

CONSTITUTIONAL
CONSIDERATIONS,
INTERSPERSED WITH
POLITICAL OBSERVATIONS,
ON THE
PRESENT STATE OF IRELAND.

By MATTHEW WELD, Esq.

BARRISTER AT LAW.

HANC RETINETE QUESO QUIRITES QUAM VOBIS
TANQUAM HEREDITATEM MAJORES VESTRI RELIQUERUNT.
CICERO.

*Remember, O my friends, THE LAWS, THE RIGHTS,
The generous plan of power deliver'd down
From age to age, by your renown'd forefathers,
(So dearly bought, the price of so much blood,)
O let it never perish in your hands!
But piously transmit it to your children.*

ADDISON'S CATO.

DUBLIN:

PRINTED BY J. MOORE, 45, COLLEGE-GREEN.

1800.

CONSTITUTIONAL
CONSIDERATIONS
BY
JOHN RUSSELL
OF THE
HOUSE OF COMMONS
IN PARLIAMENT ASSEMBLED
IN THE YEAR 1832
LONDON: PRINTED BY RICHARD CLAY AND COMPANY, BUNGAY, SUFFOLK.
1832.

TO THE
RIGHT HON. JAMES FITZGERALD,
THE INCORRUPTIBLE FRIEND
OF HIS COUNTRY;
WHO NOBLY AND DISINTERESTEDLY PREFERRED, THE
INDEPENDENCE OF IRELAND,
TO SELF AGGRANDIZEMENT:

SETTING FORTH AN EXAMPLE,
THAT EVEN VENALITY AND APOSTACY MUST
ADMIRE AND VENERATE;

THESE PAGES ARE INSCRIBED,

By him, who, as incapable of Untruth, as he is of Adulation;

Has the Honour to remain,

With every respect,

His most obedient,

And faithful, humble Servant,

M. WELD.

RIGHT HON. JAMES FITZGERALD,

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY

OF THE GOVERNMENT

WHO NOW HAS THE HONOUR OF PRESIDING,

IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS,

ON THE 11th DECEMBER 1874,

IN ANSWER TO A QUESTION

PUT BY MR. W. W. WILSON,

MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT,

RESPECTING THE

PROVISIONS OF THE ACT RELATIVE TO

THE RATES OF

THE RAILWAYS

AND

THE RATES OF

M. WILSON.

Houses of the Oireachtas

P R E F A C E.

THE following Pages were not originally intended for public view, written at different times, partly as relaxation from more serious study, and partly with the intent of possibly beholding the question of Union in a new point of view, and then retracting an opinion warmly supported, as perhaps rashly adopted; but the reverse has been the result—for the closer the investigation, the more the subject is deliberated; the greater the opposition of every well wisher to Ireland.—I have now been induced to change my intention, and to present these “CONSIDERATIONS” to the public; not from the vain presumptive expectation of discussing the subject with as much ability as has been already displayed by others, but from two circumstances

B

cumstances, the unexpected resumption, (which I learn from authority I cannot doubt,) of the measure in the ensuing Session of Parliament, and the fond, perhaps delusive hope, of proving the humble instrument of arousing the dormant opposition of the genius and energies of my Country. Here let not the Unionist sarcastically smile, but remember while he hugs himself in his consequence, how often assiduity, and perseverance have accomplished, what power, and might have despised—how humble, in interest, and in strength, and yet how final in success! the little means that broke the Lions toils, and restored the noble animal to freedom, and his native woods?

Impelled solely by these motives, and an enthusiastic love for my Country, I place this Constitutional and Political Discussion before the tribunal of the public,—a Commercial disquisition is not here entered
into

into, nor are those arguments that have been already urged against the measure here recapitulated (as far at least as could be avoided) at being the second* to resist the downfall of my County, as it is to me a most pleasing reflection, (though I lament the cause,) so it is my most anxious wish, to see so unwarrantable an attack, at length, either prudently abandoned on the part from whence it originated, or get an eternal quietus from opposition.

Before I conclude these preliminary remarks, I will be permitted to observe, that although customary, perhaps fashionable, it has been to deprecate the profession of the Law interfering in political discussions, that however true this position may be in the abstract, (which is by no means admitted) yet that there are periods when the state is in danger and it behoves every man to protect as far as he can, the common weal.

* Mr. SPENCER had the honor to be the first.

When this attack is made on the constitution, how incumbent on those whose knowledge of the constitution and the laws, is so closely interwoven, the one emanating the *Lex Scripta*, (or Statute Law,) at least from the former, to step forth in defence of both? Strange then indeed it would be, were the profession to look on with indifference (which they have not) at the abrogation of the constitution and the appelliant jurisdiction so nobly asserted and so gloriously obtained in 1782, and I cannot conclude without expressing the consoling wish, that as the bar of Ireland have ever stepped forth in defence of their country, and as the guardians of the constitution, and the laws, so may their bright example and exalted principles, ever animate and actuate posterity!

MOLESWORTH-STREET;

January 1, 1800.

CONSIDERATIONS, &c.



A Year has now revolved since the proposition of a Union has been deliberated in the Parliaments of Great Britain and Ireland; brought forward in a season of Irish calamity, a rebellion and foreign invasion, in quick succession, had desolated "a country, almost afraid to know itself;" breathless from intestine divisions, and exhausted from the fatigues of war: But undismayed by these discouraging circumstances, the natives of Ireland beat the proud and implacable enemy of Britain, and forced him to surrender; thus incontrovertibly proving their attachment and fidelity to England. This was the moment, when as it were to take the country by surprise, and the base and ungenerous proposal of Union, was

was stolen into an address of thanks to the Viceroy:—The people on all sides struck with terror, beheld the measure with astonishment and abhorrence.—But the genius of the constitution interposed, and the parricidal weapon rebounded harmlessly to the arm that aimed the blow. One Hundred and Eleven true to their delegated trust, with another Miltiades at their head, defeated the haughty and presumptuous project. The friends of Ireland then hoped the measure for ever at rest, for it is an established rule, that no measure will be pursued by the minister, that has not at least two-thirds of the house to sanction it, and it is also a principle in the constitution, that the third estate, (or the representative of it,) shall not directly or indirectly, interfere or influence the free voting of the two other estates, (the Lords and Commons,) but in this too, the country was disappointed, as the session was unconstitutionally, through respect, I will not say insultingly closed, by the recommendation of a measure so stigmatized to the same body that had opposed it; in this more resembling the dictating manifesto of a conquering general, than the constitutional termination* of a Parliamentary session. I now
 proceed,

* “ You are no longer a Parliament : I tell you, you are
 no

proceed, as I have designed to consider this great question politically and constitutionally, which will naturally encircle some small portion of history.

That in a question of such high moment as the surrender and annihilation of the Irish Parliament, all the people of Ireland are materially concerned, is a proposition so true and so self-evident, I think, that it will be freely and readily admitted by all.—But it may be replied “although we admit that in this question, the people of Ireland are concerned, yet the people of England are likewise equally concerned, for it is they that are to admit deputies from Ireland in case of Union into their houses of Lords and Commons.” I reply the people of England cannot be equally concerned—all Ireland is concerned and every thing dear to Irishmen—England may be partially, but not equally concerned? But all Ireland is more interested in it, than even all England, for it is Ireland that is de-

no longer a Parliament.”—exclaimed the Usurper Cromwell, just before he gave the signal for the soldiery to enter and dissolve Parliament.

manded

manded to sacrifice as a Union peace-offering that constitution,

Multos servata per Annos.

That we have been in possession of upwards of six hundred years* so that if the illustrious epoch of 1782 had never taken place, we have a right from the agreement of Henry II. and the Charter of Henry III. as well as from the fundamental principles of true freedom, to a resident Parliament. The *Magna Charta* of the Third Henry here alluded to, is more antient by eight years, than the Great Charter of Liberty, † granted by the same sovereign to the English nation. But here, perhaps, it will be objected to me, "Of what avail are
Parliament

* So early as Henry the Second's time, it appears from the authority of the historian, Matthew Paris, as quoted in Molineux's Ireland, p. 23 and 33, that a Parliament or Grand Council of the nation, held at Lismore in Ireland, anno 1172, it is agreed between Henry II. and the people of Ireland, "that they should enjoy the like liberties and immunities, and be governed by the same mild laws, both civil and ecclesiastical, as the people of England," and further, "the freedom of Parliaments to be held in Ireland, as they are held in England."

† "An antient copy of this *Magna Charta* of Ireland, is to be found in the Red Book of the Exchequer, Dublin."

Molineux's Ireland, p. 28.

Parliament rolls, they cannot bind posterity, if the People, or if the Parliament without the People agree to a Union, every difficulty is done away." I reply, if the charters of antiquity are considered in such a light, as being revocable at pleasure or caprice, frail and insecure indeed is the British constitution! and the British laws are held by a perishable tenure! in such a case no people can have a guarantee for their rights and liberties! nor can those who attempt to over-rule this objection, offer the sanction of security and permanence for the fulfillment of the articles of that Union they so strenuously support, (were that abominable project to succeed,) the terms of it may be violated, and considered as so much musty parchment;—and here I must observe, that to those very charters that some may affect to despise, our cities and corporate bodies are indebted for their rights and immunities, Liberty for her introduction into Europe, and Learning for the dispelling the darkness of the middle ages.—To return; it is further answered, although Parliament may consent, it will not bind the People—and although the people consent, that it will not bind posterity.—I will for a moment suppose the majority of the people should consent

and entirely agree to the Union, yet the remainder who do not agree to this innovation and national degradation, are not obliged to follow their example, consequently they are not bound when they do not give their consent, and even were that obtained it would not be binding, as such subjection is subversive of the law of nations, a breach of the fundamental compact of society, as it is violatory of the law of God, who granted liberty alike to the sons of men; hence it is evident, that since the present generation would not be bound by it, posterity could not, nor be deprived of that liberty that is the right of all; if the present generation do not revere and sustain the constitution of their ancestors, how can they suppose that their children and posterity will sanction a Union, weakly advised, and wickedly adopted, when they will have established the dangerous precedent of overturning with the spirit of innovation, that which has been the work of ages? impossible to be expected.

