

14
A Privy-Counsellor analysed :

IN A

LETTER

TO

MR. GRATTAN.

CONTAINING

EXCELLENT REASONS FOR THAT GENTLEMAN'S
LATE COMPLIMENTS TO THE
CORPORATIONS AND UNIVERSITY
OF
DUBLIN.

WITH A FULL ACCOUNT OF MR. GRATTAN'S
CALM AND POINTED FORGIVENESS
OF ALL HIS ENEMIES :

AND THE HAPPY END OF POPULAR SOCIETIES.

" ———— WHEN THE SPANISH ARMADA ASSAIL'D YOUR
HIGHNESS—E'COD ! THEY CAUGHT THE WRONG SOW BY
THE EAR !!! "

Mayor of Coventry's Address to Queen Elizabeth.

DUBLIN:

Printed by William Porter, Grafton-Street.

1798.

Houses of the Oireachtas

A
L E T T E R

TO

MR. GRATTAN.

DUBLIN, November 20, 1798.

SIR,

AS you have been pleased to address the Guild of Merchants—Corporation of the City—and the University of Dublin—through the channel of a British print, you will pardon my noticing you through the medium of an Irish one.—We may have our mutual reasons for the adoption.—You may wish to *attack* in a kingdom where you are not known, and I may wish to *parry* in a kingdom where you are.—In the former, you might justly hope to sink your political character in your literary

A

expertness;

expertness ; but in the latter, an unequivocal intimacy with both precludes you from a chance of profiting by any ignorance of the one, or any activity of the other ; and as the *Courier* has done you the irreparable injury of publishing your Letter, I trust he will be impartial enough to make you the only atonement in his power, by copying mine.

You might still have enjoyed the advantages of obscurity, amidst the great body of the English Nation, but that the celebrity of your evidence at Maidstone officiously introduced you to their notice ; and the favourable impression they must now receive from the publication of your Paragraph and Letter, (with the several Answers thereto,) will probably create an intimacy as lasting as your life ; and I can assure you, that your publications leave in Ireland not one doubt respecting you, save as to the situation of your understanding ; and, in Great Britain, no doubt whatsoever as to your *literary* capacity.

But perhaps you will think me too partial to you, when I declare, that I should attribute the
rhapsody

rhapsody of your stile rather to the soreness of your pride, than the overflowing of your folly, but that the unparalleled *incoherence* of some passages cultivates a strong ground of *conjecture*; and almost induces me to doubt the charitableness of risking any expression which might tend to increase the malady.

However, as you seem to court a war of words, it is probable that your *next* Paragraph or Letter may determine the true state of your situation; and, until then, I shall be inclined to adopt your own expression to the Guild of Merchants, "*That at present you deserve not absolute silence, nor yet much notice.*"

Your Paragraph in the Oracle, of the 29th of October, does so much honour to your judgment and discretion, that any eulogium of mine must be squandered on so finished, and so convincing, a performance; and, therefore, if I notice it at all, the only course left me is to criticise on its defects, which a very few words will fully perform, and which such an ingenuous author, as you are, must disinterestedly admire.

In that argumentative Paragraph you very shrewdly assert, that “ *the nonsensical and false charges brought against you, by the Guild of Merchants, are not grounded on legal evidence ;*” —and then, with equal shrewdness, and more ingenuity, you produce the most extraordinary and convincing species of *legal* evidence, to disprove their charge, and establish your own innocence, that forensick expertness could, by possibility, give birth to—namely—you produce *yourself* as your *own witness*, and give decisive testimony in your *own favour*, by further asserting, “ *That the charge is false and nonsensical, and that it is remote and unsupported ; and that therefore the Corporation have put their seal to falsehood and folly.*—No doubt, this is most eligible evidence to justify a politician in his *own* opinion ; but I much fear the reasoning part of the nation will say, that it is *not quite so legal* as that which it assumes to *answer*.

Quære——will much doubt be entertained whether the seal of the Corporation, or (*the late Right Honourable*) Henry Grattan’s signature, has been affixed to the *greater folly*, or the *more remote assertion* ?

But

As Nelson and Hughes, who had the assurance to accuse you before the Irish Lords, did not rely *solely* on their seals or their signature, it happened most fortunately for your character, that their accusation was corroborated *only* by *oath*; whilst your justification has been (*more legally*) certified upon honour.

