

MISCONCEPTIONS OF FACTS,
AND
MISTATEMENTS
OF
THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS,
Etc. Etc. Etc.

By THE RT. HON. JOHN FOSTER.

BEING A SECOND APPENDIX TO
"UNION, OR SEPARATION."

[The attention of the House of Lords was called by the *Marquis of Lansdown*, to "Union or Separation," as "containing more sound sense, more knowledge, and more experience of the world, than volumes which had been written on the subject."

FIFTH EDITION.

✉ The following authority may satisfy the reader, that
the Author's statements are founded on Authentic
Documents, and faithfully extracted :

SIR,

*Agreeably to the request, contained in your Note
to me of Friday last, I have compared the EXTRACTS, which
you sent me, with the ACCOUNTS that I laid before the
HOUSE OF LORDS and HOUSE OF COMMONS: and I find
them CORRECTLY STATED.*

I am, Sir, &c. &c.

THOMAS IRVING,

INSPECTOR-GENERAL'S OFFICE,

Custom-house, London.

July 1, 1799.

To the Rev. Dr. Clarke.

MISCONCEPTIONS OF FACTS,

AND

MISTATEMENTS

OF

THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS,

BY

THE RIGHT HON. JOHN FOSTER,

SPEAKER

OF

The Irish House of Commons,

PROVED & CORRECTED

ACCORDING TO THE OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS

AND AUTHENTIC EVIDENCE OF

THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF GREAT BRITAIN.

IN

A LETTER TO WM. JOHNSON, Esq.

Member of the Irish Parliament,

FROM THE REV. DR. CLARKE,

SECRETARY FOR THE LIBRARY, AND CHAPLAIN IN ORDINARY TO

HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS THE PRINCE OF WALES.

—D U B L I N :—

PRINTED FOR J. MILLIKEN, 32, GRAFTON STREET.

1800.

RECONCEPTIONS OF FACTS

AND

STATEMENTS

OF

THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

THE RIGHT HON. JOHN FOSTER

SECRETARY

THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

PROVED & CORRECTED

ACCORDING TO THE OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS
AND STATISTICAL EVIDENCE OF

THE NATIONAL GENERAL OF GREAT BRITAIN

IN

A LETTER TO WM. JOHNSON, ESQ.

Member of the Irish Parliament

FROM THE REV. DR. CHARLES

SECRETARY FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS
THE GREAT BRITAIN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

DUBLIN

PRINTED BY J. MILLIKEN, 24, GRAYSON STREET.

1800.

MISCONCEPTIONS OF FACTS,
AND
MISTATEMENTS
OF
THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS,
Éc. Éc. Éc.

My Dear Sir,

IN order to give vigor to the Laws, power to the Rights, increase to the Commerce, improvement to the Morals, and security to the Property and Lives of our Fellow-Subjects, your efforts have not been wanting, through support of an Union.* To be connected with you, in such things, is a public satisfaction, to which my mind is not insensible.

Far be it from me, however, while I value your opinions, to depreciate wantonly, those of other men. The judgments of ignorance should rather be shaken off in silence; or let to fall of their own accord, like dew drops from the lion's mane. But there are opinions which claim notice, because they derive authority from the rank of their author. Falling from on high they make impression, and uttered in places of great consequence, they come forth with importance. Mr. Foster's speech in the Parliament of Ireland is of this cast.

* See Mr. Johnson's "Letter to Mr. Spencer, on the "Union": also, his "Reasons for an Union."

It is now before the British public, after having been corrected by himself;* and consequently, it rests with every man here to embrace those truths, or confute those errors, which Mr. Foster would impress upon us, while he instructs us on a measure of such magnitude to the empire. I feel myself, however, particularly called upon to do justice to myself, without arrogating a claim to any thing, except what the simplest humility cannot surrender—truth. Because, if those representations of Mr. Foster's on the commerce of Ireland be true,—mine, which I have given under the sanction of official documents, must be false

In order, therefore, to judge justly upon whose side the errors lie, the same authority shall be resorted to, which Mr. Foster quotes to accredit his assertions: I mean that of Mr. Irving, Inspector General of the imports and exports of Great Britain. And, according to this evidence, I commit the business to the just tribunal of public decision.

The official accounts given into Parliament by Mr. Irving, will appear, however, to have been grossly, I do not say wilfully, misstated by Mr. Foster. And the great end or conclusions which this perversion of the public accounts goes to establish is:—first; the trade of Ireland affords such advantages to Britain, that all apprehensions of being deprived of it, in case an Union be rejected, are idle on the part of Ireland.

The next proposition which Mr. Foster's arguments present against an Union is one that is founded on an assumption of facts, or of things as facts, but which have no existence. And the end or consequence aimed at, through this assumption is—that all extension of the commerce of Ireland, in the establishment or participation of the great articles of British manufacture, in consequence of an Union, is radically impossible.

* According to the Publisher's advertisement in the Newspapers.

To these two heads or questions, all that Mr. Foster's book contains on commerce may be reduced; one of which tells the Irish they cannot lose their trade, if they refuse an Union; and the other, that they cannot extend it, if they embrace an Union—*therefore, let them reject it.* But we shall find his conclusions presently crumble all about him.

However, though his edifice be pulled down to the foundation, I do not mean that he should be hurt, by a single stone of the ruin. I therefore premise, through respect for even Mr. Foster's erroneous opinions, that his mistatements, I doubt not, have arisen from misconceptions. For that must be called a misconception, which differs, unintentionally, from the reality of things. That must also be called a misconception, when any person, (as I shall shew Mr. Foster, has done) gives two different opinions upon one and the same point. And that must be called a mistatement, where a man swerves from the fair official accounts, which he tells you are his authority: and tells you, that he quotes them *accurately*, while he shifts the sums, and shifts the denominations.

Now let us consider, in detail, those misconceptions and mistatements.

FIRST POINT.—*Does the trade of Ireland afford such advantages to Britain, that all apprehensions of being deprived of it, are idle on the part of Ireland?*

The reverse of this is demonstrated by the Inspector General's accounts, as clearly as arithmetical evidence can do, and as incontrovertibly, as any mathematical proof whatever. These accounts fairly and obviously shew that the trade is infinitely more beneficial to Ireland, than to Britain: the same accounts, therefore, cannot prove the direct contrary, as Mr. Foster says he makes them do, but by great perversion. Let us examine this.

In the trade of raw articles, which are certainly of the first consequence, because, being the materials of manufacture, we

may call them the elements of industry, Mr. Foster states, (p. 80. of his speech published here) that there is a "balance of supply to Great Britain" of nearly *two millions and an half*: (See Table A.)—If this were really the case, and the trade in fact so advantageous to Great Britain, I must agree with any man that there were little danger of Ireland's being deprived of it. I find, however, by the Inspector General's accounts, that instead of this "balance of supply to Britain," this part of the trade is most indisputably a *Loss* to her, by a balance of above *three hundred thousand pounds*: (See Table B.) So that, in fact, *Mr. Foster's account*, is TWO MILLIONS and SEVEN HUNDRED THOUSAND POUNDS, wide of the reality. Does the trade appear thus to preponderate with benefits to Britain?

This misstatement arises from a misconception, in calling articles raw materials, which in reality, are not such; nor are they considered, or stated as such in the official accounts. Raw articles are materials which may be wrought into manufactures, and produced in another form. Hides, for instance, are raw materials, because they are produced in another form, which we call leather: but beef, butter, and provisions, enter into commerce only as such, and in no other shape. Mr. Foster, however, reckons on Irish *provisions* as *raw* articles, by which, he *swells* one account; and he counts on English *provisions*, cod, ling, herrings &c. as *manufactured* articles, by which he *diminishes* the other. And again, he calls *Irish linen yarn* a raw material; but he counts on *English cotton yarn* as manufactured goods: yet Mr. Foster tells us—"I have detailed these statements accurately from the printed Reports."

However, that we may not be deceived by names of things, or be led astray by a partial view in *one* branch of our trade, let us examine the whole products, both *raw* and *manufactured* of the two countries.

We find on inspecting the public accounts referred to by Mr Foster, that, on calculating the trade carried on between the

two countries, with their *respective Products and Manufactures*, Ireland gains a balance of almost THREE MILLIONS AND AN HALF yearly. (See Table C.) Here again, then, the trade does not preponderate with benefits to Britain.

Now let us take another view of the trade, as to *all the imports and exports* of the two countries: and what do we perceive? We find on a fair view given in the public accounts, that there is a balance, on the *general Import and Export trade*, in favor of Ireland, amounting to above TWO MILLIONS GAIN ANNUALLY: (See Table D.)—Here again then, with above *two millions* loss before our eyes, the trade does not preponderate with benefits to Britain.

Further, that we may consider the trade in every possible shape, in order to arrive at the whole truth, let us examine the *entire trade, revenues, and bounties*. And what is the result? It is proved by the public accounts, that Ireland is a gainer, by a balance of above TWO MILLIONS SEVEN HUNDRED and SEVENTY SEVEN THOUSAND POUNDS ANNUALLY. (See Table E.) Now I ask, in every view of this trade, how does it appear according to the official accounts of the Inspector General, that the advantages are, (as Mr. Foster asserts,) “*more on the side of Britain—and certainly so much so, as to put an end to all the foolish threats which have been made, particularly as to our linen trade depending wholly on British bounty, and British discretion.*”

As to the latter part of this assertion on bounties, we shall soon see the truth.

But as to the commerce of the two countries, Mr. Foster cannot make it appear, that the balance is “*so much on the side of Britain,*” and the *excess of gain prodigious.*”—It is utterly impossible, according to the official documents. And therefore, his conclusion against an Union falls to the ground, because he has built it on misstatements which exhibit such a perversion of the Public Accounts, as could originate only, I do conceive, in misconception.

I now come to the linen trade. And here again I find Mr. Foster deep in errors. Some lines back I quoted his assertion, relative to the linen trade *not depending* on British Bounties, or British discretion. And, in page 84, he remarks on bounties, “when their operation is boasted of by Mr. Pitt, as “having raised our manufacture to its present height, he “forgets the fact. They took place in 1743, and operated “as the REPORT” (of the Board of Trade) “I have mentioned stated, as TWELVE per cent on *British*, and SIX “and an HALF per cent on Irish; the remaining five and an “half compensating the charges of freight, commission, &c. “from Ireland to Britain.”

Here, you observe, it is stated by Mr. Foster that, while the bounty on British Linens is estimated at *twelve* per cent, the bounty on Irish Linens is estimated at *six and an half*: and, therefore, according to *his Report* of the Board of Trade, *Britain* has an advantage over the *Irish* exporter, equal to five and an half per cent. Now, remark the words of the Report, as they stand precisely in the *passage alluded to* by Mr. Foster. “IRELAND will be able to export this article under the new opening given to her trade, to an advantage over the *English* exporter equal to *five and an half per cent.*”* Thus, therefore, you see a direct contradiction to what Mr. Foster puts before you as the statement of the Board of Trade.

I shall here explain this matter:—Britain pays twelve per cent. bounty to Irish Linens exported from this country: but the British Merchant, who exports those Irish Linens, is at a charge of five and an half per cent. in Britain, for warehousing, &c. &c. before he can export them: whereas, the bounty being the same in Ireland as in Britain, and the *Irish* merchant not having *this* expense which the *British* merchant has here, the Irish one, therefore, has *so* much advan-

* Copy of the Report of the Lords Commissioners, contained in the Accounts laid before the House of Lords, Feb. 22, 1799.—See page 16, paragraph 2.

tage (or five and a half per cent.) over the British exporter. So that Mr. Foster turns the *British* exporter into an *Irish* exporter. The former may be called an exporter of Irish linens; but those *Irish* linens receive twelve per cent. bounty.—Can Mr. Foster deny this? Can he deny that Britain favours Irish linens imported by a protecting duty, also, equal to twenty-five* per cent.? Whereas all other linens imported, pay this twenty-five per cent.: and all other linens besides British, exported, pay about six per cent.—Consequently, there is an equality of *export bounty* paid by Britain to *Irish* and *British* linens; there is an advantage of five and an half per cent. bounty, in favour of direct exportation from Ireland, *against Britain*; there is twenty-five per cent. in favour of Ireland, over *foreign* linens imported; and, if we add twelve per cent. bounty, paid to Irish linens exported, to six per cent. duty paid by *Foreign* linens exported, it makes *eighteen per cent.* in favour of the Irish exports. How, then, can Mr. Foster say, that, where there is *such* support, there is not *dependence*—and such *voluntary* support, there is not *discretion*? Cannot the British Parliament take away this support of bounties and protecting duties from the Irish linens? If so, it is discretionary.—And is not this support of bounties and protecting duties, necessary to the Irish Trade? If so, it is dependent. But the fact of dependence shall be further established:—Let us consider, therefore, the operation of the *Bounties*.