I now come to consider the right of Parliament to enact an Union.—Parliament have no right to annihilate the Parliament? Have the Lords Spiritual? No.—The Lords Spiritual,

ritual, or the Bishops cannot resign, alien, much less annihilate their rights and privileges that must be handed over unimpaired to their successors, the chief or principal of which is sitting as Lords or Barons of Parliament in the legislature, for they are severally considered by the laws as a corporation sole, the indispensable essence of which is *perpetuity*.—The Lords Temporal, have they the power? no, they are the hereditary counsellors of the crown, and by virtue of the words of their creation, by writ or king's letter, are summoned to attend the House of Peers, and it is held not only to them, but *their heirs*; and as they cannot lose their nobility but by death, (when *instantly* it devolves to the heir) attain, or degradation, so neither can they resign or annul that right that is in them inherent and hereditary.

The members of the House of Commons?—
 “They are the trustees of the nation, as they cannot resign their seats in the Commons House,” so neither can they betray or resign that trust for which they were returned to Parliament, if they do, “they betray their constituents and dissolve themselves.” †—

† Price on Civil Liberty.

Thus have I proved, that the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons in Ireland, as it were, “maintain a perpetual succession, and enjoy a kind of legal immortality.” It is true, however, at the same time, that they have power—much power, although it does not extend either to self-destruction, or the overthrow of the rights and liberties of the people.—For instance, they make new, revoke, and revise old laws—but they cannot destroy their trust—they are the trustees of the national liberties, nor can they, hence *de jure*, annihilate themselves. I shall here quote some authorities to prove, that the omnipotence of Parliament is oftentimes misunderstood and misquoted——“The omnipotence
 “of Parliament signifies nothing more than
 “the supreme sovereign power of the state,
 “or a power of action uncontrolled by any
 “superior; in this sense, the King in the
 “exercise of his prerogatives, and the House
 “of Lords in the interpretation of laws, are
 “all omnipotent; that is free from the con-
 “troul of any superior provided by the con-
 “stitution;” * than this nothing can be more
 manifest, the custom of Parliament, the usage

* Blackstone's Commentaries by E. Christian, Esq; barrister at law. Note 12. vol. 160. London edition.

of the Lords and Commons, the Speakers of both houses, in recurring to precedents, amply proves that there are certain rules or laws Parliament they must conform to. But not to rest this on my own authority, I shall quote the observation of a constitutional oracle of the law, Lord Chief Justice Holt, says, “ † That
 “ the authority of Parliament is from the law,
 “ and as it is circumscribed by law, so it may
 “ be exceeded; and if they do exceed those
 “ legal bounds and authority, *their acts are*
 “ *wrongful* and cannot be justified, any more
 “ than the acts of private men.” If then they are obliged to conform to the laws of Parliament, of necessity they cannot destroy the Parliament.

I shall now adduce another authority, the celebrated Dr. Price. “ Nothing can be more
 “ absurd, than the doctrine some have taught
 “ with respect to the omnipotence of Parlia-
 “ ment; they possess no power *beyond the li-*
 “ *mits of the trust*, for the execution of which
 “ they were formed; *if they contradict this,*
 “ *they betray their constituents and dissolve them-*
 “ *selves;*” * and the celebrated Locke who

† 1st Salkfield's Reports, 550.

* Price on Civil Liberty.

wrote,

wrote on government, expressed the same words nearly † as Price, but as I have quoted him on a former occasion, I shall not now repeat it. From these authorities I am justified in positively denying the power of Parliament. Should they enact a Union, it would be, *ab initio*, nugatory—to speak legally, *it would not be law*; there are bounds beyond which the Parliament cannot pass. But to illustrate this argument—man was formed a free agent—an intellectual being—with the faculties of thought and reflection—the powers of locomotion, &c. and dominion given him over all the animals that dwell on the earth or the waters. But at the same time bounds were set to this power, that said “thus and no further shall you go,”—that command that expresses, “thou shalt do no murder,” also says, “thou shalt not commit suicide.” In the same manner when the Parliament or Grand Council of the nation was formed, it was endowed with great powers and privileges, and formed for the advantage of the governors and the governed; but still it was found necessary to enforce the attendance of members of Parliament, by the sanction of that established law,

† Vide, Locke on Government, b. 2. c. 19. f. 216, 17, 18, 19, 20, *ad finem*.

that

that declares, " *a member of the Legislature cannot resign his seat in Parliament,*" was it the spirit of this law that, that enormous power which was denied severally, should be given collectively? if then that power of self annihilation, and even the lesser power of resigning a seat is denied to a part, it must appear self evident, that it is implicitly denied to the whole, for this would be annulling that which is the source of all written law, and destroying that very end, which to obtain, a Parliament was instituted.

Is there any lawyer that will take upon himself to assert, that Parliament has a right (of itself) to prolong itself, as was the case in 1648, when the House of Commons came to the resolution, " that whatever is enacted, and declared law, by the Commons of England, assembled in Parliament, hath the force of law; *and all the people of this nation are included* thereby, although the consent and concurrence of the King and House of Peers be not had thereunto."* Such was the vote of the long Parliament,

* January 4th, 1648, which was the last of three Resolutions, that passed the House without a negative.—Rapin's England, Vol. II. p. 568.

that

that prolonged itself, and afterwards sat on the trial, and adjudged their unfortunate Sovereign to death—but although that vote and this prolongation were effected, but by the Commons, yet had they been past by the three Estates, I have no hesitation in pronouncing them, in the words of the Lord Chief Justice Holt “wrongful and unjustifiable,”—if then the Parliament are not empowered indefinitely to prolong themselves or unjustly to bind the people by the Constitution much less have they a right to annihilate themselves—that they have the power is another question. But I deny the right, unless it be force that constitutes right. If the latter be admitted then we will be reduced to the necessity of confessing all the Acts of the long Parliament as just and right, the execution of the first Charles, as legal, and the Protectorate of Cromwell not to have been an usurpation—nothing is more dangerous than arguing from matter of fact, to matter of right, nor more erroneous than from matter of right, to matter of fact. An individual, or a body may have the power to commit an act, but it is not to be inferred they have the right from having the power: it is as great an absurdity to assert, because Cromwell trampled

trampled on the liberties of the three nations, they were *de jure* his slaves and vassals, as to assert that they having a right to liberty under him, were necessarily free.

If it be granted that the Parliament of Ireland has the right to overturn the constitution? Indeed ethics have received no practical improvement from the Protectorate of Cromwell to the Consulate of Buonaparte, and it will necessarily result as a consequence, that the Parliament of Great Britain have a similar power to overthrow the British Constitution, by annihilating themselves, (when the minister *so wills it*) a reflection that cannot fail to impress the people of England, with no pleasing feelings on the subject, dreadful and despotic power! terrific prerogative indeed! were a Parliament possessed of such a fatal gift; then the *principi quod placuit*, the will of the prince being equivalent to law, would be presumptuously revived—and the liberties of the people of the Sister Countries would be insecure and unsubstantial; they would then depend on the capricious or evanescent will of the ruling prince—if he acts the part of a despot they are slaves—if he prove pacific and humane, they may thank his toleration for allowing them the permission

of wearing their heads—had the Parliament the right of self-annihilation, no doubt but that discovery would have been made in the period of those arbitrary princes, whose reigns cast a stigma on English history. No doubt but Henry VIII. who was confessedly the most despotic and absolute prince in Europe, whose proclamations had the force of laws, would have availed himself of this most monstrous and terrific prerogative.—No doubt but that the oppressive sovereigns—Elizabeth—James I.—Charles I. who severally imprisoned members of the English House of Commons, and all of whom (except Elizabeth) raised money without the consent of Parliament, would have exerted and enforced *this dreadful power to abrogate the parliament*. Nor would they have long delayed, the extinction of that body, that even kept these tyrants, in awe, and within some bounds, and without which (I speak of a resident constitutional parliament) No people can be free, without it: no people can have a security for life, property, liberty and law; here in corroboration of this argument, and further, to shew that the Commons of England have been intimidated before now,—I will illustrate it by an instance from the history of England, “*bo man* (said Henry VIII. to Edward Montague, a Mem-

a Member of the House of Commons) *will they not suffer my bill to pass?* then laying his hand on Montagues head, “*get my bill passed by to morrow, or else to morrow this head of yours shall be off.*” There was something so *convincing* and *impressive* in this that the bill for supplies past the next day. Had this despot said “*by to-morrow get a bill passed to annihilate the parliament or before to-morrow night you shall all swing!*” we very possibly might have no Constitution at this day to pride ourselves on. No rights or liberties in the power of *any Parliament* to destroy (for there would be no parliament,) or by one fatal Act for ever to consign irrevocable and irremediable! a great and generous people and their posterity to ignominy! hence it necessarily results, that was there no other reason, but that of the dreadful and dangerous precedent* of a Parliament being endowed

D 2

with

* Here let it not be said that Scotland forms a precedent; her Parliament, (if Parliament it can be called and which was corrupted by the treasurer of Queen Anne)—was totally and radically, differently constituted from the Parliaments of England and Ireland, “the king could put a negative on Parliament before debate,”—It sat in one room for assembly. See Robertson’s history of Scotland, page 44, 45, and 46.

and

with the enormous right of self-immolation; this consideration alone, were there not innumerable and irrefragable arguments besides against a Union—*this*, I say, *alone* should deter the Parliament of Great Britain functioning—how much more then the Parliament of Ireland enforcing an Union? But should the reverse unfortunately take place, in vain was the genius of an Alfred exerted in raising a Constitution from the ruins of German, and Saxon Institutions; in vain were the laws of the Confessor restored, and idle the proud declaration of the Merton Parliament. How easily then were this *fulmen* of annihilating Parliament admitted—the destruction of the rights and liberties of a people accomplished, for it is Parliament *alone*, that has so long preserved the English, and Irish from slavery.