However, as I fear the British and Irish nations are too solid and sulky to be convinced by the most exquisite ingenuity, if it has not *some* sense or argument to embellish it, I apprehend you had better handsomely give up the Paragraph at once, and try if we can have better success in commenting on your Letter.

But if I should continue the same stile of approbation and panegyric on your Letter, which I have used to your Paragraph, we might justly be suspected of being in collusion to impose upon the public, and therefore I shall now *affect* to proceed under colour of a more serious animadversion; though I trust you will do me the justice of thinking that I am so entirely disinterested on the subject, that I feel
neither

neither influenced nor biased in the most remote degree, by any puerile respect for either your writing or your character.

As your Paragraph had the singularity, so it had the end, of the phoenix, and from its ashes, after eleven days' labour, has arisen a Letter, which possessing all the qualities of the parent, adds the additional ornaments of length and rhapsody; and to enliven the former subjects of invective, adds *a compliment* to the University of Dublin and its reverend Doctors, as it were to give variety to a production, of which you perhaps doubted the insipidity.—In that solid, argumentative, and well-digested Letter you say, "*You wish to begin with the MERCHANTS, as you respect them most;*" and to convince them of that *respect*, and of your own *humility*, you proceed to tell them, very respectfully, (by a figure of rhetoric) "*that in bearing down your character they forfeit their own.*"—I presume you mean *public* character, and on that point we disagree; for, on the contrary, I know of no means by which so respectable a body as the Guild of Merchants could so effectually forfeit their

their characters, as by any futile effort to support
yours.

And perhaps you are the only man of this country, who is at this moment ignorant, that every public body in Ireland *elevates* its character in the same proportion as you *reprobate* it, and that every loyal subject becomes estimable in the same degree as he is honoured by your invective:—therefore, the Guild of Merchants, I apprehend, find themselves both served and honoured by your first animadversion, and would willingly return you the same compliment, but fear it would not answer you the *same purpose*.

However, *guessing* the imbecillity and imprudence of your first observation, you proceed to qualify it by a worse—and assert, “*that the Guild of Merchants are no more the Merchants of Dublin, than they are the People of Ireland!*”——Singular! to find such a faithful sympathy between public *character* and private *memory*, that no sooner the one is *injured*, than the other instantly becomes *impaired*. And in the critical moment, you totally forget, that the Guild of Merchants compose almost all the
 respectable

respectable traders in the city of Dublin; and at a full meeting of whom, and by a unanimous suffrage, (the *late Right Honourable*) HENRY GRATTAN was disfranchised from the rank of freeman "because he was concerned in promoting the Rebellion."——This naturally startled you, and to the pardonable flush of your spirits on that occasion, I am willing to impute your florid and laconic description of the Guild and their motives. But for the total absence of Wit, in your description, I should have been led to think it favoured of reverie.——And the purest advice I can give you, to avoid similar failures in satire and irony, is——rather to pursue your old and successful practice of *plagiarism*, than hazard the invention of any new system of calumny, which none of the subjects could *feel*, and very few of them could *understand*.

But seeming to feel that your painting of the Guild could hardly catch the eye of your own country, you most plaintively complain to the British Nation of the "*scandalous proceedings which a certain description of people had adopted to bear down your character.*" But you very judiciously

judiciously prevent all British strangers from forming any grounded opinion as to the extent of the charge, or the justice of the punishment—by wisely omitting to specify the *persons*, the *charge*, or the *infliction*; and most bravely hold out “*the shield of a character*” with which they are unacquainted, to “*receive the shafts*” of a charge of which they are ignorant, and then cunningly plume yourself upon the *invisibilty of both*.

However, in pity to the shade of departed reputation, I will try to lay the spirit of enquiry by which it is tormented, and drive all your disgraces within the circle of a single period—You have been degraded by your *King*—your *Country*—your *City*—your *Corporation*—your *Parliament*—your *University*—and your *Connections*——’Tis done!!

Public curiosity is now satisfied—enquiry will be at rest—and your ingenuity will be saved the expenditure of any further equivocation. Nothing is now requisite but *explanation*.

B

You

You have been degraded by your *King* from the rank and confidence of a *privy-counselor*.

You have been degraded before the *Parliament*, by evidence upon their secret committee.

You have been degraded by the *Metropolis*, from the privileges of a *freeman* and *constituent*.