Mr. Foster remarked, as we quoted before, that “when their operation is boasted of by Mr. Pitt, as having raised “our manufactures, he *forgets the fact.*” In order to overturn this assertion, we shall appeal again to that high and “*decisive evidence,*” to which Mr. Foster himself refers us

* Mr. Foster fairly states according to the Public Accounts, at 33*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.* but it should be 25*l.* per cent.

more than once: I mean that of the Lords Commissioners for Trade and Plantations.

According to the Report of those Lords of Trade, I find, (page 14) that the Import of Irish Linens into Great Britain increased, between the years 1743 and 1773, from six millions, to seventeen millions of yards. But the increase of Irish linen, *exported* under favour of British Bounty, far exceeded in proportion the *import* during the same space. The quantities exported were, in 1743, above forty thousand yards; and, in 1773, above two millions of yards. The increase in *Import*, therefore, was nearly from *one* to *three*; and the increase in *Export* nearly from *one* to *seventy*.* Thus, we have the fact of increase clearly and undeniably established. Now, the next fact to be ascertained, is, upon what did this *increase depend*? According to the very same evidence, the Board of Trade, it depended upon the operation of Bounties. Their words are,—(Page 14: paragraph 4)—“ This increase may be attributed to *Bounties and Duties*.”

That a Report of a Board of the Lords of Trade is “ decisive evidence,” every man must agree with Mr. Foster; and, without meaning any disrespect to this gentleman, I certainly conceive them more competent, and more likely to be impartial on this point, than Mr. Foster, or any man circumstanced as he is. And, therefore, according to *their* judgment, and *their* testimony, I must believe that Mr. Foster either misconceived, and therefore mistated, or else—forgot the fact.

Beside, since it is to their Report he applies on different points of the linen trade, he cannot consequently resist the testimony of that Report, strongly and evidently confuting

* But if we mark the proportion of increase up to 1799—in IMPORTS, it is from one to six, and in EXPORTS from one, to one hundred and fifty: The number of yards in the former increase, was from six, to thirty-seven millions; and the latter from forty thousand, to six millions.

him, and directly confirming the opinion of Mr. Pitt—that the linen manufactures of Ireland *have* flourished upon British bounties. But if he should still have any doubt on the bounties being *discretionary*, I trust I shall remove it soon by his own evidence, and by the further corroboration of the Lords of Trade. And, as their Report was made in 1780, and not under the present Administration, or present circumstances, no objection can be taken to the nature or substance of what Mr. Foster properly calls “decisive evidence.”

What however will Mr. Foster say to his own evidence, when he bore testimony to Irish linens *depending* on British Bounties and British Discretion? His words were,* “as to Bounties, Britain almost ruined *our* manufacture of *sail-cloth*, by bounties on export of *her own* to Ireland. In 1750, or thereabouts, when *her* Bounty commenced, *we exported more than we imported*; and, in 1784, *we exported NONE, and imported 180,000 yards.*” Such, then, is Mr. Foster’s statement of *facts*, which confirm the *total dependence* of one branch, and consequently of another, of the Irish linen manufacture on British bounties, and British discretion. For, by changing the bounty, the manufacture was utterly destroyed in Ireland, and secured to Britain. Let him say again, *who* “forgot the fact” of the operation of British bounties?

After mistating (page 84,) the *Report*, as I have pointed out, relative to bounties, he proceeds, and says, “by this *unequal* encouragement, the export of British bounty linens rose, &c. &c.” You will remark, that the system of Bounties to which he attributed *unequal* encouragement toward Ireland, is what the Board of Trade stated expressly to afford “*advantage in favour* of Ireland, equal to five and an half per cent.†” Now, what says the Board

* Woodfall’s Report (page 110) of the Irish Debate on the Propositions in 1785.

† The Reader will have seen before, according to the testimony of the Lords of Trade (Report: p. 16, paragraph 2),

further on this unequal encouragement?—Calculating its *success* in various manners, they state (page 16, par. 4) “*so far will it operate to the diminution of British export trade, to the diminution also of the returns for that trade, and consequently to the prejudice of our navigation, and of the commercial interests in general,*” (and they add further, page 18, paragraph 1) “*by all the collateral consequences of a proportionable transfer of our navigation, and general commerce to the ports of Ireland.*”

With such words before him, and from such authority, solemnly stating to the Lords of Council the disadvantages to Britain in *favour* of Ireland, arising from the *export bounty system*, it is strange that he could call such “advantages” *unequal* encouragement, and rest his assertion on the authority that contradicts him.

But, consider the fact of the Irish exports having so wonderfully increased from Britain, (as from one to a hundred and fifty) under what Mr. Foster calls unequal encouragement, and in preference to a direct export from Ireland, where there is a decided superiority over the British exporter equal to five and an half per cent. :* and what stronger argument can be produced against Mr. Foster, than his own, to shew the dependence of Irish trade on a British market, and British encouragement?—Or consider his other fact, of the exports of British linens gaining head on the export of Irish, notwithstanding the numerous and substantial supports to keep the Irish on a level with them; and then let him tell us, how could the Irish manufacture cope with the growing progress of the British, were those supports taken away?

You now perceive of what consequence to Ireland this encouragement from Britain is, and, that while Mr. Foster states the Bounties to be but *unequal* encouragement, towards Ireland, his “decisive evidence,” the Report of *The Lords*

that there is a decided five and a half per cent. in favour of direct export from Ireland.

* See the last note.

of Trade, state the reverse.—Let him seriously pause upon those facts; and next reconsider his *own* statement.

Mr. Foster's words are, (page 108, of Woodfall's Report)
 “ The Honourable Gentleman (Mr. Flood) complains of
 “ the Report of the English Privy Council, who say, that to
 “ put *Ireland* on a footing of *exact reciprocity* as to linens,
 “ *Ireland* ought to give a Bounty on the *exportation* of Eng-
 “ lish linens, because England gives a Bounty on the ex-
 “ portation of Irish linens.——CAN ANY THING BE
 “ MORE JUST?” (adds Mr. Foster.) Here, is Mr. Foster
 laying down his solemn opinion to Parliament, that the *en-*
couragement given by Britain in favour of Ireland, is not
 strictly *just* toward Britain; that it is not *reciprocal*, that
 it is not *equal*, so much is it in *favor* of Ireland: and
 now Mr. Foster solemnly tells the Parliament, that this
 same encouragement is *unequal*, so much is it *against* Ire-
 land.

We have seen by the indisputable proofs of facts, that,
 with *advantages in favour of the Irish Exporter*, he finds it
 necessary to resort to the British market, and to the British
 Exporter. Mr. Foster, however, tells us gravely (page 87,
 Speech on Union) that if Ireland loses the British trade, she
 can find *other ports* for her linens. It may very fairly be
 asked, if Ireland, with five and an half per cent. in her fa-
 vor at home, has not found them now; when this advantage
 shall be lost, where will she find them then? No where.—
 It is utterly impossible; as I could prove satisfactorily to
 every man, were it not too tedious to enter here into the
 general commerce and manufactures of Europe. But, I do
 assert, that those new ports for linen trade will be found no
 where. Let him shew us, with all the advantages of Bri-
 tish encouragement, what new ports *has* Ireland opened
 since the acquisition of her free trade?—what new manufac-
 tures *has* she established? But take away British encourage-
 ment and British connection, and adopt Mr. Foster's “ other
 port” arguments in favour of separation; and, I tell Mr.

Foster, that the ruin of Ireland will be utter and complete; and, that the resources, which he loosely asserts as possible, cannot be proved by fair deduction; that he cannot detail them; no, nor perceive them, were his intelligence but one microscopic eye.

He informs us, that the Bounties paid by Britain to Ireland amounted, in 1797, to about twenty-four thousand pounds. But why does he fix on this year? Let us refer to the fair official evidence.

The Inspector General tells us, that in 1796, the Bounties amounted to forty-two thousand pounds; in 1795, to more than forty-two thousand; (Table 9, Official Accounts); and on an average of *four years*, that the bounties were *annually thirty-four thousand, seven hundred and eighty-three pounds* (Table 17, Official Accounts).—Is Mr. Foster's, then, a fair statement?

But he tells us further, with a sneer, that it was this *great* twenty-four thousand pound bounty, (that is, this *small* twenty-four thousand pound bounty selected by himself out of several years,) which, on three million of yards in 1797, brought the linen trade to its present height. Not so, however, according to his official evidence. The Inspector General (who coincides with Mr. Foster as to protecting duties being bounties,) tells us, with all the fairness of an accountant, that there was *twenty-five per cent. also* in favour of Ireland, that year, on nearly *forty millions* of yards imported, (Table 8, Official Accounts). Here, then, is a trifling difference between Mr. Foster and his official evidence, of about
THIRTY-SEVEN MILLIONS.

In page 85, Mr. Foster tells Mr. Pitt, that his “is an idle threat, and that the British Nation will never consent to a war of prohibitions or duties.” But does Mr. Foster forget, that he has *himself* proclaimed that war; that he was the menacing herald in 1785? Who announced *the war of bounties, wherein Ireland could not cope with Bri-*

rain?*" Let us, however, in this instance, act with the mercy of the law, which makes no man criminate himself. We shall, refer, therefore, to Mr. Foster's "decisive evidence" on this point.—The Lords of Trade pronounce distinctly on this war of bounties or duties "a small REDUCTION on those *Duties*, (on foreign linens) would enable " Britain to supply herself with linens as cheap as ever, and " with *advantage to the revenue.*" And the Lords of Trade observe also, that this reduction "might probably obtain in " return a *larger* consumption of woollen manufactures, and " other goods upon the *Continent of Europe.*" (P. 17, par. 2.) Here, then, you will observe, First, the Lords of Trade point directly to the war of duties; but, *he* calls it Mr. Pitt's idle threat: Secondly, the Lords of Trade, deliberating with solemn wisdom, to promote the interests of Britain, authorise this measure, of the war of duties; but, Mr. Foster says, for Britain, "its wisdom and interest would forbid it:" Thirdly, Mr. Foster scoffs at Mr. Pitt's insinuation, that Great Britain loses revenue by the present system; but the Lords of Trade declare expressly, that it not only loses revenue, but commerce; and that by what Mr. Foster has long since proclaimed, namely, the war of duties, the *revenues* might receive *advantage*, and the *commerce* and *manufactures* increase. Will he call this *but Mr. Pitt's idle threat and insinuation?*

Again, he points to Mr. Pitt, as led into a labyrinth by mistakes. We are presented, however, by Mr. Foster's official evidence, with a clue which may serve to guide us through *his* maze of error.

That we may proceed cautiously, however, through such an operation, some previous remarks are necessary. We shall beg leave to consider as manufactured articles in one country, what have been classed as manufactured articles in another: we shall be guided by the distinctions made in the offi-

* See Woodfall's Report, p. 112.

cial accounts, which Mr. Foster has quoted, but *not* followed. Yet it will not be disputed, I believe, that articles of a similar nature, or, in other words, provisions; and yarn, &c.; having been classed under any denomination in the public accounts, with respect to one country, ought to be classed under the same denomination with respect to the other. This, however, (as I observed in a former instance,) Mr. Foster has not done. I shall beg leave, notwithstanding, to conform to those public accounts, which he has brought forward as evidence, but of which the details and general object are altogether perverted.

