A

REVIEW

OF

MR. GRATTAN'S

ANSWER

TO THE

EARL OF CLARE'S SPEECH.

PART THE FIRST.

IN WHICH THE MERITS OF THE CONSTITUTION OF 1782, AND ITS APTNESS TO THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF IRELAND ARE INVESTIGATED.

DUBLIN:

PRINTED FOR J. MILLIKEN, 32, GRAFTON-STREET.

1800.

" *A nation ought to know itſelf.* Without this " knowledge it cannot make any ſucceſsful en- " deavours after its own perfection. It ought to " have a juſt idea of its ſtate, to enable it to take " the moſt proper meaſures; to know the pro- " greſs already made, and thoſe that are ſtill to " be put in execution. Without this knowledge " a nation will act at random, and often take " the falſeſt meaſures. It will think that it acts " with the greateſt wiſdom in imitating the con- " duct of a people reputed wiſe, and not per- " ceive that *ſuch regulations and ſuch proceedings* " *as are ſalutary to one ſtate, are often pernicious* " *to another. Every thing ought to be done accord-* " *ing to its nature.*"—Vattel, Law of Nations, ch. ii, 1ſt book.

" The firſt and moſt important duty of a na- " tion towards itſelf, is to chooſe the beſt con- " ſtitution poſſible, *and that moſt ſuitable to its* " *circumſtances.* When it makes this choice, it " lays the foundation of its preſervation, ſafety, " perfection and happineſs: it cannot take too " much care in placing theſe on a ſolid baſis."—Ib. ch. iii.

A

REVIEW,

&c. &c.

IF I aſpired to the rank of an antagoniſt to Mr. Grattan, I ſhould heſitate to approach the liſts, where he has declined the combat. "He "will take no notice of any Anſwer, except one "coming from the Author of the Pamphlet;" a quarter from whence a reply is not well to be expected. But the matter, which Mr. Grattan touches, belongs to the Iriſh public; for its information I ſhall proceed over the ſame ground. So trippingly has he run this career, that he has left nothing to anſwer in the way of argument; but he has made inſinuations which are to be repelled, and miſtatements which are to be corrected. It ſeems to be the covered deſign of this performance, to excite a ſpirit of unreflecting enthuſiaſm in favour of an eſtabliſhment, which, although it is reluctantly given up, cannot otherwiſe be ſupported. Mr. G. does not conſider, that the predilection, which he wiſhes to revive, has by himſelf been frowned and ſcolded with peculiar aſſiduity out of the country. Mr. G. has acquired a name in the affairs of Ireland; he

conſiders himſelf the author of the Conſtitution of 1782. That ſcheme of government, his boaſt and labour, is condemned as the great ſource of the calamities of this country. It is conſidered eſſential to the peace, ſtability, and well-being of Ireland, to deface his trophies, by altering the Parliamentary Conſtitution, the only member of our liberties which he claims to have eſtabliſhed; and the propoſal is nearly carried into effect. Does the ſtateſman riſe in the pride of wounded dignity to aſſert his reputation? Does the legiſlative parent vindicate his offspring? Does he prove the merits of his work by its ſalutary proviſions and practical good conſequences? Have the jarring elements, of which this iſland is compoſed, coaleſced; and has civil ſociety improved under the influence of his inſtitutions? Has he offered, by any piece of ſolid reaſoning, to account for the apparent defects of his ſyſtem; to prove that it was well aſſorted to the people, for whoſe uſe it was deſigned; to juſtify it againſt paſt experience, by the probable tenor of its future operations? No ſuch defence—no ſuch eulogium has he attempted. Without the ſlighteſt reference to its value or demerits, he means, ſo far as depends on him, to render his ſyſtem immortal. For the intention we readily might give him credit, ſtill it would be no more than decent to aſſign ſome public motive. Upon this, ſo ſolemn an occaſion, he writes with the light vivacity of a young gentleman's travelling diary. He appears to be engaged in collecting monumental inſcriptions, or preparing mottoes for a gallery of portraits. Shall I ſay, that Mr. Grattan is inſenſible to his own fame, or that he ſlumbers whilſt his favourite edifice is menaced with deſtruction? Or ſhall I invert the elegant compliment he offers

to

to the memory of Mr. Flood:—" On a *great* ſubject he is miſerable. The diſtaff is more ſuited to his arm than the thunderbolt." I cannot ſuppoſe theſe things; but fact, and reaſon, and experiment, and the ſenſe of the nation are againſt him. I proceed to compare Mr. Grattan's Pamphlet with the printed Speech he profeſſes to anſwer.

Mr. Grattan chuſes " to begin with this performance at the Iriſh Parliament of James I." I will concur with him in paſſing over the more early parts of our hiſtory. To the Lord Chancellor's Speech they form a material and luminous introduction, although they do not practically affect the preſent queſtion. But Mr. G. might have found in the Speech, ſomewhat prior in point of order, matter very much deſerving his critical attention.

" My opinions," ſays the Earl of Clare, " upon " this ſubject, have not been recently or lightly " formed; early profeſſional habits had taught " me to inveſtigate the foundation of Iriſh titles, " and of neceſſity to look back into Iriſh hiſtory: " it had been my fortune to be called into active " and forward public ſervice, perhaps during " the moſt eventful period of it; and from a " critical and attentive obſervation of what has " paſſed in Ireland for the laſt twenty years, I " am ſatisfied in my judgment and conſcience, " that the exiſtence of her independent Parliament has gradually led to her recent complicated and bitter calamities, and that it has at length become deſperate and impracticable. I did, more than once, when I ſat in the Houſe of Commons, ſtate, without reſerve, that the rapid growth of faction, and precipitate folly and paſſion of men, who from time to time

" were ſuffered to take a commanding lead in " the councils of that aſſembly, would inevit- " ably reduce us to the alternative of Separation " or Union. I have with as little reſerve ſtated " the ſame opinion ſince I have had the honour " of a ſeat in this Houſe."

Here the Anſwer ſhould have made its firſt ſtand, if it propoſed to argue. The Speech relates the progreſs, by which an intelligent mind was led to adopt the meaſure in contemplation. It accuſes Mr. Grattan's friends of that degree of intemperance and faction, by which the conſtitution of Parliamentary Independence was rendered impracticable and dangerous. If my recollection is accurate, Mr. Fitzgibbon, with prophetic good ſenſe, told theſe gentlemen in the Houſe of Commons, at the cloſe of the memorable debate of 1785, that their imprudent exerciſe of the privilege of independence, would compel the Crown to conſult its ſafety by an Union. Indeed, in a ſubſequent part of the Pamphlet, Mr. G. alleges this long-formed opinion of a principal Miniſter as the vindication of his own party. His argument and inference ſtand thus :—" A principal Miniſter of the Crown has been led, by the indiſcretion of my party and myſelf, to give up as an untenable form of government, the ſeparate Parliament of Ireland ; and becauſe we forced upon him this ſenſe of expediency, our indiſcretion is completely vindicated." Methinks another queſtion ariſes, which it would have become Mr. G. to diſpoſe of: Which have his party and himſelf diſplayed the temper of provident and ſober legiſlators, or of indiſcreet political combatants ?—But we ſhall have occaſion again to reaſſume this topic.