You have been erased by *Derry* from the rolls of their loyalists.

You have not been much *flattered* by the self-conviction of your intimates.

And the brilliant shadow of your former honors has been wisely chased from the walls of our university, lest even its shade should obscure the *principles* of the rising generation.

Your talents—your name—nay, even the pride of your services—have been degraded: and can never be restored, unless (in the words of your own address to your constituents) it shall

“ *please*

“ *please Heaven to dispose of Kings and of Parliaments ! ! !* ”

These are grievous punishments, it is true—affailing at once the pride of a vain man, and disappointments of an ambitious one, to whom no consolation can now remain, save the honest reflection of having at least *attempted* to ruin his country.

But so strong is my veneration, even to the mourning *reliques* of virtue or of patriotism, that if it were possible to palliate the insatiableness of your ambition, or the tortures of its disappointment, I should pardon the efforts of your *asperity*, as I should the *groans of Tantalus*, or the *curse of Ixion*.

However, as you declare in your Letter, that “ *you receive your injuries with calm and pointed forgiveness, the result of a proud superiority,* ”—I am happy that your *pride*, and your *philosophy*, anticipate the purposes of my commiseration, and furnish that miraculous panacea to your conscience, which, under every circumstance and through every measure, can keep pace with the climax of your errors.

B 2

You

You say, "*to be angry with such men were to be degraded;*" I should be equally inexcusable with yourself, were I by any unnecessary rebuke to rouse that anger, or increase that degradation, which is already more than sufficient to undeceive your country. I shall therefore restrain myself to the humble office of keeping the *result* of that "*proud superiority*" in practice, for the exercise of which you have had, and probably will have, so many and such pressing occasions.

Your justification is the most judicious that under such circumstances could possibly be adopted. Wide and comprehensive,—it envelopes all crimes and all difficulties,——and wants nothing but *proof* and *argument* to render it *efficacious*.

You begin by saying, that "*You are so linked and connected with every thing which belongs to the Irish Nation, that a comprehensive description of them could not by any injustice disgrace itself, without including their natural friend and advocate in their degradation.*"

So far as that sentence is *intelligible*, I perfectly agree with you.

I freely

I freely admit, that you have been *lately* so linked and connected with *a thing* that belonged to a *great body* of the Irish nation, that it is now doubtful *which* the disgrace belongs to. And I also admit, that your degradation does arise from being the natural friend and advocate of *that body* of the people with whom you were so linked and connected ; and which body, after having caused the veins of 35,000 of his Majesty's deluded subjects to be opened, has at length *given you the slip*, and (at least *affected*) to return to its allegiance.

And as to another great body of the Irish nation, of whom if you were not the *natural*—I admit you were the *pretended*—friend and advocate, it is now pretty well ascertained, that your friendship has ruined the *credit*, and your advocacy the *cause*, of your clients ; and that the only advantage they can now derive from their experience, is the comfortable reflection, that in destroying *them*, you have ruined *yourself* ; and must now relinquish your trade, as you can expect no farther *credit*.

Your

Your next ground of defence is neither so general or so judicious. You rely (as a proof of *your innocence*) that there was not *legal* evidence of your *guilt* before the Guild of Merchants, and I equally admire your play upon the word "*concerned*," as used by the Guild ; and your silence on the word "*promoted*," as used by the Corporation. The former expression you conceived more *difficult of proof* than the latter, and if you could weaken the application of the one term, you would let the other take its chance of credit.

But when you took and subscribed the *oath of a Freeman*, you had quite comprehension enough to understand the *extent* of your obligation ; and I do not recollect in that oath any *salvo* for a play upon expressions, more especially relating to *treasonable practices*. However, if you have any doubts upon that subject, you can easily reconcile yourself by recurring to your *own jurat*.