He states, that the *linens*, on an average of the last three years, amount to 2,600,000*l.* But the Inspector General's accounts authorise me to say, that the *Linen Trade* amounts to 2,844,402*l.** Here, then, is a misstatement of above TWO HUNDRED AND FORTY-FOUR THOUSAND pounds, by Mr. Foster.

It is also asserted by this gentleman, that the linen trade forms not one half of the Exports of Ireland: but, according to the Inspector General's accounts which are now before me, I perceive that it exceeds the half, by about EIGHTY-EIGHT THOUSAND, NINE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-NINE pounds†.

Yet these are the official accounts, which Mr. Foster tells the Parliament, and the two Nations at large, he has *accurately* detailed; “and you may see (says he) the advantage of arriving at truth by such a detail.”

Again Mr. Foster tells us, page 85,—“Mr. Pitt seems to have got into a labyrinth on this subject; his mistakes

* Official Accounts, No. 4—LINEN TRADE.

Plain shirting and sheeting, at 1 <i>s.</i> 5 <i>d.</i> per yard,	2,600,101
Other linens	320
Linen yarn	243,981

£. 2,844,402

† No. 15.—Total amount of the products and manufactures of Ireland, exported to Great Britain, £. 5,510,825.

and threats are very curious: he (Mr. Pitt) says, *Great Britain* takes from *Ireland* MANUFACTURED PRODUCE, to the amount of between FOUR AND FIVE MILLIONS; whereas even the *British* statement, at the price current, makes the linen 2,600,000 *l.* and it is the *only manufactured produce.*—You will observe Mr. Foster states that *linen* is the only manufactured produce, and that Mr. Pitt, said, *the manufactured produce* amounted to between *four and five millions.* Now, remark Mr. Pitt's words, (page 48, third edition)—“*Great Britain* imported from *Ireland* to the amount of near THREE MILLIONS in the MANUFACTURED article of *linen*, and linen yarn.” Thus, you see, the sum is not, as Mr. Foster quotes, for MANUFACTURES: it approaches *three millions* instead of *five*:—but Mr. Pitt proceeds, and says, that *Great Britain* imported also to the amount of “between *two and three millions* in *provisions* and *cattle*, besides *corn* and *other* articles of PRODUCE.” Thus you see also a plain *distinction* between the articles of *manufacture* and *produce*, and different sums stated for them respectively; which different sums make Mr. Pitt's *total.* But Mr. Foster confounds all together under one head of *manufactured produce*, and then tells us there is none other but that of *linen*, which amounts to 2,600,000 *l.* and that Mr. Pitt says, “*Britain* imports, of *manufactured produce*, “to the amount of between *four and five millions.*”

So far for the accurate justice of quotation: now as to the fair value of the articles.

Mr. Foster says, “even the *British* statement, at the “price current, makes the linen 2,600,000 *l.*”

The *British* statement is now before me, and makes the *linen*, and *linen-yarn*, as stated by Mr. Pitt, to amount to 2,844,402 *l.*: and even this is an estimate, at 1s. 5d. per yard on the *linens*: a more true estimate, perhaps, might be taken at three millions. However, that we may be convinced whether Mr. Pitt has erred, or Mr. Foster, I shall submit to you the *British* statement, or that of the Inspector General.

No. 4.—Linen trade	—	—	2,844,402
Provisions	—	—	2,448,404
No. 4.—Cattle	—	—	168,242
			£.5,461,048

Are not those precisely the articles mentioned by Mr. Pitt? Do they not amount to above between *four* and *five* millions? Where is the mistake? Or *who* appears to be in a labyrinth?

However, in the next paragraph, Mr. Foster again asserts, (page 85) Mr. Pitt says, “our LINEN constitutes “*four-fifths* of our export to *all the world*.”

Mr. Pitt’s words are (page 49) “The increasing produce “of the *chief article* of *manufacture* (linen) AND *four fifths* “of her whole export, are to be ascribed not to that independent legislature, but to the liberality of a British Parliament.” Surely this does not state that linen constitutes four fifths of the Irish export.

Mr. Foster proceeds, (page 85) “The British paper “shews, that what goes to Britain, which takes, *as he* (Mr. Pitt) *says*, seven eighths of all our linen, is not *one half* “even of our *exports to her*—much less can it be *four fifths* “of our exports to all the world.”

Now the British paper, or the Inspector General’s accounts present to my eye, at this instant, that the linen trade *exceeds the half* of the WHOLE export to Britain by *eighty eight thousand, nine hundred and eighty nine pounds*.—I have detailed it before in page 14.

And, *as Mr. Pitt says*, Britain *does* take seven eighths of the Irish linens, and MORE by 653,824 yards*.

Again:—As Mr. Pitt really says (*not*, however, as quoted by Mr. Foster, that the *linens* are *four fifths* of the Irish

* Annual medium during four years preceding 25th March 1798.

To America and foreign states of Europe and Africa	—	—	4,904,119
To Great Britain	—	—	39,885,776

exports to all the world, but) that the *Irish linens*, and also four fifths of the whole Irish exports depend on Britain; the fact is decidedly so. As to linens, it has been abundantly demonstrated already. And as to her *whole exports*, it appears, by the custom-house books of IRELAND, that they amounted on an average of the last four years to £.4,691,634 and her exports to Britain amounted to 4,175,166. Consequently her exports to Britain are more than *ten parts of eleven*.

I believe, therefore, it is obvious how far Mr. Pitt is wide of misstatement, and Mr. Foster of accuracy.

But this Gentleman asserts, that Mr. Pitt again forgets a fact, in stating that “*Articles* which are essential to her Trade, and to her subsistence, or serve as raw materials for her manufactures, are sent from hence [*Britain*] free of duty.”*

Let Mr. Foster inspect the Tables in the Official Accounts, and I believe he will allow there are articles which are essential to trade, and to subsistence, or serve as raw materials, that are sent to Ireland free of duty; and from the trade of many of which other countries are actually prohibited in favour of Ireland. But, to satisfy the public, I shall give the Tables from the official documents, and then every man may himself judge how far Mr. Foster has been candid. (See Tables F. and G.)

In order to show the great advantages to Britain, from the Irish trade, Mr. Foster, by a *partial* view of her commerce, tells us also, (page 89) that “the Export trade of her manufactures from Britain to Ireland, is equal to about ONE third of her Export to all *Europe*.”

On a *fair* and *proper* comparative view, however, of the commerce of Britain with Ireland, what says the Inspector General? He informs the Parliament of Great Britain, that on an average of four years preceeding January 1799, the

* Mr. Pitt's Speech, page 48.

Total Exports of *British Manufacture* amounted to about *thirty millions and an half*; and the British manufactures exported to *Ireland*, amounted to about *two millions and an half*,—that is, a **TWELFTH** part of her export.* Such I conceive, with the Inspector General, to be the just and accurate comparative view.

I shall not trouble you further on this head with long details, but shall state to you some of the results of those figures now before me, and the truths established by the official documents. And I desire Mr. Foster to contradict me if he can.

Ireland depends upon Britain for the sale of eight parts out of nine, of all the articles of her trade. Those eight parts of Irish exports are received by Great Britain almost, the whole of them, duty free. Whereas, Ireland charges duties on them, and raises a revenue for herself at home, at the expense of Britain; because, the purchasers and consumers in Britain must pay those charges in the price of the articles. A great part, however, of what Britain sends to Ireland, she imposes no duty on; but Ireland raises revenues on them. Ireland raised during the last year, **SEVEN HUNDRED, & THIRTY-ONE THOUSAND Pounds, REVENUES** on the *British Trade*; and on the Trade WITH ALL THE WORLD BESIDE, but *One Hundred and Seventeen Thousand Pounds, Revenues.* †

Although Britain carries on about 1-9th of her commerce with Ireland, yet the British revenue by no means derives from this commerce with Ireland one-ninth of its profits. For, if we deduct from the annual revenues received by Britain, through Irish commerce, those bounties which Britain pays to Irish linens annually; we shall perceive, that,

* Official accounts, No. 17, Exports to Ireland, £.2,631,899—Total Exports, £.30,648,892.

† Lord Auckland,—Table VI.

Revenues derived to Ireland, from her Trade

with Great Britain	—	—	£.731,966
From the World beside	—	—	117,454

Britain receives * but one pound from Irish trade, where 935*l.* is the due proportion. Such, then, is the truth, according to the accurate accounts of the Inspector General of Great Britain, (No. 17,)———But, if Mr. Foster be right the Custom-House books of Great Britain display to the Parliament of this Kingdom a positive falsehood.

The dilemma, which ensues, is——that we must discredit either Mr. Foster, or this evidence to which he appeals. We cannot assent to contradictions. In those accounts, however, to which he has referred, and which are now before my eyes, the *total reverse* appears of what Mr. Foster asserts.———Yet he tells us, and puts it before us in various shapes, that the existing trade is much *more beneficial* to Britain than it is to Ireland! But I most obviously and unerringly see, and I do assert, on no equivocal authority, that it is not even *mutually* beneficial.——He assures us, that if the House of Commons whereof he is now Speaker, be incorporated with the English Commons, this Union will injure your trade and manufactures. The direct contrary of all this, has been demonstrated through the irresistible arguments of different, and most able men; some of whom have been the guides and ornaments of past times; others of whom have been the political prophets of our own days, and the admiration of the good and wise. I see an Union, therefore, through such mediums, without being distorted by the fallacy, or dimmed by the shade of interest, as the true and only measure that can give stability or

* Revenues received on an average of four years; preceding January 5, 1799.

By Britain from Ireland,	-	£.40,911
Bounties paid by Britain to Ireland,		34,783

Remains 6,128

We shall find, therefore, that 6,000*l.* revenue from Ireland, bears a proportion to the revenues of Britain which arise from trade, and amount to 5,734,525*l.* as one pound to nine hundred and thirty-five Pounds.

improvement to those eminent advantages which Ireland now enjoys. These must be utterly lost, if she does not become one with Britain, without distinctness of views or separation of interests. Thus, therefore, I do see, and, I doubt not, that the people of Ireland will most plainly see, the direct REVERSE of what Mr. Foster would impress upon us.

—————The trade of Ireland does not afford such advantages to Great Britain, that all apprehension of its loss is idle on the part of the former; and therefore we should NOT agree with him to keep the House of Commons in Ireland, in manifest opposition to national prosperity, and Imperial good.

The next Question, to which the arguments of Mr. Foster may be reduced, is as follows:

SECOND POINT.—*Is all extension of the trade of Ireland, under Union, by an establishment or participation of the great branches of British manufacture, radically impossible?*

In support of this point, Mr. Foster states (in page 68,) that iron, woollen, cotton, and pottery wares, constitute the principal manufactures of Great Britain. And he proceeds to shew, that iron is imported into Ireland, at only 12s. 6d. per ton; and into Britain, at near 3l. (it is, in fact, at 3l. 4s. 6d.) yet Britain manufactures and exports this iron to Ireland, to the amount of 119,000l. annually, though she pays a further duty on importation into Ireland, of 12l. 14s. per cent. And this extraordinary power and superiority in trade, arise, says Mr. Foster, from the vicinity of coals to the British manufacture.

Now that this is *not* the case, will clearly appear; and, consequently, his assertion of the radical impossibility of Ireland's not extending her manufactures under an Union, because she has *not* coals in her vicinity, must fall to the ground.

It is not solely the vicinity of coals, but the various relations of commerce that promote manufactures. If it were the vicinity of coals, why should such extensive manufac-

tures of iron, and even those of the coarsest kind, be carried on in London, and not in Newcastle? why are they not carried on in the latter place, rather than in an expensive metropolis? by which means heavy wages for labour, heavy charges for distant carriage, and the heavy duty of 9s. 3d. per chaldron for coals, would be saved. It is evidently, therefore, *not* solely the vicinity of coals, which causes the establishment or extension of manufactures; nor can the want of this vicinity, be a radical prevention.

