that the contemptible opposition of 15 members in the English House was headed by one Sheridan—A MERE IRISHMAN.



heaven, that enlightened assembly, the British Senate, were too magnanimous to reject an Union, though it *was to be the salvation of Ireland*, and have exhibited a mortifying contrast to the conduct of our own besotted legislature. And yet it is but candid to say, that if Mr. Sampson's pamphlet had been published as early, and circulated as extensively in England as it was here, the event would, most probably, have been very different. It is very remarkable (and indeed it delighted me much to see) that after Mr. Sheridan had, in the insidious manner I mention, endeavoured to mislead the House of Commons, Mr. Canning, who is well known to be a ministerial character in high confidence, publicly, on the part of government, denied, disowned, disclaimed, renounced and disavowed all manner of connection whatsoever, with that abominable pamphlet, or its author. I was proud to find this great man echoing my own sentiments, so unworthily slighted in my native land; (prophets, alas, are seldom honored in their own country) and I will confess that the cheek of the author glowed with secret satisfaction at the flattering suggestion, that, perhaps, the great Mr. Canning had in a leisure hour read *Cease your Funning*. Those who are authors can judge of the sensation I experienced; I appeal with candour even to the gentleman who, in a pamphlet, called *Impartial Review*, &c. has defamed me under the name of Mr. *Funning*. Let him conceive the delight he would feel in thinking that the right honourable John Foster perused the passage in which the *Impartial Reviewer*, decorates him with gorgeous and resplendent panegyric. Let him consider how his fancy would be tickled to think he saw another high personage writhing, as he read the biting and galling satyr, the venomous and malignant ridicule with which the author has gibbeted his character by what he has said of it; then may he understand the gratification which his friend, Mr. *Funning*, enjoys at tracing his own ideas in the great Mr. Canning's

oration :



oration :—his friend, Mr. *Funning*, thus particularly appeals to a brother author to shew him his generosity, and that he forgives the attack made upon him. Nay, he would console his fellow artist. He has certainly mistaken Mr. *Funning*, but any man may make a mistake, and some men are nothing the worse of it. For instance, a most respectable and patriotic gentleman, early in the Union controversy, answered publicly for the sentiments of a whole sect, a whole city, and a whole county; and though the sentiments of that sect, city, and county, have turned out the opposite of the three things which their sponsor promised and vowed in their name, yet the character of that respectable and patriotic gentleman is as good as it was before. Mr. *Funning* hopes this intelligence may be comfortable to the author of *An Impartial Review*, &c. In truth, I forgive all my enemies, which considering all the efforts made to depreciate my well intended publication, is a great exertion of generosity.

Even in these days of effrontery it is scarcely credible that the following advertisement could have appeared in print, and yet it was actually published in so many words in that grave and temperate news paper, called Saunders's News-Letter, a few days after my first edition came out :

“ The friends of a certain gentleman, late a state prisoner, and now on his way to Lisbon, have seen, with much indignation, in a pamphlet called “ CEASE YOUR FUNNING,” an assertion, that Mr. Sampson was the author of a work entitled, “ Arguments for and against an Union between Great Britain and Ireland considered,” they think it very illiberal to impute to an unfortunate man offences of which he never was guilty, and are anxious to declare to the public, that after experiencing the lenity of government, he is incapable of publishing so dangerous and inflammatory a libel.”

“ They



“ They desire not to be understood as giving any countenance to another malignant report, that the work in question is written by Edward Cooke, Esq. Under Secretary to his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant.”

But this was too barefaced to impose upon any one except the printer of the newspaper, and in spite of this ingenious deception, the world still pretty generally puts the fiddle upon the right horse and gives *Arguments for and against an Union* to its real author. It was very well understood that this denial by Mr. Sampson's friends might have been expected, and that a man who was capable of writing such a pamphlet, was also capable of denying it, or indeed of doing any thing else: One would suppose that the oral slander which imputed this work to Mr. Cooke was not thought sufficiently public, but that it was necessary to make it more notorious by printing the mock exculpation of that gentleman in the last sentence of the advertisement: It is easy to see through this artifice. But Mr. Cooke has himself proved in the most satisfactory manner that he never wrote the libel of *Arguments for and against*; for he absolutely in the House of Commons voted for the Union, which demonstrates that he never could have written the pamphlet, as any one must see who reads *Cease your Funning*, and Mr. Canning's speech in the British parliament. And it is very well known that Mr. Cooke, from motives of delicacy, as being an Englishman, intended not to vote upon the Irish Union, but was compelled to do so in order to shew he was not the author of *Arguments for and against*, &c. &c.

In the next place gentle reader——But hold——Mr. Moore (in whose shop I write this) tells me that if I scribble more preface, it will be impossible for him to sell this edition at the same price as the former ones, and therefore, for the sake of the Public,

I remain the Public's,

Very devoted humble Servant.



Houses of the Oireachtas



---

## Cease your Funning.

---

I LOVE wit as much as any man, but a joke may certainly sometimes be carried too far.—I have never submitted to the justice of Lord Shaftesbury's fanciful position, that *ridicule is the test of truth*, and I own I think its application is peculiarly offensive when political subjects of the deepest and most serious importance, are treated with idle levity and buffoon irony.—These sentiments have been principally excited by reading a pamphlet entitled ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST AN UNION CONSIDERED.—The Author of this work has evidently written after the model of some of Swift's lighter compositions; a style which in my apprehension has never till now been successfully imitated, tho' attempted with some talent by the supposed annotators of the late Alderman George Faulkner, and in some few other instances.

This stile consists altogether in the art of supporting in a strain of grave irony the opposite of the opinion which you mean to establish. It is a good-humoured application of the argument called by logicians *argumentum ad absurdum*;

A

but



but whether it partakes more of jest or sophism, I again protest against the use of either upon subjects of national importance and public concern. I shall briefly enumerate a few of the most prominent artifices by which the Author of this work, who I am convinced is either a member of Opposition or an absolute United Irishman, endeavours by an affected recommendation of the measure to cry down and depreciate the projected Union, the only chance of this country's salvation; premising that, in order to give a higher relish to his ridicule, he has had the address to circulate a report with very successful industry that the work in question is the production of an English gentleman of considerable talents who is an Irish member of Parliament, and in high official situation in Dublin Castle. Indeed such has been the prevalence of this report, and so well simulated is the mask assumed, that on the first perusal I was scarcely able to distinguish whether the Author was in earnest or not, and I am credibly informed that to this hour several well-meaning people continue in the erroneous opinion that he was so.