The

The Speech maintains, that James I. eſtabliſhed a regular Government and Parliamentary Conſtitution in Ireland, (page 11.) It makes a diſtinction between this General Aſſembly of the States of the iſland, introduced by James I. and the Provincial Meetings of the ſettlers of the Pale, dignified by the name of Parliaments. "Here," exclaims the author, "his pages only deſerve attention, in order to "vindicate the lineage of our liberties againſt "ſlander." And then he leaves the lineage of our liberties to vindicate itſelf, with only the aid of a few hard expreſſions to ſerve as catch-words——"This ſtatement is a traduc-"tion 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 parliamen-"tum*, the ſtatute-book, the extent of acts of "Parliament before the reign of James through-"out the realm, and the act of annexation among "others, anſwer him. From all thoſe you find, "that Ireland had a Parliament from the begin-"ning, and that the Legiſlature was not of the "Pale, but of the nation." Mr. Grattan's Anſwer, page 2.

Now, this concluſion, I do moſt deciſively contradict. The *modus tenendi parliamentum*, if indeed the document be genuine, which is much diſputed, was tranſmitted to Ireland by Henry II. long previous to the period when the principle of repreſentation was known even to the Engliſh Conſtitution. It was, probably, the wiſh and hope of Henry, that the Iriſh Chiefs might be drawn as near to the condition of ſubjects, as his Engliſh Barons; but his deſign was totally fruſtrated. The *modus tenendi parliamentum* proves merely the inclination of the Monarch;

and

and thoſe hiſtorical facts, which are known to every perſon in the leaſt converſant with our annals, demonſtrate that the intention never became effectual. The matter in controverſy is, whether before the reign of James I. there was a general plan of regular government in Ireland under the ſuperintendance of a national repreſentation; and Lord Coke and the opinions of the Judges are cited, who declared what nobody denies, that a Parliamentary Aſſembly was uſually held for the management of the diſtrict, comparatively a narrow one, which was under ſubjection to the laws of England. The records of our ſtatutes before James, and the Act of Annexation prove no more. What by a bold flight of imperialiſm we now denominate the Act of Annexation, (33d Hen. VIII. c. 1.) was in truth no more than an alteration in the Royal ſtyle. Little did the framers of that act imagine, that it was to be reputed the great bulwark of the title by which the Crown of England holds the ſovereignty of this realm. It ſets out that the King of England, uſing only the ſtile of Lord of Ireland, enjoyed nevertheleſs all kingly prerogatives. It prays in the name of Parliament and of all the King's loving ſubjects, that his Majeſty will be pleaſed to aſſume the title of King of Ireland, and alleges as a motive, that the *Iriſhmen* will be thereby rendered more obedient. This ſtatute is any thing but a limitation of the Iriſh Crown to the Monarchs of England; for it ſuppoſes the dominion of Ireland to be already veſted in them. By the lineage of our liberties, Mr. G. means the pedigree of Parliament. Let him hear the ſentiments of an intelligent man, who conſidered this matter at a period when it was not involved in obſcurity.

Davies' Tracts, page 232. "For the ſpace of "140 years after Henry II. had taken poſſeſſion "of

" of Ireland, there was but one Parliament for
" both kingdoms. The laws made in the Parlia-
" ment of England were from time to time tranſ-
" mitted hither under the great ſeal of that king-
" dom, to be proclaimed and executed as the laws
" of this realm.

" In this manner was the great charter of the
" ancient liberties of the Engliſh ſubjects, the ſta-
" tutes of Merton and Marlebridge, ſent over by
" King John and King Henry III. the ſtatutes of
" Weſtminſter, the firſt, ſecond, and third, and
" the ſtatute of Glouceſter by King Edw. I. the
" ſtatutes of Lincoln and of York by King
" Edw. II.

" Among the reſt, that of Weſtminſter the ſe-
" cond, and that of York, in their ſeveral pream-
" bles do make expreſs mention of the people
" and land of Ireland, as well as of England,
" where the laws were made.

" All which ſtatutes, together with the war-
" rants and writs, whereby they were tranſmit-
" ted, we find enrolled, and preſerved to this day
" among the records of this kingdom.

" But what then? How long ſince? In what
" King's reign was this great common council,
" this high Court of Parliament, erected firſt and
" eſtabliſhed in Ireland?

" Doubtleſs, though the reſt of the ordinary
" courts of juſtice began with the firſt plantation
" of the Engliſh colonies here, yet the wiſdom
" of the ſtate of England thought it fit to reſerve
" the power of making laws to the Parliaments
" of England for many years after.

" So as this high extraordinary court was not
" eſtabliſhed in Ireland by any authority out of
" England, for many years after the form that
" now it is, till towards the declining of King

" Edward

" Edward the Second's reign. For before that " time, the meetings and conſultations of the " great Lords with ſome of the Commons, for ap- " peaſing of diſſenſions among themſelves, though " they be called Parliaments in the ancient annals, " yet being without orderly ſummons, or formal " proceedings, are rather to be called Parlies than " Parliaments.

" But by what reaſon of ſtate was the ſtate of " England moved to eſtabliſh this Court of Par- " liament in Ireland at that time ?

" Aſſuredly this common council was then in- " ſtituted when Ireland ſtood moſt in need of coun- " cil ; for under the conduct of Edward le Brus, " the Scottiſh nation had over-run the whole " realm, England had the ſame enemy at her back, " and the barons' rebellion in her bowels ; and " ſo, being diſtracted in herſelf, could give neither " conſilium nor auxilium to the diſtreſſed ſubjects " here, ſo as they, being left to their own ſtrength " and council, did then obtain authority from the " ſtate of England to hold this common council " of the realm among themſelves, for the quench- " ing of that common fire that had almoſt con- " ſumed the whole kingdom.

" And this, by the teſtimony of the beſt anti- " quaries, was the firſt time, and firſt occaſion of " inſtituting this high Court of Parliament in " Ireland."

