

Second Edition.

AN

A N S W E R,

TO A

PAMPHLET

ENTITLED, THE

Speech of the Earl of Clare,

ON THE SUBJECT OF

A LEGISLATIVE UNION,

BETWEEN

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

By HENRY GRATTAN, Esq.

D U B L I N :

PRINTED FOR J. MOORE, NO. 45, COLLEGE-GREEN.

1800.

Second Edition

MA

J. W. P.

TO A

TRAMPHLET

RELATIVE TO THE

Speech of the Earl of Clarendon

ON THE 21ST OF

A LEGISLATIVE UNION

BETWEEN GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

HENRY GRANT

DUBLIN

PRINTED FOR R. MOORE, NO. 22, COLLIER STREET

1841

Houses of the Oireachtas

TO THE

P R I N T E R.

I HAVE seen a pamphlet, purporting to be written on the Union, and published in the name of the Earl of Clare. The speech of the Noble Earl, delivered in the House of Lords, I have nothing to say to, but a publication is not a speech, and though it be the work of a member of Parliament, has no privilege. Whether his Lordship be the author, I have no authority, save the assumption of the publication, to affirm; but the pamphlet contains against several, with whom I have acted, charges, the most direct, and against myself, for the last 20 years, charges the least qualified and insinuations, the most deep. What is yet worse it tends to lower
the

the character of the Country, and to tarnish the brightest passages of her history, as well as the memories of the persons concerned in those transactions. Matter so various and comprehensive, could not be regularly discussed in any debate that has come or is likely to come before the House of Commons: in the interval of business, I therefore resort to the only method of defence, the Prefs.

H. GRATTAN.

MR. GRATTAN will take no notice of any Answer, except one coming from the Author of the Pamphlet.

AN

A N S W E R,

&c. &c.

OF the work which it is proposed to answer nearly one third is the common place of Irish History : much of abridgment, much of misrepresentation, no new discovery, no new remark ; the termini or landmarks of historic knowledge, remain precisely as they were, in their old sober station. What was long known before by many men, by many women, and by many children, the compendium of the studies of your childhood, this pamphlet reports to you, for the amusement of your age, without any other novelty, save that of misrepresentation. The idea is to make your history a calumny against your ancestors in order to disfranchise your posterity: the execution is without the temper of a commentator or the knowledge of an historian.

We will begin with this performance, at the Irish parliament of James 1st. The author is now within 187 years of his

his subject. Ireland, says he, had no parliamentary constitution 'till that time. Here his pages only deserve attention, in order to vindicate the lineage of our liberties against slander. This statement is a traduction of the inheritance of the realm, a calumny against her antiquities and a falsification of her title. Lord Coke, the judges of England, the records of Ireland, the *modus tenendi parliamentum*, the statute-book, the extent of acts of Parliament before the reign of James throughout the realm, and the act of annexation among others, answer him : from all those you find that Ireland had a Parliament from the beginning, and that the legislature was not of the Pale, but of the nation. *

The boldness of this assertion is rendered the more remarkable by the distinguished feebleness of its reasoning. The pamphlet attempts to prove that to be true in argument which is false in fact, and its argument is, that James 1st generalized Irish representation, by forty private boroughs, that is, that he rendered representation general, by making it particular. It teaches you to think, that it was James instead of Eliz. who created the 17 Counties, and not the 40 boroughs, by him erected to counteract that county representation, in order to pack a Parliament; a traffic which this work seems disposed to admire. It conceives that the legislature was not general, because the representation was not so; it should have said, that the legislature being general, the representation ought to be so. It discovers two ideas of a new and extraordinary nature on this subject that Parliament—is confined by the bounds of representation, and that national representation is extended by

* See the speech of the late secretary of State, Mr. Hutchinson, on the subject of parliamentary reform, in the parliamentary debates of 93. It is a complete answer to the pamphlet on this part of the subject. See extract from it at the end.

by the creation of private boroughs: and for this paradoxical idea of Parliament, and this paradoxical idea of representation, it offers you nothing like extent of erudition, or force of imagination: the art of modern war says the pamphlet, is to traduce the house of Stewart; the art of modern court loyalty, it might have added, is to praise the principle of the Stewart and to plant it in the House of Hanover.

The pamphlet now comes to its own times, and it is to be remarked, that as it dwelt on the past with all the fury and prejudices of the present time, so it expatiates on the present, with as much error and mistake, as if it were treating of the remotest antiquity. It states the adjustment of 82, to be described by its author as follows: "that it emanated
 " from the armed convention assembled at Dungannon, was
 " approved at county meetings of the people, armed and
 " unarmed, and was sanctioned and registered by the Irish
 " Parliament:" No such thing, nor any thing like it, did its author say, nor suggest, nor hint; and this statement of the pamphlet is not misrepresentation, nor misinterpretation, but palpable invention, did not the pamphlet assume the name of a judicial character, I would say, downright fabrication; I respect and admire the meeting at Dungannon, but the subjects of 82 did not emanate from thence; two years before were they discussed in Parliament, they were discussed on the 19th of April, 1780, on a motion made by myself, and in the course of that session, and of the next session, repeatedly and fully; they were adopted by different counties, and various descriptions of men, and they finally passed the Parliament. Such is the history; the pamphlet falsifies the history, to blemish a great transaction, and attributes that falsification to me in order to blemish an individual.

We

We follow the work where it will be perhaps more fortunate. It objects on the question of the claim of right to the declarations of the Volunteers; their character now, it seems, it professes to admire; their conduct however (this was the most leading part of the conduct, of the old Volunteers,) it condemns; the inconsistency of setting up a character, and putting down a conduct, is glaring, but in a work pregnant with every thing which is exceptionable, hardly deserves notice. But will any man seriously say, that those bodies should not have come forward at that time with resolutions in favour of a claim of right? does any man mean to affirm that we could have established that claim without them? If so, he is a mistaker of the truth. Does any man mean to say, that the claim did not deserve to be established? if so, he is a slave; and in neither case does he deserve an answer. To have countenanced resolutions essential to the establishment of your constitution, and to have opposed any further interference, when that constitution was established, was the duty and the pride of them by whom the business of 82 was conducted. By the first step they procured the constitution; by the second, they saved the government; and in both they deserved well of their country, and are placed far above the reach of the author of this little performance, its little censure or its little praise. We thought that at that time, as in the period of *magna charta*, armed men might make declarations to recover liberty, and having recovered it, we thought they secured their glory as well as their freedom, by retiring to cultivate the blessings of peace.

The pamphlet has further objections; it condemns the expedition with which the claim of right was established, it calls for discussion, and delay—to do what? to debate whether the English Parliament had a right to make laws for
Ireland

Ireland ; whether the privy councils in both countries should alter your bills, or whether the mutiny bill should be perpetual ? why, for the two preceding years, these subjects had been, and little other than these subjects had been, debated. The pamphlet has proved to you, however, the necessity of expedition, by its argument for delay ; for it explains to you, that we were to delay the question, in order to sell it, that is, in order to diminish, clog, and condition your claim of right : you were to delay, the pamphlet explains, in order to preserve to the Parliament of England, over this country, a share of legislative power, and the pamphlet administers additional arguments against its project of delay, by shewing you, that the viceroy of that time was intriguing against your favourite measures, and it gives you still further arguments against delay, by suggesting that there were certain gentlemen at that time, who would not with their lives have supported their liberties ; it might have added, nor with their votes : perfectly well do we understand the author ; and this pamphlet might have added, with peculiar authority, that there were certain young gentlemen at that time, ready to barter honour for office, and liberty for chains. It was therefore, we did not listen to the idea of delay ; we did not chuse to set up the inheritance of the people of Ireland to auction ; we were applied to for delay, and we refused it ; we thought the 16th of April was the day of the Irish Nation, and we were determined not to sleep, until laying our heads on the pillow, we could say, this day Ireland has obtained a victory.