I do not pretend to trace the progress of this facetious writer regularly from page to page, but shall point out a few of his topics which appear to me sufficient to detect at once the duplicity of the style and the depth of the intention. He affects with great appearance of gravity throughout the entire pamphlet to denounce the existence of the Irish Parliament as the cause of the late



late rebellion and invasion, and he draws from these principles once established an inevitable conclusion that the return of such calamities is only to be prevented by the annihilation of the cause of them. Here, indeed, *latet anguis in Herba*. This is the very language of the United Irishmen.—The same positions, the same inferences, are to be found faintly visible in the speeches of all the Opposition members in England and Ireland, and glaringly conspicuous in every number of the Press, and Union Star; avowing themselves in the confessions of Doctor M'Nevin, proclaiming themselves in the manifestos of Arthur O'Connor. Is it not evident then that the Author in question is such as I have described him?—Is it not evident that by insidiously inferring the necessity of an Union from the corruption of the Irish Legislature, he in fact directs the attention of this deluded nation at one and the same moment to the pretence of a Reform and the project of a Separation?—He never imputes the late calamities of this country to any thing but Parliament, and so far from accusing the prevalence of French principles or the extravagance of French ambition as instrumental to our misfortunes, he never speaks of that abandoned nation without partiality and panegyric. He cannot expect that so flimsy an artifice must not be seen through by every discerning man. Every such man knows that his assertions and his arguments are equally unfounded, that his Majesty has every year since his accession



sion, returned thanks to the legislature, for the patriotism and loyalty of their conduct, and that both Lord Cornwallis and Lord Camden, have repeatedly declared (from the throne) that the discomfiture of the disaffected and rebellious, was entirely owing to the virtue, spirit, and sagacity of Parliament. It is well known that if it was not a good Parliament, it would never pass the intended Union, which is to be the *salvation of the country*, and which there is very little doubt, will be passed by a great majority\*—notwithstanding the sly opposition, and affected support, of such wolves in sheep's clothing, as the author of the pamphlet in question.

But this writer knew very well that his inference was a *non sequitur*; that in truth the Union is to be conceded to Ireland, because the Parliament is a good one, and deserves to go to a better place—and that even if the Legislature, as he insinuates, was the cause of our misfortunes, it evidently could not improve our condition, to remove these representative delinquents into a more remote theatre for the exhibition of their depravity, and give new temptation and opportunity to transgress at a distance from the controul and censure of their constituents; he saw plainly, that every

\* The event has falsified this prediction; but it is well known that several of the infatuated Members of the House of Commons who opposed the principle of this salutary measure, have declared that they were induced to do so by this abominable work. So far have the poisonous effects of *Arguments for and against an Union* extended.



every thinking mind would be struck by the disproportion of the remedy to the evil, and would of itself precipitate into the real conclusion—that so abandoned a legislature could only be corrected by radical reform, or complete dissolution. Thus have I satisfactorily proved, in this instance, that a concealed United Irishman has jesuitically assumed the style and character of a loyal Englishman, who does honour to our country by representing it, for the basest and worst of purposes.

It providentially happens, that the best concerted and best executed fraud cannot long remain undiscovered, and frequently is the instrument of discovering itself. Thus, reader, it is worth observing, how artfully this disaffected scribbler introduces an eulogy upon the French Republic. Even the incorporating Union, *which is to be the salvation of the country*, he affects to recommend principally upon the example of France, well knowing that this salutary measure stands independently upon its own intrinsic merits, and really seeking to depreciate its excellence by putting it upon an improper footing. Vide page 8 of this work, where you may find these words:—“*France has not only united to herself, and incorporated a great addition of territory, but has rendered absolutely dependent on her will almost all the smaller states which surround her.*” Mark the vile and profligate insinuation, that the consequence of our Union must be an absolute dependence of Ireland upon the will of England, whereas,



whereas, every unprejudiced man knows, that, in fact, an Union is the only thing which can secure the independence of Ireland, and ensure the salvation of the country. He proceeds—

*“ Geneva is incorporated, Savoy is incorporated, all the Austrian provinces in Flanders, all the German states on this side of the Rhine are incorporated, Spain is subject,”* &c. &c. It would be disgusting to transcribe more of this nauseous hypocrisy. The reader has already perceived the drift of it. In the first place, it seeks, by these pretended comparisons, to excite an idle national pride, and to suggest to Ireland how little her case resembles that of Geneva, (which contains about 25,000 inhabitants) or Savoy, or any petty province, or conquered enemy. But Ireland will not be diverted from her great object by such silly sophism; she knows her own greatness and dissimilitude to those affronting caricatures, and she adopts the Union upon its own intrinsic merits, and *because it is certainly to be the salvation of the country.* The second object is not less mischievous, and indeed it was scarcely to be expected that any man could have the audacity to pronounce, even under the mask of this scribe, an exaggerated and fulsome panegyric upon the enemies of his country. We all know very well for what purposes certain persons thought it proper to magnify all the exploits of the French. The invincibility of their troops was a constant theme of declamation with the paragraph writers of the Press, and other coadjutors of this pamphleteer, at the time those troops



troops were impatiently expected for the invasion of this country, and now that the *Great Nation* has been defeated in her attempt to effect an *incorporating Union* with Ireland, the same gentry find it expedient to renovate the hopes of their party after the late disappointment, and the wretch whom I am now employed in detecting, in his pretended recommendation of an Union, absolutely adopts the cant of French phraseology, and talks of establishing an united empire, *one and indivisible*.—*Vide page 9.* Nor are these the only instances in which the rebel vocabulary breaks through, and exposes the hypocrite. In page 11, the gentleman has thought proper to say—“*The king of England resides in another kingdom—the councils of the government of Ireland are framed in the British cabinet—the government of Ireland is actually administered by a British Lord Lieutenant, who distributes the patronage of the Crown—the Irish Parliament is subject to British influence, and near one million of the rents of this kingdom are annually exported to absentees—nor can this inconvenience cease whilst affairs remain as at present.*” It sometimes happens to a man, on hearing particular things, to fancy he has heard them before, and to ask himself, where did I meet this last? Just so did I feel upon perusing this passage. I rubbed my eyes, but found it was not a dream; for, on taking down an old file of the Press, which was my part of the plunder in ransacking a rebel’s house as a yeoman, I found not only the sentiments, but the identical phrases. The weak argument



gument by which he would thus injure the cause of Union is this—that if English influence at present predominates, the transplantation of our legislature will remedy the evil, and power, consequence, and government, will revert into Irish channels once more. He knew such an inference could not be swallowed by any man at the outside of Swift's hospital, and thus, in fact, wounds the cause, by an affectation of unskillfully defending it. He knows it is his premises that are false, that they are the mere cant and fabrication of the United Irishmen, that English influence does not predominate here, and that, in fact, an Union is made necessary by the unpliant and stubborn independence of the Irish parliament, as he is forced afterwards to admit and to exemplify by the mulish resistance in which the said parliament counteracted the interests of the empire upon the questions of the Regency,\* and Commercial Propositions.—*Vide page 12 and 13.* Every one knows, that after an Union such mischievous instances can never occur again, that this is the real motive for the measure, and therefore it was necessary for this cunning incendiary to throw dust in our eyes upon the subject. I shall no longer, by disguising my sentiments, follow the example of this sophist, whom I reprobate.

