

4
CAUSES OF THE DECADENCE

OF THE

INDUSTRIES OF IRELAND:

A Retrospect.

BY

EDWARD BLACKBURNE, LL.D. Q.C.

"In the second, which is the industry of the people, our misfortune is not altogether owing to our own fault, but to a million of discouragements."—*Swift*.

DUBLIN:

WILLIAM MCGEE, 18 NASSAU-STREET.

1881

Price One Shilling.

R. D Webb and Son, Printers,
74 Abbey-street, Dublin.

CAUSES OF THE DECADENCE OF THE INDUSTRIES OF IRELAND.

ALTHOUGH the Land Bill has become law, and (to use the language of one of its eulogists) a "generous measure has been given to Ireland"—given in a great degree to silence popular clamour, and allay discontent—I fear that the chronic condition of the country will be unchanged, and that disaffection, with all its attendant evils, will rear its head in a more rampant and defiant manner than before.

Should my apprehensions unfortunately be realized, and Ireland still remain a "bye-word among the nations," it is plain that the real difficulty has not yet been grappled with—that the Land Act is powerless as a means of getting rid of it, and that its solution must be arrived at in a very different manner.

The vice of, I may say, nearly all Irish legislation, arises from ignorance. Our rulers either have no desire to know what are the real wants of the country, or content themselves with taking their information from one (or both) of two classes, from which I believe this unfortunate country has in no small degree suffered: I mean Whig political economists, and their congeners—Whig statisticians

in whose hands Ireland has been treated as a *vile corpus*, and experimented on accordingly.

Since the foregoing was written, I have met with the following observations, which are so just and apposite, that I give them without comment to my readers. The writer, after alluding to the ministers of the Crown, says:—"But whatever be the case with the principal servants of the Crown, it is certain that a very scanty, vague, and superficial knowledge of the circumstances of Ireland, and opinions the most erroneous respecting some of them, are actually prevalent both among the British members of the Imperial Parliament, and among intelligent and otherwise well-informed individuals unconcerned in the business of legislation; and the fact affords considerable regret, inasmuch as under a constitution like ours the advancement of the welfare of Ireland, evidently affecting that of the empire, might almost as reasonably be ultimately expected from a diffusion of a correct knowledge of these circumstances among the members of the legislature, and among men of talents and capital in private life, as amongst the members of the executive power. Indeed this general want of accurate and genuine information respecting the circumstances of Ireland among the people of Britain is not much to be wondered at. When ample and satisfactory information on any particular subject cannot be acquired without laborious researches, the pursuit thereof will naturally be relinquished by all but those whom powerful motives stimulate to persevere. Unless

such motives operate, unless there be some strong inducement to exertion, men will, in general, content themselves with casual additions to their knowledge, or such information as they may happen to obtain while in quest of amusement." *

I think I am right in affirming that the classes to which I have referred, have, as a rule, made free trade their idol; and while this country has been year after year going down, its industries decaying, its towns and villages rapidly becoming more and more impoverished and dilapidated, they have without scruple affirmed in the teeth of facts that it was both prosperous and thriving. In confirmation of this I need merely refer to the speeches of successive Viceroy's at the annual civic dinners—cooked like the banquets for the occasion.

The English governments have, I must say, without exception, laid hold of these fallacious statements, assumed their accuracy, and made them useful implements. But in what manner? Not for the purpose of raising the status of the country, and further promoting its well-being as a source of strength instead of weakness to the commonwealth, but for that of heaping taxation upon it, and fettering its industries; and accordingly fresh imposts have been put on the country without stint or limit, and this at a time when, owing to free trade and other causes, the value of its produce has been largely diminished.

* Newenham : *A View of the National, Political, and Commercial Circumstances of Ireland*, preface, p. ix. London, 1809.

I shall in the following pages point out what, with her great natural resources and capabilities, I conceive to be one of the chief causes (if not the chief) of Ireland's unhappy condition. Whether the remedy is to be easily reached is a very different question; but in medical parlance its diagnosis is of no small use in enabling the physician to get at the root of the disorder, and thus to successfully grapple with it.

I am not aware if I am correctly stating the views of political economists in stating the following as one of their propositions, viz.—that a community deriving its support from agriculture alone, from the difficulties and obstacles in its path, can never take a foremost position in the acquirement of wealth nor reap its attendant benefits, and that unless other industries are in addition resorted to, such a community must sooner or later fail in the race.

I care not, however, whether in the eyes of political scientists I am right or not in laying down the above proposition; because in doing so, I am not putting forward a theory unsupported by facts, but one which is borne out, I may say, by the history of every country. And I go further, for I assert that any attempt to crush the industrial enterprise of a country circumstanced as Ireland is, either by individual jealousies or by national interference, is one the effect of which will sometime or other fall, and that seriously, on the authors.

Entertaining these views, the manufacturing industry of Ireland has always been to me a matter

of deep interest. It is in vain to expect that the country will ever rise from its present condition so long as its inhabitants are merely "hewers of wood and drawers of water" for England. Want of employment, and consequent poverty are, I believe, the real causes of the chronic discontent which prevails; and a nation which may be said to depend altogether on a variable and uncertain climate for support, unaided by any other means, must of necessity be always in a state of comparative indigence, and be a source of weakness instead of strength to England.

Before proceeding further I wish to dispose of a reason which is commonly given for the non-success of manufactures in Ireland, growing out of the character of the people, who, it is said, are unsuited, from their idle and lazy habits, for any industrial pursuits which require either application or attention. Their intelligence is, however, not questioned. This reason, or objection (as perhaps it may be better styled), is as old as the time of Swift, and I shall give his answer: "We are apt to charge the Irish with laziness, because we seldom find them employed; but then we do not consider they have nothing to do. Sir William Temple, in his excellent remarks on the United Provinces, inquires why Holland, which has the poorest and worst ports and commodities of any nation in Europe, should abound in trade, and Ireland which has the most and best of both should have none. This great man attributes this surprising accident to the natural aversion man has for labour,

who will not be persuaded to toil and fatigue himself for the superfluities of life throughout the week, when he may provide himself with all necessary subsistence by the labour of his hands. But with due submission to Sir William's profound judgment, the want of trade with us is rather owing to the cruel restraints we live under, than to any disqualification of the inhabitants." *

No doubt the same writer, in his *Observations on the Case of the Woollen Trade*, deals hardly with the "handicraftsmen," as he styles them, for their want of honesty, stating that "they would rather get a shilling by cheating you, than in an honest way of dealing;" but he accounts for this as follows—"This I must own is the natural consequences of poverty and oppression."†

To deal, however, with the present time, I have I think a distinct answer, which is not founded on conjecture or opinion, but on the fact that a very large proportion of the manufacturing population in England consists of Irish, amongst whom there is no want of industry or application.

Having said so much on this point, I shall proceed to discuss the question as to the causes which have led to the decadence of manufactures in Ireland; and the present appears to be a very suitable time to do so, when England is at last awakening to the fact that that which is styled "free trade" is "protection"

* Swift's Works, vol. ii. p. 103, London, 1864.

† *Ibid.* p. 84.

of the very worst type—viz., “protection” by other nations of their own wares against English and Irish manufactures, while a free market is opened to all foreign productions.

I do not propose to enter into the general question of “free trade,” nor to discuss the several arguments put forward in its favour by the Manchester school of political economists. It is sufficient for my purpose to say that for the reason I have already given, there has been no trial of “free trade” properly so termed. I would, however, add that *a priori* I cannot very well understand how it would be possible for a country like England (even if all other conditions were equal), overweighted as she is by local and imperial taxation, to compete successfully with foreign countries where labour is cheaper and the means of living are more abundant.*

It has been assumed, as a matter of fact (if the North be excepted), that Ireland has never been a manufacturing country; and from the assertion having been so frequently made, the fact has been taken as admitted. I hope, however, presently to show that there never was a more fallacious statement, and that Ireland through “free trade” has suffered more severely than England.

In order to deal with the question in the manner in which I propose to lay it before my readers, it becomes necessary to give a short outline of the most salient features of Ireland’s history as regards

* See an exhaustive article styled “Isolated Free Trade,” by Sir E. Sullivan, in the *Nineteenth Century*, for August, 1881, p. 8.

some of her principal manufactures from an early period down to the establishment of free trade. In doing so, I shall divest the subject as much as possible of technicalities in the shape of "protective duties," "bounties," "drawbacks," and other matters of a similar kind, and apply myself chiefly to facts.

The woollen manufacture being unquestionably the oldest of all the Irish industries, I shall take its history first. I find that so far back as the reign of Edward III. the woollen manufacture flourished in Ireland, and that it enjoyed a high reputation, not merely at home but abroad. "Lord Charlemont, in a paper contained in the first volume of the *Irish Transactions*, asserts that there are records proving the existence of the woollen manufacture in Ireland as early as the middle of the thirteenth century; and from a passage in a poem written by a Florentine nobleman within about the year 1350, he shows that Ireland was then famous for her woollens, which were exported to, and were in great request even at Florence, at that time most eminent itself for trade and manufactures, and remarkable for its luxury and dress." *

Although it is not probable that the warlike adventurers who came to Ireland in the reign of Henry II. did much or anything to encourage either its peaceful avocations or industries, yet the increased and increasing intercourse between the two countries must have had no small influence in tempting settlers of a different class to Ireland. Sir Walter Scott, in his novel

* *Quarterly Review*, vol. i. p. 420.

The Betrothed, the scene of which is laid in 1180, speaks of Flemish woollen manufacturers as having been then established in Wales; and it may be that through the facilities of communication some of their descendants found their way to this country, who, if they did not introduce the woollen manufacture, must have materially assisted its progress.

