



# Bodleian Libraries

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

This book is part of the collection held by the Bodleian Libraries and scanned by Google, Inc. for the Google Books Library Project.

For more information see:

<http://www.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/dbooks>



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 2.0 UK: England & Wales (CC BY-NC-SA 2.0) licence.

A N S W E R

TO THE

A D D R E S S

OF THE

RIGHT HONOURABLE

*HENRY GRATTAN,*

EX-REPRESENTATIVE OF THE CITY OF DUBLIN IN  
PARLIAMENT,

TO HIS

FELLOW CITIZENS OF DUBLIN.

BY

PATRICK DUIGENAN L. L. D.

A CITIZEN OF DUBLIN, AND ONE OF THE REPRESENTATIVES  
OF THE CITY OF ARMAGH IN PARLIAMENT.

*Fourth Edition, with Additions.*

Thy Tongue imagineth Wickédness, and with *Lies* thou cuttest like  
a sharp Razor.

Thou hast loved Unrighteousness more than Goodness, and to talk of  
*Lies* more than Righteousness.

Thou hast loved to speak all words that may do hurt, *O thou false  
Tongue!*

PSALM lii. VER. 3, 4, 5.

Ambubaiarum collegia, pharmacopolæ,  
Mendici, mimæ, balatrones; hoc genus omne  
Mæstum et follicitum est.——

HOR. SAT. 2.

To which are added, by way of APPENDIX :

1. The Address of the Catholics of Dublin, in 1795, to Mr. Grattan, with his Answer at the Meeting in Francis-street.
2. Mr. Grattan's Address to the Electors of Dublin, 1797.
3. Mr. Grattan's (supposed) Letter to Dr. Duigenan, in 1798.
4. Extracts from the Examination of John Hughes and Samuel Nelson of Belfast, before the Secret Committee of the House of Lords.

D U B L I N :

PRINTED FOR J. MILLIKEN, 32, GRAFTON-STREET, AND  
J. WRIGHT, PICCADILLY, LONDON.



## ADVERTISEMENT.

---

THE following Answer to Mr. Grattan's Address, was written in the latter end of the year 1797, and in January 1798 it was sent to London for publication: by several unforeseen accidents the publication was impeded, and the Author did not get back his Manuscript 'till the beginning of May 1798. Since that time, and whilst it was printing in this City, the Banditti, stiling themselves *United Irishmen*, have broken out into open Rebellion throughout the province of Leinster, and have committed the most barbarous ravages. That Rebellion still rages in the heart of the Country, and Murder and Robbery no longer conceal themselves under the veil of night, but stalk forth hideous and formidable in the face of day. The Author thinks this advertisement as to the time of writing the following sheets necessary for the explanation of some passages contained in them.

DUBLIN,  
June 16th, 1798.

1870

1871

1872

1873

1874

1875

1876

1877

1878

1879

1880

1881

1882

1883

1884

1885

1886

1887

1888

1889

1890

1891

1892

1893

1894

1895

1896

1897

1898

1899

1900

1901

1902

1903

1904

1905

1906

1907

1908

1909

1910

1911

1912

1913

1914

1915

1916

1917

1918

1919

1920

1921

1922

1923

1924

1925

1926

1927

1928

1929

1930

1931

1932

1933

1934

1935

1936

1937

1938

1939

1940

1941

1942

1943

1944

1945

1946

1947

1948

1949

1950

1951

1952

1953

1954

1955

1956

1957

1958

1959

1960

1961

1962

1963

1964

1965

1966

1967

1968

1969

1970

1971

1972

1973

1974

1975

1976

1977

1978

1979

1980

1981

1982

1983

1984

1985

1986

1987

1988

1989

1990

1991

1992

1993

1994

1995

1996

1997

1998

1999

2000

2001

2002

2003

2004

2005

2006

2007

2008

2009

2010

2011

2012

2013

2014

2015

2016

2017

2018

2019

2020

2021

2022

2023

2024

2025

2026

2027

2028

2029

2030

2031

2032

2033

2034

2035

2036

2037

2038

2039

2040

2041

2042

2043

2044

2045

2046

2047

2048

2049

2050

2051

2052

2053

2054

2055

2056

2057

2058

2059

2060

2061

2062

2063

2064

2065

2066

2067

2068

2069

2070

2071

2072

2073

2074

2075

2076

2077

2078

2079

2080

2081

2082

2083

2084

2085

2086

2087

2088

2089

2090

2091

2092

2093

2094

2095

2096

2097

2098

2099

2100

---

---

## C O N T E N T S.

---

- Mr. Grattan rejected with contempt the instructions of his constituents, the citizens of Dublin.* Page 2
- *reprobated tythes as a prelude to his attempt to subvert the Protestant Church establishment in Ireland.* 3
- *declined to offer himself a Candidate to represent the City of Dublin in the present Parliament from a certainty of rejection.* 7
- *'s project of reform, is a project for the separation of Ireland from the British Empire.* 8
- *'s conduct in the regency business proves his design to separate Ireland from the British Empire.* 10
- *intrigues with the Romanists of Ireland to effect a separation of Ireland from the British Empire.*

C O N T E N T S.

<i>causes a Romish Convention to assemble in Dublin.</i>	Page 16
—————'s designs favoured and supported by the republican faction in England.	18
<i>Character and projects of the late Mr. Edmund Burke.</i>	19
<i>Mr. Grattan's conduct during the short Lieutenancy of Earl Fitzwilliam.</i>	21
—————'s outrageous conduct on the recall of Earl Fitzwilliam.	23
<del>—————'s</del> factious answer to the address of the Romish assembly at Francis-street chapel.	24
<i>Mr. Grattan openly justifies the horrible Irish massacre of 1641.</i>	29
<i>Remarks on Mr. Grattan's gross abuse of the Earl of Strafford.</i>	23
<i>Remarks on Mr. Grattan's justification of the barbarous Romish massacre in 1641.</i>	33
<i>Proceedings of the Romish assembly at Francis-street Chapel on the 9th of April 1794.</i>	41
<i>Account of Mr. Theobald Wolfe Tone.</i>	45
<i>Mr. Tone's state of Ireland for the use of the French convention.</i>	46
<i>Mr. Grattan's list of grievances, with remarks on it.</i>	54
—————'s views in exaggerating the power of France,	and

CONTENTS.

- and depreciating that of Great Britain, and introducing the separation of America from Britain into his address.* Page 63
- Discussion of the question whether the power of Great Britain be diminished by the separation of America.* 69
- Further Remarks on Mr. Grattan's Introduction of the American Revolution in his address.* 70
- Remarks on the different situations and circumstances of America and Ireland.* 74
- The events of former rebellions in Ireland, recited for the purpose of severing Ireland from the British Empire.* 77
- Mr. Grattan's charge of corruption against the present Irish government refuted.* 83
- Mr. Grattan's assiduity and success in carrying on the trade of parliament.* 88
- *violently opposed the act of renunciation, which alone could secure the independence of the Irish legislature, and his reasons for so doing.* 91
- *violently opposed a parliamentary censure on a libel published in England purporting to be a copy of a speech of Mr. Fox.* 92
- Mr. Grattan's arguments in favour of Emancipation.* 96



CONTENTS.

<i>Romish Titular Bishops in Ireland have published seditious libels under the Title of Pastoral Letters. P. 98</i>	
<i>The pastoral letter of Doctor Troy titular archbishop of Dublin, with remarks upon it.</i>	111
<i>Further arguments of Mr. Grattan for Emancipation.</i>	118
<i>Mr. Grattan grossly misrepresents the impediment to the Catholic claim of emancipation.</i>	123
<i>The real impediment to the claim of emancipation.</i>	125
<i>A great share of temporal power adheres to, and is inseparably connected with the supremacy in spirituals.</i>	127
<i>Mr. Grattan's argument drawn from the imbecillity of the Pope as a temporal prince examined and refuted.</i>	130
————— <i>argument drawn from the state of the province, of Canada, examined and refuted.</i>	132
————— <i>assertion that the Irish Romanists have a natural and indefeasible right to a full participation of the legislative and executive capacities, examined and refuted.</i>	134
————— <i>argument drawn from the contribution of the Romanists to the expenditure of the war, and their service in the fleets, and armies, examined and refuted.</i>	137

C O N T E N T S.

- Connexion of England and Ireland highly advantageous to both,  
but more especially to Ireland.* Page 141
- Remarks on a pamphlet, entitled, "Some Observations on a  
"late Address to the Citizens of Dublin."* 148
- Remarks on Mr. Grattan's account of the creation of boroughs.*  
153
- Mr. Grattan's plan of reform in representation explained and  
exposed.* 168
- The question whether any and what kind of reform in repre-  
sentation is necessary, discussed.* 178
- Objections against the present state of borough representation  
considered.* 279



---

TO THE

RIGHT HONOURABLE

HENRY GRATTAN.

---

AT the close of your parliamentary existence, the dissolution of the late Parliament of Ireland, you have thought fit to publish a letter, addressed to your fellow citizens of Dublin, stuffed with invectives which I have heard you utter in the House of Commons at the commencement of three sessions of that parliament; and prophetic denunciations of impending destruction against all your political adversaries, that is, every Protestant gentleman, of sense, honour, and spirit, in the kingdom, and every true friend of the constitution in church and state. This constitution too you have endeavoured to vilify and traduce with peculiar acrimony and malignity, and have exerted all the talents you possess to irritate and inflame the lower order of the people to resistance against lawful authority, and excite them to massacre and rebellion; thus, in your last agonies of disappointed ambition, imitating the impious and expiring tyrant in the catastrophe of a tragedy, whom the poet generally paints as expending his last breath in blasphemy, curses, and execrations.

As you have addressed this letter to your fellow citizens of Dublin, and as several positions in it might gain some credit, (at least in Great Britain, where it has been published, and industriously circulated) from the audacity of the publi-

B

cation,

cation, people ignorant of the facts generally thinking that no man of any character would venture to vouch the truth of positions under his signature, if they were utterly groundless; and as I have the honour of being a freeman and a freeholder of the City of Dublin, and therefore one of those whom you have addressed, I have taken up my pen to answer your letter, to detect your falsehoods, to expose your misstatements, to pluck off your mask of patriotism and public spirit, and unveil to the world your projects and designs, in all their natural deformity.

As in your letter you have abandoned all decency, and indulged, what appears from your constant practice a natural propensity, in all kinds of the most savage abuse of every thing which must be held revered and respectable in a state whilst it has existence, and have even *out-pained Paine*; it is impossible, in answering it, strictly to adhere to all the rules of politeness, to which every decent writer is entitled from his antagonist. No man wrestles with a sweep-chimney without soil from his foot; however, I shall endeavour to keep myself as uncontaminated as possible in the contest, though my adversary be armed, as Doctor Bentley is represented to be in the Battle of the Books, that is, wielding with one hand a flail, and with the other, a pot of ordure.

You begin your letter by stating, "That you have found the citizens of Dublin gracious masters, and they have found in you an unprofitable servant; but that so long as the present representation in the Commons' House continues, so long must you respectfully decline the soliciting at their hands a seat in that assembly."

The first part of this statement, that the citizens of Dublin have found in you an unprofitable servant, is very true; but it does not express the whole truth, for they have found you not only an unprofitable, but an ungrateful, disrespectful, and mischievous servant.

Mr. Grattan rejected with contempt the instructions of his con-

When you had acquired a reputation for parliamentary ability (considerably greater than you deserved) by retailing in the House of Commons Molyneaux's State of Ireland, and Swift's Drapier's letters, the citizens of Dublin, ignorant of your real

real character, returned you as one of their representatives in the last parliament, without expence to you. What return have you made them? As soon as you had disclosed your dangerous project of subverting the religious establishment of the country, and substituting popery in its stead, under the pretence of granting equality of civil privileges to all descriptions of his Majesty's subjects (the very mask assumed by King James the second, when engaged in the execution of a similar project,) but really with a view of smoothing your way to the subversion of the civil constitution of the country, (which was also the design of King James); the corporation of the City of Dublin, alarmed at such conduct in their representative, assembled and drew up an address to you, containing instructions for your conduct in parliament relative to the claims of the Romanists, as contained in an acrimonious libel on the Protestants of this kingdom in the form of a petition, drawn up by a Romish convention; and they directed you, their representative, to oppose in parliament any further extension of civil privileges to the Irish Romanists, as subversive of the constitution, they being already, in possession of every privilege necessary to secure their liberties civil and religious, their lives and properties.

When this address was presented to you, you rejected the instructions of your constituents with a degree of arrogance and contempt, perhaps peculiar to you; and while that parliament continued, your efforts to subvert the constitution in church and state, both in and out of parliament, were violent and unremitting: you assembled Romish conventions and committees; you supported on every occasion in parliament the Romish demands of subversion of the Protestant establishment; you reprobated all the laws made in this kingdom for the security of the state against the plots, machinations, and the rebellions of the Romanists since the second year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth; as the most effectual way of rooting out the Protestant religion in this kingdom.

You had before this commenced your attack upon it by a declamation in parliament against tithes, the scanty maintenance of the Protestant parochial clergy: It is well known, that

stituents,  
the citizens  
of Dublin.

Mr. Grat-  
tan repro-  
bated  
tithes, as a  
prelude to  
that

his attempt  
to subvert  
the Protef-  
tant Church  
establish-  
ment in  
Ireland.

that the parochial clergy in this kingdom do not receive one fifth part of the tithes to which they are juſtly entitled, and that they cannot obtain that fifth without great difficulty: Yet to deprive them even of this pittance, and thereby to reduce them to abſolute beggary, you pronounced a philippic in the Houſe of Commons againſt them, in which you vomited forth all the falſhoods and calumnies which you could collect from every libel againſt tithes ſince the publication of the pretended Hiſtory of Tithes, by Selden; which, as well as its offspring the ſwarm of falſe and malicious publications againſt tithes by all the hives of political waſps and hornets, the diſſenters of various denominations, afterwards printed, have been long ſince fully and ably refuted and expoſed by Montague, Tyldenſey, Leſlie, Comber, and many other learned writers. The materials of this pretended hiſtory, particularly that part of it which relates to Jewiſh antiquities, Selden himſelf chiefly ſtole from Joſeph Scaliger, as he did the materials of many others of his writings, though his literary vanity prevented him from acknowledging his plagiariſm, and though he lived to repent and be aſhamed of his pretended hiſtory.

This Pandora's box you farther enriched with all the ſcandalous ſtories reſpecting the Iriſh Proteſtant clergy, no matter whether true or falſe, which you could poſſibly collect, or which could be collected for you by a Romiſh fryar, the companion of your Attic evenings, who had himſelf publiſhed a virulent pamphlet againſt the payment of tithes to the Proteſtant clergy of Ireland, remarkable only for its petulance, ignorance, vulgarity and falſhood.

This ſpeech has been printed with your name prefixed to it, and you have not diſowned the publication: I did not indeed hear you pronounce it; but I have read it. The fryar's performance is ſomewhat inferior to the ſpeech in point of ſtile, but infinitely inferior in falſhood and malignity.

Your proceedings in this point were exactly ſimilar to thoſe of the French jacobins, who commenced their career for the general ſubverſion of all orders of the ſtate, by the abolition

abolition of tithes, and the slaughter and extermination of their established clergy.

Thus diametrically opposite to the instructions of your constituents, the Protestant citizens of Dublin, (for Romanists, at the time when you were elected representative for the City of Dublin, were excluded from the elective franchise) your conduct in parliament has been, and as diametrically opposite to your own often-repeated doctrine, "That representatives in parliament are bound in duty to pursue the instructions of their constituents; and that acting otherwise they betray their delegated trust." To put this your unfaithful conduct in so clear a point of view as to preclude you and your pitiful faction from any defence, I shall state one or two other facts so notorious that they cannot be denied.

The corporation of the City of Dublin, lord mayor, aldermen, and common council, met in a post assembly in September, 1792, and without one dissenting voice agreed on a letter which they caused to be sent to all magistrates, corporations, and members of both houses of parliament in Ireland. This letter, in a very clear, concise, and nervous manner, expressed the decided disapprobation of this the first corporation in the kingdom, of the claims of the Irish Romanists to any other privileges and advantages than those which they then enjoyed. It stated, that the Irish Romanists ought to be contented with what they then enjoyed; that is, "The most perfect toleration of their religion, the fullest security of their property, and the most complete personal liberty;" and that they ought not then, nor at any other time, attempt any interference in the government of the kingdom, as such interference would be incompatible with the *Protestant ascendancy*, (a term coined by you at a former period, when you declared your determination to support it); and then the letter defined the precise meaning of the words *Protestant ascendancy* in the following terms:

A Protestant King of Ireland;

A Protestant Parliament;

A Protestant



A Protestant Hierarchy ;  
Protestant Electors and Government ;  
The Benchers of Justice ;  
The Army, and the Revenue, through all their branches and  
details, Protestant ;  
And this system supported by a connexion with the Protestant  
Realm of Great Britain.

In this definition, the corporation of Dublin adhered scrupulously to the laws of the land, which laws restricted the enjoyment of all the enumerated offices and privileges to Protestants only.

At the very commencement of the session of parliament which followed the publication of this decisive declaration of your constituents against the claims of the Romanists, you not only supported their claims in the House of Commons with the utmost vehemence ; but you treated your constituents with great contumely and disdain : you even attempted ridicule on the occasion, *invitâ Minervâ !* ridicule is not your talent ; when you could not argue against the letter of the corporation, you strove to be witty upon it ; and with that view you purloined a wretched witticism from a pastoral letter of the Irish Apostle of popery, the late Mr. Edmund Burke. You essayed a laugh ; you could not excite even a smile in the audience ; but your constituents were justly enraged at this glaring breach of the trust they had committed to you, and this public defiance of their instructions on a point in which their dearest interests, the security of their lives and property, were concerned.

After this faithful detail of your conduct in parliament as one of the representatives of the City of Dublin, is it possible for imagination to conceive any impudence so consummate as yours in the very exordium of your address ? You admit the citizens of Dublin to have been your masters while you remained one of their representatives, and *gracious masters*, and yourself to have been their servant ; and yet your conduct in parliament was one continued series of active and determined hostility against them and their dearest interests ; fighting, ridiculing,

ridiculing, and reprobating their instructions, and exerting on all occasions the most indefatigable industry to find out ways and means to break and defeat the trust they had reposed in you: yet these are the very persons whom you presume to address in the stile of an humble servant, who had used his best endeavours to execute with fidelity the service in which they employed him!

As to the second part of the exordium of your letter, in which, with the affectation of modesty, suggested only by the extremity of assurance and deceit, you beg leave to decline the honour of soliciting at the hands of your fellow citizens of Dublin a seat in parliament so long as the present state of representation in the Commons' House continues, you certainly never wrote it (shameless as you are) with a view to its gaining credit in the City of Dublin; you must have written it for circulation in England. Here we know you too well; we may cry out to you, *pete peregrinum!* you declined soliciting a seat in parliament for the City of Dublin, knowing that such solicitation would not succeed; and not on account of the present state of the representation in the Commons' House. You know, and we all know, that the Romanists have not yet had time, by the operation of the act of parliament made in their favour in 1793, to become freemen of the City of Dublin, and that all the freemen are yet Protestants. You found, on inspection into the register, that sixty-eight Roman Catholics only had been registered as freeholders in the County of the City of Dublin; and that therefore the Romanists could give you but a very feeble support in an election for the City of Dublin: You knew at the same time, as we all know, that the whole Protestant body of freemen and freeholders, incensed at your infidelity and arrogance, would have voted for any man in the community rather than for you.

When I say the whole Protestant body, I do not mean all the freemen and freeholders who pass under the general description of Protestants, and usurp that title when it serves their interest; I know there are several persons, and some of them freemen and freeholders, but who, (praise be to God!)

are

Mr. Grattan declined to offer himself a Candidate to represent the City of Dublin in the present parliament from a certainty of rejection.

are few in number, that are Atheists, Deists, Jacobins, Republicans, and United Irishmen. Such of this tribe, I admit, as are freemen and freeholders, would have voted for you, *Parcit cognatis maculis, similis Fera*; but their whole number is insignificant; and, joined with the Romanist freeholders, they would not have amounted to one-twentieth part of the electors of the city.

Certainty of defeat then, it is notorious, prevented you from standing as a candidate for the representation of the City of Dublin in the present parliament; and the consequence you assume, and which your Jacobin masters in England, for whom you are acting the honourable part of master fireworker in Ireland, endeavour to confer on you, by insinuating that you might have been elected representative in the Irish Commons for the City of Dublin, if you would have done the city the honour to offer yourself a candidate for it, is founded in fraud and deception; the baseless vision flies the light of truth, as spectres vanish at the dawn of day.

Mr. Grattan's project of reform, is a project for the separation of Ireland from the British Empire.

If the present state of the representation in the House of Commons had determined you *not to solicit* (I presume you mean *not to accept of*) a seat in that house, and if all honest men who wish to serve their country should, as you insinuate, also decline to accept of seats in that house, and if it be necessary for the preservation of liberty, and the salvation of the country, as you maintain, that a reform should be made in the state of the representation in the House of Commons, pray, by what means is that reform to be effected?

According to the law of Ireland, as well as England for ages past, the sole right of enacting new laws, and altering those already established, is vested in the king, lords, and commons; no new law, nor alteration in the present laws, can be constitutionally effected, but by the joint consent of the king, lords and commons; and if all those persons who wish for an alteration in the state of the representation of the commons now by law established, whom alone you allow to be patriots desirous of the salvation of their country, shall abdicate the House of Commons, and leave it to be filled only by corrupt men, who live by their *stipendiary talents*, exercised

cified in what you stile the *trade of parliament*, who have always resisted your schemes of reform, and whose interest it is (by which alone they are guided,) to resist all reform in the representation, as you describe them; it is plain a House of Commons so composed will never vote for the reform you desire; nor, as you state it, for any reform in the present representation of the Commons; and that therefore no reform can be effected by the constitutional power of the state as established for ages.

There is then no method left, according to you, to effect this reform, but the subversion of the present constitution by rebellion, civil war, massacre, and sanguinary revolution, and that by the only means of carrying so destructive a plan into execution, the introduction of a French army of Jacobin assassins, to assist their fellow assassins here, the United Irishmen, in shaking off the influence of the British Cabinet, stiled by you *a foreign cabinet*, and rendering this country a field of battle for the English and French nations; and, if possible, tearing it for ever from its sister island; that such is, and for some time past has been, your real scheme, it is easy to prove by a simple recital of some of the principal manœuvres in your political career.

Passing over your constant virulent invectives since your first entrance into the House of Commons, against Great Britain, and its conduct respecting Ireland; your perpetual agitation of every circumstance which could, even in the remotest degree, create jealousy between the two countries, with the most acrimonious exaggeration; your reiterated harangues, tending to shew that the interests of the two nations are incompatible, except upon such terms as you well know Great Britain, consistent with her own safety, or even existence as an independent nation in the present state of Europe, could never accede to, in which you have always used every kind of deception and false colouring, that the furious zeal of a desperate projector and a thorough contempt of candour could furnish; I shall introduce the proofs of your project of separating the two countries by your conduct in the regency business.

Ireland,

The conduct of Mr. Grattan in the regency business proves his design to separate Ireland from the British Empire.

Ireland, after its conquest by the English, was a lordship, and a feudal appendage to the crown of England; and the kings of England, before the reign of Henry the eighth, were styled lords, and not kings of Ireland; and the island was styled the land, not the kingdom of Ireland. That monarch created it a kingdom, and styled himself king, and not lord, of Ireland; but, to prevent any idea being entertained, that Ireland, from its new stile of a kingdom, was therefore a dominion separated from the crown of England, and that the feudal annexation of it to, and dependance upon, the imperial crown of England was thereby in any manner dissolved, impaired, or weakened, it was declared, by several statutes passed in the parliament of Ireland, in the reign of that prince, and in almost every reign since, to the reign of Queen Anne, *that the kingdom of Ireland is inseparably annexed, united, and belonging to, and depending upon, the imperial crown of England; and that whoever is king of England, is thereby, ipso facto, king of Ireland,* as may be seen by our statute book. This is clearly to be the known established law of the land, in a very particular manner, by the Irish act of recognition of King William and Queen Mary, in the fourth year of their reign, and by the act passed in the seventh year of the same reign, declaring the pretended Romish parliament assembled in Dublin by King James the second, after his abdication in England, an unlawful assembly; and none of these Irish acts have ever been repealed.

Such being the known established law of Ireland, what was your conduct when from the sudden indisposition of our most gracious monarch, it was thought necessary that a regent, that is a person to exercise the kingly office during the continuance of that public calamity, or a *king pro tempore*, should be appointed? The legislatures of the two countries being independent of each other, except in all cases which respected such their union, as before stated; and the two nations having no legal tie to bind them together, except a king common to both, which king, by the known law of Ireland, was always to be the person who wore the imperial crown of England; and a regent, once established, being (as to power and

and administration) to all intents and purposes a king, and in possession of the crown, you immediately suggested in the Commons of Ireland, the expediency of the parliament of Ireland proceeding to the nomination of a regent for Ireland, without waiting for the determination of the parliament of Great Britain in that particular, and you supported the propriety of such a measure with the utmost zeal, grounding the expediency of resorting to this dangerous experiment on sophistical arguments, deduced from the independence of the Irish legislature on that of Great Britain; arguing against the known established common law of Ireland, declared and recognized by so many Irish statutes; and asserting an unconstitutional power to be lodged in the Irish lords and commons, of abrogating by their resolutions the known law thus declared and recognized by statutes; and persuading them, that they had a right, by their votes, to nominate a regent, that is a *King pro tempore*, for Ireland, notwithstanding the unrepealed Irish law, that whoever was king or regent of England, was *ipso facto* king or regent of Ireland: and you and your party on that occasion prevailed on a majority of the Irish lords and commons, led astray by your sophistry, and not aware of the mischief of the precedent they were about to establish, to nominate and elect a regent for Ireland, before any regent of the British Empire was nominated in England; thus presenting to the British parliament the mortifying and dangerous alternative, of nominating the pretended regent of the Irish crown, regent of the imperial crown of Great Britain; (and thereby in fact surrendering to the Irish houses of parliament the right of nominating a regent of England): or, of compelling obedience in Ireland to the person to be nominated regent by the parliament of Britain, by a British army and a civil war, as England was under the necessity of doing, to quell the usurpation of James the second in Ireland, after he had abdicated the crown of England; thus cutting asunder, as far as in you lay, the only bond which bound the two countries together, and laying deep the foundation of future contention, slaughter, and civil war; for those who have assumed the right of nominating a regent,

will,

will, on failure of issue in the royal line, and on other contingencies, assume the right of nominating a king, or of changing the monarchical government into a republican; and a difference of opinion on such great imperial questions between the two nations will be the certain parent of civil war, and perhaps of mutual destruction. In vain will you plead in excuse or extenuation, that the person nominated regent in Ireland was the heir apparent of the crown, and the person who, it was highly probable, or even certain, would be elected regent in England; the notorious violation of the law of the land, and the precedent authorizing, and as it were inviting, separation of the two countries, your own exultation on the success of the measure, and your repeated triumphant expressions of delight, on your having established such a precedent; all demonstrate that your favourite project is separation, and that you would have preferred the nomination of any other person to the office of regent, rather than the heir apparent, had you not been convinced, that such was the loyalty and attachment of the parliament of Ireland to the present royal family, that the very mention of any person, as proper to fill the office of regent, other than the illustrious prince who was nominated on that occasion, would have instantly blasted your whole design; and that great personage, when in the fulness of time he may come to mount the throne of his ancestors, will find but little cause to be obliged to you for your conduct in the affair of the regency.

Mr. Grattan intrigues with the Romanists of Ireland to effect a separation of Ireland from the British Empire.

If any doubt can be entertained of your design to separate the two countries, to which all your proceedings tend, though you sometimes think it necessary to disavow it, the rage of disappointed ambition and avarice with which you were inflamed on the recall of Earl Fitzwilliam from the government of this country, put you so much off your guard, that you almost threw away the mask; it extorted from you unequivocal proofs of your dangerous intentions. It is here necessary to state briefly your intrigues with the Romanists of Ireland.

This

This body, about two thirds of the inhabitants of this island (and not three fourths, as you constantly state when you intend to magnify the prowess of your men in bukram) is composed of two classes of men, the descendants of the old native Irish, and those of the ancient English colony settled in Ireland before the reign of Queen Elizabeth. These two classes were inveterate enemies to each other until the year 1641, the year of the barbarous Romish massacre, when the civil dissensions in England encouraged a rebellion in Ireland, and caused an union of these two classes; the old English colonies taking up arms with the view of re-establishing and maintaining the Romish religion in Ireland; the native Irish professing the same view, but really taking arms with the design of separating the two nations. This union between the two classes has ever since continued, and has so blended them together, that they may now be said to be almost one people; save that in the descendants of the old English colonists may be observed something more of civilization, and in the descendants of the old native Irish, where they are yet unmixed with English blood, evident remains of their ancient ferocity and barbarism. At the time of the first descent of the English in Ireland in the reign of Henry the second, the country was in a savage state; the natives lived in clans under elective chiefs, in the same manner as do the native Indians in America. There were no towns nor buildings in the country, except at the mouths of rivers, where the Danes and other northern nations had built small towns or factories, for the purpose of collecting such commodities for exportation as countries, however barbarous, are known to furnish: The English colonists possessed themselves of, and settled in, some part of the nation opposite to Britain, and a constant predatory and desultory war was waged between these colonies and the savage natives for some centuries, until the accession of Queen Elizabeth. In her reign the Spanish monarch, then the mightiest potentate in Europe, designing to subject England, cast his eyes on Ireland as that part of the British dominion which it would be easiest to subjugate, as an acquisition the possession of which would facilitate, or rather



ther enforce his success against Great Britain; and with this view he furnished the native Irish with arms, ammunition, and officers; sent an army twice to their assistance, and rendered them so formidable, that the queen found it necessary to send great bodies of English troops from time to time to this country, and at length a great and formidable army (for that age), consisting of twenty-two thousand men, and commanded by her most favoured general. She at length completed the reduction of this island, but died before she could reap the fruit of her conquest. Her successor, King James the first, sent numerous colonies of industrious English and Scotch into this kingdom, received the native Irish into the mass of his subjects, extended the English laws and civilization over the whole nation, and encouraged industry, manufactures, and population; yet the natives, wedded to their barbarous customs, abhorred their conquerors, and in two subsequent rebellions, one in the reign of Charles the first, the other in that of King William and Queen Mary, endeavoured to sever this nation from Britain; and the mass of Irish Romanists at this day, particularly that part of it which is composed of the native Irish (infinitely the most numerous) so detest the English nation, that it may be asserted with great probability, they continue Romanists more from hatred to the English, who are Protestants, than from any conviction of the truth of the Roman Catholic doctrines, as distinguished from those of the Protestants; for they are in general the lowest order of the people of this country, and very ignorant. One thing is certain, that they account every Protestant in the country, even though descended from their own sept, an Englishman; and that they have but one word in their language to signify Englishman and Protestant, to wit, *Safonagh*.

When you first entertained your project of separating the two countries, namely in the time of the American war, you found, that the persons who professed themselves friendly to such a project, that is, the herd of republicans, consisting chiefly of atheists, deists and disciples of Voltaire, Rousseau, Paine, Price, and Priestley, were in number, consequence,  
and

and property, so insignificant, that you could never carry it into execution with so inadequate a power as they could furnish. The whole real Protestant body of the inhabitants of Ireland, by which I mean all sincere christians of that persuasion, whether of the established church, (the most numerous class) or dissenters, you well knew, would reprobate such a measure the moment you should venture to disclose it to them, and with the greatest alacrity risk their lives and fortunes in resisting the execution of it. You knew the hatred which the Irish Romanists entertained of the British name and nation; you knew their attachment to the Stuart race was extinguished with that race, and that even that attachment originated with, and was continued by, the hope, that the interest of the house of Stuart with the French court would obtain succours for the Irish Romanists, to enable them to break off their connexion with Great Britain, and to create a king of their own, or an independent republic; and it was perfectly indifferent to them whether the government in Ireland was monarchical or republican, so that it had no connexion with the British government. You therefore looked to the Irish Romanists, as the most powerful auxiliaries that you could obtain for the execution of your project, from their numbers and inveteracy against England. They were poor, it is true; they had not in their possession one-fiftieth part of the real, nor one-twentieth part of the personal property of the nation; but they laid claim to almost the whole landed property, of which they thought their ancestors were unjustly despoiled by the English colonists; and these claims, together with their poverty and savage antipathy to the Protestants of the country (all of whom, as I have already observed, they reputed Englishmen,) you thought would excite them to rapine and slaughter, and their numbers would ensure success. Your ambition and avarice presented to your imagination the elevated and lucrative situation of president of the congress of the Irish republic as attainable by you: with these views you determined to court the Irish Romanists; and to convince them of your attachment to them, and your hostility to the Protestants, you commenced

commenced your operations by an attack on the parochial clergy of the established church, and on tithes their only subsistence.

Mr. Grattan causes a Romish Convention to assemble in Dublin.

The Irish nobility and gentry of the Romish persuasion of ancient families and estates are very few; the nobility of that description not exceeding four or five, and the gentlemen of any consequence not exceeding twenty. These were generally men of honour, and averse from any schemes of democratical republics. You knew, therefore, that your application to them would be fruitless; but there were men of other descriptions among the Romanists, well suited to your purpose: these were men of very low and mean parentage, who, by great attention to trade and commerce, had amassed considerable fortunes, and from the nature of their respective trades and employments, had great and extensive connexions among the lowest order of their persuasion, particularly in cities and trading towns. To such men you applied yourself, disclosed your scheme, and the means you intended, with their cooperation, to pursue for the execution of it. You gave them your instructions for the different parts they were to act in the business, and you found them very apt scholars. These are the persons whom you stile in your letter *that part of the great body of the Catholics, the most popular and energetic.*

In consequence, and in execution of these instructions, a Romish merchant in Dublin, who had very shortly before emerged from the lowest order of society into mercantile opulence and consequence, and who had been for a considerable time your private agent for managing your intrigues with the Romanists, issued out formal writs for the election of a Romish convention to assemble in Dublin at a certain time limited in the writs. The French revolution having shortly before blazed forth, and a national assembly having been elected in that ill-fated country, these writs directed that the elections throughout Ireland should be carried on in the same manner, and on the same plan, which had been adopted in France for the election of their national assembly. So well were the Irish Romanists prepared previous to this election, that

that these writs were executed throughout the whole nation; a Romish convention in consequence met in Dublin, and drew up one of the most false and acrimonious libels against the Protestant government of this country, that could possibly be devised, stiled it a petition to his majesty, and caused it to be presented as such. The then chief governor of Ireland did not think fit to disperse this unlawful meeting, and it continued sitting with the doors of the apartment in which it assembled, carefully closed and guarded for a considerable space of time, to the great reproach of those who were then intrusted with the regulation of the police of the country; and when at length the members of it thought fit to close their sitting, they appointed a permanent committee whom they stiled *the Committee of the Catholics of Ireland\**, consisting of nine persons who had been the most active amongst them, two or three of them merchants, as many men whom they stiled doctors of physic, the rest shopkeepers, manufacturers, or tradesmen in Dublin.

The success of so daring a measure as the preceding, and the supineness of government on the occasion, gave your Romish and infidel allies spirits and courage to assemble provincial conventions of republicans and other traitors, for the purpose of procuring and publishing resolutions of supporting and carrying into effect projected innovations in the state, subversive of the first principles of our constitution; and at length to summon a general convention of these miscreants, from all parts of the nation to meet at Athlone, one of the king's garrisons in the heart of the kingdom, for the same traitorous purposes.

The state was at length roused from its lethargy, and the parliament passed an act to suppress such dangerous assemblies. The furious opposition you gave to this act in the House of Commons, as well as to the act for restraining the sale of gun-powder by certain regulations, when these con-

C federated

\* Of this Committee three are now in gaol, accused of high-treason, to wit, M'Nevin, Braughall, and Sweetman; and their secretary M'Cormick, accused of the same crime, has fled out of the kingdom, or absconded.

federated traitors were forming magazines of ammunition in different parts of the kingdom; and to the insurrection act to prevent the nightly robberies and murders repeatedly committed on the peaceable inhabitants, by gangs of these confederates stiling themselves *United Irishmen*; your constant insertion of these acts in your bead-roll of pretended grievances ever since, and your complaints of them in your present address, all demonstrate how much you think the execution of your project of separation impeded by the operation of these salutary statutes.

Mr. Grattan's designs favoured and supported by the republican faction in England.

Thus defeated in Ireland, your masters, the *republican faction* in England, were consulted; they looked to an insurrection in Ireland as the most effectual mode of raising a clamour against the ministers in England, and distressing and perhaps overturning the government there. It was represented to them, that the most powerful engines they could use for undermining the present power of the government in Ireland were the subversion of the Protestant establishment in Ireland, and the substitution of popery in its room; that the mass of Irish Romanists having a rooted aversion to the British name and nation, and having for more than a century looked to the French nation for assistance to enable them to throw off all connexion with Great Britain, had heretofore shewn some marks of attachment to the monarchical form of government, by their adherence to the interests of the Stuart family; but that this seeming attachment to monarchy was adopted by them merely on the supposition, that the Stuart family, by its influence at the court of France, could procure them the means of separating themselves from England, and from complaisance to the then monarchical government of France: but that now, the Stuart family being extinct, republicanism being established in France by the revolution, and also in America, by a successful rebellion, (which by the assistance of the French was lopped off from the British Empire, and formed into an independent republic,) the whole body of the Romanists of Ireland had thrown off the mask, and declared themselves determined republicans; at least that part of  
 them

them which you stile the most *popular and energetick* : that their ancient nobility and gentry were, as to number, and influence with the mass of their persuasion, contemptible; that the *energeticks* had lately banished them both from their assemblies and councils; that the body of republicans in Ireland distinct from the Romish body, though perfectly agreeing in opinion with the English republicans, being all Atheists, Deists, and disciples of Voltaire, Rousseau, Paine, Price and Priestley, passing under the general name of Dissenters, were too few and too weak to attempt a revolution with any prospect of success without the co-operation of the Romanists; and that such Protestant Dissenters as were real christians, being greatly the majority of that class of people, would, on any attempt to subvert the established government, join heart and hand with their brethren the Protestants of the establishment.