\* It is a melancholy reflection that the events of the 22d and 25th of January, afford another instance of the impracticable and obstinate character of the Irish Parliament. As nothing contributed so much to the defeat of the Minister upon those occasions as the pamphlet of *Arguments for and against an Union*, I wish the author, if possible, a quiet conscience.



probate. I have hitherto hinted my opinion of what he is, and shall now boldly avow my sentiments as to who he is. I have consulted several eminent political and literary personages, who all agree with me in discovering in legible characters the principles and style of a certain democratic counsellor, the well known author of *Hurdy Gurdy*, and the *Old Lion of England*, and who has recently experienced the lenity of government, in being suffered to banish himself: and for the sake of his health, to make Lisbon the scene of his exile. For shame, *Mr. Sampson*! Is this gratitude? Is this honor? Is this a return for the mercy extended to you? And had you no other way of thanking my Lord Cornwallis, than by opposing the wisest measure of his government, and by making a travesty and caricature of his Secretary, the vehicle of your malignity? — This is one of the many proofs that rigid and effectual justice ought, long since, to have been executed upon the Author of the pamphlet in question.

It is almost below criticism to notice the puerile and school-boy allegories, tropes, and metaphors of this author. Such, if a writer was serious, might be considered as innocent relaxations from reasoning, and sometimes happy, though light, illustrations of argument; but when a gibing satyrist wishes to counteract this great nation, in her struggle for such a constitutional blessing as the Union, it is evident that he must intend to ridicule both the country and the

B

measure,



measure, by comparing her successively to the Seven United Provinces, to the Sabines, to a lady going to be married, a trader going into partnership, and an awkward booby commencing his education. To the following passage I am not able, with candour, to deny the merit of wit : *If any person has a son, uneducated, unimproved, and injured by bad habits and bad company, in order to remedy these imperfections, would it not be his first endeavour to establish him in the best societies, and introduce him into the most virtuous, the most polished, and most learned company, and if he could once reconcile him to such companies, and teach him to relish their conversation, would he not be certain of his son's improvement, and of his finally turning out to his credit and satisfaction.*—(Vide page 8.)—This I admit to be witty, irresistably amusing ; no gravity can withstand the idea of Old Ireland going to school to England ; but while I pay this just tribute to the humour of the writer, I once again, and once for all, protest and exclaim, against the use of wit upon such occasions.—I trust there is too much good sense, or (as the Rt. Hon. the Attorney General says,) spirit and honor, in this nation, to be disgusted, or in any other way diverted, from the great object of an incorporating Union, either by any ludicrous or affrontive similes, or by the affectation of using weak and trifling arguments in support of it.—The real argument in support of it, stands upon a rock, and none but cloven-footed traitors pretend there is any other ;—I wish it was the only, because I am sure it is the best, argument ever



ever advanced upon the subject, and that is, *that it will certainly be the salvation of the country.*

Another topic of this work, I cannot pass by with the slight censure reluctantly imposed upon pardonable wit, and amusing bagatelle. ' It is of a more serious complexion, and betrays the suppressed United Irishman in every feature. This Gentleman affects to recommend the Union (but *non tali auxilio, &c.*) as if it would preclude the possibility of any future rebellion at home, or invasion from abroad.—If we believe him, the *existence of the Irish Parliament constitutes a disunited state of the British Empire, which leaves a particular part of it open to the attacks of France, and if that avenue of disunion should be closed, then, &c. &c.*—(Vide page 9.) Now we all know, that though an Union will certainly be the salvation of the nation, yet it is impossible that a new modification of a moral relation, can produce any change in the physical situation of the country. Under every possible mode of connexion, the coast must remain in the same geographical position as to France, and as to the probability of internal dissention, the foolish malecontents of this island, may, perhaps, be recruited by some more foolish malecontents, whom this salutary measure of an Union may disgust, in consequence of such inflammatory productions as the Pamphlet in question. Therefore we must admit, that though an Union will certainly be the salvation of the country, yet it is possible, and in *rerum natura* that after it is accomplished, there *may be* such a thing as



rebellion and invasion. What then does this Judas mean? Evidently to lull us, and England, into a fatal security on this important subject:—To persuade England of the physical impossibility of such events, and to give France an opportunity to elude our invincible fleets, and once more annoy our domestic peace;—but it is impossible I trust that the French can be so easily gulled; they have already suffered pretty smartly by taking the advice of our Author and his auxiliaries, and I appeal to every reasonable man, whether there is not every probability that even after an Union the gallant and generous nation of England will make upon a similar emergency as great, or nearly as great efforts to save this country from invasion as it did before such an event was in contemplation. As all the Irish militia will necessarily and *ipso facto* become Englishmen, and the Protestants become the majority of our people upon the establishment of the Union, (vide page 26) it will of course be useless to send over the English militia as heretofore, and therefore probably that may not be done, but I really cannot see why the English navy should not sail to our assistance after this desirable event, —we know it did so before very effectually, and therefore I think I may justly conclude that as an Union was not then found necessary to bring the English navy to our succour, so that (as far as men may conjecture about futurity) there is no great probability that there is any thing in an Union which will make it *impossible* for the same thing to happen again.