The barony of Forth, in Wexford, was largely peopled from Flanders; but I am unable to say whether this thriving and industrious community have ever been engaged in the woollen or any other manufacture.

Passing to the reign of Henry VII. a new condition of things arose, and one to which I think the sad state of Ireland's history as regards her manufactures is in no small measure to be ascribed. I allude to "Poynings' Act."

The reason for the enactment is succinctly given by Sir John Davies, the Attorney-General for Ireland in the reign of James I. He writes: "For whereas all wise men did ever concur in opinion that the readiest way to reforme Ireland is to settle a forme of civill government then conformable to that of England, to bring this to passe Sir Edward Poynings did passe an act whereby all the statutes made in England before that time were enacted, established, and made of force in Ireland. Neither did he only respect the time past, but provided for the time to come; for he caused another law to be made that no Act should be propounded in any parliament of Ireland but such as should be transmitted into England, and approved by

the king and counsell there as good and expedient for that land, and so returned back again under the Great Seale of England. This Act, though it seemed *primá facie* to restrain the liberty of the subjects of Ireland, yet was it made at the prayer of the commons upon just and important cause.”*

The reader will see from the above that no measure could be propounded in the Irish parliament until it had been first approved of by the King and English Privy Council, such approval being verified by the Great Seal; the natural result of which was to make Irish interests subservient to those of England, and prevent all legislation which might in any manner prejudice her. It was one thing (in Sir J. Davies’ language) “to settle a forme of civill government” in Ireland; but a very different matter “to cause a law to be made” which would render the Irish parliament a tool in the hands of the English government, and deprive it of any real power. Sir John Davies does not state what was the “just and important cause” which led to the “prayer of the Commons;” but I think there is no doubt that it was exceptional, and that in any case it never was intended that the enactment in question should be used as a weapon to cripple and injure the best interests of Ireland. It is difficult to understand how any country could exist, much less flourish, under such a condition of things, and Ireland bitterly felt its effects.

* *A Discoverie of the True Causes why Ireland was never Entirely Subdued until the Beginning of His Majestie’s Happie Raigne*, p. 230, London, 1747.

I pass now to the reign of James I., and give from Froude a description of the country during that period.

“Unlike the Norman conquerors, who were mainly military leaders, the new colonists were farmers, merchants, weavers, mechanical labourers. They went over to earn a living by labour in a land which had produced little but banditti. Then for the first time the natural wealth of Ireland began to reveal itself; commerce sprung up, as yet unhampered by navigation acts or disabilities, busy fingers were set at work on loom and spinning wheel, fields fenced and drained, grew yellow with rolling corn, and the vast herds and flocks which had wandered at will on hill and valley were turned to profitable account.”*

Such was the condition of things in the reign of James, which was not, however, permitted to continue. Fears were entertained that the growing prosperity of Ireland would entail corresponding injury on England, and accordingly, in the succeeding reign, the first movement was made (so far as I am aware) to cripple, I might add repress, the Irish woollen manufacture.

Wentworth, better known as the Earl of Strafford, was found a willing instrument for the purpose. According to Leland, “Ireland he regarded as a conquered kingdom in the strictest sense. He avowed and defended the opinion under all the terrors of impeachment, when it was charged against

* *The English in Ireland*, vol. i. p. 76, London, 1881.

him as a traitorous principle; and from this crude conception he deduced a conception at once ridiculous and detestable, that the subjects of this country, without distinction, had forfeited the rights of men and citizens, and for whatever they were permitted to enjoy depended solely on the royal favour." *

Entertaining such narrow, mistaken, and distorted views of the relations between the two countries, it cannot be a matter of surprise that he viewed with distrust and perhaps jealousy the thriving and flourishing country of which he had been appointed viceroy; and perceiving that the woollen manufacture was one of its great sources of wealth, he determined that it should be put down. But how was this to be effected? It was plain that in the then hostile mood of the Irish Parliament it would be slow to originate any English scheme for interference with this important staple of the country, even though it had received the *impri-matur* of the English Privy Council. He was obliged therefore to take another course, and determined of his own motion to effect that which he could not accomplish by parliamentary assistance.

Accordingly, in July, 1636, he wrote to Sir Christopher Wandesforde, one of the Lords-Deputy, and stated "that he would 'discourage' the woollen manufacture all he could;" at the same time adding, "yet have I endeavoured another way to set them

* Leland's *History of Ireland*, book v. cap. i. p. 10.

on work, and that is by bringing in the making and trade of linen cloth—the rather in regard the women are all naturally used to spinning, that the Irish earth is apt for rearing of flax, and *that this manufacture* would be, in conclusion, rather a benefit than other to this kingdom.” *

The reasons given by Leland for Strafford's action are so strange that I cannot forbear to quote them. “He found among the Irish little trade or manufactures, except some small beginnings of a clothing trade, which promised to increase, and might in time essentially affect the staple commodity of England. Ireland furnished wool in great quantities, and its people could afford to sell their cloth in foreign markets on more moderate terms than the English traders. A governor, particularly jealous of any diminution of the king's customs, was alarmed at this prospect. He considered further that the Irish subjects, if restrained from indraping their own wool, must of necessity fetch their clothing from England, so as in some sort to be dependent on this country for their livelihood. Hence the connection of these realms must become firm and indissoluble, as the Irish could not revolt from their allegiance to the Crown without nakedness to themselves and their families. For these reasons he laid discouragement on their woollen manufacture, but at the same time determined to establish another article of trade at least equally beneficial to this people, and which

* Lord Sheffield: *Observations on the Manufactures and Trade of Ireland*, p. 149, Dublin, 1785.

promised service rather than detriment to England.”* I should be very slow indeed to fix Strafford with the absurdities of the above. Whatever his failings and prejudices were, he was unquestionably a man of intellect and talent, and the notion of strengthening the connection between the two countries by the inability of the nation to revolt in consequence of their having no clothes, I feel assured never emanated from him. I believe that he was but an instrument in the hands of England, and that the project of the destruction of the woollen manufacture did not originate with him, but was the result of instructions from the other side.

In order to arrive at a just conclusion in the matter, I think the general character of the man must be considered, and not one or two isolated acts of his administration. Strafford, no doubt, entertained strong feelings and prejudices—the natural result of his early life and training—of which it was impossible for him to have at once, on his coming to Ireland, divested himself, but it is to be borne in mind that although he (according to Leland) may have considered that all the Irish subjects alike were to be treated as enemies, he must have had some feeling towards those who had sprung from the same stock with himself, and to whom, in fact, the prosperity of the country was chiefly owing. He must have also seen that the step which he was about to take would not merely involve his popularity, but also raise great, if not

* *History of Ireland*, vol. iii. p. 29.

insuperable difficulties in the way of his carrying out any reforms in the country. Indeed the portion of his letter in which he proposes the linen manufacture as a kind of substitute, and to which I shall have occasion again to refer, bears out, I think, my view.

Again, I find when the two Houses of Parliament united in a petition that the King would establish a mint in Ireland, that Strafford readily promised to enforce the request; "but the English council" whose views (Leland writes) were not so favourable to the Irish subjects, defeated their application—"thereby," saith Mr. Carte, "giving them occasion to reflect on the unhappiness of their situation in being under the control of a body of men of a different country, who have no natural inclinations for the welfare of theirs, or any interest in the good of it;" an assertion, Leland adds, "which we must pronounce false and precipitate, unless we consider the tempers and understandings of their fellow-subjects of England as odious and contemptible to an extraordinary degree."*

I think, therefore, that I am warranted in asserting that, in the language of Lord Coke, "this arrow never came," in the first instance, "out of" Strafford's "quiver;" that the various circumstances to which I have referred point altogether to a different source, and that he merely acted upon the instructions which he had received from England.

* *Ibid.* p. 25.

Strafford's attempt to injure the Irish woollen trade failed, and he never again renewed it. He possibly found that public feeling and opinion were too strong, and in the disturbed condition of the country he did not deem it wise to do so—and the manufacture continued to prosper.

This state of things continued for some time. In spite of civil war and commotions the industries of the country gained ground; but a serious check was given to them by the Insurrection of 1641, and as a consequence great misery and destitution prevailed among the people. This was, however, of but short continuance, as I find that in 1664 a number of woollen manufacturers came to Dublin from the west of England, and it is said that nearly at the same time sixty Dutch families settled in Limerick, while some English "clothiers" were domiciled in Cork and Kinsale. The French introduced the drugget manufacture to Waterford, while in 1675 some London merchants established a woollen factory at Clonmel.*

I now approach the reign of Charles II., in which I believe the first serious inroad was made on the trade and industries of Ireland. The circumstances are detailed at length by Leland, of whose account I shall avail myself.

"Scarcely," he writes, "had the Act of Explanation passed, when the English Commons seemed to envy the prosperity of the subjects of Ireland which the

* Lord Sheffield, p. 152.

settlement of this kingdom promised ; and notwithstanding all the solicitude expressed for the interests of a new colony of their fellow-subjects, resolved on a measure calculated at once to mortify and distress them."

The rents of England had of late decreased— a result which was ascribed to the importation of Irish fat cattle, and a temporary Act was passed in 1663 for its prohibition ; but notwithstanding the inconvenience to both countries, and the objection of the King, a Bill was brought in for a perpetual prohibition of the cattle from Ireland, either alive or dead.