But to proceed, there is an axiom or principle in the Constitution that is mandatory, and undeniable; it is this, *that no antecedent Act of Parliament, can bind the succeeding Parliament*, it follows from hence, as a necessary impli-

and it must be farther remarked here—that the internal and external situations of Scotland were totally distinct and inapplicable to this Country, viz. the connexion of Scotland with the crown of France—her separate act of peace and of war, &c.

implication, that the freedom or privileges of Parliament, are the inherent, inalienable hereditary, right of the people, that no vote, no act, nothing even with the concurrence of the three estates can invalidate, much less annihilate,* that such an Act so attempting it *would not be law*, nor would the people be bound by it. So speaks the testimony of ages, such is the Constitution and such the concurrent authorities of *Magna Charta* and the laws of the land: if then the Parliament, cannot bind the succeeding Parliament, *a fortiori*, they have not the right to vote away, nor can they destroy the immortality of Parliament.

The consideration of Union, and especially of Parliament involves the state of representation of the English House of Commons.—England does not, cannot say, “come Ireland and participate the superior blessings of our Reformed Constitution,” (even if she could,
Ireland

* In corroboration of what I have above stated. I shall quote Sir George Mackenzie, who wrote upon the Scotch Union—“in all societies and governments, where there is
“an association of powers as in our Parliaments, there are
“certain fundamentals, which like the noble parts in the
“body, are absolutely necessary for its preservation.”

Ireland would reply, that home was sweet, and a resident Parliament necessary.) She cannot say, “ behold a united people, one voice, one will, and one arm stretched forth against our enemies, nor do we apprehend, the slow, cowardly, but certain attack on our liberties from internal traitors—the Borough system is no more.”——No—people of Great Britain,——No—people of Ireland,——but it is the minister who says, “ with every energy the present system must be carried on, through every difficulty,—come people of Ireland, you are not sufficiently taxed as your wealth will admit of—come, or I will force your assistance to the empire, behold the Welsh have united to England—Scotland has been forced to do the same, why then you *Hottentot* Nation should you be so prone to BARBARITY,* so
averse

* See Mr. Pitt’s Speech on the Union—It is not undiverting in Dublin to read those *little pleasantries* of his, the more especially so, as such aspersions on the Irish Nation, must prove *effectual* in making Union Converts. Also, see a pamphlet, in favour of Union, which it professes to be; entitled, “ Considerations on Public Affairs, 1799, Ireland” in order to induce us to Unite, it calls us “ Colony,”—“ Plantation,”—it “ *dont know what the word Ireland means,*”——“ the perjurable fealty of Ireland,”——“ the barbarous hordes of Ireland.” Who could resist an Union with *so liberal, and so enlightened* a partizan? Who in the
subsequent

averse to *civilization*, as not to throw your constitution into the common mass, thus *consolidating one great empire, unrivalled in honor and glory, the deliverer of mankind!!! the safety of nations!! thus adding wealth, peace, security, stability and permanence to the British Empire.*"—

Such are the disgusting pomposities, in which Mr. Pitt speaks of the Union—one's risibility is tempted to laugh at it from its similarity to the exordium of a Mountebank—but that its falsity and insincerity calls forth our contempt. But why are you still to be persecuted with Union? (that forerunner of disunion and destruction) because the minister of England has proposed it to his complacent Parliament, that knows not but to acquiesce to his will, and in every instance adopts whatever the minister assumes right, or wrong with the same facility, whether it be the *forcing* a government on Holland, or a Union on Ireland, his reasons are cogent,—O hasten! then *Patriot* Hibernians to *his virtuous* Parliament, entering the sacred threshold of Westminster, delay not to worship the idol Union, he has set up, for if you have not *confidence* enough in the *worth* of your *own* Parliament

subsequent pages that follow, betrays his ignorance of Irish aye, and of English history too—although the Address of the Pamphlet is "*London.*"

Parliament and *your love* for your country, it were dangerous to undergo the fiery ordeal, quick! quick! then hasten to ministerial idolatry.

—But look to your resident, national Parliament, that you are now haughtily summoned to surrender; reflect a while and answer me, will you people of Ireland, surrender it under whose paternal care the Country has rapidly improved?—That Parliament, that since it became *the Parliament of Ireland*, (on the repeal of Poyning's law) has progressively, yet rapidly drawn new features on the Country, though what was yesterday an unwholesome bog, or a dreary and lonely waste, to day the sail of commerce gladly glides along—witness in your Metropolis within how short a term from the prorogation of the last Session, the hovels, that have been levelled, and the splendid piles that have been raised. It is to your Parliament you are indebted, do you think an English Parliament would do the same? No I will not, I could not impose so on your credulity. What does a Londoner know or care for your Country—seated behind his counter, he despises all the world beside—talk to him of your Linen Trade, the Staple of the Country—“ he would prefer the Scotch linens, were they superior to yours—talk to him of your internal

nal

nal navigation—of the Drogheada, and Newry Canal, this collateral branch, or that extension to the Scotch channel. It is complete Arabic—he knows more of Buonaparte's expedition, or the Canal of Suez, than he does, or cares for you or your island. Talk of the proposed wet docks at Wapping, of the exports or imports of London, or the price of Stocks, there he will comprehend you: But he can see no reason in the world, why his Parliament should grant away sums for another Country, while his own stands in need of them."—Although there is great illiberality in this yet there is a great deal of truth, and perhaps what the generality of people will call sound sense—and believe me it is, and ever will be the isolated language of trade—and yet these are the people to whom you are invited,—no, with whom you are forced to unite, and to make a surrender of your Parliament, that you may become the petitioners of theirs—to then ask as a boon what you now can enforce as a right. Strange infatuation, unaccountable love of slavery! But to return to the question of Union, as affecting the people of Great Britain—how would the people of England relish their Sovereign's creating *instanter*, one hundred Burgeffes to serve in
E
their

their Parliament, would they not justly consider it as an undue exertion of prerogative, and would it not naturally arouse that “ jealousy “ of royal power, which is the very basis of “ the English Constitution, and the principle, “ to which the nation is beholden for all that “ liberty which they enjoy above the subjects “ of other Monarchies.” If their dislike to this exertion of power, be great, (although granted to their Countrymen,) how much greater then ought their objection to be, one is led to suppose to the admission of one hundred strangers? if so, they may account for our feelings, at the supposition, however remote, of having our constitution dissolved, and being mocked with a small minority in a foreign legislature! It must appear evident to whoever reflects on the subject, that a Union adding one hundred members to the British Legislature, will have completely *quoad* England, the same effect, as if one hundred burgeses were created by Royal Charter, and indeed will operate on Ireland too, as effectually as if they were the representatives of boroughs.— One great probability, I had said certainty, however seems to arise, that is their devotion to the Minister, for if ever they were inclined to serve their country, their efforts will prove
ineffectual

ineffectual, and so concluding, will make the *best bargain* they can. But it may be said in reply, that although antiently the King could create boroughs, yet that prerogative has been long disused,—I answer, that nevertheless the privilege still remains, but that in such case, it would rest with the commons of England, whether they would receive the burgeses so created or not, in the same manner the commons of England may reject the Union,—but I contend that in both cases, the effect produced on the British Constitution would be the same, namely, the “increase of that power, that has increased, is increased,” and that certainly ought not to be enlarged,—equally fatal too the Union would prove to both countries, they would too late repent the deed when reflection would have succeeded calamity; the government thus metamorphosed into an absolute monarchy,—Britain! then in the bitterness of thy sorrow, thou mightest condole with Irishmen.

*Adoreront Caesar avec moins de douleur,
Puisqu'il sera ton MAITRE aussi bien que le leur!*

But I shall be told the people of England approve of the measure of Union, and the great
E 2
opposition

opposition to the measure, has originated and been confined to Ireland. I answer, that it is by no means certain, that the people of England approve of the measure, although their Parliament do—but I know the contrary to be the fact—that they, I speak of the English Nation, behold with indignation, the foul means that have been resorted to, and that with the repugnant spirit of Freemen, they disapprove of the force and bribery that have been called in to bring about the Union—for they well know, that the annihilation of English liberty, must necessarily succeed the destruction of it in Ireland, and they must be convinced, that the Union will prove the *curfew* of freedom. And in time, people of Ireland, be persuaded before it be too late, that what the Wooden Horse of the Grecians was to Troy, an Union will prove to Ireland—her destruction! But again it may be urged, “there will not be so many as one hundred, but perhaps sixty at the most; out of these, thirty-two would probably be returned for the counties, (one for each) one for Dublin, one for Cork, one for Waterford, one for Derry—that would give thirty-five—so that the remaining twenty-four would be for the boroughs, as might be agreed”—— It is replied, that the borough system in England

land is too considerable to require any addition—and it is here again urged, that the intire of the Irish deputies would operate on the constitution in a like degree as if created burgeses by Royal Charter; then let it be seen how the borough system will stand—England at this moment has in her Parliament, for different boroughs, three hundred and nineteen burgeses—the sixteen Barons of the Cinque Ports, (who are burgeses to every intent) nine for Wales, fifteen for Scotland, and sixty for Ireland, would make the round sum of *four hundred and nineteen* burgeses, and let it be remembered that at this present moment, the aggregate amount of representatives, for the cities, counties, towns, and boroughs of Great Britain inclusive, is five hundred and fifty-eight.—Thus would the borough interest preponderate in the ratio of three to two, a truly formidable majority, and a most dangerous engine in the hands of any minister, but the more to be apprehended, when wielded by one who is a Strafford in principle, a Wolfely in execution, and a Pitt in success, active, indefatigable, bearing down before him like a torrent, all opposition to the alarming and rapid approaches towards arbitrary power.