Seeing then, that the constitution was established without delay, or barter, or auction, the pamphlet does not despair, it has a cure, viz. corruption ; it does not indeed set forth corruption in words, but it does amply and broadly in idea.

The expressions are these: "the only security for national concurrence is a permanent and commanding influence of the English executive, or rather English cabinet in the councils of Ireland." By councils of Ireland it means, and professes to mean, nothing less than the Parliament, see page 45. Here is the necessary substitute, it seems, for the British Parliament—here is the half million—here is the dependency of the Irish Parliament avowed as a principle; here breaks out of the taint and fore of that unfortunate system, whose rankness the pamphlet seems to have deeply inhaled, and with whose political incense it now deigns to regale our nostrils and its own; here is acknowledged the truth of the complaint of the opposition, namely, that the British minister some years after the settlement of 1782, wished, through his agents here, to filch back our Constitution of 1782, so honourably and nobly obtained, and to resume by fraud what had been obtained by treaty. In vain shall a minister come forth in sounding words, such as national concurrence or national connexion, and wrap himself up in the threadbare coat of zeal for empire, to stab his country to the heart; such arguments are not to be answered but punished, and when any man shall avow that he has no idea of governing in this country without rendering her Parliament by the means of influence, perfectly dependent on Great Britain, he avows not his profligacy only, but his incapacity also. Such a minister could not govern without corruption; he could not govern with it; he might indeed begin by attempts to pack a Parliament, but he will conclude by an attempt to abolish the legislature.

To return to the pamphlet. On the subject of the claim of right, the author seems to have three parental ideas; First, That the Volunteers should have made no declaration on the subject: Secondly, That the question should have been left

left open to delay : and Thirdly, That the British cabinet should succeed to the power of the British Parliament. By the first plan the constitution had been lost, by the second fold, and by the third corrupted. We follow the pamphlet ; it states, that the adjustment of 1782 was described by the author of it as follows ; then he introduces a description which certainly was given by its author, but which was not a description of the adjustment of the parliament of 1782, but of a parliament that sat 187 years ago, and which was assembled by James I. in the year of our Lord 1613. Here again is that of which we have so often reason to complain in this work invention ; true it is, that the boroughs created by James I. have had their effect on posterity, and true it is, that those boroughs continue to send members to parliament ; so far the parliament of 1782 and of 1613 had a similitude ; but it is not true that the parliament of 1782 was a packed parliament like that of 1613 ; it is not true that the representatives of the boroughs were either attorneys clerks or the servants of the Castle as in 1613 ; nor is it true that the boroughs of 1782 resembled those created by James in 1613 ; and so far the two parliaments have no similitude. Mr. Burke, speaking to me of some country that had prospered under a constitution consisting of three estates, but estates defectively formed, observed, “ that it was of the nature of a constitution so formed as ours, however clumsy the constituent parts, when set together in action, ultimately to act well,” so of that in question. The boroughs, in a course of time, ceased to be under the influence of the king, and the constitution took root in the people ; the crown became dependant for supply on the parliament, and the parliament by the octennial bill, became more intimately connected with the country ; but however altered, depurated, and naturalized, this borough system

system was an evil still; in 1613 it was corruption—in 1800 it may be Union. The author of the pamphlet has not thought much on these subjects; 'tis astonishing how shallow is that little performance; it charges my description of the parliament of 1613, as my description of the parliament of 1782—that is, it makes a false inference, on its false inference, it makes a false comparison, and the folly of its own inference and the fallaciousness of its own comparison, it attributes to another person. We follow the work. It affirms that the rivals of Mr. Flood had agreed in 1782 to support a draft of a clandestine bill or treaty for imperial legislation which the pamphlet describes, and adds that they sacrificed to flimsy and corrupt popularity the peace of ages, &c. &c. Here are two assertions which I do affirm publicly, and in the most unqualified manner contain not one syllable, or tittle, or shadow of fact; the two assertions are wholly and most absolutely destitute of foundation. The author of the pamphlet is called upon to support them—he has access to the Duke of Portland, to many of the cabinet of 82, in both countries, and to the official and the un-official agents of that time.

We have seen with what liberality the pamphlet asserts, we will now see with what œconomy it reasons, and certainly its falter in fact must prejudice its authority in logic. It denies the settlement of 82 to have been final; the words of the settlement are as follows: “His Majesty recommends it to take into consideration the discontents and jealousies prevailing in Ireland, in order to come to such a *final* adjustment as may give mutual satisfaction to both kingdoms”—See his Message to the respective Parliaments.—Parliament declares, “that no body of men whatever has any right

to make laws for Ireland, save only the King, Lords, and Commons thereof, that this is the birth-right of the people in which the essence of their liberty exists, and which we cannot surrender but with our lives"—See Address of the Irish Commons 16th of April.—“His Majesty has recommended the subject to his Parliaments of both kingdoms, trusting that their wisdom will recommend measures as may terminate in a *final* adjustment”—See his Majesty's answer.—“the British legislature has concurred in a resolution to remove the causes of your discontents and jealousies—the intention of the king, and willingness of the British Parliament come unaccompanied with *any stipulation or condition whatever.*”—See the Duke of Portland's speech, 27th May.—“We conceive the resolution for an unqualified, unconditional repeal of the 6th of Geo. I. to be a measure of justice and wisdom, worthy of the British Parliament, and furnishing a perpetual pledge of mutual amity—gratified in these particulars, *no constitutional question will exist* between the two countries to interrupt their harmony”—See Irish Commons Answer 27th May.—“We rejoice that the name of Portland will be handed down as blended with a *full and perfect* establishment of the constitution of Ireland”—See Commons Address to his Excellency same day.—“His Majesty assures his Commons of his affectionate acceptance of their acknowledgments of his Majesty's and the British Parliament's attention to their representation, and which they so justly consider as furnishing a *perpetual* pledge of mutual amity.—The declaration that *no constitutional question* between the two nations will any longer exist that can interrupt their harmony, are very pleasing to him”—See the King's Answer to Irish Address of 27th May.—“We have seen this great national arrangement established on a basis which secures the tranquility of Ireland,
and

and unites the affections as well as the interests of both kingdoms"—See Commons Address at the close of the session of 1782, "Convince the people of your several counties that the two kingdoms are now inseparably one, indissolubly connected in unity of constitution and unity of interest—that every just cause of jealousy is removed—that the two nations have pledged their faith, and their best security will be an adherence to that compact." See the second speech of the Lord Lieutenant at the close of the session and the adjustment.

Here is the record; the pamphlet proposes to do away the force of record by the force of intrigue, and to set up a private correspondence of the then Lord Lieutenant against a public act. It produces an intrigue carried on with a view to clog the settlement, as sufficient not to condition or interpret, but to over-hawl and overfet it;—it does not make the covenant conclusive on the infincerity of the Viceroy, but the infincerity of the Viceroy conclusive against the covenant—as if it were possible to construe away the obligation of a deed of trust by a private protest of the trustee, or as if treaties between two nations were to be set aside by the private letter of the Envoy. It goes further, it gives the private intrigue an extent which the intrigue itself never affected—it makes the correspondence, containing a wish pending the adjustment and before its conclusion, to condition the Irish claim of right, tantamount to a public protest purporting to render it final in nothing.—The pamphlet states, "That all the parties looked on the adjustment of 1782 as leading to a future political treaty."—Would any one believe, would any one conceive that the alledged author of that pamphlet should be ignorant of the parties to that treaty, that he should not know they were the King and the respective

spective Parliaments of the two countries; and that they were not, as he imagines, the individuals concerned in bringing that treaty to a conclusion?