These reasons prevailed on your English masters to lend their aid to the plan of subverting the established church of Ireland, and substituting popery in its room, as the first step to a republican revolution; and by the artful intrigues of this English faction in the British cabinet, Earl Fitzwilliam was selected as a proper person to fill the important employment of Lord Lieutenant of this kingdom. This nobleman was himself an enemy to republicanism, and utterly ignorant of the intrigues of the faction; but they had the art, nevertheless to render him a ready tool for carrying into execution this their first step towards a republic.

The late Mr. Edmund Burke, a man of splendid but not solid talents, had obtained the confidence of this nobleman to such a degree, that he regulated all his political exertions with unbounded authority.—Mr. Burke was himself sprung from parents who were Irish Romanists; he received his early education in the College of Dublin; but having quitted Ireland at a very early period of life, and all his relations by blood or alliance being Irish Romanists, he became thoroughly tinged, or rather dyed in grain, with the political sentiments of that class of people. He had procured the favour and protection of the late Marquis of Rockingham,

Character  
and projects  
of the late  
Mr. Ed-  
mund  
Burke.

ham, uncle to Earl Fitzwilliam, who obtained for him a seat in the British House of Commons, in which, during the American war he constantly harangued with the utmost vehemence in favour of the Americans, and by promoting ill humours and dissensions at home, conduced as much as any man in England to the separation of America from the Mother Country. Indeed it may be truly said, that the ill success of the British arms in America was in a greater degree owing to intrigues of a republican faction at home, one of the active leaders of which at that time was Mr. Burke, than to the power either of France or America. Encouraged by the success of the American rebellion, Mr. Burke formed the dangerous project of overturning the Protestant establishment in Ireland, and substituting popery in its room; and with that view he exerted all his abilities to persuade several very popular and powerful English noblemen, that the only method of retaining Ireland in obedience to the British crown, and maintaining the connexion between the two countries, was the complete establishment of popery in Ireland; and that the irreconcilable difference of the established religion of the inhabitants of the two nations respectively would be the indissoluble cement of peace and union between them.

As a convincing argument in favour of the practical truth of this new and strange doctrine, he adduced the example of England and Scotland before the union, where difference of religious establishments had produced no separation, artfully suppressing in his representations, that though the religious establishments of the two countries last mentioned were in some particulars different, yet they were both Protestant establishments, agreeing in all material matters of faith, and differing in discipline only. He magnified the numbers, wealth, and power of the Irish Romanists beyond all bounds of truth, and actually persuaded these noblemen, utterly ignorant of the real state of Ireland, that the Irish Romanists if not gratified by the proscription of the Protestant establishment, and the substitution of popery in its room, would withdraw the Irish nation from its connexion with

with Great Britain, and form themselves into an independent government, after the example of America; adding, that they were sufficiently powerful to effect such a revolution.

Whether Mr. Burke had, at the time he formed his project of establishing popery in Ireland, entertained it only as a step toward a separation of Ireland from the British Empire, is not quite clear, though his strong attachment to republican principles during the American war gives good ground for suspecting him of such a design: it is, however certain, that he concealed with great care this part of his plan (if it was a part) from his patron, and the great noblemen to whom he had access by his means; and when the French revolution blazed forth, and consumed all religions in that country, and popery its established religion among the rest, Mr. Burke changed, or affected to change, all his former opinions in favour of republicanism so often repeated in his most flaming harangues, and wrote with great violence against the French republicans; for which change, if it was real, no other probable reason can be adduced, than the subversion of popery in France by these republicans, which he stiles in one of his latest productions the pulling down the *majesty* of religion.

Under the influence, or rather under the absolute controul of such a man, wedded to the promotion of the interests of popery, did Earl Fitzwilliam take upon him the government of this kingdom. Your masters in England gave you immediate notice of the success of their intrigues, that they had procured the delivery of this kingdom into the hands of a person the fittest in the world for their and your purpose; and you immediately set off for England to prepare and sharpen your tool for the effectual execution of the work in which you intended to employ him.

Happily for this kingdom, your presumptuous precipitancy marred your project; you set your engine immediately to work with so much violence that the whole machinery fell suddenly to pieces. You posted back to this kingdom, to anticipate any popularity which the Lord Lieutenant might obtain

Mr. Giattan's conduct during the short Lieutenancy of Earl Fitzwilliam.



obtain among the Romanists by confining the power of the state to their hands, and by the ruin of the Protestant interest in Ireland, as far as he could effect it. You were jealous of the fame of so glorious an achievement, and one so conducive to the success of your project of separation, and were unwilling to share it even with the chief governor. You were desirous that your allies, the *energetick* Irish Romanists, should be convinced that he was only your engine in the business, and that the whole merit was your own. You immediately assembled the standing committee of the Romanists already mentioned, consisting of nine persons, traders, mechanicks, and men styling themselves doctors of physic.

This standing committee were cramped a little in the exercise of their authority over the whole body of Romanists in this kingdom by the convention bill; and you and they together, not daring in open violation of the law, to summon a new Romish convention, took however as effectual, though not so daring a method of proclaiming the general union and confederacy of the Irish Romanists against the constitution. You and your nine worthies drew up and published a kind of manifesto under the guise of a petition to parliament, wherein was demanded, as a matter of right, a full and perfect communication of all privileges and offices of the state, without exception, to the Romanists; that no distinction in these particulars should be continued between them and Protestants; and that all laws which created such distinctions, and which had been enacted in Ireland since the commencement of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, should be repealed.

The committee published advertisements in most of the public Newspapers, addressed to the Romanists in all counties, cities, towns, and boroughs, throughout the kingdom; ordering them immediately to draw up similar manifestoes, under the guise of petitions to parliament, and transmit them to their secretary, a manufacturer in the liberties of the City of Dublin, and a most *energetick* Romanist.

These orders were complied with by the Romanists in every quarter of the kingdom with great expedition; the  
severa<sup>l</sup>

several manifestoes were almost in the same words with that drawn up by you and your *energetick committee*; and were all presented to parliament on its meeting, with long lists of names subscribed to each.

The Lord Lieutenant arrived in this kingdom shortly after you, and acted in every thing exactly conformable to your advice. The great law officers of the crown were immediately dismissed from their employments, as were many others of great family and abilities from several most important offices in the state, without any reason being assigned for their dismissal, other than that they were Protestants adverse to your measures, and that you wanted their employments for your own creatures. Open menaces of removing the Lord Chancellor were thrown out, and if your domination had continued he might probably have been succeeded by a Romanist. The court of the viceroy was crowded with Romanists of the lowest condition, the most obtrusive and active among the mob of that persuasion; (such persons as your admired apostle Mr. Paine calls *nobles by nature*) the most popular and *energetick* Romanists, were seated at the festive board of the Earl Fitzwilliam, to the no small degradation of his great station.

The ministry of England, at length roused from their lethargy by the rapidity of your revolutionary progress in this country, found it necessary suddenly to recall the unfortunate nobleman whom you, with the assistance of Mr. Edmund Burke, had duped into such destructive measures, and all your plans of avarice and ambition were defeated at one stroke. The rage of you and your allies, the *popular and energetick Romanists*, burst forth on this occasion with the utmost fury. Your committee, at your instance, summoned a general meeting of their party at a Romish Chapel in the city of Dublin; they were resolved to send deputies to London with a petition to his majesty, praying that he would continue Lord Fitzwilliam, that is, you, in the government of Ireland, and stuffed, as usual with them, with all manner of shameless falsehoods; for your Romish party had, from the beginning of your operations, totally abandoned

Mr. Grattan's outrageous conduct on the recall of Earl Fitzwilliam

done all regard to truth, thinking that the impudence and audacity of their assertions would gain credit to some of them, at least in England, where from the ignorance which prevailed respecting the internal state of Ireland, honest men might be induced to think, that even the most hardened liars would not openly publish such details, and present them to the throne, without some foundation or colour of truth.

One of these daring falsehoods, with which all the publications of your Romish allies were at that time and have been ever since garnished, was, that what with equal falsehood and deceit they are pleased to stile *the emancipation* of the Roman Catholics was impatiently wished for by the Protestants of Ireland; and the Romish assemblies, to countenance this falsehood, in several of their resolutions, which they caused to be ostentatiously published in the daily Newspapers both in England and Ireland, with great gravity returned thanks to their Protestant brethren, for their cooperation in the great work of their emancipation; though it is notoriously known in Ireland, that the great body of Protestants view such a measure with abhorrence; that those who pass under the general denomination of Protestants, and give any countenance or support to such a measure, are generally republicans, and avowed disciples of Paine, Price, and Priestley, or timid persons who dread the horrors of a Romish rebellion; and (praised be God!) among the mass of people passing under the general description of Protestants in Ireland, republicans, infidels, blasphemers and cowards are very few, and inconsiderable with respect to power or property.

Mr. Grattan's factious answer to the address of the Romish assembly at Francis-street chapel on the recall of Earl Fitzwilliam.

This assembly also voted an address to you: your answer to which very plainly points out your design of separating the two countries, and the use you intended to make of the Romanists in the execution of that design.

I shall here take the liberty of reminding you of a few passages in that answer, which together with the address was printed on one sheet of paper, and sent in thousands over all Ireland, with advice to all Romanists to have the sheets framed

framed and glazed, and hung up for perusal in all their houses.

This answer was published in March, 1795, at the time when the British Empire was actually engaged in a furious war with a savage enemy, the enemy of mankind in general ! not for advantage, for commerce, or for dominion ; but for preservation, for existence as a free country. You therein insert the following passages, addressed to the Irish Romanists :

“ Let me advise you by no means to postpone the consideration of your fortunes till after the war ; rather let Britain receive the benefit of your zeal during the exigency which demands it.

“ My wish is, that you should be free *now* ; there is no other policy which is not low and little ; let us at once *instantly* embrace, and greatly emancipate.

“ If he (Earl Fitzwilliam) is to retire I condole with my country. For myself, the pangs on that occasion which I should feel at rendering up my small portion of ministerial breath, would be little, were it not for the gloomy prospects afforded by those dreadful guardians which are likely to succeed. I tremble at the return of power to your old *task-masters*. That combination which galled the country with its tyranny, insulted her by its manners, exhausted her by its rapacity, and slandered her by its malice ; should such a combination (at once inflamed as it must be now by the favour of the *British court*, and by the reprobation of the *Irish people*) return to power, I have no hesitation to say, that they will *extinguish Ireland, or Ireland must remove them*. It is not your case only, but that of the nation ; I find the country already *committed* in the struggle ; I beg to be committed along with her, and to abide the issue of her fortunes.”

Then the answer, after remarking that the Irish parliament had voted great supplies, goes on to say, “ And when this country came forward, cordial and confident, with the offering of her treasure and blood, and resolute to stand or fall with the British nation, it is no proof  
“ of

“ of wisdom or generosity to select that moment to plant  
“ a dagger in her heart.”

Though the manifest tendency of your answer (being all in the same strain with the above selected passages) was to excite the Romanists of Ireland to insurrection, for the purpose of severing the island from the British Empire during the war with France, which would ensure the insurgents the assistance of the French assassins; yet it may not be impertinent to insert, in this my answer to your most impudent address to the citizens of Dublin, a few comments on the above passages, as my answer is not intended for your perusal alone, but for the perusal of my fellow citizens of Dublin, and of all other my countrymen into whose hands it may fall.

It is proper to remark here, that the Irish Romanists, before the lieutenancy of Earl Fitzwilliam, were intitled to every civil privilege and advantage to which Protestants were intitled; save only that their obstinate refusal of the oath of supremacy, and of the oaths and engagements prescribed to be taken by the test act, precluded the few Irish peers of that persuasion from voting in the House of Lords, and their commoners from seats in the House of Commons. They were also, by the same means, precluded from filling about 32 civil employments, among which were the offices of Lord Lieutenant, Lord Chancellor, Judges, and Commander in Chief of the army; in the persons filling which offices was vested the superior executive authority of the state; situations of legislative and executive authority, which can never be conceded to Romanists while they deny the supremacy of the state, and while even the form of a Protestant establishment is preserved in Ireland.

In fact, the Irish Romanists, previous to the arrival of Earl Fitzwilliam, enjoyed a more rational, a more extensive, and better secured civil liberty, than the most favoured class of subjects in any state in the known world, those of Great Britain only excepted; yet you and your party harangued and addressed what you call the *popular and energetick* part of them into an opinion that they were slaves; fraudulently  
and

and maliciously stiled the subversion of the Protestant establishment in church and state, *emancipation* of the Roman Catholics; and told them that they must work their own deliverance, when the British Empire is involved in a war with a potent neighbouring nation, which has declared by public decree, that it will support and assist the subjects of all states who shall rebel against their rulers.

The true and palpable construction of the words, " Let me advise you by no means to postpone the consideration of your fortunes till after the war. My wish is that you should be free *now*; there is no other policy which is not low and little; let us at once instantly embrace and greatly emancipate. You must destroy your former dreadful guardians, your old task-masters, or they will extinguish you. The country is already committed in the struggle; I beg to be committed along with her, and to abide the issue of her fortunes;" is, *fly to arms immediately; destroy by fire and sword all Protestants who oppose your pretensions, and all the great Protestant officers of state, many of whom I displaced in the short interval of my domination, and intended to have done so by the rest: they are all task-masters, and keep you in worse than Egyptian bondage. You have no time to lose; if you don't dispatch them before a peace shall be concluded, they will extinguish you. Great Britain can send no assistance to the Protestants of Ireland; you are the Irish people, the country, the nation; the Protestants are but a handful. England is not able to defend herself against France when your assistance is withdrawn from her; the French will assist you with innumerable hosts; I myself will be your general. If you wait till a peace is concluded between Great Britain and her enemies, you will be too late.* Your present address is replete with the same doctrines, as I shall hereafter make more fully appear.

Your confederates, the *popular and energetick* Romanists, have not neglected your advice, so far as their abilities enabled them to follow it. A very considerable number of the Irish Romanists, and much the largest portion of them, preferred peace, quiet, and the exercise of their lawful occupations, protected by civil liberty, to rapine and murder.

The

The whole body, though they amounted to two-thirds of the inhabitants of the island, yet were not in possession of one-twentieth part of the real and personal property of the kingdom, taken together. Hence, from a disapprobation of so wicked a measure in a large part, and from inability in the rest, (and indeed in the whole, if they had been unanimous) no open general rebellion of the Romanists followed the dismissal of Earl Fitzwilliam; but assassination, nightly murder, robbery, and conflagration through a considerable part of the kingdom immediately followed this your flagitious publication; and in your present you openly avow, that these calamities are the consequences of the rejection of what you stile Catholic emancipation. Adverting to the present convulsions in this kingdom, in your address, you write thus: "They (that is the government) have told us " at some times, though at other times they have said the " contrary, that it is the spirit of plunder, not politics, that " is abroad: idle talk, whatever be the crime of the pre- " sent spirit, it is not the crime of theft; if so it were easi- " ly put down: no, it is a *political* not a predatory spirit, " it is the spirit of *political reformation*," that is, *Catholic emancipation*: for in your late project of reform, proposed in the House of Commons, the first and principal part of the reformation which you and your party declared must precede all further reform, was Catholic emancipation, so that the disciples of the Protestant reformers, who had two centuries ago converted the nation from what our foolish ancestors thought the errors of popery, were to be re-reformed into popery, for the re-establishment of civil liberty; and popery and liberty were indissolubly connected by the dogmas of you and your faction, instead of popery and slavery heretofore-coupled together in the political creed of our silly ancestors; and you openly and audaciously avow, that all the present nightly assassinations, robberies, and burning houses, the horrible murders of multitudes of Protestant clergymen, magistrates, witnesses, and others, with the dreadful conspiracy for the murder of more, arise from the spirit of *political reformation* which you and your faction have

have sent abroad among *the popular and energetick Romanists*, that is, the dregs of the mob of that persuasion; and this spirit is conjured up by a faction contemptible in number, never amounting to thirty, as well as I recollect, on any question in the House of Commons since the recall of Earl Fitzwilliam, of which five or six only at any one time were members for counties, and frequently reduced to seven.

But, sir, it is not surprizing that you, who have so repeatedly harangued and addressed for Catholic emancipation and reform of the Commons' House, by which, as I shall demonstrate before I quit you, you mean the subversion of the Protestant religion in Ireland, separation of the island from the British Empire, and an Irish republic; I say, it is not surprizing that you should justify the present nocturnal murders and outrages of an Irish banditti, and fine them down by representing them as arising "from the spirit of political reformation carried to different degrees; to *liberty in most instances*; to ambition in others; and to power in others," and again, "here there may be conspiracy; there may be republicanism; there may be a spirit of plunder mixing in the public cause; but it is a public cause; and let no man persuade you that *it is not the cause of liberty on one side and tyranny on the other*;" when you had the audacity in the same address to justify the horrible Irish massacre of the year 1641, and to falsify history in the most palpable manner for that purpose.

Mr. Grattan openly justifies the horrible Irish massacre in 1641.

This, sir, you did; and although at the first view it may seem that you digressed a little from the proposed subject of your address, to wit, the justification of your own parliamentary conduct, in justifying the Irish massacre; to those who shall attentively consider your address, as I have done, it will clearly appear, that you have inserted this justification of that dreadful catastrophe, for the purpose of encouraging the continuance of the present barbarous disorders, so gently represented by you, as *the exertions of the spirit of political reformation, operating for liberty in most instances! as exertions in the cause of liberty against tyranny!* by the  
example



example of the glorious exploits of the ancestors of the present Romish banditti in the same cause with the present.

It is not a little remarkable, that the designs of the leaders of that rebellion were the same with yours, the separation of this kingdom from England, and the establishment of an independent government here; and with that view, and as the sure means of effecting their purpose, they intended the utter extirpation of the Protestant religion, and had projected a reform in parliament by the destruction of the boroughs some time before they broke out into open rebellion, as may be seen by the histories of that time, and particularly by that most valuable one, Mr. Carte's history of the Duke of Ormond, and the authentic documents which he has published in the appendix to it.

You begin your justification of the Irish rebellion with a false and acrimonious invective against king James the first. (I shall before I conclude this answer, expose your malignant misstatement of the conduct of that prince to his Irish subjects.) You then proceed to abuse, by most malicious misrepresentations, (to which you have so habituated yourself, that they seem to be natural to you,) the whole of the conduct of king Charles the first, and the administration of the Earl of Strafford, his minister in Ireland. It is no wonder that you, who presume with an assurance peculiar to yourself to misrepresent in the most flagrant manner what is every day happening before our eyes, should misrepresent antiquity without quoting any historian to support your misstatements. You sometimes add to your malignant fables the words, "*says the historian;*" pray, why did you not declare the historian's name? Such misrepresentations of transactions in the reigns of James the first, and Charles the first, but not tinged quite so deeply with acrimonious invective, are contained in two books, both of them of modern date; one written by a mercenary profligate scribbler, of the name of Brooke, hired by a club of Irish Romanists to defame the Protestant government of Ireland, and called *the trial of the Roman Catholics*; the other by a bigotted Romish physician of the city of Dublin, of the name of Curry, styled,

*an historical review of the wars of Ireland*, a second edition of this last treatise has been lately published in the city of Dublin by your *energetick* Romanists. Is the historian you allude to, but whom you decline to name, one of these? They both are in stile and credit, as historians, rather below the level of Oldmixon and Ogilby in England. Any person who wishes to be convinced of the false colouring with which they and you have disguised and deformed the history of those times, will be fully satisfied by reading the three first books of the first volume of Carte's history of the Duke of Ormond, and the authorities there referred to; and Hume, 6th vol. page 401, 402, &c.; he will there find your calumnies fully refuted, and that Ireland owes her constitution, her laws, her manufactures, her trade, her civilization, to the two monarchs, and the great statesman, you have thus basely traduced and abused; that from a woody desert, inhabited only by savage barbarians for the most part, it assumed the appearance of a civilized country by the great care and attention of these monarchs and their ministers, particularly the Earl of Strafford. History gives the following account of the Earl of Strafford's administration in Ireland: " In the government of Ireland, his ad-  
 " ministraton had been equally promotive of his master's  
 " interest, and that of the subjects committed to his care;  
 " a large debt he had paid off; he had left a considerable  
 " sum in the Exchequer; the revenues, which never before  
 " answered the charges of government, were now raised to  
 " be equal to them; a small standing army, formerly kept  
 " in no order, was augmented, and was governed by exact  
 " discipline; and a great force was then raised and paid for  
 " the support of the king's authority against the Scotch co-  
 " venanters.

" Industry and all the arts of peace were introduced  
 " among that rude people; the shipping of the kingdom  
 " augmented a hundred fold; the customs tripled upon the  
 " same rates; the exports doubled in value to the imports;  
 " manufactures particularly that of linen, introduced and  
 " promoted; agriculture, by means of the English and  
 " Scottish

“ Scottish plantations, gradually advancing; the Protestant religion encouraged without the persecution or discontent of the Catholics.” See Hume’s history, vol. 6th, page 402, and the authorities there quoted.

Remarks  
on Mr.  
Grattan’s  
gross abuse  
of the Earl  
of Strafford.

As you have raked up the ashes of the dead for the purpose of defaming them, and thereby justifying rebellion and massacre; it may not be amiss here to insert an account of the conduct of the Earl of Strafford, when brought to trial before his peers by merciless cruel republicans, who hunted him to death, and murdered him in defiance and contempt of the known laws of this country; though you, with as much ignorance as malice, state that he “*justly lost his head;*” as if the putting any man to death by a public execution, against whom no crime, which could warrant judgment of death by the known laws of the land, was proved, and against whom no judgment was pronounced by his peers who tried him, was an act of justice; eighty peers attended at his trial on an impeachment for high treason by the Commons. After the trial had lasted eighteen days, the managers of the Commons, finding they had failed in the proof of any act of treason against him, and that the peers intended to acquit him, immediately suspended the progress of the trial; the Commons his accusers turned judges, contrary to all law and justice, brought in and passed a bill of attainder against him in their own house, sent it to the lords, compelled a majority of the lords, by great and outrageous mobs, and menaces of assassination, to pass the bill; forty-five lords only, out of eighty that attended the trial, being present in the house at the time the bill passed; the rest being kept away through dread of republican violence; and of these forty-five, nineteen voted against the bill. His majesty was prevailed upon by a forged letter, pretended to have been written by the Earl himself, to give his assent to this murderous act; such was the justice by which the Earl of Strafford lost his head! it is modern French justice! I am not ashamed to quote my historical authorities, see the State Trials, 1st vol. Hume, 6th vol. from p. 400 to 411. Carte’s Ormond, 1st vol. p. 131 to 136. Mr. Whitlock, the famous republican, favourite

favourite of Cromwell, and author of the memorials, was himself chairman of the committee of the House of Commons, appointed to conduct and manage the impeachment against the earl before the lords; he thus describes the behaviour of that great man on his trial: "Certainly never any man acted such a part on such a theatre, with more wisdom, constancy and eloquence, with greater reason, judgment, and temper, and with a better grace in all his words and actions, than did this *great and excellent* person, and he moved the hearts of all his auditors, some few excepted, to *remorse* and pity." And the same author, speaking of the earl's death, thus expresses himself; "he died with charity, courage, and general lamentation. Thus fell this noble earl, who for natural parts and abilities, and for improvement of knowledge, by experience in the greatest affairs, for wisdom, *faithfulness and gallantry* of mind, hath left few behind him, that may be ranked equal with him," see Whitlock's memorials from p. 40 to 43; such was the language of one of the prosecutors of that great and unfortunate statesman respecting him; how different from that of you, his posthumous defamer! who stile him with as much falsehood and malice, as vulgarity, a *robber*.

After your stating, contrary to all truth, to all authentic history, that the Irish were, before the rebellion and massacre, the most oppressed nation on earth, that these oppressions were the natural effects of a borough parliament; that the inhuman persecutions under which the Irish then laboured were provocations sufficient to excite in the minds of the people sentiments of the most savage revenge, and fully to justify them; you break out into the following rant: "*Massacre*, confusion, civil war, religious fury followed *naturally and of course*; here you see hatched and matured the egg which produced the massacre, and all that brood of mortal consequences. The principles of *robbery* were planted by the deputy (the Earl of Strafford) and the government were surprized at the growth of popular pillage; had the country been left to a state of barbarous

Remarks  
 on Mr.  
 Grattan's  
 justification  
 of the bar-  
 barous Ro-  
 mish massa-  
 cre of 1641.

“ nature, she could not have been so shattered and con-  
 “ vulsed, as, when thus reduced to a state of barbarous  
 “ art.” Thus you defend the justice of this horrible mas-  
 sacre ; for the man who tells us, that the provocation given  
 was such as called for the revenge, justifies the revenge, it  
 then becomes but justice ; homicide is even justifiable by the  
 common law, if the provocation is so great that human nature  
 cannot brook it, a robber may be justly slain by the party at-  
 tacked, such homicide is self-defence ; here then you address  
 the citizens of Dublin with a defence of the barbarous massacre  
 of their unoffending Protestant ancestors by merciless Romish  
 murderers. Gracious God ! a century and an half has passed  
 since that horrid transaction, and no man has in all that time  
 been found audacious and wicked enough to justify it, except  
 yourself ; many have attempted to extenuate it, some partially  
 to excuse it, but no one fully to justify it, until you took up  
 your pen for that purpose ; to awaken the horror in the minds  
 of Irish Protestants, which such an attempt must justly  
 excite, I shall delineate from authentic historians some of  
 the most prominent and terrible features of that dreadful  
 catastrophe.

“ *The Irish, every where intermingled with the English,*  
 “ *needed but a hint from their leaders and priests to begin hos-*  
 “ *tilities against a people whom they hated on account of their re-*  
 “ *ligion, and envied for their riches and prosperity, the houses,*  
 “ *cattle, goods of the unwary English were first seized, these*  
 “ *who heard of the commotions in their neighbourhood, instead of*  
 “ *deserting their habitations and assembling together for mutual*  
 “ *protection, remained at home in hopes of defending their pro-*  
 “ *perty, and fell thus separately into the hands of their enemies,*  
 “ *after rapacity had fully exerted itself, cruelty, and that the*  
 “ *most barbarous, that ever in any nation, was known or heard*  
 “ *of, began its operations, an universal massacre commenced of*  
 “ *the English now defenceless and passively resigned to their inhu-*  
 “ *man foes, no age, no sex, no condition was spared. The wife*  
 “ *weeping for her butchered husband, and embracing her helpless*  
 “ *children, was pierced with them, and perished by the same*  
 “ *stroke, the old, the young, the vigorous, the infirm, underwent*  
 “ *the*

“ the like fate, and were confounded in one common ruin ; in  
 “ vain did flight save from the first assault, destruction was  
 “ every where let loose, and met the hunted victims at every  
 “ turn ; in vain was recourse had to relations, to companions,  
 “ to friends ; all connections were dissolved, and death was dealt  
 “ by that hand, from which protection was implored and expect-  
 “ ed ; without provocation, without opposition, the astonished  
 “ English, being in profound peace and full security, were mas-  
 “ sacred by their nearest neighbours, with whom they had long  
 “ upheld a continued intercourse of kindness and good offices, but  
 “ death was the lightest punishment inflicted by those enraged  
 “ rebels ; all the tortures which wanton cruelty could devise, all  
 “ the lingering pains of body, the anguish of mind, the agonies of  
 “ despair, could not satiate revenge, excited without injury, and  
 “ cruelty derived from no cause ; to enter into the particulars  
 “ would shock the least delicate humanity, such enormities, though  
 “ attested by undoubted evidence, appear almost incredible, de-  
 “ praved nature, even perverted religion encouraged by the ut-  
 “ most licence, reaches not to such a pitch of ferocity, unless the  
 “ pity inherent in human breasts, be destroyed, by that contagion  
 “ of example, which transports man beyond all the usual motives  
 “ of conduct and behaviour.

“ The weaker sex themselves, naturally tender to their own  
 “ sufferings and compassionate to those of others, here emulated  
 “ their more robust companions, in the practice of every cruelty ;  
 “ even children, taught by the example, and encouraged by the ex-  
 “ hortation of their parents, essayed their feeble blows on the  
 “ dead carcases or defenceless children of the English ; the very  
 “ avarice of the Irish was not a sufficient restraint to their cruel-  
 “ ty, such was their frenzy, that the cattle which they had seized,  
 “ and by rapine had made their own, yet because they bore the  
 “ name of English, were wantonly slaughtered, or when covered  
 “ with wounds, turned loose into the woods and deserts.

“ The stately buildings or commodious habitations of the plan-  
 “ ters, as if upbraiding the sloth and ignorance of the natives,  
 “ were consumed with fire, or laid level with the ground, and  
 “ where the miserable owners, shut up in their houses and pre-  
 “ paring for defence perished in the flames, together with their

“ wives and children, a double triumph was offered to their insulting foes.

“ If any where a number assembled together, and assuming courage from despair, were resolved to sweeten death by a revenge on their assassins, they were disarmed by capitulations and promises of safety, confirmed by the most solemn oaths, but no sooner had they surrendered, than the rebels, with perfidy equal to their cruelty, made them share the fate of their unhappy countrymen.

“ Others, more ingenious still in their barbarity, tempted their prisoners, by the fond love of life, to embroil their hands in the blood of their friends, brothers, and parents, and having thus rendered them accomplices in guilt, gave them that death, which they sought to shun by deserving it.

“ Amidst all these enormities, the sacred name of religion found- ed on every side, not to stop the hands of those murderers, but to enforce their blows, and to steel their hearts against every movement of human or social sympathy; the English, as heretics, abhorred of God, and detestable to all holy men, were marked out by the priests for slaughter; and of all actions, to rid the world of these declared enemies to Catholic faith and piety, was represented as the most meritorious; nature, which in that rude people was sufficiently inclined to atrocious deeds, was further stimulated by precept, and national prejudices em- poisoned by those aversions, more deadly and incurable, which arose from an enraged superstition, while death finished the sufferings of each victim, the bigotted assassins, with joy and exultation, still echoed in his expiring ears, that these agonies were but the commencement of torments infinite and eternal.”

Such is the description of this hellish massacre given by Mr. Hume in the 6th vol. of his history from page 410 to 436, and he styles it, *an event memorable in the annals of human kind, and worthy to be held in perpetual detestation and abhorrence.* That he has not heightened the picture beyond reality, the writings of Temple, of Clarendon, of Rushworth, of Whitlock, cotemporary historians, and volumes of original depositions taken on the occasion, and now extant in the library of Trinity College Dublin, sufficiently prove; some differ-  
ences

ences of opinion have indeed prevailed, respecting the number of the immolated victims ; Mr. Carte, a writer of singular humanity, and justice, examines those opinions respecting the number with great candour, and in his history of the Duke of Ormond, 1st vol. p. 177, 178, states that though some writers had swelled the amount of the murdered to upwards of one hundred thousand, yet that Peter Walsh, a Romish fryar, calculated the number slaughtered to amount to eight thousand only ; but that Sir William Petty in his Political Anatomy of Ireland, computed the number of Protestants massacred in cold blood, in the first year of the Irish rebellion, to amount to thirty-seven thousand, and to this last calculation, Mr. Carte gives his own approbation, founded on the known abilities of Sir William Petty, his skill in calculation, and the opportunities he had of obtaining authentic information, he having, shortly after this dreadful period, surveyed the whole kingdom. It is here to be remarked that in Mr. Hume's account Englishman and Protestant are synonymous, the native Irish Romanists to this day counting every Protestant, though of Irish name and family, an Englishman, and having, as I have already observed, but one word in their language to signify both. Did you mean to insult the citizens of Dublin by justifying this horrid massacre, as a just retaliation on the Irish Protestants, as oppressors of the Irish nation ? What opinion do you think the citizens of Dublin will entertain of the heart of the man, who could justify so barbarous a transaction ? Surely every Protestant in the nation, and every Romanist too, who is not one of *your energetics*, will hold the same opinion of its advocate, as Mr. Hume held of the event itself, to wit, that he is worthy to be held in perpetual detestation and abhorrence !

I have cited this historical account of the Irish massacre in the words of the historian, without adding one tittle to it, not with a view of awakening old animosities, and exciting to new outrages, the purpose for which you lugged it head and shoulders into your address.

I am perfectly convinced that many, I hope and believe a great majority, of the Irish Romanists of the present day,  
hold



hold it in as much abhorrence as I do, but I have taken this notice of it, because you have provoked it; and to hold you up in your proper colours to the nation, which you have insulted by justifying it, to shew the reasonable Romanists, (for I write not to your *energetics*) to what barbarous and dangerous extremities you are urging them, merely for the gratification of your own ambition, and avarice; and to dissect and expose to public inspection, the heart of a man, capable of publishing to the world his approbation of the barbarous Irish massacre, and of the present horrible nocturnal murders, conflagrations, and robberies, perpetrated by your *popular and energetic Romanists*, throughout a great part of this nation, exactly of the same kind with those perpetrated by the Irish rebels in the year 1641, and which you emphatically stile, *the exertions of the spirit of political reformation, operating for liberty in most instances*, and which in your address you stimulate them to, as well by your avowed approbation of former massacres, as by telling them, that the exertions of the present government, in stationing and employing the king's army in different parts of the nation, for the suppression of these murders and robberies, and the protection of the loyal and peaceable subjects under the guidance of the civil magistrates, are murders, and the minister a murderer, and employer of murderers; thus you sound the trumpet of insurrection and massacre, by the most notorious and malignant falsehoods!

“ The minister (you exclaim) destroyed liberty, and property,  
 “ he consumed the press, he burned houses and villages,  
 “ he *murdered* and he failed (that is, my brave confederates,  
 “ he has not yet been able to suppress the murders, and robberies of you the *energetic Romanists*) recall your murdered, we said, and in his place, dispatch our messenger, try  
 “ conciliation,” that is, banish your magistracy, recall the army, who are sub-murderers, from the country, extinguish all law, abandon the loyal and peaceable Irish Protestant subjects, to murder, robbery and conflagration, give the kingdom up without further contest to the *popular and energetic Romanists*, and submit your throats to the knife, without further

ther

ther struggle; for *the mass of the people, the Irish nation*, are determined to massacre you all, you are foreigners, *murderers*, and merit slaughter.

I cannot yet dismiss your answer to the address of the Romanists assembled at Francis-street Chapel without one further remark as well on your vanity, as your deceit: you mention therein during the very short government of Earl Fitzwilliam that, "we (meaning yourself and your puny faction of ten or twelve members in the House of Commons) obtained a great force and a great supply with the consent and confidence of the people," and you add, "it is no proof of wisdom to take the taxes and continue the abuses, to dash away the affection of the people of Ireland, to select the moment when the people of Ireland came forward with her blood and treasure, resolute to stand or fall with the British nation, to plant a dagger in her heart," all these paragraphs are a continued chain of deceit; if, you intended to insinuate, that by your influence, and that of your party in the House of Commons, a large supply was procured in the lieutenancy of Earl Fitzwilliam, and a considerable increase of troops voted; do you think any man in Ireland, can be imposed upon by such legerdemain? The exertions and influence of you and your party, could not have added or deducted, one shilling, to, or from, the supply; nor one man to, or from, the number of troops voted; you might indeed have retarded the supply, perhaps for a couple of days, by your frothy harangues, and you might by such means, have detained the members of the House of Commons for a night or two to late hours; the impotence of you, and your party in the house, is so well known, that your boast of having obtained a great force and a great supply, instead of procuring you any credit, only excites laughter at your extravagant vanity, in those who know, and consider only your imbecility; a sneer of contempt at your deceit, in those who know you intended this part of your answer to the address, for the inspection of the English Jacobins, your masters, to induce them to believe that you are of great weight and consequence in the Irish House of Commons, and might, if you had  
thought

thought proper, have defeated or diminished the supply; and a stare of surprize in all, at your impudence, in openly publishing in Ireland, what every man in Ireland, who has ever adverted to public affairs, knows to be a falsehood. Secondly, you intended to insinuate, that you and your friends procured an ample supply, and an additional number of troops on the terms express or implied, that government should exert all its interest to cause your bill for what you stile *Catholic emancipation*, to be enacted into a law, and that the recall of Earl Fitzwilliam was a breach of the terms, and a stab to the heart of the nation; but it is evident no such terms could have been agreed upon, because the whole nation knew that you and your friends could neither procure the grant or the denial of a supply, therefore no terms could have been made with you or them, on that score; it is indeed certain enough that Earl Fitzwilliam, or rather you his governor, did determine to exert all the interest and power of government to cause that bill to pass into a law, and that such exertion of that interest was defeated by the sudden recall of Earl Fitzwilliam, but that his recall, and the defeat of such a bill, were considered by the *nation* as a *national* calamity, as a stab to the heart of the nation, and as a signal instance of ingratitude, after ample supplies had been voted by the Irish House of Commons, is a falsehood as groundless as any other contained in your address, for every Protestant in the nation, except some usurpers of that name, the disciples of Paine, Price, and Priestley, shewed every demonstration of joy on the recall of Earl Fitzwilliam, that is, a body of the Irish people possessing forty-nine parts out of fifty of the landed property of Ireland, and at least nineteen parts out of twenty, of the personal property, the great landed and moneyed interest of the kingdom; and as to the bill for what you fraudulently stile the *emancipation of the Roman Catholics*, you informed *your popular and energetic Romanists*, your committee of nine, in your answer to the address of them and their mob, that you meant with *their permission* to introduce their bill, immediately after the recess, which took place on the recall of Earl Fitzwilliam, which permission that most respectable committee of nine, composed

composed of traders, shopkeepers, and empirics, by their resolution of the 9th of April 1795, most graciously conceded to you: after the playing of this farce, between you and this doughty committee, you introduced this bill into the House of Commons, out of which it was scouted by an immense majority of the House, you and about twenty more, only, supporting it; what proof then have you of the truth of your assertions that the recall of Earl Fitzwilliam, was a stab to the heart of the nation, and a mark of the blackest ingratitude to the *nation*, which had granted ample supplies? almost the whole body of the landed and moneyed interest of the nation, manifested the utmost joy on the recall of that nobleman, and the same House of Commons, which had granted the supplies, almost unanimously scouted out your emancipation bill, the favourite measure of that nobleman and those employed by him; in short, it is plain, that in your answer you mean fraudulently to impose your Romanist committee, and their mob, your *popular and energetic Romanists*, on your Jacobin masters in England, as the Irish nation, the Irish people; so much for your answer to the address of the *popular and energetic Romanists* assembled in Francis-street Chapel.