Ibid, page 296. " For the ſpace of 140 years " after the meeting of this high Court in Ireland, " it is apparent, *that never any Parliament was* " *called to reduce the Iriſh to obedience, or perfect* " *the conqueſt of the whole iſland, but only to reform* " *the Engliſh colonies that were degenerate, and to* " *retain the ſovereignty of the Crown of England* " *over them, and to no other end or purpoſe.*"

Davies

Davies then proceeds to recount the objects for which ſubſequent Parliaments were held, and concludes, that until 10 Henry VII. they were for " ſuch mean and ordinary matters, " as, but for want of other buſineſs were not fit " to be handled in ſo high a court." Page 298.

After dwelling on the merits of Sir Edward Poynings, he treats in theſe words of the ſeveral Parliamentary Aſſemblies from 10th Henry VII. to his own time, 1613:

" For what end was the Parliament holden by " the Lord Leonard Gray, in 28 H. VIII. but to " attaint the Giraldines?

" Wherefore did Sir Anthony St. Leger call " the next Parliament after in 38 H. VIII. but to " inveſt that Prince with the title of King of Ire- " land, and to ſuppreſs the abbeys and religious " houſes?

" To what purpoſe did Thomas Earl of Suſſex " hold his firſt Parliament in 3 & 4 of King " Philip and Queen Mary, but to ſettle Leix and " Offaly in the Crown?

" And his ſecond in the ſecond year of Queen " Elizabeth, but to re-eſtabliſh the reformed re- " ligion in this kingdom?

" What was the principal cauſe that Sir Henry " Sidney held a Parliament in the 11th year of " Queen Elizabeth, but to extinguiſh the name " of O'Neale, and entitle the Crown to the great- " eſt part of Ulſter?

" And laſtly, what was the chief motive of the " laſt Parliament holden by Sir John Perrott, but " the attainder of two great peers of this realm, " the Viſcount Baltinglas, and the Earl of Deſ- " mond, and for veſting their lands, and the lands

" of their adherents, in the actual poſſeſſion of " the Crown.

" And now having made a ſummary collection " of the principal cauſes of ſummoning the for- " mer Parliaments, which from time to time have " been holden ſince the firſt inſtitution of this " high court in Ireland, I muſt not forget to note " alſo unto your Lordſhip, what and how many " perſons were called in former times to make " up the body of this great council.

" For the perſons, before the 33d year of King " H. VIII. we do not find any to have had place " in Parliament, but the Engliſh of blood, or " Engliſh of birth only; for the mere Iriſh in " thoſe days were never admitted, as well be- " cauſe their countries lying out of the limits of " counties, could ſend no knights, and having " neither cities nor boroughs in them, could ſend " no burgeſſes to the Parliament; beſides, the " ſtate did not then hold them fit to be truſted " with the counſel of the realm.

" For the number, ſince before the 34th year " of King H. VIII. when Meath was divided in- " to ſhires, there were no more than twelve " counties in Ireland, beſides the liberty of Tip- " perary; the number of knights muſt needs have " been few; and ſince the ancient cities were but " four, and the boroughs which ſent burgeſſes " not above thirty, the entire body of the whole " Houſe of Commons could not then conſiſt of " one hundred perſons; and though Queen Mary " did add two ſhires, and Queen Elizabeth ſeven- " teen more, to increaſe the number of knights " in that houſe, yet all did not ſend knights to " the Parliament; for the remote ſhires of Ulſter " returned none at all.

" For

" For the Lords temporal, though they are yet " but few, yet was the number leſs before King " H. VIII. was ſtyled King of Ireland; for ſince " that time divers of the Iriſh nobility, and ſome " deſcended of Engliſh race, have been created " both earls and barons.

" And laſtly, for the biſhops and archbiſhops, " though their number was greater than now it " is, in reſpect of divers unions made of latter " years, yet ſuch as were reſident in the mere " Iriſh countries, and did not acknowledge the " King to be their patron, were never ſummoned " to any Parliament."

" The preſent Parliament," he ſays again, (ſpeaking of the firſt Parliament of King James, anno 1613) " is not called in ſuch a time as when " the four ſhires of the pale only did ſend their " barons, knights, and burgeſſes to the Parlia- " ment, when they alone took upon them to " make laws to bind the whole kingdom, ne- " glecting to call the ſubjects reſiding in other " parts of the realm unto them, as appeareth by " that Parliament holden by the Viſcount of " Gormanſtown, which Sir Edward Poynings, " in the tenth year of King Hen. VII. cauſed to " be utterly repealed, and the acts thereof made " void, chiefly for that the ſummons of Parlia- " ment went forth to the four ſhires of the pale " only, and not unto all the reſt of the coun- " ties.

" But it is called in ſuch a time, when this " great and mighty kingdom, being wholly re- " duced to ſhire ground, containeth thirty-three " counties at large; when all Ulſter and Con- " naught, as well as Leinſter and Munſter, have " voices in Parliament by their knights and bur- " geſſes; when all the inhabitants of the king-

" dom, Engliſh of birth, Engliſh of blood, the " new Britiſh colony, and the old Iriſh natives, " do all meet together to make laws for the com- " mon good of themſelves and their poſteri- " ties.

" To this end his Majeſty hath moſt graci- " ouſly and juſtly erected divers new boroughs " in ſundry parts of this kingdom. I ſay his " Majeſty hath done it moſt juſtly, even as his " Highneſs himſelf hath been pleaſed to ſay, " that he was obliged in juſtice and honour to " give all his free ſubjects of this kingdom indif- " ferent and equal voices in making of their " laws, ſo as one half of the ſubjects ſhould not " make laws alone, which ſhould bind the other " half without their conſents."

It appears from the ſame hiſtorical tracts of Sir John Davies, page 80, that until the reign of James I. charters of denization were habitually granted by every Prince to the Iriſh, as to perſons not entitled to the legal advantages of ſubjects; and theſe charters were held neceſſary in order to qualify the grantees to maintain actions in any court of common law. James I. diſcontinued the practice of granting ſuch particular charters, *becauſe he had received the entire nation into the claſs of ſubjects.* In another paſſage the ſame author informs us, that before the acceſſion of this Prince, the royal authority was ſo feeble and precarious, that no laws could be enforced but by an army. It is alſo deſerving of notice, that not one of the Iriſh annaliſts ſpeaks of Parliament. It did not enter into their notions of national dignity or intereſt.

In Farmer's Chronicle of Iriſh Affairs, preſerved in the Deſiderata Curioſa Hiberniæ, we are informed, that when the ſeſſion of 1613 was opened by Lord Chicheſter, the proceſſion from Chriſt Church to the Houſe of Parliament was repeatedly

peatedly interrupted by altercations, extending even to blows, between different peers for precedency; a plain teſtimony that they were convened to an extremely unuſual aſſembly. A paper, preſerved in the ſame collection inſtructs us, that the people of Ulſter had no conception of the nature or meaning of Parliaments. See examination before Sir T. Caulfield.