Notwithstanding the avowed abhorrence of the King to the measure, the Commons determined to mortify him by declaring in its preamble that the importation of Irish cattle was a NUISANCE, the effect of which was to deprive him of any dispensing power in favour of his Irish subjects. A fierce battle was fought in both houses over the obnoxious word ; the Commons, however, gained the day, and the Bill became law ; but the King could not refrain from expressing his resentment at the jealousy exhibited towards him.

England soon felt the inconvenience of the illiberal and stupid course which had wantonly interfered with the commerce of the country ; while as regards Ireland the people were thrown into despair. There was no money to meet the subsidies which became due, and Ormond accepted part of them in provisions. The King himself was anxious to alleviate the difficulties of Ireland, and with the consent of his council

(obtained with difficulty) he allowed a free trade from Ireland to all foreign countries, either at war or peace with England. The exportation of Irish wool was prohibited by law, except to England, without the licence of the chief governor; and Ireland, "forced by a necessity which leaks through all restraints, conveyed their wool by stealth to foreign countries, and have experienced the advantage of this clandestine commerce."

"But the most effectual measure which the Irish subjects could pursue to elude the violence of an oppressive law was that of applying themselves to manufacture and working up their own commodities, and in this they were encouraged by the noble spirit of their chief governor." *

"Many of the chief men of rank and influence in the country encouraged the growth of Irish manufacture from motives of self-interest if not from motives of patriotism. Ormond erected a woollen factory at Clonmel, and brought over 500 Walloon families to carry it on."† Others followed his example, and the woollen and linen manufactures gave, in a short time, renewed vitality and strength to the country.

"That the woollen manufactures were the great source of industry in Ireland, appears from the Irish statutes 17th & 18th Charles II. cap. 15, from the resolutions of the Commons in 1695 for regulating

* *History of Ireland*, vol. iii. p. 442, seq.

† Smiles' *History of Ireland*, p. 172.

these manufactures, from that of the Committee of Supply in that session, and from the preamble to the English statute of William III. cap. 10, which recites ‘that great quantities of those manufactures were made and were daily increasing in Ireland, and were exported from them to foreign countries.’”*

The unhappy condition of the country in the reign of James II., the result of his tyranny and persecuting policy, in no small degree crippled and checked its trade and manufactures. It would seem, however, to have rapidly regained its former condition, as in the subsequent reign considerable supplies were raised from 1692 to 1698.†

* *The Commercial Restraints of Ireland considered in a Series of Letters to a Noble Lord, containing an Historical Account of the Affairs of that Kingdom*: Dublin, 1779, p. 34. This valuable and rare book is, perhaps, the best ever written on the subject of Irish trade and the restrictions put on it by England. The letters appeared anonymously. Their author was, however, the Right Hon. John Hely Hutchinson, Provost of Trinity College, Dublin. In his address to the reader, he says: “The numerous references in those letters will, it is hoped, be excused when the motive for giving the reader that trouble is considered. In a subject of great importance an anonymous writer thought he should not take too much liberty in mentioning facts or opinions from himself. He has therefore resorted to the statute books and journals of parliament of both kingdoms, and to some of the most approved commercial authorities among the English writers.” The English government did not like the book—it told too many plain truths, and accordingly I find in the King’s Inns’ Library copy the following:—“Of this remarkable book, see the *Times* of February 14th, 1846. Extract of a letter of Sir Valentine Blake, M.P. for Galway, in which he says, ‘that immediately after its publication it was suppressed, and burned by the *common hangman*, and that Mr. Flood, in his place in the House of Commons, said he would give one thousand pounds for a copy, and that the libraries of all the three branches of the legislature could not produce one copy of this valuable work.’”

† *Ibid.*, p. 22.

The page of history to which I am about next to allude, is one which I think English historians would (if they could) have gladly consigned to oblivion, for I question very much whether there is to be found in the annals of any country a parallel.

Indeed, at this distance of time, it is hard to realize the fact that such an "outrage" (I do not think that this word is too strong to apply to the transaction) would have been attempted, much less carried out, or that England would have lent itself to such an act of cruel persecution, and that, too, in the case of a nation governed by the same king, and under the operation of laws over which she might be said to have had entire control.

The success of the Irish woollen trade had become an object of jealousy to England. The prohibition of the government on the export of wool had compelled the Irish to manufacture for themselves, in order to work up the raw material, and thus find a market for their produce; and we have seen with what result—"that great quantities of those manufactures were made, and were daily increasing in Ireland, and were exported from them to foreign countries."*

In the time of William, however, matters culminated. England was actuated not merely by jealousy, but by fear; and accordingly means were taken to check the growing prosperity of the woollen trade.

Addresses were presented to the King by both houses of Parliament. That of the Lords besought

* *Ante*, p. 19.

his Majesty "in the most public and effectual way that may be, to declare to all his subjects of Ireland that the *growth* and *increase* of the woollen manufactures hath long and will ever be looked upon with jealousy by all his subjects of this kingdom, and if not timely remedied, may occasion strict laws totally to prohibit and suppress the same; and, on the other hand, if they turn their industry and skill to the settling and improving the linen manufacture, for which generally the lands of that kingdom are very proper, they shall receive all countenance, favour, and protection from your *royal* influence, for the encouragement of and promotion of the said linen manufacture to all the advantages and profits that kingdom can be capable of."*

In the address of the Commons they say, "that being sensible that the wealth and peace of this kingdom [England] do in a great measure depend on preserving the woollen manufacture as much as possible *entire* to this realm, they think it becomes them, like their ancestors, to be jealous of the establishment and increase thereof elsewhere, and to use their utmost endeavours to prevent it, and therefore they cannot without trouble see that Ireland dependent on, and protected by England in the enjoyment of all they have, and which is so proper for the linen manufacture, the establishment and growth of which there would be so enriching to themselves, and so profitable to England, should *of late* apply themselves

* *Commercial Restraints*, p. 94.

to the woollen manufactures, to the great prejudice of the trade of this kingdom, and so unwillingly promote the linen trade, which would benefit both them and us, and we do most humbly implore your Majesty's protection and favour in this matter, and that you will make it your royal care, and enjoin all those you employ in Ireland to make it their care, and use their utmost diligence to hinder the *exportation* of wool from Ireland, except to be imported hither, and for the discouraging the woollen manufacture, and encouraging the linen manufacture of Ireland, to which we shall *be always* ready to give our *utmost* assistance."

The King's reply to the Lords was shortly: "That his Majesty will take care to do what their lordships have desired," while to the Commons his answer was more specific and pointed: "I shall do all that in me lies to discourage the woollen trade in Ireland, the encouragement of the linen trade there, and to promote the trade of England."* Accordingly a Bill for restraining the exportation of woollen manufactures from Ireland was brought into the British House of Commons, in February, 1697 (o.s.), but did not become law until the subsequent year.†

It would seem as if the British Parliament were ashamed of the course which they were about to take, and were anxious, if possible, that the Irish legislature should make the first move, trusting that

* *Commercial Restraints*, p. 95.

† *Ibid.* p. 91.

the popularity of William, and his consequent influence would make the latter swallow the nauseous draught without any difficulty,* and thus screen England from any odium which might, and probably would, attach to the discreditable course which it had taken.

Accordingly, in July, 1698, Lord Galloway, at the time one of the Lords-Justices, received a letter from King William, in which he writes, "that it was never of such importance to have at present a good session of Parliament, not only in regard to the affairs of that kingdom (Ireland), but especially of that here. The chief thing that must be tried to be prevented here is that the Irish Parliament takes no notice of what has passed in this here, and that you make effectual laws for the linen manufacture, and discourage as far as possible the woollen."

At the opening of the following session, on the 27th September, 1698, the Lords-Justices in their speech refer to a Bill transmitted for the encouragement of the linen and hempen manufactures, which they recommend in the following words:—"The settlement of this manufacture will contribute much to people the country, and will be found *much more advantageous* to this kingdom than the woollen manufacture, which being the settled staple trade of England, *from whence all foreign markets* are supplied, can never be encouraged *here* for that purpose, whereas the linen and hempen manufactures will not

* *Ibid.* p. 98.

only be encouraged as consistent with the trade of England, but will render the trade of this kingdom both useful and necessary to England." *

The King's letter to Galloway does not seem to have been received very favourably in Ireland. The people were not anxious to immolate themselves; and accordingly I find that strong measures had to be adopted. In the *Commons Journals* there is the following:—"Oct. 13th, '88. It was resolved that a printed paper intituled, the 'Protestant's case, who are of the woollen manufacture in Ireland, humbly presented to the Honourable House of Commons,' delivered at the door of this house, is false, scandalous, and of dangerous consequence."

The Commons itself, too, was by no means so plastic or submissive as the English government had expected. On the 1st December, 1698, "The house according to the order for the day, resolved itself into a committee of the whole house, to consider the duty to be laid on the woollen manufactures of this kingdom to be exported, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the chair. Mr. Sergeant Rowe reported from the said committee that they had considered of the matter to them referred, and were come to several resolutions therein which he was directed to report when the house will resume the same. Ordered that the report be made on Saturday morning next." †

The proceedings seem to have "hung fire," and accordingly the Lords-Justices delivered what was

* *Commercial Restraints*, p. 99.