The Romish committee having by your advice dispatched three delegates to the British court, as ambassadors with a remonstrance, which they presented to his majesty at his levee, against the recall of Earl Fitzwilliam, and being there received with all the contempt, which the presumption and absurdity of their mission merited, returned to Ireland and summoned another meeting of their party, at the Romish Chapel in Francis-street on the 9th of April 1795, four members of your committee of nine here displayed their oratorical abilities; as they were all known to be your puppets, and to act under your controul, and instructions, a short account of the proceedings of this assembly and of the tendency of their speeches will serve more clearly to illustrate your dangerous projects; one principal object with this assembly, was, to impose a belief on the Irish Protestants remote from Dublin, that the pretensions of these *popular and energetic Romanists*, were favoured by the body of the Protestants of Dublin, and

Proceedings of the Romish assembly at Francis-street Chapel on the 9th of April 1795, their public declarations of their republican principles, and their determined hostility to Great Britain; and their recognition of Mr. Tone, a French spy, as one of their agents, as well as Mr. Grattan.

to

to give a countenance to this fraud, a few Romish students of Trinity College Dublin, (Romanists having been shortly before enabled by act of parliament to receive their education in that seminary) repaired to that assembly; their appearance at the Romish Chapel was preconcerted, they were received with great acclamation, and one of the orators welcomed them in a most bombastic address, he affected, as did the rest of the assembly, to treat them as if they were the whole of the Protestant students of the College of Dublin, although all the assembly knew the contrary; many of these young men being the children of leading Romanists then present, and they were part of a body, who had on that day presented a fulsome address to you, and were then returning after perfuming your idolship with their incense; two of these Romanist students in their turn harangued the assembly, and inveighed with all the bitterness of the most malignant Romish natives, against all connections between Great Britain and Ireland; they appeared to be perfectly well tutored in all the rebellious doctrine of separation of this country from Britain; in all the Romish publications of the transactions of this assembly, the attendance of this handful of students is blazoned forth, as if it was the attendance of all the members of the Protestant University of Dublin; the speeches uttered at this assembly were published in most of the daily papers in Dublin, and were carefully copied into Jacobin Newspapers in London; one orator, of the name of M<sup>c</sup>Nevin, one of the committee of nine, after representing Great Britain as almost totally subdued by the arms of France, advises the Romanists immediately, and during the war, to commence all kind of hostilities against Britain, and thus declaims, “ what may we “ not expect from the madness of her returning prosperity, “ when amidst the *wreck of all her greatness*, by a treatment “ equally irritating and unjust, she seems to solicit insurrection among the people, or to command a dereliction of “ their rights!” Throughout all their speeches, these Romish orators affect to take it as granted, that what they call Catholic emancipation, is the wish of all the people of Ireland, that the Protestants of Ireland are attached friends to their

their pretensions, or too inconsiderable to be at all considered in the discussion of them, and that they are only opposed by the British ministry; such deception they think may have weight in England, where the falsehood, the utter contempt of truth, the meanness, poverty and impotence of the declaimers are unknown, but they well know, that they and their assertions, are treated with due contempt in Ireland.

The same orator proceeds thus: " It is the protection of England, which has taken away your regular army to be employed in her *impious crusade*, her protection has not left you a port from Bilboa to the Baltick, and involved you in a war, in which had she been successful, *had not the judgment of God overtaken her*, she would have the power, and I doubt not, the inclination, to rivet your bolts for ever, her protection has been well compared to that of the exalted oak in the thunder storm; to the unphilosophic clown who seeks its shade, the tree serves to conduct more unerringly the lightning's force upon his head; the moment is at hand, when the world shall know how to estimate the connection of both countries, and the independence of our state; the problem will be now resolved, whether Ireland be a free and *imperial* nation, or only an outlying province to Great Britain."

All these orators magnified the general population of Ireland, and the excess of the number of Romanists, over that of the Protestants in it, beyond all bounds of truth and probability; and further to excite rebellion, they diminished the population of Britain in the same degree, and descanted throughout, on defeats and discomfitures of the British arms, which never happened, and they all in the most violent terms reprobated all ideas of an union with Great Britain, and urged the necessity of a parliamentary reform.

Another of these orators of the name of Ryan, a member of the committee of nine, endeavoured in his harangue, to persuade such of his audience as had taken the oath enjoined to be taken by the act of 1793 by all Romanists who were desirous of having the benefit of that act, that nothing contained in that oath, could prevent them from endeavouring to overthrow

overthrow the present Protestant Church establishment in Ireland—The clause in the oath relating to the church establishment is as follows :

“ And I do hereby disclaim, disavow, and solemnly abjure  
 “ any intention to subvert the present church establishment,  
 “ for the purpose of substituting a Catholic establishment in its  
 “ stead.”

The argument of the last mentioned orator, is thus :  
 “ You have not absolutely sworn, that you will not endeavour to subvert the present Protestant Church establishment; you have only sworn that you will not endeavour to subvert it, for the purpose of substituting a Romish Church establishment in its room; but notwithstanding this oath, you may subvert the present Protestant Church establishment, provided you do not substitute a Romish establishment in its room; now when we subvert the present, we will live without any establishment, and we will not substitute a Romish establishment in the room of that subverted”: his words on this occasion are remarkable, “ and I will say, that I have  
 “ reason to think that Catholics, so far from being willing  
 “ to subvert one establishment, *in order to substitute their own*  
 “ *in its place*, would not, if all establishments were levelled  
 “ to the ground, desire or consent to build up an exclusive  
 “ establishment for their own clergy and their own creeds.”—

This assembly then came to several resolutions, some of them I shall insert.

“ Resolved unanimously, that we are sincerely and unalterably attached, to the rights, liberties, and *independence*  
 “ of our native country, and we pledge ourselves, *collectively*  
 “ and *individually*, to resist, even our own emancipation---if  
 “ proposed to be conceded on the ignominious terms of an  
 “ acquiescence, in the fatal measure of *an union*, with the  
 “ sister kingdom.”

“ Resolved unanimously, that the right hon. Henry Grattan be requested to introduce the Catholic bill, immediately on the meeting of parliament.”

“ Resolved unanimously, that the thanks of this meeting  
 “ be respectfully presented to our agent, *Theobald Wolfe Tone*,  
 “ *Esq.* for the readiness with which he accompanied our de-  
 “ puties

“ duties to England, and the many other *important services*,  
 “ he has rendered to the Catholic body in pursuit of emanci-  
 “ pation, *services which no gratitude can overrate, and no re-*  
 “ *muneration can overpay.*”

Before I proceed further in detailing the conduct of you, and your confederates, the *popular and energetic Romanists*, it is necessary for me to explain, not to you, but to the public, who this Mr. Tone, your fellow agent for the Romish committee of nine, is, and what his public conduct has been; as such explanation, will strongly tend to illustrate your conduct in some particulars, and to clear away all doubts respecting your real designs.

This Mr. Tone, is the son of a mechanic of some sort in Dublin, who found means to procure him an education in the College of Dublin, and he afterwards made his way to the bar; he formed that society of assassins, the United Irishmen; his name has often appeared as secretary to that pack of blood hounds; in 1792 he published a pamphlet, entitled *An argument on behalf of the Catholics of Ireland; the object of it is to shew the deplorable state of Ireland, arising from her connection with Great Britain, to prove that the emancipation of the Romanists, by their admission into the legislature will be followed necessarily by a parliamentary reform, and that such reform, produced by such means, will enable Ireland to exist, as an independent state, perfectly severed from Great Britain; he states that every hour brings forth to Ireland infinite resources and provocations to independence, he lavishes the highest praises on the national assembly of France, describing them, “ as a body of representatives, not “ of their constituents merely, but of man, whose nature “ they have exalted beyond the limits, that even Providence “ seemed to have bounded it by,” he closes his pamphlet, by an address to the people of Ireland, in these words, “ let “ them once cry reform, and the Catholics of Ireland are free, “ independent, and happy.”*

This pamphlet recommended Mr. Tone to your committee of nine, your *popular and energetic Romanists*, they employed

Account of  
Mr. Tone.



ployed him as your co-adjutor in emancipation, and voted him the sum of fifteen hundred pounds for his trouble.

A man of the name of Jackson was sent over to Ireland in the beginning of the year 1794, by the French convention, as a spy, to procure them intelligence of the state of Ireland, the disposition of the inhabitants, and the practicability of an invasion; Mr. Hamilton Rowan, and Doctor Reynolds, both of them now exiles, outlawed for high treason, and Mr. Tone, now an exile too, immediately on the arrival of the French spy, formed a strict connection with him; Rowan was introduced to him by a man of the name of Lewins, one of the orators at this assembly in Francis-street Chapel of the 9th of April 1795, a remarkable Romish agitator; Tone being a man of letters and a barrister, was fixed on by the French spy, to draw up a state of Ireland to be transmitted to the French convention, to encourage them to invade the kingdom; this business Mr. Tone, co-agent with you for the Irish Romanists, performed in April 1794, Jackson was arrested by the government in the same month, and after putting off his trial by affidavits, once or twice, he was at length tried, and convicted of high treason, at the bar of the court of King's Bench, on the 23d of April 1795, and being brought up to receive sentence on the 30th of that month, he died at the bar, having previously swallowed poison; his aforesaid associates made their escapes; on this trial, the paper drawn up by Tone, as a state of this nation, for the use of the French convention, was read in evidence, having been intercepted at the post office; in this paper, this co-agent with you for the Irish Romanists, grossly mistakes the relative numbers of inhabitants of different sects; he reduces the Protestants of the established church to one half their number, he more than doubles the number of Protestant dissenters, indeed he trebles it, and he adds at least one-third to the number of Romanists; his reason for thus falsifying is obvious, he was a man of desperate fortune, he was as firmly attached to the project of the separation of this nation from Great Britain, as you, or the assembly at Francis-street Chapel, his and your employers;

Mr. Tone's  
state of Ire-  
land for the  
use of the  
French  
convention.

employers; Mr. Tone's attachment to this project may be seen by his writings, and that of the assembly at Francis-street, by their speeches, published by themselves with great ostentation, in which they publicly avow the doctrine of separation: Mr. Tone very well knew, that the execution of such a project, could not be even attempted with any reasonable prospect of success, without the aid of an army of French assassins, and he was apprehensive, if he stated the relative numbers of the inhabitants of Ireland of different sects truly, that the French would decline the hazard of an expedition to Ireland: In respect however to the property, political opinions, and inclinations, of the different sects, his statement is more to be depended on, though not accurately true; it proceeds thus: "The Protestants of the established church have  
 "engrossed, besides the whole church patronage, all the pro-  
 "fits and honors of the country exclusively, and a very great  
 "share of the landed property; the dissenters are steady re-  
 "publicans, devoted to liberty, and through all the stages  
 "of the French revolution, have been enthusiastically attach-  
 "ed to it; the Catholics, the great body of the people, are  
 "in the lowest degree of ignorance, and are ready for any  
 "change, because no change can make them worse; the  
 "whole peasantry may be said to be Catholics, they are in a  
 "semi-barbarous state, which of all others is the best adapt-  
 "ed for making war; *in Ireland the very name of England,*  
 "*and her power is universally odious, save with those who have*  
 "an interest in maintaining it, that is, with the Protestants  
 "of the establishment, who compose the parliament, and  
 "grand juries, and are aristocrats, whose very tenantry, and  
 "dependants would desert and turn against them, on the  
 "first convulsion, which would level them in the dust; the  
 "dissenters are enemies to the English power, from reason,  
 "and from reflection, *the Catholics from a hatred of the English*  
 "*name, resulting from the tyranny of near seven centuries;*" and he states the same grievances which you have so often complained of, to wit, "the church establishment, the payment  
 "of tythes, the government prosecutions, the convention act,  
 "the gun powder act, &c. &c." all which he represents,

“ as depressing public spirit, and as leaving no method for  
 “ the people to make their sentiments known, but by war,”  
 that is, by open rebellion when the French army shall arrive,  
 and by nocturnal murders and plunder, until that blessed pe-  
 riod—so far proceeded your co-agent for the Romanists,  
 your fellow labourer in the vineyard of emancipation, in his  
 treasonable correspondence with the enemy !

However heightened the colouring of this picture, drawn  
 by the pencil of Mr. Tone, of the situation of this country,  
 for the inspection of the French convention, may be, the  
 time of painting it, and several traits in it are very well wor-  
 thy of notice ; at the very time he painted it, in April 1794,  
 and for a long time before, he was the acknowledged agent,  
 of the *popular and energetic Romanists*, the identical persons  
 who employed you ; and the ostensible employment of you  
 both, was the work of what you and these Romanists frau-  
 dulently stile *emancipation* ; at that very time, it was notori-  
 ous, that he had carried on, or attempted to carry on, a  
 treasonable correspondence with the enemy, with the privity  
 at least of some of the Romanist orators, at this assembly of  
 Francis-street Chapel, particularly a man of the name of  
 Lewins, as has been proved on Jackson’s trial ; this assembly  
 voted him as their agent, their thanks for many *important*  
*services*, he had rendered to the Catholic body, in pursuit  
 of *emancipation*, services as they describe them, which *no gra-*  
*atitude can overrate, and no remuneration can overpay* ; they do  
 not think fit to state, what these services were ; your services,  
 or part of your services, to these Romanists, were, your  
 violent exertions in the House of Commons in their favour,  
 and your planning their several applications to parliament ;  
 Mr. Tone was not in parliament, and could not serve them  
 that way, but Mr. Tone had written a pamphlet, in which  
 he strongly recommended a total separation of this country  
 from Great Britain, as the only method by which the Ro-  
 manists could compleatly emancipate themselves ; and as  
 such separation could not be effected by any other means,  
 than by an army of French murderers, and as these *popular*  
*and energetic Romanists*, assembled at Francis-street Chapel,  
 the

the employers both of you and him, have fairly, and unequivocally, expressed their approbation of separation; it is by no means unreasonable to conjecture, that Mr. Tone's correspondence with the French convention, and his endeavours to induce them to send an army to invade this country, *were the important services, which no gratitude can overrate, and no remuneration can overpay,* rendered by him to the Catholic body, in pursuit of emancipation, mentioned in their resolution, but which they dared not openly avow, on account of their treasonable nature; it is not a little remarkable, that Mr. Tone on this occasion, repeats the same pretended grievances of the nation, which you have so often repeated, and also that he pointedly admits, that the only friends of the British connection in the country, the only loyal subjects, the only decided enemies of the French revolution, and the people who possess almost the whole property of the country, are the Protestants of the established church; he also pointedly admits, what has so often been objected against the Irish Romanists, and against their claims to political power, their inveterate and invincible hatred of the English name, nation, and empire; he also pointedly admits that the bulk of them are the peasantry of Ireland, the most wretched in Europe, and that they are in a semi-barbarous state; will you not admit, sir, that Mr. Tone your co-adjutor, the acknowledged agent of the *popular and energetick* Romanists (whom you every where and on every occasion state, to be representatives of the whole mass of the Irish Romanists, and their assembly, the only legitimate organ empowered to express the sentiments of that whole body,) the man to whom that assembly had voted the sum of fifteen hundred pounds at one time for his services; and also their thanks in the most energetick manner; will you not, I say, admit that he knew this body, and their opinions, as well as you, and was as capable of forming a right judgment of them? and how ridiculous are your pathetic rants, about the hardship of the exclusion of Romanists, from about thirty of the great offices of the state, and from seats in the legislative body, that is, the exclusion of a

body of subjects, of little property, and incurably disaffected to the civil and religious establishments, of the nation, (if their own agent, your worthy co-adjutor Mr. Tone, is to be believed,) from the legislative and superior executive capacity!

Further to demonstrate that your co-agent Mr. Tone, entertained the same project with yourself, the total separation of the two nations, I shall give a short extract from a letter of Mr. Tone, to a confidential correspondent of his in the North of Ireland, engaged in the same conspiracy, for raising a rebellion in this kingdom; this letter is published by the secret committee of the Irish House of Commons, in their report of the 10th of May, 1797, and appears to have been written early in the year 1794, upon the institution of the society of United Irishmen, at which time it may be inferred from a passage in the letter, that you and Mr. Tone had no connection, and when from his want of knowledge of you, he had great doubts, whether you or your party could be prevailed on to support measures, which by your answer to the address of the Romanists, on the recall of Earl Fitzwilliam, and by your present address, it appears you have now very fully adopted, and which probably you had adopted before: the extract is as follows; “ my unalterable opinion is, that the bane of Irish prof-  
 “ perity, is in the influence of England; I believe that influ-  
 “ ence will ever be extended, while the *connexion* between the  
 “ two countries continues;” then the letter, alluding to re-  
 solutions contained in it, goes on thus, “ nevertheless, as I  
 “ know that opinion is for the present, too hardy, though a  
 “ very little time may establish it universally, I have not made  
 “ it a part of the resolutions, I have not said one word, that  
 “ looks like a wish for *separation*, though I give it to you, and  
 “ your friends, as my most decided opinion, that such an event  
 “ would be, a regeneration to this country.” In the same letter Mr. Tone calls the *French Revolution* the *Morning Star* of liberty to Ireland.

You had not at the time this letter was written, publicly avowed your plan of emancipation, you were not at that time, in the honourable employment of co-agent, for the  
*popular*

*popular* and *energetick* Romanists, with Mr. Tone, and therefore in this letter, he expresses some doubts of your political creed, which you have since very compleatly satisfied.

The resolution of this assembly at Francis-street Chapel, expressive of the firm determination of the whole Romanist party there assembled, to resist an union with Great Britain, and rather to relinquish their favourite measure of emancipation, than consent to such a measure, was not at all called for by any circumstance relating to the ostensible cause of their meeting; it originated entirely in that inveterate hatred, which Mr. Tone, your colleague in the agency, for the Romanists, asserts, that all Irish Romanists entertain of England, her natives and her power; and even their own interest could not prevent them from declaring it so far as they dared, though much out of time.

It has been the opinion of very great and able statesmen, that an union with England, on just and equitable terms, would be very advantageous to Ireland, would contribute greatly to increase her trade, and her opulence, and conduce to the strength of the empire at large, and in any event, it could not be more prejudicial to the Romanists of Ireland, than to any other class of his majesty's subjects here, but much less, (if it could be at all prejudicial, which I cannot admit), in as much, if we were one people with the British nation, the preponderance of the Protestant body of the whole empire would be so great, that all rivalry and jealousies, between Protestants and Romanists would cease for ever, and it would not be necessary for the safety of the empire at large, to curb Romanists, by any exclusive laws whatsoever; but the immortal hatred of these *energetick* Romanists, to the British name, nation, and religion, and the annihilation of all their hopes of an independent Romish republic in Ireland, which they foresaw would be the effect of an union, chased from their minds in a moment all ideas of reason, prudence, and interest, and induced them, without any necessity whatsoever, to express their hostility to Britain; a conduct, which I hope will give the British ministers proper ideas of the danger of countenancing any further

ther innovations, in church or state in Ireland, projected by you and your associates, in favour of Irish Romanists.

The settled determination of your associates and employers, the Romish committee of nine, and the *popular and energetick* Romanists, whom you stile the great body of the Catholics, and also of your colleague in the work of emancipation, Mr. Tone, being thus published and declared for the separation of the two countries, and it being also avowed by him, that the obtaining of what they stile emancipation, and also parliamentary reform, was only considered by them as ancillary to separation, and to the establishment of an independent Romish republic in Ireland; and your colleague thinking that the business could not be completed without a rebellion at home, and the aid of a French army of invaders, and having accordingly solicited such aid, I shall now quote a few passages from your address to your fellow citizens of Dublin, to afford them some further assistance in judging, whether your opinions upon these projects, and the means of effecting them, are not the same with those of your employers, *the popular and energetick Irish Romanists*, and of your colleague Mr. Tone; and whether all your proceedings, do not directly tend to the same point with those of your aforesaid colleague and employers.

As to emancipation and reform, you have so publicly avowed that they are the object of your pursuit, both in and out of parliament, in all your speeches and addresses, for these two years past, that it is needless to quote any passage, to prove that you have openly patronized the measures. As to separation, which includes rebellion, and invasion, you have observed some caution; you have thought it prudent to disguise your opinion on this daring measure under a veil, but it is a veil of thin gauze, scarce sufficient to cover you from legal prosecution, your view in using any disguise at all.

Mr. Tone ascribes the inveterate hatred of the English name and nation in the Irish Romanists, to the tyranny of the English government in Ireland, for near seven centuries; you do not go so far back; you begin your account of the  
horrible

horrible oppression of the Irish, by the English government, with the reign of James the first; you then proceed to the reign of Charles the first, and justify and approve the horrible Irish massacre of that reign, as a measure of just resistance and retaliation; you state, that all the present nightly murders, robberies, and conflagrations, arise from the "spirit of public reformation, carried to different degrees, to liberty in most instances," you represent the minister, without specifying who the Minister is, *as a murderer of the people*, notoriously meaning, that the government, that is, those employed by the king in the different offices of it, are murderers of the people; you state that peerages are sold, consequently that the House of Peers is degraded, (this you asserted in parliament, you were called on for your proofs, you could produce none) you vilify in the basest manner, the House of Commons, calling it a *borough parliament*, meaning, I presume, a *borough house* of parliament, as if all the members of it were members for boroughs only, and stating that all boroughs are venal, that the members for such boroughs are not representatives of the people, and that all their acts are gross oppressions of the people. Thus you vilify, degrade, and traduce, king, lords, and commons, the whole constitutional supreme legislative and executive power of the nation, and tell the nation, that all acts of parliament, that have been enacted since the commencement of the reign of James the first, are wicked and unwarranted impositions, calculated to encourage and authorize the commission of murder, rapine, and every species of oppression on the Irish subjects, and "on the whole, that the cause of the Irish distraction of 1797, was the conduct of the servants of government, endeavouring to establish by unlimited bribery, absolute power; that the system of coercion, was a necessary consequence, and part of the system of corruption, and that the two systems, in their success, would have established a ruthless and horrid tyranny—tremendous and intolerable, imposed on the senate by influence, and the people by arms." You make the following eulogy, on the Irish peasantry, by a part of whom,



whom, all the present nocturnal murders, and depredations, are committed, “ to vindicate their native energy, against a “ vulgar error, they are a strong, hardy, bold, brave, labori- “ ous, warm hearted and *faithful race of men,*” some of them are certainly, very fit for the purpose of you and your colleague Mr. Tone, and are so far *faithful*, that it is difficult to prevail on them to impeach their accomplices.

Mr. Grattan's list of grievances, with remarks upon

You then proceed to your bead-roll of grievances, which you commence with enumerating certain inequalities in the trade, between Great Britain and Ireland, and close it with the following grievances, “ the bar bill—the convention bill ” —the gunpowder bill—the indemnity bill—the second in- “ demnity bill—the insurrection bill—the suspension of the “ habeas corpus—General Lake's proclamation, by order of “ government—the approbation afforded to that proclama- “ tion—the subsequent proclamation of government, more “ military and decisive—the order for the military to act “ without waiting for the civil power—the imprisonment of “ the middle orders without law—the detaining of them “ in prison without bringing them to trial—the transporting “ them without law—burning their houses—burning their “ villages—murdering them; crimes many of which are con- “ cealed, by the suppression of a free press, by military force “ —the preventing legal meetings of counties, to petition “ his majesty, by orders acknowledged to be given to the “ military, to disperse them; subverting the subjects right to “ petition, and finally the introduction of practices, not only “ unknown to law, but unknown to *civilized and christian* “ countries; such has been the working of the borough sys- “ tem, nor could such measures have taken place, but for that “ system.”

As to your pretended grievances in respect to trade, they have been often introduced by you and your party in debate in the House of Commons, where they have always met with a full and free discussion, and as far as I, who am no trader, nor much skilled in trade, have been able to judge, the matters of complaint, on the score of trade, have been always suggested by a few smuggling merchants on this side

of

of the water, aided by a few of their confederates in Liverpool, who had projected schemes of advantage to themselves, and of damage to the fair traders, and the revenues both of England and Ireland, by an alteration in the rules of commerce established between the two countries; and these matters of complaint were adopted, and fostered with the greatest care and attention, by you, your puny party in parliament, and *your popular and energetick Romanists*, with a view of sowing the seeds of discord between the two countries; but all your propositions, respecting the inequality of trade between the two countries, since the free trade was established, have been uniformly rejected by a very great and decisive majority of the Irish House of Commons, whom no reasonable person will suppose, to be so blinded to the interest of the nation, and their own interest individually, as to reject your measures respecting trade, if they thought they would conduce to the increase of the wealth of the nation in general, and to that of their own tenantry and estates in particular. Your conduct in respect to laying what you termed protecting duties on English refined sugar, imported into this kingdom, convinces me either of your ignorance of trade or something worse; for by the operation of this law, a few sugar refiners in this kingdom, where that trade is a monopoly confined to about forty persons, have made astonishing fortunes, in a short period of time; particularly the president of your Romish convention, and of your standing Romish committee, their gains being at least eighty per cent, and the subjects of this kingdom pay on an average, from six pence to eight pence per pound, for common lump sugar, more than is paid in England for the same commodity, of an infinitely superior quality; these protecting duties, and the consequent plunder of the Irish subject by these insatiable harpies the sugar refiners, were your job in parliament, and its effect.

The first act of parliament you reprobate, to wit, the bar bill, is a bill appointing assistant barristers in the the several counties, with small salaries, for the purpose of deciding suits by civil bill, in a summary way, and trying persons for  
small

small offences, at the sessions of the peace; all this business in Ireland fell under the cognizance of the judges of assize, at the two annual circuits; manor courts are very rare in Ireland, a great part of the business determined by civil bill in Ireland, is in England determined by the manor courts, which in that country are very numerous, and never falls under the cognizance of the judges of assize there; and it cannot be deemed any hardship on the subject, that country gentlemen acting as justices of the peace, at a quarter sessions or sessions of the peace, should be assisted by a barrister, having some knowledge of the profession of the law; the judges of assize complained that the business at assizes was so increased, that they were not able to go through it, and for these reasons, these assistant barristers were appointed, in the several counties throughout the kingdom; such appointments are the places complained of by you, as being created since the place-bill passed in parliament which place-bill vacates the seat of any member of the House of Commons, who accepts of a place of honour or profit under the crown tenable at pleasure, and contains further incapacities respecting place men; you complain of this bar-bill as tending to corrupt the bar, and increase the influence of the crown in the House of Commons; as to corruption of the bar, the salary to each barrister is so small, being 400l. per annum, and the duty so heavy, each being obliged to attend eight sessions of the peace annually, in the county to which he is appointed, that no man of any rank at the bar, and of talent worth purchasing, would accept the place of assistant barrister; and as to influence in the House of Commons, all those barristers are excluded from seats in the house; such is your grievance of the bar bill!

Your enumeration, in your list of grievances, of the exertions of the military, and of the civil magistrate, in suppression of disorders, more cruel, mischievous, and destructive than the operations of armies in civil wars, or organized rebellions, are all infinitely exaggerated by you, with every circumstance of the most malignant acrimony, and the necessity of the exertion, with more than ordinary turpitude,  
 suppressed,

suppressed, in so much that the suppression of truth, in this your detail of grievances, betrays more deliberate rancour, and baseness of mind, than the suggestion of that which is false; one village only throughout the kingdom, and that a small one, consisting of mean thatched houses, in the county of Cavan, had been burned by the military in these troubles, before the publication of your address: upwards of one thousand men, all members of the gangs of assassins, called United Irishmen and defenders, and all to a man *energetic* Romanists, had assembled in and near that village, for the avowed purpose of destroying by fire and sword, a neighbouring colony of industrious Protestant weavers, who were brought from a remote part of the North of Ireland, and settled there, by the proprietor of the estate; a small party of the militia of the city of Dublin, then quartered in the town of Cavan, were brought out by the civil magistrate to suppress this banditti, they found themselves unequal to the business from the number of the insurgents, and were obliged to send to their fellow soldiers in Cavan for assistance; when the reinforcement appeared, the great body of the insurgents were posted on a hill at some distance from the village, through which it was necessary to march to attack and disperse them, and as the militia, consisting only of one company, marched through the village, and were in the middle of it, they were suddenly fired upon from all the windows of the houses on each side, and some of them killed and wounded; the houses were all, what in Ireland are called cabbins, built of mud and clay, the covering thatch, the windows, if they can be so called, were small holes in these mud walls and the entrances only larger holes; the firing was thick, and heavy, the militia for the preservation of their lives, were obliged to set fire to these houses, and they being contiguous one to the other, and the covering inflammable, the greater part of the village was burnt down, twenty or thirty of the assassins were slain, and the rest of the gang, seeing the ill success of their ambuscade, ran away; such is your burning of villages, and murdering the inhabitants; as to the burning of any other houses by the military, very few indeed

indeed have suffered in that way, and that only in such parts of the country, as the number of magistrates, required by the insurrection act, have by petition to government, declared to be in a state of insurrection, and which have been proclaimed so to be accordingly; and where the proceeding to such extremities became absolutely necessary, for the protection of the lives, and properties of his majesty's loyal subjects; the same is true, with respect to the transportation of some of your *popular and energetick Romanists*; the transportation was only sending them to man his majesty's fleet, and no persons were ever sent to the fleet, except such as fell under the description in the insurrection act, or before that was enacted, such as were the most notorious and profligate vagabonds in the community, who had no visible way of getting a livelihood, and who were justly suspected of being a part of the gangs of nocturnal robbers and assassins, who were infesting the country; the military never acted, nor had orders to act, against the insurgents without the civil magistrate, except in cases of the utmost extremity, where the houses of the peaceable and loyal inhabitants would have been burned, themselves and their families butchered, and their property pillaged or consumed, had it not been for the intervention of the military.

It is untrue that legal meetings of counties to petition his majesty, have been prevented by orders given to the military to disperse them, where the sheriff of a county, or even a magistrate, had called the freeholders of the county, to meet for the purpose of petitioning his majesty, government has given no orders to the military, or others, to disperse them; you know that no such orders were given to disperse two such meetings, which you and your associates held at the Royal Exchange, within twenty yards of the Castle of Dublin, the residence of the Lord Lieutenant, in the summer of 1797, and one of these meetings was called, as well as I recollect, by some freemen and freeholders of the city, without a magistrate; and they called to the meeting not only the freemen and freeholders of the city, but the *householders*, in order to insure the attendance of a sufficient

cient mob, of *popular and energetick* Romanists; this last species of meeting, you call an *aggregate meeting*, and it was not called for the purpose of preparing a petition to his majesty; and pray, sir, who told you, that such a meeting was legal, and in what book do you find the law so laid down? In my reading I have not been able to find it. It may be much doubted whether the sheriff of a county has any special power of calling the freeholders of a county together, for any purpose whatsoever on the requisition of a certain number of freeholders of the county: he has power by law to call the county together, to attend at the assizes, at the quarter sessions, and at elections of members of parliament, or any other county elections, and to attend his county court held monthly, and he can assemble the *posse comitatùs*, to enable him to execute the king's writs; in all these various assemblies of the county, the freeholders may, if they think fit, prepare petitions to his majesty, and they have opportunities recurring with sufficient frequency for such purposes; but admitting that the sheriff of a county or a private freeholder, may at all times he thinks proper assemble his county, either with or without a requisition of any freeholders for that purpose, where did you find the law, in what book, or in what record, that any freeholder of a county, or any number of freeholders has, or have, a right to assemble, not the *freeholders*, but the *householders* of a county, to meet for the purpose of petitioning the king, or for any other purpose? sir, you call such *aggregate* meetings as these legal; my opinion is otherwise, I think they are not legal, even if the convention act, and the acts for suppressing riots, and unlawful assemblies, were out of the question; they certainly tend to disorder any breach of the peace, by assembling the *mob*, and not the *freeholders* of the county, let the pretence for assembling be ever so plausible.

Another of your grievances, is the suppression of a free press, by military force; here you practise your usual malice and deceit, you do not expressly allege, that such suppression of a free press, by military force was by the orders of government; yet you evidently insinuate it, and wish it  
 should

should be so understood ; for you insert it in the list of grievances, which you impute to government ; thus indirectly charging the government with invading the liberty of the press. The transaction to which you allude is, the destruction of the press and types of a printing house in Belfast, in which was printed the *Northern Star*, the most flagitious paper that ever was published in any *civilized and christian country*, to use your own words, or in any country whatsoever, where any form of regular government was preserved ; the circumstances I shall briefly detail. It was discovered that several private men in the militia regiment of the county of Monaghan quartered in Belfast, a town notorious for disaffection and sedition, had been seduced to become members of the infamous society of United Irishmen, and had taken the oath administered to all the members of that detestable gang of traitors ; many of them were immediately arrested and tried by courts martial, four of them were condemned to be shot, and others of them to various species of military punishment ; the four wretches condemned to death, when kneeling on their coffins, prepared for the fatal bullets, declared in the most solemn manner, that they had been seduced from their allegiance, and into the measures which brought them to their then deplorable situation, principally by reading the treasonable publications, in the *Northern Star* ; and earnestly exhorted their fellow soldiers, never to read that flagitious paper : this pathetic dying exhortation, and the view of the bleeding carcases of these unhappy victims to treason, made such an impression upon the private soldiers of the regiment, that upon their return to their quarters they unanimously drew up a declaration of their sincere repentance and their determinations of loyalty for the future, in which they with great justice ascribed the seduction of their unfortunate companions and many of themselves to the wicked and treasonable artifices of the inhabitants of Belfast—this declaration one of their serjeants and a few of the privates carried to the two News-papers printed in that town, by one of them (the Belfast News-Letter) it was published : by the other (the Northern Star,) it

it was rejected with expressions of contempt and insult, though the poor men offered to pay for the insertion of it at any rate of advertising, which the printer should demand; this conduct in the printer of the paper, to which the regiment so justly attributed the misfortune of their companions, so incensed the private soldiers, that some of them on the following night stole from their quarters, broke into the printing-house, and demolished the presses and types; now, sir, have you any proof whatsoever, or any reason for forming even a probable conjecture, that the above violence committed by a few private militia soldiers, was commanded or even countenanced in any manner by the government of this country? if so, what are your proofs or reasons? was not the law of the land open to redress those who were injured by the violence? were not the ears of the officers of the regiment open to any complaint, which might have been made on this occasion? had not the injured full opportunities of applying for redress, either to the common law of the land, or to the martial law, if they thought fit? did you even hear that any persons employed under government, either directly or indirectly, interfered to screen the offenders from justice? if so, let us know their names, and the names of your informers; you cannot—you know you cannot—this pretended grievance, like the others, is the creation of your own malice, and every insinuation you can throw out against government, as restraining, or even in any manner checking or controlling the liberty of the press, stands fully and completely refuted by the impunity, which has hitherto attended the publication of the seditious and treasonable addresses, to which I now write an answer.

The remainder of your grievances are the several acts of parliament passed in this kingdom for the suppression of the present disorders, and the exertions of the magistracy and the military, in the execution of them; you tell the subjects of this country that the laws of the land, established by the joint consent of the king, lords, and commons, the supreme constitutional legislative power of the nation, are horrible oppressions, and the execution of them, *robbery and murder,*



*murder*, the effects of a “ruthless and horrid tyranny tremendous and intolerable,” and you thus impeach laws, the necessity and expediency of which were fully debated in the senate of the nation, before they were enacted, and there sanctioned, by the almost unanimous approbation, of the representatives of all the landed, and moneyed interest of the nation, of the knights, citizens, and burgesses, in parliament assembled, you and your party in the House of Commons, who opposed these laws, never amounting (as I have already observed) on any one question relating to them, to the number of thirty, not more than six or seven of which were representatives for counties, and frequently dwindling to fourteen, and even to seven; and the most boisterous and noisy of your faction, who adhered to you on all questions, being members, for what you represent as venal boroughs.— You attribute the enactment of all these laws to the influence of the crown, exerted in the House of Lords, and Commons; you state that the king is the “*creature of the people*,” and that he may commit treason, against his *creator the people*,” and it is impossible to conceive that he can commit greater treason against the people, than by causing by his ministers, certain ordinances to obtain the sanction of laws, for the *murder*, and robbery of the people, “for establishing a ruthless, and horrid tyranny over them, tremendous and *intolerable*, and imposing it on the senate, by influence, and on the people by arms,” such are your expressions! The man who writes thus, cannot be supposed to mean, that such grievances can be remedied by the laws of the land, the enactors of which he thus calumniates and vilifies; when he tells the subject, that the laws are only a system of robbery and murder, of tyranny ruthless, horrid, tremendous and *intolerable*; he in fact, not only justifies the subject in taking arms against the government, but he stimulates him to do so, he must look to revolutionary measures for redress of those pretended grievances, he cannot look to constitutional ones, the Robespierian method of reforming the state is in your opinion the only effectual one.