I pass by the idle and intentionally feeble inference drawn from the preference which the United States of America gave to an incorporating union over a federal one : but as I pass, must observe upon the artifice which this sly gentleman displays in recommending upon all occasions the example of avowed republicans to this loyal nation. However, let me just hint how little analagous the cases are : in the first place, after the success of the rebel arms all the States of America started upon equal terms—no one had any thing to give up to another—there was, therefore, no *stratum* for the benefits of an incorporating union, whereas in our case Ireland has a separate Legislature established for many centuries to surrender, and must naturally expect the resulting benefits to be exactly in proportion to the sacrifice made, and perhaps it is owing to this very circumstance, that America, notwithstanding all the advantages of an incorporating union, and the interposition of the Atlantic, has remained subject to French cabal and intrigue and all the mischiefs resulting from them ; whereas in Ireland, under all its peculiar circumstances, an incorporating union must *certainly be the salvation of the country*.—This Man in the Mask has really passed by the only national analogy applicable. The case of Corsica is precisely in point. Upon the acquisition of that island in this war, England was weak enough to establish a connection with it upon such federal principles as the present connection with Ireland—an English



glish Viceroy and Corfican Parliament; and what was the event? The Corfican gem dropped out of the British Crown almost as soon as it was set there, whereas had the union been incorporate, without any Parliament at all, it would certainly, as in Ireland, *have been the salvation of the country.*

I know very well what he means by the introduction of Scotland. I know he would suggest that England is divided from it as it was from Mercia by a river, and from Ireland by a sea; but the fallacy of this dark and malignant insinuation is plain to the simplest understanding. If the truth be once established, distance cannot affect it. If it be true that an incorporated union is advantageous for countries divided by a river half a mile broad, the addition of another half mile will not alter the moral, though it does the physical, position. Therefore you may add *ad infinitum*, &c. &c. Q. E. D. But as the Author remarks, example is the best of arguments, and what more pregnant example can be conceived than the case of America? America was united to England by an incorporated union, that is, by an English Government without any Parliament except that at Westminster, and though the entire Atlantic lay between them, no country was ever more happy or prosperous, or advanced more rapidly in every desirable improvement, until the unnatural and profligate rebellion which broke out in the provinces, and which ended in their separation from the parent country,



country, and which if any form of Government could have prevented, it would have been that incorporating union, the blessings of which she unmeritedly enjoyed. But it is easy to know a certain person's sentiments of that unnatural rebellion, who in page 19, panegyricizes the virtues of Washington, and the sagacity of Adams, and who if the late dreadful rebellion had succeeded here, would have spoken with equal sincerity of the virtues of Holt and the sagacity of O'Connor. In speaking of Scotland, I know, too, that he would suggest to our minds discouraging ideas: For instance, that though Edinburgh has considerably improved since the Union, yet that the two events stand not in the relation of cause and effect to each other, and that such a city in the same space of time must at all events have advanced. This is certainly flimsy, for who can tell what might have been the situation of Edinburgh at this day if there had not been an union? Most probably the luxury that would have been induced by the residence of a Court and Legislature would long before now have been its destruction, and it might at this hour be a heap of ruins.

He also must have wished to insinuate that all the avenues of ambition and promotion being fortunately closed in Scotland by the Union, Scotsmen are proverbial emigrants, and are obliged to transplant themselves into England, where their success in pushing their fortunes is a source of endless ridicule and national jealousy, and



and where in spite of all their pains in asserting themselves to be Britons and not Scotsmen, the surly natives never fail to remind them that they are not Englishmen. Certainly this is true; but how entirely does the application fail as to Ireland, whose natives have always been popular and favourite characters in England. We know no jealousy ever exists in the bosom of an Englishman towards an Hibernian, and that the males and females of that liberal nation have always vied in paying compliments to their fortunate neighbours. Neither does the example of Scotland militate against our adoption of an Union, for though there have been two rebellions in 80 years, and though in spite of an incorporating Union the French contrived to intrigue there lately, and Muir, Palmer, and others, preached republicanism and the pike philosophy in that happy province, yet we all know that all this happened AFTER the Union, whereas in Ireland, the Union being subsequent to such misfortunes, must completely extinguish the possibility of their revival, and *be in every sense the salvation of the country.*

I come now to the most unprincipled part of this work. Every body knows that one of the strongest and most unanswerable arguments in favour of an Union is that it must of necessity extinguish all religious animosities, and for ever silence the discordance of sectarious conflicts. For instance, it is obvious that the Catholics  
can



can never hereafter complain of not participating in the constitution, because there will be no constitution for them to participate in ; and that they will have nothing to ask from their Protestant brethren, because their Protestant brethren will have nothing to give them ; and on the other hand, the Protestants can have no alarm lest their privileges should be taken from them, when they will have nothing to be robbed of.—This equitable and natural composition of claims, which otherwise must have clashed in endless discord, has almost without an exception, reconciled both parties in a common unanimity of approbation, to a measure which demonstrably *will be the salvation of the country*. But how does this abandoned hireling of a desperate faction, endeavour to distort this happy circumstance, and frustrate so desirable a consummation ?

Forsooth he laments, with hypocritical quotation, in page 22, *that it is a consummation devoutly to be wished, but never to be expected* ; and in order to tear open and fester the gaping wounds of his languishing country, he labours to disgust both religions against the Union, by affecting to represent it as exclusively advantageous to each.—He argues that each religion is to be bettered at the expence of the other, and that both must gain, because each must lose.—To the Catholic he affects to say, while the present order of things continues, the Protestant Ascendancy must be

C

maintained ;



maintained ;—there is no getting rid of it—the King's Coronation Oath—the Test Laws—the Constitution in Church and State—all stand in your way ;—Government wish to serve you, but the Constitution is a Gordian Knot of difficulties, and there is no way but cutting it asunder ; What will signify an Irish Act of Parliament, if the Irish Parliament itself is out of the way ?—His Majesty can have no further scruples about his oath, when his Irish Parliament have made free with theirs ; in an Union all difficulties will vanish, and then who knows what the King and British Parliament, may hereafter do for you. This is a just paraphrase of the topics he addresses insidiously to the Catholics—for this very purpose, that they should see the tendency of his sophisms, and be prejudiced against that Union, *which is to be the salvation of the country.* To the Protestants he says, the Catholics are the majority now—nothing but an Union can make them the minority. For though four Catholic Irishmen, are more numerous than one Protestant Irishman, yet if to the latter you add ten Protestant Englishmen, the Protestant Irishmen will then exceed the Catholic Irishmen, in the proportion of eleven to four.—Hasten then, to work this sum, and avail yourselves of political arithmetic—Besides, your True Blue politics are going out of fashion—(*Vide page 52*)—*Who will be a guarantee of that system, and whom will it content ? The Catholics will not acquiesce in its propriety—A party of Protestants in Ireland, term it unjust and absurd—*  
*another*