† *Commons Journals*, 1688.

naively termed a “quickenings” speech to both houses; in which, after taking notice that the progress which they expected had not been made in the business of the session, they used the following remarkable words:—“The matters we recommend to you are so necessary to the prosperity of this kingdom, depend so much on the good success of this session, that since we know his Majesty’s affairs cannot permit your sitting very long, we thought the greatest mark we could give of our kindness and concern for you was to come hither, and desire you to hasten the despatch of the matters under your consideration—in which we are the more earnest, because we must be sensible that if the present opportunity his Majesty’s affection to you hath put into your hands be lost, it seems hardly to be recovered.”* This appears to have had the intended effect, as on the 2nd January the houses resolved:—“That the report of the committee of the whole house appointed to consider a duty to be laid on the woollen manufactures of this kingdom, should meet on the next day *and nothing intervene.*”†

On that day, however, a message was delivered from the Lords-Justices sending a Bill entitled “An Act for laying additional duty upon woollen manufacture exported out of Ireland,” the passing of which his Majesty recommended should be done during the then session, “as what may be of great advantage for the preservation of the trade of this kingdom.”‡

* *Commercial Restraints*, p. 101.

† *Commons Journals*, 1688.

‡ *Commercial Restraints*, p. 101.

The Bill was accordingly presented, and on the question of its being received the affirmative was carried by 74 to 34, and the royal assent was given to it in the same month, viz.—January, 1698 (o.s.)

Hutchinson thus gives the effect:—"By this Act of William (10 Wm. III. cap. 5, Irish) an additional duty was imposed of four shillings for every twenty shillings in value of broad cloth exported out of Ireland, and two shillings on every twenty shillings in value of new drapery, friezes only excepted, from 25th May, 1699, to the 25th March, 1702. But this did not satisfy the English Parliament, where a perpetual law was passed prohibiting from the 10th June, 1699, the exportation of all goods made or mixed with wool, except to England or Wales, and with the licence of the Commissioners of the Revenue. Duties had been before laid on the importation into England equal to a prohibition, therefore this Act has operated as a total prohibition of the exportation." *

The inevitable result soon followed. According to Hutchinson:—"Of the exportation of all those (the woollen) manufactures, the Irish were at once totally deprived. The linen manufacture proposed as substitute must have required the attention of many years before it could be thoroughly established. What must have been the consequences to Ireland in the meantime? The Journals of the Commons in Queen Anne's reign have informed us, and you will prove

* *Commercial Restraints*, p. 103.

this melancholy truth, that a country will sooner recover from the miseries and devastations occasioned by war, invasion, rebellion, and massacre, than from laws restraining the commerce, discouraging the manufactures, fettering the industry, and, above all, breaking the spirit of the people." *

Arthur Dobbs follows in the same strain. After alluding to the exports and imports of the three years preceding 1699, he writes:—"This annual increase was occasioned by their falling into the woollen manufacture—the French refugees who settled with us at the same time laying the foundation of the linen manufacture. . . . But upon checking the export of our woollen manufacture to foreign kingdoms, and by laying on heavy duties upon its being exported to England in 1699 and 1700, equivalent to a prohibition, most of those who were embarked in it were laid under the necessity of removing elsewhere; and being piqued at the difficulties they were laid under, many of the Protestants removed into Germany, and settled in the Protestant states there, who received them with open arms. Several Papists at the same time removed into the northern parts of Spain, where they laid the foundation of a manufacture highly prejudicial to England. Many also of the Protestants who were embarked with Papists in the woollen manufacture removed into France, and settled in Roan [Rouen] and other parts. Notwithstanding Louis XIV. had repealed the Edict of Nantz, and forced abroad the French Protestants

* *Ibid.*, p. 31.

into different parts of Europe, yet these were kindly received by him, and great encouragement given to them, and were protected in their religion. . . . Thus a check is put on a sale of our woollen manufactures abroad, which would have given full employment to all the industrious poor of Britain and Ireland, had not our manufactures been forced away into France, Spain, and Germany, where they are now so improved as in a great measure to supply themselves with many sorts they formerly had from England.”*

It is difficult to understand how Macaulay (except on the hypothesis that he was ashamed of England's conduct) could have designated the woollen trade question as “political.” “The French question,” he writes, “had been simply commercial. The Irish question, originally commercial, became political. It was not merely the clothiers of Wiltshire and the West Riding, but the dignity of the Crown, the authority of the Parliament, and the unity of the Empire. Already might be discovered among the English, who were now by the help and under the protection of the mother country the lords of the conquered island, some signs of a spirit, feeble, indeed, as yet, and such as might be easily put down by a few resolute words, but destined to revive at long intervals, and to be stronger and more formidable at every revival.”†

Froude is more candid; for although in the first instance he ascribes the course taken by England to

* *An Essay on the Trade of Ireland*, p. 6, Dublin, 1729.

† *History of England*, vol. v. p. 54.

have grown out of the rejection by the Irish Lords and Commons of the "King's Person Security Bill,"* he subsequently boldly lays bare the truth, and gives the discredit to the English traders, who "saw their artizans emigrating," and "saw, or thought they saw, the produce of the Irish looms competing with theirs in the home market, in the colonies, and on the Continent. They imagined their business stolen from them, their towns depopulated, the value of their lands decreased, their country plunged at last into ruin; all for the sake of that miserable spot which had been a thorn in England's side for centuries."†

Short-sighted jealousy and fear were the actuating causes; and Hutchinson gives what is, I believe, the true solution. "The apprehensions of England seem rather to have arisen from the fears of the future than from the experiences of any past rivalry in this (the woollen) trade. I have more than once heard Lord Bowes, the late Chancellor of this kingdom, mention a conversation that he had with Sir Robert Walpole on this subject, who assured him that the jealousies entertained in England of the woollen trade in Ireland, and the restraints of that trade, had at first taken their rise from the boasts of some of our countrymen in London of the great success of that manufacture here."‡

Although the conduct of the English legislature may be explained, I do not think it can be defended;

* *The English in Ireland*, vol. i. p. 289, 292 note.

† *Ibid.* p. 293.

‡ *Commercial Restraints*, p. 293.

but as regards the Irish Parliament, it is impossible to offer anything by way of either explanation or palliation. It was bound at any risk—even at that of extinction—to have resisted the shameful act of oppression; and had it made a firm stand, England would have hesitated before engaging in a dispute where right and justice were altogether on the other side.

An attempt at explanation may be offered, arising out of the history of the times. The stormy period of the Revolution had passed; repose, security, and confidence had taken the place of disturbance, unrest, and doubt; and gratitude to William may have caused the Parliament to take the fatal step. I think, however, the proceedings to which I have referred dispose of this.

Froude has given a different solution, viz., that it arose from political cowardice — “the dread of abolition” if they, “the Irish houses, refused.”* But this, however, can hardly be said to “mend the matter.”

The country soon felt the effects of the deadly act. A bitter wail went through the land; destitution and idleness took the place of plenty and employment. The cry of distress was, however, unheard. Four years were permitted to elapse; for Parliament was not summoned until 1703. In that year the Irish Commons laid before Queen Anne an affecting representation, containing, to use their own words, “a

* *The English in Ireland*, vol. i. p. 297.

true state of their deplorable condition ;” and a further address was laid before the Duke of Ormond, then Lord Lieutenant, by both Houses, setting out the distressed condition of Ireland by the loss of trade and decay of their manufactures.

From the period when the “Woollen” Bill received the royal assent, up to the time of the death of Queen Anne, “the country was marked with the strongest circumstances of national distress and despondency.”*

Swift writes in 1726 :—“I think it manifest that whatever circumstances can possibly contribute to make a country poor and despicable are all united with respect to Ireland—the natives, controlled by laws to which they do not consent, disowned by their brethren and countrymen, refused the liberty of trading with their own manufactures, not even their native commodities.”†

Again he writes :—“Ireland is the only kingdom I ever heard or read of, either in ancient or modern story, which was denied the liberty of exporting their native commodities and manufactures wherever they pleased, except to countries at war with their own princes or state ; yet this privilege, by the superiority of mere power, is refused us in the most momentous parts of commerce ; besides an Act of Navigation, to which we never consented, pinned down upon us, and rigorously executed, and a thousand other unexampled circumstances, as grievous as they are invidious to mention.”‡

* *Commercial Restraints*, p. 34.

† *Ibid.* p. 80.

‡ Swift's Works, vol. ii. p. 585.

The remarks of Froude on the subject are well worth quoting. After alluding to the extensive supplying of wool, and "that the rivalry which the English clothiers so much dreaded had become a fact," he continues:—"Ingenuity could not have invented a commercial policy less beneficial to the country in whose interests it was adopted, or better contrived to demoralize the people at whose expense it was pursued. A large and fast-spreading branch of manufacture was destroyed which was tempting capital and enterprise and an industrious Protestant population into Ireland. A form of industry was swept away which would have furnished employment to the native Irish, and brought them under settled habits, *which would have made four Ulsters instead of one, and raised each of the four to double the prosperity which the province which preserved the linen trade has in fact obtained.*"*

I now leave the narrative of the destruction of the woollen manufactures of Ireland, from the deplorable effects of which I believe this country has never recovered.

I must not pass by without notice the well-known statute of George II., entitled "An Act to encourage the home consumption of wool by burying in wool only;" and which provided that no person should be buried "in any stuff or thing other than what is made of sheep or lamb's wool only," under certain penalties. And "the judges," at their respective

* *The English in Ireland*, vol. i. p. 499.

assizes, and the justices of the peace, at their respective quarter sessions, "were directed to give this Act in charge;" which was to be read publicly after service on the first Sunday after the 1st of May, for seven years."*

The English Government did not, I assume, consider it necessary to lay "Poyning's embargo" on the introduction of this measure, which remains on the statute-book to "tell its own story."