Let me now entreat the public, to compare the Earl of Clare's account of the origin of our preſent Parliamentary Conſtitution with Mr. Grattan's contradiction, and Sir John Davies's teſtimony, and to determine to whom this extraordinary compliment ſhould with propriety be applied:—"The boldneſs of this aſ-"ſertion is rendered more remarkable, by the "diſtinguiſhed feebleneſs of its reaſoning."—Mr. Grattan's Anſwer, page 2.

Certainly no hiſtorical fact can be placed more completely beyond controverſy, than this, which the Earl of Clare aſſerted, and which Mr. Grattan very raſhly controverts, that James I. introduced regular government in Ireland, and extended the cares of Parliament, and the circle of its duties, from the colony to the iſland. He gave to the nation a deliberative aſſembly of dignity, weight, and univerſal intereſt. But it is objected, becauſe the baſis of this aſſembly was not a popular repreſentation, that it therefore muſt have been a contrivance to overpower the freedom of Parliament, and extend the prerogative*. Do thoſe who make the objection know what at the time was the ſtate of the royal prerogative? In England it was high; in Ireland it was unlimited. Although King James had never called a Parliament, he might have governed without interruption like his predeceſſor; and the

* "To pack a Parliament." Mr. Grattan's Anſwer. See alſo his Addreſs to the Citizens of Dublin.

the Prince, who had power to create an entirely new conſtitution, was doubtleſs not obliged to depend on that conſtitution for his influence. It matters little whether the ſeventeen counties were created by Elizabeth or James. Doubtleſs the plan which James carried into effect, was ſketched in the cabinet of Elizabeth. Theſe ſeventeen counties appear to have had a legal, but until the year 1613, they had no political exiſtence.

As to the merits of the conſtitution eſtabliſhed by King James, it is new matter, too extenſive for a digreſſion. I am ſatisfied to aſcertain the date of Parliament in Ireland under its preſent form, and of regular government under any form whatſoever. To Mr. Grattan's accuſation I reply, that Ireland never was at any period leſs fit for a popular government. —James I. who might have governed this nation as an abſolute Monarch, reſtrained his prerogative by ſummoning a Parliament, and ſtill more encumbered himſelf, by augmenting conſiderably the number of perſons whom that Parliament was to conſiſt of. He who need never have intermeddled with county repreſentation, or permitted himſelf to be fettered by it, is preſumed by Mr. Grattan to have taken ſo much trouble, merely to counteract that county repreſentation. He is preſumed to have in a great meaſure created a Parliament, or at leaſt drawn it from the oblivion in which it ſlumbered, for no purpoſe but to traffic with it. Mr. G. writes for that part of mankind, who will accept as argument, hard words, and intemperate declamation.

clamation. He makes his aſſertion, and then wraps himſelf in myſterious jargon, intelligible perhaps to his votaries, but to no other. See Anſwer, pages 2 & 3.—Let me inform him, that the traffic of packing a Parliament is of much more recent date. Such things were ſaid to be in the contemplation of ſome of Lord F————m's counſellors. There are others, I believe, better acquainted with theſe arts, than either the Monarch, or the modern Miniſter whom Mr. Grattan cenſures.

To my view the defects and errors of King James's project are of a very different complexion. It did not immediately connect Ireland with the ſuperior government; it did not create an intereſt on behalf of this nation, in the breaſts of thoſe who were to regulate its deſtiny; it gave birth to the fatal principle of diſtinctneſs. That which it profeſſed, it unqueſtionably accompliſhed. A competent proportion of the notable men of Ireland, were called under this inſtitution to aſſiſt and to controul the government; and this practice was more congenial to the conſtitution it was deſigned to imitate than Mr. G.'s favorite plans of general repreſentation. If in the relative circumſtances of Great-Britain and Ireland, an eſtabliſhment of ſeparate Parliaments was calculated to produce the good of the weaker nation, that end King James's Parliament would have accompliſhed; but Wales was the precedent in point. If the ſame courſe of proceeding had been followed in the ſettlement of Ireland, we might have avoided moſt of the calamities of the laſt age, and we ſhould have been by a century more forward in cultivation and proſperity. Parliaments were

not

not regularly held, although the groundwork of them was laid, until after the Revolution. For the inconveniencies ſince that period, Parliament may be deemed reſponſible; of the evils of the former century it certainly is blameleſs. "*The lineage of our liberties*," is not then, what Mr. G. ſtates it, but critically thus:—For 140 years after the Engliſh ſettlement in Ireland, our barons made one Parliament with thoſe of England. From Edward II. to Henry VII. a Provincial Aſſembly was occaſionally held for purpoſes nearly of a private nature. Under Henry VII. an appearance of more ſolemn legiſlation was aſſumed; but until James I. it did not extend its cares from the ſettlement to the iſland. The model of a national Parliament was formed, among other projects for regular government, by that Prince; his projects were fruſtrated by improvident efforts, to force an ignorant people from their religious prejudices, and the country was governed very much without Parliaments until the Revolution. From that event to the year 1782, we languiſhed under the aſſiduous uſe of theſe aſſemblies. About the year 1782, a new ſyſtem aroſe; by the acknowledgment of the actors in this change, it appears to have been ſtruck out haſtily, improvidently, and with little foreſight. From this innovation we ſeemed to live in a delirium of liberty; not valuing any franchiſe, but that of obſtructing government and quarrelling with our rulers. At length the fever reached our lower people; they burſt into inſurrection; the ſervant againſt his maſter, the peaſant againſt his landlord. This is the hiſtory of our Parliament. Let Mr. Grattan lay his hand upon his conſcience, and anſwer there, how far his precipitancy as a ſtateſman, his intemperance an an orator,

his

his imprudent ambition, as the leader of a party, contributed to our calamities.