But the author is ignorant of the sentiments of those individuals, as well as of the nature of the treaty. Thus Mr. Fox's sentiments the pamphlet has misrepresented; *he* has declared that he wished to make the best terms he could for Great Britain; but as Ireland would not condition her independence, he gave up the second proposition. It has mistated the sentiments of General Fitzpatrick; *he* declares that he was totally ignorant of the dispatch of the Duke of Portland, and that he had at the very time assured the Irish Parliament, in the name of the Government which he then represented, that no farther measure was intended. He has mistated Mr. Grattan's sentiments, who publickly declares that every part of the assertion, as far as relates to him, is totally unfounded, without a shadow of colour or pretence; and calls on the author to support his assertions. But I think I could quote *another* authority against this pamphlet; it is another pamphlet in the name of the same author published in 1798; which charges the people of Ireland and the opposition with a breach of faith in agitating certain political and commercial questions, after the kingdom had 'come to a final settlement with England, "A
 " settlement so complete and satisfactory as to render a
 " revival of political or constitutional controversies utterly
 " impossible."

That pamphlet accordingly quotes the address of 1782; declaring that all constitutional questions between the two countries should cease, and it extends the word *constitutional* to mean all *commercial* questions; and it extends the words *between the two nations* to mean questions *between the administration and the country*. This interpretation by
 the

the pamphlet of 1798, was as extravagant as the *opposite* interpretation by the pamphlet of 1800, in the name of the same author. The author is *there* made to differ from Mr. Pitt, and to say that the adjustment went to every thing; the author is *here* made to differ from himself, which is much less surprising, and to say that the adjustment extended to nothing. But here I must observe, that it is the argument only that is inconsistent, the sentiment is perfectly uniform; it advanced covenant against national redress, and it now advances the will of the minister against covenant. Thus has this pamphlet on the subject of a national treaty, expatiated with extraordinary vehemence and confidence without knowing its purport, without knowing who were the parties, without knowing who should be the parties, without knowing what were the sentiments of the parties; in direct contradiction to the sentiments of the principal agents, and to the spoken, written and printed opinion of the alledged author of the publication.

We follow the work; having denied a covenant which did exist, it fabricates a covenant which never had any existence whatsoever; it asserts, page 47, that an alliance offensive and defensive, was formed by certain parties in both countries to play the independence of Ireland against their antagonists; 2dly, it affirms the principal object of that alliance to be, to guard against any settlement which might cut off the sources of jealousy and discontent between the two nations. I do aver in the most solemn, public and unqualified manner, that there is not the least foundation, colour or pretence for either of those assertions; and it is with great pain I feel myself forced to declare, that they are absolutely and wholly destitute of any foundation, in fact or in truth; I refer to these facts—

Imme-

Immediately after the settlement of 1782, the English part of this pretended alliance went into opposition; the Irish part of this pretended alliance, till 1785, supported the government, and some of them, for years after; the English part of this pretended alliance opposed the French treaty; the Irish part supported it; some of the English part of this pretended alliance opposed the war, the Irish part supported it. Here then is a publick proof of the falsehood of the first position. We are furnished with further means of falsifying the second.

The original propositions that passed the Irish Parliament in 1785, were that very settlement which the pamphlet describes; that is, a settlement purporting to cut off the sources of any remaining discontents and jealousies between the two nations, and they had our warmest support. So that the pamphlet has been so indiscreet and ill advised as to advance and affirm two criminal charges positively and publickly, having, within the reach of its author's knowledge, certain facts, proving the falsehood of those very charges, at the very time they were so injudiciously advanced.

The author is called upon to support them; he must have access to the Duke of Portland, to Mr. Pelham, and to many of those who must have been parties in this pretended alliance. They are not our friends, they are his.

The work proceeds to state, but not to state fairly or fully, the propositions; and I cannot but again observe, that these frequent mistakes in fact must create a prejudice against its logic. The best way of answering misrepresentation is by reciting the fact. The original ten propositions were formed with the consent of the British cabinet; they were the work (at least the first nine) as I

C

understand

understand of a gentleman of this country, and they shewed in their ability and their compass; the hand of a master. A tenth was added, which stipulated for revenue to be given by this country to Great Britain; that 10th was altered in the cabinet in Ireland and divided into two resolutions, the 1st declaring that no Irish revenue should be given to England until all Irish charges were previously satisfied; the 2d, that the Irish revenue should be raised to the Irish expences. The Irish ministry took the new revenue and the English Parliament altered the original proposition. Pending these alterations, some members of our house spoke on the subject, and pledged themselves that they should on the return of the propositions give them opposition in case they should be altered even in an iota. I recollect Mr. Foster speaking to that point, he did not so pledge himself, but I perfectly recollect that the then attorney general did; the pamphlet has given reasons for the inconstancy of his sentiments, give me leave to justify the uniformity of mine. The bill founded on the altered propositions departed from the original ones in the following particulars: it stipulated for a perpetual revenue bill it stipulated in certain leading and essential matters for a covenant of referential legislation, it included in that covenant four articles of American commerce, it stipulated for the reduction of our duties of protection on cotton among others, and it gave us nothing in substance but the re-export trade which we have gotten without it. To the public it is sufficient to say so much, to the pamphlet it is unnecessary to say any thing; but when that pamphlet calls opposition to those altered propositions a breach with England and a sacrifice of the common interest on the altar of faction, the author should be reminded, that the person whose name it assumes had pledged himself to oppose those altered propositions; that is, according to the pamphlet, to cause that breach with England and to make that sacrifice on the altar

of

of faction ; and also that a great part of the present cabinet of England did actually execute what the pamphlet calls a breach with England, and sacrificed the common interest on the altar of faction—Lord Auckland, the Duke of Portland and most of his connexions. But we stand in need of no authorities ; did we, I should quote Mr. Denis Daly, the then muster master, who declared he could not support the altered propositions. The truth is, the opposition to the bill which comprehended them, was no breach with England, however there might indeed mix in the debate an offensive disposition to contrast the two nations ; but we must always distinguish between the nature of the question itself and the craft of the expectant flattering the court of England by reviling his own country for his private advantage.

We follow the pamphlet to the regency, and here its charge against the country is not her conduct but her power. The pamphlet reprobates the right of Ireland to choose a regent ; now, she is not responsible for the right but the exercise of it, and we have shewn that she exercised that right for the preservation of the monarchy, and the connection. The pamphlet states the power of choice to be tantamount to a power of separation ; but who gave that power ? it was the law ; and who displayed that power ? the minister ; it was he who stated that the two houses of Parliament in case of regal incapacity could supply the deficiency exactly as they thought proper, when a servant of Government here maintained that the houses of the British Parliament could do more, and could provide for the deficiency in Ireland as well as in England, that is to say, could republicanize both countries. He did not make our situation better, nor give any great security to the monarchy or the constitution.

The

The pamphlet asserts, that if the proceedings of our Parliament could have any effect, we were separated for some weeks from England. Now if we were separated for an hour, it was not by the proceedings of Parliament, that is to say, by the address to the Prince, which never had effect, but by the indisposition of his Majesty, which had effect, and which alone had effect to suspend the royal function and of course the only connecting power of the two countries.

The pamphlet having confounded the proceedings of Parliament with causes which Parliament found but did not produce, proceeds to a gross misrepresentation of concomitant circumstances. It charges on the Parliament the crime of expedition, but it does not state the cause of it; one cause was the sedition of the Irish minister;—that ministry apprehended dismissal and were forming an opposition. The then representative of Majesty in Ireland was supposed to be employed at that time in canvassing for a party against the future Government with the king's commission in his pocket. Thus his Royal Highness would have been a regent in chains with a court in mutiny.

The pamphlet charges the commons at that time with disrespect to the king, marked by the limitation of the supply. The fact is true, but it is not true as the pamphlet states it—the commons abridged the grant of the supply because the King's minister in Ireland could not be trusted, and he could not be trusted for the following reasons:—because he had declared he would make certain members of Parliament victims of their votes, because he had censured the Parliament and the Parliament had censured him, and because one of his servants had pronounced in Parliament the necessity of resorting to the rankest corruption. It was for these reasons that Parliament did not think proper to trust either with the revenues of the country.