I cannot

I cannot overlook one trait of your character, which manifests itself in this your list of grievances; and that is, the most consummate assurance, that any mortal I have ever yet seen, or read of, was possessed of; you insert in this list of grievances, the very acts of parliament, and the exertions of the magistracy and military in the execution of them, which your own machinations, and those of your confederates, the *popular and energetick Romanists*, and of your colleague Mr. Tone, have rendered absolutely necessary for the preservation of the state, and of the lives, liberties and properties, of the peaceable and loyal subjects of it; for all people conversant in the affairs of Ireland know, that to you and to your aforesaid confederates, to your and their seditious and treasonable publications, whether as speeches, answers, essays, or addresses, to your intrigues, plots, and conspiracies, may be fairly traced, as to efficient causes, all the outrages, murders, conflagrations, and devastations of the United Irishmen and defenders, and the consequent enactment of laws, to suppress them, and the exertions of the civil magistracy and military in execution of the laws; your complaints are the same as would be those of a murderer and robber, if he should complain of the laws of society for the punishment of murder and robbery; but I never yet heard that any murderer or robber was impudent enough to make such complaint.

But, sir, you are not content with thus justifying rebellion, you feared that the *popular and energetick* Irish Romanists, together with the republican and atheistical Irish disciples of Paine, Price, and Priestley, usurping the name of Protestants, would hesitate a little, before they would embark in an open rebellion, for the purpose of effecting a separation of this island from the British Empire; peace might be concluded between Great Britain and France, in which case the rebellion must be adjourned, and perhaps postponed *sine Die*. Your advice, to the *popular and energetick* Romanists by "no means to postpone the consideration of their fortunes," "till after the war," required that your confederates should be expeditious in their operations; a dread of the fleets and armies of Great Britain pallied their exertions;

Mr. Grattan's views in exaggerating the power of France, and depreciating that of Great Britain, and in introducing the separation of America from Britain into his address.

this

this you undertook to cure by the stimulating blister of your address, and to compose it, you mixed up all your pungent provocative drugs of falsehood, misrepresentation, acrimonious invective, exaggeration, and depreciation, of which you have a most plentiful store; the power of France, without whose aid the work of separation could never be attempted or effected, was therefore to be magnified, and that of Great Britain diminished in the same ratio; and the success of the Americans in the cause of separation from the British Empire was to be decorated with all the pretty flowers of language and metaphor you were capable of culling.

The present war with France you represent as “unparalleled in expence and disgrace, and attended with the grossest and rankest errors, closing the account of blood with proclamations of insolvency, with the loss of our station in Europe, and of one hundred and thirty millions, to lose that station,—to place the crown of England as low in Europe, as America, and to put France at the head of Europe, instead of Great Britain, while her people crouch under a load of debt, and taxes, without an empire to console, or a constitution to cover them, the King of Great Britain is put at the feet of France, he is driven out of almost all footing in Europe, and the enemy have made gigantic encroachments on the British empire,” and all these evils and disasters you attribute to the minister of the crown, that is, to the crown, employing corruption to sway a borough parliament, meaning the parliament of Great Britain, which you brand here with the epithet of a borough parliament, so often bestowed by you on the parliament of Ireland; you add also to the list of calamities, “the loss of thirteen provinces in America, and of an hundred and twenty millions of money to lose those provinces.”

After painting Great Britain thus as an undone nation, despoiled of her territories, and at the feet of France, that is subdued by France, or unable to make any further resistance against her, and consequently unable to quell any insurrection or rebellion in Ireland, or to afford any assistance to the loyal subjects of Ireland, when such rebellion shall blaze out;

you

you proceed to the praise of the American revolution, in which you make a clear avowal of your dangerous designs, and close your eulogy upon it, in a flourishing strain of figurative expression, alluding to a circumstance of Holy Writ, with which you thought proper to ornament, and enforce the menace contained in it, against all Irish loyalists, (that is, all the Protestants of the established church, and all the real christian Dissenters in Ireland, in whose possession is almost the whole of the landed and personal property of the kingdom) in case they should dare to oppose the projected rebellion of your *popular and energetick Romanists*, thus notoriously holding up the formation of a republick in America separated from Great Britain by the perfidious intervention of France, as an example worthy to be imitated by your Irish confederates. I shall quote the passage here; “ We saw in the  
 “ American revolution, that a people determined to be free  
 “ cannot be enslaved, that the British government was not  
 “ equal to the task, even in plenitude of empire, supported  
 “ by the different governments of the provinces, and by the  
 “ *sad apostacy* of the hapless loyalist; that loyalist is a lesson  
 “ to the rich and great, to stand by their country in all situ-  
 “ ations—and that in a contest with a *remote court, the first*  
 “ *post of safety is to stand by the country, the second post of*  
 “ *safety is to stand by the country, and the third post of safety*  
 “ *is to stand by the country*; in that American contest we  
 “ saw that *reform*, which had been born in England, and ban-  
 “ nished to America, advanced like the shepherd lad in Holy  
 “ Writ, and overthrew Goliath—he returned riding on the  
 “ waves of the Atlantick, and his spirit moved on the waters  
 “ of Europe, the royal ship of France went down,—the Bri-  
 “ tish man of war labours,” and at the same time that you encourage your *popular and energetick Irish Romanists* to rebellion, by magnifying the power of France, and depreciating that of Great Britain, you encourage and incite the French, to invade your native country, by representing the power of Britain to be so enfeebled, and her resources so exhausted, that she cannot prevent the irruption of the French armies into this island, or even impede their progress when they shall land therein.

I shall first examine how far you are warranted by factin your assertions of disgrace of the British arms, and of the gigantick encroachments of the enemy on the British empire, during this war, which she has been obliged to wage for self defence only, against the unprovoked attack, of the most barbarous and faithless nation, which ever yet deluged the earth with the blood of the human species, and whose merciless hostilities against your country, you are wicked enough to represent as a war undertaken by them in the great cause of popular liberty. I cannot in the progress of this war, find any disgrace of the British arms, unless you are pleased to stifle their inability to do, or failure in doing. all the mischief to the enemy, which every loyal subject might conceive or wish to be practicable; as for instance, the inability of our commanders to retain Toulon, though they had therein taken and destroyed a great part of the navy of France, demolished one of the greatest naval arsenals in the world; and for the present almost annihilated the French power in the Mediteranean Sea; a second instance is the inability of Earl Howe to take and destroy the whole French Squadron which he engaged, he only took six capital ships, and so disabled the rest, that some of them have remained as wrecks in the port of Brest ever since, and have been condemned as irreparable, the remainder lay in port unrepaired for a year afterwards; a third instance, a similar inability in Lord Bridport, who only took and destroyed part of the enemies fleet, and keeps all the rest now besieged in Brest, but cannot take that fortress, nor destroy the remains of the French navy inclosed in its port: The inability of the British arms to retain the island of Guadaloupe, after they had conquered it, or compleatly to reduce the French colony of St. Domingo; though they have reduced the French to the necessity of uttering desolating these two almost invaluable colonies, and rendering them for ever unproductive to France, or nearly so, by their putting arms into the hands of their negro slaves, for the defence of them; the negroes having now got the whole civil and military power in those islands into their hands, will never return to the mattock or the hoe; they will defend these islands

islands for themselves, not for their former French masters. Other instances of disgraces and defeats of the British arms in this war are, the inability of Earl St. Vincent to reduce Cadiz, and seize the whole Spanish fleet, though with a squadron greatly inferior in number of ships, men, and guns, he defeated the Spanish fleet, took four of their capital ships, drove the rest into Cadiz, where he has besieged them now for upwards of nine months, cruising at the mouth of the principal harbour of Spain, in the sight, and almost within gun shot of a fleet vastly superior in number, and annihilating the trade of that great emporium of European commerce: the inability of Admiral Duncan, compleatly to destroy the Dutch fleet, though he has taken and destroyed two thirds of it, and keeps the remainder blocked up in the Texel, utterly annihilating the Dutch trade, whilst the squadron which that power found means to send abroad has become an easy prey to the British navy; such have been the only disgraces experienced by the British arms, in the course of this war. Let us now enquire what have been the gigantick encroachments of the enemy on the British Empire in the course of the war. I cannot find any encroachments, not even pigmy ones; I can find that Britain has made very great and very valuable encroachments on the territories of the enemy during the war; she has seized the most valuable possessions of the French in the West-Indies, and has compelled them, conscious of their inferiority, to desolate the remainder, that they might not, if conquered, increase the power of Britain; she has driven France from the Newfoundland fishery, and seized the islands St. Pierre, and Miquelon, in the gulph of St. Laurence; she has expelled France from the East Indies, except from two small islands, unproductive in themselves, and retained by the French at a very great expence, as a station for their piratical cruisers, which the British power in the East Indies so controul, that their depredations do not answer the expence of their equipment; Britain has seized on the Cape of Good Hope, the key of eastern commerce, and of the island of Ceylon, in which is the only port, Trincomale, where great ships can

refit, from Bombay to the mouth of the Ganges; and by these means she has secured to herself the exclusive commerce of the whole great peninsula of India; she has also seized on the spice islands, those inexhaustible mines of wealth; the French themselves admit, that they have made no encroachments on Britain, for their only demand on the last negociation of peace was, that Britain should restore all her conquests on the territories of France, and her allies, which demand was as scornfully rejected by Britain, as it was insolently made; with as little truth do you assert that the king of Great Britain is put at the feet of France, and driven out of all footing in Europe; what territory did the monarch of Britain possess in Europe, before the war, which he does not now possess? If the troops which he sent to the aid of the Dutch, have been forced to abandon Holland, it was not in consequence of any defeat which they suffered, it was in consequence of the treachery of a Jacobin faction in Holland, which had sold their country to the French, such traitors were not to be defended, and that unhappy country now groans under the most intolerable internal slavery to the French, and as it is in fact become a province of France, Great Britain engaged in a war with France has possessed herself of all the external powers of that state, to wit, her commerce and her colonies; in fact Great Britain has at present possessed herself of almost the whole commerce of the European world, and has destroyed that of France, Spain, and Holland; the British monarch is not "*worked out of his Empire,*" as you assert, nor has Britain lost any part of her European territories, and therefore she has lost no footing in Europe, which she possessed before the war, except her commercial footing with France and her allies, which she must always lose in every war with France, whilst the war continues. Having thus exposed the falsity of your statement of the present situation of Britain with respect to power and Empire, I shall not waste my time, in defending the British constitution against your insolent attack in the following words: "The people of Britain are without an Empire to console, or a constitution to cover them," it would be

lost

lost labour, the people of Britain (your Jacobin masters excepted) will only smile with contempt at such the groundless petulant invective of a little Irish demagogue!

Thus I have exposed your falsehood, in respect to the present situation of Britain, and your malevolent views, in introducing the American revolution into your address, and the loss of thirteen provinces to Great Britain in a former war, when Mr. Pitt, the minister to whom you allude, was not the prime minister, nor any minister whatsoever, and to whom you cannot impute the loss of these provinces. As to the loss sustained by the British Empire, by the separation of these provinces from it, the amount of it is not very easily determined; there are men, and very able men too, who maintain that the relinquishment of the *jus domini*, the right of direct dominion, over these provinces by Britain, has been so far from a loss to the latter country, that it is an advantage; they argue thus; colonies in distant regions are only advantageous to a parent country, so far as they afford a beneficial market for the commodities and manufactures or commerce to the parent country; in any other light, colonies in very distant regions are so far from being advantageous, that they are extremely prejudicial, as they are drains of the population of the parent country, as well as of her wealth, in defraying the expences of civil and military establishments within them, and involving the parent country in wars for their support; and if the parent country can retain the trade of a colony, without being at the expence of maintaining civil and military establishments within it, and without waging wars for its support, further than as it would support an allied power, the parent state will gain, and not lose, by its being dismembered from it, as the human frame is invigorated, not debilitated, by the lopping off a large wen, which during its adhesion sucks away its vital juices: These arguments they justify by experience, for they allege, that during the connexion between Great Britain and the thirteen states of America, these states involved Britain in more than one destructive war for their support, and put her to immense expence in maintaining  
civil

Discussion of the question, whether the power of Great Britain be diminished by the separation of America.



civil and military establishments within them; that an attempt on the part of Britain to raise supplies from them for the maintenance of these establishments, when they were refused by their colonial assemblies, was the apparent immediate cause of the separation, although the real cause lay much deeper, in the secret intrigues of factious demagogues amongst them with the French nation, as may be proved from the Memoirs of the Marquis of Montcalm, French Governor of Canada, at the time the British arms expelled the French from North America; and that since this separation, Great Britain enjoys a much more extensive and beneficial trade with these states, than she did before; the exclusive benefit of which trade, the nature and quality of the wants and demands of the Americans, and of the products and manufactures of Great Britain, secure to her beyond any possible competition, at the same time that she is exonerated from the expence, and discharged from the military protection, she was obliged to furnish, when they acknowledged her dominion: I fully acquiesce in the force of these arguments, as they carry conviction along with them, and I never heard them controverted; solid advantages contribute much more to the wealth and strength of an empire, than the vain parade of expensive and useless, though extensive, dominion; and no nation more strongly verifies this doctrine than Spain; for if her power was to be estimated by the extent of her colonies, she would be the most powerful nation upon earth.

Further remarks on Mr. Grattan's introduction of the American Revolution into his address.

You, sir, have introduced the American Revolution into your address, to depreciate the British power, and to stimulate your *popular and energetick Irish Romanists* to revolt by the example, you tell them, "that they saw in the American Revolution, that a people determined to be free, can not be enslaved," at the same time that you tell them, one great object with you, is their *emancipation*, consequently that they are at present slaves; you then proceed menacingly to admonish the rich and great, that is, all the Protestants of Ireland, the few Romish nobility and old gentry, and every Irishman of property, to join the insurgents,

surgents, *your indigent energetick Romanists*, when the rebellion shall commence, by the example of the hard fate of the American loyalists, whom with equal falsehood and virulence you stile *apostates*, and you tell the rich and great, amongst the Irish, "that the American *apostate hapless loyalist*; is a lesson to them to stand by their country in all "situations—and that in a contest with a *remote court*, (meaning the British court) the first post of safety is to stand by "the country, and the second post of safety is to stand by "the country, and the third post of safety is to stand by "the country," *elegant climax!* The plain English of this is, when the country, that is, the vulgar, the mean, and the indigent, part of the Irish nation, shall rebel against their present sovereign the king of Great Britain a *foreigner*, you the rich and great, must not presume to resist, your oaths of allegiance are no longer binding, you are no longer to support the constitution, and the head of that constitution, his majesty; you must instantly join the mob, they are the *nation*, they are the country, I have often repeated that they are the physical strength of the nation, they are the people, and therefore the *creators* of the king: you owe a higher allegiance to them, than to the king, who is but their *creature*, and dethronable at their pleasure; the nobility of France stuck by the throne against the people, "*they only encumbered the throne with their ruins.*" If you do not on the breaking out of an Irish rebellion, immediately take your station in the ranks of the rebels, you are *apostates*, enemies of God and man, you shall be butchered like the French nobility and gentry, or robbed of your property and exiled like the American loyalists. The rancour of your heart may be sufficiently estimated by the term of reproach, *apostate*, bestowed by you on the American loyalist; it is a term of peculiar contumely, generally applied to those who desert the christian religion, and of the same import with renegado; you affix to it the meaning of deserter of the cause of his country, and you add *hapless* to it, further to degrade the loyalist by representing him as in a forlorn condition, the consequence of his apostacy, and to insult him with

with your pity; how has the American loyalist deserved such treatment, from any one—even from a traitor, who had remaining in his breast the smallest spark of good nature, of generosity, or honour? These gentlemen were born and educated in provinces, subject to the British Empire; rebellion raised its standard in these provinces, on pretence of violation of civil privileges by the parent state, though the charters of these provinces (granted by the parent state to its subjects, sent out as its factors to settle in savage countries, and there to superintend the disposal of its commodities, and specifying the precise conditions on which these subjects were equipped, dispatched and supported, who had voluntarily engaged in the business, and solicited the appointments) excluded them from these privileges: the charter of Pennsylvania in particular, and that of most, if not all the others, providing that the settlers in these provinces should always be bound by, and submit to, the acts of the British parliament, or the rules established, or to be established, by the king of England, and his privy council. The real causes of the Americans taking up arms against the parent country were the intrigues of the French nation, which from their natural enmity to Britain, suggested to the Americans the practicability of separating themselves from the parent state, and offered to assist them in the undertaking; their distance from the head and great body of the British empire, and the nature and vast extent of their country, presenting to their view the most flattering hopes of success, which the event realized; the American loyalists, justly thinking, that the whole British empire, not any particular province of it, was the country of every natural born subject of the empire, took up arms in support of their country, as their duty to it, to their God, and their king, demanded from them; they were unsuccessful, and lost their property in the provinces, torn by treachery and rebellion from the empire, and many of them lost their lives in the contest, sealing their fidelity with their blood, and glorying in the title of loyalist, expressive of their unshaken integrity, *fidei intemerata*, which even you deny them not; and these  
martyrs

martyrs to the love of their country, to honour and good faith, you stile *apostates*; miserable man! fly from society—the wretch who thinks incorruptible fidelity, *apostacy*, ought not to associate with man, let him repair to the desert, foxes, wolves, tigers, and other savage animals, remarkable for ferocity and treachery, are his only proper companions!

However, sir, though you think fit to menace the rich and great in Ireland, with the fate of the American loyalist, if they shall dare to resist the projected rebellion of your *popular and energetick Irish Romanists*, and insinuate that the condition of these loyalists is very miserable, yet such insinuation is not strictly true; for first these loyalists are supported in their misfortunes, by a consciousness of their having acted as faithful, honourable, and spirited citizens: their ill success, so far from diminishing their merit, enhances it, they are not of the same opinion, with the bloody fanaticks in the unhappy reign of Charles the first, who deemed their success a proof of the justice of their cause, and that God had decided in their favour, thus impiously attributing to the Deity, an approbation of rebellion, slaughter and robbery: the American loyalist, well knows the truth of the adage, *nunquam successu crescit honestum*, he knows experimentally the truth of these fine lines in Mr. Addison's Cato:

'Tis not in mortals to command success,  
But we'll do more, Sempronius, we'll deserve it.

And secondly, their grateful country has given to these loyalists a compensation for their losses: the British parliament has, with equal generosity and justice, voted very large sums of money for their relief.

It remains now to be examined, whether the example of the American revolution can inspire your *popular and energetick Irish Romanists*, with any reasonable hopes of a similar revolution in their favour, by their rebellion, and the assistance of the French assassins: and first, the different situations of the thirteen provinces of America, and Ireland are to be considered.

These

Remarks  
on the dif-  
ferent situ-  
ations and  
circum-  
stances of  
America  
and Ire-  
land.

These provinces, which were colonies of the British Empire, and now form a separate republic, which I shall stile British America, extend upwards of three thousand miles along the shores of the Atlantick Ocean; their inland extent is unknown, and their distance from Britain is one thousand leagues in the nearest part; they are every where, indented with huge bays, and inlets of the sea, some of which may be not improperly stiled mediterranean seas; they are intersected by great rivers, and for the most part at any considerable distance from the shores, uninhabited, and covered with immense forests; Ireland is an island on all sides accessible to the British fleets, separated from Great Britain by a channel from about thirty to six leagues broad, and eighty leagues long, and Great Britain lies between it and the continent of Europe; it is an open country without forests and without fortifications. The obvious cause of the ill success of the British arms in America, was the nature of the country, and its distance from Britain, and neither the courage or power of the Americans, or their treacherous allies the French; the expence of transporting great armies, the subsisting, and supplying them with all kinds of military stores when transported, at such a distance was enormous; and both subsistence and supply hazardous and precarious: the marches of the army in a country, intersected by great rivers, were attended with great difficulty and danger, particularly as it was covered with forests, where small bodies of light troops could harass and retard the advances of numerous and formidable forces; the partial population of the country in patches called plantations, near the sea and great rivers, and its immense extent, rendered a permanent conquest of it impracticable; a planted district here and there, as it required a military force to conquer it, so it required a military force to preserve the conquest; and as many military posts were required, as there were planted districts. In Ireland every one of these natural defences are wanting, and the triumphant British navy rides mistress of the ocean, always ready to intercept foreign succours to Irish rebels, and even without that bar to the interference of foreigners, on  
any

any dispute between Great Britain and Ireland, the British arms must have a decisive advantage by the proximity of the two islands. Troops and warlike stores could at all times be sent with certainty in a few hours from Britain to Ireland, in small and even undecked vessels; and not from any part of the continent of Europe, but at the intervals of weeks, perhaps of months, according to the variation of the winds, and seasons, in stout vessels, and always with the provision for, and at the hazard of, a long sea voyage: the superficial contents of the island of Great Britain are to those of Ireland, in the proportion of seven to two, or three and a half to one; the aggregate population of Great Britain, (supposing its local population in all parts only equal to that of Ireland) must therefore be to that of Ireland in the same proportion; but it is certainly much greater, so that it may with reason be concluded, that its inhabitants are four fold more numerous than those of Ireland; they are infinitely richer and their trade and maritime power, considered, which in estimating the relative strength of islands is of prime consideration, Great Britain must be more powerful than Ireland in a tenfold proportion at least, and probably in a greater; to all this must be added, the different dispositions, views, and interests, of the people of Ireland; the Romanists of Ireland may be computed at nearly two thirds of the inhabitants, your colleague Tone, in his information to the French Convention, admits that they are the poorest class in the community, I have already mentioned their relative poverty; of this class of inhabitants, I am well convinced two thirds are easy and happy under the present constitution, and would not join the standard of rebellion, for the purpose of separating this island from the British Empire, and setting up an independent democratic republic; if in the crisis of such an attempt they did not stand by government, they would at least be neuter; the nobility, and old gentry of that communion, possessed of ancient estates, very few indeed in number, would stick by the crown, because it is notoriously their interest so to do, and because they now enjoy all the benefits and privileges of the constitution, equally with Protestants, except

except the few herein before mentioned, from which they in fact exclude themselves, and for the attainment of which on their own terms, they would never risk a civil war with their Protestant countrymen and Great Britain; the Irish Protestants of the established church, would to a man resist such a rebellion, and your colleague Tone admits, " that " they have engrossed, besides the whole church patronage, " all the profits and honours of the country exclusively, and " a very great share of the landed property, that they are " aristocrats, adverse to any change, and decided enemies " of the French revolution," that is, that they are the most powerful and the richest members of the state, and to a man loyal subjects. The Protestant Dissenters of Ireland, your colleague Tone thinks would all join the republican standard, you seem to think so too, but I must take the liberty of differing from you both, such Protestant Dissenters, as are real christians, a very few excepted, would resist a rebellion of Irish Romanists, who would certainly compose the great bulk of the insurgents; they would consider, that in an Irish independent democratic republic, the Romanists from their great excess over them in number, must be their absolute rulers, and they would spurn the idea of submitting their lives and properties to the mercy of an Irish Romish democracy, and exchanging constitutional civil liberty, for the tyranny of a mob government, the only calm to be expected after a tempest of successful rebellion and devastation. Such Dissenters indeed, as usurp the name of Protestants, but who are in reality Atheists, and Deists, the disciples of Paine, Price, and Priestley, philosophers of the new French school, in which every professor is eminent exactly in proportion to his ignorance and brutality, thank heaven they are not numerous in Ireland! such Dissenters I say, would as far as in their power strengthen the ranks of rebellion; to such an infernal crew, *your popular and energetick Romanists*, that is a few traders in some commercial towns in Ireland, and the Romish mob of such towns, would certainly attach themselves. To such a detestable yet feeble confederacy, exclusive of the British fleets and armies, would be opposed the flower  
of

of the Irish nation, whether we consider rank, station, wealth, ability, or even number, the event of such a contest would neither be protracted nor uncertain.

With a malignant kind of dexterity, you throw a veil over the events of rebellions in Ireland, undertaken for the avowed purpose of severing this country from Great Britain, and establishing an independent government in it; whether monarchical or republican, signified not, it was to be independent of the British monarchy: and to encourage revolt, you hold up the recent American revolution, painted in glowing colours, to the Irish nation, as an example worthy of imitation; it shall be part of my business to recall the attention of my countrymen, to the events of the rebellions heretofore commenced by the Irish Romanists, in the cause of separation, when the relative power of the Irish Romanist to that of the Irish Protestant, bore an infinitely greater proportion than it does at present; for the cause of separation from, and independency on Britain is not now a new cause of rebellion, it has been repeatedly fought and decided on the Irish stage. Passing over the almost continued hostility between powerful sects, and the British colonies in Ireland, from the first conquest of Ireland, by Britain, in the reign of Henry the second, I shall come at once to the reign of queen Elizabeth. In her reign, the Earl of Desmond, a great nobleman, originally of English blood, whose dominions extended almost all over Munster, entered into a league with the then powerful Spanish monarchy, for severing Ireland from England, and rendering it independent; he took up arms, and pretending he did so, in support of the Romish religion, he was joined by almost the whole Irish nation, then bigotted Romanists; the very English colonies, which acknowledged the queen as their sovereign, being then mostly Romanists, and confined to a few counties in Leinster, the Spaniards sent him great supplies of military stores, and troops, yet the power of England soon crushed him and his adherents, and his head was stuck up, as the head of a traitor, on London bridge. The great Earl of Tyrone, the ablest Irish chieftain, both as to courage and skill,

The events of former rebellions in Ireland, recited for the purpose of severing Ireland from the British Empire.



skill, which had before that time appeared, and who had been trained to arms, in the army of Elizabeth herself, next raised a rebellion in Ireland, in the very same cause of independence on, and separation from, England; he was also assisted by Spain, at that time the most powerful nation in Europe, who sent at one time six thousand Spanish infantry, famous for their superior discipline over all other Europeans, and then a very considerable army, to his assistance; he was joined by the whole body of the Irish nation, then forty to one in number over the English colonies, yet he and the Irish nation were in a few campaigns compleatly subdued and conquered by the power of England; and the consequences of his rebellion and suppression were, the slaughter or dispersion into foreign countries, of all the Irish chieftains who served under him, and of the greater part of the inhabitants of six whole counties in the northern part of this kingdom; the calamities brought upon the Irish Romanists by that unsuccessful rebellion, as may be learned from Morrifon, and other cotemporary writers, can only be equalled by those of the Jews, at the time of the destruction of Jerufalem by the Romans; England in those two last mentioned rebellions, was unaided by Scotland, then a distinct kingdom. The next rebellion in the cause of separation from England, and independence, was that which commenced with the horrible Irish massacre in the year 1641, that massacre which you so zealously and so officiously justify! the Irish Romanists at that time, encouraged by the distracted state of public affairs in England, and abetted by the republicans in that country (as you are at present by your masters, the English jacobins) broke out into rebellion for the purpose of separation and independence; the Irish Romanists, at the breaking out of this rebellion, were in the proportion of eleven to two, to the Irish Protestants, or of five and a half to one, according to Sir William Petty, (*see his political anatomy of Ireland*) the same author states, that they murdered thirty seven thousand Irish Protestants, in the first year of the rebellion in cold blood; the English army in Ireland did not amount at that time to four thousand men, ill paid and ill clothed,

clothed, the Irish Romanists suddenly possessed themselves of nine tenth parts of the kingdom; as soon however, as their quondam abettors, the English republicans, had done their business in England, they would not suffer Ireland to remain an independent state, they immediately sent an army to reduce their Irish associates in rebellion and murder, and in two short campaigns effected a complete conquest of Ireland, and slew in the field, hanged and quartered, or drove into exile, all the *energetick Irish Romanists* of that day. Of the leaders executed I shall mention two only of eminent turpitude; Lord Maguire hanged and quartered at Tyburn, and his head fixed on London bridge; and Sir Phelim O'Neil, hanged and quartered at Stephen's-green, and his head fixed on Newgate in Dublin; they confiscated all their estates, bestowed them upon the English soldiers, and finally Cromwell, first their general and then their dictator, wisely united Ireland to England, causing thirty members to sit as representatives of Ireland in the British parliament. The desolation and havock brought by this rebellion in the cause of separation and independence on the kingdom would be almost incredible, were it not testified by unquestionable authorities.

The last rebellion of the Irish Romanists against the crown of England, was that which commenced in the reign of King William and Queen Mary. At this period the Irish Romanists, by the agency of Lord Tyrconnel, appointed lord lieutenant of the kingdom by King James the second, were in possession of almost all employments of trust and confidence in the nation; many of the Irish nobility and gentry of that day, were Romanists, and many of the Irish, as well as English, Protestants were disaffected to the revolution and the government of King William. The Irish Romanists almost to a man, espoused the cause of the abdicated monarch, not out of any affection to him, but with the hopes by his means of obtaining independence; one hundred thousand effective men, all Irish Romanists, flew to arms; the dethroned king, their engine of separation, unable to support and arm such a number, regimented sixty thousand of them, dis-

posing

posing them into fifty regiments of foot, and sixteen of horse; the French monarch Lewis the fourteenth, then in the zenith of his power, sent experienced generals and officers to command and train the Irish army, and many thousand veteran French troops to assist them, with all kind of military stores, cloathing and arms; his fleet rode triumphant on the sea, having defeated the British fleet under Lord Torrington, off the southern coast of Ireland; a small body of Irish Protestants only, in the northern part of this kingdom, took up arms to stem this torrent, but they would have been soon swallowed up, had they not received speedy succours from England, and an English army assisted by the Irish Protestants, made a complete conquest of the Irish Romanists of that day, and of their French auxiliaries, in three campaigns, drove such of them as escaped the sword, pestilence and famine, miserable exiles into foreign countries, and confiscated their estates and property.

That the Irish Romanists adhered to King James with no other view, than by his means to separate Ireland from the British empire, may be proved by numberless occurrences during that short war. I shall mention only two of them: when he assembled the Romish convention, which he and his adherents called a parliament in Dublin, one of their first measures was the preparing a bill, declaring the independence of the kingdom of Ireland on the crown of England: James when the bill was tendered to him for the royal assent hesitated; he had still hopes of remounting the throne of England, and he feared that his assenting to such a bill would disgust and alienate his English friends, and impair his own authority if he should remount the throne: but the Irish Romanists told him plainly that if he refused his assent to the bill, they had no further occasion for him, that he might go about his business, and that they would establish a government without him. This same pretended parliament also attainted by bill, several thousand Irish Protestants, including in it by the lump all men of that persuasion, of rank, consequence, or property; and passed a bill for depriving the Protestant clergy, of almost the whole of their tithes, and for rendering

rendering the recovery of the remaining pittance impracticable.

Don't you deplore, sir, the ill success and unhappy fate of the members of this pretended parliament, all slaughtered, hanged or transported, for maintaining your glorious and patriotick principles of separation from England, and subversion of the Protestant establishment; patriots as illustrious as yourself!

Another signal instance of the contempt, in which the Irish Romanists of that day held James and his authority, and that they meant only to make a tool of him for effecting their own purposes is, that when his deputy Lord Tyrconnel repaired to the Irish camp, after the departure of James to France, one of the principal Irish officers came to him, and commanded him instantly to quit the camp, or he would cut his tent cords, with which command the hapless deputy was obliged to comply.

One other example of unsuccessful rebellion, in the cause of separation and independence I omitted to introduce in its rank in point of time, because it was not the rebellion of the whole native Irish, and degenerate English colonists in Ireland, but of a part only of both races; and that is the rebellion of Thomas Fitzgerald Lord Offaley, eldest son and heir of the Earl of Kildare, in the reign of King Henry the eighth; that nobleman, being then chief governor of Ireland under the king, broke out into open rebellion, renounced his allegiance to King Henry, and set himself up as an independent prince; in a short time, he and his adherents were reduced, and himself with five of his uncles taken prisoners, they were sent to England, and hanged and quartered as traitors at Tyburn, the earl his father died of grief, a prisoner in the Tower of London, and the whole family estate was confiscated. This illustrious race of the Fitzgeralds would have been extinguished, had not Queen Mary, out of compassion to the misfortunes of that great house, afterwards restored the only shoot which remained of the ancient trunk, to his family honors and estate.

And now, fir, having rehearfed to you the miferable fate of Lord Offaley, and his uncles; of the Earls of Defmond, and Tyrone; of Lord Maguire, and Sir Phelim O'Neil; of the Romifh parliament convened by King James, and of all their adherents, all Irish Romanifts, and all engaged in the fame caufe, of which you have now fet yourfelf up as the champion, that is the caufe of feparation from Great Britain and independence on the Britifh crown, I leave you to found the trumpet of infurrection, and to cheer in vain your murdering tattered bands of *popular and energetick Romanifts*, by the example of fucceffful rebellion in America, a diftant country, and to wafte your poisonous breath, and acrimoni-ous ink, in fruitless attempts to deprefs the fpirits of his majesty's faithful and loyal Irish fubjects, by the example of the unfucceffful American loyalifts: Raife your ominous voice, and croak aloud to your *black*, to your *grey*, or to your *green*, flock, in the figures fo often ufed by you in your declamations, vulgarly called nonfence, fuch as, "a naked man oppreffed by the ftate is an armed poft; the government *bloods* the "magiftracy with the peoples liberty"—all you will be able to do, and it is mischief enough, is to encourage a few desperate affaffins and robbers in different parts of the kingdom, to perfift in their nocturnal murders, and plunder, till they expiate their crimes on the avenging gibbet, juftly accusing with their laft breath, (as did the privates of the Monaghan militia fhoot for a mutiny) flagitious demagogues, as the caufe at once of their guilt and difgraceful punifhment.

That you might have no topick of inflammation of the Irish Romanifts untouched, you repeat in this addrefs two calumnies againft the government of the country, which you have already advanced in the Houfe of Commons more than once, the falftiy of which has been demonftrated as often as you prefumed to advance them, and though you flood publicly convicted of deliberate malicious falfehood, in the two instances more than once, you with your accuftomed effrontery, again repeat them in this addrefs; and you instructed your jacobin mafters in England, to retail the fame falfehoods, for they appear in the copies of a fpeech, published in the  
English

English prints as spoken by Mr. Fox on Irish affairs in the English house of commons; they are thus set forth in your address: "They (government) agreed to the first Catholic bill, and then *proscribed* the person of the Catholic, and "*opposed his freedom in corporations,*" by the first Catholic bill, it is plain you mean the bill which passed in favour of Irish Romanists, in the year 1793, for that is the bill which enabled Romanists to become members of corporations, and in that particular, put them on a footing with Protestants, repealing the test and corporation acts, in their favour; in both these particulars of proscription of Romanists, and opposition to their freedom in corporations, by government since that act, you assert what is not warranted by fact; I clearly exposed the falsehood and malignity of such assertions in my place in the House of Commons in your hearing, stating the transactions in which they were founded; the substance of my speech on that occasion is in print, and it is not necessary here to repeat what I then said; you did not then attempt to refute me, if you shall hereafter attempt to vindicate your assertions on these heads, and produce your pretended instances of proscription, and opposition in corporations, I am able again to disprove them.

Your next charge against the present Irish government is corruption, you charge them with supporting their decided majority in parliament, against the measures of you and your petty faction, by corruption; that is, you in fact charge, that all the knights of the different shires in Ireland, six or seven excepted, (which is as many as I recollect, ever to have voted with you and your party, against the measures of government on any question) all the members for cities and great towns, for all open boroughs, and for what are stiled close (that is boroughs chiefly under the patronage of great and powerful noblemen or gentlemen, having large estates in the country) about ten or twelve members for boroughs excepted, the whole strength of your faction in the House of Commons, are induced by bribery to vote against your measures; the accusation is so notoriously unfounded, that no defence is necessary; the whole representatives of the landed and moneyed

Mr. Grattan's charge of corruption against the present Irish government refuted.

neyed interest are not, nor could they be, bribed to vote and act against the true interests of their country, that is, their own interests; the absurdity of the accusation is a sufficient refutation; but to support your accusation you adduce two instances, one, that to overwhelm an oligarchical party in parliament, "a new host of places and pensions, was resorted to, this is the famous half million, or the experiment of the castle to secure the dependence of parliament, and to prevent the formation of an Irish party against the dominion of the British Cabinet." This allegation of corruption in the government, you have founded, on an assertion, declared in several of your speeches, to have been once made in the House of Commons, by a person then employed in the service of government; the assertion, as you frequently stated it, was, "that it had cost government half a million to defeat an opposition party, in the House of Commons;" and you have frequently admitted that the transaction alluded to happened during the time Lord Townshend was lord lieutenant of Ireland; his lieutenancy commenced in 1767 and ended in 1772, so that, according to you it must have happened, more than twenty-seven years ago; and that it ever happened, or that such assertion was ever made, rests upon *your credit*.