I have reſted on this hiſtorical aſſertion of Mr. Grattan; as between antiquaries the queſtion is of little import. Whether Henry or James laid the foundation of the conſtitution, the form of our government ought to be ſubjected to this teſt, and to this alone, is it productive of civil good and ſocial proſperity? Theſe ſpeculations of national vanity, are ſtarted to divert the public mind from the eſſential conſiderations, on a ſober view of which the merits of the Union ought to be decided. Mr. Saurin, a gentleman, whatever may be his weight or conſideration in other reſpects, who in this affair of the Union has acted under impreſſions of ſingular ſimplicity, and deviated far from a ſound intelligence either of our hiſtory or conſtitution, is made in ſome of his printed ſpeeches, to recommend the preſent ſtate of connection, by the experience of 500 years. The preſcription of 500 years may well be alledged to protect the rights of the Britiſh Crown in Ireland. That it cannot cover the inſtitution of Parliament we have already ſhewn; the truth is, that the preſent ſtate of connection can boaſt a preſcription of exactly 18 years, ſince the repeal of the law of Poynings. That event was the material revolution in the annals of the connection. Until 1782, the bonds of union between Great Britain and Ireland were the identity of the Monarch, the influence of the Crown, and the initiative of the Privy Council. By the abrogation of the laſt, at the period I mention, the Parliament of Ireland acquired new rights, and aſſumed a new poſition in the Britiſh empire. The ſeparate Parliament, brought to perfection by King James, was held in check by the

controul of the Privy Council over its deliberations. It is only from the year 1782, that Ireland has had a Parliament, acting and deliberating from within itſelf. We have therefore preciſely the pride of 18 years to feed our vanity, and the experience of 18 years to inſtruct us, how far this ſpecies of eſtabliſhment is calculated to confirm and protect the combination of the Britiſh iſlands.

The tranſaction of 1782 is a ſort of myſtic ground, over which Mr. Grattan waves his wand, and forbids the impertinent approach of criticiſm. Whoever does not think with him on this ſubject, " is a ſlave," page 4. Preciſely in the ſame ſpirit Lord Peter is made to ſay, " If any " man refuſe to believe that this brown loaf is " a leg of mutton, may G—d d——n him." Thoſe were called ſlaves in France by the conſtitutionaliſts, who deſired to ſupport the Crown on the baſis of the antient corporations. The Briſſotines would have neither crown nor corporations. Danton proceeded further ; he would not admit order; and Robeſpierre diſcarded decency and humanity. As each innovation ſucceſſively prevailed, the innovator protected himſelf, and overwhelmed his adverſary with this ſort of ſummary denunciation. At this day few can doubt that he, who endeavours to feel his way, when he deviates from antient eſtabliſhments, is the man who takes the moſt ſolid precaution againſt tyranny. About the time Mr. Grattan began to take a lead in politics, the ſtate of Ireland unqueſtionably offered materials upon which to ground a " great tranſaction." In that form, which he imparted to the *tranſaction*, I moſt urgently proteſt againſt qualifying it, with this epithet of approbation. We ſhall be enabled to form a judgment

judgment by conſidering what, previous to the affair of 1782, were the neceſſities of Ireland, and how far the arrangement of that period was calculated to remove them. It is, perhaps, the fault of my weak judgment; but I ſee this famed proceeding ſomewhat in the ſame light with that compliment, of which Dr. Goldſmith obſerves jocoſely, that "it was like ſending you ruffles when "wanting a ſhirt."—"The Pamphlet," ſays Mr. G. "now comes to its own times; it ſtates the "adjuſtment of 1782." To that eventful tranſaction I ſhall endeavour to accompany "the Pamphlet," and the Anſwer.

The Earl of Clare conducts us to this æra of 1782, by a very clear and circumſtantial detail of the origin and growth of the factions that beſet the government of Ireland. He has fully detected and expoſed the political profligacy of parties, who preſerved the image of a free conſtitution, without care or concern to communicate its practical advantages; merely uſing it, like the appearances of decorum, to enhance the ſtipend of immorality. I will not attempt to imitate or abridge this valuable piece of hiſtory; and it is ſuperfluous to tranſcribe from a recent Work in univerſal circulation. (See Speech of Earl of Clare, from page 26 to 30.) But here the angry animadverſion of Mr. G. is provoked; and he acquits himſelf ſomewhat as in the *affair of the lineage of our liberties.* He comes on with bold aſſertion, but flies off, after this vigorous onſet, into rhodomontade and arrant nonſenſe. "The Pamphlet," ſays he, "now comes to its "own times, and it is to be remarked, that as it "dwelt on the paſt with all the fury and preju-"dices of the preſent time, ſo it expatiates on "the preſent with as much error and miſtake,

" as if it were treating of the remoteſt anti-
" quity." In what conſiſts this error? A ſerious charge deſerves to be ſupported by evidence of ſome material miſconſtruction. The Ariſtocracy of Ireland had common ſympathies with the people; it never laid rapacious hands upon the public property; it never haraſſed the Crown by its cabals, nor diſturbed the people by its controverſies; turbulent alternately, and oppreſſive, as it happened to be thwarted or indulged. Theſe are not Mr. G.'s allegations; indeed they would ill become him. No; he ſeeks the important materials of his accuſation from another quarter. Truly he is ſuppoſed to have attributed a higher ſtock of merit, than he is at preſent willing to admit, to the famed Convention at Dungannon!

And does Mr. Grattan indeed diſcard Dungannon now? How low are laid the glories of that celebrated ſpot! Time was, when Dungannon was to have been decorated with monuments and trophies; and thither, as to Mecca or Delphos, the votaries of independence were to reſort in pious pilgrimage. At this day, to give the aſſembly at Dungannon a principal ſhare in the conſtitution of 1782, is to " blemiſh a great tranſaction." I cannot ſpeak to the preciſe words, as I do not know to what particular occurrence the Earl of Clare alludes; but ſurely what that nobleman aſſerts was the general tenor of all Mr. G.'s public declarations. " The Preſby-
" terian Church*," ſays he at one time, " is the
" parent of the conſtitution." Mr. Flood went further; he made the conſtitution of 1782 an emanation from America†. I will not waſte time

* Debate on the Catholic Bill, 1782.

† " A voice from America ſhouted to Liberty—the echo
" of it caught our people, as it paſſed acroſs the Atlantic,
" and it reverberated here." Mr. Flood's Speech in 1783.

in

in ſplitting frivolous points. Mr. G. ſcarcely advances a page from this reſolute charge, when he takes up and places on his front the obloquy he deprecates. It is alledged, that the tranſaction of 1782, in which that gentleman bore a principal figure, was not a ſound and ſober exerciſe of legiſlative deliberation; that a popular outcry was indiſcreetly, not to ſay criminally, excited, to which Government yielded from panic and from neceſſity. The eſſence of the accuſation is, the dangerous precedent of intimidating Government. Now, the meeting at Dungannon was either an inſtrument of intimidation, or it was a pageant. "I reſpect and admire the meeting at Dungannon," ſays Mr. G. For what does he reſpect it? Becauſe it fulfilled ſome public purpoſe. But one object alone was in the contemplation of the meeting—to conquer from the Government a ſyſtem of legiſlative independence. On this point Dungannon profeſſed to ſpeak the ſentiments of one armed province, and to direct and animate the energies of the remainder. With theſe pretenſions, and on theſe alone, Dungannon was attended to; yet, in the language of Mr. G. to make Dungannon a principal in the buſineſs of 1782, is "to falſify hiſtory, and blemiſh a great tranſaction." Then Mr. G. admires and reſpects the agent, whilſt he conſiders the only act of its exiſtence a blemiſh. He admits Dungannon to be a ſource ſo impure, as to "blemiſh" the tranſaction of 1782; and yet, according to himſelf, the participation of the Dungannon Convention is incontrovertible.