*Another party in England term it by fouler names, great leaders in Opposition, possibly the future Ministers of England, may condemn it, and some members of the British Cabinet are supposed to be adverse to it. Its stability may depend upon accident, upon the death of a single character, upon the change of a minister, or the temper of a Lord Lieutenant; the policy of this system is much doubted by the people of England, and while your Parliament exists, you are never secure against such contingencies.—And again, in page 26—Great Britain is not pledged upon any specific principle to support one sect in Ireland, more than another—I know not by what tie she is debarred from assisting the Catholics, while the kingdoms remain separate—that is, in other words, perhaps in the next rebellion, the English may join the Catholics against the Protestants. No comparison is too ludicrous for such trash as this, and indeed I am fatigued with serious resentment against such absurd profligacy. It is like an old finner, clapping two boys on the back, to make them break each other's heads, while he runs away with the prize for which they contend. It is like a fraudulent groom porter, proclaiming the odds in favour of one gambler, while he whispers them in favour of the other—or a sharper looking over, and advising one hand, while he is making signs on his fingers to the adversary. It is impudently, and for disaffected purposes, representing Government as an Auctioneer, setting the blessings of an Union up to a puff auction, threatening the Protestants that they will be outbid by the Catholics, and the Catho-*



lics that the Protestants will get the market ; and presumptuously imputing to Lord Cornwallis's administration, the abominable and Machiavelian principle of *divide & impera*, which is in reality the badge of the United Irishmen, and other confederates of that audacious pamphleteer.— A gang of swindlers in London (a place notorious for such gentry) hired an alley which communicated from one public street to another. At each end stood one of the gang, and vociferated “ *Walk into the auction, great bargains, walk into the auction.* ” The deluded passengers, who were quietly going the broad way to St. Paul's cathedral, listened to the voice of the charmer, and stepped in ; while, at the other side, the equally deluded croud going through *Ave-Maria-lane* did the same. What was the consequence ? They knocked their heads together in the dark, and the remainder of the robbers picked the pockets of both. Such would be the despicable images justly applicable to the British nation and cabinet, if this shameless scribbler was a true representative of their sentiments, but we know very well the magnanimity of that nation and cabinet in conceding this Union to Ireland, *which is to be the salvation of the country*, and we will not be inflamed by such scandalous misrepresentation. We know that government is incapable of such monstrous and depraved duplicity as to say to the Catholics, emancipation can never be granted till there is an Union ; and to say to the Protestants, emancipation can never be refused till there



there is an Union. In the treating of this topic the rebel blood breaks out in spite of every concealment—Vide page 19. The old inflammatory topic is put forward, that *nine-tenths of the property of Ireland are in the hands of British descendants, and that these Protestants thus possessing nine-tenths of the property, are only one-fourth of the inhabitants in number, and have been obliged to rely upon British assistance for the preservation of their property and existence.* This once more, as in a former passage, suggests to the Catholic Irish the desperate project which the United Irishmen have ever proclaimed as the only chance of recovering their rights, a separation from England, and yet the same man who urges this argument of the Catholic numbers as conclusive upon the occasion, affects in another passage to recommend an Union upon the specific merits of its annihilating that argument altogether—Vide page 26. In the event of an Union *the Catholics would lose the advantage of the argument of numbers which they at present enjoy.* But, alas, this is not mere nonsense—human wickedness is equal to such a flight, though human folly is not. The sophist well knew, that the inferences founded upon the numbers of the Catholics are no more affected by the numbers of the English Protestants than by the number of Dutch, Swiss or American Protestants, and that before and after an Union, whether the English nation were Jews, Turks, or Anabaptists, the Catholics in Ireland would continue the majority of the people, and all arguments



guments and expectations drawn from that fact, whether justly or otherwise, remain precisely as before. But this is neither more or less than a hint to the disaffected part of the Catholics, to turn this sophism to their own purposes. It teaches them to say—if we are the minority of the empire, the danger of our claims, which results from our numbers, and with which you alarm the Protestant, vanishes; and if we are the majority, you establish our right to emancipation upon the very same principle that you establish the rights of the Protestants. Vide page 23. *Every state ought to establish that religious sect which is most numerous.*

In page 53, already cited, among other dangers incident to the Protestant interest, while the legislatures remain separate, we find that its stability may rest upon accident, upon the death of a *single* character. The word *single* is printed in italics. Reader, restrain your indignation when this is explained to you. It is generally conceived, in consequence of the misrepresentations of the United Irishmen, that his present Majesty is hostile to a further emancipation of the Irish Catholics, but that the heir apparent to the crown entertains different sentiments upon that subject. Observe, then, this incendiary, with affected zeal for the established religion, running the king's life against the Protestant ascendancy, but, in reality, suggesting to the Catholics the short cut to the accomplishment of their wishes. It required more than ordinary presumption to introduce into a work, affecting

to



to recommend that measure *which is to be the salvation of the country*, the blasted assassination principles of the Union Star, and to point out the beloved father of his people to his loyal subjects as an obstacle to their prospects, which only can be removed by the termination of his life. Indeed the mischievous principle which pervades the whole work is (to use a colloquial expression) *the putting bad things into one's head*, under the subtle pretence of doing general good. It reminds me of a familiar, though innocent illustration. Some college students were inflicting the discipline of the pump upon one of those unpopular characters called a bailiff, who had been detected in violating the academic sanctuary. A senior fellow who was a *spectator* of the punishment, and who, though bound to enforce collegiate decorum, entertained the usual antipathy to the sheriff's officer, exclaimed, "fye, lads, don't be cruel, don't nail the man's ear to the pump." The youths, who had not before thought of this improvement, thanked the preceptor for his hint, and the unhappy victim was accordingly affixed to the instrument of his disgrace.\*

In page 31 occurs a passage worthy of observation.—"*It does not follow, that if an Union were made*

\* It has been long suspected that the author of *Arguments for and against an Union*, was not entirely ignorant of the *Union Star*. I should scorn to insult exiled and humbled guilt, if the base trick of imputing the first work to Mr. Cooke, did not warrant every severity. It is of a piece with the English Opposition last year, accusing the Irish Government of writing the *Union Star* themselves.