For if it were solely the vicinity of coals, the manufacturing places of Ireland, are not so distant from Whitehaven, and from the western coasts of Great Britain, whence they receive their supply, as we are on this spot. Beside, we are charged 9s. 3d. duty per chaldron on coals here, while there is imposed but 1s. 2d. per chaldron on coals, sent to Ireland. And notwithstanding this heavy expense for fuel, and the great price of food, labour, taxes, and all the necessaries of life; various and extensive manufactures are carried on, in and about this metropolis.

The inference, therefore, is obvious. It is want of capital, and of the invigorating influence of commerce, and not want of coals, that produces the present effect with respect to the iron manufacture in Ireland. Consequently, we find no argument whatever, under this head, which proves the *impossibility* of the *establishment* or *extension* of manufactures; but arguments to prove the reverse. Get capital, by giving security to the British manufacturer,—which security, is Union; and then solid success will soon confute Mr. Foster's visionary alarms.

A stronger body of facts cannot be adduced, to overturn Mr. Foster's assertions on this question, than his own statements furnish. Let us however hear Mr. Foster, upon the very point, whereon all the pressure of his arguments bears.

He gravely admonishes Cork, with respect to woollens, &c. and assures them, that these manufactures can *never* be promoted in Ireland, by the measure of an Union, *for the*

reasons which he had assigned, and to which he refers them. His *reasons* and his words are, (p. 67,) “ it is self-evident, “ that these manufactures never can travel *from the country* “ which *has* the coal, to that which has it *NOT*, *viz.* from “ Great Britain to Ireland.” Again, (p. 87, which is ten pages further) he says, “ Necessity may compel us to search “ for coals, which do *EXIST* in Ireland.” And again (in p. 194 of Woodfall’s Report) he warns the Parliament of Ireland, with this fact: “ Were she” (England) “ even to “ raise the revenue on coals to you, that she does on her “ own coast carriage, what would become of you? You “ have *not Irish coal.*”——“ To such wretched shifts are “ Gentlemen driven, who attempt to support what is not “ supportable.”—It is Mr. Foster’s rebuke to Mr. Flood, —uttered by himself,—page 107, Woodfall’s Report.

I have been thus particular with respect to coal, because, it is the great basis of argument, upon which he would substantiate the radical impossibility of the establishment or extension of Irish manufactures: but, by which, it appears that Mr. Foster absolutely proves nothing. It is equally contradictory, with respect to the other manufactures, as well as iron.—Were I to enter into the particulars of the great feat of the superfine broad cloath manufacture at Bradford, and of the kerseymere and fancy goods at Trowbridge, and then into the particulars of the western parts of Ireland, I could demonstratively shew, that the arguments of Mr. Foster are totally invalid and inconclusive.—I shall but generally observe, however, that in all calculations relative to the establishment of manufactures, it is highly erroneous to consider only one branch of expense; we are to calculate all the great branches of expense—fuel, food, labour, taxes.

I find, therefore, that the ton of coals, containing thirty-two bushels, costs in Irish currency about 1*l.* 12*s.* at Bradford* and Trowbridge; and in London, upon the general

* About One Shilling, Irish, the bushel.

average, about 1*l.* 18*s.*—at the present moment, the average is 2*l.* 14*s.* 1*d.*¹/₂. whereas the ton of coals in Ireland costs about 20*s.* or one guinea.—Where, then, is his ground for the impossibility of extending manufactures in Ireland?—Food is in her favour, being very much against England—Labour at least double the price against England; and Taxes infinitely more.

It is demonstrable, that his argument of coals, is not only a local, but a radical error; because not founded upon true principles, as might be shewn, by manifest proofs drawn also from the seats of the cloth manufacture in France, before the Revolution.—For in Champagne, and other places where fancy goods, superfine cloths and kerseymeres were made, fuel was extremely dear: yet, notwithstanding this, they rendered kerseymeres at 3*s.* 6*d.* per yard, while English kerseymeres, with the advantages of coal, as stated by Mr. Foster, amounted to from 9*s.* to 10*s.* per yard. Since this then is the case, and I do assert it as a fact, whence arose this great disproportion between the *dearness* of the manufacture in the coal country, and its *cheapness* in the country where fuel is expensive?—From three advantages which Ireland possesses—cheapness of food, and cheapness of labour, and low rate of taxes. Were we to sift this matter in every possible shape, it would prove but more and more the reverse of what Mr. Foster would enforce. The fact also is, notwithstanding Mr. Foster's contradictions of existence and non-existence—there *are* coals in Ireland, and in abundance. But there is not *capital* to dig them, nor to explore the mines of lead, silver, and copper, of the country; nor to cut canals, nor to erect machinery for great *cotton works*, nor to drive a foreign trade. And as to the other article of Pottery, since the very coarsest kind is made in the neighbourhood of London, where coals are so dear; why is it not made in Dublin?

Mr. Foster's argument, with respect to coal evidently does not apply here: and, if I be rightly informed, materials for the finest China are abundant in Ireland.—But capital fails.

And this is the reason upon which Mr. Foster might build his complaint, that "there is not a single pottery in Ireland." Get capital therefore, by UNITING with the first partner in the world, in opulence, character, and commerce.

I have now before me, in a manuscript with which I have just been favoured, a corroborative support, of what I before maintained against Mr. Foster's arguments, as not being founded upon true principles. It is the opinion of Mr. David Hume, in a letter to Lord Kaims, and of Dean Tucker on the same subject. You will perceive that the views of those celebrated men were comprehensive, and not limited to a single article, for considerations on commerce.

Mr. David Hume's letter to Lord Kaims, relates to a tract of Dean Tucker's, and contains the following passage:—
 "All the advantages which the author (Dean Tucker) insists upon as belonging to a nation of extensive commerce, are undoubtedly real: *Great capital, extensive correspondence, skilful expedients* of facilitating labour, *dexterity, industry, &c. &c.*"

Herein you see, on the authority of two of the first men of our age, how numerous are the relations, which invigorate and promote trade. And does not Union secure participation of all these to Ireland? Surely then, the authority of Hume and Tucker are no weak opinions in its favour.

"But" Mr. Hume proceeds and says to Lord Kaims, and it is well worthy of particular remark on this occasion—
 "Among the advantages, we may reckon the DEAR PRICE of PROVISIONS and LABOUR, which enables the POORER country to rival them, (the rich,) first in the coarser manufactures, and then in those which are more elaborate."

Can an opinion more pointed or more weighty be given in favour of an Union? Mr. Hume says further—"I indulge myself in the hopes, that we in Scotland also possess *some advantages*, which may enable us to *share* with them (the people of Britain) in wealth and industry."

Mr. Hume's opinion has proved well founded even upon "some advantages"—but, where there are *numerous* and *extravardinary advantages* for the same end, Mr. Foster asserts it is an *impossibility*. This opinion too of Mr. Foster's is in direct opposition to a maxim laid down by Dean Tucker, in this remarkable correspondence now before me.

We are anxious to establish an Union between the two countries, at a moment that the commerce of Britain is become great beyond example, and when it is wise for her to communicate, and more so for Ireland to receive a portion of that commerce. This cannot be done with policy, but by Union: and when an Union takes place, this event must unavoidably follow, notwithstanding the impossibility urged by Mr. Foster. For it is certain, according to Dean Tucker—"That the RICHER, that is, the more industrious all countries are, the *more beneficial* they will become "to each other." The more abundant the commerce of Britain, and the more extensive its industry, the more will they both expand their benefits to Ireland, when the channel can be opened with safety to her capital, and to her commercial and manufacturing interests, by an Union.

Upon the high authorities of those celebrated men in my favour I might rest this point—but I shall call in Mr. Foster himself to my support; and no better words or ideas than Mr. Foster's are requisite to confute him upon the radical impossibility of extending the Irish trade. He says (page 111, of Woodfall's Report) "Were a man to look for the "country, *most advantageous to settle manufacture in, what "would be his choice?—where labour and provisions are "cheap—that is, IRELAND. And what would he next "look for?—why, to a rich, steady, and extended market "near him—which England, stretched alongside, affords:— "and it is impossible, but that in time, with as good climate, "equally natural powers, cheaper food, and fewer taxes, we "must be able to sell to them." Here we see Mr. Foster, proving to every man, that Ireland is the most advantageous*

country to settle manufactures in; and which must even out-rival England and sell to her. But to day, he says it is no such thing: commerce cannot be extended in Ireland; no English merchant ought or will come to settle in it (that is in the country which Mr. Foster has proved to be so advantageous for manufacture): the merchant, or *The Speaker* for the merchant, says, it is all an *imposition* on the Irish Nation; it is all a *dupery*. But, if the *Parliament be in Ireland*—ay, then indeed, the English Merchant *will* hazard his capital (page 69, Mr. Foster's late speech).

One simple question shall be asked here—How long have Parliaments been in Ireland?—and what English House has been established there? Yet we find English Houses in every country throughout Europe, and in every quarter of the globe. I shall commit this to your own comments, and only request you may cast your eye on Dean Tucker's arguments in the Tract of "*Union or Separation*," to be convinced of the futility and hollowness of these opinions of Mr. Foster, as to the residence of Parliament. It is always a presumptive proof in favour of a measure, when its adversary contradicts himself.

But can the extension of commerce be promoted by comparative cheapness in Ireland, if as Mr. Foster maintains, the taxes will be increased, and *Union* is but a measure of taxation? Here again his own words will answer, "that he "strangely construes the *means* of revenue, into giving revenue;" (Woodfall, page 107.) Disproportions in Taxation must ever remain, if the superstructure be equal in both countries. And, as a great portion of the revenues of Britain arises from the *excise duties, and the disproportion in these

* The accounts of the year 1797 being now before me, I shall state them, as it will answer fairly the purpose of comparison. It appears, therefore, that the gross produce of the excise is nearly half of the whole ordinary revenue; and

duties upon necessaries in Britain and Ireland is extreme: if therefore, upon this basis, so unequal now, future additions be made exactly equal in both countries, consequently the *inequality* in taxes upon necessaries of life will ever remain in FAVOR of Ireland.——But, if the superstructure be unequal, on any manufacture in both countries, and be proportioned by the growth of that manufacture; consequently, the taxes in both countries can never be equal, until the manufactures in both countries, be equally prosperous. And God grant, for the happiness and power of every portion of the Empire, that this period may soon arrive!

These are my answers to the radical impossibility of extending manufactures under an Union, because there is *no coal* in Ireland; and because there—*is coal*, as asserted by Mr. Foster.

I shall now call your attention to some points arising out of the two preceding propositions, and shall consider them under the following head:

THIRD POINT.—*What is the Nature and Extent of the Commercial Intercourse between Great Britain and Ireland?*

On looking over the Commerce between the two countries, I find, that it consists of a few great articles, for which Ireland could not find a market in any other part of the world, to any extent.

The first of those is *Linens*:—the whole export of which amounts to about forty millions of yards: and of those, about thirty-five millions are taken by Great Britain. Mr. Foster, however, asserts, that the linen manufactures may find other

and the net produce *more than half* of the *whole* ordinary revenue of *Great Britain*.

Whole Gross produce of the ordinary Revenue	25,515,719
Whole Gross Produce of the Excise - - -	11,916,496
Whole Net produce of the ordinary Revenue -	18,488,607
Whole Net produce of the Excise - - -	9,374,333

markets, " it is impossible (says he) to foresee, if they be prohibited from British ports, what ports we may find, what returns we may get, and in those, how much of what she now supplies us with, may be included. We know our linens beat the German and Russian, in the American market—they are preferred even to the Scotch, &c. &c."—(Page 87, Mr. Foster's last Speech.) Now let us see what he says in a former speech:—" expect a market to favor the linens of Ireland? Where will he find a market under Heaven for that manufacture, which brings two millions (about three millions now) annually into the kingdom? Will Portugal take them? will Spain take them? will France take them? will Russia, Germany, or Holland take them?—they are your powerful rivals, and able to undersell you. Where then will you find a market, if England shuts her ports?" &c.&c. (Woodfall's Report, page 193.) Here again, I shall leave to your own mind all comment on such contradictions.