The misconduct of former governors, by a kind of political legerdemain, you transfer to the present; but for a moment supposing that a corruption of parliament was designed by multiplying the lucrative offices of the state, and conferring them on members of parliament, has not the place-bill lately enacted, a measure adopted by a ministry of a much later date, than that of Lord Townshend, compleatly defeated the design? That bill, amongst other regulations, disqualifies persons, possessing a great number of lucrative offices, to sit in parliament, many of which were heretofore filled by members of parliament; and it vacates the seats of all members of the House of Commons, who shall after their election, accept of places of profit under the crown tenable at pleasure; add to this powerful check to corruption, the pension bill; both these bills are of modern date; yet whilst you,

for

for the purpose of inflammation, load the present government with the imputed guilt of the misconduct of former governors, you conceal from view the merit of the present or of immediately preceding governors, in correcting such misconduct, if such there was, and in preventing future governors from adopting such corruptive measures; with the same view, you accuse the present government with creating new places for gentlemen of the law profession, but you omit stating the absolute necessity of the creation, arising from defect and delay in the dispensing of public justice, both criminal and civil, which occurred in almost all the counties in the kingdom, before they were created; and you also omitted, that barristers holding such new created employments, were incapacitated by the act which established them to sit in parliament; you accuse government with a design to corrupt the bar by the creation of these places, with what justice I leave the world to determine; but in preferring this accusation, you fall into a strange inconsistency; contrary to the whole tenor of your address, you stumble here on one truth, to wit, "That in this country formerly the rule of government was the law of the land," you state throughout your address that the whole proceedings of government in this country, from the commencement of the reign of James the first to the present day have been a continued system of the most atrocious and horrible tyranny, over the inhabitants of this kingdom, over *Irishmen* in large characters, that strong, hardy, bold, brave, laborious, warm-hearted, and *faithful* race of men, as you describe them. The law of England was not extended over all Ireland, till the reign of James the first, before that time the inhabitants of four fifths of this kingdom, were out of the pale of the English laws, and were governed by certain barbarous customs, called the *Brehon law*, of which Sir John Davis gives some account; at what time was it then, "that the rule of government in this country was the law of the land," according to you? The fact is certainly true, the law of the land has been always the rule of government in this country, since it became entirely pervious to the common law of England; but how came you, against  
your



your very nature and design, to deviate into this truth? it renders your address a heap of inconsistency—from compassion to you, I will endeavour to reconcile you with yourself; the law you there meant, as the rule of government, was the *Brehon law* before the reign of king James the first: and the government, the then Irish chiefs or Sachems, and their Brehons or judges; what a pity that you did not live in those times! you would, if then in existence, have been a *Brehon*, and could I entertain the belief of transmigration, I should certainly conclude, that your soul formerly animated the body of a sturdy dogmatick Brehon, a supercilious and despotick barbarian, whose nod was plunder, and whose frown was death!

It is not here amiss to examine whether the conduct of government, in nominating to the offices of the state, members of the House of Lords and Commons, can be considered as an effect of a system of corruption of parliament, adopted by the crown; it is notorious that in every civilized state, whether monarchical or republican, there must be a set of men, selected from the body of the people, whose peculiar province it is, to transact the business of the state; it is highly reasonable, and indeed necessary, that such men should be paid by the community for their trouble, for we find by experience, that the duty of laborious offices which officious men have sometimes undertaken to perform without emolument, has been always in the end neglected or abandoned, nor is it to be expected that men will gratuitously expend and waste their time and their labour. In a great empire, as is that of Britain, there must be many and skilful public officers, which from the constitution of our mixed monarchy, must be nominated by the crown; this power of nomination gives a considerable degree of influence to the crown, but it is a proper and constitutional influence, with which the very nature of our government demands that the crown should be invested, and without which our constitution could not exist; to what body of men then is the monarch to look for a supply of publick officers? is he to exclude from all public functions the whole House of Lords, the whole body of the nobility

lity of the nation, the hereditary council of the crown? and is he also to exclude all the members of the House of Commons, the ablest and most enlightened part of the people, partly possessing and certainly representing, the whole mass of the landed and monied interest in the nation; of whole talents, abilities, and capacity for public service from their situation, he has the best opportunity of judging? and is the monarch to resort to the jovial clubs of country squires, to a fox-hunt or horse-race, to the cloisters of a college, to the counting-houses of traders, to the factories of weavers, the forges of smiths, to the plough, the loom, or the hammer, for prime ministers, and secretaries of state? and is the monarch in a mixed monarchy like ours, to be stripped of all influence of every kind in the senate? The man who can answer these several questions in the affirmative, and frame his answers from his own real opinion, is a person too absurd to be argued with, he must be entirely ignorant, not only of all the œconomy of political society, but of the very nature of man, considered as a reasonable and a social being.

You declaim, sir, in your address, with a considerable degree of asperity, against what you call the trade of parliament, by which I understand, the buying a seat in the House of Commons, for a venal borough, or procuring a seat in that House by other means, with a view of making great advantage of the purchase, by compelling the minister to buy the talents of the purchaser, and thereby not only to silence his clamorous opposition to all measures of government, right or wrong, but to employ his mercenary eloquence in a slavish support of administration on all occasions. Of these venal boroughs the number is small, and I freely admit, that such trade has been driven, and sometimes with success; but your assurance in selecting such a topic for inflammation, is surely unmatchable! it is a universally received opinion, that some of the most turbulent and clamorous *antesignani* in your scanty ranks of opposition, set up in that trade of parliament, in which, thank Providence! they have failed and become bankrupts; their unhappy fate has drawn from you the most pathetic complaints in your address. Pray which are they,

or the hapless American loyalists, the greatest objects of compassion in your eyes? thus you pour forth your tragick effusion, from the very bottom of your soul: "What man of small fortune, what man of great fortune, can now afford to come into the House of Commons, or sustain the expence of a seat in parliament, or of a contested election? I know some who have great talents, (*that is, strong lungs and consummate assurance*) and have exercised them in the public service, are disposed to decline situations, to the individual so expensive, and to the public now so unprofitable," (you might have added "*and to themselves.*") But your disappointed satellites, are not the only persons who followed the trade of parliament, no man followed it in my memory with so much assiduity or success as you yourself have done, since your commencement in that business; returned into parliament for a close borough at your first appearance on the public stage, by the interest of a nobleman, in whose patronage it was, you immediately opened your shop, and exposed your wares to sale, the stock of a second-hand retail political haberdasher, the whole consisted of an assortment collected from the two store-houses of deceased politicians, the one Molyneux's State of Ireland, the other the Drapier's Letters; the Irish Nation at that time laboured under two grievances, the first a real one felt severely by the public at large; the second, more a theoretical than an actual grievance, though sometimes really felt, and always menacing. The first consisted in a severe and impolitic restriction of the trade of Ireland, by the commercial regulations of Britain; the second was an assumed power in the British legislature to bind Ireland by its statutes; and to this grievance may be added, the effects of an Irish statute called Poyning's act, by which the Irish parliament in its legislative capacity, was controlled by the great law officers in England: the nation, galled by *these oppressions*, equally pernicious and disgraceful, loudly expressed on all occasions their dissatisfaction at them; and zealously applauded and supported as well every honest patriot, as political adventurer, who argued or declaimed against them; and as usual in such cases, the multitude always expressed loudest their approbation of the loudest declai-

Mr. Grattan's assiduity and success in carrying on the trade of Parliament.

mer, measuring the merit of the orator by the uproar, turbulence, and fury, of his harangues. In such a season several able and honest senators stood forth the champions of their country, and combated these oppressions with the weapons of argument and reason: you joined their ranks, and fought against the common enemy with less effective execution, but with superior noise, turbulence, and acrimony, battering them incessantly with the artillery of Molineux and Swift. The campaign was successful, the English minister listened to the voice of justice and reason, and agreed to a treaty, the grievances were redressed; the ports of the world were opened to the Irish trader, the independence of the Irish legislature on that of Britain was acknowledged; and Poyning's act repealed. The giddy multitude, captivated by the fury and bluster of your operations, attributed the whole success to you: and you carried away the palm from your upright, honest, patriotic associates, with much less real merit, whether we consider your abilities or motives. You were determined however to work your own emolument out of the national prosperity, and to take advantage of this tide of Irish exultation to bring into port a Galeon freighted with a precious cargo on your own account; though just set up in the trade of parliament, you seemed to have understood it better, than older merchants; you contrived matters so, that a vote was carried in the House of Commons, for bestowing on you fifty thousand pounds out of the public purse, as a reward for your exertions in establishing the independence of the Irish legislature; and you had address sufficient to obtain the consent of the crown to this most extraordinary and unmerited donation, by your engagement in future to support the measures of government: by a judicious disposal of this money you have secured to yourself an estate in fee simple of three thousand pounds per annum and upwards: and you, who accuse the present government of corruption in the distribution of places and pensions, are, and for some years have been, in possession of a pension in fee simple of three thousand pounds per annum, the most unmerited that ever was bestowed, and purchased by the most unwarrantable, wanton, and profuse expenditure of public money, that has ever occurred

curred in the annals of this or the sister kingdom. To expose in a clearer point of view the inanity of your claim to this donation, it is necessary here to recur to some part of your conduct, after receipt of that costly proof of public prodigality and folly. The English nation, from the time of their conquest of Ireland, in the reign of King Henry the second, to the year 1782, had claimed and frequently exercised a power of legislating for Ireland: the claim is asserted in all their law books where Ireland is mentioned, particularly by Lord Coke in Calvin's case, and in his Institutes, and may be found particularly stated in judge Blackstone's Commentaries, vol. 1. p. 100, 101. In the reign of George the first, the claim was questioned by the Irish, and the English parliament passed a declaratory law in the 6th year of that reign, in which they asserted the power of the British parliament to bind Ireland by its acts *as part of the common law of England*. Previous to, and in, the year 1782 the Irish parliament, as is before stated, made heavy complaints of this assumed power of the British parliament, to legislate for Ireland; and a bill passed in the British parliament repealing this declaratory act, in consequence of these complaints, by way of contenting the Irish nation; the late Mr. Flood, and some other leading members in the Irish House of Commons, saw clearly, that such repeal of a declaratory act, did not abrogate the law as it stood before that act was made; and that if by the common law of England, as laid down by their most eminent lawyers, Ireland was bound by British acts of parliament before the enacting of that declaratory act, the repeal of that act left the law as it stood before; and that the right of binding Ireland by British acts, might be again, not only claimed, but exercised, by the parliament of Britain, whenever they should think it convenient to do so, and Mr. Flood and others insisted in the Irish House of Commons, that the repeal of the act of the 6th of George the first, did not, and could not, establish and secure the independence of the parliament of Ireland, and that nothing short of an act of renunciation by the British parliament of all right of legislating for Ireland, could establish or secure that independence.

To this most reasonable doctrine of Mr. Flood, and the gentlemen who supported his opinion, you opposed yourself with all your wonted fury and acrimony in the Irish House of Commons, and absurdly insisted, that the simple repeal of a declaratory act abrogated the law which was antecedent to the act; your obstinacy on this occasion was exactly in proportion to your absurdity. However the British parliament concurred in opinion with Mr. Flood, and passed an act of renunciation of all power of legislation for Ireland.

Mr. Grattan violently opposed the act of renunciation, which alone could secure the independence of the Irish legislature, and his reasons for so doing.

It was matter of wonder to men who had been carried away by the torrent of popular applause, and looked upon you as a zealous assertor of the independence of the Irish legislature, to see you thus vehemently opposing the only measure which could establish and secure it; but their wonder ceased, when they found that the concurrence of the minister of the day, with the commons, in presenting to you fifty thousand pounds, without whose concurrence you could not have touched the money, had been purchased by your engagement to support his measures: and that he resisted the idea of renunciation at that time, not knowing how the parliament of Britain might feel on so momentous a measure; if that minister is now living, and has read your address, when he came to this passage, "*no—no—no—the half million, said the minister, this is my principle of attraction: among the rich I send my half million,*" how must he blush at his own folly in bestowing on you, one solitary representative of a close borough, without estate, family or connections to make you considerable, one full tenth part of that sum, which you represent as sufficient to corrupt the whole Irish senate, fifty thousand pounds! and what tortures must he feel, when he finds his accomplice has turned approver against him! Imagination paints him to me on such occasion crying out with Macheath, "That Jemmy Twitcher should peach me! or with the Roman poet, *Clodius accusat mæchos Catilina Cethegum!*"\*

The

\* The French directory, consisting of five persons, demanded as a bribe from the American ambassadors, the sum of fifty thousand pounds; they were contented with ten thousand pounds a piece. Our Irish sham patriot is not contented with a less sum than fifty thousand pounds for himself. Mock patriotism is a more productive profession in Ireland, than in France!

Mr. Grattan violently opposed a parliamentary censure, on a libel published in England, purporting to be a copy of a speech of Mr. Fox in the British House of Commons on the state of Ireland.

The next transaction of your political life which it is necessary here to mention, is your conduct in the last session, when the extraordinary attack stated in the publick prints to have been made in the British House of Commons by Mr. Fox on the proceedings of the Irish Parliament, was animadverted upon in the Irish House of Commons. A false and infamous libel on the Irish parliament, particularly on the House of Commons, was published in most of the London newspapers in the month of March, in the year 1797, and from them copied into the republican Irish prints, entitled Mr. Fox's speech on the state of Ireland, and purporting to be a copy of a speech made in the English House of Commons by Mr. Fox. This libel, after stating a variety of the most malignant and groundless falsehoods, respecting Ireland, the dispositions of its inhabitants, and measures pursued by government there, proceeded to condemn in a rancorous invective, the rejection of the two measures by the Irish House of Commons, which your address mentions as panaceas proposed by you and your party for the cures of all popular discontents in Ireland, to wit, *emancipation and reform*. For the first of these measures, there appeared on a division in the Irish House of Commons twenty votes only: and as your party joined emancipation and reform together, declaring that emancipation was only the first part of reform, and that there could be no reform without emancipation, the decision of the House, almost unanimous, against emancipation, put an end to divisions of the House on the string of resolutions you had prepared respecting the remainder of your scheme of reform; many of the twenty who voted for emancipation, declaring they would vote against all the remainder of the proposed reform. This libel, published as the speech of Mr. Fox, stated this almost unanimous decision of the Irish House of Commons to have been procured by the influence of the crown, and represented the members of that House as only puppets of the minister, including in this censure all the Irish representatives of counties, cities and boroughs: it asserted the propriety of the interference of the English House of Commons with the proceedings of the Irish parliament; and

of

of their entertaining and examining the merits of appeals made by any defeated party in the Irish Commons, be it ever so insignificant, and reversing the decisions of the Irish parliament in all matters of internal legislation of that country, on two principles, one, that if a rebellion should blaze up in Ireland in consequence of measures pursued by the Irish parliament, there were no other means to extinguish it, except English forces and money, which could be only levied by the authority of the English Commons. The other, that the Irish parliament was an engine, entirely worked and directed by the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland and his secretary, who were tools of the English ministry, which ministry was accountable to, and controllable by, the English House of Commons. The last of these principles, if admitted, would at once destroy all idea of independent legislation in Ireland: but it is so notoriously false that no arguments are necessary to confute it. The first principle is also generally false, as there is force sufficient in Ireland of loyal Irish subjects, to quell any rebellion which may blaze forth from the fuel furnished by you and your party; but were it necessary, in case of an Irish rebellion, to obtain assistance in men and money from England, the furnishing such assistance would give no more right to the English House of Commons to legislate for Ireland, than the furnishing of similar, assistance by Ireland to quell a rebellion in Britain, would give to the Irish House of Commons to legislate for Britain; and the libel stated, that Mr. Fox had made a motion in the English House of Commons, for an address to his Majesty to change his ministers in Ireland, which he prefaced with this speech, and that the whole opposition party had supported this motion, which however was rejected in the British House of Commons, by a great majority.

When this libel was published, some members of the Irish House of Commons, one of whom I was, thought it proper to stamp it with some signal mark of disgrace; it contained so many acrimonious falsehoods respecting the government, parliament, and Protestants of Ireland; and urged a doctrine so destructive of the very idea of independent Irish legislation,

or



or as you stile it in your address, self-legislation, that we thought it merited the utmost reprobation; and with that view, I produced the libel, as published in the *Morning Chronicle*, an English newspaper, in the Irish House of Commons: I exposed its malignity and falsehood; and moved that it should be read by the clerk at the table; which motion I intended to have followed with two others, one for a vote of the House, declaring it a false, scandalous and malicious libel on the Irish nation and parliament, and particularly on the House of Commons; and another, for a vote condemning it to be burned by the common hangman at the door of the house. But the House were of opinion, that the motion, said to have been prefaced by this libel having been rejected by the British House of Commons, they were not called upon to take any notice of it, as the doctrines contained in it, were sufficiently reprobated by such rejection; and my first motion was lost by a previous question which put an end to the business. On this occasion you defended the libel, and its doctrines, with the utmost violence of voice, expression and gesture: you roundly asserted the propriety of appeals from the parliament of Ireland to the British House of Commons, and you attempted to vindicate and support many of the falsehoods and misrepresentations contained in it; you were so transported with rage at what you considered an attack on your jacobin masters in England, that you became almost quite unintelligible, and as most of the falsehoods and misrepresentations contained in it are repeated in your present address, it is not difficult to trace this libel on the Irish government, nation and parliament, to its true source; it is certain, if such speech was actually spoken in the British House of Commons, that the materials must have been furnished by you, and that the falsehoods contained in it, are not imputable to the Speaker, though his extreme credulity, in taking so readily upon trust the unsupported assertions of a desperate, disappointed, dogmatick, political railer, is justly blameable.

And now, sir, see how the account of political integrity and consistency stands with you. You received fifty thousand

land pounds for asserting the independence of the Irish legislature on that of Britain: you immediately afterwards opposed the necessity of renunciation of the power of legislating for Ireland on the part of Britain, the only measure which could annihilate such power and establish and secure the independence of Irish legislation. In your present address you preach up the doctrine of the necessity of self-legislation, as you have often done before; yet in the very last session of parliament, you maintained with all your power, and with the utmost violence, the justice and propriety of the English House of Commons interfering in matters of internal legislation in Ireland, and dictating to the Irish parliament what measures they should pursue, and what laws they should enact, and that if the Irish parliament should decline, even unanimously, the adoption of such measures, and enactment of such laws, it was fit and proper that the English House of Commons should exercise an appellatory jurisdiction over the decisions of the parliament of Ireland, reverse them at their pleasure, and take proper steps to compel them to adopt measures directly contrary to such decisions. Such has been in the last session your support of the doctrine of self-legislation! Your conduct on these occasions puts me in mind of that of a party in the Irish commons in the year 1640, composed of Romanists and Puritans, the constituent parts of the faction of which you at present assume the station of leader. Such party prevailed on the House of Commons of Ireland, so far to betray their own independence, as to send a petition by two agents, Mr. Bellew and Mr. Cashell, to the House of Commons of England, praying them to redress the then pretended grievances of Ireland, which petition was presented on the 13th of November 1640, at the bar of the English House of Commons, see Carte's Ormond, 1st vol. p. 115; the Irish House of Commons of that day, agreed to such petition; you could not persuade the Irish Commons in 1797 to be guilty of a similar piece of treachery to the nation. You and a few, a very few others only of that House in 1797, were found mean enough to contend for a controlling power in the British commons over the parliament

ment of your country, at the very time you pretended to assert its right of self-legislation.

Having thus, sir, in general remarked on the flagitious tendency of your address, and the more prominent falsehoods and misrepresentations contained in it, and exposed the true causes of the nocturnal murders and robberies, which of late have disgraced the country, I shall now take the liberty of adverting to the two measures which you state to be the only methods by which these disorders can be suppressed; which measures, with equal fraud and falsehood, you are pleased to dignify with the titles of *emancipation* and *reform*; and I shall make a few observations on the arguments by which you have attempted to support the necessity of them. I hope to make it clear to every reader, that by the first you really mean the subversion of the Protestant establishment in church and state; and by the second, a republican government separated from, and independent of Great Britain; which I shall demonstrate, would, if attempted, be attended by the desolation of the kingdom; and that success in such a measure, would only perpetuate desolation and misery.

Mr. Grattan's arguments in favour of emancipation; remarks on and refutation of them.

I shall begin this part of my answer, with observations on your arguments, or rather rhapsody, in support of what you term Catholic emancipation. You commence your arguments (if such they can be called) with stating "that the sentiments and principles of the Irish Romanists, have suffered a mighty change, that the Irish Romanist of the present day, does not hold the same sentiments and opinions held by the Romanists in the year 1692, and that the revolution in America had worked a prodigious alteration in the political opinions of the Romanists of Ireland." Now, sir, admitting all this to be fact, I cannot conceive how you can apply it as an argument in favour of abolishing the tests, by the refusal of which, the Irish Romanists preclude themselves from sitting in parliament, and from filling the great offices of state; as to all other privileges they are already fully on a level with their Protestant fellow subjects: all it amounts to is this; the American revolution has made all the Irish Romanists of the present day republicans; in

1692 they were royalists; therefore in the present political situation of Europe, it is politic in the governors of the British Empire to transfer the powers of the state in Ireland, a kingdom dependant upon the imperial crown of Great Britain, from the Irish Protestants, attached loyalists and faithful subjects, to Irish Romanists, all republicans, and ready to follow the example of revolted America. You indeed mark the alteration in the sentiments and principles of Romanists, which you assert to have happened, thus, "with the Irish Catholics of the year 1792, the influence of pope, priest and pretender, is at an end," insinuating that the imposition of exclusive tests on Irish Romanists, arose from such influence, which rendered them inimical to the present establishment in church and state; the first part of your assertion is easily proved not to be fact, to wit, that the influence of the pope and priest over the Irish Romanists, is at an end; the second I admit to be true; but the influence of a principle full as hostile to the constitution has succeeded, to wit, the influence of pure democratic republicanism. That the Irish Romanists, whom you call the *popular and energetick* part of them, (with which Irish Romanists alone you are connected, and whose sentiments and opinions you constantly obtrude on the public, as those of the whole body of Irish Romanists) are staunch republicans, and separatists from Great Britain, has been frequently acknowledged and avowed by them, in a great variety of publications; amongst others by the laboured account of their proceedings, speeches and resolutions, when assembled at the Romish chapel in Francis-street, on the 9th of April, 1795, as I have before mentioned. Separation from Britain is a disavowal of all allegiance to his majesty, and as there is now no pretender, the Stewart line being extinct, and as the assistance of the French republic is absolutely necessary for effecting a separation, the establishment of a republican form of government in Ireland, must be the natural consequence of such separation. Ever since the decline of the Spanish monarchy, the Irish Romanists have looked to the French, as the only nation which could enable them to separate themselves from

Britain, and to establish an independent government: they attached themselves to the house of Stewart, as I have already observed, merely because the French monarch favoured that house; and they hoped by the interest of the Stewart race, with the monarch of France, to procure from France aids sufficient to effect their only purpose, separation; they were then obliged from interested motives only, to affect an attachment to monarchy; but the Stewart race being extinct, and the government of France changed to a republic, the Irish Romanists immediately adopted republican principles, (I mean here only those you stile the *popular and energetic* part of them) as most agreeable to the ruling powers in France, who on that account would be more ready to assist them; and separation from Britain being their only object, they were ready to embrace republicanism, the moment it appeared to them to conduce to the attainment of that object. The absurd argument which I have often heard advanced in favour of the claims of Irish Romanists to political power in our state, *that the Romish religion attaches those of its communion to a monarchical government*, has been sufficiently refuted of late by their own writers; they perhaps were afraid that such arguments would do them mischief with the present ruling powers in France, and delay or impede succours from that country, for effecting a separation, they therefore took some pains to prove that the Romish religion suited a republic full as well as a monarchy. Some Romish priests, very eminent in their stations amongst persons of that communion, have taken care to distinguish themselves on this topic. Their titular bishops, under the pretence of publishing pastoral letters, have published pamphlets highly inflammatory and seditious, particularly a man of the name of *Huffey*, who has informed us in his pamphlet published in January, 1797, that he had been recently appointed bishop of Waterford by the pope. This man, a native of Ireland, but educated in some Spanish seminary or convent, was brought back to this kingdom by Earl Fitzwilliam, for the avowed purpose of placing him at the head of a seminary, to be established here, for the education of Romish priests: this

Romish titular bishops in Ireland have published seditious libels, under the title of pastoral letters: particularly one *Huffey*, a Romish priest, imported into Ireland by Earl Fitzwilliam.

this design has been since the recall of Earl Fitzwilliam carried into effect : and grants have been obtained from parliament for that purpose amounting to nearly thirty-six thousand pounds, more than half as much of the public money as was formerly squandered upon you ; and Mr. Hufsey has been made the president of this seminary. Notwithstanding this man's obligations to government, he published a pamphlet at the time before mentioned, entitled, " A Pastoral Letter to the Catholic Clergy of the united dioceses of Waterford and Lismore, by the Right Reverend Doctor Hufsey." As the great mass of Irish property real and personal, is in the hands of Protestants, this writer in the first place inserts this injunction, to his subordinate priests : " Do not permit yourselves to be made the instruments of the rich of this world, (i. e. the Protestants) who will try by adulation, and possibly by other means, to make instruments of you, over the poor (i. e. the Romanists) for their own temporal purposes, and perhaps to render your sacred ministry odious to them. The poor were always your friends—they inflexibly adhered to you, and to their religion, even in the worst of times. They shared their scanty meal with you and with your predecessors ; and thereby preserved a succession of spiritual pastors throughout the kingdom, if they had acted otherwise, conformed to the *errors* of the nation (i. e. the Protestant religion) and imitated the conduct of the *rich*, who not only shut their doors against you, but not *unfrequently hunted you like wild beasts*, I should not be able to address the present respectable body of clergy, under my spiritual authority." He then proceeds to reprobate all Protestant places of education, and particularly the charter-schools established by royal authority, where the children of such Romanists as please to send them, are educated and maintained gratis, in the following words : " Remonstrate with any parent, who will be so criminal as to expose his offspring to those places of education, where his religious faith or morals are likely to be perverted. If he will not attend to your remonstrances, refuse him the participation of Christ's bo-

“ dy : if he should still continue obstinate, denounce him  
 “ to the church, (i. e. excommunicate him) in order that  
 “ according to Christ’s commandment, he be considered as  
 “ a heathen and publican.” After thus, as far as lay in his  
 power, cutting off all friendly intercourse between Irishmen  
 of different religious persuasions, and drawing as strong a  
 line of separation between them as he possibly could, Mr.  
 Hussey proceeds thus : “ If in any of your districts, the Ca-  
 “ tholic military frequent Protestant places of worship, it is  
 “ your duty to expostulate with them, and to teach them  
 “ how contrary to the principles of the Catholic faith it is,  
 “ exteriorly to profess one *faith* and interiorly to believe ano-  
 “ ther : an Irish soldier, ought not to be ashamed of openly  
 “ professing the Catholic religion—*the religion of Irishmen,*  
 “ (in Italicks) instructs them, that in all matters regarding  
 “ the service of the king, their officers are competent to  
 “ command them, and that they are bound to obey ; but in  
 “ matters regarding the service of the King of kings, *their*  
 “ *officers have no authority over them.* The many compulsory  
 “ means lately employed, (and several instances of them  
 “ within this very diocese, not many days since) to drive the  
 “ Catholic military to Protestant places of worship, alarmed  
 “ the *true* (in Italics) friends to the king and his service,  
 “ and every well-wisher to the peace and quiet of the coun-  
 “ try. Such unwarrantable steps could not make profelytes  
 “ of the Catholic military—it might, in time, make them  
 “ indifferent to all forms of worship, and thereby jacobini-  
 “ nize them on the French scale, and perhaps in the hour  
 “ of danger, induce them to forget their duty, and their  
 “ loyalty, *in order to be revenged of their persecutors.*” The  
 dangerous and malignant tendency of this last passage can-  
 not be fully explained, without adverting to a few facts. It  
 is a practice with the military in Ireland, when quartered in  
 towns in which there are churches, to call forth the soldiers,  
 on the sabbath day on the parade, and to march them to the  
 church ; when at the church door, such of them as are Pro-  
 testants enter and attend divine service ; the rest are dismis-  
 sed, generally with an admonition to repair to their respec-  
 tive

tive places of worship: and no Romish soldier is ever ordered or compelled to enter a Protestant church, and attend during the celebration of divine service. A man of the name of Hyland, a private soldier in a regiment of dragoons, refused to attend the parade of his regiment on a Sunday morning, alledging that he was a Roman Catholic, and that he would not march with the regiment to the church door; he was told, that his marching with his regiment to the church door from the parade, was a military duty, with which he was bound to comply, and that he had full liberty to depart from the church door, and go to a Romish chapel, or where else he pleased; this did not content him, he persisted in his refusal to obey his officer, he was tried by a court-martial, condemned to be whipped, and being a worthless ill disposed fellow, he was afterwards turned out of the regiment. *Your popular and energetick Romanists*, about this time, were very active in obstructing the recruiting of his majesty's army destined to act against their friends the French, and with that view, they framed a lying story from this transaction respecting Hyland, and published in all their scandalous prints, that Hyland, a Romish soldier, had been cruelly whipped, for refusing to attend the celebration of divine service in a Protestant church. The calumny was recited in the speech of M<sup>r</sup> Nevin, on the 9th of April, 1795, at Francis-street chapel; however this story might have operated on the bulk of the lower order of Romanists, and prevented their enlisting in his majesty's service, it ought not to have had any operation on Mr. Hufsey, for he knew from his own experience, that Romish soldiers were not compelled to attend the celebration of divine service in Protestant churches, and were not prevented from attending it in chapels frequented by those of their own communion. He asserted that he had a commission from the pope to act as chief almoner or chaplain to all the Romish military in Ireland: and the government of the country indulged him in the liberty of visiting at his pleasure, the camp at Lehaunstown, near Dublin, in which several regiments were quartered, mostly militia, many of the private soldiers of which were Romanists,



Romanists, here he was permitted freely to exercise his functions as a Romish priest, frequently celebrating mass, and preaching, without any interruption in the camp, although there were three Romish chapels in the neighbourhood, to which the Romish soldiery had free access on every necessary occasion, yet this man, to give some colour to his publication of this incendiary pamphlet under the title of a pastoral letter, states that there were several instances within the diocese of Waterford, not many days before his publication, of compulsory means being used to drive the Catholic military to Protestant places of worship; though being urged to mention these instances, he could not produce one. The county Fermanagh regiment of militia, when this pretended pastoral letter was published in Waterford, was quartered in that city. The commanding officer was informed, that Mr. Hufsey had said, that these instances of compulsion had happened in that regiment; the Romish soldiers in the regiment were very few; and he ordered immediate enquiry to be made, whether any such compulsion had been practised on any soldiers in the regiment, and being answered in the negative, he and his officers wrote a very civil card to Mr. Hufsey, then in Waterford, requesting that he would let them know, whether in his letter, he alluded to any occurrence, which he might have heard, had happened in the Fermanagh regiment, assuring him at the same time that no compulsory means had been employed, to drive any Romish soldier in that regiment, to a Protestant place of worship: to this card Mr. Hufsey never condescended to write an answer; and the officers of the regiment, after waiting some time for an answer, published their card in the daily newspapers. The truth is, Mr. Hufsey declined all answer, perfectly conscious that he had published a falsehood respecting the military, and being unwilling to acknowledge it, and apologize for it, even on the score of misinformation, because such acknowledgment would defeat the end for which he had invented it, to wit, to awake and encourage discontent amongst the soldiery, and disinclination to the service. If Mr. Hufsey in stating that compulsory methods had been employed

employed to drive the Catholic military to Protestant places of worship meant, that the Romish soldiers were obliged to attend on the parades on Sunday mornings, and from thence march to the doors of Protestant churches with their Protestant fellow soldiers, the performance of such military duty no way interfered with their religious persuasion, as they were not obliged to enter the church, and attend the celebration of divine service within it, but were always dismissed at the door ; and Mr. Hufsey could in such proceeding find no cause of complaint. It is plain then, when he complains of force being employed to drive the Catholic military to Protestant places of worship, he meant that the Romish soldiers were forced to attend at the celebration of divine service in Protestant churches, which as I before observed is a direct falsehood.

Mr. Hufsey then proceeds to clear the Irish Romanists from the imputation of being royalists, which he considers a groundless calumny on that body of people : he even aims at eloquence on this topick, and thus declaims : “ As the Catholic faith is a religion preached to all nations, and to all people ; so it is suitable to all climes, and all forms of government—monarchies or republicks—aristocracies or democracies, despotick or popular governments are not the concerns of the Catholic faith. It may well suit a small sect (meaning the Protestant religion) to regulate its creed and form of worship, according to the shape or form of government, of the limited boundaries where that sect arose, exists, and dies away. Not so the religion, which the prophet foretold should extend from the rising, to the setting, sun, it is therefore called the Catholic or universal religion.” But Mr. Hufsey does not close his pastoral instructions here, he endeavours, with all his powers, to inflame the Irish Romanists against their Protestant countrymen by a picture of the condition of Irish Romanists whilst the Popery laws were in force, blazoned and embellished with the boldest strokes and most glaring colours of falsehood and malice, and subscribed by a menace, of so insolent

solent and daring a nature, that I cannot help exclaiming with the Roman poet,

*Quid domini facient, audent cum talia fures!*

*When pastor Hufsey and his flock of United Irishmen, with such menaces already in their mouths, shall become our masters, what are we to expect!* Thus proceeds this Romish priest rampant: “ If the conduct of the Catholic laity has always been loyal  
“ and peaceable, even in the worst of times,—if even when  
“ religious penalties made them total strangers in their na-  
“ tive land—if when the ruling party (that is, the Protec-  
“ tants) with insolence in their looks, and oppression in their  
“ hands, ground them down—when some of the most pow-  
“ erful men in the nation declared in the senate, that they  
“ hoped to see the day when no Catholic would dare to  
“ speak to a Protestant with his hat on—when even the  
“ course of justice was perverted, and the channel of it dried  
“ up, according to the prejudices and party views of the  
“ judges who sat upon the bench, and were paid for the  
“ impartial administration of it, by taxes levied on the op-  
“ pressed sufferers.” And then after stating that some of these Popery laws had been lately repealed, he continues,  
“ That however a *junta* (in large letters) for their own in-  
“ terested or their sinister views, may raise *mobs* to try to  
“ throw obstacles against the total repeal of them, yet all  
“ their efforts must be useless—*the vast rock is already detached*  
“ *from the mountain’s brow, and whoever shall oppose its descent*  
“ *and removal, must be crushed by his own rash endeavours.*” And he does not conclude this malignant inflammatory libel, without overstepping all bounds of truth, in the most notorious manner to encourage the Irish Romanists, already goaded by recitals of invented, aggravated, and magnified oppressions, to revolt, by multiplying their relative number to that of Protestants, and stating, “ That nine tenths of  
“ the nation at large, and ninety nine hundredths of the  
“ diocesses of Waterford and Lismore, are still faithful and  
“ steady Catholics, notwithstanding what they and their an-  
“ cestors suffered for their fidelity, and for which they are  
“ as

“ as unrivalled in the history of the church, as insulated an  
 “ exception to the prevaricating versatility of man, as the  
 “ *geographical situation of the island itself is to the rest of the*  
 “ *world.*”

The reflections thrown out in this performance against the Protestant ancestors of the present race of Irish Protestants, for enacting that code of laws stiled Popery laws—against the laws themselves—and against the judges who administered them, require some observations; as well as the assertion that the conduct of the Romish laity of Ireland has been always loyal and peaceable, even in the worst of times; I have already observed that the superficial contents of Britain bear to those of Ireland the proportion of three and a half to one. Britain altogether is certainly better peopled in proportion than Ireland, but supposing it equally peopled, its population must be to that of Ireland in the proportion of seven to two. The Romanists in Britain do not amount to a two hundredth part of its inhabitants: in estimating the relative numbers of inhabitants they are of no account: of the inhabitants of Ireland not more than two thirds are Romanists, as has been often fully proved, the rest are Protestants. So that in the population of the British Empire in Europe, the Protestants are to the Romanists, in the proportion of about twenty three to four, or nearly six to one, which is the fair way of counting the relative numbers of different religious persuasions in a great Empire, from which to draw conclusions of the propriety of political predominancy of one over the other: and not from partial calculations of the numbers in particular districts of that empire, the sophistical method of argument adopted by you, sir, and your associates, when you urge the propriety of Romish predominancy in Ireland, and of abolishing the Protestant establishment.