I shall now deal briefly with the history of the linen manufacture, at which I have already glanced incidentally, and which, according to Leland, owed its origin to Strafford, who established the manufacture in Ireland, not merely to undersell the French and Hollanders, but to encourage a spirit of enterprise in the country; and who himself embarked in his favourite project, at an expense of £30,000—imported flax seed from Holland, and trained artizans from France and the Low Countries.†

In this view he differs from Arthur Dobbs, who in the passage already quoted ascribes it to the French refugees who settled in this country after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes.‡ I think, however, that rightly considered, there is no discrepancy, and that the true view is that Strafford introduced the manufacture, to which the skill and energy of the new settlers gave increased vitality.

The success of the Irish linen trade has been pointed out as a mark of the great kindness of England to

* 7th Geo. II. (Irish), cap. 13.

† *History of Ireland*, vol. iii. p. 30.

‡ *Ante*, p. 27.

Ireland, and of the deep interest which she took in the latter's welfare. I fear she is not entitled to credit on this account, and that the reason for her *partial* non-interference with the new manufacture arose, in the first instance, from a feeling of contempt at its insignificance. For it cannot be denied that for some time its operations were but limited.

Arthur Dobbs writes:—"I shall next consider how little of the kingdom is taken up with this manufacture. When I say there are not above five counties employed and fully embarked in making linens—viz., Antrim, Down, Armagh, Tyrone, and Derry—I am, I believe, near the truth. Part of these, which are only spinning counties, will be more than equivalent to the parts of other counties wherever this manufacture has made any progress. There are not above five more employed in spinning—viz., Donegal, Monaghan, Cavan, and as many spinners dispersed among the other counties in Ireland, as may make up five spinning counties in all. So there are not above ten counties in thirty-two any way embarked in the linen manufacture;* England, therefore, could look with contempt on a manufacture whose exports at the commencement of the eighteenth century only amounted to £14,112."†

Although it cannot be denied that during the earlier period of its career the linen manufacture received no small impetus and encouragement from England, not merely by non-interference, but by pro-

* *Essay on Trade*, p. 33.

† *Commercial Restraints*, p. 135.

tection, this state of things was not permitted to continue. Newenham writes:—"Irish woollens were excluded by heavy duties from the British markets; but the British linens soon met with no obstruction in their passage to Ireland." Having then referred to various statutes passed in the reign of Queen Anne, and that of the two succeeding reigns, he gives as a result, "That Ireland was obliged to admit an apparently dangerous rival into her home market; which England would never consent to do with her woollens, in order to secure a convenient foreign market for her linen manufactures, the sale whereof Britain was bound to promote in consideration of the surrender which the Irish made of their valuable woollen manufacture."*

Froude, speaking of 1772, thus writes:—"The next year they [the House of Commons] had to hear from the Linen Board that many thousands of the best manufacturers and weavers, with their families, had gone to seek their bread in America, and that thousands were preparing to follow. Again a committee was appointed to inquire. This time the blame was laid on England, which had broken the linen compact, given bounties to the Lancashire mill-owners, which Belfast was not allowed to share, and in 'jealousy of Irish manufactures' had laid duties on Irish sail-cloth, contrary to express stipulation. This accusation, as the reader knows, was true."†

* *A View of the National, Political, and Commercial Circumstances of Ireland*, p. 113.

† *The English in Ireland*, vol. ii. p. 137.

Again, speaking of 1774, he writes:—"They [the Irish manufacturers] had submitted to their condition, and had manufactured those articles to such good purpose that at one time they had supplied sails for the whole British navy. Their English rivals had now crippled them by laying a disabling duty on their sail-cloths, in the hope of taking the trade out of their hands; but they had injured Ireland without benefiting themselves."*

Notwithstanding the difficulties which it had to encounter, the linen manufacture continued to thrive, and established a reputation which it has never lost. I shall, therefore, leave the subject, as it is unnecessary to pursue it further, and proceed to deal very briefly with the history of the two other industries—viz., the silk and cotton manufactures.

I have not discovered the period when the former was brought to Ireland; but it would appear to have been in the reign of Charles II. one of considerable importance, judging from the various articles set out in the schedule of duties appended to an Irish statute of that period.† It probably received no small development and strength from the accession of emigrants who settled in the country after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, in the latter part of the seventeenth century.

Arthur Dobbs, in 1729, gives the annual value of the imports of "raw, thrown, and undyed silks" at £30,900 ;‡ while Lord Sheffield, who wrote at a much

* *The English in Ireland*, p. 137.

† 14 & 15 Ch. II. c. 9.

‡ *Essay on Trade*, p. 55.

later period, stated that there were in the country about 1,500 silk manufacturers.*

The manufacture does not seem to have thriven, possibly from the great cost of the raw material, and also from the heavy prohibitory duties; for I find that in 1778 the examiner of the Customs returned to the House of Commons that no Irish-wrought silk or manufactures mixed with silk had been exported out of Ireland from the 25th of March, 1770, to the 25th of March, 1777.†

I pass to the history of the cotton manufacture, the most recent of the Irish industries, the exact date of the introduction of which I am not, however, able to fix. Lord Sheffield, who wrote in 1785, says:—
 “This [the cotton manufacture] can hardly be said to have been above four or five years in Ireland, yet it seems to have already taken root, and be well established. It is computed that near to 30,000 people are employed in it. The number at Prosperous, in Kildare, is 3,000. There are other works at Balbriggan and Celbridge.”‡ This statement, however, cannot be accurate, for I find that in 1757 an Act was passed for preventing frauds and abuses committed by persons employed in the fustian, *cotton*, and other manufactures of the kingdom. Lord Sheffield probably intended to convey that the cotton manufacture had not assumed any large proportions until the period

* Lord Sheffield, p. 193.

† *Memoir of Right Honble. John Foster*, prefixed to *Debates and Proceedings of the H. of C.*, p. x., Dublin, 1786.

‡ Lord Sheffield, p. 198.

he mentions. The cotton manufacture at Prosperous owed its origin to Mr. Robert Brooke (who had held, I believe, prior to his embarking in it, a high official position abroad). He built the town and erected considerable works. His capital, however, proving insufficient, he applied to Parliament for a loan, and an Act of the Irish legislature was passed to enable him to borrow a sum of £25,000 from the government.*

The undertaking, however, proved a failure; for in 1792 a second statute was passed, which having recited that Brooke had sustained several losses in carrying on the manufacture, and had failed in his circumstances, provided for a sale of the premises. I may add that the town itself suffered considerably in 1798, and I am not aware if the industry has ever been revived.

The foregoing presents a tolerably accurate outline of the history of some of the Irish industries up to and during the greater part of the eighteenth century. My narrative would, however, be incomplete if I omitted to give (even at the risk of wearying my readers) an outline of the state of the country, for the consideration of the one, in truth, involves that of the other.

The Act of William III. substituted distress and need for comparative independence and plenty; while the heavy restrictions placed on its trade and commerce generally (to which I shall have to refer), plunged Ireland more deeply in want and—as its natural

* 23 & 24 Geo. III. cap. 12.

result—in crime. In the year 1762 Hutchinson states :—“ A national evil made its appearance which all the exertions of the government and of the legislature have not since been able to eradicate. I mean the risings of the Whiteboys. They appear in those parts of the kingdom where manufactures are not established, and are a proof of the poverty and want of employment of our people. Lord Northumberland mentions in his speech from the throne that the means of industry would be the remedy, from whence it seems to follow that the want of these means must be the cause.”* Again he writes :—“ Can the history of any other fruitful country on the globe enjoying peace for fourscore years, and not visited by plague or pestilence, produce so many recorded instances of the poverty and wretchedness, and of the reiterated want and misery of the lower orders of the people ? There is no such example of ancient or modern times.”†

Comment on the above is unnecessary, and I shall briefly refer to the commercial relations which subsisted between the two countries prior to 1689, and to those which succeeded, taking Hutchinson as my authority :—“ For several centuries before this period [1689] Ireland was in possession of the English common law and of Magna Charta. The former secures the subject in the enjoyment of prosperity of every kind ; and by the latter the liberties of all parts of the kingdom are established.

“ The statutes made in England for the common

* *Commercial Restraints*, p. 69.

† *Ibid.* p. 79.

weal, are by an Irish Act of the 10th Henry VII. [Poyning's Act], made laws in Ireland, and the English commercial statutes, in which Ireland is expressly mentioned, will place the former state of commerce in a light very different from that in which it has been very generally considered in Great Britain." He then refers to various "commercial" statutes passed in the reigns of Edward III. and IV., in which Ireland is expressly named, and having added that "in those reigns England was as careful of the commerce and manufactures of her ancient sister kingdom—particularly of her great staple, the woollen trade—as her own," he gives as the result of Poyning's Act, in the time of Henry VII., "that the English commercial system and the Irish, so far as it depended upon the English statute law, was the same; and before this period, so far as it depended upon the common law and Magna Charta, was also the same.

"From that time until the fifteenth of King Charles II., which takes in a period of 167 years, the commercial constitution of Ireland was as much favoured and protected as that of England. By several English statutes in the reign of King Charles II. an equal attention was shown to the woollen manufactures of both kingdoms; . . . the shipping and navigation of England and Ireland were also much favoured.