Having

Having discussed the competency of Parliament, which necessarily involved a slight sketch or outline of the representation in England, I now recur to the people. It has been urged, “ although Parliament be incompetent, yet the people are fully competent to agree to it, and to instruct their representatives accordingly.” If so, (which is not admitted) it is replied, why not collect the general sense of the people? Let the sheriffs of the different counties assemble their bailiwicks, and fairly and candidly argue the point, and then instruct their representatives accordingly. No rebellion, no invasion, rage now to bar the general inquiry into the operative expediency, or advantages that are asserted will result from the Union.—*But no; they dare not meet the population of Ireland on the discussion, I pledge myself they dare not: they shrink back, conscious of the abhorrence and loathing of the nation; while at the same time they beg, threaten, influence, and * bribe for Union addresses. But it may be said to me, “ See the addresses that have been presented, look at the artillery of signatures that arrest the eye in the public prints, are not these de-*

* This certainly shews that popular opinion is not *despised*, at least by the Union party, they will wade through every filth like true courtiers to accomplish it—“ neck or nothing.”

monstrative

monstrative declarations for Union?"—No ; they carry no weight, no conviction—it will be proved. “ But there have been addresses for Union,” it will be objected to me—I do not contradict it—I grant there have—but people of Ireland, who are they that have affixed their signatures to those addresses, do you know them? Men, many of whom have been active in the late rebellion, many of them in duress, and under the immediate terror of the suspended rope, that have been MERCIFULLY—MOST MERCIFULLY! snatched from execution to sign or address for Union ; a momentary smile may arise from such contrarieties, but it is repressed by indignation and manly honesty that abhor such duplicity, and checks such levity. But I shall here be cavalierly answered to look at the high founding names that occupy the van, in the new raised recruits against Ireland ;—do you know them Irishmen? alas! in some respects you know them too well. You know them from their signatures to be ABSENTEES—you know that they bask in the sunshine of a court in another country ;—if you have any knowledge of them it is through the medium of an agent or receiver of their rents ;—men, who although they have considerable estates in this country,

country, have all their lives lived in another kingdom, yet that if they have come to Ireland it is for the first time, and that perhaps in a military capacity. This for the purpose of forcing or cajoling their tenants to sign and acquiesce in the Union addresses, like the vassals of a feudal lord, these the sole cause of their emigration to *uncivilized* Ireland; and yet those very worthy and right renowned absentees, now unblushingly come forward and petition for the surrender of your constitution, (under which they are not resident)—that with the ruins of it, and the plunder of your then degraded province, they may found the retreat to a more genial soil, exultingly crouch and tell the minister, It was they that did the deed!

Had any individual two years ago, or when the rebellion raged, presumed to hint at Union, I know the reception he would have met, and the surmise would have been set down by the government *nomenclators*, as little short of treason; and yet they, even they, now obstinately persist in that measure so obnoxious to the people. Is it not extraordinary, and to be wondered at, that in a revolutionary age, the proposition and project of
 revo-

revolution should originate with them! Have they caught the Gallic infection, to pull down the Irish constitution, not to rebuild; to destroy, not to reform; annihilation the sole end and the means? But to return to the subject of Union addresses, in illustration of which I shall relate the following circumstance that took place in the city of Limerick, the gentry there, should they throw their eye over this pamphlet, will promptly recollect it—a shop-keeper who was violently averse to a Union with Great Britain, whose name is Sullivan, was called on by the Anti-unionists of that city to sign a declaration against it, to which he readily acquiesced, and “declared his heart and soul were in the address, that he was solely actuated by principle, and knew too well the ruinous and calamitous circumstances it would bring on the country not to oppose it”—however, the day following some Unionists of consideration waited on him to ask him for his “sweet voice,” his signature to this address for a Union—he hemmed—stammered—they were persons of consequence, one personage in particular, a very excellent customer—he hemmed again—took up the pen and wrote his name—well, on the following day he was reproached for signing both addresses as a Judas, an apostate for his direliction from the

cause of his country—do not (said he) condemn me too rashly, or unheard; I am and ever shall be an opposer of a Union—it will be the ruin, as it will prove the degradation of my country.—“Why then (said they) were you such a blockhead as to sign for it?” Pooh—says he, don’t you know very well they are all good customers to me, and as I am a poor man! why I would not disoblidge either side,” *ex uno disce omnes*. From this specimen (for the truth of which I call upon the gentlemen of Limerick to contradict me if I am wrong) one may form a tolerable guess how the other addresses and eleemosynary declarations have been granted to the gallant conqueror of India.—While on this topic of enforcing the people to address for a Union, and return thanks, &c. I will relate one anecdote more (which I met within, I believe, an English newspaper) it is so analogous to the point—“A child, who by the force of discipline had been made to belie her sentiments, and to return *thanks* for her *mortifications*, had a medicine administered to her; and after every bitter sup, she made a curtesy, and returned thanks; unfortunately, however, one luckless night there was a mistake in the medicine, and the child, after suffering great misery, *died* next morning, to the inconsolable

ble grief of her parents, whose sorrow was heightened at the recollection of the *thanks* which had been *extorted* for the draught of death!" Let Ireland apply the moral, and treasure it up in her recollection.

That there should be found in Ireland, some prompt to step forth in the cause of Union (or any other project) when we recollect "that falsehood and fraud spring up in every soil," and reflect on the diversity and contrariety of human opinion, and the powerful and influential success of corruption, superadded to these, our surprize will cease—nay, we are astonished that the seduction has been so confined and so partial, and we feel proud of being Irishmen! It is an ungrateful but necessary task to call to mind, the various other artifices to hunt down and brow-beat popular opinion, which is strong and indignant against the fatal project.—Bribery—the preventing those who were confessedly against the Union, and who were under the necessity of attending their military duty at quarters, from accepting an escheatorship to enable them to vacate their seats in favour of those who would have pursued a similar course—intimidation—by cashiering the old and faithful servants of the crown, because they

could

could not brook to sell their country—and namely, branding every man in the purlieus of the Castle, and in their journals, as a rebel, jacobin, fire-brand, incendiary, that dared to stand by his country and oppose Union.

Such are the pitiful arts, the advocates of Union, avail themselves of, while at the same time, the consciousness of a bad cause, makes them bitterly complain of opposition—they are outrageously impatient of being contradicted in their favourite speculations, it is all clamour on the part of those that oppose their tactics, boisterous and premature; none oppose a Union who are not rebels, jacobins and a long &c.—thus on their part prematurely and inconsistently endeavouring to silence all public discussion. But why this imperious hastiness on their part—if it is a good measure, propose it to the country at large, if advantageous it will soon be pointed out, the Irish are not slow to comprehend,—but should it prove to be a bad measure, why urge it at all? but the Unionists reply, “it will tend to the peace and be advantageous to the country!” O yes, it has already had *that pacific* effect, by raising up two parties in the state, those that are for it, and those that are against it,

it, and as to advantages they are *incalculable*—for in short a Union is endowed with the gift of Pactolus, every thing that it will touch will be turned into gold, warehouses will involuntary start up, and merchantmen spontaneously ride at anchor in our harbours, floating manufactories will arrive from BIRMINGHAM! by every tide, and all through the Minister who, wonderful to relate, like another Gulliver, is to drag the commerce, shipping *and all* of even our enemies to our shores! and still more astonishing, this omnipresent, all potent Union, (to which by the bye if we don't acquiesce to, the minister threatens to take away our commerce,) is endued with an attractive and repulsive power, is one time to charm the commerce of the Indies to Cork and Waterford, and nearly at the same moment to London, and all as it were, by the power of magic, and the minister!

*Irritat Mulcet, falsis terroribus implet
Ut Magus ; et modo me Thebis, modo Ponit Athenis.*

Such are the preposterous, ridiculous lures held out to entrap a nation with—such the Arabian tales, a great statesman, the words coldly dropping from his lips, “ Chaste as the
ificle

ifice that depends from Diana's fane," condescends to divert the Irish people with—such little subtleties are unworthy the minister of a great people—let him be convinced, strong and energetic as language can convey it, that the acquiescence of a people so obtained, is not popular consent, but a delusive and insecure permission, and as it is founded in insecurity, must terminate in dissolution;—for the corroboration of this, look to the nations that have been forced or oppressed into Union; cast your eye on the sacred volume—behold how short and how transitory the domination of terror and insolent oppression? Look to the Ægyptians and Israelites—so long as the former allowed the latter their religion, liberty, and laws the Union was by them cemented.—But when the tyrant Pharoah, from a protector, was changed into an oppressor—his power was no more, and soon were the chains of the enslaved broken over the heads of their oppressors by the act of the Most High—the Israelites restored to freedom by the stretched out arm of the Almighty were led forth; “from the land of Ægypt and out of the house of bondage.” Recur, I entreat you, to the historic page, and behold nations for ever shaking off those shackles which were forged to enslave them.

—Look

—Look to the revolt of the United Provinces from Spain, caused by the bigotry of the Spanish monarch, and the tyranny carried into execution by the Duke of Alva, † they shook off the Spanish yoke, and asserted their ancient liberties and laws. ‡——Look to the Swedes breaking the Union of Calmar, when they shook off the haughty yoke of Denmark, and when their liberties were restored by the illustrious Gustava Vassa, justly called “the deliverer of his country.” Look further back into history, look to the dissolution of the unions of Arragon with Castile and Spain, of Pisa with Florence. Recal to mind in 1308 when Duke Albert oppressed the then inconsiderable Canton of Switz, it revolted, and was the first of the Cantons that asserted its liberty, and that afterwards gave the name of Switzerland to the country.—Look to a later period,

† Robertson's Charles V. vol. 3. 470.

‡ The cruel Duke of Alva was repulsed at Alkmaer—that very place that witnessed the weak capitulation and defeat of ministerial visionary speculations.—I do not despair, that very soon they will be again defeated by the Commons of Ireland—and peace restored to this country by the final abandonment of Union, which defeat must give pleasure to every friend of Ireland.

to the revolt of the people of Tranfylvania §, Moldavia, and Wallachia from the Turks.— Now penetrate into claffic hiftory. Go fo far back as the Grecian and Roman republics, look to the diffolution of union between the Romans and Latins, and the feparation of Sparta Athens, and Lacedemon from their confederates.— Now come lower down to our own times, behold the ftate of Venice rifing at the bottom of the Adriatic Gulf, raifing itfelf to greatness from the humble origin of fea-weed and a few fifhermens' cots—and behold her indignantly fhaking off the yoke of Padua, when that ftate attempted to reftrikt her in her commerce.— Witnefs too the Corficans under the brave Paoli, fhaking off “ the infupportable yoke of Genoefe tyranny and flavery.”— Look to Naples— look to Ægypt—the recent inftance of America is fresh in the remembrance of all, I fhall not dwell on it—are not thefe inftances from antient and modern hiftory, Britons fufficient to teach you the impolicy and infecurity of Union ! If not, I will bring it more home.— Look, I entreat you, to the period when your Ifland was under the yoke of Rome— let it not be called freedom, for forced by the love of conqueft and the defire

§ The firft of thefe countries is at prefent under the Crown of Hungary, and the latter principalities now acknowledge the fupremacy of the Ottoman Porte.

of

of wealth,* the Romans were induced to invade your country under the emperors Claudius Nero and Domitian, but they were not long in possession, until your brave ancestors indignantly repelled Roman slavery, and finally shook it off under Honorius the emperor of the West.† Are not these instances sufficient?—surely they hold forth a warning to ministers and a prudential maxim to the rulers of the world? It was by force Roman usurpation was upheld, when that was withdrawn the perishable fabric crumbled into dust, not leaving “a wreck behind,” and such will ever prove the ultimate fate of oppression.