The

The pamphlet asserts, that the Irish Parliament proceeded without a tittle of evidence; it is not the fact. The pamphlet, indeed, acknowledges that its own charge is not true, by making another, namely, that the House of Commons did not attend to the evidence. Here it is as deficient in candour as before in fact; the case was, that the report of the physician regarding the state of his Majesty's health, had appeared before in every paper; it was a subject too interesting and too melancholy not to be perfectly known, and was read in the House, pro forma. On this part of the subject, the pamphlet is, in an eminent degree, indecorous and licentious, when it speaks of the House of Commons; nor is it less so when it speaks of the persons concerned in the proceedings of that time, as of a set of men who had accomplished a breach between Great Britain and Ireland, and had committed (I think the words of the charge are), *enormities*. The persons guilty of those enormities were some of the present servants of the crown, a majority of two Houses of Parliament, several bishops, a great part of the present cabinet of England, the Duke of Portland and his party, Lord Spencer, who was to have been Lord Lieutenant, and Mr. Pelham, who was to have been his Secretary—were it not presumptuous, I might ascend much higher.

An alliance to play against England the independency of Ireland, whose basis was to prevent measures of concord—a breach made between the two countries in 85, and now their enormities in the address on the regency, are charges against the Duke of Portland's party very unfounded and very puerile, but made with great boldness by the author, who seems to enjoy a genius for crimination, which in its extent and extravagance, becomes harmless. The pamphlet charges on that period much indecorum. I do lament it.

“ You

“ You have set up a little king of your own, said a principal servant of the crown, speaking to the House of Commons, and talking of his Prince with the vulgar familiarity with which one slave would salute his fellow.” “ Half a million or more was expended some years ago, to break an opposition, the same or a greater sum may be necessary now”; so said the principal servant of the crown. The House heard him, I heard him, he said it standing on his legs to an astonished House, and an indignant nation, and he said so in the most extensive sense of bribery and corruption. The threat was proceeded on, the peerage was sold, the caitiffs of corruption were every where, in the lobby, in the street, on the steps, and at the door of every parliamentary leader whose thresholds were worn by the members of the then administration, offering titles to some, amnesty to others, and corruption to all. Hence arose the discontents of which the pamphlet complains—against such proceedings, and the profligate avowal of such proceedings, against the consequences that followed—they were many and bloody, we did then, and we beg now to enter once more our solemn protest.

Could that nation, who had refused to obey the legislative power of the British Parliament, who had armed for her defence and her freedom, who had recovered her trade, reinstated her constitution, and acquired a great, and it shall not be my fault, if it be not an immortal name—could they who had taken a part for that nation, in all her glorious acquisitions—could the nation or such men, could both forget themselves, and support a rank instrument of power, and become its little comrade, and its copander in its dirty doings, in the sale of the peerage, conspiracies against Parliament, and its vile and vulgar abuse of the people.

A pamphlet

A pamphlet of 98, published in the name of the same author, is pleased to mention, that the experiment of conciliation had been fully and abundantly tried, and it particularly instances, the acknowledgement of our Parliamentary constitution—it was an experiment, magnanimous on the part of Great Britain, and her then minister, and we ought to take this public opportunity, of making acknowledgements to both, but we must lament, that their noble purposes were counteracted, and their wise experiment betrayed by a calamitous ascendency in the Irish Cabinet, from 89 of the above councils, at once servile and insolent who had opposed the establishment of the Irish Constitution, and scarce were they placed in power, when they planned its overthrow, set up a counter experiment, or conspiracy, to undo what England thought she had recognized, and Ireland thought she had secured, that very parliamentary constitution, our bond of connexion, and pledge of peace, and took two methods to accomplish their crime, both of which, they proclaimed with much public immodesty, but without danger; a project to pack a Parliament and a project to abolish it.

We follow the work, it complains of the Whig Club, the minister was the author of it—his doctrine, and his half million were the authors of it, but Clubs of this kind are only preserved by violence, that violence did happen—an attack was made on the rights of the city, a doctrine was promulgated, that the common council had no right to put a negative on the Lord Mayor, chosen by the board of Aldermen, except the board itself should assent to the negative put on its own choice, this doctrine was advanced by the court, to secure the election of the mayor to itself; in the course of the contest, a minister involved himself in a personal altercation with
the

the citizens—with Mr. Tandy, he had carried on a long war, and with various success—he was now involved in an altercation more general, in the compass of his wrath—he paid his compliments to the Whig Club, and that club advanced the shield of a free people over the rights of the city, and humbled a minister in the presence of those citizens whose privileges he had invaded, and whose persons he had calumniated. The pamphlet charges the club with a crime on account of a publication on the subject of the poor, pending a probable invasion—idle charge. At this time of a probable invasion, is a society formed for the very purpose of investigating their condition with some of the officers of state, and several clergy at its head.—At such a time did some of the English clergy publish treatises proving, that the peasantry could not live by their labour—did the author read a very learned pamphlet in favor of the Union, published by Mr. Douglass, at a time of apprehended invasion, recommending Union as the best means of relieving the lower order from the oppression of the rich, and then he quotes Adam Smith—did the author read Mr. Pitt's pamphlet, published pending an apprehended invasion and condoling with the peasantry of Ireland, on the great *practical grievance* of tythes? But to have done with such trifling, we follow the work to its charge against the propounders of the reform plan of 97—the work sets forth two plans, that of those gentlemen, and that of the United Irishmen—they differ in the following essentials—the plan of the former left the counties as they are, the former did not propose to annualize Parliament—the former rejected the idea of personal representation, the former did not propose to abolish the oath taken by the elector. What then did the former do—it destroyed boroughs, and it proposed to supply their place by the present freemen and freeholders, that is, by those whom the law calls

calls the Commons—it created no new constituency, but it did what every plan of reform professes to emulate—it gave representation to the constituency, that is, to the Commons in the place of the monopolist—when I say it made no new constituency—I beg to make an exception, it introduced in the place of the potwalloper as he is termed, substantial leaseholders and substantial householders, that is, it gave property more weight, and population distinct from property less weight—on the whole it took away the monopolist and the potwalloping rabble, and communicated the representation of the kingdom to the proprietors thereof, as constituted its electors by law, or as entitled to become such by a property greater than the law had required.

The effect of this plan had been to prevent an Union; if we are to advert to the evidence of the prisoner examined by the Houses of Parliament, it had been to prevent a rebellion, and to break off a French connection. When the pamphlet sets forth that Mr. O'Connor, &c.* approved of this plan it should have stated the whole truth, or have stated nothing; it has done neither. It has suppressed their declaration which was, that had that plan taken place, they would have broken off their connection with France.

Neither the history of that reform, nor the history of any public measure, does the writer set forth. A plan of reform

D

had

* The author is pleased to term Mr. O'Connor our *unreserved* friend—in his manifesto, shewed to the Irish government for permission to publish, Mr. O'Connor sets forth that save only on the question of reform, he had no communication with us of any kind whatever—that manifesto must have been read by the author of the pamphlet, who thus makes another charge he should have known to be groundless, and which he is now called on to maintain. We do not call for legal evidence, but if the author has any evidence at all, such as would convince an honest man of the truth of any of those charges, or justify an honest man in making them, he is called upon and requested to produce that evidence.

had been proposed in 93, and debated in 94. It was objected first, that the plan did not give satisfaction; in that the most vehement partizans of parliamentary reform had signified their disapprobation—secondly, that the plan opened the way to another plan or to the project of personal representation. It became highly expedient before any other plan was submitted to the consideration of Parliament, to be able to assure that august body, that such plan would give general satisfaction, and put an end to the project of personal representation. The persons concerned in the forming that plan, did accordingly obtain from the north of Ireland, and moreover from the advocates of personal representation, authority to declare in Parliament, that if the plan of 97 should pass, they would rest satisfied. If a further answer to the author be necessary, it is his own avowal of his own principle, viz. that no Irish representation at all is necessary, and that he should be satisfied to be governed by the English Parliament, without a single representative. With such a person, I shall no further discuss the subject of representation.