I must observe further, however, on the linen trade, that it is admitted duty free into Britain, in direct competition with her own manufactures. Britain also supports this competition against herself, even by bounties, to the amount of 34,000*l.* per annum: and moreover she enables the Irish linens to stand the competition with foreign linens both in the British and foreign markets. She pursues this system in favour of Ireland, and much to the detriment of her own manufactures of all kinds, which are charged with reciprocal duties by foreign nations; and in consequence of which, her exports to the Baltick and northern nations, have suffered materially. The loss to Great Britain through the Irish linen trade, has been calculated at above two thirds of a million per annum.

Beside this, the Linen manufacture of Ireland stands indebted, not only to British channels for foreign trade, but to British capital and credit.—It stands indebted to this capital and credit, not only because the British merchant pays the Irish manufacturer speedily, in order to enable him to carry on his manufacture at home; but because the British merchant gives

long credit to all purchasers, in order to encourage the sale of these linens*. It is therefore, in so much, to the bounties, the capital, the credit, and the liberality of Britain, that the linen manufacture of Ireland owes its progress and present flourishing state.

Should Great Britain, however, be disposed to apply to her own linen manufactures that system of policy, which she has uniformly adopted in the protection of all her other manufactures, and place the Irish linens on the same footing as foreign linens, by charging them with twenty-five per cent. duty, what must follow? This important branch, that gives bread to so great a proportion of the industrious part of the people of that country, would if not annihilated, be reduced to a very ruinous state. And if it should not be ruined, Britain would add to her revenues 650,000*l.* per annum in duties alone, and save 34,000*l.* in bounties. But, if it should be ruined, Britain would save 34,000*l.* per annum bounties, and probably gain the manufacture to itself, as in the instance of the sail cloth branch, quoted by Mr. Foster.

With respect to the arguments held out by the opposers of Union, in support of the many advantages, which the commerce and manufactures of that country have derived from the watchful attention of their own Legislature, they are, in truth, unfounded. Not that I mean to derogate from the high character and merits of your Legislature, but this is an act not within your competency; because it is beyond the faculty of the nation. The fact indeed overturns the assertion, For were those gentlemen asked in candor and honor to say with all the legal privileges of Ireland for general import

* If I be rightly informed by British Merchants, they pay for Irish Linens by bills of two or three months credit; but which are immediately discounted for the Irish Trader by British Bankers. Whereas the British retail dealer in those linens seldom gives less to his customers than one year's credit; and the British exporter from 12 to 18, and 24 months credit to the purchasers.

and export, what new manufacture has been created, or what manufacture do the Irish possess of any consequence, at least, which creates an export trade, beside the manufacture of linen? The reply would be, none.

If they compare their Foreign Trade before the freedom of their Legislature with the foreign trade at present, they must exclude the trade to the States of America; because the States in the first period constituted a part of the British dominions, and the trade having existed with it as such, did not appear distinct as now. If they next compare the amount of the trade to the Continent of Europe before and after the freedom of the Legislature, the increase which has been attributed to its watchful attention will be found very trifling, if it be not altogether invisible.

Whoever, therefore, will investigate this subject with fairness and accuracy, will find that the increased commercial prosperity of Ireland has arisen perhaps solely from its increased trade with this kingdom; and has been promoted by the credit and capital of Britain.

The next great article in the commerce of Ireland, is the *Provision* trade and what must ensue, were this trade cut off?—Ireland would lose *thirty thousand pounds** per annum in her revenues, from the export alone—and nearly † TWO MILLIONS and an HALF in her sale, for which she could not resort to any other market. But it may be asked, what would Britain lose?

It appears, by my Lord Auckland on the Union (page 35, table 7.) and no man is more fair or more accurate in his details, that though all the beef furnished to the fleets be in-

* Lord Auckland on Union—Table 6.

Duties collected in Ireland on Beef, Butter, and Pork sent to Great Britain—1798	£. 33,495
---	-----------

† Annual Amount of Provision Trade with Great Britain, on an average of the last four years.	£. 2,448,404 13 0
--	-------------------

cluded, Britain would not lose a supply, equal to *one-third* of what is sold at a *single* market in London—Smithfield. Such a portion in general consumption is of small comparative magnitude. And as to the British colonies, America would soon supply them, and be grateful for the boon, if permitted. Under the present pressure, and the great demand of provisions for our fleets, this permission has been partially given, and, if extended, the trade, which has been a monopoly to Ireland, must be lost to her.

Those two articles constitute almost the whole of the commerce of Ireland. And of what nature and extent its Linen trade is with Britain, you may judge, when, out of forty millions of yards, thirty-five are taken by Britain: and of what consequence its Provision trade is, you may also judge, when its export to Britain is about 2,400,000 l. and to the rest of the world about 200,000 l.

If those two branches of commerce be cut off, Ireland is ruined. For as to Mr. Foster's "new port" argument, however it may flatter the views of Separatists, it is absurd.

With all its support and indulgencies from Britain, and the relaxation of the navigation laws, why does not Ireland open *new ports* now? why have her ports stood so long idle and useless to herself? why do not the fisheries, that school of mariners, occupy and save to her 113,000 l. annually, which she pays to Britain for fish? why does she import circuitously by British means, and under heavy expenses, indigo, sugar, wool, cotton, and other West India products, to the amount of 541,392 l. annually?—because she has faculty to import only to the amount of 165,665 l. annually. Take away her great support, and enfeeble that faculty, will she then become more vigorous, extend her commerce, open "new ports," and become more flourishing, when she becomes more feeble?

Numerous and strong proofs could be adduced here, to shew the inability of Ireland to carry on, either her trade or manufactures, without the aid of capital, and credit, through the British merchant.

You have seen how Ireland depends on Great Britain for its trade, which is formed by linens and provisions. You have seen its want of faculty to profit of the freedom of trade which it obtained with the British colonies. But I shall now lay before you the whole state of its Exports, Imports, and Revenues; in order to ascertain what it owes to Britain: or, in other words, what it gains at present, and may hereafter lose, by the loss of *Union*.

According to the estimated value, in the Custom-house books of IRELAND, it appears that

The EXPORTS from that country to *all parts of the world*, amount on an annual average of the last three years, to - - - £. 4,691,634

Of which sum her exports to Britain and her colonies amounted to - - - 4,175,166

Consequently she depends upon Britain for the *WHOLE* of her *export* trade, except about *half* a million, in above four millions and a half.

According to the same authority, the *Custom-house books of Ireland*, it appears that

The IMPORTS into that country, from all Parts of the World, amount on an average of the last three Years to - - - £. 4,297,812

Of which sum the imports from Britain and her colonies amount to - - - 3,546,762

Consequently she depends upon Britain for the *WHOLE* of her *imports*, except about *seven hundred and fifty* thousand pounds, in above four millions two hundred thousand pounds.

But

But it is still more important to remark here, that

The total value of *all* Foreign Merchandize imported into Ireland (beside the native products and Manufactures of Great Britain) amounts to - - - - £. 2,080,387

And of this sum, there was imported, through the medium of Great Britain - - - - 1,205,952

because *this fact* furnishes the *strongest* proof of the *dependence* of Ireland on *British capital*.

When Mr. Foster speaks of the freedom of Ireland for foreign trade, who disputes it?—When he speaks of other ports and other resources than Britain, I doubt it. Because, according to the foregoing observations, it appears that Ireland has NOT faculty at this moment to import, from the States of America and all the world, but to the small amount of about 750,000 l.

The protected and favoured state in which she appears, with respect to her REVENUES also, is not less striking. If we first consider what revenue she draws from her trade with the world, except Britain, it amounts * to but 117,454 Whereas, from her trade with

Great Britain, she derives † - - - - £.731,966

Such is the comparative profit gained in her trade by Ireland with Britain, and with all the world. Now what is the comparative profit of Britain and Ireland in their mutual trade with each other, in the year ending January 1798. It appears that Britain draws a revenue from her Irish trade amounting to † - - - - £.47,326

Whereas Ireland draws a revenue from the British trade amounting to - - - - 634,403

Balance in favour of Ireland - - - - 587,077

* Lord Auckland, Table 6. † The same.

‡ Official Account, No. 14. D

But if we deduct the medium of *four years* bounties [see Table E.] from *four years* revenues, the account stands thus:
 Ireland draws Revenue from *British* Trade - £.634,403
Britain from *Irish* Trade, after deducting Bounties, £.6,128
 —The above facts require no comment.

You see obviously before you, and upon authority not to be disputed, how much Ireland depends on Great Britain; that four parts out of six of her *Imports* depend on Britain—that ten parts out of eleven of her *Exports* depend on Britain—that most of her *Foreign* trade depends on Britain—that seven parts out of eight of her *Linen* trade depend on Great Britain—that above eleven parts out of twelve of the *Provision* trade depend on Britain: and that the revenues are, through British liberality, *above an hundred to one* in favour of *Ireland*, and against *Britain*.

Here we may apply the words of Mr. Foster, during his discussion of the propositions: “ THIS subject is NOT under-
 “ flood: when known, and Ireland is unprejudiced and in her
 “ calm reason, she will *never* reject the *many blessings* it holds
 “ out to her trade.” And again, (page 112, Woodfall’s
 Report.) “ commercial jealousy is roused, it will INCREASE
 “ WITH INDEPENDENT LEGISLATURES; without an
 “ united interest of commerce in a commercial empire, *politi-*
 “ *cal Union* will receive many shocks, and SEPARATION OF
 “ INTERESTS must threaten SEPARATION OF CONNEX-
 “ ION, which every honest Irishman must *shudder* ever to
 “ look at as a possible event. I will only add, that if this
 “ measure be refused, Ireland will receive *more solid injury*
 “ than from any *other evil* that ever befel her.” Such were
 Mr. Foster’s words; and, beyond doubt, if any dissention
 arise between the two countries, Ireland hazards the whole
 of this trade, which Great Britain has in her power to com-
 mand, and cut off as she sees fit. But by Union this trade is
 secured: it is not only secured, but, by forming a closer pa-

litical connexion, Ireland establishes a new fund of capital and credit, the want of which is evidently the sole and great difficulty, that she labours under in her commerce and manufactures.

Since, therefore, Ireland depends, without contradiction, at this moment, upon Britain for her Trade, her Revenues, and her Protection; for without this protection, where would be her trade?—since this is the case, with the loose band of connexion now subsisting between the two countries, were it not an act of common sense, to secure all those advantages indissolubly? were it not an act of honorable pride, to possess them as a *RIGHT* which cannot be torn from her, rather than as a *boon* which degrades into *DEPENDENCE*, and may be annihilated by caprice? Surely with its quick and high feelings, the wisdom of the nation should combine, and prudently and proudly proclaim, with one voice—*Union*.

Having now fully considered the propositions, formed by Mr. Foster's opinions against Union, namely—that the trade of Ireland is not dependent on Great Britain, and cannot be lost; and that her commerce and manufactures cannot be extended; I trust these erroneous assertions appear confuted in all their bearings. There remains but one great question more to which the rest of his book tends—the *necessity* of an Union.

I shall pass over that waste of ingenuity, which labours at a fallacy in respect to Parliamentary power over Treaties, but which no Parliament whatever possesses; and much less an Irish Parliament over British treaties.—There is one mode, however, and only one, whereby that power may be obtained in substance by the Irish nation: it is through Union. For then no partial British treaty can take place, nor partial embargo be laid on.

As to the question of necessity; his arguments endeavour to shew,—first, that an Union is not only *unnecessary*: but next, that it is *necessary* to reject it.

FOURTH POINT.—*Is an Union necessary?*

Mr. Foster labours through nearly fifty pages, to prove that the Union is unnecessary, on account of the Adjustment of 1782, which he calls FINAL.