Of all the arguments that have been adopted by the supporters of Union, I shall

* Gibbon, the celebrated historian, in his *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, mentions that exclusive of the contiguity of Britain to Gaul, the Romans were attracted and induced through avarice, at the pleasing though doubtful intelligence of the Pearl Fishery, to invade Britain, which he corroborates by quotations from Suetonius and Tacitus.—The minister too has long thrown an ardent and wishful eye at this country, in order to gratify his avarice by obtaining the invaluable pearl “Richer than all his tribe,” and the brightest too in the Irish diadem, “*the right and power of the people taxing themselves in a resident Parliament.*”

† The independence of Britain, &c. was soon confirmed by Honorius himself.—Gibbon, vol. v. p. 337.

only consider a few, the two most specious and prominent, are the pretences, that, “ Union will *in future*, restore harmony to the country, put down rebellion and close up the inlet to the enemies of the Empire.”—the second, “ that the Legislature of the two countries may happen to differ on some great question, as they did on the different powers granted by the different Legislatures on the Regency question.”—To the first I reply, that however plausible it may appear at first view, it is only problematical, not certain—we know it had not that effect on Wales, which was United to the English in the 11th of Edward the First—so far from giving harmony to the Welsh, or preventing rebellion, they rose in arms under their leader Griffin Loitis, in the reign of Edward the Second, and again in the reign of Henry the Fourth, under Owen Glendower,—and with respect to the Scotch, we know it did not restore harmony, or prevent rebellion—that country was United to England in the Fifth of Anne, and yet in A. D. 1715, they rebelled, and again in 1745.—And we also know that the Usurper Cromwell (from whom Mr. Pitt seems to have borrowed his favourite theme Union!) United the three Kingdoms in his mongrel Parliament.—But it was short lived, written in characters of Irish blood;

blood; the effects of it in this country, are still apparent to this day in the desolation of castles, palaces, and towns, the monuments of oppression!—Mr. Pitt then and past experience are at variance—much as has been said of the late rebellion, much of the late invasion, the Union as endangering the connection is more to be apprehended—with respect to Union closing up the inlet to the enemies of the Empire, common sense revolts at the position—hear what a great and able statesman (Sir Francis Bacon) has said on the subject, he confessed, “ that by the annexation “ of Scotland to England, Scotland was shut “ up, *and by that means Ireland*, by the convenient situation of the West of Scotland “ towards the North of Ireland, where the “ Sore was.”* I must here observe, that it strikes me, an Union would unavoidably create jealousy between the countries—the suspicion of the treachery of the Representatives on the part of the electors (and justly too)—the discord and distrust between those who profess to vote for the Union, and those who are against

* Speech of Sir Francis Bacon in the Commons of England, 1641.

it. Would this suspicion cherish confidence, or this discord call forth harmony?

*Blessed Revolution that creates
Divided hearts, United States!
Whoever yet an UNION saw,
Of Kingdoms without Faith or Law?**

I come now to consider the second specious argument “that the countries through their separate legislatures might happen to differ on some great question as they did on the different powers conferred on the regent,”—it is replied that is very unlikely and very improbable, for on that great question “the regency,” even then Ireland shewed an unbounded confidence in England, and manifested her cordiality towards her, by throwing unrestricted, unlimited power into the hands, of the common regent of both countries, and yet Ireland is now insultingly told that from this circumstance, she may happen to differ, (which if we are to judge from past experience, proves the contrary,) in future, from England—we are averse exclaim the population of Ireland, to a Legislative Union, —“What you contemptible *Colony*” (exclaims

* Verses of Dean Swift on the Scotch Union.

the minister, retreating behind his armed legion,) “ you *barbarous, uncivilized* state dare
 “ you refuse?—it is a measure I desire, no
 “ party cabal, no temporary clamour, no loss
 “ of popularity, nothing short of the last ex-
 “ tremity shall prevent me to accomplish it,
 “ and all the remainder of my life shall be de-
 “ voted to effect it.”—like Drawcansir in the
 Rehearsal—“ and all this I can do, because I
 “ dare!”

Sic jubeo, sic volo stet pro ratione voluntas

But to return, so long since as the period, when the present illustrious family were invited to the throne of England, Ireland recognized them by a solemn act distinct from England, why was not this objection, of the countries differing in opinion, then urged as a cause for Union,—but no, William III. was a Patriot, and would not overturn, what he had sworn to defend.—This proves in corroboration of the Regency business, that there is no danger to be apprehended from this excuse, “ difference of opinion,” and that it is but a fraudulent pretence.*—But now to prove the
 falsity

* Mr. Pitt, speaking of the Irish Regency, says, “ such
 “ an act would have been politically and practically the cause
 “ of

falsity of the position, I will admit for argument, “the countries may differ in some Great Question,”—where is the mighty danger to be apprehended—to allow the Unionists the utmost latitude, suppose the Irish Parliament (which they never have done) pass some vote, contradictory to the interests of Great Britain, or the connexion between the countries—this cannot be passed into law, without the Royal Assent, or the crown may exert the royal prerogative of proroguing or dissolving the Parliament so acting.—Thus I trust the absurdity of the objection is pointed out. But to consider this question of ‘separation ensuing from the countries differing in opinion’ in a more enlarged point of view.—It is for the present assumed that the Union has

“of discord and separation, and must have impaired the security of the Empire,”—and yet the Right Honourable Gentleman, with all his subtlety, answers himself—speaking a little further on in the same flowing speech, of the commercial advantages Ireland at present enjoys, he says, “their existence *for a moment* is almost in every branch, dependant upon the generous discretion of the Legislature of Great Britain,”—for an instant now presuming that separation was to be apprehended, would not *this dependance on that generous discretion!* added to self-interest, prove an antidote and prevent the tremendous effect of those state bugbears, “Regency and Separation?”

irrevocably

irrevocably passed! Suppose then some future Monarch to appoint his son viceroy or king of Ireland, as was the case of the second Henry who constituted his son John, king of Ireland: if the person so appointed should aim at the deposition of the ruling monarch of England, where is there any longer an Irish Parliament to check such an attempt, or as they have done before now, (although a foreign force backed by James the second was in this country,) to preserve the connexion between the countries; would this secure the unity of the empire, and prevent separation? 'O yes!' exclaim the supporters of Union, it would prevent the two countries differing on the question of Regency'!!!! So long then as Ireland is blessed with a separate and resident Legislature, we may confidently pronounce, this cannot be apprehended, and it is through the medium of your Parliament alone, that good faith and an amicable understanding can be communicated to, and subsist between the countries.

Before Poyning's act was passed into law, the Parliament of Ireland had the great and unbounded power, *without the king's being consulted, (rege inconsulto,)* to enact laws, &c. if during that memorable and eventful period,

when

when Richard duke of York, was lieutenant of Ireland, armed with royal power, &c. (and who had a title to the crown of England,) at the time that the York and Lancastrian factors nearly rent England in twain—and yet the Irish were not separated from England, although their Parliament was armed with such unlimited power, and the third estate of it had such a dangerous title to the throne of England! if I say the Parliament armed with such powers, when it was *unnecessary to obtain the king's consent to any act*, and yet they did not separate from England, how is it possible, when the present Irish Parliament has no such power, and no law can be enacted *without the sanction of the common sovereign of the two countries*; how is it possible I repeat for the Parliaments of the two countries to differ, or how can their unity be endangered?—there are two other arguments that have much been insisted on, and ignorantly held forth by the partizans of Union, namely, “ that the two Legislatures of Great Britain and Ireland may happen to differ on the point of making peace or declaring war, and further, that the two kingdoms may be committed through their Parliaments differing as to commercial treaties, leagues, or alliances with foreign states, princes,

ces,

ces, &c.”—But how ignorant are they of the laws and constitution who assume so frivolous and such weak pretences—that great luminary of the law and of the constitution, Judge Blackstone, expressly declares, that “the king has the sole prerogative of making war or peace.”—It is true the British House of Commons has the power of impeaching the minister “for improper or inglorious conduct in beginning, conducting, or concluding a national war,”—but beyond this, the British has no more power, than the Irish House of Commons, that power of making peace or war, being expressly “the sole prerogative” of the sovereign,—and with respect to making leagues, treaties, &c. with foreign powers, *the Parliament of Great Britain has no more power than the Parliament of Ireland*, for the same learned judge most expressly and unequivocally recognizes, “the king’s prerogative to make treaties, leagues and alliances with foreign states and princes; and it is by the law of Nations, *essential* to the goodness of a league, *that it be made by the sovereign power*, AND THEN IT IS BINDING UPON THE WHOLE COMMUNITY; and in England, the sovereign power, *quoad hoc*, is vested in the person of the king;” how then is it possible for the Parliaments

ments of either country to differ on that subject, over which neither have a power (save ministerial impeachment in the Parliament of Great Britain,) much less a controul; it would be equally as rational an argument for Union, to assert, that the British and Irish Parliaments may differ, because the countries are islands in *juxta* position, and not one continent! such are the petty quibbles, through deficiency of solid argument, the Union partisans are driven to; and such the despicable sophisms held forth to cajole and betray the Irish people. While on the subject of those pitiful subterfuges that are resorted to, in order to cover the enormity of this forced Union, there are a few more I shall consider; I wish at the same time to avoid those arguments that have been urged by others, and to endeavour to be as brief, as the importance of the discussion and explicitness will admit of.

Some have vociferated, as if they held forth the Gorgons head while they expressed it, "That two legislatures under one monarchy were as absurd as having two heads."—I will not question that those who start the objection have heads, but I will lament with the fox in the fable, that it is "*pity* they want brains!"