We follow the work to the Catholic question: It is pleased to quote me as follows, "Let me advise you by no means to postpone the consideration of your fortunes till after the war, your physical consequence exists in a state of *seperation from England, &c.*" I am extremely sorry to be obliged to declare again what I have been compelled to do so often; that this paragraph published as mine by the author of the pamphlet, is not misinterpretation, not misrepresentation, but *palpable fabrication*. I never said nor published, that the physical consequence of any part of his Majesty's subjects existed in a state of separation from England, nor any thing that would warrant that interpretation; but I did say the reverse—that as our domestic security consisted in concord with another, so our security

security against an invader from abroad, depended on our connexion with Great Britain. On this expression then boldly attributed to me, but which I never delivered, the author founds two charges as destitute of truth and unreal as the foundation on which they rest—a charge of revolution and jacobinism. The author in a production functioned by his name, in one of the public papers, is made to say that a certain party had resorted to the Catholic Bill as a new subject of discontent, after the Place and Pension Bill had been conceded: here again I am forced to lament the necessity of declaring that this assertion also is totally and absolutely destitute of foundation—and I will prove its departure from the fact, by the proceedings of Parliament. The first Catholic Bill after that of 1782, passed in 92—the second, early in the session of 93—and the place and pension bill did not pass till the close of it, so that the *refutation* of the charge, appears on the rolls of Parliament. As to the last Catholic Bill, they to whom he alludes, did not resort to it as a new subject of discontent to annoy the government, being at that time themselves the administration—it follows, there is an arithmetic and moral impossibility of the truth of this charge of the author. I beg indulgence in addition, to state a few facts—the Catholics were not excited to come forward by an opposition, they were induced to come forward by Mr. Mitford's Bill in 91—they came at the latter end of the session of that year to some of our party, myself among others, to know whether we should not advise them to petition Parliament for further indulgences—my answer was, I am your friend, but go to the Secretary and consult him; don't narrow your cause to the fate of an opposition and a minority. I give this advice as a friend to your body—in the winter of 91, I was applied to Mr. R. Burke with a request to know my sentiments on the Catholic subject, which I did not disclose to him, declaring at the same time, my good wishes to the Catholic body, and

on the opening of the session, in January 92, I gave the Catholic a decided support. Forgetting this, the pamphlet quotes a declaration, "that the Catholics could not induce any one member of Parliament to patronize their petition. This declaration was published, December, 92, and the author charges from thence, that until the petition was recommended by ministers, we had been catholic persecutors. That charge also is a departure from fact, I remember giving in support of the catholic petition, and claims a decided voice and vote in 1792.

In January, 93, their claims came recommended from the throne, and in supporting their bill so recommended; I observed, that however, I might think it were judicious to go farther, I did think the bill communicated, most important rights. In the session of 94, the catholic subject was not mentioned, but in summer, on a change being made in the British Cabinet, being informed by some of the leading persons therein, that the administration of the Irish department was to belong to them, and that they had sent for us to adopt our measures, I stated the catholic emancipation, as one of them. Thus the charge that we were originally persecutors of the catholics appears to be a departure from the fact. Thus the charge that we took up the catholics after the passing of the place and pension bill, as Irish matter of opposition, appears likewise to be a departure from fact. The proofs are in the proceedings of Parliament.

The pamphlet of 98, in the authors name, has said, that the experiment of conciliation was abundantly tried. Here is the second experiment, and here it is but just, to acknowledge the wisdom of his Majesty, and the benignity of his intentions,

intentions, when he was graciously pleased to recommend the Catholics in 1793, in his speech from the Throne, so that this body thus royally patronized, might be attached not only to the constitution, whose privileges they were to participate, but to the great personage, also, at whose special interposition, they were thus parentally, and majestically recommended. But as in the first experiment, the people of England, so in the second, was his Majesty betrayed, by those infatuated, weak, and pernicious counsels, which had been in 89, the instruments of political corruption, and now became the horn of religious discord.

I will give the learned author every advantage, and suppose contrary to my fixed and unalterable opinion, the policy of excluding the Catholics from the Constitution; yet should I nevertheless condemn the hostile, and outrageous manner in which that exclusion, was defended, "If, says he, the Catholics do not subvert the protestant government, they must resist the ruling passions, and propensities of the human mind; they can never be cordially affected to his Majesty's Government. I am confident, the old roman superstition, is as rank in Ireland now, as in 41—the profound ignorance of the lower order, the general abhorrence of the protestant religion, by the people, qualify them to receive any impression their priests can make, and if their minds be divested of veneration for the priest, such is the ignorance, and barbarity of they people, that the would fall into a state of rude nature—the popish superstition is not confined to the lower order, it flourishes in full vigour, amongst the higher order."

This was the language, improper because not founded in fact, and impolitic and indecent in a minister, though
the

the facts could support it. The best way to distinguish the indecorum of such speech, is to advert to a speech made on the same side of the question by a gentleman who said every thing that could be urged against their pretensions, without uttering a single syllable which could give offence to their persons, so that the Catholics might much more easily forgive the latter his vote, than the former his speech, and on a comparison of the two productions, you will see the eminent superiority of sense with temper over talents without it. There are two sides in this question which men of principle might take, for the measure or against it, but the ministry that took both parts could be justified by neither; the fact was, that the ministry encouraged the Protestants, and forsook them afterward; they brought forward the grand juries, and left them also—then to the Catholics—then to the Protestants—then back again to the Catholic, and then to the Protestants once more. This was a great mistake, but there was a greater, and that was to be found in those speeches and publications from a quarter in high confidence, which vilified the acts of concession in the moment of conferring them, and affecting to support the King's Government, called the bill he had recommended *an act of insanity*; the incoherent plan was erroneous, but this was infatuation, it was the petulance of power, it was the insolence of wealth, it was the intoxication of sudden and giddy elevation, breathing out on a great and ancient description of his Majesty's subjects, the phrenzy of his politics and the fury of his faith, with all the impoverished anger of a feverish and distempered intellect. It went to deprive the Protestant ascendancy of the advantage of temper, and of the graciousness of good manners which should always belong to the powerful sect; it went to deprive the state of a certain comeliness of deportment and mild dignity which should always belong to Government; it fought in the king's co-
lours

lours against the king's benevolence, it went to deprive his Majesty of the blessings of gratitude and his people of the blessings of concord ; it went to corrode where the crown had intended to heal, and it curdled with the temper of the minister, the manna that was descending from the throne.

The argument that accompanied this invective was of little moment ; a man in a fury can't argue ; the weakness of his reasoning will be exactly in proportion to the strength of his passion.

Behold a melancholy example of the victory of human passion over the human understanding. The present danger of the papal power after the deposition of the Pope, the incompatibility of the real presence, and the worship of the Virgin Mary, with the interest of the House of Hanover and the incompetency of Parliament to alter the oaths of its own members, such are the author's the arguments. However, if the pamphlet of 98 denies the competence of Parliament, here comes the pamphlet of 1800 to console you, and as the one sets the law above the law-maker, so the other sets the law-maker above the Constitution, and both together would prove that the legislature is incompetent to admit a Catholic, but is perfectly competent to destroy a Parliament.