A friend will venture on liberties, which he does not permit to any other. This is ſurely the condition of Mr. G. with reſpect to his favorite

favorite conſtitution. After much heſitating and ſtammering, he reaſſerted the poſitions which he has affected to repel; and if the accuſation of the Speech be a "*blemiſh*," he has counterſigned the diſgrace of his "*tranſaction*." "The ſubjects of 1782 did not emanate from "Dungannon; two years before they were diſ- "cuſſed 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 counties and various deſcriptions* "*of men, and finally they paſſed the Parliament.*"

Does Mr. G. mean, that in 1782 the propoſition he advances was more clear than in 1780, or the parliamentary conviction of its propriety more prevalent? If ſo, what becomes of this machinery of counties and deſcriptions? Doubtleſs they urged the tardy prudence of Government, and produced an expediency which it was held neceſſary to acquieſce in. Without this circumſtance Mr. G., leſs rich by 50,000*l.*, might ſtill aſſail in vain the deliberative wiſdom of the Houſe of Commons. Then external and popular interference was employed in 1782, againſt the ſovereign authority; and the fatal precedent was created, and what more does the Speech import, or allege to have been pronounced by Mr. Grattan? But this gentleman in the next page puts this matter beyond all difficulty.—"Does any man," he exclaims, "mean "to affirm, that we could have eſtabliſhed that "claim without the Volunteers? If ſo, he is a "miſtater of the truth." Now, Mr. G. appears to me to be the only perſon diſpoſed to queſtion the fact he here triumphantly eſtabliſhes. The Earl of Clare did not doubt the interpoſition of the Volunteers, nor the importance of that interpoſition, but he arraigned its propri-

ety.

ety. Mr. G. ſets forward with vehemence, and concludes by confirming the very impreſſion he propoſed to overturn. Admirable apologiſt!

One circumſtance, indeed, is pretty obvious from this bungling vindication—that experience and common ſenſe have altered the temper of this country. If the ſpirit that appeared at Dungannon ſtill continued to animate any conſiderable portion of men, Mr. G. would have appealed to it; he would not thus falter in his panegyric. In truth, time has diveſted this tranſaction of its impoſing circumſtances, and extinguiſhed the enthuſiaſm that upheld it. We know the value of the acquiſition; it gave dominion to the Ariſtocracy; it conferred his fortune upon Mr. G. and left to the people falſe views, perverſe habits, and viſionary pretenſions.

The Earl of Clare, in tracing the hiſtory of our cabals, developes a ſyſtem of adminiſtration "which would beat down the moſt powerful nation upon the earth."—— Government, at length awakened "to the defects and dangers of it, attempted to ſhake the power of the Ariſtocracy." During this conflict, Mr. G. entered upon the ſcene. Probably he did not deſign or foreſee the conſequences of his meaſures; for he ſeems very much to have taken his politics at random. But Mr. G. under colour of the independence of Ireland, did deciſively play the game of the Oligarchy. Theſe cabals were already beyond all proportion too powerful for the Crown and for the country, although they were reſtrained by the law of Poynings and the ſupremacy of the Britiſh Parliament. Mr. G., by his forcible declamation, excited ſo much outcry, and an antipathy to theſe two regulations ſo violent, that Government,

ment, in a moment of diſtreſs and diſmay, thought it prudent, by the ſacrifice of them, to gratify the popular impatience; and the Oligarchy remained thenceforward without any curb whatſoever. The Iriſh Parliament and nation were ſo conſtituted, that the popular influence was mere theory. That people, whoſe name was uſed, and whoſe force was moſt raſhly ſet in motion, took nothing by the conceſſion; but the Oligarchy, who ſtood behind the curtain ran away with the advantage. Thus the Iriſh Nation was taught, that its Government might be intimidated; it was inſtructed how to proceed, and what moments to ſelect; and no one ſtep was taken, by which it might be induced to forbear from reverting again to the experiment. In the affair of 1782, the *rights of men* were at every inſtant in the mouths of legiſlators and of popular leaders; but, lo! when the exertion was made, the public found that they had toiled with great ſimplicity to augment the powers of a few perſons of overgrown influence. And the manner this ſervice was received by the Oligarchy, aſcertains the nature of it. Mr. G. was rewarded by a profuſe donation. It was juſt in the ſame ſpirit, that a ſum of £30,000, was voted to the Duke of Ormond, to requite his exertions in procuring the act of Settlement. The Commons were grateful in the one inſtance for the influence they acquired; in the other, for the eſtates of the unfortunate Iriſh that were ſecured to them. Let no man talk of Ireland in a tranſaction, thus contrary to every principle of ſound policy and national advantage. Boaſt, if you will, that you improved the borough market, and enhanced the value of a ſeat in Parliament. To found upon them a claim of merit, theſe matters muſt be proved to have ſome connection

with

with the welfare of the country. The free trade, although the effects of it upon this kingdom are exceſſively overrated, ſtands on a very different ground. Even this matter as between Great-Britain and Ireland was more proper to be negotiated for, than extorted. The times however, the juſtice of the demand, and the importance of the acquiſition will apologize for ſome tranſgreſſions of political intemperance. One muſt reſpect the perſons who upon that occaſion urged the pretenſions of Ireland with effect, and directed its energies with ſagacity. Theſe were not the merits of the Conſtitution of 1782; this is not the fund which Mr. Grattan draws on.

Is there on earth a diſpaſſionate man, who will aver, that in the affair of 1782 an appropriate remedy was applied to the grievances of Ireland? The inhabitants of this country at the time might be divided, into thoſe who were concerned in the political management of the kingdom; thoſe who derived ſome profit by their reſidence; and the claſs of cultivators who were fixed to the ſoil by the difficulty of removal. The firſt claſs were not in general the great properties of the kingdom. The natural Ariſtocracy tranſplanted itſelf to England, leaving their political influence in Ireland, as a proviſion for the younger branches of their families. Under the adminiſtration of the Lords Juſtices an act of Parliament was obtained, which under the uſual pretence of public improvement, converted at one ſtroke all the boroughs of the land into private property. When the James's and the Charles's created corporations, the law ran, that no corporator ſhould exerciſe his franchiſe, unleſs he reſided within the precincts of the borough. But the new dynaſties that ſettled themſelves in Ireland, found this ob-

ſtacle inconvenient. They procured a law, that threw open the privilege of electing in boroughs to non-reſident freemen; and then, by introducing a number of their own connections and dependants, wherever they could gain admiſſion, they compleatly ouſted thoſe, who were alone in the contemplation of the original charters. I have heard it aſſerted that *during ſome former Parliaments* 220 members ſat by private nomination. If this aſſertion be accurate; if, in conſequence of the habitual non reſidence of the natural leaders of the country, the compoſition of theſe members was ſtill more defective, ſurely it was not patriotiſm to extend thoſe powers which had hitherto been made ſubſervient to mercenary views, and which ſtill were probably to be ſubject to the ſame miſapplication; for the ſcheme of 1782 contained neither precaution nor corrective.