How

How ignorant too must they be of that constitution they are so studious to overturn, else they would know that it is composed of three estates, (or to speak in the farrago of their jargon, consists of three heads,) so those Union philosophers of the eighteenth century, who stand forth the champions of unity of power and consolidation of empire, and enforce the necessity of the overthrow of the Irish constitution of 1782; would equally argue for the demolition of the constitution of England: for their two Houses of Lords and Commons, may as well differ on a regency question, as ours did from theirs; and if from this difference of opinion in regency, &c. &c. a necessity of unity and consolidation arises, it proves this, that you should at once destroy the legislatures of both kingdoms, erect a despotism *one and indivisible*, and let the will of the prince be your rule of action, "*habet legis vigorem!*" See then the absurdity a doctrine so absurd leads to. But it may be replied, "all this granted, still things cannot go on as they have done latterly, martial law cannot always continue, and without the *untried* project, Union, the connexion between the countries is imperfect!" No doubt things cannot go on for ever as they have done, (it is

replied) putting Ireland, and consequently Union out of the discussion.—But now, putting Ireland in question, where at present exists the necessity of martial law, but to silence the country and enforce Union? But that “the connexion between the countries is imperfect,” has already been proved untrue. But I ask (so far from forming *a perfect* Union by the incorporation of the British and Irish legislatures) if with the present free and friendly connexion of the people, the identity of the crown of both nations, and the perpetual annexation of this kingdom to Britain, yet that an invasion was not deterred or prevented thereby—would not (allow me to put the question) an incorporating Union, disgusting to, and abhorred by the people of Ireland, yet still enforced by bribery, and carried by fraud and violence, prove but an additional stimulus to invasion, and hold out the flag of invitation to some modern “deliverer of Europe?” if this is admitted, and it cannot be denied; this *all perfect* Union, instead of closing up “the fore” would open a wide inlet to the enemies of these kingdoms.—But it may be further urged against me, “Ireland, in case of Union, will become part of Britain, and no country was ever known to oppress itself.”—My answer is this, that physically

fically speaking Ireland, never was, nor ever
 can be part of Great Britain, (unless an earth-
 quake or some convulsion of nature throw up
 an isthmus between the countries) but still we
 are firmly annexed already, and form a very
 important part of the British empire, and that
 no reason can exist for forcing the Union on
 us now, that would not necessarily afterwards
 continue to render that oppression permanent!
 But to exemplify the falsity of the position
 "that a country never oppressed a part of it-
 self," Cork is a present instance, a recent proof
 of the instability and the weakness of the po-
 sition; although cheered by the *blessed consol-
 ation*, that a Union would ruin Dublin, yet as
 if it was to follow hence as a necessary conse-
 quence, that Cork *from this calamity* was to be
 benefited! it weakly and foolishly addressed
 for Union, although that mercantile city knew
 a Union to be ruinous to the kingdom at large!
 and destructive to Dublin; yet because it was
 told "it would be advantageous to it"—adopt-
 ed it, and such will ever be the narrow, illi-
 beral policy of self and sordid interest.—What
 then can you expect from England in case of
 Union—can you look for her preferment of
 your interests, should merchandize or profit
 come in collision?—Can you expect more—
 could

could you expect less, but that like Cork, “the bone of your bone, and flesh of your flesh,” that she should prefer herself. So much for the *truth* of that position, “that a country never oppressed itself.”—But the Union deputies “strongly armed” in patriotic virtue, will issue forth to the conflict—I doubt not the valour of Irishmen; but in this case I should not only suspect their strength but their virtue; From the experience of the influence of government in the last session (I am fully justified in this observation) obtaining so many to vote for a Union, which they were instructed was the wish of the minister, but the ruin of the country; you may hence augur, and it is but natural to infer, how much greater this influence would be over *a then* minority in the proportion of one to five majority, subsequent to a Union in a *House of Commons of the empire*, not only by previous electioneering and *ministerial conviction*, but by how much inferior in number the Irish deputies, by so much the greater ministerial success.—Why then should we be unjustly deprived of our constitution—the people of England well know the advantage of their constitution, they are well aware of the value of the checks on arbitrary power (as they are called by Judge Blackstone and D’Lolme)
—why

—why then deprive us of our only security by our representatives in Parliament?—they cannot answer—and yet they know and feel that it is the same minister who has attempted by force and bloodshed to press a government on Batavia; that now by arms attempts to force Ireland to Union! Why use the unworthy arts of artifice and fraud to Ireland, why shall that minister say to this country, your adjustment is final, and Proteus like in 1799, assert it was not.—Surely this is not the method to instill conviction to this ministerial *desideratum*—for it is saying to that people, some of whom are now bribed, and others influenced, and forced to unite to England “there is one law for you, and another for England, what I have said in approbation of the past and final adjustment in 1782, I have recanted in 1799. Martial law shall compel Ireland to call for Union as terms of capitulation and mercy!!! there shall be one system of government for Ireland and another for us, until I frighten and force that kingdom to a Union!!”

It has been well remarked by writers on legislation, that when a society is in a primitive state of nature or of simplicity, their laws are few and simple, but when a people emerge from

from such a situation, and approach to improvement and civilization, their laws necessarily increase in progressive proportion—than this nothing can be more obvious, as agriculture, navigation, commerce, inventions, arts, sciences, luxury, &c. increase, a necessity will arise of new regulations and new laws—then let me ask, would it not be the extreme, the very *acme* of folly for Ireland, an infant state, progressively improving, rapidly, as the most zealous advocate for her welfare could wish, to give up the right of making laws, at the period of all others, when the greatest necessity exists for the enacting them? The humblest comprehension can only answer in the negative.—No, never! as time advances, so should the opposition of Irishmen encrease.—Whatever arguments were persuasive in 1782 for re-asserting our constitution and against Union, apply now with fifty fold force. Whatever repugnance you had last year to Union, should be three fold now—and year after year should encrease that disinclination, and leave pure and undiminished, *your support of your separate and resident legislature*. Here let it be examined, the powers, arguments, strength, numbers, and influence of those who are advocates for the Union, and the resources we are possessed of
 who

who support the constitution of 1782, gloriously obtained by a Grattan! we have past experience and present enjoyment on our part, of the indispensable necessity of a resident Parliament. They hold forth a vague theory of improbabilities and idle speculation as to future times. We have the majority and the hearts of the nation, (save only a few seduced, terrified, and bribed.) They have the ill will of an influenced minority, who would equally support any measure however destructive to Ireland. We have force of experience, argument, and of reason—they, specious pretences, illusory jargon, blandishing subterfuges, and the force of terror and of power. We have the prayers of all, the secret hopes, and anxious wishes for our success, even of those who have deserted their country. They have the execration of all—even of those very wretches their prodigality feeds—and whose penitential tears, as they fall on their daily bread, while they call on Heaven for our success—curse the authors of their apostacy and their infamy! Despair not then people of Ireland, our cause is good, it is that of our country—we will succeed! The measure of Union will fail—it will crumble into atoms before a nation determined to support its freedom and a separate legislature.

But I hasten to the consideration of such other arguments as may be objected to me. Perhaps, here may be urged, the example of "all the countries that have united other states to them, that it was the policy of antient Rome, &c. and why should not England then adopt a similar policy?" In answer to the first, I shall observe, I well know many empires added states, colonies, &c. through Union, but that *none of them deprived the subordinate or lesser state so uniting of their constitution or Parliament*, (precedents of which truths I shall hereafter adduce. But that if the greater state has deprived the lesser of her constitution, that state has revolted and shaken off such tyranny, (which has been already proved) and that with respect to antient Rome, although some affect to say, "she sent liberty to the states she had conquered, or united to her," yet that it was not the case; no, it was not an equal distribution to all, of that freedom that she was not in possession of to bestow on one, but a general participation of slavery *the mistress of the globe* dealt out to a conquered world. And here let me ask that nation that so unconcernedly looks on at our meditated subjection, how she would have relished the removal of the seat of government and her Parliament to

to the capital of Normandy, (Caen) when William Duke of that Province was her sovereign?—How would the free born spirit of England have beat, had the treaty of Troyes been carried into effect, which was that France and England would be for ever united under Henry V.? France being the larger country and more populous, how and with what patience would you have borne the idea of the seat of government being removed to Paris, and your Parliament modelled to the old regimen of the French! I know how you would have felt and how you would have acted—*then feel for us*, for be assured, certain as darkness succeeds the light of the day, *that your liberties* are irrevocably gone if a Union is past.

An eloquent historian, speaking of the treaty and articles of Troyes, observes, “It is hard
 “to say whether its consequences, had it taken
 “place, would have proved more pernicious
 “to England or to France, it must have re-
 “duced the former kingdom (England) to the
 “rank of a province, and it would have in-
 “tirely disjointed the succession of the lat-
 “ter.”* In the same manner might I urge to you, how you would approved the removal of

* Hume's England.

your Parliament to Madrid, had Mary I. England, the queen of Philip the Spanish monarch united your country to Spain? I confess in however an alarming a point of view, and however seriously an Union is to be apprehended and rejected; yet at times it strikes me in a ludicrous light, and often calls to mind the burlesque ceremony of the Arch-Duke, (now Doge) of Venice wedding the Adriatic — what a spectacle to behold the *nuptials* of *two sister* countries? The olympic games or gymnastic exercises of Rome in her dotage, would be nothing compared to this *consolidating* fight. — What a scene of pageantry and of triumph! to behold on some propitious halcyon day, “*When every lake is peace, and every grove melody,*” the gala barges of the London aldermen, floating between the streights of Portpatrick and Donaghadee. The noblesse of each island, the London and Dublin corporations to meet, *half seas over*, to witness the portentous nuptials! while the premier of England, his brow with ivy crowned, should preside as high priest at the nuptial consummation of this “happy, happy, happy pair.” Zerxes lashing the sea, Cleopatra sailing down the Cydnus in her decorated galley, or the Adriatic engulfing the bridal ring, would fall short when compared

compared to this raree-flew, this new-fangled amphibious exhibition!