We leave these arguments and the vehement spirit with which they are poured forth, and come to the close of the pamphlet and the beginning of the subject, the Union. Of 101 pages, 26 only are devoted to the question, the rest contain feelings, battles, and fores from a perpetual encounter with all descriptions of men and with patriotism in all ages. As the author scarcely argues the question of Union or indeed affects it, here I shall say but little ; however two great points
he

he would establish I beg to advert to. They contain positions which are not only glaringly unfounded but exceedingly dangerous: the 1st, that this country is unable to pay her establishments, 2d, that her Constitution is incompetent to provide for her security. He attempts to warrant his first by a statement affecting to prove that in three years if she was to continue without an Union, we shall owe 50,000,000l. He states that we borrow annually 8,000,000, he should have stated that we borrow but 4,000,000; whatever capital we may create on each loan, he should have stated how much less we should borrow on the adoption of an Union. He should have stated that the projectors of the Union only proffered the payment of 1,000,000 of our war establishment, that the present year was provided for, that the saving in the two following years of war will be, according to this proffer, but 2,000,000, and the purchase of boroughs will be 1,500,000. He should have stated further that our war contribution was rated at 4,400,000, and that our present war expence was only 4,652,000, so that the proffer appears fallacious, and if we be unable to support our present war expence, we will be unable to support our war contribution, and the reader will observe the present war expence is an occasional war establishment, principally caused by insurrection, whereas the war contribution will in all probability be a permanent war contribution, except as far as it may be augmented*. But there is an answer to his argument which is more decisive, it is his own argument in 1798 which is as follows: "First, as to the adequacy of the Constitution for the purpose of security and connexion, then for that of wealth and prosperity.

A Parliament

* See Lord Farnham's most excellent pamphlet, and likewise his most judicious speech on the subject of Union.

“ A Parliament, perfectly distinct from, and independent of the other Parliament, forms a system the most critical and complicated ; to a common observer, utterly impracticable ; but experience has proved, that in the midst of popular turbulence, and in the convulsion of rancorous and violent party contests, the Irish Parliament, as it is now constituted, is fully competent to all political and beneficial purposes of Government ; that it is fully competent to protect this, which is the weaker Country, against encroachment, and to save the Empire from dissolution, by maintaining the Constitutional connexion of Ireland with the British Crown.”—Here is the refutation of his second great argument published by himself. Hear him conquer himself in his pamphlet of 98—here (page 5) he writes as follows “ there is not a Nation in the habitable globe, “ which has advanced in cultivation and commerce, in “ agriculture and manufactures, with the same rapidity in “ the same period,”—speaking of Ireland since the Constitution of 82 viz. for the last 20 years.

Here we add nothing, but that the author has been, by his own account, recommending an Union for these eight years; he has been, according to his own account, betraying the Constitution in the very moments of his panegyric.

On this important discovery let others expatiate; to us it is more material to observe on his work, where it sets up our History against our Constitution, and the annals of the Parliament against its legislative capacity. To establish this, he has thought it prudent to advert to four periods, in which the greatest legislative questions were successfully discussed, and the greatest legislative abilities were triumphantly displayed.

This pamphlet quotes the period of 1753, and relates, that a question regarding a surplus in the treasury was

E

then

then started, to try the strength of two factions; which, in its consequence, transmitted a spirit, that afterwards degraded the Parliament; what, when, or where, this Parliamentary degradation appeared, we are at a loss to discover; this is not history, nor comment, nor fact, but it is a garbling of history to establish a conclusion the opposite of that which the history itself would administer; the principle then determined, the importance of that principle, the abilities displayed on the discussion of it, the real effect of both on the public mind, have escaped the pen of the historian; from that pen you would collect, that Mr. Malone and Mr. Pery were nothing more than two prize-fighters, embattled in the cause of faction, under two great state criminals, the Primate and Lord Shannon; that they agitated a matter of no moment, but that they propagated sedition of great moment, and fatal consequences to the next generation.

Having thus disposed of the Parliament, and the characters of 53, without the vexation of any study, or sordid obligation to fact, the pamphlet proceeds to dispose of the character of the House of Commons and the principal Gentlemen of the country for 15 years longer. It had before represented them as incendiaries, it here represents them as plunderers; it sets forth, that under the pretext of public improvement, the Commons plundered the country; and that their Parliament, to pay their Parliamentary following, plundered the treasury, until they imposed on the crown, the necessity of resorting for supply to Parliament; which the author most pathetically bemoans, and which he seems to think the only great grievance of the country.

Having given this History of Parliament, from (53) to (68) it advances to the administration of Lord Townshend;

friend, in which it seems to recollect nothing but the noise of opposition.

The pamphlet of 98, in the name of the author, had observed, that from the revolution of 82, the system adopted by those in whom the power resided (they were those, among others, whom he had just been pleased to reprobate, as incendiaries and plunderers) was to cement the connexion which had so long subsisted between Great Britain and Ireland, to their mutual advantage; the pamphlet of 1800 is pleased to observe, that the precedent of their government, was fatal; and that a system was formed on it, that would beat down any nation on earth; accordingly, it states, that the English Government opened their eyes, shook indeed the aristocracy, but generated a race of political adventurers, full of noise and indecorum. I think I have heard spruce authority as petulant and indecorous as young ambition. The attempts of the court to pack a Parliament at that period, the encrease of the establishment, for that purpose, the great abilities displayed, the altered money-bill, protests, prorogation, in short, the history of the period, once more escapes this historian. The learned author now approaches the year 79—the expedition of his march is very great, and very liberally does he leave untouched every thing behind him; he is arrived; and here he scarcely is stricken with any thing worthy his history, save only the weakness of Lord Buckinghamshire, in arraying the Volunteers, and the illiberality of the nation, in demanding a free trade; the pamphlet commends the Volunteers of that period; and yet I think I remember a young Barrister going forth in his cock-boat, and scolding the waves of that ocean, and the waves regarded him not. Certainly the Volunteers did take a most decisive part in the political and commercial question of that day. Well, he has done with the year 79; whatever he had to say on

the great questions then discussed, and on that most pregnant period, in a few lines he has said it; history is nothing in his hands; in his account of the Parliament of Ireland for 30 years, the learned author has five ideas, and those are all; faction in 53; plunder till 68; then the noise of opposition; then the weakness of government; then the ungenerous proceedings of Parliament; and as he before condemned your efforts to recover your trade, with oblique censure, so now he condemns your efforts to recover your constitution, with direct animadversion; he calls the settlement of 82, the separation of a colony from Great Britain; bold adulation of England, this; the alleged author of the pamphlet, was in Parliament the 16th of April, 82; he made no objection to this separation; he was in Parliament, the 27th of May, 82; he made no objection to the separation; he wrote me a letter of congratulation at that time, on the success of that settlement; he did not there mention this separation. Reading this publication now, and in the society of the two other pamphlets of the same name, every Irishman feels himself less a gentleman, and more a slave. The pamphlet in its oblique censure, and in its direct animadversion, disparages every great act, and every distinguished character in this country, for the last 50 years.

Mr. Malone, Lord Pery, late Lord Shannon, Duke of Leinster, the Mr. Ponsonbys, Mr. Brownlow, Sir William Osborne, Mr. Burgh, Mr. Daly, Mr. Yelverton, Mr. Ogle, Mr. Flood, Mr. Forbes, Lord Charlemont, and myself; I follow the author through the graves of these honourable dead men, for most of them are so; and I beg to raise up their tombstones, as he throws them down; I feel it more instructive to converse with their ashes, than with his compositions.

Mr. Malone,

Mr. Malone, one of the characters of 53, was a man of the finest intellect that any country ever produced.—“The three ablest men I have ever heard, were Mr. Pitt, (the Father) Mr. Murray and Mr. Malone; for a popular assembly I would chuse Mr. Pitt; for a Privy Council, Murray; for twelve wise men, Malone.” This was the opinion which Lord Sackville, the secretary of 53, gave, of Mr. Malone to a Gentleman from whom I heard it. “He is a great sea in a calm” said Mr. Gerrard Hamilton, another great judge of men and talents; “aye,” it was replied, “but had you seen him when he was young, you would have said he was a great sea in a storm;” and like the sea whether in calm or storm, he was a great production of Nature.

Lord Pery, he is not yet canonized by death; but he, like the rest, has been canonized by slander. He was more or less a party in all those measures, which the pamphlet condemns; and indeed in every great statute and measure that took place in Ireland the last 50 years; a man of the most legislative capacity I ever knew, and the most comprehensive reach of understanding I ever saw; with a deep engraven impression of public care, accompanied by a temper which was tranquillity itself, and a personal firmness that was adamant; in his train, is every private virtue that can adorn human Nature.