Though the great leading principles of *legal* evidence, as admitted or applied by the superior
or

or ordinary courts of *criminal* judicature, are decided and immutable, yet, the practice—the necessity—the mode—and the extent of evidence, is frequently varied before other tribunals. Parliament,—courts-martial and military—courts of admiralty—corporation-courts—jurisdictions by statute—&c. frequently admit evidence for *special* purposes, by *privilege*, *custom*, or *ex necessitate rei*, which strictly would not be sufficient in the ordinary *criminal* courts of justice; yet, by that privilege, custom, or necessity, it becomes legal evidence, *quoad* the subjects—purpose—or application; and I believe you will hardly *rest* your justification on an argument that a corporation, in *execution of its corporate power* or capacity, must, in *all* instances produce the same strict, technical, full, *extent* of legal evidence to *remove* a corporator, which would be necessary to *HANG* him. And your charge against the Guild being disfranchisement, without as much legal evidence as would *take away your life*, I apprehend that so far from reprobating the Guild of Merchants, for not going far *enough* in evidence, you ought rather to have given them your most sincere and public

public thanks, for not having gone *further* than was necessary to a *civil* purpose.

I do not deny a *precipitancy* of the Guild in your amoval, but (it being performed) I admire your hardiness and courage in provoking a *canvass* of its *causes*.

Yet, however the Guild might have been zealous or precipitate, the one was fully authorized by your *conduct*, the other by your *absence*. The evidence of Hughes and Nelson, and the silence of Sweetman, were equally comprehensive and convincing ; being *concerned* in rebellion, and *promoting* it, though different words have the same import. In rebellion all are principals, from the crude conspirator to the finished rebel, through all the tools and instruments of its workmanship ; and the Guild of Merchants, who (not you) were to judge of the credit to be given to your accusers, unluckily thought differently from you, and supported their opinion by a corporate expulsion. You were not called on for your defence, because you had fled from its *jurisdiction*, and to the errors of your conduct, had wisely added the impossibility of being called upon to defend it.

Therefore,

Therefore their zeal in your amoval, you must attribute to their *loyalty*, and the want of notice to your *elopement*.

I do not wish to hurt your feelings by a recital of the Freeman's *oath*;—as you always evinced a very just detestation to the revenue, in all its departments, I should not presume that you would class the obligation of a free merchant with the oath of an exciseman, *taken for form, and observed at discretion*. Yet if you attempt to refine upon the construction of the one, you establish the doctrine of the other; and defend yourself upon the same principle, which you have spent half your life, and all your argument, in reprobating.—

Lord Mansfield has clearly determined—that a *breach* of a corporate oath is sufficient cause of amoval, (without *conviction* in a court of law)—Analyse your oath—consider your conduct—reflect on the accusation—read the proofs—and as you are now very justly indifferent to public opinion, and all its consequences, give me a little of that candour, a retention of which can now be of no further value to you, and say truly—Have the Guild or Corporation proceeded upon

evidence, “ *not only not true, but recorded to be false?* ”——I shall again appeal to your *candour*—it seems the most valuable quality to persons so illiberally accused as you have been.—*Candour* has been the most reviving *preservative* amongst many of your friends and intimates—by their recent *candour*, some of them have lately obtained a general *leave of absence* from this kingdom, instead of being obliged to travel a much more troublesome and *painful journey*.

Therefore take courage—answer me with *candour* (like Beattie’s argument for the Christian religion) “ *if it can do you no good, you may be assured it can do you no harm.* ”

Queries——Have your Speeches in Parliament, since Lord Fitzwilliam and you were *deposed*, tended to *promote Rebellion?*

Has your Address to the Catholics, desiring them “ *instantly to embrace, and greatly to emancipate,* ” tended to *promote Rebellion?*

Has

Has your celebrated Address to your Constituents, (so prettily handled by his Worship, Dr. Duigenan) tended to *promote Rebellion*?

—I do not suspect you for countenancing the Union Star—the instructions there were too plain and intelligible for your pen—But pray did you write for the *Press*?

—I shall ask you no questions relative to your journey to Maidstone, as a witness to the *purity* of O'Connor, because he gave you the *retort courteous*, and confessed himself *guilty*—circumstances not *equally* confirming your credit and his veracity.

—But, Mr. Grattan—Did you, with *all your innocence on your head*, when a mortal, cruel, and bigoted rebellion, burst forth in your country—when the Irish gentry were proscribed—butchered—and would have been annihilated but for their union and their gallantry.—I say, did you *fly for the same, or not*?—Were you then found in the ranks of loyalty and of honour, encouraging, by your counsels, or aiding by your person, (such as it was) the cause of your country?

Or, did the Evening-star find you an *emigrant* in Anglesea—skulking behind some corresponding cragg—and rehearsing to the unconscious rock the fabricated periods of that inflammatory eloquence, which at once fired and *consumed* your country?