*made, that the government of Ireland would be less vigilantly administered ; it would probably be administered with more attention, because it would be less distracted by the business of party and of parliament, and for the same reason it would be administered more impartially."*

In the first place, this is a malignant and slanderous calumny against government in general, and not merely insinuates, but proclaims that government hitherto has not only not been administered vigilantly and impartially, but has been *distracted*. In that general slander is also included much private defamation of Major Sirr, Inspector Shee, Mr. Gregg, the gaoler of Newgate, Mr. Justice Swan, and other active and cool officers in the executive department.\* Secondly, it impudently asserts that such the misconduct and frenzy of government is owing to that very patriotic parliament which is about to pass a measure for *the salvation of the country* ; and thirdly, it seeks to inflame and stir up the good people of England against their legislature, by advancing an argument which, if pushed, would conclude against the existence of all parliaments whatsoever, and at once demonstrate the pre-eminent superiority of an absolute monarchy, not disturbed by any *distractions* but its own. This sophist well knew the maxim—" he who proves too much proves nothing ;"

\* The fly hint against Mr. Cooke, whose services in this department no one can say enough of, is also obvious. Indeed it is pretty plain that Mr. Cooke is no friend of the author of *Arguments for and against an Union*, and whatever be the cause, he has done him all the mischief in his power. One would suppose that this Gentleman had committed him.



nothing ;” and with affected simplicity exposes himself to the application of it. But, in truth, it is very possible that the mixed government may be best for England, and the pure executive for Ireland. However, even though it were to be admitted that the liberty of the subject is secured by the responsibility which the executive owes to the legislative, yet the British executive who will hereafter govern this country, *undistracted* by an Irish parliament, being composed of men of honor, they will find themselves bound in honor to feel that responsibility encreased, in proportion to the distance at which it resides, and therefore, in fact, the principles of the Irish Constitution, moving in an orbit more remote from the focus of the prerogative, will be attracted thereto in the encreased ratio of their own centrifugal force. Besides, if hereafter any ill-advised Lord Lieutenant should be tempted to make any unconstitutional attempt in his Government, a direct appeal can be made upon the subject, with a reasonably fair wind to the Parliament of the empire, in about four days, and as from the encreased numbers of imperial senators, there will be much more time for public business, than formerly, there may be always expected a debate, and satisfactory determination upon the subject, to be known in Ireland, (wind and weather still permitting) in about ten days more, unless it should unfortunately happen to be the time of the Session allotted for Measures of Finance, or English Turnpike Bills, and in the interval, whatever

D

little



little encroachment has been made by the prerogative, will only have been *de bene esse*, and the same instance will probably not recur, soon after the law has been settled upon the subject.

In page 48, this disaffected man almost openly charges Government with taking advantage of a season of war and confusion, to force an Union upon the Irish people, whereas, in truth, that very circumstance demonstrates the magnanimity of Great Britain, inasmuch as the greater are our calamities, the greater is our necessity for a measure which is to be *the salvation of the country*.—But mark the manner of this slander. *As to a time of war, it is true that the Volunteers took advantage of the embarrassments of Great Britain in the last war, to assert the Independence of our Parliament.—It is likewise true, that the United Irishmen in the present war, have taken advantage of the supposed weakness of Great Britain, to play the game of separation.—When, therefore, enemies of the empire take advantage of a time of war and embarrassment to effect its ruin, we should turn against them their own game, and make use of a time of war, to establish its security.* What is this but to say the Volunteers were no better than the United Irishmen, and that Lord Cornwallis's government is as bad as either of them. Observe the generalship of this masterly position—he posts his favourite corps, the United Irishmen, in the centre, and flanks them with the Volunteers, and Lord Cornwallis's administration.—He knows too how popular the memory of the Volunteers is with all loyal subjects in the  
country,



country, and that the Lord Chancellor, and all the great officers of state, are proud to have belonged in their youth, to that immortal association; and yet in so many words, he stiles them *the enemies of the empire, who took advantage of a time of war and embarrassment, to effect its ruin.*—Can the views of this disguised traitor be any longer disguised?

In the same manner that he has halloed the Protestants against the Catholics, in the hopes of their joining in a common cry against the salutary measure which is to be *the salvation of the country*, has he endeavoured to commit all the classes of society in pernicious jealousies against each other, the Lawyer against the Merchant, the Man of Landed Property against both the Clergy and the Dissenters, and the Dublin Citizen against the Inhabitant of Cork. To all these several descriptions, he successively affects to demonstrate their peculiar and exclusive advantages, at the expense of all the rest, in the corrupt expectation of uniting them all (as I foresee will be the case,) in one common opposition to the measure. This man for his own abandoned purposes, would set the two breasts on the same bosom against each other. *To demonstrate (says he) to the Clergy the advantage of an Union, would be lost labour indeed. (Vide page 37.)* And yet, (*in page 56*) he affects to give as the 8th Article of the Union, an *arrangement* with respect to tythes.—We all know what an *arrangement* that factious crew to which he belongs would make in that respect.—He wishes to disgust the



Rebels against an union, which is to be so advantageous to the Clergy, and to terrify the Clergy from a measure which is to be accompanied by an arrangement with regard to tythes ; one would suppose he did not expect any one would read his whole pamphlet, but that each part would be studied by those it was intended to mislead. In one and the same page (32,) he affects to conciliate the Dissenters, by urging inducements irreconcilably contradictory. They too, like the Catholics, are to be appeased with a burnt-offering of tythes—they too, like the Protestants, are to be reinforced numerically, by the accession of Scotch and English Dissenters ; and yet, in the same page they are told, that the inevitable consequence of the measure, must be the annihilation of their sect, and their necessary merging in the mass of the Protestants. The author knew that no man writing in a strain of such profligate inconsistency, could be supposed to be in earnest, and he advisedly, at once subjects the measure of an Union, to reprobation, and the defence of it to ridicule. In page 33, the temporal peers are insidiously reminded, that nothing will be left to them but their properties ; and are insultingly informed, that being allowed to retain their properties, will be more than a compensation for the loss of their consequence ; while the spiritual peers are told, that *they will be amply recompenced by the security given to their Diocesan Estates, and to the general interests of the Church ;*—and what is that security, and what are those interests ?—That desertion of the Protestant



testant interest, and that arrangement of tythes which are promised to the Catholics and Dissenters as the reward of their acquiescence. It is easy to see that the same unprincipled attempt is made in the passage addressed to Country Gentlemen, and that they are scarcely mentioned in the pamphlet except for the purpose of invidious classification, and of shewing them their interests as contradistinguished from the profession of the law and the mercantile community; whereas in truth all ranks, trades, and professions are equally concerned in this momentous measure.