Mr. Brownlow, Sir Wm. Osborne, I wish we had more of these criminals;—the former seconded the address of 82—and in the latter and in both, there was a station of mind, that would have become the proudest senate in Europe.

Mr. Flood, my rival, as the pamphlet calls him—and I should be unworthy the character of his rival, if in his
grave

grave I did not do him justice—he had his faults; but he had great powers; great public effect; he persuaded the old, he inspired the young; the Castle vanished before him; on a small subject he was miserable; put into his hand, a distaff, and, like Hercules, he made sad work of it; but give him the thunder-bolt, and he had the arm of a Jupiter; he misjudged when he transferred himself to the English Parliament; he forgot that he was a tree of the forest, too old, and too great to be transplanted at 50; and his seat in the British Parliament, is a caution to the friends of Union to stay at home, and make the country of their birth the seat of their action.

Mr. Burgh, another great person in those scenes, which it is not in the little quill of this author to depreciate.—He was a man singularly gifted—with great talent; great variety; wit, oratory, and logic; he too had his weakness;—but he had the pride of genius also; and strove to raise his country along with himself; and never sought to build his elevation on the degradation of Ireland.

I moved an amendment for a free export; he moved a better amendment, and he lost his place; I moved a declaration of right; “with my last breath will I support the right of the Irish Parliament,” was his note to me, when I applied to him for his support; he lost the chance of recovering his place, and his way to the seals, for which he might have bartered. The gates of promotion were shut on him, as those of glory opened.

Mr. Daly, my beloved friend—he, in a great measure, drew the address of 79, in favour of our trade; that “ungracious measure;” and he saw, read, and approved of the address of 82, in favour of Constitution; that address of “separation;” he visited me in my illness, at
that

that moment, and I had communication on those subjects, with that man, whose powers of oratory were next to perfection; and whose powers of understanding, I might say, from what has lately happened, bordered on the spirit of prophecy.

Mr. Forbes, a name I shall ever regard, and a death I shall ever deplore—enlightened, sensible, laborious and useful—proud in poverty, and patriotic, he preferred exile to apostacy, and met his death. I speak of the dead, I say nothing of the living, but that I attribute to this constellation of men, in a great measure, the privileges of your country; and I attribute such a generation of men, to the residence of your Parliament.

The Ministers of the Crown, who, in the times related by the pamphlet, did the King's business, were respectable and able men; they supported sometimes acts of power, but they never, by any shocking declaration, outraged the Constitution; they adjusted themselves to the idea of liberty, even when they might have offended against the principle, and always kept on terms of decency with the People and their privileges; least of all, did they indulge in a termagant vulgarity, debasing, to a plebeian level, courts and senates, and mortgaging Irish infamy on a speculation of British promotion.

In the list of injured characters I beg leave to say a few words for the good and gracious Earl of Charlemont; an attack not only on his measures, but on his representative, makes his vindication seasonable; formed to unite aristocracy and the People, with the manners of a court and the principles of a patriot, with the flame of liberty, and the love of order, unaffailable to the approaches of power, of profit, or of titles, he annexed to the love of freedom, a veneration

ration for order; and cast on the crowd that followed him, the gracious shade of his own accomplishments; so that the very rabble grew civilized, as it approached his person; for years did he preside over a great army, without pay or reward; and he helped to accomplish a great revolution, without a drop of blood.

Let slaves utter their slander, and bark at glory which is conferred by the People; his name will stand;—and when their clay shall be gathered to the dirt to which they belong, his monument, whether in marble, or in the hearts of his Countrymen, shall be consulted as a subject of sorrow, and a source of virtue.

Should the author of the pamphlet pray, he could not ask for his son, a greater blessing, than to resemble the good Earl of Charlemont; nor could that son repay that blessing by any act of gratitude more filial, than by committing to the flames his Father's publications.

I have attempted to vindicate the dead, let us now vindicate the Parliament. The question of 53, was the beginning, in this country, of that Constitutional spirit which asserted afterwards the privilege of the Commons, and guarded and husbanded the essential right of a free Constitution; the question was of its very essence; but the effect spread beyond the question, and the ability of the debate, instructed the Nation, and made her not only tenacious of her rights, but proud of her understanding. There might have been party—there might have been faction, mixing with a great public principle; so it was in the time of Ship Money;—so it was in the revolution;—in these instances the private motive mixed with the public cause; but still it was the cause of the public and the cause of liberty; in great moral operations as well as in the great operations of Nature, there is always a degree of waste
and

and overflow; so it is with the sea; shall we therefore pronounce the ocean a nuisance? thus, afterward, in the time which the pamphlet describes as the period of plunder, there was a spirit of private jobbing, mixing with the spirit of public improvement; but that spirit of public improvement and the commencement and birth of public ease, was there also, and so continued, from the time of the profoundly sagacious Lord Pery, to the time of Mr. Foster and his wife regulations.

In the history of Parliament, I observe the learned historian omits her laws—the corn law—the octennial bill—the tenantry bill—he has not only forgotten *our* history but *his own*, and most impartially contradicts what is written by himself as well as others. “No Nation in the habitable globe, in cultivation, in commerce, in agriculture, in manufacture, has advanced in the same rapidity within the same period,” says the pamphlet of 98, in the name of our author (page 5); “a settlement so compleat and satisfactory, as to render the revival of political or Constitutional questions utterly impossible,”—so said the same pamphlet, (page 9), speaking of the settlement of 82; “a Parliament, (speaking of the Irish Parliament) fully competent to all practical and beneficial purposes of Government, fully competent to preserve this Country, which is the weaker, against encroachment, and to save the Empire from dissolution, by maintaining the Constitutional connexion with Great Britain,”—so said the same pamphlet, speaking of the Constitution of 82; thus have these different works furnished their own answers, and like opposite poison administered their cure and their contradiction:—In preparing that Constitution, and that trade, the Irish Parliament had great merit, and the servants of the Crown had great merit;—as the author has censured the proceedings of both, let me be their vindicator; those servants of the Crown proved themselves to be Irish-

F

men,

men, and scorned to barter their honour for their office; that Parliament, whose conduct the pamphlet reprobates, had seen the Country, by restrictions on commerce, and by an illegal embargo on her provision trade, brought in 79, to a state of bankruptcy; that Parliament had reposed in the liberality of the British Parliament an inexorable confidence; that Parliament waited and waited, till she found, after the English Session of 78, nothing could be expected; and then, that Parliament (and here behold the recuperative principles of our Constitution, and contemplate Parliament, as the true source of legitimate hope, tho' sometimes the just object of public disapprobation), that Parliament at length preferred a demand; I say a demand; for a free trade, expressed in a sentence, the grievances of a Country; they shorten the Money Bill, assert the spirit of the Country, and supported as they were by the whole Nation, break in one hour, that chain, which had blocked up your harbours for ages; they follow this by a support of Government and of Empire, as ample as was their support of their Country and her commerce, bold and irresistible, and do more to deter and intimidate the common enemy, than all your present loans, and all your establishments.

I come to the second period; and here they fall back; here they act reluctantly; but here you see again the rallying principle of our Constitution; that very Parliament, whom the pamphlet villifies, whom the Minister thought he had at his feet, those very Gentlemen, whom the pamphlet disparages, whom the then Secretary relied on, as a rank majority, made a common cause with the People; made a common cause with their liberties; and assisted and backed by the voice of that people, preserved, carried, and established, the claim, inheritance, and liberties of the realm, and sent the Secretary post to England, to recant his political errors in his own country, and to register that recantation in the rolls of his
own

own Parliament. These achievements we are to estimate, not by the difficulties of the day, but by the difficulties resulting from the depression and degradation of ages. If we consider that the People and Parliament, who had thus associated for the defence of the realm, and had added to the objects of their association, the cause of trade and liberty, without which that realm did not deserve to be defended; had been in a great measure excluded from all the rest of the world, had been depressed for 100 years, by commercial and political oppression, and torn by religious divisions; that their Ministers had not seldom applied themselves to taint the integrity of the higher order, and very seldom (except as far as they concurred in the bounties of the legislature) applied themselves to relieve the condition of the lower order; that such a people and such a parliament should, spontaneously associate, unite, arm, array, defend, illustrate, and free their country; overawe bigotry, suppress riot, prevent invasion, and produce, as the offspring of their own head armed cap-a-pee, like the Goddesses of Wisdom issuing from the Thunderer, *Commerce* and *Constitution*; what shall we say of such a People, and such a Parliament? let the author of the pamphlet retire to his closet, and ask pardon of his God, for what he has written against his country!