—When the plunderers of Europe invaded that country which you profess to *adore*—and desperately plunged at its religion and its constitution—when you had no pretence to say it was the *cause of the IRISH People*—where were you?—Why did you desert your standard, when the enemy were FRENCH?—Answer—or plead guilty.—I ask you but one question more—now—Are the charges against you *remote and nonsensical*?

The Guild of Merchants—the Corporation of Dublin—and “*all other Corporations and persons adopting similar proceedings*,”—receive with equal satisfaction the acrimony of your reproach, and the “*calmness of your forgiveness*,”—and offer you neither their *enmity* or their *friendship*; they know you can want neither an *enemy* or a *flatterer*, while you possess your *own confidence*.

In

In atonement for my foregoing strictures upon your performance, and the pain and constraint I feel in becoming your commentator, I must now express my delight and admiration of the *style* in which you have so ingeniously painted—"your calm forgiveness" of the Reverend Doctors—so admirably adapted to *decry* the principles of the *Union*—your compliment, judiciously beginning with blasphemy, and ending with nonsense—the glorious prototype of religion and politics *UNITED*.

The first part of your compliment to the Doctors is admirable. You say—"Were it not *robbing Heaven, &c. &c.*"—the *sublimity* of the idea must strike even the stupidity of the Guild—and robberies of that kind having been seldom attempted since the time of the Giants, in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, must give an admirable scope to the researches of the learned and accomplished professors of astronomy, to discover the *manner* by which you intend to perform the same; and the Reverend Professors of Theology and Divinity will certainly feel much obliged by your timely notice of your intention to *plunder* a place, which they have hitherto
 been

been accustomed to consider as very much belonging to *themselves*; whilst the boldness of the expression displays an undaunted contempt for danger, both of soul and body—and must render immortal the name of that hero, who having made every attempt upon *this* world, has declared his intention of assaulting the *next*.

As to the residue of the compliment, beginning with the words “*up and down*,” and ending with the word “*Clergymen*,” nothing can be so complimentary to the profound learning and erudition of the Reverend Doctor Barret and the learned seminary, as the solution of a sentence, which most certainly will puzzle all the rest of the world.—If the Reverend Doctors *cannot* decypher it, they will probably take it as a *greater* compliment than you intended.—If they can, they will have the honour of solving the ambiguity of a diction, unparalleled in any language, living or dead, upon the face of the habitable globe, (except one passage of *Rabelais*, which his Most Christian Majesty referred to the learned College at Salamanca for an explanation.)

My

My humble advice to the Doctors of the Holy Trinity is—to refer your compliment to the Historic Society, as a *standing* subject for disquisition and argument—and the more especially, as I understand that one of the fundamental laws of that learned institution is—
“ never to come to any decision.”

The sole cause of your compliment is said to have arisen by the removal of your *picture* from the Hall of the University, where it had been placed in opposition to the Right Hon. Henry Flood—who, to shew how inferior *his mode* of “*forgiveness*” was to your’s, bequeathed almost his whole fortune to the Reverend Doctors.

Yet however you may be attached to the *other* system, you may, with great propriety, copy the moderation of the Court—when you recollect the vicious treatment your (former) friend, Mr. Broom, has given to divers Kings, Queens, and Lord Lieutenants, who appear, stuck up in rags, in his riding-house, to frighten his horses—and that not one of them—their heirs or successors—have ever complained of the indignity they have suffered.

Nor

Nor do I apprehend that Mr. Broom will even be attainted for the same, (as by law he might) at least for a considerable time after his * *death and interment*;—and as your's has only experienced the fate of other family pictures, and the same which probably your own heir will think proper to perform in time to come, if he shall, at any period, chance to read your life and adventures, or these presents, I should recommend it to you, not to give yourself further uneasiness upon this subject, unless you think proper to recur to your invincible and standing argument, viz. that the learned Doctors had not *legal evidence* sufficient to amove your—portrait.

As I am aware that any thing respecting an Administration of which you are not a *Minister*, must be ungrateful to your feelings, I have postponed that subject to the last, and I shall only advert to that branch of it in which you have been *official*.