"In 1663 the restrictions between the trade of England and Ireland, and the restraints upon that of the latter, commenced. By an English Act of that year, the importation of all commodities except victuals, servants, horses, and salt, for the fisheries of

New England and Newfoundland, from thence to the English plantations, was prohibited; and in 1670 another Act was passed in England, prohibiting the exportation from the English Plantations to Ireland of several materials for manufactures, without first unloading in England or Wales." After enumerating various other Acts relating to the same subject, he proceeds:—"Those laws laid Ireland under restraints highly prejudicial to her commerce and navigation. From those countries the materials for shipbuilding and some of those used in perfecting her staple manufactures were had. Ireland was by those laws excluded from all the trade of three-quarters of the globe, and from all beneficial intercourse with her fellow-subjects in those countries which were partly stocked from her own loins. But still, though deprived at that time of the benefit of those colonies, she was not then considered as a colony herself; her manufacturers were not in any other manner discouraged; her ports were left open, and she was at liberty to look for a market among strangers, though not among her fellow-subjects in Asia, Africa, or America. By the law of 1699 she was brought within a system of colonization; but on worse terms than any of the plantations, who were allowed to trade with each other. . . . Let the history of both kingdoms, and the statute books of both Parliaments be examined, and no precedent will be found for the Act of 1699, or for the system which it introduced."*

* *Commercial Restraints*, pp. 164, seq.

Such, as regards her trade and manufactures, was the condition of Ireland from 1699 to 1780 ; one which I do not hesitate to say, when the relations of the two countries are borne in mind, is without precedent.

Pitt, in his speech on the commercial propositions of 1785, said :—"The object of that species of policy which the British government has exercised towards Ireland had been to debar her from the enjoyment and use of her own resources, and to make her completely subservient to the interests and opulence of Britain ;"* while Newenham thus described it :—"To cramp, obstruct, and render abortive the industry of the Irish, were the objects of the British trader ; to gratify commercial avarice, to serve Britain at the expense of Ireland, or to facilitate objects of the British minister."†

A contemporary writer thus gives the practical result of the condition of things :—"That, while the ports of Ireland are open to receive from Great Britain and her colonies, or any other part of Europe, Asia, Africa, and America, Great Britain, either by an interpretation of the Navigation Acts, or subsequent laws, by actual prohibitions, or by prohibitions arising from duties, shuts her ports against Ireland in those articles of commerce which Ireland admits freely from her."‡ The same writer adds :—"There are three species of prohibition now existing ; the first is that which arises from the extension of the Navigation

* Newenham, p. 89.

† *Ibid.* p. 97.

‡ *The Proposed System of Trade with Ireland Explained*, Dublin, 1785.

Act, the second arising from actual prohibition laid upon particular articles of manufacture, and the third, virtual prohibitions laid upon certain articles by means of heavy duties." He then gives a formidable list of articles prohibited by law to be imported from Ireland.

In 1779 a brighter day dawned on the trade and manufactures of Ireland. To state fully the causes which led to this, would be to write the history of the period. I shall therefore merely give a short outline.

In 1778 the American war was at its height. England at the time was fighting single-handed with America, France, and Spain, and the heaviest demands were made on her resources of every kind—of men as well as money. She was unable, under the circumstances, to furnish troops for the protection of Ireland, whose ports were left unprotected, and exposed to the inroads of the American privateers, which swept the coasts with impunity. The material condition of Ireland was, at the time, lamentable. The only trade she might be said to possess unshackled by English legislation was the linen, and it was ruined by the war. "The state of the channel was creating serious inconvenience in England, and English attention, already roused to the Irish problem, began to direct itself upon it in earnest. . . . The King recommended that in consequence of the undoubted distress in Ireland the English Treasury should undertake the cost of the Irish regiments which were serving in America. The message brought on debates, in which

both houses agreed to demand an account of the entire condition of Irish trade. . . . Lord Townsend implored the Peers to awake to a sense of the insolent cruelty with which the poor island had been so long afflicted. With keen antithesis, he too, like Shelbourne, contrasted Ireland with America: the Irish patient under misery, which might have driven a wiser people into madness; the Americans, rebellious in the midst of plenty and prosperity. Ireland, he said, perishing in the fetters which chained her industry, had petitioned for partial release, and England had answered insolently, Break your chains if you can.”*

Nothing, however, was done. “Eloquence and entreaty were alike in vain. The English Parliament, though compelled at last to listen to the truth, could not bring itself to act upon it.”†

The time, however, was at hand when England could no longer resist the just demands of Ireland. Owing to her necessities she was unable to provide troops to protect the country, and the result was the formation of the Volunteer corps—a force of men estimated at over 40,000, enrolled and armed, “and under no authority, except what they might organize for themselves;”‡ and Ireland was for the first time possessed of an army with which there was no power in the country to contend. In her case “force” was “a remedy.” England had turned a deaf ear to every remonstrance, but she was obliged to give way—

* *The English in Ireland*, vol. ii. pp. 237.

† *Ibid.* p. 239.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 255.

"her necessities, not her will, consented;" and the result was that in 1780 a partial measure of commercial relief was granted, which opened her trade with the colonies, and permitted the exportation of Irish manufactures to those ports from which they had previously been excluded, but which, rightly considered, did little more than put an end to smuggling.*

The duties, so far as the Irish trade with England, remained unchanged. These, as regards the woollen manufactures, amounted to actual prohibitions, while the other restrictions pressed heavily on the general industry of the country, and "the situation" may be said to have undergone no material change for the better.

The independence of Ireland followed in 1782; and in the subsequent year Pitt became Prime Minister. He was not long in office before he determined on the Legislative Union between the two countries, and as a means towards this end, a complete alteration of their existing mercantile relations.

Accordingly, in 1784, in a letter to the Duke of Rutland, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, he writes:—"The commercial points of discussion, though numerous and comprehensive, may certainly be reduced to clear principles by diligent investigation. The internal question of Parliamentary reform, though simple, is, perhaps, more difficult and hazardous, *and the line of future permanent connection between the two countries must be the result of both the preceding*

* *The English in Ireland*, vol. ii. p. 259.

questions, and of such arrangements as must accompany a settlement of them;" and the two points with which he proposed to deal were the Navigation Laws and the system of duties on the importation into either country of the manufactures of the other; as to the latter, by lowering the duties to the standard of Ireland.* In order, therefore, to carry out this scheme, in August, 1785, Mr. Orde, at the time Chief Secretary for Ireland, moved in the House of Commons a series of "clauses," as they were styled, on the subject.

The debate on Orde's motion was one of the most interesting that ever took place in the Irish House of Commons. A strong feeling prevailed amongst the members that there was a plain attempt made on the part of Pitt to destroy the Irish independence. Grattan denounced it on this ground, as well as on that of its being an "arrangement establishing a principle of *uti possidetis*; that is, Great Britain shall retain all her advantages, and Ireland shall retain all her disadvantages."† The Government, however, carried their point on a division, and there was a small majority for admitting the Bill.

Pitt was greatly chagrined. In his reply to the letter of the Duke of Rutland, announcing the result, he says:—"I confess myself not a little disappointed and hurt in the account brought me to-day by your letter and Mr. Orde's, of the event of Friday. I had hoped that neither prejudice nor party could on such

* *Quarterly Review*, vol. lxx. p. 299.

† *Parliamentary Debates*, p. 233.

an occasion have made so many proselytes against the true interests of the country; but the die seems in a great measure to be cast, at least, for the present.

. . . With so doubtful a majority, and with so much industry to raise a spirit of opposition without doors, this is not the moment for preparing to go further.”*

Although the relations between the two countries remained unaltered, the condition of the country rapidly improved. It is, however, difficult to understand how this took place; for the restrictions on her trade with England continued. The country was flooded with English manufactures, which were subject merely to a small duty, while those from Ireland, if the linen manufacture be excepted, were more or less heavily “weighted;” and indeed, as regards linens, these were only admitted in what I may term their “raw condition,” for coloured or printed fabrics were subject to a heavy impost.

I think the reason for the increasing prosperity of the country is to be found not merely in the watchful care, protection, and encouragement given to trade and manufactures by the Irish Parliament, but in the healthy feeling of self-reliance and self-dependence which infused itself into and invigorated the industrious classes. A writer in 1810 says :—“ It must not, however, be forgotten that there are still some persons who, admitting in the fullest extent the actual prosperity of Ireland, ascribe it exclusively to the arrangement of 1782, by which the independence of the Irish

* *Quarterly Review*, vol. lxx. p. 310.

Parliament was finally settled. . . . Now, it cannot be denied that the concession of independence to a long oppressed and injured people was calculated to elevate their character, to rouse them from their indolence, to animate them to exertion; and thus to lay the foundation of their future wealth and aggrandizement.”* And Foster says :—“Can those that hear me now deny that since the period of 1782 this country has risen in civilization, wealth, and manufactures—until interrupted by the present war—in a greater proportion, and with a more rapid progress than any other country in Europe, and much more than it ever did itself before? And to what has this improvement been owing but to the spirit, the content, and enterprise which a free constitution inspired?”†

There can be no doubt, however, that although the circumstances of the country had improved, her general industries and manufactures, except by comparison, cannot be said to have done so. Indeed, it was not to be expected that these could in a bound recover the ground which they had lost through many years of oppression, and while many of the shackles which fettered them still remained.

It may be contended that in rejecting the mercantile propositions of Pitt, Ireland disregarded her true interests, and that had she accepted them her position would have been better and more assured. I freely admit that although Grattan spoke of the measure as one in which “Great Britain shall retain all her

* *Quarterly Review*, vol. iii. p. 60.

† *Speech on the Union*, p. 2, Dublin, 1800.

advantages, and Ireland shall retain all her disadvantages," the chief ground of objection was that of "encroachment" on her independence; but I think that upon consideration it will be found that had Pitt succeeded the consequences to Ireland would have been most disastrous. The truth is, what Ireland wanted at the time was protection for her manufactures, which had been kept down not merely by restriction, but by competition; and had Pitt's free-trade propositions been carried, there would have been but an increase of the evil, which would have terminated in a collapse of all those industries brought into competition with England, by whom she would have been overmatched.