The true question, however, on such an Adjustment, as a bar to an Union, seems to be this—Is it efficacious? What is the political and civil state of the country, under its operation? Are the people happy and content? Is there individual security and public prosperity? Because if this be not the case, the measure is clearly not efficacious: and whatever is not efficacious, *ought not to be, nor can it be, final.* Let us not dispute, like casuists, about words, when we are in search of things. What I mean here by *not final*, is, that no constitutional adjustment, which *fails* in those effects, *can bar all other arrangements, to accomplish* such great and necessary purposes. Any position to the contrary, tends to violate the eternal principle of all laws, which is the *good of the people*: and lays waste at once, the essence of all power, which is *necessity*, immutable necessity, to establish the *good of the people.*

Beside, no laws whatever, whether political or commercial, if they be laws of regulation, are in their nature *final*. Had it been otherwise, the adjustment of 1782, could *not* have taken place: but having taken place, it is a demonstrative proof *against*, and not in favour of Mr. Foster. If he argues this point, therefore, on the *principle* of compacts, as a lawyer or a statesman, he is altogether wrong: and if he argues it on the grounds of *fact* he is equally erroneous, for his own words recoil upon, and defeat him.—Let us follow this point.

He tells us (page 3, Late Speech) that “ Mr. Pitt’s arguments (if they deserve that name) are matter of surprise; for they either rest on *misrecollection* of FACTS, or, so far from being *borne up* by the AUTHORITIES he refers to, are *clearly and incontrovertibly* OVERTURNED by them.” And (in page 27,) he maintains on the ground of “ MANY

“PROOFS”—any *one* of which, he says, is sufficient to justify HIS *assertion*,—that the settlement of 1782 was FINAL;—he adds, that those authorities, which overturn Mr. Pitt's *statement*, are “the opinions of the *British Parliament* and *British Ministers*, who conducted the measure:” and in page 31, he says, “Mr. Pitt *contradicts the King, Lords, Commons, Viceroy, and himself.*”

Observe, that the *fact* in question here—is, whether the adjustment was considered in 1782 as *final* or *not*: the authorities referred to on this question, are the *Ministers* and *Viceroy*: and the *contradiction*, as stated by Mr. Foster, is from those authorities to Mr. Pitt, and from Mr. Pitt to them.

Now, I find, that the authorities which this Gentleman has quoted, clearly corroborate the arguments of Mr. Pitt, and incontrovertibly overturn Mr. Foster's assertions. The *records* of the *British Parliament*, the solemn and concurrent declarations of the *Ministers*, and that very *Viceroy* to whom he has referred you, maintain the contrary: for, from those very lips, *I have heard*, in the *British House of Lords*, on March 19, 1799, a positive and unqualified *contradiction* to what this misconceiving Gentleman has *asserted*: And this I testify in the face of day. What are then, his fifty pages of Arguments, and “Many Proofs?” According to the following express words of his Grace the Duke of Portland, for the intentions on that measure of 1782,—“THE ADJUSTMENT *was* NOT FINAL.”—Where are Mr. Foster's authorities—where his proofs of Mr. Pitt's contradictions to his Majesty?—I mention the name of my Sovereign with a deep sense of duty, and all the feelings of just attachment; and I refer to his gracious message on the present occasion, as to an act of uniformity, that establishes the Royal intentions in 1782: I refer to it as a corroboration, that no contradiction in word or act exists, on the point of the adjustment being *not* final.

There is another appeal, set up by this Gentleman, of a still more sacred nature: it is an awful one to Heaven.

I deplore the introduction of Religion, as a proof, when it proves nothing. The best instruments are injured by injudicious application. In all times, but chiefly in the present, evidence of this nature should not be lightly resorted to: and never for the purpose of fallacy, lest it be degraded by the consequent disrepute. Not to endeavour to shield it from this, were a dereliction of all reverence for my religion, and of that duty which I peculiarly owe to the great cause of God and man, under the circumstances of our days.

However, though at issue on the fact, I shall but concisely remark, and with pain, on the futility of Mr. Foster's proof. This Gentleman asserts, that the National Thanksgiving, on the adjustment in 1782, is a proof of its being *final*; I am surpris'd at a position so devoid of force, though not of fallacy.

Its force is that of a mere shadow, which the broad light of LEGISLATIVE *principle* disperses. Will, however, its champion maintain, *against* reason, that this adjustment of 1782, not only removed all errors of past, but comprehended all perfections for future times? This is contrary to common sense, and the melancholy evidence of calamities which desolate a nation that is dear to us.—It argues also an assumption of wisdom and power that belong but to the Deity.

Mark the fallacy:—A solemn thanksgiving was offered up for a final adjustment, says Mr. Foster. Agreed: but a *final* adjustment of what?—of a British claim, a degrading law to bind Ireland in legislative chains. It was on breaking this power of bondage over Ireland, on snapping the fetters of usurpation asunder, and on some other subordinate points, that the *adjustment* was considered *final*. This was the great, and important occasion, which restored its liberty to Ireland, and caused a solemn *Thanksgiving* to be made to the Great Giver of all blessings.—The three other objects of those days, Poyning's Law, the Appellant Jurisdiction, and the Mutiny Bill, were subordinate. But so far, and no farther, did the idea of *final* adjustment reach; and upon this happy and

glorious deliverance from bondage was that pious return of gratitude offered by an entire people.

When, however, Mr. Foster asserts, in order to prove an *Union unnecessary*, that the adjustment went further, in so much as to bar future regulations, he first, maintains an utter impossibility not only in principle, but in object; because, as Lord Lansdown well observed, there was a precise point then in agitation—because it was impossible it could be final upon other points—because it was impossible it could be final upon a point directly the reverse of the one in view, which was, in 1782, a *Separation*—now it is an *Union* of the Parliaments. Secondly, he misconceives and militates a *fact*. Thirdly, he would melt and mould what was *particularly final*, into *universally final*; and, we shall now see, that his arguments for this purpose begun, as they have concluded, in errors.

The second page of Mr. Foster's Speech appears thus—

Speaker.—"The Noble Lord (Castlereagh) has said, that the evils he mentioned arose out of the settlement of 1782; because until then, this kingdom *acknowledged* the power in the British Parliament to bind Ireland."

It is unnecessary to state to a man of your known discrimination at the bar, that by *power* here, can be meant only *authority*.

Lord Castlereagh.—"I did not mean to say *acknowledged*; but that, before the adjustment of 1782, this country was in the *habit of paying obedience* to that power."

Here, you perceive, his Lordship clearly shews, by his explanation, that Ireland *obeyed* an authority which had been *assumed*, but did not *acknowledge* it as *just*.

Speaker.—"The Noble Lord copies his brother Minister in ambiguity of expression, as well as in all his positions. The Minister says, what *puts an end* to any thing is not *final*."—Be so good as to remark *this* ambiguity of expression. The adjustment, as you have seen, was certainly final on *some* points; but, because Mr. Foster cannot have

it *final* upon every constitutional point, he says it was *not* final. He proceeds—"And his Lordship tells us, that paying *obedience to a power* is not an *acknowledgment of that power.*" Now what manner of reasoning is this?

Mr. Foster argues here that, *paying an obedience to a power, IS an acknowledgment of that power.* Consequently, therefore, as Ireland *did* actually *pay obedience* to that power, he establishes, by *his own* reasoning, that Ireland *did acknowledge that power or authority.* So that, while he attempts to prove that Lord Castlereagh maintained the *acknowledgment* of this authority, *he* establishes it upon his *own* arguments: whereas Lord Castlereagh makes a clear and sound distinction, without any confusion or casuistry whatever, but which is warranted in truth and fact—that Ireland *did pay obedience to an assumed authority,* but did *not acknowledge it as a just right.* And upon this principle, and this ground only, the adjustment of 1782 took place. Thus you see, Mr. Foster substantiates by his arguments that charge expressly against himself, which he brought against Lord Castlereagh: but to which his Lordship took exception, and which exception Mr. F. resisted, maintaining, that *paying obedience and acknowledgment of a power were one and the same thing.* Here Mr. Foster, however, holds up a false principle in the Law of Nations; whereas Lord Castlereagh argues against it with the able discrimination of a Publicist, Ireland, says his Lordship, lost its just and *sole* legislative jurisdiction, but it never lost its right. So too says the law: and so says the maxim of that great Publicist, Vattel: "If any Sovereign Power be stripped unjustly of its authority by an usurper, it still preserves its right." (Book II. chap. 12.)

But follow Mr. Foster a little further, and you will see, when Gentlemen endeavour to support what is not supportable, that not only facts and authority, but their very words and arguments contradict them.

Mr. Foster has attempted to maintain, that Lord Castle-reagh's explanation of "*paying obedience to a power*" was "*an acknowledgment of that power.*"—Now, it may be asked here—Did Ireland *pay obedience*? because, if it did,—unquestionably, according to Mr. Foster's argument, it *acknowledged* that power. If Mr. Foster therefore will not deny, (and I am sure he will not,) that it *did* pay obedience; consequently he cannot deny his own argument that it *acknowledged* that power. Now if it *acknowledged* that power, he will not, I expect also, deny his own words in the next sentence—"The measures of that year arose out of "*the disavowal of that power:*" yet, in the preceding sentence, he maintains, paying obedience to a power is an *acknowledgment* of that power; and in two sentences from this, he maintains,—Ireland's "*denial of the British claim.*" So that while Mr. Foster in one breath is *paying obedience* to a power, he is *acknowledging* it; and, while in another, he is *paying obedience*, he is *disavowing* it; and, while he is *acknowledging*, he is *denying* it. This is logical precision, clearness of reasoning, and accuracy of facts.

FIFTH POINT.—*Is it necessary to reject an Union?*

The next point that Mr. Foster aims at, is to shew the absolute *necessity* of rejecting an Union. There is scarcely an argument, however, made use of by him against an Union, that is not a logical demonstration of its *necessity*.

He details, in frightful exhibition for the electric spirit of Irish patriotism, the loss of liberty, the loss of independence, and the loss of the purse, together with the loss of Parliament. To these four principal exceptions of Mr. Foster, which are formidable if they were founded, I shall give a short but distinct answer. First, as to the loss of liberty by an Union—I recur to the only proof we can have on this occasion,—that of example. I ask, therefore, is Scotland enslaved by the Union? certainly not.—Scotland, as a nation, is as free as England. And, with respect to

individuals, " Union has broken asunder the bands of feudal vassalage," says Mr. Dundas; under whose chains the people groaned. The application is obvious.

Secondly: As to the loss of independence,—Ireland is at this moment, completely dependant as a nation, in her crown, commerce, revenue, and protection. And, as to the great body of the people, were there is such a frightful distinction in the extremes of opulence and poverty, there must be individual dependence, and all its abject and immoral consequences. Whereas Union will give unrivalled independence to the nation, by an identity in all things with Great Britain. And as to individuals, it will, as it has done, through the uniform results of commerce, in all times and countries, bring back the high, and advance the low in Ireland to that point of political morality, where BOTH will be happy.

Thirdly: As to the loss of the purse, what does it contain? The opulence of a State depends upon the opulence of its individuals. And, according to the unquestionable authority of your near Relative before Parliament, there are above two millions of persons out of three, who are excused through poverty from paying four-pence per annum each to the State.* Union, however, will throw open to industry, all the means and treasures of commerce. Look to Scotland, " and who would wish (says Mr. Dundas,) to change their present situation for all the *pomp* and *poverty* they enjoyed previous to the Union?"

Fourthly: As to the loss of the legislature: Mr. Foster, indeed, may lose his Chair, but the Catholics will gain a PARLIAMENT.—Union will shake off the shackles of hideous distinction from three millions of mankind; it will give power to rights, wealth to poverty, extent to liberty, and happiness to all.

* Speech of Robert Johnson, Esq. May 24, 1795, in the Irish House of Commons. Dublin, printed by Mercier.