Of the ſecond claſs I have deſcribed, the natural deſtination was induſtry. But the habits of this order were badly caſt. It was taught to look to other things than frugality. Mixing with a peaſantry, whom they were permitted to trample under foot, this deſcription of men became overbearing and intemperate; and politics were ſo very near at hand, that they almoſt conſidered the purſuit as a proviſion for their children.

The third denomination contained a people, ſuſpected for its race, deteſted for its religion, deſpiſed for its poverty; untaught, unprotected; with fierce paſſions, which every thing was calculated to irritate and inflame, and nothing tended to mollify. Upon theſe materials the ſtateſmen of 1782 were to act. What was their conduct? They utterly neglected thoſe claſſes which were proper ſubjects for reform; and they removed the checks by which Government was enabled

to

to bridle that order, whoſe evil example and corrupt practices threw the entire ſtate into confuſion.

Do I mean to imply, that Mr. Grattan's friends in 1782 ought to have promoted a more popular repreſentation? By no means; although at that time the expedient might have been reſorted to with greater ſafety, than of late, when Mr. G. thought right to recommend it. I think after the acquiſition of the free trade, they ought to have ſuffered the country to reſt. I think they were to blame in raſhly deſpoiling the Crown of advantages, which although not correſponding to the theory of the Engliſh Conſtitution, were in the caſe of Ireland beneficial, and afforded a ſubſtantial ſecurity to the ſubject. Above all I reprehend them for exaſperating the diſcontents of this nation, and exciting and fomenting a diſpoſition to innovate, and all this on the ſcore of matters, which were either nugatory or injurious, and which in general were adverſe to the elementary principles of political prudence. To this Mr. Grattan replies. "To have counte-
"nanced reſolutions eſſential to the eſtabliſh-
"ment of your conſtitution, and to have op-
"poſed any further interference when that Con-
"ſtitution was eſtabliſhed, was the duty and
"pride of them by whom the buſineſs of 1782
"was conducted." Thus Petion might have ſaid, "I raiſed a mob to dethrone the King, and I put up a tri-coloured ribbon to ſtop them, when they would fain diſpatch him; but my barrier was laughed at." And thus might Mirabeau and Barnave have declared, "when we had inſtigated the people to every kind of phrenzy, and undermined the foundation of ſocial order, we preached to a populace who diſregarded us, the boundaries of law and liberty." We are converſant with the hiſtory of Mr. Grattan's tranſaction. We know that, when certain gentlemen were

taken into power by the Duke of Portland, and by Lord Northington*, their former followers did not exactly agree with them, as to the meaſure of innovation; they turned about indeed and chid the angry ſpirit of the times; but the ſpirit of the times retorted the rebuke, and ſcoffed and reviled its monitors; and ſpoke of inconſiſtency, upbraiding its former friendſhip, and their preſent elevation. Fortunately the Government of Ireland had preſerved its armed force and its influence. Theſe were of more avail than Mr. Grattan's counſel or Petion's ribbons. The ferment was allayed for that time; but the deſire of innovation, and the pretext and precedent ſunk deep in the public mind of this kingdom. You may trace every one of them in the ſteps preparatory to the late diſturbance. I admit that it is rather the part of an auſtere political moraliſt, to ſit in judgment, and try, by the experience of the preſent time, a matter tranſacted before the awful leſſon of France had afforded its inſtruction. Many, concerned in the politics of 1782, would recoil in theſe days from any tendency to innovation. But when Mr. Grattan oſtentatiouſly puts forward the affair of 1782, he abandons his claim to that indemnity. "We ſaved the Government," ſays Mr. G. That I deny; tho' I entirely admit that he endangered it. We thought," ſays he, "that at "this time as in the period of Magna Charta, "armed men might make declarations to reco-"ver liberty, and having recovered it, we "thought they ſecured their glory as well as "their freedom, by retiring to cultivate the "bleſſings of peace." But it was neceſſary in order to repair the miſchief, that the armed men ſhould be of the ſame opinion. A very great proportion

* See debate on Mr. Flood's motion for a Parliamentary reform.

proportion of them happened to differ, as did a ſtill greater proportion of their unarmed fellow-ſubjects, who felt in themſelves the ability and diſpoſition for martial atchievements.

I cannot paſs over this eternal vigilance to compare the affair of 1782 to Magna Charta. If the admirers of Mr. Grattan talked of the law for perpetuating entails, or any other factious effort to force upon the Crown and Country a mutinous Ariſtocracy, I ſhould admit the parallel. Every individual in the land can point to the immunities he derives from Magna Charta. He muſt be judged by his Peers; he is protected from outrage; from judicial injuſtice or the capricious exerciſe of authority. Now what is any plain man the better for Mr. Grattan's Conſtitution? In civil and religious matters the ſeat of ſupreme authority has uſually drawn to it a certain ſuperintendance, over public bodies of the ſame deſign and conſtitution, more remotely ſituated. Thus the Parliament of Paris was ſet over the French judicatories. Our monarchy is of more delicate texture than that of France, and in the adjuſtment of its component parts the neceſſity is ſtronger to preſerve harmony by means of a paramount authority. In matters of internal regulation we had not been moleſted by the ſupremacy of the Engliſh Parliament; but we were debilitated by laws of our own; by a vicious diſtribution of powers; by factions, and penal incapacities upon the people. Mr. G. ſtept into our aid; he was indeed a bold reformer. He dealt unmercifully with the theoretical imperfections that injured none. But he was tenacious of the real, tho' latent evils; and never meddled with that which was practically defective. I feel no ſatisfaction in reviving theſe matters; but really if gentlemen will write romances upon that leap in the dark, with which