But I may be told it is useless to argue against it—vain to attempt to oppose Union; and I may be directed to look at the unalterable determination, the power, weight, and influence of government; and further to look around on all sides at the military force with unbounded controul.—Yes I do see—but they carry no terror: although at the same time I will freely acknowledge that a standing army is and ever has been justly considered as an object of constitutional jealousy; and experience in all ages and in all countries, unerringly proves, how dangerous, yet insecure, military power is, what a strong yet fallible auxiliary to despotism, an overgrown standing army! The Pretorian bands have executed Roman Emperors, and elevated monarchs from the private ranks of the soldiery; they sold the Roman Empire,* and were the cause of its decline. The military have before now given a sovereign to Imperial Russia,† they dethroned a king of

* The Pretorian Bands sold the Empire to Didius Julianus, A. D. 193.—*Gibbon*.

† Catharine I. who was the wife of a common soldier.

England, they restored the Second Charles, and assisted the deposition of the Second James, —put not then your confidence in force, or vauntingly threaten us with it if we do not acquiesce to Union : force may endure for a time, but rely on it, it never has been, is not, or ever will prove permanent. How specious and frivolous are all these pretences for Union, how thin and transparent that cloak, that can scarcely obscure the proffered degradation? “ *There is no period,** when real and “ enlightened patriots *ought to watch with more* “ *vigilance over the rights of the people, than in* “ *times of danger from foreign enemies, for the* “ *public in general, are then so much engrossed by* “ *the dangers from without that they overlook the* “ *encroachments which are more apt at those times,* “ *than any other to be made on their constitution* “ *from within ; and it is of small importance that* “ *men defend their country from foreign foes, un-* “ *less they retain such a share of internal free-* “ *dom, as renders a country, worth the defend-* “ *ing.*” —How true, and how prophetic, how eagle sighted into futurity? I will presently prove from authorities, ancient and modern, that the various nations that have united other

* Moore's View of Society and Manners, vol. 3. p. 55.

states to them, have invariably permitted them to retain their separate constitutions, why then wrest our constitution from us; the only instances you can point out where countries separated, where when caused by the oppression of the mother country, or the defeat of their people not being naturalized: but these apply not to us, pathetically exclaims, Ireland!

— *Quid me preferre patriæ,
indignum coges?*

Why do you force this unnecessary indignity on me—our Union with England is perfect and complete, who ever is king of England, is *de jure* & *de facto*, king of Ireland.—What more can be desired—do you think that the alienation of the affections of the people, by Union, would more firmly establish it? O weak and mistaken statesmen indeed, were you to suppose it!

I now come to consider, if even Parliament have the power, (which I do not admit, and the contrary of which has been proved,) yet that the fantastic measure of Union is unnecessary; nor has the abrogation or surrender of the constitution of the states united been
adopted

adopted by the state that united them—I am aware the enquiry will prove a barren and dry subject, but it is essential and indispensable.—Alexander the lord of the Grecian Empire, allowed the Jews the exercise of their religious customs, and constitution in Palestine—and in the same manner were that nation permitted to retain their constitution, &c. at Alexandria.—The Carthaginians, even when subdued, were allowed by the Roman Senate, to live free under their constitution and laws, and the free possession of their territory. The seven provinces likewise were allowed the annual assembling of the states,* by the Romans under the Emperors Honorius and Theodosius II. Likewise when the Kingdoms of Navarre and Arragon were united to the crown of Castile, their ancient constitutions were all retained by them—and in the same manner, on the Union with the three northern crowns, Denmark, Sweden and Norway, under John I. it was expressly provided, that they should retain their customs, laws, and constitutions; and yet the minister has the presumption to say, “your Union is not perfect, I demand the Irish constitution, you did not ask my consent for your constitution of 1782, I was not then minister, therefore I demand the surrender of

* Gibbon, vol. v. p. 343.

it,

it, as a preliminary ratification of a project that I am enamoured with."—The next instance I shall present, is the Union of Poland and Lithuania in 1386, under one monarch, when it was stipulated, that one and the same person should be the sovereign of both, with the proviso, that the Lithuanians should still retain their own laws and customs; and that *no appeal should be from the Dutchy to the kingdom; and further, that each should expressly retain its supreme senate.*—When Philip II. king of Spain, demanded the crown of Portugal, through right of succession, amongst the articles concluded on in the ratification, it was expressly stated, that "no Parliament or treaty of state, concerning Portugal, should be holden out of that kingdom;" and further some of the mercantile part was even more favourable to Portugal, than to Spain.—When Normandy was annexed to the crown of France under Lewis X. that Dutchy was allowed to retain all its ancient customs, laws, privileges, &c. in corroboration of the above facts, the treaty of Troyes will perhaps come more home than any of the other authorities cited.—This has been before mentioned in these considerations—but here it is necessary to observe, that still by the Union then agreed
K upon,

upon, it was stipulated, “ that all the rights, “ privileges, dignities, and liberties, and “ that the Parliament of France was never- “ theless to remain, although united to “ England.” But I hasten to dispatch these authorities—When Brittany was united to France, the Bretons still retained their Appellant Jurisdiction and their Parliament; even in the subjugated Roman Empire, they are allowed their separate sovereignty’s and diets.— And also in despotic Spain, several of the various monarchies, and principalities that compose it, are allowed their own cortes or diets; and in the same manner, the Saxons, Bavarians, &c. in Germany. Likewise, look to republican, modern France, from whose example we are told by authority, ministers have borrowed the plan of *consolidation*.—But has France annulled the separate assembly, or Parliament of Batavia? No, that republic has her separate legislature although united to France—the latter country justly conceiving (in this respect) has not thought it a necessary preliminary to deprive the Hollanders of a separate and distinct legislature,—they still retain their distinct republic, and retaining, have, (as the majority of the people of Ireland hitherto have done,) when invaded, opposed the enemies of the parent state. But had

had they been deprived of a resident legislature, "it needs no ghost" to tell it, they would like the Americans, have availed themselves of foreign assistance and *for ever have shaken off a yoke tyrannical and oppressive!* if then it be lawful to be instructed by an enemy, (and a reputed secretorial pamphlet says it is,) let not Great Britain or England, which ever term she is vainest of, copy the oppression of a neighbour and an enemy; if she does copy, let not the type resemble the tyrannical, while she forgets the only unexceptionable part of the example.

Thus do these various precedents, ancient and modern, hold out an example to the licentious minister of 1800, that the wisdom of his forefathers (who had *at least* not less than he has) as well as recent example prove, it was neither thought necessary, right, or just, to overthrow the liberties and constitutions of nations, of whom *they* wished to make friends, and only to retain them, *united to them in the bonds of amity*, NOT THOSE OF TERROR, FORCE, OR CORRUPTION! the last word, makes me pause with horror,—yes, alas! I do remember that even in Ireland, there are a class of beings falling under this general head, with

whom I will say a word;—ye placemen, ye pensioners, and ye sycophants, who now implicitly bend your neck to slavery, and support the degradation of that country, to which many of you, nay the majority, owe your birth; and to which you are all indebted for your support—allow me in uncourtly terms to observe, you will find, when too late, if we are so unfortunate as to experience an Union, the real cause that buoyed you up to consequence;—that taken away, you shall sink to the level of original obscurity; and those situations, places, pensions, employments, &c. which men now fill who reside in the country, will on that event, be greedily given away to those that are *Non-residents*, the British *satraps*, and long the needy expectants of the Union obligarchy: then you will find you have been the silly dupes of an ambitious faction, endeavouring on the smoking ruins of a country they will have destroyed, to raise themselves to consequence; seeking titles, seats, &c. in the imperial Parliament, as the rewards of their perfidy—thus become the self-instruments of your destruction, discarded from office, and despised; your services will be unrequired and unnecessary—for the base act would then be committed, which you long have been expected to

to perpetrate. But remember the employer, associates not with the murderer he has hired, conscious of internal baseness, he shuns the partner of his guilt.—The Neapolitan disclaims the acquaintance of the very Lazzaroni, he has in pay for assassination! for once then let a spark of public virtue animate you; for once let self interest stimulate you to desert the minister—fly to the side of your country, and let the future historian mention in the recording page, “when this daring attack, under
 “the pretext of Union, was made on Irish
 “freedom, so great was Hibernian virtue,
 “and such the public spirit of that island,
 “that the very placemen and pensioners rose
 “in a body, deserting the minister, who was
 “left the solitary supporter of the measure,
 “they having joined the ranks of their coun-
 “try!!—if you dare not, hasten to the wages of your prostitution—the very paracide is worthy of his bribe! go ye servile tribe, go now and terminate your inglorious career; confirming your own destruction and that of Ireland, by Union! this last deed of perfidy and treason, against your country: then go, and if such an injustice can be attoned, become your own executioners, and let this last guilty act close, the ruin of your country, the pe-
 rioid

riod of your dishonour, and the catalogue of your crimes.

But to return from this long digression, the example of past ages and recent experience, uncontradictibly prove, that a constitution is much easier destroyed than rebuilt; how strange that in an innovating age, a revolutionary æra, the minister should force, with such perseverance and bigotry, his enslaving Union on the Irish people? If unfortunately that was to succeed, in vain might the dupes who have been seduced and cajoled to add their marks for Union repent their folly. The groans of an oppressed and indignant country would then be vainly and ineffectually heard—too late, for they would be treasonable, and the commiserating tear of the Irish slave must be reserved for the pillow or the closet! I now come to the consideration of a country whose fate, I trust, we shall never suffer, although many of the fatal circumstances that enslaved that state, too nearly assimilate those base attempts that have been made on the freedom and constitution of our own country. I allude to Poland, dismembered through the court intrigues of the cabinets of Berlin, St. Petersburg, and Vienna.* Troops were
marched

* See the account of this infamous state swindling, in Coxe's Travels—under the head Poland.

marched into the Polish territories, under the specious pretence of these magnanimous courts being *deeply* interested in the pacification of Poland, and the re-establishment of tranquillity; (the very pretence, the *disinterested* Union advocates now hold forth as a masque for their anxiety for that deep laid project) another pretence too for the introduction of the troops, was to guard the line of the territories to keep off the plague! but they brought a greater plague with them than they pretended to prevent, despotism! and hapless Poland, soon partitioned by the three allied sovereigns, ceased to be a nation! Thus proving the fatal effects of internal faction and discord. Those anarchical distractions from within, and more especially the unhappy irreligious dissensions between the Polish Dissidents and Polish Catholics, was one of the primary causes of her reduction to a province, had long marked her out as weak and vulnerable, and upheld her an object of easy plunder to the allied powers; and yet even this nation was great, and to be lamented in her fall—virtue did not, even to the last struggle, forsake her, *notwithstanding open, unblushing bribery*, with paracidal front, impudently frowning, stalked over the victim of immolation! Notwithstanding bribery, un-

seduced

seduced and unawed by hopes, fears, promises, and threats; the virtue and patriotism of the nation was great—"in the senate or upper house, there was a majority of *only six*; in the lower house or assembly of the nuntios, *but one single vote* in favour of the measure,"* (i. e. the partition of Poland) and yet this ever to be lamented nation fell—great and honourable even in that downfall, not inferior to the intrepid patriotism of the Spartans and Athenians, when led on by Leonidas, they fell covered with wounds in defence of their country!