The last point relative to the necessity of rejecting an Union, is an argument built, first, upon effect *by analogy*: and, secondly, upon effects by *assumption*.—I must observe, however, in Mr. Foster's words to Mr. Flood, "that it would be absurd to follow him through all his errors; many of them the most ignorant child would be ashamed to advance; but I will point out a few, not perhaps so obvious without examination." (Woodfall's Report, page 107.)

He remarks in his late speech, (page 103)—it is stated by Mr. Dundas, that *under Union, the linen trade of Scotland increased as one to twenty-three*. But, adds Mr. Foster, the linen trade of Ireland, without Union, increased as one to eighty-eight: then, (asks Mr. Foster exultingly,) *has Mr. Dundas any more such arguments to produce?*

I answer Mr. Foster, and tell him, that Mr. Dundas produced *no such* argument. And further, I do believe that Mr. Foster himself would not have been so uncandid, as to produce this unfair comparison, had he paused a moment for reflection. Did Mr. Dundas enter into *any* comparative view of the Scotch linen trade with the Irish? most certainly not: yet Mr. Foster details a *comparison*, and asks, if Mr. Dundas has any *more such* arguments?

The simple fact is this—Mr. Dundas states the increase of the Scotch linen trade under the Union, "because linen is the staple manufacture of Ireland—and because a celebrated character, (Mr. Foster,) had *descended* so far as to *create* an *alarm* on this subject."—(Page 20, Mr. Dundas's speech.) Mr. Dundas's object was to shew to the world, that there was *no ground* for Mr. Foster's *alarm*: because if the linen trade of Scotland increased *so much* under the Union, how much *more* must it increase in Ireland, where it is the staple manufacture. We see, consequently, a fact was stated, which related simply and solely to the increase of the *Scotch* linen trade.

But what does Mr. Foster? he perverts this fact into a most unfair *comparison* of the greater portion of Irish trade, with

an infinitely less portion of Scotch trade, as to their *past* increase: I say, most unfairly; because I shall prove it immediately. If he had argued justly, he would have stated commerce against commerce, as I shall now do, and convince him, there are *fair* arguments to be produced, which will utterly defeat him on his own ground, though he has, with all the meditation of his skill, chosen it out for triumph.—Were, I however, to follow his example, I should tell him, that if we compare the commerce of Ireland in 1707, with only *one* country, which is England; and now with *two*, England and Scotland; which comparison will give no inconsiderable advantage in his favour; we shall find that Irish commerce has NOT increased, even thus considered, as *one* to *ten*; whereas, since the same date, the linen trade of Scotland has increased *with Union*, as *one* to *twenty-three*. (See Table O.)

This is, however, Mr. Foster's mode of stating comparisons by *partial* views.—I decline it. It is altogether unfair in comparisons, and inconclusive in argument. The plain and just question is, how much has the trade of Ireland increased since 1707 *without Union*; and how much has that of Scotland increased *with Union*? With the advantages which we have given Mr. Foster in the foregoing comparison, the trade of Ireland has certainly increased very considerably,—from *one* to *nine*: but the trade of Scotland has increased infinitely beyond this—*from ONE* to *FORTY-TWO*. Now, I might fairly ask Mr. Foster, has *he* any more *such* arguments to produce? (See Table P.)

Thus we see, that his argument *against* an Union, upon this ground of *effects* by *analogy*, turns out a demonstration in *its* favour.—Let us next examine his *effects* upon *assumption*, and try his force in that quarter.

When I asked if Mr. Foster had any more such arguments to produce as his last, I was aware that he advances amidst hofts of similar array;—but they are, like modern *Conscripts*, unfriendly to the *cause*.

Two, however, of his chosen supports against Union, appear formidable;—the splendor of TALENTS, and the power of all-destroying TIME. With the one, he would guide and grace his triumph over Union; and, by the other, hollow out an abyfs, to ingulph it in for ever.—Let us, however, advance, and meet him upon the ground whereon he attempts this.

Mr. Foster says, if an Union takes place, all Talents will pass away from Ireland. But here I ask, and not without a tribute of mourning for the cause of an injured empire and the keen sufferings of departed genius—what has banished, during ages, from Ireland talents that have enlightened and adorned other nations? Was it an Union? No; it was Disunion, civil and religious Disunion; a political poison, for which, I trust, we have found out the antidote. It was by this disgraceful and impolitic Disunion, the Arms of Spain, the brow of Austria, and the throne of France, have been crowned with laurels, gathered by Irish hands. Was it by Union, that talents of another order, and no less brilliant, have passed from Ireland? Was it thus the Genius of Britain fostered the strength of Denham, the elegance of Roscommon, and the talents of Steel? Was it thus the reason of Britain was instructed, or its fancy amused by the wit of Farquhar, the wisdom of Swift, and the sweetness of Parnell? Was it thus its mind was enlightened by the genius of Goldsmith—its heart touched by the sentiment of Sterne—or its soul exalted by the sublimity of Burke? No, Sir, there was an attraction in Britain which can never grow up, and flourish in Ireland, but under the shade of Union. Its widely spreading protection will add another monument to that truth, which has been established since the history of science began—that the seats of *commerce* are the seats of *learning*.

Since the beginning, knowledge has kept pace with wealth, extended with industry, and flourished with commerce—such has been its progress since creation over the globe. The

Monarchies of Egypt and Assyria, the history of the Phœnicians, the Grecian colonies, the Empire of Rome, and the East under the Caliphs, all demonstrate this truth. Thus has knowledge pervaded Europe; always ABANDONING the POOR or impoverished, and uniformly ABIDING with the RICH. We have but to open our eyes, and the proofs rush in upon the mind. We behold the splendor and opulence of British commerce attracting and renumerating the genius of the civilized world to day. Will then Mr. Foster deny, that like causes will produce like effects?—If so, he may deny the existence of light amidst the splendor of the sun.

Now let us view Mr. Foster's argument of Time. He says—if the Parliament be removed, it will not be able to *administer in time* to the WANTS and WISHES of the people, or to *guard against excesses* or DISCONTENTS. Does this gentleman argue upon time, without one moment's reflexion? Let him pause upon the memory of long generations of his ancestors, who have passed away; and let him answer if Parliaments had not *time* to administer to the *wants, wishes, and woes* of the labourers, manufacturers, and poor of Ireland? Were not these people, and are not their descendants at this day badly lodged, ill fed, and worse clothed, than any other men in the civilized world? Have they not cried to past Parliaments, throughout *ages*? And are not *ages time* to administer comforts, which are the just and common rights of every member of a civilized community? Have not the people of Ireland expressed their *wants* and *wishes* in the loud murmurs of *discontent*, and all the fury of *excess*? Why then have not former Parliaments administered to their wants and wishes, and guarded against those excesses and discontents, throughout ages?—Mr. Foster will answer, *They had not time!*—but who will be so weak, as to be deluded by words, when there are such melancholy facts before him?—A nation, bleeding at every pore, appears in the face of heaven, as evidence against Mr. Foster!—but I trust in God, the *time* is *now* come, when we shall act like men, and live like brethren.

Thus, Sir, I have considered all the prominent arguments of Mr. Foster's speech. And I hope I have established, as far as moral demonstration can be founded upon facts, which are intelligible to the meanest capacity, and the ablest cannot controvert; that the trade of Ireland may be *lost without an Union*—that it must be *extended with an Union*—and therefore, that *an Union* is the great charter of Ireland's *political SALVATION and AGGRANDISEMENT.* All assertions to the contrary, on the part of Mr. Foster, I trust, are fully and fairly confuted. And I must here remark, in Mr. Foster's own words, that upon this subject, he has indeed “observed “largely, but nothing was ever so mistated, misrepresented, “misunderstood.” There are certain mistatements, however, that are irreconcilable. The most able and honest men, indeed, may have different opinions upon one and the same subject: but that one and the same individual should support different opinions with himself, on the same point, is scarcely to be credited.

Yet you have seen before how Mr. Foster, in 1785, told the Irish Parliament, in confirmation of his object then, that there were *NO COALS* in Ireland. And in the year 1799, he tells them, in confirmation of his object—there *are* coals.

Mr. Foster, in the year 1785, gravely admonished the Parliament, and informed them, that they could never have salt, bark, or hops, but through the medium of Great Britain.—In 1799, he promises them salt, bark, and hops, through other mediums.

Mr. Foster, in 1785, menaced Ireland with the war of bounties from Britain.—In 1799, he inspires Ireland to scoff at the war, and desires Britain to beware of its war of bounties.

Mr. Foster, in 1785, told the Irish nation, that the linen trade depended upon English protection,—In 1799, he tells them, it is no such thing.

Mr. Foster, in 1785, cautioned the manufacturers, merchants, and northern landlords of Ireland, to secure their trade and rents by a solemn compact.—In 1799, he threatens po-

erty, and loss of liberty, if their trade and rents be firmly secured by a compact, infinitely superior in substance, though not the same in form.

Mr. Foster, in 1785, told Ireland, that the bounty system was unjustly in its *favour*.—In 1799, he tells Ireland that it is an unequal encouragement *against* it.

Mr. Foster, in 1785, shewed that the linen manufacture of Ireland depended upon Britain, by the ruin of its sail cloth branch when British bounties were withdrawn.—In 1799, he asserts, that the Irish manufacture is not dependent on British bounties, or British discretion.

Mr. Foster, in 1785, proved, that the trade of Ireland must be extended, and new manufactures established, by a compact with Britain.—In 1799, he asserts, that it is radically impossible under any compact.

Mr. Foster, in 1785, said, there were *no* markets *under heaven* for the Irish linens but Britain.—In 1799, he says, there are *other* markets.

Mr. Foster, in 1785, gravely told the Parliament of Ireland, that the very *existence* of that nation depended on its beneficial connection and commerce with Britain.—In 1799, he asserts upon evidence, which *he* has stated, that this connexion is much *more beneficial* to Britain.—This evidence, however, proves to be but a tissue of misconceptions, interwoven with misstatements. I have examined it with pain, and often with surprise; it contains false policy, false law, false reasoning, false rhetoric;—it is a work of melancholy error, and fraught with bad practical consequences.

Upon a question, however, the most solemn in its results, and which involves the fate of an empire, and of millions in the remotest regions of the Globe; all passion and prejudice must be put down. Solid and sober Reason should speak with its profoundest voice, and be guided by its most comprehensive combinations. This is not a business of Party, nor of Opposition:—it is the cause of a bleeding world; it is judgment upon the question of our existence. Is the

Empire to stand or fall? For, if the kingdoms do NOT UNITE—they SEPARATE. And should that awful day arrive, it dates the death-warrant of Ireland, and decides, perhaps, the ultimate fate of Britain.

As to Ireland, the case is obvious:—it *cannot* subsist without connexion. If not connected with *Britain*, it *must* be connected with some other power. Ireland, however, has grown up and flourished, under the shelter of the *British Oak*:—but, if engrafted upon the French tree of liberty, one of two events must follow.—It will become a poor, meagre, stunted arm, that will wither of itself, or be cut off and cast away to perish, according to French interest, or French caprice.—Or, it may become, perhaps, a vigorous member of France, or a strong and noxious excrescence replete with poison, and emitting pestilential vapours, deadly to its neighbouring Britain. In order to save herself, therefore, Britain *must* lopp it off for ever.

It is the policy of preservation.—View that remarkable declaration of destruction towards nations, which was drawn up by *Condorcet*, and presented by the Assembly to the King.—It states, that the French “do not mean to attack territories “ by *Fire* and *Sword*, but by what will be MORE DREADFUL “ —the introduction of *FRENCH LIBERTY*.”

I trust, however, that the Parliament of Ireland will save its Country, invigorate the Empire, and immortalize itself by an incorporation with the British Legislature; and soon remove the existing monuments of human misery in Ireland; under the unrivalled and widely diffused liberties of a constitution the most perfect; amidst scenes of nature the most fertile; and means of opulence beyond calculation.

E

I trust.

I trust, notwithstanding Mr. Foster's opposition, that the Parliament of Ireland, thus *incorporated*, will check the gaze of millions upon those ravished rights, which had been given to them by God and Nature. But the with-holding of which has long marked out the grounds for dissention, kindled the flames of tumult; and has enabled inhuman traitors to madden the people into excess, despair, rebellion.