The Irish Romanists in four desperate and general rebellions, against their sovereign, each attended by the desolation of the kingdom, attempted to establish the Romish religion in Ireland, and a government separated from, and independent on Britain; to wit, Desmond's, Tyrone's, Sir Phelim O'Neil's, and that which ended in the year 1691. In all these

these they were subdued by the united efforts of the Protestant subjects of the Empire, English, Scotch and Irish. Such has been the loyalty of the Irish Romanists, asserted by Mr. Hufsey to have always continued, even in the worst of times; it seems loyalty and rebellion are synonymous terms in his vocabulary. After the close of the last rebellion in 1691, very great numbers of the Irish Romanists, having entered into the service of the French nation, then, and ever since, hostile to the British Empire; the Protestants of the Empire, harrassed by so many rebellions of the Irish Romanists, which sprouted out in succession like Hydra's heads, and perceiving that the body of Irish Romanists in the service of France, was constantly recruited from Ireland, and that their hostile disposition to the Protestants had by no means ceased, but would infallibly excite them to a new rebellion, as soon as their recruited strength, like the renovated locks of Sampson, and the encreasing power of the French monarchy, could inspire them with any hopes of success; found it absolutely necessary to adopt such measures, and enact such laws, as seemed best calculated to prevent the repetition of such convulsions, which had been before fatal to multitudes of Irish subjects, Romanists as well as Protestants, and highly calamitous to all; from such considerations sprung the popery laws, they were founded on necessity and reason, and nothing can demonstrate the wisdom and expediency of them so much, as that whilst they remained part of the laws of the land, the Romanists resident in Ireland, if not loyal in sentiment, were passively loyal, and remained perfectly quiet; because they dared not be otherwise; during that period, we never heard of unlawful Romish conventions, nor of traitorous speeches made at unlawful assemblies in Romish Chapels; we never heard of a Romish banditti styled *United Irishmen*, nor of their nightly assassinations and depredations; all these are the blessed fruits of the repeal of that code, as are the inflammatory, menacing, and ranting harangues and publications of you, sir, of your colleague Tone, and of the Romish Priest Hufsey, the chaplain and emissary of the Marquis Del Campo, who whilst employed in the honourable office

vice of Spanish embassador in England, acted the dishonourable part of a spy to the French Jacobins then at war with the British Empire. This priest is the precious importation of Earl Fitzwilliam, whose Prime Minister you were; it is pretty plain that you are well acquainted with Mr. Huffey, for your sentiments in your address, corresponded exactly with his, in his pastoral; you have even imitated his stile; the same pauses, the same interjections, and the same dogmatick sentences; nay you have gone farther: as he interlarded his performance with quotations from scripture, and ornamented it with all the canting hypocritical garb of the Cromwellian fanaticks, so you have condescended to insert in your address allusions to the sacred writings, nay to honour them with the title of *holy writ*. I advise you, sir, to take care—be more on your guard—perhaps some of your staunchest adherents may suspect you of Christianity, and begin to think, that you are not so sound a French philosopher, as you have heretofore professed to be. Such opinion, sir, would injure your reputation and sincerity with your associates in the cause in which you are embarked: what would your colleague Tone say? I certainly, sir, entertain no such suspicion of you, however, I give you this hint, *fas est et ab hoste doceri*. I will so far humble myself, sir, in your opinion, as to confess that I am a sincere christian in theory; I am one of those persons, whom you ridicule in your address, under the name of Dreamers; whose understandings are at a stand, and whose principles of civil government, loyalty, and religion, being long since rooted in that stationary understanding, are by no means shaken or influenced by the revolutions of America or France. The glaring misrepresentations of the behaviour of Irish Protestants to their Romish countrymen, whilst subject to the regimen of popery laws; and the false and infamous reflections on the judges of the land, stated in the last paragraphs I have quoted of this pretended pastoral letter, are all calculated to revive old animosities, and inflame the hatred, which the native Irish are known to harbour, against all Englishmen and Protestants; and it must be confessed the Priest is an adept in the science

of

of exasperating aggravation, and a very proper and able agent for the Marquis Del Campo, who now is, or lately was, Spanish Embassador at Paris. One stroke of his respecting the judges of the land is worthy of particular remark; he states that they denied justice to all Irish Romanists, though they were paid for the impartial administration of it, by taxes levied on the oppressed sufferers; by the calculations lately made relating to the tax of hearth-money, it was computed that there were in Ireland two millions one hundred thousand persons who were so poor, that they could not pay the hearth-money tax, at least without the greatest hardship: and that numbers of them on that account were excused from the payment. These two millions one hundred thousand were the inhabitants of wretched habitations, called cabins, in each of which there was only one fire hearth, and the tax (if levied) would amount in the year to four-pence per head only; of these, nine-tenths at least were Romanists, in fact they were the bulk of the Irish Romanists, and these people were chargeable with no other tax whatsoever, and therefore their contribution to the expences of the state, in which are included the salaries of the judges, could have been very little indeed! It is here to be observed, that all laws which peculiarly affected Irish Romanists in their restrictions or provisions have been repealed, and that an Irish Romanist is now in every respect on an equality in point of privilege with an Irish Protestant, save that the test required to be taken by all members of the Houses of Lords and Commons, and by about 30 of the great officers of state, excludes them from parliament and from these offices, as they refuse to take it. Mr. Huxley, after stating that a great part of the popery laws, which he styles *impolitic religious penalties*, are now removed, mentions that the rest, that is, the tests, are in such a state of progress to be totally removed, that if any body of people shall presume to throw obstacles in the way of such removal they will be crushed by their own rash endeavours; heightening this threat and rendering it more terrible, by the simile of a monstrous rock rolling down from a precipice upon them, and reducing them to atoms in a moment. The persons

persons he supposes may design to throw obstacles in the way, he calls a *junto*, meaning the Protestants of Ireland in general, the probable agents in creating obstacles he calls *mobs*. Sir, the assurance of this man is very nearly equal to your own. Surely the undaunted spirit of political lying never manifested itself more openly, than in this priest, on this occasion. Mobs, sir, all persons, your friends and enemies, know and admit are the tools with which you and your associates work. The bulk of mobs, though they may be guided by persons of superior rank, are always the indigent and uninformed classes of society, and Mr. Hufsey admits, that such classes are chiefly, if not entirely, composed of Romanists. But the collections of people whom Mr. Hufsey means to represent as mobs, are the great corporations, and the grand juries of the several counties, of the kingdom, all of whom have at different times expressed their decided opinions against, and deprecated, the repeal of the parts of the Popery laws which were abrogated in 1793, and against all further relaxations of them; and upon what sound reasons they grounded their opinions may be now seen by the conduct of you and your associates. Mr. Hufsey concludes with an argument for the separation of this country from the British Empire, and grounds it with sufficient artifice, as if it was an observation *en passant*, on the geographical position of Ireland, that it is a nation whose *insulated* situation separates it from all the rest of the world: and that the persevering disposition of its natives is, as distinct from that of the inhabitants of the rest of the world, as its geographical situation is from the rest of the earth.

Thus has this Irish Romish priest, under the mask and title of a pastoral letter, published a libel, in which he endeavours with all his power to draw a line of everlasting separation between Irish Protestants and Romanists, and to perpetuate hostility, to exasperate the Romanist against the Protestant by the most rancorous falsehoods, recounting antiquated hardships, and exaggerating them with the most malignant representation; as he does also the relative numbers of the Irish Romanists, to encourage insurrection by  
 miscalculated



miscalculated strength : inventing oppressions of the Romish military in religious matters never exercised or thought of, except by himself ; that under pretence of complaint on that head, he might introduce the doctrine of mutiny against their officers, telling them that they are not bound to obey their officers in spiritual matters, and reserving to himself, and others of his own kidney, the determination of what shall be deemed spiritual matters, that is, the determination of, what commands of their officers shall be obeyed by the Romish soldiers, and slyly and wickedly suggesting to the soldiers, that the proper opportunity of revenge on their officers, is the time of action, telling them they may then revenge themselves of their *persecutors*, so he stiles the officers, by slaughtering them and deserting to the enemy : indeed, the main drift of the libel seems to be, to induce the Romish soldiers, on the invasion of this country, well known to be designed by the enemy, to cut the throats of their officers and join the hostile battalions. He endeavours, insidiously enough, to preach up your own doctrine, and that of your colleague, and of your *popular energetick Romanists*, that is, the doctrine of separation from Britain, and the establishment of a republic in Ireland, independent of Britain, and he threatens absolute destruction to all Irish Protestants who shall presume to impede the progress of his measures, exactly in the same strain with your address, your three posts of safety, and example of the dismal fate of American loyalty ! Since the Irish government deemed it necessary to establish a seminary in Ireland for the education of Romish priests, to obviate the ill effects of foreign education, and principles of foreign politics, imbibed by gentlemen of that persuasion, destined for the ministry, and to plant the principles of loyalty to their king in their minds in the place of such rank weeds of disaffection, which were hitherto suffered to take root in them ; surely no man on earth could be found more unfit for the government of such a seminary than an Irish priest, bred in Spain, the chaplain and emissary of the Marquis Del Campo, whose malignant pen overflows with gall against the Protestant subjects of the British empire ;

empire ; how long such a man will be permitted to remain president of the seminary, it rests with our chief governors to determine\*.

Another very eminent Romish ecclesiastic, of whom, it is no compliment to say, that he is a much more loyal subject, than the Salamanca priest just mentioned, published a pastoral letter in the year 1793. This letter also deviates in a great measure from its title, and launches with some degree of temerity too far into the ocean of politics. The author of it, Doctor Troy, the titular archbishop of Dublin, is universally reputed a gentleman of great worth and integrity ; I quote his work merely to shew, that even he, whom I believe to be as loyal a subject to his sovereign, as any Romanist can be to a Protestant prince, and himself a steady royalist, takes some pains to prove, that Romanists have not, as Romanists, any particular attachment to monarchy : he thus writes, page 26, “ The ancient republics of Florence, “ Pisa and Sienna were established and governed by Roman “ Catholics, who still continue to support those of Poland, “ of Venice, of Genoa, of Ragusa, of Lucca, and of Ma- “ rino. The Roman Catholics form the most considerable  
“ part

The pastoral letter of Doctor Troy, titular archbishop of Dublin, with remarks upon it.

\* Mr. Hufsey is now removed from the presidency of this seminary, he was not removed until the 29th of January last, after this tract had been written, about a year after the publication of his pastoral letter, and just three days before the trustees appointed visitors of this seminary by act of parliament, all Romanists, (except the Lord Chancellor, and the three chief judges) and many of them titular Romish bishops, who in fact govern the seminary ; (the judges seldom interfering ; ) presented a petition to parliament desiring a further pecuniary aid to their seminary, of ten thousand pounds of the public money, which they obtained ; together with an implied engagement from parliament to grant them an annual stipend of eight thousand pounds. And Mr. Hufsey was then removed by them from the presidency of this seminary, not for the publication of this infamous libel, but for non-residence.

The Irish Romanists were enabled by act of parliament to found this seminary for the exclusive education of Romish priests from the subscriptions of their own people in 1795 ; and in the year 1798, when they presented their last petition to parliament for aid, no Romanist either in England or Ireland, had subscribed a penny towards the foundation. They have now obtained from parliament thirty-six thousand pounds, and an engagement to give them annually hereafter eight thousand pounds for their subsistence out of the public purse, in the midst of a most expensive war.

“ part of the Helvetic union, and it is remarkable, that  
 “ they have adopted a democratical, whereas the Calvinist  
 “ and Zuinglian cantons, have preferred an aristocratical  
 “ form of government.” As you, sir, allege in your ad-  
 drefs, that the minds of the Romanists have been, by the  
 American and French revolutions, greatly changed, and that  
 a very marvellous alteration has taken place in their opi-  
 nions; it will not be amifs here to give you some further quo-  
 tations from this pastoral epistle of Doctör Troy, published  
 in 1793, he being then and now titular archbishop of Dub-  
 lin. In page 31, is the following passage: “ It is a funda-  
 “ mental article of the Roman Catholic faith, that the  
 “ pope or bishop of Rome, as fucceffor to St. Peter, prince  
 “ of the apostles, in that fee, enjoys by divine right a spi-  
 “ ritual and ecclesiastical primacy, not only of honour and  
 “ rank, *but of real jurisdiction and authority*, in the universal  
 “ church. Roman Catholics conceive this point as clearly  
 “ established in the scriptures, and by the constant tradition  
 “ of the fathers in every age, as it is by the exprefs decisions  
 “ of their general councils, which they consider as infallible  
 “ authority in points of doctrine.” The same author, page  
 97, “ Catholics cannot conscientiously abjure the ecclesi-  
 “ astical authority of the bishop of Rome. He is guardian  
 “ of the general canons, and can alone dispense with them,  
 “ *proprio jure*, or by inherent right. Others enjoy that  
 “ power by delegation from him. The erection, suppress-  
 “ sion and union of bishopricks, and other particular bene-  
 “ fices; the elevation of sees to the metropolitical dignity  
 “ and jurisdiction; the institution of general fasts and ho-  
 “ lidays; dispensations from their observance; the regula-  
 “ tion and inspection of our liturgy; *appeals from inferior ec-  
 “ clesiastical courts to his supreme tribunal*; the suspension and  
 “ restoration of bishops; *and numberless other particulars of  
 “ our general church discipline* mentioned in the canons, de-  
 “ pend on the pope, as on our ecclesiastical superior, and  
 “ are connected with his primacy of jurisdiction in the uni-  
 “ versal church. Henry the eighth of England, was the  
 “ first christian prince, that assumed ecclesiastical supremacy,  
 “ and

“ and commanded an enslaved parliament to enact it as a  
 “ law of the state. *The Catholics consider it an usurpation.*”  
 A declaration of the principles of Romanists having been  
 published in 1792, drawn up by the standing committee,  
*your popular and energetick Romanists*, whom you represent as  
 now free from all influence of pope and priest, Doctor Troy  
 thus writes respecting that declaration and the Irish laity of  
 his communion, page 102: “ The declaration was *respect-*  
 “ *fully* submitted to the consideration of the Catholic clergy  
 “ by the Catholic committee, nor was it published, till after  
 “ the clergy of Dublin had generally approved and signed  
 “ it, as containing nothing contrary to the articles of Catho-  
 “ lic faith ; it was afterwards subscribed by bishops and cler-  
 “ gy in every part of the kingdom in similar terms.”

“ The Catholic laity of Ireland respect their clergy, and  
 “ consider it a duty to be regulated by their determinations  
 “ in all points of religious doctrine. They are attached to  
 “ their pastors and spiritual guides, who love them as their  
 “ children in Christ. Clergy and laity are united by the  
 “ most tender and interesting considerations. Every effort  
 “ to dissolve this union must prove ineffectual. Interest and  
 “ duty continue to render it indissoluble. In adversity and  
 “ prosperity, they must rise or fall together.” I must here,  
 sir, remind you that you and your party in the House of  
 Commons in 1793 produced this very declaration mentioned  
 in Doctor Troy’s letter, and read it in the House, as a justi-  
 fication of the tenets of the Romanists, and as an argu-  
 ment of their being loyal subjects, and fit to be trusted with  
 the franchises to be conferred on them by the bill in their fa-  
 vour then before the House. And yet when that very de-  
 claration was reduced into the form of an oath ; and it was  
 proposed on the debate of the bill, that all Romanists who  
 should take the benefit of that bill, in case it should pass  
 into a law, should take that oath ; you, and all the Romish  
 party in the House made use of every argument you could  
 think of, and every artifice it was in the power of the most  
 ingenious chicane to suggest, to defeat the proposal : in  
 which you would have been successful, had not some very  
 I leading

leading interests in the House, who had been cajoled by the minister of that day, to concur in this bill, taken the alarm at this infamous duplicity of a party, founding their pretensions on a declaration of their principles drawn up by themselves, and afterwards declining to verify their sincerity in these principles by an oath; and told the minister roundly, that they would vote against, and damn, the bill, unless the oath was inserted: the minister, with whom on that occasion you and your party were acting in concert, informed you of this circumstance, and you were obliged most reluctantly to consent to the insertion of the oath in the bill, modified however, and much reduced below the strength of the declaration. It has given me pain, in reading Doctor Troy's letter, to observe to what lamentable and sophistical casuistry, a man, as he is, of learning and good understanding, and, (detached from extreme bigotry to his sect) of great integrity, is reduced, to reconcile that part of the declaration, stating *that it was no part of the faith of a Romanist, that the Pope was infallible*, to the avowed doctrine of the Romish church in that point. In short, let any honest Protestant of tolerable understanding and learning read this pastoral letter of Doctor Troy attentively through, and let him take it for granted, as I do, that he has therein fairly set forth and explained the doctrines of the Romish church, and it will be impossible for him not to conclude and determine, that the votaries of a sect, holding such doctrines, are thereby completely disqualified from being either legislators or dispensers of the law, in a Protestant state: and that it would be insanity to admit them to either of these functions. Your first argument then in favour of what you are pleased to stile emancipation, to wit, that Romanists are not now what they were formerly, for that they have freed themselves lately from all influence of pope, priest, or pretender, and that therefore they should be admitted into parliament, and rendered capable of filling the great offices of the state, is founded entirely on your own ipse dixi—your own dogmatic assertion, your constant and only argument—not only without proof, but in contradiction to the incessant publications of your

your

your committee of nine, your *popular and energetick Romanists*, and of every distinguished member of the Romish communion who have thought proper to publish their opinions on this subject. The influence of the pretender I have shewn already to be out of the question; your *popular and energetick Romanists* are now under the influence of a more dangerous principle than attachment to the pretender, and more inimical to our constitution; inasmuch as the influence of the pretender over them induced them to endeavour to transfer the imperial diadem of Britain, to which the kingdom of Ireland is annexed, and on which it is dependant, from the brows of one prince, to encircle the head of another. But the influence of republicanism over them, teaches them to overthrow the constitution by substituting in the place of the monarchy, a democratic republic; and to destroy the unity of the British Empire by tearing Ireland from it. The influence of pope and priest over the Irish Romanists, which is one and the same influence, remains as it always did and always will remain, as long as they shall continue to be Romanists, because it is of the very essence of their religion, and cannot expire but with their religion: and it is the very principle of their religion, which in a Protestant state excludes them from the functions of legislation or execution of the laws.

Besides the arguments already adduced to prove that this influence exists unimpaired with the Romanists, there is one argument, which, exclusive of all others, proves it to demonstration, and that is, the rejection of the oath of supremacy by the Romanists, they will not abjure the power of the pope. The oath of supremacy is, *that no foreign prince, prelate, state, or potentate, hath, or ought to have, any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority ecclesiastical or spiritual within this realm.* I shall, sir, before I finish, more fully explain the reasons of the incapacity of Romanists to exercise certain civil functions from this influence of the pope over them; at present I have stated enough to overturn your first argument in favour of Romish exaltation arising from the extinction of all influence of pope, priest,

and pretender, over them so roundly and so groundlessly asserted by you. But as in this part of my answer I have mentioned and quoted Doctor Troy's pastoral letter, I cannot avoid observing, that this letter contains some of the leaven, of which there is such an exuberance in the seditious libel already mentioned of Mr. Hufsey. The following passage is to be found in page 99 of Doctor Troy's letter: "At this day, Protestantism is the established *state* religion in Ireland; the Catholic religion is that of the *Irish people*:" In the same spirit, Mr. Hufsey asserts, "that popery is the *religion of Irishmen*:" Both very strongly insinuating, that the Protestants of Ireland are so insignificant a body of men (though in number one third at least, and in property and power twenty parts out of twenty-one, of the whole people) that when the word *people* is made use of, they are not entitled to any notice or consideration; this serves to animate the Romish party, by magnifying their strength, and depreciating that of the Irish Protestants. Menace also is not entirely omitted in Doctor Troy's letter, though introduced with more address and caution, than are used by Mr. Hufsey. The quotation from Tertullian, addressing the Roman emperors and other pagans on behalf of the christians in page 12 of Doctor Troy's letter, deserves notice, in which the account of the numbers of christians, and their ability to do mischief to the Roman empire, nay, to overturn it, at that time, if they were so inclined, is evidently applied by the Doctor to the present state of Ireland: His majesty and his Protestant Irish subjects, being alluded to by the pagans, and the Irish Romanists by the christians. The same allusion is continued in subsequent quotations respecting the persecutions of christians by Pagan and Arian emperors and kings; and as I have a personal respect for Doctor Troy, which I assure you, sir, I do not entertain for you, for Mr. Hufsey, or your associates, I do earnestly recommend it to Doctor Troy hereafter to employ his pen, in setting before the people of his persuasion, that they now enjoy, equally with their Protestant countrymen, every advantage of a free constitution, the envy and admiration

admiration of every nation on earth, where the nature of that constitution is understood ; in preference to rousing into action those furies, destructive of the human race, revenge, envy, avarice, and ambition, by the publication of threats and ill considered and erroneous calculations of the relative numbers, strength, and power of the Irish Romanists : which if fairly compared with the real strength of the Irish Protestants, arising from the combined energy of their numbers, property, and situation, will afford no rational encouragement even to *popular and energetick Romanists*, to commence hostilities against their Protestant countrymen, if they had (as they have not) provocations sufficient to justify such dangerous extremities : and if compared with the relative numbers, strength, and power of the Protestants of the British Empire, of which Ireland is only a part, and which Protestants, in case of an Irish rebellion, would to a man unite against the Irish Romanists ; the almost infinite disparity of force must ensure the defeat of such ruinous projects, as well as the utter destruction of the projectors ; as it has already done on four successive trials ; and it would be wise in Doctor Troy, and other reasonable men of his profession, maturely to consider, whether reiterated menaces of Irish Romanists against their Protestant countrymen, and extravagant boasts of their power and numbers, will not at length impel the Irish Protestants, on the principle of self-defence, to re-enact the popery code, or at least some parts of it, which whilst it continued to be part of the law of the land, kept the Romanists quiet, and ensured their submission to their sovereign and the laws.

You state, sir, with the most dogmatic impudence, that the unconstitutional influence of the crown, and the *proscription* of the Catholics were the fundamental causes of our present discontents and jealousies. As to the first cause, the influence of the crown, it is less now in this kingdom, than it was before the present discontents arose ; and before I close this answer, I shall demonstrate that the crown neither has, nor exercises, any unconstitutional influence in this kingdom ;



as to the second pretended cause, I have already stated, that it is one of the most barefaced and malignant falsehoods, and slanders upon the Irish government, that ever was invented or propagated, that when you ventured to assert it in parliament, you were called upon to substantiate the accusation by some proof, you never produced any, because you could not, and you now repeat the calumny again, contented to sustain the character of the convicted, irreclaimable, and unrepentant political falsifier, provided you can extract from the slander even the smallest spark of inflammation. The two causes therefore assigned by you for the present discontents could not be the causes, because they never existed. You then proceed to urge the claim of the Romanists to what you call emancipation, by alleging, “ that the  
 “ Irish Romanists of the present day have laid aside all their  
 “ ancient prejudices, that their minds have been in a state of  
 “ progressive improvement during the last 25 years, whilst  
 “ the mind of the state, that is the understandings of all  
 “ persons concerned in the administration of the govern-  
 “ ment, stood still, and received no improvement, that the  
 “ state was the bigot, and the people the philosopher. That  
 “ all persons who opposed the claims of the Romanists in  
 “ parliament were declamatory dreamers, and infinitely in-  
 “ ferior in understanding to the Romish orators who figured  
 “ away at Francis-street chapel, as may be seen by the  
 “ speeches of both published in the newspapers. That the  
 “ Romish newspaper publications of the present day, amongst  
 “ which are many of your own lucubrations, are the most  
 “ exquisite specimens of erudition, argument, and elocution  
 “ that were ever produced: that the clergy and higher order  
 “ of the laity are now the ignorant classes of society, and the  
 “ lower classes of the people the enlightened: that the *intel-*  
 “ *lectual vision* of these lower classes of the people was be-  
 “ come comprehensive to an astonishing degree: that when  
 “ government complained of the press, they complained of  
 “ the superiority of the popular understanding. That when  
 “ once the powers of Intellect are possessed by the great body  
 “ of

Further ar-  
 guments of  
 Mr. Grat-  
 tan for  
 emancipa-  
 tion.

“ of the nation, ’tis madness to hope to impose on that na-  
 “ tion, civil or religious oppression, particularly *in those whose*  
 “ *understandings have been stationary, though their powers and*  
 “ *riches have been progressive.* That the part, the most *popu-*  
 “ *lar and energetick,* of the great body of the Romanists, had  
 “ formed with the great body of reformers, a Catholic,  
 “ Presbyterian, and Protestant league, for the freedom of  
 “ the Romish religion, and a free and full representation of  
 “ the people, burying theological discord for ever in the  
 “ love of civil and political liberty: that the present Irish re-  
 “ ligious is unanimity against despotism.” It is here to be  
 remarked, that throughout your whole address by the term  
*people,* you mean Romanists exclusively; and by the terms  
 higher classes, Protestants exclusively, whose minds you re-  
 present to be stationary, their power and riches progressive.  
 The above declamatory and diffusive argument, in favour of  
 what you stile Catholic emancipation, may be thus condensed.  
 The Irish Romanists of the present day are not of the same  
 opinions with their ancestors, they were monarchists, the  
 present race, at least the most *popular and energetick* part of  
 them, are republicans; all such persons, usurping the titles  
 of Protestants or Presbyterians, as are the disciples of Paine,  
 Price and Priestley, being also republicans and enemies to  
 the connexion with England, have embodied themselves into  
 a faction for the purpose of overthrowing the constitution  
 and forming a republic separated from Great Britain: and  
 being themselves unequal to the attempt, they have applied  
 to the *popular and energetick Romanists* for aid. The views of  
 both parties being the same as to separation and republican-  
 ism, they have entered into a league, the object of which is,  
 the subversion of the constitution in church and state. There-  
 fore the Irish Protestants, attached friends to the constitution,  
 ought to arm the Romanists with additional political powers,  
 to enable them to be more effective allies to the deistical re-  
 publicans in the patriotic work of subversion and separation.  
 Such, sir, is the absurd argument, you have the presumption  
 to adduce, in support of your project of emancipation, when  
 disrobed of all the unsubstantial frippery with which you have  
 attempted

attempted at once to deck and disguise it. I cannot however dismiss this doughty argument, without a few strictures on your taste and feelings so fully delineated in the progress of it. You pour forth your praises on the daily publications in the Romish newspapers, as well of the unrivalled excellence of the stile of these compositions, as of the matter of them. Now, sir, as to the stile of these daily publications, I have the general opinion of all men of letters with me, when I assert that such effusions of barbarism and nonsense never before, at any period since the invention of printing, flowed from the press, as have flowed from the Romish presses in the city of Dublin, for these five or six years past, and I leave you, sir, in full enjoyment of the delight you daily receive from the perusal of such Attic compositions; your own performances sometimes fill their columns, you are yourself in composition a perfect *artifex deliciarum*, treasure up, sir, every one of those valuable productions, they will be preserved by nobody else, may you be the asylum—the retreat of all those ephemeral emanations from intellects congenial with your own!

Where all the suffering brotherhood retire,  
And 'scape the martyrdom of jakes and fire.

I shall observe no further on your taste, but conclude with the line of the Mantuan poet,

Qui Bavium non odit, amet tua carmina, Mævi!

As to the matter of these publications, which you represent as *powerful, of profound and spirited investigation*, I may safely appeal to the public, whether there ever was, in any age or country so much profligacy and wickedness, so openly and so notoriously recommended to practice, and praised in such extravagant terms, as in the daily publications, of these infamous newspapers, which are the disgrace of the age, and of the nation. They publicly excite to murder and robbery, and that they have been too successful in propagating such hellish doctrines is a melancholy truth, that cannot be denied. The state of the  
country

country attests it, and you, sir, have openly in your present address lavished your praises on the horrible murders and robberies nightly committed, as I have already observed: You state, sir, expressly, that all these disorders are committed in a public cause, that is, for the benefit of the public, thus exclaiming to the citizens of Dublin: "It is a public cause, and let no man persuade you, that it is not the cause of liberty on one side, and tyranny on the other;" in this manner asserting the justice and propriety of all these nocturnal murders and depredations. In another place you insinuate that the execution of the law on some of those malefactors, gave them a title to martyrdom, and that the cause of reform, in which according to you they had committed the murders for which they suffered, would be promoted by their martyrdom; as the christian religion was propagated by the blood of its first martyrs: Thus encouraging assassination and murder by the grossest impiety. It may be justly observed on these newspaper publications, that their stupidity and vulgarity do not in the least diminish the acrimony of the poison they contain, the vehicle is sufficient to convey it to the understandings of the mob, well inclined to use it against their superiors. It is observed in history, that the poison, a few drops of which diluted in wine destroyed Alexander the Great, was of so frigid a nature, that it bursted all vessels into which it was put, except an excavated ass's hoof; but such its frigidity and the baseness of its vehicle in no wise diminished its deleterious qualities. One newspaper weekly published in Dublin, points out by name the victims destined, as it asserts, to assassination by a committee of United Irishmen; and strongly urges the necessity of immediate execution. I presume, sir, this is one of your *powerful publications*; and as each successive day exceeds the preceding, in examples of all kinds of murder, robbery, and wickedness, I am strongly induced to agree with you in one point, viz. that the minds of your *popular and energetic* Romanists, as well as your own, are in a state of progression; for it is an old and true observation, that vice is progressive, *nemo repente fuit turpissimus*.

I have now, sir, gone through such arguments (if they deserve that name) as you have adduced directly in support of the measure,

measure, so fraudulently stiled by you *emancipation*. But other arguments you have introduced in support of the same measure by way of answer to arguments which as you state had been made use of by its adversaries, and which you grossly misrepresent, as usual with you, mixing your misrepresentations with a due portion to direct notorious falsehood; and suggesting that your adversaries had used arguments, the absurdity of which proves them to be the genuine offspring of your own brain, created by you for two purposes, the one, to fix the imputation of folly on your adversaries; the other to shew your dexterity in refuting them; as children erect houses of cards to have the pleasure of overturning them by a blast of their mouths. For instance, you state: "That the only impediment to the Catholic claim (meaning emancipation) as the law now stands, was the *oath* requiring the abjuration of the worship of the Virgin Mary, and of the doctrine of the real presence. That it was argued by the adversaries of that claim, that it was irreconcilable with the safety of the king, that to make these points, at such a time as the present, a matter of alarm to the safety of the king, was to give an air of ridicule to the serious calamities in which his ministers had involved him." Then, sir, you launch out into the most delightful declamation on the absurdity of persons insisting that others should be of the same religious opinions with themselves. This is an old topick with philosophers and freethinkers, such as Tom Chubb the soap-boiler, and Tom Paine the stay-maker; Toland, Tindall, Collins, Morgan, Apgill, &c. &c. they have already exhausted all their eloquence and wit upon it, and there is no sect of christianity, against which the ridicule, attached to such a doctrine, applies so strongly as the Roman Catholic, because of all christian sects, that has most violently and most frequently exercised persecution, and it is in fact the most intolerant. How did you hug yourself when the following beautiful figurative sentences flowed from your pen! "That kings had no right to enter into the tabernacle of the human mind, and hang up the images of their own orthodoxy; that the Catholics did not insist his Majesty should be of their religion, that his Majesty had no right to exact that the Catholics should be of his—that we know of no royal rule either for  
 " religion

“ religion or mathematics: that in matters of religion both  
 “ king and subject are equally dark and should be equally  
 “ humble; that when courts or kings assume a dictation on  
 “ that subject, they assume a familiarity with the Almighty,  
 “ which is excess of blasphemy as well as blindness!” then  
 you proceed, sir, *like* a great philosopher as you are, to philo-  
 sophize on the nature of the divinity and his attributes, and the  
 inefficacy and even folly of addressing the divinity in *prayer*,  
 which you honour with the title of *luxurious and complimentary  
 devotion*: in all which most philosophic rant, though you  
 display the profundity of your speculation on your own *immea-  
 surable inanity* (to use your own expressions) yet you are cer-  
 tainly somewhat inferior to your masters, Tom Chubb, Tom  
 Paine, and the rest of the gang, all of whom, exclusive of their  
 priority of declamation on the subject, in some parts of their  
 writings outdo you, in flighty, frothy, and unintelligible bom-  
 bast! It is worthy of notice however, that your deduction  
 from the admitted absurdity, of persons insisting that others  
 should adopt their religious opinions, is somewhat too general,  
 for you deduce generally, that difference of religious opinions  
 should not exclude any subjects from becoming legislators in  
 the state; from which it will follow, that in a christian state,  
 the Mahometan, the Jew, and the Pagan, have an equal right  
 with the christian subjects, to become legislators; a doctrine  
 which such philosophers as yourself, and particularly your  
 French masters, had not only swallowed themselves, but endea-  
 voured to ram it down the throats of others, but which every  
 sect of real christians will find somewhat hard of digestion.

But, sir, after thus paying my homage to your philosophy,  
 to your eloquence, and your wit, it is time to return to your  
 assertions, and pray, sir, where have you found the *oath* re-  
 quiring the abjuration of the worship of the Virgin Mary and  
 the doctrine of the real presence, which *oath* you assert to be  
 the only impediment of the Catholic claim? I have very care-  
 fully examined the statutes, and I cannot find that any such  
 oath is enjoined to be taken on any occasion by any of his  
 majesty's subjects. All members of parliament before they  
 are permitted to vote in either house, are obliged to repeat and  
 subscribe

Mr. Grattan grossly  
 misrepresents the  
 impediment to  
 the Catholic claim  
 of emancipation.

subscribe a declaration, in which is contained a disavowal of the belief of the doctrine which enjoins the invocation and adoration of the Virgin Mary, and of other saints. They are also, at the same time, obliged to take the oath of allegiance to his majesty, the oath of supremacy, and the oath of abjuration of the descendants of the late King James the second; but no oath whatsoever abjuring the worship of the Virgin Mary and the doctrine of the real presence. Protestants admit the blessed Virgin, as having been the earthly mother of our Redeemer, to be in dignity the greatest of saints, but they do not think her to be a divinity, or part of the divinity, and therefore entitled to adoration. The declaration above mentioned was enjoined to be repeated and subscribed by all members of parliament in England, in the latter end of the reign of King Charles the second, when the nation was full of apprehensions of the evils likely to ensue, from the accession to the crown of the then heir apparent, who was a Roman Catholic, the justice of which apprehensions was afterwards fully established; and the legislature then framed this declaration, as a sort of barrier against the inundation of popery, which they dreaded; it was afterwards adopted in this kingdom. It is a doctrine which can be well maintained by all the principles of justice, reason, and common advantage of all the subjects of a state, in which there is an established religion, that no person should be admitted to be a legislator in such a state who is not a member of the established religion: but our laws enjoin no oaths to be taken abjuring points of doctrine, which, reduced to practice, induce no detriment to the state. Thus, sir, your assertion, that the only impediment to the Catholic claim, as the law now stands, is the oath requiring the abjuration of the worship of the Virgin Mary, and of the doctrine of the real presence, is false in fact, there being no such oath by law required to be taken by Romanists or any other subjects; and indeed in this particular, I believe the falsehood is not imputable to your heart, but to your ignorance of law and fact. And then, sir, what becomes of your elegant declamation, in which you have laboured to rival and surpass your masters the soap-boiler and stay-maker, founded on this false assertion! all your reprobation of royal

rules

rules in religion or mathematics ! of royal dictation in matters of religion ! of the blindness and excessive blasphemy of kings in assuming a familiarity with the Almighty ! All this rant proceeds from your own blindness, ignorance, and vanity, seasoned with a due proportion of your inveterate malignity against the monarchical government of your country.

And now, sir, I will tell you a real and true impediment, The real impediment to the claim of emancipation. as the law stands, arising from an oath, to the admission of Romanists into either House of Parliament, or into the great executive offices of the state; an impediment which has not law alone, but reason and the safety of the state for its basis, and which, sir, many members of the last Parliament as well as myself, whom in your address you distinguish by the title of dreamers, have frequently mentioned in the House of Commons in debates on this claim of the Romanists, and supported by arguments founded on justice, reason, and law; to which arguments you sometimes opposed declamatory, inflated nonsense, loud hysterical exclamations, uncommon grimace, and distortions of your body; for in truth you were unable to refute the arguments, and so were men much abler than you, then voting with you in the House: at other times, conscious of your inability to answer, you sat wrapped up in your own assumed importance, like the maniac in Bedlam, who fancied himself pope, and affected to treat the arguments of your opponents with contempt, which they returned with considerable interest. *The true impediment is, that Romanists refuse to take the oath of supremacy, part of which oath is, "That no foreign Prince, Prelate, State, or Potentate hath, or ought to have, any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence or authority ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this Realm."* By the Irish Statutes of the 28th of Henry the 8th, chap. 5th, and of the 2nd of Eliz. chap. 1st. the kings and queens of this realm, and their successors, are declared to be supreme heads, that is, governors of the church of Ireland, and by these two acts, as well as by another, of the 28th of Henry the 8th, chap. 13, the authority and jurisdiction both temporal and spiritual, before that time claimed and exercised by the pope in Ireland are utterly abolished; and by the last statute it is enacted, that if any person shall by writing or act, maintain the



authority of the Bishops of Rome heretofore used in this kingdom, he shall incur the penalty of premunire.

It is very notorious that all Irish Romanists acknowledge the authority, pre-eminence, and jurisdiction of the bishop of Rome in *spirituals* within this kingdom; if any change has taken place in the understandings and opinions of the Irish Romanists, as you, sir, assert, it is not a change of their opinions of the jurisdiction of the pope in *spirituals* in this kingdom: the oath of allegiance prescribed to be taken by Irish Romanists contains a clause, that the pope has no *temporal or civil jurisdiction* directly or indirectly within this realm; one fortieth part of the Irish Romanists have not yet taken this oath; but they all to a man refuse to take the oath of supremacy, disclaiming the *spiritual* jurisdiction of the pope: and Doctor Troy before mentioned, the Romish archbishop of Dublin, in open defiance of the statute of the 28th of Henry the 8th before mentioned, has in his pastoral letter published in 1793, maintained the *spiritual* jurisdiction of the pope in Ireland: he has also stated, that the declaration of the principles of Romanists before mentioned was respectfully submitted to the inspection of himself and the Romish clergy in Ireland, by the standing committee of the Romanists, and was approved of by them before it was published.

Doctor Troy thus states: "That Catholics are obliged to believe, as an article of their faith, that the pope or bishop of Rome, as successor of saint Peter, is the supreme visible head of the church on earth, and the centre of Catholic unity; with a primacy by divine right of *real authority and jurisdiction* in the universal church, and that all Catholics owe him canonical respect and obedience on that account; and he represents this supremacy of the pope as one of those points on which all Catholics are agreed, as an *immutable article of their faith.*" See Doctor Troy's pastoral letter, page 72. It appears clearly that Doctor Troy has fairly represented the opinions of the Irish Romanists of this day of the *spiritual* supremacy of the pope, and that they have not in the least changed their opinions in that respect; because they reject universally at this day the oath of supremacy, abjuring the  
spiritual

spiritual authority of the pope in this kingdom. That it is impossible to divest the supremacy in spirituals, of a very considerable share of temporal power, is very easy to be proved: the absolute separation of the two powers is impracticable. I shall just mention one instance of the indissoluble connexion in a christian country, of spiritual and temporal power; on the lawfulness of matrimony depends almost entirely, the succession to all temporal property, whether real or temporal: matrimony by the Romanists is held a sacrament, the validity of it is entirely of spiritual jurisdiction: If the pope then, as Romanists hold, has the supreme and final jurisdiction in this particular, he must derive very great temporal power and influence from it; he must ultimately decide, whether a person claiming under his father or his mother, is entitled to the succession to their real or personal property, because such decision will depend on the validity of their marriage; he must decide whether a party has or has not, a right to intermarry with another, or whether a party is barred from that right by consanguinity, affinity, precontract, or former marriage; he must ultimately decide on separate maintenance, alimony, or whether a man is, or is not, bound to pay the debts of a woman, claiming him as her husband, with a hundred other temporal incidents. It will, sir, be worth your attention to consider what opinion the parliament of this kingdom, just escaping from the fangs of the pope's usurped authority, entertained of the *temporal* effects of the *spiritual* jurisdiction of the Pope exercised in the case of matrimony alone: In an Irish statute enacted in the 33d year of Hen. 8th, entitled "an act for marriages," are the following passages: "Whereas heretofore the usurped power of the  
 " Bishop of Rome hath always entangled and troubled, the  
 " *jurisdiction and regal power* of this land of Ireland, and also  
 " inquieted much the subjects of the same, by his usurped  
 " power in them, as by making that unlawful which by God's  
 " word is lawful, both in marriages *and other things* whereof  
 " some sparkles be left which hereafter might kindle a great  
 " fire." The statute then proceeds, "that it was customary  
 " for the Court of Rome, to divorce parties who had been  
 " long married and had issue, on the pretence of pre-contracts  
 " without

A great share of temporal power adheres to, and is inseparably connected with, the supremacy in spirituals.