In 1799, fourteen years after the virtual rejection of his commercial propositions, Pitt brought forward the measure of the Union, which then met a similar fate, although it was carried the following year. I do not propose to enter into the general considerations connected with it; but shall confine myself to the Sixth Article, as to which my observations shall be but brief.

So far as I have been able to see (for the subject is, from various causes, clouded) the Sixth Article of Union did not differ in its actual results from the propositions of '85—both were framed in the interests of England. I have shown that had the scheme of '85 been carried the result to Ireland would have been disastrous; and Foster, in answer to the taunts of Pitt for having "changed his front," and condemned in 1800 the propositions of '85

of which he had been himself the author, replied :—
 “The Irish Parliament was then to continue, and could prevent any evil which might follow ;” and it was plainly on this ground that he supported them. The real distinction between the two propositions lay solely in this—that in the one case there was to be no “breathing time ;” while, to use the words of Foster, there was to be given to the Irish manufactures “a lingering death instead of condemning them to immediate immolation.”

At the risk of prolixity, I must recall to my reader’s recollection the condition of Ireland at the time. The woollen trade was but just recovering from the effects of the Act of William ; but only so far as regarded its foreign trade—the prohibitions between the two countries remaining as before. The cotton manufacture was a comparatively new industry, and required heavy protecting duties to strengthen it. In the words of Foster, after referring to the various protective duties on the different cotton manufactures :—“We have, I believe, about thirteen mills erected at a great expense, capable of working 500,000 lbs. of cotton, we have many factories built, and much capital vested on the faith of these duties, giving a very extended employment to the industrious poor, and all are to be ruined by this fatal project.”*

The silk trade, although recovering, was depressed, and I believe I am correct in stating that all Irish industries (with the exception perhaps of the linen

* *Speech on the Union*, p. 16.

manufacture) were but emerging from their prostrate condition—they were healthy plants, but they were weak and required care to mature them.

The expedient of nursing manufactures by protection and bounties is, I am well aware, one which in many quarters meets with disapproval, as being false in theory and bad in practice. It appears to me, however, that whatever weight the objection may have, viewed as a general proposition, it altogether fails when the peculiar circumstances of Ireland are borne in mind; and that it was impossible for her, without artificial aid, even on her own ground, to compete with England.

The truth of the aphorism that “history repeats itself” was never more conspicuously shown than in the case of the last Irish Parliament. Little more than a century previously its predecessor had, at the bidding of England, destroyed the woollen trade, and its successor was found a willing tool at the same dictation to work out a similar purpose, but more extensive in its operation; and, as in the former case, there can be no excuse made for, nor any extenuation offered on behalf of those who sold their country and betrayed her best interests.

As the protective duties were not to cease for some time after the Union, the effects on the trade and manufactures were not immediately felt in their full severity; to this, however, other circumstances contributed—amongst them the European war.

A contemporary writer, in reviewing Sir Francis d'Ivernois' *Effets du Blocus*, stated “that although

the most flourishing of her [Ireland's] manufactures was in ordinary times exposed to the competition of German and other foreign linens, and her agricultural produce, such as grain, salted provisions, hides, tallow, etc., was encountered at our market by rival articles from Poland, America, or Prussia, through the operation of the blockade she exchanged competition for monopoly." * In other words, the exceptionable position of Ireland, arising from the war and its attendant circumstances, gave her for the time advantages which with the advent of peace would disappear.

Although the injurious effects of the Sixth Article may not have been immediately felt, it is, I believe, a fact that the rapid strides which the country was making up to the date of the Union received a check; and that her material prosperity, if it did not retrograde, made no advance. The writer to whom I have already referred says:—"But an objection more formidable, because it tends not only to invalidate the arguments, but upset the facts advanced by Sir Francis d'Ivernois, has been brought forward in the work of Mr. Newenham. He states that the balance of trade up to 1799 had been constantly and greatly favourable to Ireland, and from that time to 1805 highly favourable."

It is unnecessary to enter into the writer's reasoning in reply, because, rightly considered, it supports my view that the trade and manufactures had fallen off

* *Quarterly Review*, vol. iii. p. 53.

very shortly after the passing of the Union ; for had it been otherwise he could have easily refuted Newenham's allegation by facts, instead of resorting to "hair-splitting distinctions," based on the difference between "current" and "official values."

Had Pitt courageously stated that England's past conduct was indefensible, and that she must bear the consequences, and realised the fact "that every addition to the wealth of Ireland must eventually operate in augmenting that of England, and that to promote the prosperity of Ireland is in effect the same thing as to promote that of England ;" and "that a spirit of industry and enterprise ought to be much more munificently encouraged in the former than in the latter ;"* and if animated by these views, he had brought forward a measure of "Union" which would have developed the country's resources, stimulated her industries, and as far as possible got rid of the injustice of the past—how different would have been the result for Ireland, and I may add for England !

If the Union, by the injury done to the trade and manufactures of the former, has brought poverty and misery on her, has it been so great a benefit to the latter ? Or, rather, has it not proved an element of weakness ? What has been the condition of Ireland since 1800 ? The unhappy country has, I may say, from a comparatively short period since the passing of the Act of Union, been the arena of constant conflicts, and has been kept, with scarcely a pause, in a state of

* Newenham, p. 5.

unquiet and insecurity ; and which has, I believe, arisen in no small degree from the same causes which operated in 1762.

The course which two eminent statesmen took long subsequently stands out in bright relief to Pitt's conduct. The impetus which the Union was to give to the trade and manufactures of the country, culminated in famine, and the wretched people, solely dependent on agriculture, were prostrated. Lord George Bentinck saw where the real cause of the evil lay, and boldly brought forward a remedy, which had the government of the day adopted, would have gone far to efface the bitter memories of the past, and placed Ireland in a very different position. I allude to his proposal with respect to railways. Again, another true friend of Ireland, Lord Eglinton, with a like clear perception, inaugurated the Galway packet project, which was, however, I may say in its inception destroyed by English mercantile jealousy and intrigue. Both of these true friends of Ireland have gone to their rest ; their names must, however, always remain "green" in the memories of all who have the real interests of the country at heart.

There are two writers whose works are commonly cited to prove that Ireland's trade and manufactures were gainers by the Union, I allude to Moreau and Montgomery Martin.

The "tables" of the former are marvellous specimens of care and painstaking research, and have been largely traded on by succeeding writers on Ireland.

As, however, they merely traverse a period of twenty years prior to the Union, and one of somewhat similar length subsequent to that date, and which is covered by the Sixth Article, I think they must be deemed as of little value for the purpose for which they have been cited.

Mr. Montgomery Martin's pamphlet, with a high-sounding title, is a production of a different character. It was plainly written as a "counterblast" to O'Connell's Repeal manifesto, and is made up of the same materials as those with which the public are familiar. His great *cheval de bataille* are figures, "as if," in the language of O'Connell, "the welfare of Ireland could be conjured up by a series of arithmetical calculations;" while, as a specimen of his "facts,"* I give the following:—"Before the Union there were about ten hotels in Dublin, now there are nearly fifty, and on a scale of grandeur and comfort not surpassed in London." This certainly is to my mind a novel mode of showing the prosperity of the country. For to what does it amount? Is it not to this—that two classes had largely increased, viz.: absentees, and commercial travellers, neither of which are calculated to add either to the wealth or prosperity of Ireland.†

* *Ireland as it was, is, and ought to be*, p. 42, London, 1834.

† An eminent political economist has, I am aware, attempted to establish the proposition that absenteeism is of no injury whatever to Ireland; "that the income of a landlord when he is an absentee is really as much expended in Ireland as if he were living on it;" and gives the following explanation of his theory:—"When a landlord becomes an absentee, his rent must be remitted to him one way or another, either in money or commodities. When a landlord has an estate in Ireland, and goes to live in London or Paris, his agent gets

I would merely add that his historical facts are by no means accurate, and this being so, I should have doubts as to the soundness of his figures, and shall, therefore, dismiss his book without further comment.

The consideration of my subject has, I may say, been "forced" upon me by the condition of Rathfarnham and the adjoining neighbourhoods of Milltown and Rathgar as regards their manufacturing industries, and with which I now propose very shortly to deal, taking their condition at three distinct epochs. In speaking of Rathfarnham, I include the district which extends from the river Dodder to the base of the Dublin hills, and which forms one of the most beautiful outlets in the neighbourhood of the city. Admirably suited for manufactures from its proximity to the metropolis, as well as from the water power it possesses (and which, I believe, might at a comparatively small cost be largely increased), it was at one time a place of considerable importance from the number of mills and factories with which it was studded.

his rent and buys a bill of exchange with it. Now this bill of exchange is a draft drawn for equivalent commodities which must be sent from Ireland. The merchants who get £10,000, or any other sum, from the agents of an absentee landlord go into the Irish markets, and buy exactly the same amount of commodities as the landlord would have bought had he been at home; *the only difference being that the landlord would eat them and wear them in London or Paris, and not in Dublin or his house in Ireland.*"—*Evidence of J. R. M'Culloch, Esq.*, 4th Report, p. 813. The Quarterly Reviewer, commenting on the above absurdity, says:—"We rather suspect that the learned lecturer is as good at a distinction as the Irishman in the farce who, speaking of porter, says—'If it wasn't for the malt and hops, I had as lief drink Thames water.'"—*Quarterly Review*, vol. xxxiii. p. 459.