You *were* a Privy Counsellor—you took and subscribed the *oath* of a Privy Counsellor—you were thereby bound to your allegiance in its
strictest

strictest sense—did that *Oath* speak of “discovering treason—misprision of treasons—treasonable conspiracies—&c. &c. &c.?”—Were you thereby bound to his Majesty’s crown and dignity—and the Constitution in *Church and State*?—and did you *fully, fairly, and unequivocally* fulfil that obligation?

Nelson and Hughes say, *not*!—They have the presumption to say—you enquired, and were informed of, the *numbers of conspirators*—the *numbers of their opponents*—the state of the country—and that you were “*pressed to COME FORWARD,*” —and you CONCEALED IT all!—Was that an insignificant inducement to remove you from the *rank, and confidence* of a *Privy-Counsellor*?—Far be it from me, to accuse his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, with the *crime* of your degradation;—your spirited description of his Excellency’s “*extraordinary contest—struggling to SPARE the Irish people, against an IRISH FACTION!!*” is sufficiently comprehensive of *your* approbation, and his Excellency’s *merit*. Nor could it be supposed, that *he* who removed *you* from the *Privy-Council* would have found more favor in

D

your

your sight, than they who removed you from the *Corporation*: and we must therefore attribute your dismissal to your SOVEREIGN—and your silence on *his* virtues substantiate the conjecture.

I shall not enter into any disquisition (*at present*) of his Excellency's measures—my mind is made up—but it is foreign to the present subject. As to FACTION—I am equally inimical as *yourself*—I own it not—and be assured, I shall never be the advocate of a *malignant* or *sanguinary Faction*—nor yet of a *wrong-headed, obstinate, and mischievous Perverseness*.—I despise *Faction*—I am unconnected with it—and in my opinion nothing can be more *disgraceful*—more *dangerous*—or more *dishonourable* to a *free Country*, than a FACTION to set up an OLIGARCHY—except a FACTION to set up a REPUBLIC!!!

Your *gracious* SOVEREIGN heard of your *Curiosity*, and has *promoted* you from the station of a *Privy-Counsellor* to the rank of a CITIZEN—an *elevation* so accordant to your *Principles* and *Politics*, that you must be delighted at your *preferment*;—however, if any *perverse chagrin* should induce
you

you to think otherwise, you have still a salutary anodyne in your "*pointed forgiveness*—and a high consolation in your *irrefragable* argument——

" That his MAJESTY had not *legal evidence* for

" your amoval.——We have now, (I hope much to your *satisfaction* and *amusement*) gone through your PARAGRAPH and LETTER—I repeat to you—I belong *not* to the FACTION you reprobate ; but I am a *Freeman*—a *Free-Merchant*—(nay, something *more* in this country)—and, *above all*, I am a LOYAL SUBJECT. I write not to assail *you*—but to defend *them*. You ill-advisedly called out *their* advocates, whilst you ostentatiously assume that office for a *Body you call* THE PEOPLE, but *I call* The DUPES !

I lean not on your *private character*, or your *private conduct*—I know of *nothing* reprehensible in either—and if I did, I am neither mean or malicious enough to publish it :——But you have made your *public character*—*Fair Game*——you have so interwoven your political *delinquency* with your *calumny* of the Metropolis—that any man attached to the *one*, is called upon to expose the *other* :——You have fallen from a *great height*——

and *never* will have strength to scramble back to your situation !

I shall have the honor sedulously to attend to your *performances*——and as often as you shall please to *tumble* for the amusement of my *native City*——so often I shall be ready to give due credit to that entertaining versatility of your *native talents*, which changed you from the *Hero*——to the *Harlequin*——of IRELAND.

N. B. As your *absence* from your Country, whilst the *Rebellion* was deciding, has probably prevented many of your *Friends* from corresponding with you (since that *unconstitutional* practice, of opening gentlemen's letters in the post-office) you would, perhaps, wish to know the *fate* of your Brethren in the *popular Societies for Reform and Emancipation*——which you so judiciously planted, and so luxuriantly embellished——you have therefore annexed a List of a *few* of these “*dear Friends*” with whom you were “*so linked and connected*” in *bono publico*——and whose glorious *martyrdom* in defence of their Societies, must

must surely twine another laurel round the temples of their *Founder* and their *Patron*.—Permit to assure you, (with the true spirit of *diplomatic* courtesy) that I hold you in the *highest* *Consideration*,

And am, &c. &c. &c. &c.

MERCATOR, &c.

A LIST