To the merchants the Author evidently insinuates with his characteristic artifice that none of the expected commercial advantages are necessarily connected with an Union, and that in the present system of connexion a liberal and honest policy on the part of England would communicate this participation of privileges as effectually as under any other modification of the relation between the two countries. This is evident by the insinuations in pages 38, 39, and 40, that the English will never consume Irish corn, until there be a Union; that they will violate national faith in regard of the Irish linen manufacture unless there be an Union; that unless that measure takes place they will never make use of the great canals which they have extended to Liverpool and other western ports, but like the dog in the manger, will deny the enjoyment of these benefits both to us and themselves. This nonsense could never have been written with any view but  
that



that of fomenting national jealousy, and representing the magnanimous nation of England as a monster of mean injustice, and cruel illiberality. This nonsense would represent our generous neighbours buying our Constitution with their Commerce, commuting their substantial advantages for our illusory pride, and content to injure themselves provided they degrade us. Whereas every one knows the reverse to be true. It is well understood and universally believed that the English have long determined upon the most liberal equalization of the commercial privileges of both nations; that such an event is by no means dependent upon the measure of an Union, but concurrent with it, and that the only reason for making the two circumstances cotemporary is the wish of heaping favour upon favour till the compliment overpowers us.

This reservation of the one boon until it can be accompanied by the other, is evidently the dignified and munificent intention of Great Britain, and as nothing manifests an handsome intention so much as a handsome manner, it particularly appears from the guarded and delicate silence preserved upon the quantity, degree and nature of the commercial blessings in reserve for us; not affronting this great nation by a mean numerical detail of paltry items, but enveloping the benefice in an indefinite mysteriousness, so as to take us by surprise, and confound us, as it were, by the magnitude of advantages which we had no opportunity of calculating. It is important, therefore,



therefore, that this unfortunate Scribe should not be suffered to misrepresent this matter. Indeed, wicked as his insinuations are, they have not the merit of originality : I remember on the debate of the Irish Propositions in the English House of Commons another factious character, Mr. Fox, said with epigrammatic affectation, *I would not give the Commerce of England for the Constitution of Ireland : It is not the thing I wish to purchase, nor the price I wish to pay,* This foolish and reprobated notion of compromise, where there is nothing but munificence on one hand and gratitude on the other, is adopted by the pamphleteer, but, I trust, is now sufficiently exposed. The rational Irish merchant knows that the Union is *to be the salvation of the country,* and that is as much as he wishes to know about it. The opinion I have here combated is pressed by the enemies of both nations for obvious purposes. The benefits to be acquired by an Union must be either such as are obtained by compact between the countries, or such as are the natural operation and result of the measure itself. Now in this case the advantages to be contracted for, whether for Dublin, Cork, Waterford, Limerick, or Galway, are altogether out of the question, inasmuch as they are all equally attainable under the present connection, and as the two countries are already imperially connected, there could be no honest or rational motive assignable, why they are not at present imparted, (especially as such benefits could continue only while the connection



connection exists) except the generosity of Britain wishing to make each kindness more valuable, by giving them all at once. But because that description of advantage is out of the question, we always hear of it from the enemies of the measure, who entirely overlook, or affect to do so, the benefits which naturally result from the measure itself, which flow from the mere fact of Union, and are created simply by the transfer of legislation. It would be useless to detail the particulars of such benefits, honorable confidence has already given credit for them, and sceptical incredulity is proof against conviction. A few of those which the transplantation of Parliament must instantly, *and of itself*, generate, are, the total oblivion of all religious animosities, the immediate conversion and repentance of the United Irishmen, the multiplication of the Protestants, and consequent satisfaction of the Catholics, the rush and influx of English capital into this peaceable and contented country, the improvement of agriculture, by the brotherly and edifying intercourse of English and Irish farmers, the diminution of absentees and taxes, the reduction of an expensive standing army, the improvements of the metropolis, peace with the French, and glory with the world!—These are but a few of the blessings necessarily connected with the simple fact of changing the seat of legislation. Blessings innumerable, and which only can be described by saying, *that the measure must be the salvation of the country.*

I am



I am sorry to find that it is not unnecessary to caution this credulous country, against the artifice of this disaffected hypocrite.—I lament, that since these sheets were begun, his subtle and malignant poison has taken effect, in one member of the national body.—I lament that a description of men, whom I respect so much as the Bar of Ireland, has not been able to resist the infection, and I have the vanity to regret, that they had irreparably erred, before this publication could appear, to warn them of their danger.—However, my resentment to the dupes merges in my superior indignation against the impostor, and candour compels me to remember, that if it were not for the audacious pamphlet in question, most probably 166 Irish lawyers would never have disgraced their profession and themselves by publicly denouncing to the nation a measure which *is to be the salvation of the country*. This libeller knew the strings upon which to touch the profession, and by affecting to represent their possible objections to an Union as frivolous, has, in reality, made them the subject of the liveliest anxiety and irritation. Thirty-two independent and public spirited characters have certainly rescued the Bar from universal opprobrium; they may be considered by an ominous coincidence of numbers as so many county representatives, and in that respect, as speaking (*ex cathedra*) the sentiment of the kingdom—but it is melancholy to see the extended corruption of 166 men, all influenced by the expectation of



sitting in parliament, and desperately monopolizing more than half the representation of the people, and upon this base and selfish principle resisting the *salvation of their country*. God knows there were lawyers enough before in the House of Commons, as the writer truly has stated (page 35,) *a formidable phalanx*. Of our 300 members there are no less than 17 practising barristers, and at least a dozen more, who, though they never followed the trade, were bred to that unconstitutional profession. This is bad enough, but no honest Irishman can be sufficiently grateful for the prevention of 166 more from sitting in the next parliament. It is lamentable to see the best and most respectable characters stoop before the idols of ambition. Even Mr. Saurin, who, during \* Lord Camden's administration, was in his cool senses, and refused the office of Solicitor General and a seat in parliament, has suffered his quiet and sober intellect to be inflamed by the artful insinuations of this rebel in disguise, and has for ever lost his reputation with his country and profession, and for what? For the idle speculation of sitting at the head of 166 lawyers in the next House of Commons. This passage in the pamphlet was intended for more than the Bar. The author sily reminds us (page 34) that it is the habit of Irish gentlemen to educate their sons as lawyers,

\* That nobleman was weak enough to treat the profession of the law with respect, and their armed association with affection, but the more vigorous intellect, which distinguishes the administration of his successor has appreciated the bar and the yeomanry with more justice.