“ without consummation, and of kindred between cousins ger-  
 “ man, and so to fourth and fifth degrees, and of carnal know-  
 “ ledge of any of the same kin or affinity before, in such out-  
 “ ward degrees, to procure money for dispensations, *whereby*  
 “ *not only much discord between lawful married persons hath*  
 “ *arisen, much debate and suit at law, with wrongful vexati-*  
 “ *on, and great damage of the innocent parties hath been pro-*  
 “ *cured, and many just marriages in doubt and danger of undo-*  
 “ *ing, and also many times undone, and lawful heirs disinherited,*  
 “ *and marriages have been brought to such an uncertainty there-*  
 “ *by, that no marriage could be so sure knit and bounden,*  
 “ *but it should be in either of the parties power to defeat the*  
 “ *same.*”

Innumerable other instances, of the inseparable adhesion of temporal power to supreme spiritual power, can be adduced, and Irish Romanists not only hold, that the supreme legislature of the state, whether that state be monarchical or republican, is utterly incompetent to bind them, even to a passive, much less to an active, obedience in spiritual affairs; but unequivocally hold, that the sole power of enacting, interpreting or executing laws, respecting spiritual matters, is vested in the pope, a foreign prince, and this tenet they esteem an article of their faith, and as they will not allow that any law of the state is binding on them in spiritual matters, it follows of course, that they hold it as an article of their faith, that the law of the state cannot bind them in such temporal matters as are inseparably united to spiritual matters, such as matrimony, and all its consequences; and innumerable others; Romanists then, if admitted to the functions of legislation in the state, must, if they act conscientiously, endeavour with all their power to abrogate and abolish all temporal laws now in force, or which may be at any time proposed to be enacted, which relate to spiritual affairs, whether connected with temporal matters or not, but more especially when so connected: and if they shall be intrusted with the great executive offices of the state, they must conceive themselves in conscience bound to obstruct the execution, and defeat the effect of them, to the best of their power; hence must follow a great alteration, if not a total subversion,

of

of our constitution. Is it consistent with the rules of either reason or civil policy to make legislators of those, who make it an article of their faith, that the supreme legislature of the state (whether monarchical or republican it signifies not) is not competent to bind them by its laws in all cases? and that they are in conscience bound to so active a disobedience to the laws of their country enacted by the legislature of it, in many instances, not only of a spiritual, but a temporal nature, as to endeavour with all their might to obstruct, and defeat, the execution of them? and are such persons to be trusted with the execution of those laws? no person of common sense will answer these questions in the affirmative.

It has been sometimes objected to this mode of reasoning, that no inconvenience is experienced in Roman Catholic states, the subjects of which hold the independence of the spiritual on the temporal power; to this I answer, that in such states the general tenor of the laws is conformable to the doctrines of the Romish church, and that almost all those states, whether monarchies or republics, exercise a very despotic power over their subjects, and therefore find their account in preserving a strict alliance with the clergy, to enable them more effectually to maintain that despotic authority which they assume, and to wink at religious usurpations to countenance their own invasions of the rights of the people; besides, *popular opinions are of little weight in such governments, from all shares in which the people are generally excluded*: but in a Protestant state there can be no alliance between the state and the Romish clergy; their creeds respecting the powers of legislation, are not only different, but hostile; and in a Protestant state, such as the British empire, in which part, and the most efficient and powerful part, of the legislature, is an elective popular assembly, and civil liberty its aim, it would be utterly inconsistent with its safety, or indeed existence, to permit that assembly to be elected out of a part of the people, who hold as a point of faith, so anarchical a doctrine, that the state is not supreme within the countries subject to its dominions; what infinite mischief such doctrine has produced even in Romish countries, and particularly in our own heretofore, and to what distress it has reduced

some of the greatest of our monarchs, the histories of the different states of Europe, and of our own in particular, sufficiently testify.

I have heard some objections against the probability of any political evil resulting from such doctrine in case the aforesaid impediment to the admission of Romanists into the legislature were removed; they have indeed been chiefly urged by you, sir, in your harangues in the House of Commons, and they are so very weak and absurd, that I would not have here taken notice of them, but with a view of exposing to the world the miserable weapons, the daggers of lath, with which such a political harlequin as you are, have attempted to assault the constitution.

Mr. Grattan's argument drawn from the inbecillity of the pope as a temporal prince examined and refuted.

First, sir, you have frequently dwelt on the impotence of the pope considered as a temporal prince, and ridiculed the apprehensions entertained of his power to undermine, or in any shape to affect the government of this country; and asserted that the doctrine held by Romanists, that the pope was supreme head of the church on earth, and that the state has no power to bind the laity in spiritual matters, but that such power is vested in the pope independent of the state, is merely a speculative doctrine inoperative from the inefficiency of the pope's temporal power. Contemptible sophistry! The danger of the doctrine does not arise from the power or want of power of the pope, considered as a temporal sovereign, it consists entirely in the number and strength of the subjects of the state, *whose government is partly popular*, who hold such a doctrine, as a point of faith: the person who denies that the supreme authority of the state, of which he is a subject, is competent to bind him by its laws in spiritual matters, inseparably connected with temporal in various instances, is a bad subject; and a great number of such persons in a state form a faction very dangerous to it; they are the attached partizans and agents in a state, of the foreign power whom they believe to be competent to bind them by its decrees in spiritual matters; and the danger of the state arises from their ability and readiness to execute such decrees; the state may be in the utmost danger from such principles and ability

ability in their own subjects, though the foreign oracle, whose mandates they obey, be not in his own state or sphere invested with any temporal power whatever: And it matters not to the state whether such supreme power be exercised or directed by the pope or by the Irish Romish clergy themselves, so long as they maintain the dogma, that they are in spiritual matters independent of, and paramount to, the state; or whether the pope be a weak or a powerful temporal prince: the danger to the state arises from the number and strength of its own subjects denying the state to be competent to bind them to obedience to its laws, and to have the power within itself, to decide all causes between its own subjects, without appeal or application to any foreign tribunal, but on the contrary acknowledging the power of a tribunal independent of the state in spiritual matters. If the influence of pope and priest over the Irish Romanists, as you maintain, is at an end, let them come forward and take the oath of supremacy; if they shall offer to take that oath, then, sir, you may argue that mere speculative points of doctrine held by Romanists, though contrary to the faith of Protestants, such as the adoration of the blessed virgin, the invocation of saints, and belief of the real presence in the sacrament of the Lord's supper, and that most uncharitable dogma, that the souls of all persons who are not of their communion are destined to eternal torments, ought not to exclude them from the legislative and executive capacities: and your arguments will have then some weight, though in all well regulated states, persons publicly maintaining mere speculative points of doctrine contrary to that of the established religion, have been generally excluded from any participation of legislative and other political capacities; because difference in religious opinions, even in mere speculative points, has been generally found to engender differences in political pursuits, and violent animosities, feuds, and factions in a state, where the leaders of the different sects are possessed of a considerable share of political power.

Mr. Grat-  
tan's argu-  
ment drawn  
from the  
state of the  
province of  
Canada,  
examined  
and refut-  
ed.

Your next argument against the probability of danger to the state, from the admission of the Irish Romanists into the legislative and executive capacities, is, that the province of Canada, part of the British Empire, remained faithful to Britain during the American war, though its inhabitants are Romanists; it is not strange that you should stuff this doughty argument, scouted and derided, as often as you have advanced it, into the farrago of your address; you were determined to make it a general collection of all the rags and shreds, you had employed your whole life, in scraping from every dunghill of sedition and treason in which you had rooted, with all the industry of the collector of rags for a paper mill. The province of Canada surrendered to the British arms by capitulation, part of which was, that the inhabitants should enjoy their laws and religion, in the same manner they had done before they submitted, Britain accepted of them as subjects on these express conditions; they stipulated for the enjoyment of their religion, which was the Romish, and British faith, always inviolable, secured to them the full enjoyment of that religion. They were, before their surrender, governed by a French Viceroy, they are now governed by an English one, exercising, according to the capitulation, the same powers the French Viceroy did. The executive government of the country, and the military force, are in the hands of persons appointed by his majesty, and *the people in general have no share in the government*: in such a situation of things, in a remote province, subject to a great and powerful nation, the belief of the people in the spiritual supremacy of the pope, can do very little mischief; 'tis little more there than a mere speculative point of doctrine: But the case is widely different, in a nation, *the most efficient part of whose government, to wit, the House of Commons, is elective by the people, as is the case in Ireland*, and the absurdity of deducing the political innocence of such a doctrine in Ireland, from its being found innoxious in the weak, remote, and newly conquered, province of Canada during the American war, *the mass of whose inhabitants has no share in the government*, is glaring and notorious. But the loyalty of the  
Canadians

Canadians to the British Empire during that period is clearly deducible from necessity arising from their situation, and from the principle of self-interest, independent of all religious considerations. There is only one entrance to the province of Canada from the ocean, to wit, the river St. Laurence: the winter is so rigorous in that climate, that this entrance is locked up by ice for six months in the year; the fortrefs of Quebec, and the opposite small island of Orleans, shut up this entrance for the remaining six months, to be opened only to the subjects of that power, whether Protestant or Romanist, which possesses these barriers; and that power must for ages command the obedience of the Canadians, be they of what religious persuasion they may: they cannot at present exist for two seasons, and hardly for one, without a supply of European commodities, they can be supplied with them only by the river St. Laurence; for between them and the united states of America lies an immense tract of country, mostly covered with forests, and thinly inhabited by barbarous and ferocious tribes of Indians: The river St. Laurence can be locked up by one thousand troops and a frigate or two stationed at Quebec; thus it is apparent that the fidelity of the Romish Empire during the American war, was founded on necessity arising from situation, and from their interest; that no consideration of religion was amongst the causes of that war, and if it had been so, and if the war on the part of the Americans had been undertaken, for the purpose of subverting a Protestant establishment and substituting a Romish in its place, yet such was the situation and necessities of the Canadians, that they must have remained faithful to Britain during the contest. The situation of the Irish Romanists is in every respect different, and the deduction of their loyalty, if invested with legislative and executive authority in the state, from the loyalty or rather obedience of the Romish Canadians to the British Empire during the American war, arising from situation and necessity, is equally ridiculous and absurd. You rather hint, than urge, another kind of argument, tacked to the Canada argument, for what you call the emancipation of the Roman Catholics, and that

is,



is, that his majesty's allies, (meaning the emperor and the queen of Portugal) are Roman Catholics; how you can deduce that a part of his majesty's Irish subjects being Roman Catholics, and not amounting to more than one sixth part of his European subjects, should be invested with the legislative and executive capacities in his dominions, at the manifest hazard of their domestic tranquility, from his majesty's alliance with foreign powers of the Roman Catholic persuasion against a ferocious foreign enemy, is more than I can discover or explain, and I resign that task to your own amazing sagacity as a French philosopher and politician.

Mr. Grattan's assertion that Irish Romanists have a natural and indefeasible right to a full participation of the legislative and executive capacities examined and refuted.

After exhibiting these egregious specimens of your argumentative powers, you proceed to assert roundly, that the Irish Romanists have as good a right to seats in parliament, and to the enjoyment of the great offices of the state, as the king has to the crown, and that such is an indefeasible right. Before I quote your insolent, petulant, and malignant assertions on this head, I must again repeat, that the Irish Romanists are now invested with all the privileges enjoyed by Protestants, except that they cannot sit or vote in parliament, nor enjoy a few great offices of the state, without taking the same test, which Protestants are obliged to take, to qualify them for sitting in parliament, and enjoying such places; that such test operates as an exclusion of Romanists in those particulars, but not of Protestants; and that Irish Romanists, notwithstanding that exclusion, now enjoy a much greater measure of civil liberty, than the most favoured subjects of any other state on the face of the earth enjoy at this day. The right of Irish Romanists to seats in parliament and to the enjoyment of the great offices of the state (the only portion of civil privileges from which they are now excluded, and excluded in the manner before mentioned only) you assert in this manner: "The principles which placed  
" his majesty's family on the throne were those of liberty.  
" His Irish subjects, if not convicted of felony, are entitled  
" to the benefit of these principles, and the Catholics have  
" in justice and reason *at least* as good a right to liberty as  
" his majesty has to the crown; we implored ministers against  
" such

“ such an enemy as democracy, a giant with a hundred  
 “ hands, to ally and identify the king with all his people,  
 “ without distinction of religion, and not to detach him  
 “ from any part of them, to make a miserable alliance  
 “ with *priestcraft*, which *was a falling cause and a superannu-*  
 “ *ated folly.*”

Now, sir, it is admitted, that the principles which placed his majesty's family on the throne were those of civil liberty, and that all his subjects, English and Irish, are entitled to the benefit of such principles, unless they forfeit such benefit, by being convicted according to law of crimes, the legal punishment of which is loss of liberty, or unless they entertain principles subversive of civil liberty; all members of civil societies, are obliged to surrender a portion of their natural rights to the society, to procure the secure enjoyment of the rights of that society, and if any members of that society hold principles subversive of the institution, the society has an absolute right to abridge such members of such parts of the rights and privileges of that society, as would enable them to disturb, or in the end to subvert it, if they were permitted to exercise them; and such right has in many instances been exercised by the legislature of this kingdom; the place bill is one which excludes from the legislative capacity persons who hold, or shall hold, certain places, under the government, on the ground, that the conduct of such persons, if admitted into the legislative assembly, might be biassed by self interest, and that they might vote therein, as directed by ministers, to retain the emolument of their places, contrary to the interest of their constituents, and to the principles of the constitution. How much stronger are the grounds for excluding from the legislative capacity subjects who hold doctrines as points of faith, not only contrary, but hostile, to the fundamental laws of the state, and the very constitution itself! The Irish Romanists have a right to enjoy, and actually do enjoy, all the privileges of the subjects of a free state, and are abridged of no privileges, except of such as they cannot be permitted to exercise, consistent with the safety of the state, to wit, the legislative and executive

tive functions; the latter in some instances only. To insinuate as you do, that all persons are slaves, who do not enjoy the legislative and executive capacities, is to insinuate a doctrine as false in theory, as in practice; all the subjects of a state are equally free, who are bound by the same laws framed by persons elected by themselves, and to which the framers are equally subject with the rest of the community; in such sense the Irish Romanists are intitled to liberty, and are free; but if you mean to assert, that Irish Romanists are as well intitled to the legislative and executive capacities as the king to his crown, by asserting that they have the same title to liberty as the king to the sovereignty, making civil liberty to consist in the enjoyment of the legislative and executive capacities, and slavery in the deprivation of them, though such deprivation be demanded by the safety of the state; such your dogma is false and sophistical, and cannot be supported on any ground of reason or civil policy, nor have you offered any one reason to support it. Your rant about *destroying all distinctions in religion, and the miserable alliance of the king with priestcraft, a falling cause, a superannuated folly*, you have stolen, as you have many others, from your masters Tom Chubb and Tom Paine; this is the plain English of it, *let all religious distinctions be abolished* (that is all religion; for as long as any religion shall remain, and there shall be different sects of Christians, Jews, Mahometans, and Pagans in the world, there will be distinctions in religion.) *Let his majesty slight and violate his coronation oath, I will absolve him from it! I am the pope of Anti Christ! That oath contains the following clause: "I will to the utmost of my power maintain the laws of God, the true profession of the gospel, and the Protestant reformed religion established by law," That oath allies the king to the Protestant religion, the Protestant religion is priestcraft! it is a falling cause! it is superannuated folly!* In such impious rants, purloined from the workshops of the soap-boiler and the stay-maker, you have the intrepid impudence to address the Protestant electors of the city of Dublin, who have just scouted you from their representation for your apostacy! And may such desperate renegadoes  
from

from the religion and constitution of their country, never again impose themselves by hypocritical frothy effusions of mock patriotism, on the too easy credulity, and on the bounty, of their honest christian Protestant countrymen !

Your next argument in favour of the Romish claim to the legislative and executive capacities is, “ That the Irish Romanists had contributed greatly to the expences of the war, and had bled profusely therein.” This argument requires examination. The public debt of the state of Ireland amounts to something more than seven millions sterling; this debt has not been all contracted since the commencement of the war; when it was proposed in the Irish House of Commons to reduce the hearth-money tax, about seven years since, calculations were laid before the house, made from the books of the hearth-money collectors, tending to prove, that there were about two millions of inhabitants in this kingdom, who from their poverty could not pay this tax, amounting only to four-pence in the year each, without the greatest hardship; of these two millions six parts out of seven were Romanists. I have already shewn that of the mass of real and personal property of this kingdom nineteen out of twenty parts are in the hands of Protestants, and four fifths of the Irish Romanists pay no tax whatsoever, being freed from the hearth-tax, so that all public taxes must be paid by the Protestants, and about one-fifth by the Romanists; and on fair calculation the public taxes, estimated by the numbers and abilities of the inhabitants to pay, will be found to be chiefly paid by the Irish Protestants. Ireland has maintained no fleet for the prosecution of the war, and her whole annual contributions to the expence of a war, in which the Empire is engaged not for conquest, but salvation, do not amount to one-tenth part of the annual expenditure; nine-parts out of ten at least of the annual expence being defrayed by Great Britain; and of this tenth nineteen parts out of twenty are paid by Irish Protestants, and in return for the pittance which Romanists have contributed to the expences of the war, they have shared the benefit of an increased trade, growing out of the ruin of that of the enemy; the annual exports of linen in particular, the staple manufacture of the nation,

Mr. Grattan's argument drawn from the contribution of Romanists to the expences of the war, and their service in the fleets and armies, examined and refuted.

having been almost doubled during the war, the same manufacture in Holland and the Netherlands, being annihilated by that calamity. But supposing the Romish subjects of this nation, bore an equal portion of the public burthens imposed for the support of the war with their Protestant fellow subjects, are they not fully repaid by the protection and security afforded them by a government whose very basis is civil liberty? Is not every subject bound to support with his life and his property that government which secures to him the enjoyment of his life and property? And does the pitiful contribution to the public burthens which can be extracted from the poverty of the Irish Romanists, to be employed in defraying the expence necessarily disbursed on his own protection, which he is obliged by law to pay, and is not a voluntary contribution, give him a title to the legislative capacity in a state, the supremacy of whose laws for internal regulation he makes it a point of conscience to disclaim? Such political anomalies can be suggested only by the head, distracted by the aches of disappointed avarice and ambition; and the heart labouring with the throes of sedition, privy conspiracy and rebellion!

The other support of the claim of Irish Romanists to the legislative and executive capacities which you urge, to wit, *that they have bled profusely in the war*, will be found, on examination, to be equally weak with that of contribution to the expences. Thank heaven! Britons have not bled profusely in this war, they have experienced no defeats, they have uniformly, when engaged, triumphed over their enemies; some blood they have lost, but let us see what proportion of that was drained from the veins of Irish Romanists, fighting under the banners of the British empire. The navy is manned and the army composed of the subjects of the empire indiscriminately, and in respect to the navy, as the relative number of British seamen in proportion to the inhabitants of Great Britain exceeds the relative number of Irish seamen in proportion to the inhabitants of Ireland, the shipping of Great Britain exceeding the shipping of Ireland in a much greater ratio than the number of the inhabitants of the former exceeds that of the latter, the number of  
British

British seamen employed in the navy, must exceed the number of Irish seamen employed in that service, in nearly the same ratio: I have already proved from the proportion of the surface of Great Britain to that of Ireland (supposing the population of both kingdoms to be in exact proportion to their respective surfaces) that the number of inhabitants of Britain exceed the number of inhabitants of Ireland in the proportion of seven to two, and that nearly all the inhabitants of Britain and one third of the inhabitants of Ireland are Protestants, so that the gross proportion of Protestant inhabitants in the British islands to the Romish inhabitants on that supposition, is nearly as six to one: from such calculation, it plainly follows, that the proportion of Protestants serving in the navy, to Romanists in the same service, is as eight, if not nine or ten to one; and in the army as six to one; it is notorious, that all the officers and soldiers enter into the army, as into a profession, by which they hope to obtain an honourable livelihood, and that not one in ten thousand becomes a soldier, from the mere principle of serving his country; they are paid for their service by their country, which counts on their gratitude for being so paid and employed; the same may be said of the seamen and marines: The soldier and the mariner are the obliged parties: and not the country, or the government that employs them: how then does it follow from a comparatively small portion of the army and navy being composed of Irish Romanists, paid by the state for their services, that they, professing principles as points of faith, subversive of the supremacy and constitution of the state, have a right to legislative and executive capacities in the state? It is also to be observed, that all the officers of the navy and in the army serving in Great Britain are Protestants, and must be so, by the laws there in force; and that almost all the officers serving in the Irish army are also Protestants. Some Romish officers have lately obtained commissions in the Irish army; they were Irish gentlemen, who being, by the popery laws now repealed, disqualified to serve in the armies of the British Empire, accepted of commissions in the armies of France, whilst its government was monarchical; the French monar-

chy being overturned, they no longer thought themselves bound to serve in the French armies; they had originally engaged to serve a monarch, and they disdained to serve the gang of assassins who had usurped the government of that country; they were soldiers of fortune, and had no subsistence, save what they could procure by their swords: yet with great spirit and honour they abandoned the armies of France, and attached themselves to those of the coalesced powers, in which they served with signal bravery, under every disadvantage of penury and distress; their country viewed their conduct and situation with admiration and compassion; though they had long served in the ranks of her natural enemy, their sufferings and their merit awoke her parental affection for them, she pardoned their past transgressions, took them to her bosom, and gave them employment in her armies, in which many of them have fallen, bravely fighting for their king and country, deserving of a better fate, and the remainder serve with distinguished honour, fidelity, courage and ability; but the claim of Irish Romanists, to the legislative and executive capacities, cannot be supported on the gratitude of the state to these gentlemen for their services; every body must see that the weight of the obligation lies on their side.

You state, sir, that to your measure, which you with so much fraud stile the emancipation of the Catholics, it was objected, "that it was irreconcilable with the safety of the king." I do not recollect that any such objection was made to it; but to this objection of your own making, you insert the following answer as petulant as it is fraudulent, "That the capacities of three-fourths of the people should not be made a personal compliment to his majesty:" Your insolence in dragging in the name of his majesty on all occasions, that you may take opportunities of avowing your hostility to monarchy in a contemptuous manner, is too obvious to be overlooked. The fraud of your answer consists in your magnifying the relative number of Irish Romanists, and insinuating, that the rejection of their claim to the legislative and executive capacities, first started and pursued by you, is founded on the gratification of the mere whim and caprice  
of

of his Majesty, and thereby endeavouring to foster and encourage their republican opinions, by inspiring them with a personal dislike to their sovereign; the reasons I have before stated were urged against your measure of emancipation, and it was asserted, and truly, that such a measure would weaken, if not subvert, the Protestant establishment of Ireland, and that his majesty could never consent to such a measure, because his consent would be a violation of his coronation oath, by which he swore *he would to the utmost of his power maintain the Protestant reformed religion as established by law*; but it never was asserted or admitted, either in debate or otherwise, that the Irish Romanists would be able to endanger his majesty's safety by a rebellion, in case his majesty should refuse his consent to such a measure; it was indeed asserted, that such a rebellion, (which was repeatedly threatened by you,) would be attended by their own ruin and destruction, as was the case in former Irish rebellions. You state, and for once you state truly, that it was objected to such a measure, "that it was irreconcilable to the connexion of Ireland with England," and your answer to this objection is the essence of deception and sedition; it is thus, "Such argument is of a dangerous and insulting nature, for it amounts to a declaration, that the privileges of a vast portion of a nation should be sacrificed to another country, that it was not the old internal question, whether the privileges of one part of Ireland should be sacrificed to the ambition of the other, but whether a vast description of the people of Ireland should be sacrificed to England;" you then proceed to state the following case: "Suppose Ireland the seat of government, and that for the better securing the safety of the king here resident, and the connexion of Great Britain with Ireland, that the Irish should incapacitate all the Protestants of England, the same affection which England on that supposition would afford to the Irish, the same affection has she now a right to expect from Ireland." Before I comment on the venom of this answer, I shall expose its sophistry and inanity; it is entirely founded on the assumption of the following proposition, that the connexion of the two countries,

Connexion  
of Englan  
and Irelan

tries,



highly advantageous to both, but more particularly to Ireland.

tries, is solely for the advantage of Great Britain, and not for the advantage of Ireland. This proposition has been maintained by all the Romish orators at the assembly of the *popular and energetick Romanists* at Francis-street chapel before-mentioned, particularly by Keogh and McNeven two of your Romish committee; they indeed went a little further, and stated, that the connexion was destructive to Ireland: yet no proposition can be falser in fact; the connexion between the two countries is highly advantageous to both, they are each parts of one and the same empire, and as the limbs derive life and vigour from the trunk in the human frame, and as its dismemberment tends to its dissolution, and the separated limbs lose all animation before the trunk, the case is precisely the same in States and Empires. If Ireland should be separated from Great Britain, the destruction of Ireland as an independent nation, must precede that of Great Britain. Great Britain might perhaps be able to support herself in an independent state, though Ireland should be torn from her, Ireland never could; there is no man, who considers the present state of Europe, but must admit, that Ireland could not by her own strength sever herself from Britain, she must be indebted to a foreign nation for effecting such a revolution, if at all practicable; and she must constantly increase that debt to maintain the revolution, until the debt equalled her full value, then she would become the property of the mortgagee, and be reduced to slavery for the satisfaction of the debt. Let us now compare the situation of Ireland connected with Great Britain, with her situation, if severed from it. At present, as one of the French conventionists stated, the marine has made Europe the mistress of the world, and Great Britain the mistress of Europe. Ireland under the protection of the invincible British navy, and without being at the expence of a single ship of War, exports her manufactures to all parts of the earth, accessible to ships, she has the full advantage of the trade of the British colonies and fisheries, she is protected by the same means from all invasion of foreign enemies, and in the midst of a war, which has ruined and desolated the finest parts of Europe, she has extend-

ed her trade, and manufactures; and if undisturbed by domestic traitors and incendiaries, would have remained in a state of the most perfect internal tranquillity and prosperity; at the same time her public burthens, if estimated by her ability and security, and compared with those of other countries, and even, of part of the British Empire, are insignificant.

But what would be the situation of Ireland, if severed from Great Britain, and on the supposition that she was able to support herself as an independent state, which I have already shewn is impracticable; she would in such case lose the protection of the British navy, she must either create a navy at a great public expence, or her foreign trade, without which, being an island comparatively small, she could not subsist, must be at the mercy of every other maritime state; and such is the limited nature of her resources, that she never could hope, in any degree of probable prosperity, to be able to maintain a navy capable of coping with the navies of the great maritime powers of Europe, and scarcely with the smaller ones, or with the Barbary pirates: consequently she must be obliged always to crouch beneath the dominion, insults, and oppression, of such states, and her trade must be burthened with taxes and impositions equal to the support of a navy; she would be excluded from the whole trade of the British West Indian colonies, and from the fisheries of Newfoundland, and the Gulph of St. Lawrence; her manufactures, which by the late regulations in the East India trade, found their way to the East, would lose that mart; her Baltick trade, whence alone she could be supplied with naval stores, particularly timber, of which she has not now of her own growth, sufficient to build a wherry, would be interrupted and cut off at the pleasure of Great Britain, and her channel trade would lie under the same disadvantage; in the event of a war between her and Great Britain (which must frequently happen, if our demagogues are to be credited, who assert that the commercial interests of the two countries are incompatible) all her Eastern ports must be closed, and her foreign commerce annihilated, from Derry to Kinfale; it is evident that internal poverty, misery, desolation, and  
 subjugation

subjugation to the horrible tyranny of the French assassins would in the end be the inevitable fate of Ireland, if separated from the British Empire; and I console myself and my countrymen on the impracticability of the scheme, even though the execution of it should be undertaken by you, sir, and your associates. The argument however against your emancipation measure, as you call it, that it is *irreconcilable to the connexion of England and Ireland*, does not amount to a declaration, that the privileges of a vast or of any portion of the inhabitants of Ireland are to be sacrificed to the interests of another country, as you stile Great Britain; or as you more emphatically state it, *that a vast description of the people of Ireland should be sacrificed to England*; but it does amount to a declaration, that the Protestants of Ireland, one full third of the inhabitants in number, and nineteen parts out of twenty in energy, power, and property, do conceive, that the grant of the legislative and higher executive capacities to the other two thirds, who hold principles, as articles of faith, subversive of the constitution of the British Empire, of which Ireland is but a part, would be highly prejudicial to the interests, not of Great Britain alone, but of Ireland also, and would be irreconcilable to the connexion between the two countries, in as much as it would tend to subvert that constitution in Ireland, which is and ought to be, the common constitution of the two countries, and to loose and slacken the bands of that connexion on which depends not only the prosperity of Ireland, but its salvation; and which connexion it is more the interest of Ireland to preserve indissoluble, than it is of Great Britain, though its preservation is the interest of both; and in as much also as the Romanists of Ireland amount to about a sixth part only of the European population of the British Empire, and possess not one hundredth part of its strength and energy, and therefore cannot upon any grounds either of reason or civil policy claim such capacities. Another argument to prove that such emancipation would injure the connexion of the two countries, which has been often urged against you, and which you have never answered, is, that the standing committee of the Irish Romanists, whom  
you

you constantly state to be the legitimate representatives of the whole Romanists of Ireland, and to whose orders and directions a very great portion of the Irish Romanists have in fact regularly submitted, and who are the persons whom you stile the *popular and energetick part of that communion*, with whom alone of all that body you have any connexion, and who are your organs with that body, have publicly and solemnly declared their inveterate and rancorous hostility against the connexion of England and Ireland; and their determined purpose to attempt a separation of the two countries, and the establishment of a republic in Ireland, whenever they shall have an opportunity. See their speeches in Francis-street chapel, published by the authority of this committee, and other their daily publications in the Romish journals.

This case, sir, you have put by no means applies to the arguments used against your emancipation scheme, when fairly explained: To place the exclusion of the Irish Romanists from the legislative and higher executive capacities in Ireland (which you suppose, contrary to fact, to be effected by the English Protestants when it is really effected by the Irish Protestants) in a ridiculous light, you put your case to shew, that it would be as reasonable for the Irish Romanists, if the King was resident in Ireland, to incapacitate all the English Protestants, as for the English Protestants, the King residing in England, to incapacitate the Irish Romanists. In the first place your case is built on a falsity, to wit, that the English Protestants have incapacitated the Irish Romanists; if called upon, they would, as good subjects, assist the Irish Protestants in extinguishing the flames of rebellion, if they should blaze forth in Ireland on the score of this incapacity, because in so doing they would only support the general constitution of the British Empire; but supposing the situation of affairs both in Great Britain and Ireland to be as you have stated, I shall examine the justice of your application of the case. The whole inhabitants of Great Britain may be said to be Protestants, for the Romanists among them are so few in number, not being one in two or three hundred, that they

may be reputed, what the Mathematicians call, an evanescent quantity; the inhabitants are four times more numerous than those of Ireland, and of the inhabitants of Ireland, two-thirds only are Romanists; the rest are Protestants: to preserve any degree of consistency in your case, you must suppose the Monarch of the British Islands, resident in Ireland to be a Romanist, and the established religion to be Romish; you then suppose the Irish Romanists, not one-sixth of the inhabitants of the British islands, able to incapacitate the whole inhabitants of the island of Great Britain! And you state expressly, "that you were justified in making these suppositions;" your deduction from it is, "that Ireland is not bound to afford greater affection to England now, than England would be bound to afford to her on the supposition of the reality of such case," or in plain English, that the Romish inhabitants of Ireland are now bound to hate and detest the inhabitants of Great Britain, as much as the inhabitants of the latter, would be bound to hate and detest the inhabitants of the former, if your case was real; but your case, sir, will not justify your deduction, because it is more consonant to the rules of justice to incapacitate a portion of the inhabitants of one nation part of a great Empire, about one-sixth part of the inhabitants of that Empire, if their principles are hostile to the general constitution, than all the inhabitants of another nation part of the same Empire, near four times larger than the nation whose inhabitants are partially incapacitated, and at least fifty times more powerful; and therefore the Irish Romanists, in the present state of affairs, have less right to complain of their incapacity, than the whole inhabitants of Great Britain would have, in the case you suppose, and consequently their degree of resentment against those who incapacitated them should be less; but in truth, sir, your whole argument, and your case compose one heap of most extravagant absurdity; you attempt to establish by studied falsehood, deception, sophistry, and improbable fictions, the monstrous doctrine, that the state is guilty of oppression, in excluding from the legislative and higher executive capacities, a class of subjects, scarce amounting in number to a sixth part of the whole; and in power and

property, when compared with their fellow subjects, inconsiderable; whose avowed principles are hostile to the established constitution both in church and state.

But notwithstanding the general simlness and absurdity of your arguments, which you endeavour at the same time to disguise and prop, by assuming a kind of dogmatic importance, they are sufficiently supplied with venom and malignity; the flaver and spume of a toad are not the less poisonous, because they are frothy; and in this last argument your malicious purpose of animating the Irish Romanists against their Protestant fellow subjects, Irish as well as English, is eminently prominent. You state that the old internal question in this kingdom was, whether the privileges of one part of Ireland should be sacrificed to another, intimating that the privileges of the Irish Romanists have been always heretofore sacrificed to the ambition of Irish Protestants; but that now the question is, whether a vast description of the people of Ireland should be sacrificed to England, and that such question is of an insulting nature, and that it is England which incapacitates the Irish Romanists: Where you mention the influence of the English cabinet in Ireland, you assert that the nation is under a *foreign yoke*, that is, that England, as to Ireland, is a *foreign nation*, and where you advise the Irish who are rich and great, so soon as an insurrection shall break out in Ireland, to join the insurgents, whom you call the country, you mention the court of England, that is the court of the Empire, as a *remote court*, as the court of a *foreign prince*: at the very time you wrote these inflammatory paragraphs, to create and aggravate national animosities, in support of the joint plan of separation of yourself and your colleague Tone, no man knew better than yourself that they were all false; you well know that the incapacities of the Irish Romanists were the work of the Irish Protestants for their own protection, and not of the English; you well know that the several acts passed in Ireland these twenty years last past for repealing the popery laws, and particularly the act of the year 1793, would never have passed the Irish House of Commons, had not the interest of

government, and in fact what is called the English interest, joined the party in the House, which supported these acts of repeal: when you stile Great Britain a foreign nation, and the court of St. James's a foreign court, you seem to forget, or at least to overlook, the acts of the Irish parliament, declaring Ireland to be inseparably annexed to, and dependent on, the imperial crown of Great Britain; and the acts enjoining the oath of supremacy to be taken in Ireland, the words of which oath are, "that no *foreign* prince, prelate, state, or potentate, hath or ought to have any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm;" and that if Great Britain be a foreign country, and the king of it consequently a foreign prince, the Irish Protestants by that oath abjure the ecclesiastical authority of his majesty, in direct defiance of our own laws and statutes. But you are so set upon the execution of your plan, to separate the two nations, that you abandon all pretence to truth and candour in the pursuit, you run head-long into all kinds of absurdity; and are consistent in one point only, that is, in an inveterate hostility against the constitution of your country in church and state.

Remarks  
on a pam-  
phlet, en-  
titled,  
"Some  
" Observa-  
" tions on  
" a late  
" Address  
" to the  
" Citizens  
" of Dub-  
" lin."

A gentleman of learning and ability, lately in a pamphlet entitled, "Some Observations on a late Address to the Citizens of Dublin," exposed with equal spirit and truth many of your absurdities, and many of your falsehoods, contained in this your address. He has proved to a demonstration, that the present disturbances in this country did not arise from the influence of the British cabinet, from attempts of the minister to subvert the parliamentary constitution by the influence of the crown; nor from the treatment of his majesty's Catholic subjects as asserted by you; and he has detected and exposed your ignorance, and your malice, in your account of what you stile with such classic elegance (allowing your attic companions, friars O'Leary and Hufsey to be classics) the *birth* of the borough *inundation*. There are however some points in which I cannot agree with this writer, and as they are points on which much of the public tranquillity depends, and as I esteem the author to be a friend to the constitution,

stitution, whose authority must have considerable weight, I deem it necessary here to examine his arguments on these points, and explain my reasons for dissenting from him; not as his political antagonist, but as a friend to the constitution also, who when he differs in opinion from any other of its supporters, and particularly from a person of so much ability as the writer, deems it a compliment due to him, to lay before him, and the public, the ground of his opinion.