The late unhappy differences, religious and political in Ireland, have long pointed out her weak side to the British minister, and it was not his interest to terminate, however it might have been his inclination to have encouraged and fomented them: the season of rebellion and foreign invasion seemed to point out irresistibly to him, the propitious epoch for enforcing Union! when these were put down, and the necessity for a military reinforcement was essentially done away, every tide brought in troops, ammunition, &c. but the enigma on the ensuing session was shortly unriddled by the speech from

* See Cox on the partition of Poland, &c.

the throne, when Union was at last disclosed to the Parliament!—I know that in the American war, this country was left to protect itself, when it was nobly defended by the illustrious volunteers, that some persons presumptuously have dared to calumniate; and I remember in the Westmoreland administration the country was left to providence and itself! “separation, regency,” as pretences for this oppressive Union were not then held forth to deceive and entrap a brave and patriotic nation. At the latter period alluded to, Mr. Pitt had not, as he has now the power to play off one part of the nation, or one kingdom against the other; he could not then deceive you as now, he attempts by holding forth golden visions to both countries; England he assures will be reimbursed the expences of a long and calamitous war, by this system of finance, &c. taxing the Irish after Union, *ad libitum*, and to the merchants of Cork and Waterford he assures, an Union will open the commerce of the world, they are to become the emporiums of the empire, in exclusion even of London, Bristol, and Liverpool!!!—while the premier insidiously whispers the merchants, traders, and manufacturers of England, “Make not yourselves uneasy or discontented, those

L

“dreams

“ dreams of gain and commercial advantages
 “ are held forth to cajole Ireland, and induce
 “ her to accede to Union,—softly don’t
 “ murmur or waken her from those visions
 “ of bliss she never can enjoy. The Union
 “ accomplished, fear not!—you ever have been
 “ and are my first consideration—be not then
 “ under any apprehensions—if commercial ad-
 “ vantages are promised, or even conceded to
 “ Ireland, be not alarmed, the instant the
 “ Union obtained, before Ireland could enjoy
 “ the advantages held out, (and she cannot
 “ enjoy more than she has at present). Send
 “ petitions from all the different manufactur-
 “ ing towns, &c. to the Commons House of
 “ the empire, (if there should happen to be one
 “ after Union) and I will promptly and cheer-
 “ fully acquiesce to the prayer of your peti-
 “ tion, by a majority of five against one! the
 “ proportion of British members against the
 “ deputies of the Irish province.”

As I have spoken of the unhappy irreligious
 dissensions in the country, I think it not un-
 necessary to remark, that the Scotch Union,
 (although different in every other feature and
 circumstance of time, constitution, &c.) was
 in a great degree brought about by means
 of

of the population of Scotland, unhappily differing in religion, which so weakened Scotland by the dissensions, jealousies, attendant thereon, that the nation was unable to resist collectively, what individually they disapproved and detested, Union!—this in corroboration of the example of Poland proves the imperious necessity of unanimity in a state. IF THE PEOPLE OF IRELAND WERE UNANIMOUS, THEIR VOICE MUST PROVE DECISIVE. NO MINISTER HOWEVER HARDY, OR HOWEVER POWERFUL, DARE OPPOSE THE WILL OF FIVE MILLIONS OF PEOPLE.

Before I conclude this topic, I will be permitted to observe, that at this very moment the minister is playing off his old game of “divide and govern,” *divide et impera*. Can any circumstance more strongly prove the duplicity of that minister whom duplicity has long marked as her own, than the detail of the articles of Union presented to the British House of Commons in January last? In one part (resolution v.) he observes, the church of Ireland, &c. is to remain as at present by law established, and yet in another place he promises as a kind of bribe *in futuro*, that they are in a few centuries to become a great people! —from forsooth the possibility of the fourth

or fifth generation being emancipated!!?—
 What is this but saying to the Protestant, “ I
 “ will by artifice and deception bring you over
 “ as the advocates for Union, holding out baits
 “ to ensnare you, and assuming that as certain,
 “ that would be revocable by the imperial, mon-
 “ grel Parliament” and to the Catholics it is say-
 ing, “ Keep yourselves quiet, three millions
 “ of people do not be uneasy; do not dare to
 “ oppose me in my present ruling passion, and
 “ very possibly, if you forbear, in another
 “ king’s reign when a few centuries shall have
 “ past, AS I REALLY DO NOT KNOW WHAT RE-
 “ LIGION * THERE OUGHT TO BE IN IRELAND,
 “ when I shall no longer be minister and “ *qui-*
 “ *etly inurned*” as which of you all will not ?
 “ You may then console yourselves in your
 “ graves, by the reflection, that some of your
 “ great, great, grand children are enjoying
 “ that emancipation in the Imperial Parlia-
 “ ment, to which the British Parliamentary
 “ Test Oaths, of Supremacy and Abjuration,
 “ and the King’s Coronation Oath are a bar ;

* The words of Mr. Pitt, in his never to be forgotten
 speech in February last, printed in Dublin by his Majesty’s
 printer, and *gratuitously* distributed through all the counties,
 cities, towns, and hamlets in the kingdom, for the *sole purpose*,
 no doubt, of taming the wild Irish !

“ but

“but wherewith I deceived, betrayed, and
 “cajoled you!!!!” oh were ever falsehood,
 deceit, flattery, and duplicity so combined, so
 apparent, or so audacious?

Monstrum nulla virtute redemptum.

How, allow me to ask, can you rely, or
 after an Union conceive that your inclina-
 tion, much less your interest, will be attend-
 ed to by the British Parliament, that very
 Parliament that on the 12th February, 1779,
 although it was instructed of the determined
 antipathy and decided opposition of the people
 of Ireland, and of their representatives against
 Union, yet still persevered and went thereon
 into a committee, which was carried against
 the people of Ireland by a majority of one
 hundred and twelve! Can you expect less
 than you have experienced antecedent to the
 Union? A majority against you!

After this disclosure of treachery, what pal-
 lation have the Union terrorists now? do they
 think with imperial Cæsar “that if good faith
 “and justice are to be violated, let them be
 “violated for the glory of conquest, and of
 “empire.” Wicked and malignant assump-
 tion!—but rest assured my countrymen (be
 neither deceived, cajoled, or intimidated,) that
 you can place no reliance, much less confidence,
 were

were the wicked measure of Union to succeed, on a nation that by that very proposition, violates the articles of the Scottish Union, and commits, *in limine*, a breach of her plighted faith, solemnly established by the king, the Houses of Lords and Commons, in both countries, in 1782.—Can Ireland then be so lost to reason, reflection, or common sense, as to credit the foolish assertion that this proffered violation of honour, on the part of England, is done to serve Ireland? oh! too credulous, and easily duped nation—No—no—*latet anguis in herba*—a deep and base project lies hid beneath this same Union!—Remain not then unfeeling or unconscious of this daring and insolent attack on your liberties, in the manly tone of Irishmen however dissonant to ministerial organs, undaunted by the force and powers wherewith he is armed, firmly tell the minister, who now attempts to enthrone himself in irresistible power, by means of Union, that though *barbarous* and *uncivilized*, you know not how to crouch as slaves! that though by terror, force, and bribery, he may perhaps for a short interval, enforce a Union, yet that by continued force and bloodshed, it must be perpetuated—that a Union, completed under the auspices of 100,000 bayonets, while it reflects indelible disgrace on the state enforcing

forcing it, cannot prove permanent, but will necessarily carry with it, silence not acquiescence, terror not conviction. It behoves you then, vigilantly, nay incessantly to watch over your constitution—for the base project may be brought forward, and the unwary blow may be struck, when it was unforeseen and unexpected.

As you love your country, never suffer it to be enslaved—inculcate these maxims into the youthful ideas of your children, and let them be handed down to posterity; place Carthage fallen by internal baseness and corruption; Poland destroyed by bribery, fraud, and force of arms; Switzerland by ungenerous conquest and thirst of Empire; before their virtuous minds: and let these melancholy instances of the abuse of power, of human perfidy and injustice, stand forth to the present and to future ages, the last awful moments of nations degraded and enslaved! preserve then your country from the vortex of Union; oh! preserve it as you regard its peace, and revere its future destiny—let no consideration induce you by wilful perjury to abandon that constitution, that you have sworn on the altars of your country, to defend—reject and resist an Union—accede not to terms—any terms

terms are base—all terms are base—they are infamous—they are dishonourable—they are unjust—you cannot accede to them! let not then the example of apostacy corrupt you, if in the cause of their country any can prove apostates! let not intreaty—the bonds of love, relation, or friendship induce you—power, controul—bribery, overcome—force or threats, intimidate—or hopes or fears, persuade you to acquiesce. It has been proved to you, the Parliament of Ireland has no right—the Parliament of Great Britain has no right—the Parliaments in conjunction have no right—the majority of the Irish people, no right—even that all the people of Ireland have no right to enact Union or bind themselves, much less posterity! it is your duty to oppose it—you owe it to your ancestors, from whom you received your constitution, (“the price of so much blood”) pure and undiminished!—you owe it to your country, to whom you are accountable—to yourselves, who have but a life interest in it—to your children for whom you are the guardians of it—to posterity for whom you are the trustees—and to your God, from whom you received your liberties, WHICH YOU CAN NEITHER ABANDON NOR RELINQUISH!