Archer, who wrote in 1801, states that there were in Rathfarnham two paper and two corn mills; in Rockbrook and its vicinity, six paper mills; while in Kilmashogue (an outlying district) there was one corn mill—in all, eleven mills of different descriptions.* I believe he is in error as to the number, which should be not eleven, but nineteen.

The mills were all in full work at the time, and as a general rule, so continued for twenty years after the Union. An old inhabitant, who recollects the period, has described to me in glowing terms the condition of Rathfarnham, and said that it was a joyous sight to witness, at the close of each day, the crowds of happy and well-clad workers which poured into the village from the various mills and factories in the neighbourhood.

When, however, the period of protection limited by the Sixth Article of Union expired, a great change took place. The manufacturers were unable to bear up against the great capital and resources of England, and I believe many of the mills succumbed. Some, however, held their ground, and I shall take from D'Alton the condition of things which existed eighteen years subsequently.

Of Whitechurch, he says:—"Cotton mills were formerly kept here by Mr. Jackson, but the edifice is now wholly deserted." Of Rockbrook:—"If the gender were applicable, it might well be exclaimed:—*O quantum mutatus ab illo!* Once a scene of pros-

* *Statistical Survey of the Co. Dublin*, 1801, p. 207.

perous industry—now a village of squalid paupers, by reason of the cessation of the several factories that formerly existed there.” Having then referred to the condition of two of the Rockbrook mills, he proceeds:—“The continuing course wears a better aspect, and Mr. Horan’s factory, which employs about thirty-five persons, leads to the more extensive and beneficial concerns of Mr. Burke, where about one hundred and sixty, all of whom constitute a village around him, get constant employment. . . . Next at sight occur Mr. Lambert’s woollen works, employing about twenty, as do those of Mr. Sherlock, . . . while Mr. Read’s woollen mill at Ballyboden gives work to about forty. . . . Near the bridge of Rathfarnham is a woollen factory kept by Mr. Murray, and employing about fifty persons. There are also paper and corn mills near this, which are worked by the respective waters of the Dodder and Cruagh rivers, that unite at this locality.”*

Archer states that in Milltown and Rathgar there were seven mills and factories of different descriptions—woollen, cotton, oil, and logwood. These seem to have undergone a change, for the following was the condition of things when D’Alton wrote. Speaking of Rathgar:—“At the adjacent edge of the Dodder are the cotton works of Mr. Waldron, where about one hundred persons get daily employment. . . . At Milltown, the extensive woollen mills of Mr. Willans are first met with, to which succeeds an establish-

* *History of the County of Dublin*, p. 794.

ment of the same kind, kept by Mr. Hodnett, where about eighty are employed, and another—Kennedy's—engaging about fifteen.”*

Such was the condition of the manufacturing industries of Rathfarnham and its neighbourhood in 1838, and which, so far as I am aware, continued with but little change up to the period when free trade was established. From this date, a manifest decline took place, and I shall now give a brief sketch of the present state of things, merely premising that I believe I am correct in stating that what is true of Rathfarnham is equally so of many other districts in Ireland, which had previously been busy hives of industry.

I shall commence with Milltown and Rathgar. The woollen factory of the Messrs. Willans having been abandoned by them, and afterwards worked for a short time, was burned down about two years ago, and has not been rebuilt. Hodnett's mills came subsequently into the hands of Messrs. Moore, but have long since been diverted from their original purpose, and are now flour mills; while Kennedy's factory has been converted into a lodging house! So much for Milltown. The cotton factory at Rathgar, which gave employment to one hundred hands, has been pulled down, and a saw mill erected on its site. It is hardly necessary to say that this has not been for the better so far as the industrial classes are concerned.

I pass now to Rathfarnham. The woollen factory

* *History of the County Dublin*, pp. 779, 798.

of Murray having ceased to be worked as such for a considerable time (I am unable, however, to fix the date), was subsequently converted into a flour mill, but has recently been pulled down, and all traces of its existence effaced. The paper mill alluded to by D'Alton exists, but having undergone various vicissitudes, is rapidly falling to decay. Passing to the districts of Whitechurch, Rockbrook, and Ballyboden, what is the condition of the mills and factories in these localities?

The paper mill at Tibraddon was, I believe, idle for many years, and has been taken down. The silk mill at Kilmashogue is a ruin. Jackson's cotton mill is now a laundry, while all that remains of a similar factory in the same locality is the mill race through which the water idly flows. In Rockbrook and Edmundstown there is but one out of five mills at work. Two are in ruins; the third, Pickering's, no longer (in D'Alton's words) "tells that it lives," having met the fate of many of its fellows; while Burke's woollen factory is now a laundry. Following the course of the stream from Rockbrook, Mr. Dollard's paper mills are reached, which, with those of Messrs. Macdonough, form "bright spots" in the wilderness, and present a pleasing contrast to the deplorable picture of decay and ruin which as a general rule meets the eye. Sherlock's factory at Ballyboden is now a laundry; that of Read has not been worked for a considerable period, and a paper-mill in the same locality has been "eloquently silent" for some six or seven years; while the mill at Willbrook, which gave considerable

employment as a pin manufactory, has been converted into a flour-mill.

The state of things, therefore, is shortly as follows ; that out of a total number of twenty-four mills and factories which were in full work at the time of the Union, and for a period subsequent to it, through the operation of various causes, there exist but two paper-mills, six flour mills, and one saw-mill. I need hardly say that I do not view "laundries"—useful institutions though they may be—in the light of either mills or factories.

Is not this a sad picture ? The hamlets which formerly presented evidences of thrift and industry have with the altered circumstances undergone a deplorable change. All hopes that the well-wishers of the country might have had, have been rudely dashed ; and I don't think I am very far astray in saying that the predominant feeling as regards the future is that of despair.

I have in conclusion but a few observations to offer. It may be objected that the present is by no means an opportune time to revive the memories of the past, and to bring up the blunders and shortcomings of England, when the minds of the people are exasperated against her, and the country is torn by agitation. I think, however, that its normal condition affords a sufficient answer. One of the chief causes of the discontent and disaffection—I might add of the anarchy—which prevails, is want of employment, and as a result, poverty. These have grown out of the vain attempts to make agriculture the sole means of the people's support.

So long as free trade was looked upon as an English institution, which it was impossible to shake, it was a thankless, as well as a useless task, to call attention to the real grievances of Ireland; for it was vain to expect that anything could or would be done to raise her from the prostrate condition in which, by its operation, she had been laid. But when a healthy action set in in England, and when the "free trade" film began to fall from her eyes, it appeared to me a proper time to disabuse the minds of the public of the false idea which I believe, as a general rule, exists not merely in England but in Ireland—that the latter never had manufactures of any consequence, and that she, therefore, sustained no injury by free trade; of which propositions I think I have established the affirmative.

The mode of revival of her manufactures is a question of a different character, and one into which I do not propose to enter, involving, as it would, many considerations outside my present purpose. I may say, however, that if this revival is to take place, it must, I think, mainly depend upon Irish exertions and Irish capital; for I fear that from the great ignorance which prevails in England as regards the capabilities and resources of the country, as well as from the cupidity of her manufacturers, it were futile to expect that she will contribute any assistance; but I cannot also conceal from myself the fact that the Irish manufactures will have to contend not merely with trade jealousies on the part of England, but with apathy, indifference, and disparagement on the part of many in this country.

I think, however, that if England were alive to her true interests, and, taking a lesson from the past, were to divest herself of the narrow-minded feelings which have hitherto, I regret to say, proved so injurious to the manufacturing industries of this country, she would see (and that ere long) by the encouragement she gave them, and by the consequent elevation of the Irish character, a blessed change in the condition of the country. I believe that its present state is in no small degree owing to the fitful and spasmodic character of the employment, which (paradoxical though it may seem) has conduced to the spread of intemperance and crime. If, however, (still untaught), England persists in keeping aloof from the endeavour to "build up" the industries of this country, she is at least bound to protect those who are engaged in the uphill task of endeavouring to do so.

Manufactures are, I need hardly say, the growth of self-reliance, capital, and industry, but these are of comparatively little avail, if protection is not given to life and property, and vigilant care taken on the part of the Government to secure them. The law-loving and industrious people of Ireland, if England will do nothing else, are entitled at least to demand this from her, that in order successfully to revive those industries which she formerly possessed, an end shall be made of the state of confusion, anarchy, and bloodshed in which this country is plunged. The words of Sir John Davies, describing the Irish character, are apposite on this part of my subject:—"There is no nation of people under the sunne that doth love equal

and indifferent justice better than the Irish, or will not be better satisfied with the execution thereof, although it bee against themselves, so as they may have the protection and benefit of the law when upon just cause they do desire it." *

Upon the entire question I shall conclude with the observations of Hutchison:—"If the cause of the poverty and distress of Ireland in the reign of Queen Anne has since continued, though not always in so great a degree, yet sufficient frequently to reduce to misery, and constantly to check the growth, and impair the strength of that kingdom (Ireland), and to weaken the force and to reduce the resources of Great Britain—that man ought to be considered a guide to the British Empire who endeavours to establish this important truth, and to explain a subject so little understood.

"If in this attempt, then, there shall appear no intention to raise jealousies, inflame discontents, or agitate constitutional questions, it is hoped that those letters may be read without prejudice on our side of the water, or without passion or resentment on the other." †

Without arrogating to myself the position of "guide to the British Empire," I may at all events lay claim to having brought before the country what I believe to be the true cause of the unhappy condition of Ireland: it must rest with wiser heads than mine to carry out the remedy.

* *A Discoverie*, etc., p. 283.

† *Restraints of Trade*, p. 33.