I trust, also, notwithstanding Mr. Foster, that through the wisdom of the present Parliament of Ireland, neither the zeal of *humble industry*, nor the splendor of *exalted talents*, will be seen henceforth to pass into foreign lands, among unoppressed people.

The people of Ireland, however, have *not been* oppressed by the Government;—I protest against the assertion. But, I repeat it, the barbarous spirit of feudal times looked *down* upon the cottage, and imperiously *above* the throne:—and thus the government was *governed*, and its subjects were slaves. This it was, Sir, which furnished you with a spectacle, that you have well described to be “such as humanity must deplore, and philosophy regret;” * for hence “the people were divided and ferocious:” hence “the gentry ignorant and corrupt:” hence “the aristocracy insolent and overbearing:” hence “these evils overspread a seemingly devoted land: and “religious feuds and political animosities divided the nation.” Let us, therefore, bear in mind what I have before established upon the proofs of ages and nations, that, as commerce enriched, knowledge enlightened mankind. Let us remember, that through commerce, the lordly yoke of feudal tyranny has been broken throughout Europe, *KINGS freed* from tyranny, and *PEOPLE* from *OPPRESSION*. Let us be assured,

* “Letter on an Union,” by William Johnson, Esq. Member of the Irish Parliament—Lond. Edit. page. 5.

that if Union be lost, the commerce of Ireland is lost : that if Union be established, the commerce of Ireland is established ; and upon a firm basis for incalculable improvement. And it cannot be too often repeated, and impressed upon the heart and mind of the Irish nation, that it is through *commerce*, and *only* through commerce, the *barbarous spirit* of feudal power will *finally depart* from Ireland.—*Thus* will the old and *corrupt body* of *civil* defects find a SEPULCHRE in the UNION.

I am, Dear Sir, &c. &c.

THOMAS B. CLARKE.

APPENDIX.

TABLE A.

MR. FOSTER'S STATEMENT.

Raw Materials—Beef, Butter, &c. supplied by Ireland to Britain	-	£. 2,910,724
Ditto by Britain to Ireland	-	447,277
		£. 2,463,447
Excess of Supply to Ireland		£. 2,463,447

TABLE B.

An Account of the Value of Raw Materials imported from
Ireland into Great Britain, on an average of the last Three
Years. [No. 4. Thomas Irving, Inspector General.]

	-	<i>Real Value.</i>
Copper Ore	-	£. 3,196
Ditto, unwrought	-	4,848
Feathers for Beds	-	8,727
Flax, rough	-	1,260
Hides, Ox or Cow	-	66,375
Kelp	-	7,462
Seeds, Rape	-	10,900
Skins, Calf, raw	-	43,293
		£. 146,061

Total

£. 146,061

E 3

Raw

Raw Materials [No. 5. Inspector General]	
From Great Britain	447,477
From Ireland, as above	146,064
	<hr/>
In favour of Ireland	£. 301,413

A P P E N D I X

TABLE C.

[No. 15. Thomas Irving, Inspector General.]

An Account of the true Value of the Products and Manufactures of Ireland imported into Great Britain annually, on an average of the last Three Years	£. 5,510,825
Ditto of Great Britain with Ireland	2,087,672
	<hr/>
Annual Balance in favour of Ireland	£. 3,423,153

(Signed) THOMAS IRVING,
Inspector-General of the
Imports and Exports of
Great Britain.

March 5, 1799.

TABLE D.

[No. 16. Thomas Irving, Inspector General.]

Total Value of Imports into Great Britain from Ireland, on an average of Three years preceding 5th Jan. 1799.	£. 5,612,689
Ditto of Exports from Great Britain to Ireland	3,555,845
	<hr/>
Annual excess of Balance in favour of Ireland	£. 2,056,844

TABLE E.

Annual Amount of Revenues to Ireland from British Commerce, on an Average of three years preceding March 25, 1798. [Lord Auckland on the Union, Table 6. extracted from the Official Accounts. - - £. 691,679

Annual Medium of four years Bounties from Great Britain to Irish Linens, [Thomas Irving, Inspector General, No. 17.] - - 34,783

Imports from Ireland to Great Britain, [Thomas Irving, Inspector General, No. 16.] - - 5,612,689

Total £. 6,339,151

Revenues of Great Britain from Irish Commerce, on an annual Medium of Four Years preceding Jan. 5, 1799, [Thomas Irving, Inspector General, No. 17.] - - - - £. 40,911

Bounties as above - - - - 34,783

Remaining profit to Revenue 6,128

Total Value of Exports from Great Britain to Ireland, on an average of three years preceding March 25, 1799, [Thomas Irving, Inspector General, No. 16.] - 3,555,845

Total £. 3,561,973

Balance in favour of Ireland - £. 2,777,178

TABLE F.

No. 12, Official Accounts.

A LIST of the principal Articles of the Produce and Manufacture of Ireland, which, in the year 1792, were favoured in the Duties on Importation from that Kingdom, together with the Rate of Duty on each Article imported from thence; and also on the like Articles imported from Foreign Countries: Likewise a List of such principal Articles, as were in the above period, prohibited from being imported from Foreign Countries, but which might be imported from Ireland.

<i>The Produce of</i>	<i>Ireland.</i>			<i>Other Countries.</i>		
	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
Bacon, per cwt.	-	-	-	free	2	7 0
Beef	-	-	-	free	prohibited	
Butter, per cwt.	-	-	-	free	0	2 6
Cattle	-	-	-	free	prohibited	
Flax dressed, per cwt.	-	-	-	free	5	4 6
Hemp ditto, ditto	-	-	-	free	2	4 0
Ditto, undressed ditto	-	-	-	free	0	3 8
Any sort of Flax whatever, or of Hemp the Produce of Ireland, and all the production thereof, as Thread, Yarn, and Linen, the Manufacture of Ireland, imported directly from thence	-	-	-	free	0	0 0
Hides, Cow or Ox, undressed, the Hide	-	-	-	free	0	0 9
Iron, unwrought, per ton	-	-	-	1	10	10 2

Ditto, slit or hammered into	{	from 0 4 5	from 9 11
Rods, per cwt.	-	to 0 9 11	to 10 3
Linen, under 22½ inches in breadth, the 120 ells	-	free	0 16 5
Ditto, between 22½ & 31½ do. do.	free		1 4 7
Ditto, ditto 31½ & 36 do. do.	free	{	from 1 16 11
			to 3 1 5
Ditto, above 36 do. do.	free	{	from 3 9 11
			to 4 14 5
Damask Tabling, per yard	-	free	{
			from 0 1 3
			to 0 10 4
Diaper ditto, ditto	-	free	{
			from 0 1 1
			to 0 4 8
Tewelling and Napkining, per 120 ells	-	free	{
			from 0 15 3
			to 14 7 6
Plain Linen, not otherwise enumerated or described, per cent. ad valorem	-	free	33 6 8
Chequered, striped, painted, stained or dyed Linen, per cent. ad valorem	-	49 10 0	80 4 2
Pitch and Tar, the last of 12 barrels	0 11 0	0 12 5	
Pork	-	free	prohibited
Rosin, per cwt.	-	0 1 6	0 2 3
Sail Cloth, the 120 Ells	-	free	{
			from 2 1 9
			to 3 16 1
Seed, Rape, the last,	-	0 1 0	6 12 6
Sheep	-	free	prohibited
Skins, Calve, per dozen	-	free	0 2 9
Thread, the Pound Weight,	-	free	{
			from 0 0 1
			to 0 2 9
Wood, viz. Planks, the 100 feet	0 2 9	1 19 8	
Yarn, viz. Cotton, the Pound Weight	free	0 0 3½	
Woollen or Bay, per cwt.	free	0 14 8	

W. SIMS, D. Col,

T. Richardson, Comp.

T A B L E G.

A LIST of Articles which in the Year 1792 were favoured on Exportation to Ireland, together with the Rate of Duty to which such Articles were subject, and also the Rate of Drawback and Bounty to which these Articles were entitled on Exportation to that Kingdom, and also to Foreign Countries; likewise a LIST of such principal Articles as in the above Period were prohibited from being exported to Foreign Countries, but which might be exported to Ireland.

Duties Outwards. To Ireland. Other Countries

	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
Coals—Per Chaldron, Winton measure	0	1	2	—	—	—
To any British Plantation in America	—	—	—	0	2	3
To any other place in British ships,						
the Newcastle Chaldron	-	-	-	0	15	5
To ditto, in foreign ships, ditto	-	-	-	1	7	6
The Ton weight	-	-	0	0	9	—
To any British Plantation in America,						
the Ton Weight	-	-	-	0	1	0
To any other Place in British ships, do.	-	-	-	0	5	2
To ditto, in foreign ships, do.	-	-	-	0	9	2
Gum Arabic, } Thirty Tons per ann.	—	—	—	1	13	4
Gum Senegal, }				0	5	10

Bounties Outwards.

Sugar, Refined, the Bounty (per cwt. in whole Loaves and Lumps) of allowed on the Exportation to Ireland, when on account of the Average Price, it is discontinued to Foreign Countries, except the British Dominions	1	6	0	—	—	—
Ditto, Ditto, (per Cwt. in Loaves broken in pieces) ditto	0	15	0	—	—	—

Drawbacks Outwards.

Silk, Organzine, or Thrown, in the								
Gum, the lbs.	-	-	0	6	11	0	6	5
Raw the lbs.	-	-	0	2	10	0	2	0
Thrown, Dyed	-	-	1	2	3	1	1	9
Tea, (per Cwt.)	-	-	5	0	0	-	-	-

Goods prohibited to Foreign Countries, but permitted to be exported to Ireland.

Coin—Of Gold and Silver

Tools or Utenfils—Used in the Cotton or Linen Manufactures, and also in the Woollen, Silk, Iron, and Steel Manufactures

Wool Cards—Exceeding 4s. per pair

Corn—When prohibited in Great Britain, allowed to Ireland, if an Embargo be laid on the Article in that Kingdom

Memorandum—Bounties given by Parliament on British Ships in the Greenland Fishery, allowed for Ships from Ireland: Ships of Ireland allowed all the Privileges of British Ships.

N. B. The Privileges are very numerous.

T. WILLIMOT, Col.

J. D. HUME, Dep. Compt.

20th February, 1799.

TABLE O.

1707.

The Amount of the Commerce of Ireland with *England only*, according to the official Rate or value

£. 569,835

1799.

The Amount of the Commerce of Ireland with *England and Scotland*, or Great Britain, on an average of Three preceding Years, according to the *same rate*, and Mr.

Foster's Statement (p. 77)

5,646,311

* * Increase not as *one to ten*.

TABLE P.

SCOTLAND. 1707.	
Imports	£. 6,733
Exports	47,779
	<hr/>
	£. 54,512

SCOTLAND 1797.	
Imports	£. 1,037,676
Exports	1,217,121
	<hr/>
	£. 2,254,797

INCREASE above 1 to 41.

IRELAND with ENGLAND. 1707. (According to the Custom-house Books.)	
Imports	£. 306,423
Exports	263,412
	<hr/>
	£. 569,835

IRELAND with GREAT BRITAIN. 1797.

(From the Custom-house Books.)

Average of Three Years, to 1799, as stated by Mr. Foster.

Exports	£. 2,775,330
Imports	2,870,981
	<hr/>
	£. 5,646,311

INCREASE not as one to ten.

Here it must be observed, that there are great advantages, through this comparison, in favour of Ireland—1st, Because in calculating the increased state of Trade at the *present* period, we reckon upon *two* countries, England and Scotland: whereas, we take its *former* state of trade in 1707, but with one country, England; and 2d, Because the Increase with Great Britain is much beyond the increase with the rest of the world. With these advantages, however, in favour of Ireland, in this comparison, what is the increase?—not 1 to 10; whereas, that of Scotland, is above 1 to 41.

FINIS.