our

our unprofitable licentiouſneſs, during the American war, concluded, they muſt expect that the facts ſhall be diveſted of their falſe colouring, and that the matter ſhall be laid plainly and without digſuiſe before the public. We were quibbling about renunciation and ſimple repeal, when we ought to have been occupied in eſtabliſhing confidence within the country. It did not increaſe the demand for labour in favour of the peaſantry, to have brought home the Appellant juriſdiction. The rich and the poor were not drawn more cloſely together by abrogating the initiative of the privy council. No man had been moleſted by the ſupremacy of the Britiſh Parliament, therefore no man was relieved, when this nominal ſupremacy was ſurrendered. To have aſſerted the legiſlative independency of Ireland, and induced Great-Britain to recogniſe it, reſembles in theory and in declamation, the exploits of Harmogenes and Ariſtogiton. It was in reality a transfer of power from the Britiſh to the Iriſh legiſlature; the latter of which had not, with the ſubjects handed over, much more political connection than the former. Parliament was not in conſequence of this tranſition blended more intimately with the nation. They were indeed placed at a greater diſtance from each other. If we call to mind that period, when the ſupreme power at Athens was veſted in a certain number of individuals, who to ſupport themſelves, admitted a portion of the citizens to an inferior degree of influence; and if we ſuppoſe in theſe circumſtances, a popular Orator to ariſe, and proclaiming to the people, that high pretenſions and prerogatives were their birthright, conclude the farce, by ſtrengthening the hands of their rulers, then that ſtate of things,

and

and that man's conduct, would exactly repreſent the Conſtitution of 1782, and the political labours of Mr. Grattan. But the Ariſtocracy itſelf was moſt egregiouſly deceived. Its triumph was ſhort-lived. It received a wound in the affair of 1782, from which it has ſuffered much and which at length proves fatal. This indeed was inevitable. Whoever would read the publications and parliamentary annals of the time muſt have foreſeen it. The conteſts of our Ariſtocracy as Mr. Hume ſays of modern wars, were like cudgel-playing in a china ſhop. The ſupremacy of the Britiſh Parliament over the empire reſted upon reaſons of ſtate, neceſſity and expedience. We were told that thoſe were of no avail againſt abſtract right, and that preſcription and uſage did not fortify them. Then how could it be expected that the Catholics ſhould bow to the Proteſtant minority, or both acquieſce in the dominion of the borough influence. The poor man too was diveſted indirectly of his reverential impreſſions for exiſting eſtabliſhments; and between the rich and him, actual power was left the ſole reſource of ſubordination. Quite conſiſtently, when an opportunity offered, the lower claſſes proceeded to ſubſtitute themſelves in place of a dominion of which they were weary.

Now this land in which ſo many looſe ſpeculations were ſet up by the politicians of 1782, was the leaſt fit of any place on earth to be thus raſhly tampered with. The circumſtance of one religious body claiming aſcendancy over another, and the propenſity to diſcord neceſſarily ariſing from ſuch condition, ought to have been before the eyes and in the contemplation of a ſtateſman. If he inclined to equalize

privileges

privileges, he ſhould have conſidered that thoſe, might repine, whoſe influence was diminiſhed; and that the other party might, perhaps, be at firſt intemperate in the exerciſe of new authority. He ſhould have preſerved the powers of Government in vigour, that it might be able to meet either emergency. If it were his deſign to uphold the aſcendant of the one party, ſtill the ſtrength of Government ought to be his care, for the reluctance of the ſubordinate body was to be overcome, and it was to be protected from the aggreſſion or the contumely of its more favoured fellow Citizens. The example of the laſt century ſtood, as an eternal incentive to enterprizes of violence. I do not mean that the reaſſumption of particular eſtates is ever dreamed of by any party or by any individuals in this country. There is ſcarcely an inſtance of a forfeiting family, which has not either become extinct, or mixed with the other races, or acquired under the preſent ſettlement a valuable property. I allude to the impreſſion, that neceſſarily muſt have remained in a nation, where the ordinary courſe of acquiſition and inheritance have ſuſtained an immenſe, and rather a recent diſturbance. It is diſtinctly remembered that, without the leaſt merit in themſelves, but purely the ſucceſs of the cauſe they eſpouſed in a time of general confuſion, a multitude of families were advanced, as if by a lottery adventure, from the meaneſt ſtations to affluence*. Whilſt this recollection is preſerved, the unpropertied part of the Iriſh will expect to derive the like advantages from

* In the reign of Charles II. when a point of ceremony was in controverſy between the Lords and the Commons, "another rebellion ſays, one of the managers for the Commons, may make Lords of us all."

from ſimilar occurrences, and muſt of conſequence continue prone to civil commotion. —They were of courſe peculiarly unfit to receive the leſſon and precedent which in 1782 were laid before them. I do not wiſh to ſpeak with levity upon this ſolemn ſubject; but really the conſtitution of 1782, taken with a reference to the topics it opened, and to the great materials for diſcord and diſcontent, which already exiſted, ſtrikes my mind, as not unlike the boon of one of Cromwell's officers to the Iriſh; he ordered by his will a bottle of whiſkey and a knife to be diſtributed to every Iriſhman who ſhould attend his funeral. He ſought to call the paſſions of the people, he deteſted, into action, and he facilitated to them the means of employing theſe paſſions for their common deſtruction.

Let party hold what language it may, common ſenſe muſt pronounce, that "*the tranſaction of* 1782," left the intereſts of Ireland unprovided for. It had all the faults of the Royal Democracy of France, the ſame tendency to unſettle the public mind, and efface received impreſſions; the ſame inadequacy of the end to the means; the ſame difficulty in ſupplying new objects of attachment, and providing againſt the miſchief likely to reſult from ſo great an agitation. The ſcheme of government, which took place in 1782, was not ſuited to the country; it did not embrace our relations, domeſtic or external; the baſis on which it was placed did not promiſe either peace or permanency. As the Conſtitutionaliſts of France were precurſors to the Republicans, ſo did the proceedings of 1782 neceſſarily and inevitably diſpoſe and prepare for the politics of Mr. O'Connor and Mr. Emmet. To a certain extent the likeneſs is accurate; and ſevere indeed, ſo far as we advanced, have been our ſufferings.

That we did not compleat the picture, by running the entire career of revolution, we are indebted neither to Mr. G. nor to his parliamentary coadjutors. It is for theſe matters that I cenſure this alleged ſtateſman—for plunging raſhly into the moſt weighty of all concerns, and managing the delicate charge of a nation's welfare without forecaſt, prudence, or circumſpection; for that very circumſtance, which he moſt whimſically makes one of his boaſts, that he miſſed a great opportunity to negotiate; for having formed a ſyſtem which left every thing at random, and laid the foundation of that moſt irkſome ſtate of ſociety, an eternal jealouſy between the Sovereign and the ſubject. Upon theſe grounds it is, and not for an idle converſation with Mr. Nelſon, that I controvert Mr. Grattan's merits, and reject his celebrated "*tranſaction*" from the catalogue of thoſe events, which it is the duty, or ſhould be the policy of Ireland to reverence.

THE END.