I state these things, because these things have been called clamour; I state these facts, in opposition to slander, as the defence of my country; to restore from calumny, the character of her Constitution; and to rescue from oblivion, the decaying evidences of her glory,

I think I know my country—I think I have a right to know her; she has her weaknesses; were she perfect one would admire her more, but love her less. The Gentlemen of Ireland act on sudden impulse; but that impulse

is the result of a warm heart, a strong head, and great personal determination; the errors, incidental to such a principle of action, must be their errors; but then, the virtues belonging to that principle, must be their virtues also; such errors may give a pretence to their enemies, but such virtues afford salvation to their country; the Minister should therefore say, what I say to my country—I, who am no better than one of yourselves, but far superior to your tyrant, who probably partake of your defects, and shall be satisfied if I have any portion either of your spirit, or of your fire—“Come—come to this heart, with
“all your infirmities, and all your religion.”

We return to the publication; we look for something to build or plant in the immense waste, the huge moral devastation this writing has left, of the talents, ability, and credit of the country. Three pamphlets of this author lie open before me, a publication of 93, another of 98, and the present of 1800, all in the same name. Here we are to look, I suppose, for whatever is by him suffered to remain unlevelled, of profound wisdom, liberal policy, comprehensive system; the true principle of Government and of a free Constitution; leaf after leaf, and period after period, have I turned them over; the author will shew in what part these great maxims are to be discovered; to mere mortal eyes, these publications seem to be a system of political, moral and intellectual levelling; they seem to run a crazy race through all ages, with a native, genuine horror of any thing like genius, liberty, or the people; great generosity of assertion, great thrift of argument, a turn to be offensive, without a power to be severe, fury in the temper, and famine in the phrase.

I find, and lament to find, in those levelling publications, the following sentiments: That Ireland is a British Colony,

Colony, and that to demand a free Constitution, was to separate from Britain; that Ireland may prudently submit to legislation without representation; that Ireland had no Parliamentary Constitution till the time of James I.; that the creation of the dependency of the crown for supply on the Commons, was a pernicious precedent; that the remedy for our present free Constitution, and the only security for the connexion, was to put in the place of the British Parliament the commanding influence of the British Cabinet over the Irish Legislature. Couple this with a declaration, that half a million had been resorted to some years back, to buy the Commons of Ireland: couple that with the declarations continued in this pamphlet, that for the last seven years, a noble Minister of the Crown had perseveringly recommended the abolition of the Irish Parliament, and an Union in its place; couple all this together, and the result of the pamphlet will be the most complete and ample justification and panegyric of that opposition, who, for a course of years have, with honest perseverance, reprobated that Minister's administration; I will not say it is a justification of rebellion, but it is the best defence I have seen; it amounts to a direct charge, for those last 50 years, on the aristocracy, and on the commons, of faction, of plunder, of breaches with England, and of acts of separation; and it particularly condemns the Parliament for those very measures on which she must rest her credit and authority with the people; and further it charges, that before any rebel was in the country, a leading Minister in the cabinet, was, himself, and has been for 8 years, a secret adviser against the Parliamentary Constitution of Ireland, of course against the fundamental laws of the land; to such a work, containing three fabrications, four capital departures from matter of fact, together with the disparagement of his country, and of almost every honest public character for the last 50 years, I don't think it necessary to say more.

I conclude

I conclude, therefore, by repeating what I have already solemnly declared—that

It is not fact, that we excited the Catholics.

It is not fact, that we persecuted the Catholics.

It is not fact, that we adopted the Catholic measures after the place-bill and pension bill had passed, and in quest of new matter of opposition.

It is not fact, that I ever declared or wrote that the adjustment of 82 emanated from Dungannon.

It is not fact, that I ever compared the Parliament that accomplished that adjustment, to the Parliament of 1613.

It is not fact, that I ever declared that the Catholic would be most powerful, if these Nations were separated.

It is not fact, that I ever abandoned to popularity the draft of a bill for vesting in the Parliament of England, a power of Imperial legislature.

It is not fact, that I ever saw, agreed to, or heard, of any such draft.

It is not fact, that I ever agreed to an alliance with any English party, to oppose any plan of National concord.

It is not fact, that I ever entered into any alliance, offensive and defensive, with them, however I might esteem their persons, and prefer their principles.

Here

Here are ten assertions made by the author—he is publicly called upon to establish them.

I have said thus much to defend my country and myself, in opposition to this publication, that takes the name of a Minister who has the support of the Governments of both countries, and with respect to whom I have no advantage, except the cause, my own personal superiority, and another advantage, which I possess in common with almost every honest subject in Ireland, and with the Irish nation herself, the advantage which the calumniated has over the calumniator. I might avail myself of many more vulnerable parts in those publications, and press the supposed author personally, as he has pressed others; but considering his situation more than he has done himself, I consign him to judges more severe than I could be—and to him the most awful, and, on this side the grave, the most tremendous—**HIS COUNTRY AND HIS CONSCIENCE!**

A P P E N D I X.

EXTRACT FROM THE SECRETARY OF STATE (MR. HUTCHINSON'S) SPEECH, IN 1793.

“**B**UT what was the history of the representation in this country? He could inform gentlemen with some accuracy, having thought it his duty, when he took a more active part in public business, to extract from all the borough charters at the Rolls Office their material contents. The number of representatives in the thirty-fourth year of Henry VIII. was one hundred; to this number Mary and Elizabeth added about forty-eight, but of these there were nineteen counties, of which Elizabeth had established seventeen, a mode of representation worthy the character of that great princess. In the first Parliament of James I. held in 1613, the members of the House of Commons were 232; the last creation of a borough was by Queen Anne, who created one only. For the difference between
the

the number of representatives at the accession of James, and the present number of 300, the House of Stuart is responsible. One half of the representatives were made by them, and made by the exertion of prerogative; of those James made 40 at one stroke; most of them at the eve of a Parliament, and some after the writs of summons had issued. The Commons in that Parliament expressed their doubts whether those boroughs had the power of returning members to sit in Parliament, and reserved that subject for future consideration. Complaints were made to James of those grants, but what was his answer? "I have made 40 boroughs; suppose I had made 400—the more the merrier." Charles I. followed the example of his father in exercising this prerogative, but not to so great an extent: Complaints were also made to him, and he gave assurances that the new corporations should be reviewed by Parliament. The grants made by these two monarchs appear, by the histories and correspondences of those times, to have been for the purpose of giving the Protestants a majority over the Roman Catholics. The grants by Charles II. James II. and Queen Anne, proceeded from motives of personal favour; thus it would appear, if the facts were investigated, that one half of the representation of Ireland had arisen from the exertions of prerogative, influenced by occasional motives, disputes among religionists, and inducements of personal favour, but had not been derived from any of those sources which had produced the English Constitution. Had he the honour of being a member of the British House of Commons, he would never touch the venerable fabric of their representation; but in this kingdom, the part of the representation universally complained of, had originated in party or private motives, and he did not believe there was one prescriptive borough in the whole kingdom. He believed some boroughs were called so, but he believed unjustly; eleven of the grants which had been mentioned, did not appear at the Rolls Office, but most of these were *modern* in the time of the *House of Stuart*."