lawyers, and by this hint that there is scarcely a gentleman's family in the kingdom which has not some dear connection in the profession, he hopes to engage the whole class of our gentry in one common resentment with those whom he exclusively appears to inflame, while he makes sure of the indignation of both by one round assertion, (page 35) that what is *bad for the Bar, must, of necessity, be good for the country.* Another most deep, and, indeed, ingenious scheme, in order to deter the Bar from an Union, is a positive denunciation, that, in the event of an Union, there will be *abler* judges upon the bench than at present. Vide page 35. This had the desired effect with Mr. Saurin, Mr. Duquerry, Mr. Fletcher, Mr. Plunket, and some other Irish smatterers in law. This was an evil, the prospect of which they could not bear. They find it easy now to humbug Lords Kilwarden and Carleton, and Judges Downes, Chamberlaine, Smith and George. They can hood-wink Lord Yelverton at Nisi Prius, and in Equity the facility and softness of Lord Clare is so proverbial, that the lowest attornies daily out-wit and over-reach him. But there would be an end to this hopeful trade if the bench were filled with *abler* judges, as in the event of an Union, from the superior learning of the English bar, there is every probability it would.\*

The

\* A late law promotion may demonstrate to the Bar, how little they have to fear from the patronage of their profession being in an Union Government.



The notion of *young adventurers who have little stake in the country, but a facility of speaking on every subject*, (page 35) was not intended to affront the bar, as might at first appear, but to excite their emulation, and stimulate their ambition, and it unfortunately has had the desired effect. The bar must have observed instances of young adventurers from another nation, who had *no stake* in this country, or any other, and *no facility* of speaking upon any subject, but merely a facility of writing, (and that too with *clerical errors*) upon some subjects, who yet contrived to rise from the lowest, to the highest, situations; and they inferred, that they ought not to be excluded from such pretensions, merely because they are Gentlemen by birth and education.

The truth is incontrovertible, though it appears in the pamphlet in question, and that is, that the bar are too fond of politics. Shortly before the French came to Bantry Bay, the bar, in a political fury, took up arms, which they have not yet laid down, and, under the vain idea of defending the country, they not only wasted their own time, but inspired all over the kingdom a similar and general idleness. In the time of the rebellion this mischief was at its height, and no man could get his business out of the hands of a lawyer. He was never to be found at home, but indulging upon guard, or dissipating in camp; and I am convinced, if, for near six months, the attornies had not been equally indolent, that the complaints of clients would have been innumerable. But  
this,



this, though inconvenient to others, was, most of all, inconvenient to the United Irishmen, and hence the resentment and venom of this hackney scribe.—*Hinc illæ lachrymæ* However, I trust the bar will come to their senses, though for a moment led away by this profligate sophist. I trust they will, even if against their own interest, concur heartily in a measure which *must be the salvation of the country*. But, even their most selfish interests, in my apprehension, must be promoted by an Union. The Irish gentlemen who will emigrate for the good of their country, must borrow money to support the expence of English living, upon mortgages of their Irish property. This must multiply foreclosure causes, and the encrease of ejectments, and other actions for non-payment of rent in the city Dublin will be incalculable.

I pass by, with contempt, the insinuation in (page 39,) that this popular measure is, in the city of Dublin, to be supported by force, as *being the head-quarters of the army*.|| The city of Dublin will derive more benefits from this measure than my short limits will suffer me to enumerate. Its beauty (to mention but one instance) will be considerably contributed to by the desirable introduction of *Rus in Urbe* in several parts of it. This, together with the ascertained advantage which Dublin must derive, after the Union, by getting rid, altogether, of that riotous and troublesome description of men,

the

|| The appointment of Colonel Coote to the command of the Queen's County Militia, is a demonstration that coercion is not intended.



the manufacturers in the Earl of Meath's liberty, demonstrates, that, in spite of this flagitious firebrand's insinuations, this city will be benefited by an Union as much as Cork, or Waterford, or any other place in the kingdom. I touch, with equal contempt, upon the crafty hint, that parliament is incompetent to its own dissolution. He repeats the sophism of Rousseau in defence of suicide—that reason being given to man to atchieve happiness, he has a right to destroy himself whenever it tells him that death is preferable to life. He knows that delusive argument was easily answered by Rousseau himself, and therefore urges it as a mock defence for what he hints to be a political suicide. The object of Parliament, says he, is general good. Now if general good is attainable by self-destruction—*ergo*, &c. &c. This would be very school-boyish if it was not very wicked.

This topic is, (upon the plan of the work) strongly enforced, by being weakly combated ;—one example is worth a dozen arguments.—In the reign of Oliver Cromwell, the Long Parliament perpetuated itself by a vote.—History informs us of the good consequences of that measure.—Of course, a *multo fortiori* ; if Parliament has a right to perpetuate, it has a right to destroy, itself. I shall conclude now with two remarks :

1st—This infamous production labours to establish one proposition :—That no man can agree to an Union, unless impelled to do so by the most  
abject



subject fear, or most abandoned corruption ; whereas, in truth, all good men concur in their approbation of it, upon the most enlarged conviction, (independent and regardless of all paltry detail) *that the measure will be the salvation of the country.*

2d—That there is demonstration of the utility of the measure, from one circumstance :—That during the successive reigns of various Viceroy's, no English secretary had ever the public spirit to propose this important revolution, but that as soon as an amiable young nobleman of our own nation assumed the reins of government, the first measure of his administration was *the salvation of his country.*

Lord Castlereagh, uninfluenced by the selfish examples of his English predecessors, felt the Irish blood running in his veins, and determined it should never blush in his face—his country, and posterity, will do him justice\*.

The pamphlet I have answered, I do not hesitate to pronounce, the most audacious, profligate, and libellous production, which ever disgraced the licentiousness of the press, or insulted the feelings of a nation.—A bad head, and a bad heart, must have concurred to compose it, and the most unblushing and unfeeling effrontery, alone, was equal to the publication of it.—I rely upon the wisdom and spirit of the British Parliament, in which my country is so soon to be represented, not to suffer it to escape with impunity, and I trust

\* I hate old proverbs and vulgar adages.—One most illiberal one is contradicted by this Nobleman's conduct ; that if you put an Irishman on a spit, you can always get another to turn him.



trust one of the first motions made in the Imperial Legislature, may be—" That his Majesty's  
 " Attorney General, the Rt. Hon. John Toler,  
 " or Captain Taylor, the Lord Lieutenant's Aid-  
 " de-Camp, may be ordered to prosecute the Au-  
 " thor, Printer, and Publisher, of the said Libel,  
 " by Indictment, Information, or Court-Martial,  
 " as the circumstances of the case may require."

FINIS.