He states, “ that eligibility to certain great offices of the  
 “ state, and seats in the legislature, (that is the legislative  
 “ and higher executive capacities) have been withheld from  
 “ Roman Catholic gentlemen, but not from the lower or-  
 “ ders of that communion, because it is morally impossible  
 “ for men in their rank of life, to attain such situations :  
 “ that such ineligibility is calculated to wound a very natu-  
 “ ral pride in Roman Catholic noblemen and gentlemen,  
 “ and to create amongst them a well warranted discontent,  
 “ that it is a species of stigma that must be galling to men  
 “ of birth and property, that such discontent does reign  
 “ amongst the aristocracy of the Roman Catholic commu-  
 “ nion, that it is to be regretted when in 1793 (the Era of  
 “ the passing of the last act for the relief of Irish Roman-  
 “ ists) the political principle, which could alone justify Ro-  
 “ man Catholic political exclusion, was *totally given up*, that  
 “ any of those political exclusions should be suffered to re-  
 “ main, it was preserving the hardship, and at the same  
 “ time acknowledging the injustice of imposing it, and then  
 “ he concludes, that there is no man who has the capacity  
 “ of observing and reflecting, who has watched the progress  
 “ of opinion, who has seen the change that within the last  
 “ three years has in this country, taken place in the Protec-  
 “ tant mind, and the effects upon the understandings of all  
 “ men produced by the present most extraordinary and  
 “ eventful times, that must not be in his conscience con-  
 “ vinced, that the period cannot be distant, nay, that it  
 “ must be very near, when all heart-burnings and dissensions  
 “ upon this remaining branch of a question, that in all its  
 “ various parts, has so long agitated the country, shall be  
 “ for



“ for ever laid asleep, by the arrival of that happy day for  
 “ Ireland, when all her sons shall form but one people, and  
 “ the Protestant shall know of no difference between him  
 “ and the Catholic, the Catholic know of none between  
 “ him and the Protestant, save only *that it is at different al-*  
 “ *tars, that they worship the same God.*” Thus, sir, this au-  
 thor, though he proves that the rejection of the measure of  
 Catholic emancipation, as you call it, has not been one of  
 the causes of the present distracted state of the country, yet  
 admits, that it is a measure which very speedily will be adopt-  
 ed ; and that the legislative, and higher executive capacities,  
 will be immediately conceded to the Irish Romanists, in as  
 full an extent as you can possibly contend for ; his reasons  
 briefly are, first, that all which has been done for the Irish  
 Romanists by the repeal of the popery laws has operated in  
 favour of the democracy of that communion, who have not  
 merited it so much as the aristocracy ; and that it is reason-  
 able, that something should be done for the Romish aristoc-  
 racy, who have good cause to be discontented with their  
 present situation. And, secondly, that a great change has  
 happened in the minds of Protestants in favour of those  
 claims of the Irish Romanists within these three years last  
 past. To the first reason I object, that it seems to be advan-  
 ced without sufficient consideration or information on the  
 subject, for if the laws enacted in favour of the Irish Ro-  
 manists for these twenty years last past are examined, it will  
 be found, that almost the whole benefit of them falls to the  
 share of the Romish aristocracy, and not democracy. The  
 only benefit which the democracy of that communion has  
 acquired by these laws is, that the poor Romish farmers, or  
 inhabitants of a corporate town, may become voters at elec-  
 tions for members of parliament, and obtain leases of land  
 or houses for lives, or for a longer term than thirty one  
 years ; the right of voting at elections for members of par-  
 liament seems to be of little value to a poor Romish forty  
 shilling freeholder ; and to poor persons the difference be-  
 tween the value of a lease for thirty one years, and a lease  
 for lives or a longer term, does not seem to be very con-  
 siderable,

siderable, as their poverty disables them from paying fines, and therefore they generally pay the full value of the land for rent, and the same cause prevents them from making valuable improvements. But the Romish aristocracy, amongst which I count wealthy men able to purchase estates, have gained very great advantages by the repeal of the popery laws, such as have estates can retain, and such as have money can acquire and retain, their estates without impending ruin from bills of discovery, gavel laws, profligacy and plunder of their conforming children. The magistracy, and all the offices of the state, including army and revenue, are laid open to them (about two and thirty places excepted) a college is erected and endowed by the state for the education of their children, and the University of Dublin is opened to them for the same purpose; they are put completely on a footing with all the other subjects of the state, in respect to all privileges except the legislative and higher executive capacities; the first argument therefore of this author for emancipation, is not as I conceive founded on fact, and therefore has but little weight with me; his second argument, from the change in the minds of Protestants in favour of the claims of Romanists within these three years last past, I confess surprizes me: I never heard, nor can I find from my own experience, that any such change has been effected, nor can I conceive, that any such change in the Protestant mind ever will be effected, until Romanists shall consent to take the test, the rejection of which by them is the sole cause of their present incapacity; I conceive myself (perhaps erroneously) to be a man who has the capacity of observing and reflecting; I have watched the progress of political opinions, and I never perceived the minds of real Irish Protestants to be changed in favour of the claims of the Romanists to the legislative and higher executive capacities; I never heard any real Irish Protestant maintain the paradox; that it was for the benefit of the state to intrust the functions of framing laws and executing them, to a class of people, who hold it an article of their faith, that the state has but a partial authority to bind them by the laws it enacts, and consequently

that

that they are in conscience bound, not only to decline all active obedience to many of these laws, but to give them all kind of active resistance; some persons indeed who usurp the title of Protestants, but are in truth infidels, disciples of Paine, Price, and Priestley, and determined republicans, as I have already observed, do support such a dogma, because they think, and justly, that the propagation of such an opinion amongst the subjects, weakens the state, and assists their projects of subversion, which must commence with anarchy; and the bitter lamentations in the seditious prints for the want of what the republicans call public spirit, shew that such persons are not sufficiently numerous or powerful to overturn the state. This writer observes, "that at the time of passing the last act for the relief of Irish Romanists, the political principle which could alone justify Roman Catholic political exclusion, was *totally* given up." I wish he had particularly mentioned the political principle, which he supposed then to have been totally given up: Romanists, under certain qualifications, were by that act, enabled to vote at elections of members of parliament; the principle which excluded Romanists from that privilege was then given up, but the principle which excluded Romanists from the legislative and higher executive capacities, was so far from being then totally, or at all, given up, that it is particularly preserved and avowed by the bill, as the author may see by perusing it; and consequently no injustice, as he supposes, is acknowledged by the bill in preserving this exclusion; on the contrary, it is defensible by every rule of reason, justice and political expediency. This author also admits, that what you, sir, call the influence of the English cabinet is in some degree a grievance in Ireland, and calls for redress; and he also concedes the expediency and justice, if not the necessity, of some reform in the representation of the people in parliament; asserting however, that in the present crisis, the attempt to reform would be dangerous, and should be postponed to a happier period; and I confess, it somewhat surprized and chagrined me, to find, that a man, who had with so much ability detected, exposed, and chastized, your falsehoods,

hoods, your misrepresentations, your ignorance, and arrogance, in many parts of your address, should thus unaccountably agree with you in the necessity of the application of your three proposed remedies for the disorders of the state, and in the sanative qualities of the ingredients of each, particularly of the first, your emancipation measure, in the fullest extent; and in respect to the two others, the extinction of the influence of the English cabinet in Ireland, and the reform of parliament, with considerable modifications; as I differ from this writer in my opinions on the three points, and have already given my reasons against the emancipation measure, I trust I shall be able in my animadversions on your reform measure, satisfactorily to prove that what you call the influence of the English cabinet, must and ought to continue in Ireland, as long as Great Britain and Ireland shall form one empire, and monarchy shall remain an integral part of our constitution; and that the laws of the land furnished with a few auxiliary provisions, can afford effectual remedies for any abuses which may from time to time creep into the constitutional mode of election of the representatives of the people in parliament; that no further reform is necessary, and that your project of reform, as brought forward in parliament by you and your friends, is but the prelude of the projected subversion of the constitution, and the substitution of a democratic republic in its room, like the cisalpine republic under the protection of France, that is its vassal: and that it is the first act only of the tragedy of separation, composed by you and your colleague Tone, now in rehearsal by your popular and energetick Romanists, and United Irishmen, to be performed on the Irish stage, if the necessary and suitable decorations, dresses, and attendants, to wit, cannon, mortars, musquets, bayonets, pikes, swords, daggers, powder, ball, bombs, and French assassins, can be procured.

It is necessary however, before I state the plan of reform, proposed and supported by you and your friends in parliament, to make a few remarks on what you so elegantly stile *the birth of the borough inundation* in Ireland; your ravings

Remarks  
on Mr.  
Grattan's  
account of  
the creation  
of boroughs

on

on this head might excite pity, if falsehood and malignant misrepresentation did not appear in every line, chequered with your frenzy: thus you declaim with all the fury of a maniac, mixed with all the falsehood and rancour of a fiend:

“ Examination into the subject had shewn that the greater  
 “ part of the Irish boroughs were creations by the house of  
 “ Stuart, for the avowed purpose of modelling and subvert-  
 “ ing the parliamentary constitution of Ireland, that these  
 “ were understated, when called abuses in the constitution,  
 “ that they were gross and monstrous violations, recent and  
 “ wicked innovations, and fatal usurpations on the constitu-  
 “ tion by kings, whose family lost the throne, for crimes  
 “ less deadly to freedom, and who in their star-chamber  
 “ tyranny, in their court of high commission, in their ship-  
 “ money, or in their dispensing power, did not commit an  
 “ act so *diabolical* in intention, so *mortal* in principle, or so  
 “ radically subversive of the fundamental rights of the realm,  
 “ as the *fabrication* of boroughs, which is the *fabrication* of  
 “ a court parliament, and the exclusion of a constitutional  
 “ commons; which is a subversion, not of the fundamental  
 “ laws, but of the constitutional lawgiver, the *birth* of the  
 “ *borough inundation* was the destruction of liberty and pro-  
 “ perty; James the first, the king who *made* (*why did you*  
 “ *not say begot,*) that inundation, by that means destroyed  
 “ the titles of his Irish *subjects* to their lands, without the  
 “ least ceremony—the robbery of *his* liberty was immediate-  
 “ ly followed by robbery of *his* property (*that is the robbery*  
 “ *of the king's liberty was immediately followed by robbery of the*  
 “ *king's property.*)

“ The king had another instrument more subtle and more  
 “ pliable than the sword—and against the liberty of the sub-  
 “ ject more cold and deadly, a court instrument that mur-  
 “ ders freedom without the mark of blood—palls itself in  
 “ the covering of the constitution, and in her own *colours*,  
 “ and in her name plants the dagger, a *borough parliament.*”

You then proceed with your rancorous and false invective on the renowned Earl of Strafford, which as it has been already animadverted upon, I shall take no further notice of here.

I shall

I shall omit all comment on the absurdity of your figures, and your notorious ignorance of grammar, displayed in this rant; but it must not escape reprehension, as a heap of diabolical (to use your own phrase) falsehood, and misrepresentation. It is an absolute falsehood, that the king *robbed* (to use your own courtly phrase) any of his Irish subjects of their lands, or destroyed their titles to their lands, by any acts of what you call a borough parliament; the title of the crown to lands of which any Irish subjects were dispossessed in the reign of James the first, was founded on the forfeitures of the Irish rebels, in the two great rebellions of Desmond and Tyrone, or on the rules of lawful descent and inheritance, according to the usual course of the common law of Ireland, and not upon statute law or acts of parliament; and in this all historical accounts of these times, worthy of that title, agree; it was indeed complained of in those times, that very long possession of Irish landholders and their ancestors gave them no title to the lands so held against very old titles to the same lands set up by the crown, founded on the maxim of the common law, of *nullum tempus occurrit regi*: and the titles of several persons to lands were defeated on legal proof of such old titles by the due course of the old common law of the land, and not by act of parliament, and the titles of more were threatened to be questioned; but in most of such cases, where forfeiture for treason was out of the question, the old possessor had the land, or a very large portion of it, restored to his possession, on his agreeing to pay a small rent to the crown, and on very moderate terms of composition; and in the case of forfeiture for treason also, the old Irish possessor had a great share of his lands restored to him on like moderate terms, see Carte's Ormond 1st book, Morrison, Pacata Hibernia, Sir John Davis, Hume, &c. so that here, sir, you are guilty of asserting two direct falsehoods, one that James the first destroyed the titles of his Irish subjects to their lands without the least ceremony, meaning without process of law, and contrary to justice; and the second, that he did so, or in your phrase that he thus *robbed* them, by the means, or by the agency, of a borough parliament.

ament. The following remark on this part of your address I have borrowed from a pamphlet lately published, signed *Vindicator*, a judicious performance, a large extract from which I shall insert as a complete refutation of your equally frantic and wicked declamation, respecting what you call the borough inundation, because every thing the writer asserts is founded on incontrovertible evidence quoted by him, and which evidence I have carefully examined. The only parliament, says *Vindicator*, which sat in Ireland during the whole reign of James the first, and after his creation of forty boroughs, sat for three short sessions only, the first for twenty-eight days, the second and third sessions for only twenty days each, in all something more than two months—they passed ten statutes, they are in the first volume of the printed statutes, they neither confiscated the property of any of James's Irish subjects themselves, nor conferred on the crown any powers to enable the king so to do; and James, so far from making a court instrument of the Irish parliament, never called another during the remainder of his reign.

Now, sir, I shall proceed to expose the infamy and malice of your misrepresentations of the whole of the transaction of the creation of boroughs by king James the first, and of his motives for that creation. Ireland was possessed for several ages by the kings of England, under the stile of lords, and from the time of Henry the eighth, of kings of Ireland; but whatever stile they used, they enjoyed not so much the reality, as the name of dominion in it, for the heads of the Irish septs never obeyed them, but as they liked, and the body of the people were governed entirely by the Brehon law, and followed the Irish customs; the English laws indeed were introduced, but were observed only in the English colony, and prevailed no where but in the counties near Dublin, after the rebellion of sir Caher O'Dogherty was quelled in the reign of James the first, and the rebellion meditated by the earls of Tyrone and Tyrconnel, prevented, the king, to settle the kingdom in tranquillity, to improve the country, and give all ranks and orders of men a full assurance of the quiet enjoyment of their liberty and property, took care

to have the customs of taniſtry and gavel kind condemned by judgment in the King's Bench; and utterly aboliſhed the Brehon law in all its branches and uſages, he extended to the aboriginal Iriſh all the privileges of ſubjects, and all the benefit of the Engliſh laws, which he took care to have duly executed without difference or diſtinction of perſons, he encreaſed the number of judges in his courts of law, he divided the whole kingdom into counties, he revived the circuits after two hundred years diſcontinuance in Munſter, and inſtituted them in Connaught, and Ulſter, and ſent itinerant juſtices twice every year to hold aſſizes in every part of the nation for the due and regular adminiſtration of juſtice. Parliaments had from the reign of Edward the ſecond been called from time to time in Ireland upon particular occaſions, but they conſiſted of few members, the number of temporal peers was but ſmall till the reign of Henry the eighth, and of theſe ſome were generally either in rebellion or did not care to attend, and of the ſpiritual, ſuch archbishops and biſhops as were reſident in mere Iriſh counties, and not did acknowledge the king for their patron, were never ſummoned to parliament; and as for the Houſe of Commons it ſometimes was compoſed only of the deputies of the four ſhires of the pale (Dublin, Kildare, Meath and Louth,) and writs were never ſent any where but in ſhire ground inhabited by the Engliſh, who continued in obedience to the ſtate, and in ſubjection to the Engliſh laws, for the aboriginal Iriſh in thoſe days were never admitted, as well becauſe 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, as becauſe they were deemed enemies, and unfit to be truſted in the great council of the realm, for before the thirty-fourth year of Henry the eighth, when Meath was divided into two ſhires, there were no more than twelve counties in Ireland (there were only eleven, *ſee thirty third Henry eighth, chapter 2.*) beſides the liberty of Tipperary, and as the ancient cities were but four, and the boroughs which ſent burgeſſes not above thirty, the entire body of the Houſe of Commons could not then conſiſt of one hundred



hundred persons; queen Mary indeed added two shires, reducing the counties of Leix and Offaley into counties, (the King's and Queen's counties) and erecting boroughs in them, whereby they were qualified to send knights and burgessees to parliament; and afterwards queen Elizabeth, in sir Henry Sidney's and sir John Perrott's times, erected sundry counties in Connaught and Ulster, yet no knights were ever sent from the remote parts of the latter province; the last parliament held in her time was called in the twenty-seventh year of her reign (it consisted of one hundred and twenty-two members, *see rolls office*) and twenty-seven years of troublesome and unsettled times, had passed since without the summons of any, but king James having now settled Ireland in peace, divided the whole kingdom into counties, and erected forty new boroughs in the seventeen counties last appointed, resolved to call a general representation of the whole nation, in which all the inhabitants thereof whether of the old English extraction or the new British colony, or the old Irish natives, should meet together to make laws for the common good of themselves and their posterity, *see Carte's Ormond, pages 11, 13, 18, and 19.*

The authority of the above account of this the first introduction amongst the whole inhabitants of Ireland as a nation, of a parliamentary constitution by king James the first, on the exact model of the English parliamentary constitution, does not rest solely on the authority of Mr. Carte, whose ability, industry, learning, and candour, entitle him to great credit; the statutes and records of the kingdom prove it beyond contradiction. In the statute of the 28th Henry sixth, chapter 2. A. D. 1450, only four counties are named as possessing the benefit of English laws, viz. Dublin, Kildare Meath and Uriel or Louth,—and seventy-two years afterwards, A. D. 1522, in the 13th Henry eighth, chapter 3. are these remarkable words, "*because that right few persons within the four shires where the kings laws is occupied in this land.*"

A. D. 1570. in the 12th Elizabeth, chapter 3. the shires and towns then obeying the English laws, are enumerated, and they only amount to nine counties; and it is to be observed, that two of those, viz. the King and Queen's coun-

ties, had been a very short time created, and that the apparent addition of another county was owing to the division of Meath into two counties; thus from the year 1456 to the year 1570, a period of 120 years, only four counties were added to the original four counties of the Pale, which obeyed the English laws: It is true that in the 33d Henry the eighth, chapter 2. A. D. 1542, an act for the election of the Lord Justice, eleven counties are named, but it does not follow, that all these had the benefit of the English laws, or parliamentary constitution. These counties are named merely as the places of *residence* of the King's *Counsaylers*, who were to be assembled in case of the death of a Lieutenant, Deputy or Justice, in order to chuse another; some great Lords lived in Munster, who were certainly of the King's Council, yet into whose territories (for they were petty princes) the King's writ never ran, nor had the inhabitants in any shape the benefit of the English laws. For though Munster had been long nominally divided into counties, yet sir John Davis observes, "The people were so degenerate as no Justice of assize durst execute his commission among them." Five of the counties named in this act, were situated in Munster, and certainly by the concurrent testimony of all the writers upon the ancient state of Ireland, came under this description. This reduces the number of counties named in this act, which had really the benefit of English laws, and parliamentary constitution, to six.

By the 34th Henry the 8th, chap. 1. Meath was divided into two counties, and the reason assigned for this division in the preamble of the act was, "That even in this ancient county of the Pale in several parts thereof, the king's writs, for lack of ministration of justice, have not of late been obeyed, ne his graces lawes put in due exercise." This made the number of counties seven. Philip and Mary after added the king's and queen's counties, which increased the number to nine, and this is precisely the number mentioned in the 12th Elizabeth, chap. 3. A. D. 1570. From this period no counties were made by act of parliament; but by the 11th Elizabeth, chapter 9. A. D. 1569, powers were given to the chancellor or keeper of the great seal for

the time being, to award commissions for that purpose. This parliament of Elizabeth which conferred these powers was dissolved in 1571, and she never summoned more than one parliament after, which sat but a short time, being assembled 26th of April, 1685, prorogued 25th of May following; assembled again 26th of April, 1686, and dissolved 26th of May following. So that the act giving the power of creating counties to the chancellor, &c. if carried into execution, could not be of much advantage to the parliamentary constitution during her reign; but in truth the intention of it never was completely fulfilled during her reign. Sir Henry Sydney, and after him Sir John Perrott, did endeavour to give effect to this act. The latter divided Ulster nominally into seven shires, but Sir John Davis observes, "The law  
 " was never executed in these new counties, by any sheriffs  
 " or justices of assize, but the people were left to be ruled  
 " still by their own barbarous lords and laws." Thus a very small portion indeed of these new counties returned members to the only parliament which prior to the 13th of James the first had been called in Ireland for the space of 42 years; that parliament summoned by James, and meeting in May, 1613, being the first parliament called by James in Ireland. There is indeed irrefragable proof of this in the rolls office. The number of members who were summoned in the last parliament of Elizabeth in the 27th year of her reign, A. D. 1585, was 122, the numbers summoned to James's parliament in 1613, amounted to 232, difference 110: But James had created only forty boroughs, which returned only eighty members, consequently thirty representatives for counties, that is the representatives of fifteen counties must have sat in James's first parliament in 1613, which never before sat in parliament, and yet in the last preceding parliament of Elizabeth more counties were represented than at any former period whatsoever: If James then created 40 boroughs to increase the borough representation, he must at the same time be allowed to have increased also the county representation to a great degree, by adding to it the representation of many counties, which though nominally created before, had  
 never

never before been actually represented: Thus it is notorious, that this first parliament of James the first, formed the very first parliamentary constitution, of which the *Irish nation* (contradistinguished, from the English settlers) ever possessed the smallest participation. This is a fact not only established by the concurrent testimony of every writer on the affairs of Ireland, but is put beyond the possibility of controversy by the acts of that very parliament: The 5th chap. of its statutes, contains a repeal of some very extraordinary acts, one so late as the 28th Henry 8th, another still later, the 11th of Elizabeth, whence it will clearly appear that this parliament was the first that ever sat in Ireland, which placed the Irish nation on the same footing with the English settlers, which communicated to them the benefit of the English laws, or suffered them to participate in the benefits of a parliamentary constitution: and was the first parliament in which the whole nation was fairly represented; and this parliamentary constitution for the whole kingdom was the work of James the first, framed on the exact model of the English constitution, and for which the memory of that benevolent monarch deserves to be held in veneration by every inhabitant of Ireland from generation to generation, and which will, whilst history or records shall be extant, secure his character from the malicious attacks of envenomed traitors.

The motives of James the first, for the creation of 40 boroughs are plain and notorious; first and principally he designed to frame the parliamentary constitution of the *whole* kingdom of Ireland, of which he was the founder, on the exact model of that of England; he had in effect created fifteen new counties, because it appears from what has been already proved, that thirty representatives for counties sat in his first parliament which had not sat in the last of Elizabeth nor in any preceding parliament: in the counties which she had created in Connaught, the representatives of some of which might have sat in her last parliament, she could not have created many boroughs, if any at all; 122 members were summoned to her last parliament, in preceding parliaments the number summoned was about 100, so that she may

be said to have increased the number of representatives by 22, she must therefore have created some boroughs, but not many, because she certainly did not summon the representatives of fifteen new counties, she summoned only the representatives of 17 counties in all, as James brought in the representatives of 15 counties never before represented, and the whole number of counties in the kingdom is but 32. In the parliament of the 12th of Elizabeth the representatives of nine counties only were summoned, in that of the 27th of her reign, her last parliament, the number of representatives exceeded that of the 12th of her reign by 22, yet 17 counties only were then represented, that is eight counties more than were represented in her former parliament, the representatives of which eight counties, amounted to 16; she must then have created three new boroughs before the sitting of her last parliament to complete the number of 22 new representatives: Mr. Carte tells us that king James created these 40 boroughs in the 17 last created counties; now if king James had not created these 40 boroughs in the last 17 created counties, 15 of the counties represented in the last parliament of Elizabeth, that is less than one half of the kingdom, having all the then existing boroughs situated in them, would have returned 118 members of parliament, and the remaining seventeen counties, more than half of the kingdom, to wit, all Ulster, Connaught, and part of Munster, would have returned in the whole to parliament only 34 members; which would be so very unequal a representation, that it could not be alleged to have been framed on the English model; the real and personal property of the nation in general would not be fairly represented; the representatives of the old English colony would remain the representatives in fact of the whole nation, as their descendants were chiefly in possession of that part of the kingdom which would return 118 of the representatives; and the new English and Scotch settlers, and the great bulk of the native Irish inhabiting the 17 new counties, would in a manner be excluded from parliamentary representation, or deprived of all interest or influence in it, as their representatives in parliament

liament would amount to 34 only. At the time James the first undertook the civilizing of this kingdom, and introducing into it, a regular government and constitution on the English model, three fourths of it were nearly in as barbarous a state as the countries inhabited by the savages in North America; the native Irish resided in forests and morasses, their chiefs were elective, the barbarian who excelled in ferocity and strength, was always elected the head of the clan, or the sachem of the tribe; he led them out to war, always undertaken for the purpose of plundering a neighbouring tribe, or the English colonists; the district belonging to a tribe was parcelled out among them by the chief, or the sachem, in such proportions as he thought fit, and the partition was revocable at his pleasure, whilst he retained his power, which however was very precarious in its duration; a stronger and fiercer savage generally ending his domination by the application of the skeyn or dagger; and on the election of a new chief, a new division of the district amongst the tribe took place; the portion occupied by the head of a family, on his death was divided amongst all his children, bastards included, who were considered on a level with the legitimate children; these family partitions were still subject to the general partitions amongst the tribe at the will of the chief, and at every succession of a chief. These modes of succession to the chieftry of a tribe, and of partition of lands, were the principal parts of the Brehon law, and were called Tanistry and Gavelkind; in truth this Brehon law, as it was called, was nothing more than a system of barbarous customs originating in savage life, and calculated for such a life only; it is, when examined, the system of that most enlightened modern philosopher Tom Paine the staymaker, which he titles, the Rights of Man. These savage Irish had no towns in their districts. English colonists had on some parts of the sea coasts built some towns for the advantage of commerce, which however they were obliged to fortify for their own protection; they did indeed sow some corn, as do the savages in North America, and on the crop, and their herds of cattle they subsisted; they were universally attached with the

blindest bigotry to the Romish profession, yet set at nought all the moral precepts of christianity, and were christians more in name than reality; their ignorance was extreme, and if we are, sir, to believe your colleague Tone, in the account of Ireland which he lately drew up for the use of the French convention, to induce them to invade this country, the bulk of the Irish nation are not yet civilized; for in that account he describes the Irish peasantry as now in a *semibarbarous state*, and your *popular and energetick Romanists the United Irishmen*, by their recent most inhuman murders, have shewn that your colleague's picture of them is a just one. Elizabeth had compleatly vanquished and subjugated these barbarians, and the benevolent James succeeding her, determined to bestow upon them a regular government, and to teach them the arts of civilized life; for this purpose he found it necessary to introduce amongst them large colonies of English and Scotch settlers, an industrious and frugal race, skilled in agriculture and manufactures, they built towns, cut down forests, cultivated the lands, and established manufactures, trade, and commerce in this kingdom; they were all protestants, they were bred up in the principles of a free representative constitution; which though somewhat different in England and Scotland, yet in its leading principles was common to both countries; personal property by their means was infinitely increased in this kingdom, particularly in the seventeen newly created counties. It is the known principle of the British Constitution, founded on wisdom and justice, that personal property shall be represented in parliament, as well as real property. That constitution had vested the power of determining, what portion of the people should be permitted to vote for representatives of the personal property of the nation in parliament, in the crown, as part of the prerogative; that power from the reign of Henry the 3d down to that of William the 3d had been from time to time exercised by the crown, in granting charters of incorporation to certain towns according to its discretion, empowering the persons described in such charters to elect and send to parliament representatives of such towns, called boroughs;

by

by the persons so elected is represented in parliament the bulk of the personal property of the nation, as that of the real property is represented in the House of Commons by the knights of the shires; and both real and personal property, by the representatives of cities and towns, which are at the same time both counties and corporations; as is the case in many places in this kingdom; justice, wisdom, the principles of the British constitution, all conspired with political expediency, in impelling James to give the same constitution to *all* Ireland, which had been for ages established throughout England, and partially in Ireland; that is in the English colony in Ireland, in which borough representation had been introduced very shortly after it had been established in England; civil liberty owed its very birth in England to the borough representation, all historians concur in attributing to the creation of boroughs, the mitigation of the rigour of the feudal system, a military aristocratic domination, which reduced the bulk of the nation to the most abject slavery, the most degrading subjection, under the iron yoke of haughty tyrants, possessing almost the whole landed property of the country, and holding the mass of the people in vassalage and bondage: the borough representation broke the chains of this military tyranny, and established our present constitution, the perfection of reason, and at once the envy and admiration of all surrounding nations. The new Protestant colonists of James had been born under a free constitution, they did not deserve to lose it, by adventuring their lives and properties, by exerting their arts and their industry, in colonizing a savage country, for the advantage as well of their native country, as of that into which they had been transplanted; neither their lives, their properties, or their religion, could be protected, without giving them a constitution similar to that under which they had been born; they had a right, an indefeasible right to it: James on his accession to the crown of England met with great opposition from the Romanists of Ireland, the old English colony was for the most part attached to the Romish persuasion, the barbarous Irish natives were all so; the inhabitants of many of the  
principal



principal cities and towns flew to arms on his accession, and refused to acknowledge him; and did so afterwards, only on being compelled by a military force; in the parliament called by him after the creation of the 40 boroughs in 1613, there were 101 Romanists in direct opposition to him, and hostile, in the most inveterate degree, to his Protestant colonies; the elections, for knights of the shire for all the new counties went in favour of the Romanists, and had it not been for the creation of the 40 boroughs, there would have been a majority of four to one against the Protestant interest; and as it was, James had only 105 against 101. From the bigotted and ferocious principles of the Irish Romanists of that day, there can be no doubt, but that all the schemes of James for civilizing and planting the kingdom, and for introducing arts, manufactures, and commerce, would have been defeated, his colonies of industrious Protestants settled in the seventeen new counties, amongst a race just emerging from barbarism, rooted out, and the nation again overwhelmed with all the miseries attendant on anarchy, civil war, and rebellion, had he not created these 40 boroughs; which however, independent of the above considerations, he was bound by the principles of the British constitution to create, when he undertook to establish that constitution throughout the *whole* kingdom of Ireland. From that period to the revolution, as this kingdom increased in population, in trade, and in the number of towns, the succeeding princes exerted their undoubted prerogative, in increasing the number of boroughs, as by the principles of the constitution they were bound to do; no principles of the constitution being better established than these; that the actual representation of the people in parliament, is not the representation of numbers, but of property; (the lower and poorer classes of the people being the majority in numbers, are virtually represented only) that personal property is as well entitled to representation as real; and that the representatives of corporate towns which are not counties, are the representatives of personal property. The personal property of the nation had increased astonishingly between the sitting of the only parliament which

which James had ever summoned in Ireland, in 1613, and the year 1640; the improvement of the kingdom in that period, and particularly during the government of the great Earl of Strafford, I have already stated; the shipping of the kingdom alone, was increased one hundred fold in that period: previous to the reign of Charles the second, another great colony of industrious Englishmen were settled in Ireland on the lands forfeited by the great Irish Rebellion in 1641, and during the reign of Charles the second, the improvement of the kingdom increased with surprizing rapidity; as may be seen by Lord Chief Justice Keatinge's representation of the state of the kingdom at the commencement of the revolution war, preserved in Archbishop King's state of the Protestants of Ireland; the immense, and almost incredible increase of personal property in the nation during the reign of James the first, Charles the first and second, required an increased representation of personal property, that is an increase of boroughs; hence it is, that 34 boroughs were added to the representation from 1613 to the accession of king William and queen Mary; none have been since added, for though no burgeses were summoned from the borough of Enniscorthy, in the first parliament held in Ireland after the accession of William and Mary, as appears by the Commons Journals, yet burgeses were summoned from it in the parliament of James the first in 1613, and in the first parliament of Charles the second, in 1661, so that the ancient charter of that borough was renewed since the revolution, the borough was not newly created. And now, sir, I think I have fully exposed the wickedness of your misrepresentation, "that the Irish boroughs for the  
 " greater part were creations by the house of Stewart, for  
 " the avowed purpose of subverting the parliamentary con-  
 " stitution of Ireland, and that they are gross and mon-  
 " strous violations, recent and wicked innovations, and fatal  
 " usurpations on the constitution, diabolical in intention,  
 " mortal in principle, and radically subversive of the funda-  
 " mental rights of the realm." For I have demonstrated from history and records, that the creations of boroughs by  
 the

the house of Stewart, were not only warrantable exertions of the prerogative of the crown founded on the known laws of the realm, but on reason, on justice, and even political necessity; that the Era of the creation of boroughs is the Era of the birth of constitutional liberty; that the British constitution and its benefits civil and religious, could not have been communicated to *all* Ireland, and to *all* its natives and inhabitants, in a just and reasonable measure, or at all, without the creation of boroughs by James the first; that that creation of boroughs by James the first, was coeval with the communication of the British constitution, to *all* the inhabitants of Ireland without distinction; and that if it is recent and an innovation, the communication of the British constitution to *all* the inhabitants of Ireland, is also recent and an innovation; that it was not diabolical, but benevolent, in intention; not mortal, but vivifying, in principle; not radically subversive, but radically stabilitive, of the fundamental rights of the realm. It is also evident, that borough representation prevails as much in proportion in Great Britain as in Ireland; from all which I deduce, that your infamous misrepresentation of the creation of boroughs in Ireland, by the house of Stewart, of its purposes and effects, is (to use your own phrase) *diabolical* in intention; and that it is very difficult to determine, on reading it, whether your ignorance or your malice is most predominant.

Mr. Grattan's plan of reform in representation explained and exposed.

Now, sir, I shall proceed to state the great outlines of the plan of reform which was proposed in the last parliament, and supported by you and your party: I did then and do now suppose, that it was entirely framed by you, though you procured another gentleman to propose it—because he contented himself with barely proposing it, leaving to you the task of supporting it, which you performed with the greatest zeal; because I look on your views as fully equal to the mischief it was calculated to produce; and because I do not believe, the gentleman who proposed it, had duly weighed the consequences of such a plan, if adopted, or by any means saw it in the same light in which it strikes me, and in which I think myself fully competent to expose it to the eye

eye of the public ; I am very sure if he had seen it in the same light, that his heart would have revolted from it : And I admit your powers of deception to be very considerable, when you were able so effectually to disguise its hellish deformity, as to prevail on him to introduce it into the House of Commons. Another ground of my belief that you were at least the adoptive father of it, is, that it strongly resembles the mode of representation established by the French democrats, with which your colleague Tone was perfectly well acquainted ; and it is not impossible that he might have communicated with you on the subject ; you know, sir, at least the public now know, he has been lately in England incog. in the exercise of his office as incendiary and French spy, and he is now probably in France, and it is currently reported, and generally credited, that he attended the negotiation at Lisle, as one of the agents of your *popular and energetick Romanists, the United Irishmen* ; for they had two there, as the Irish prints in their pay have universally asserted ; and the same channels have conveyed to us the intelligence, that their indefatigable exertions defeated the negotiation. The first part of your proposed reform, was what you styled the emancipation of the Roman Catholics, that is, the admission of them into the Houses of Parliament, and into all the great offices of the state, as well of political administration, as of jurisprudence ; without the test : this you declared was so essentially necessary to your reform, that without it there could be no reform whatsoever : your principal view in introducing your reform, with this measure in the front, was to attach all the Irish Romanists of every description, not only your *popular and energetick Romanists, the United Irishmen*, the professed republicans and assassins the Catilinarian gang, of whose aid you were assured, but the respectable and hitherto loyal part of that communion, to your party. The second part of your reform was the dissolution, utter subversion and annihilation of all corporations of every kind, in cities, towns and boroughs, which enjoyed the privilege of sending representatives to parliament, with all their franchises ; and the division of the nation into *departments*, each  
 department

department to contain five thousand houses; and as by the hearth-money books the whole kingdom was computed to contain seven hundred thousand houses, reputed every wretched cabin, a house; it would be divided into one hundred and forty departments, each of which was to send two members to parliament, amounting in the whole to two hundred and eighty members, elective by the votes, not of the freeholders, but of the householders in each department. The county representation, and mode of election, was not to be altered, so that sixty-four county members would remain in the House of Commons, which added to two hundred and eighty, would make the whole number of representatives in the Irish House of Commons amount to three hundred and sixty four; almost two thirds of the number of the British commoners: although Great Britain is nearly four times larger than Ireland, in population in the same proportion at least, and in wealth and real strength and energy, fifty times greater. The remaining parts of your project of reform, I shall omit, as they are only minutiae, and the two recited parts forming the great outline of it, are sufficient for my purpose.

This project of reform, at one stroke cuts down by the root, the parliamentary constitution of Ireland, modelled exactly from that of England; all corporations representable in parliament are to be abolished; and that renowned institution to which Great Britain owes her liberty, her property, and her glory, which she transplanted into this kingdom, and which is here coeval with the constitution, established on the expulsion or rather subjugation of barbarism, is, in the military sense of the word, to be *reformed*; that is, annihilated; Magna Charta, which secures to the subjects all their franchises, is to be defeated; freemen are to lose their franchises; corporations are to be dissolved, without quo warrantos or informations in the nature of quo warrantos, founded on abuses; because freemen in such cases would have a right by law to defend their franchises, and might defeat such attempts; and the old common law, aided by statute law, founded on justice and reason, would not  
 serve

serve your turn. When the public good demands the sacrifice of the private property of a subject, or of the franchise of a corporation, compensation is always made for the loss; no compensation is offered by your scheme to the freemen to be disfranchised for the loss of their franchises: But the injustice to individuals is not the most noxious part of your proposed dose for remedying the alleged maladies of the state, the interest of individuals, I admit, must give way to the general interest of the whole community; the deadly effect of such a poisonous drug on the body politic, and the felonious administration of it, I mean to explain, prevent, and reprobate.

A very few years since, a bill was brought into parliament in Ireland, for reducing the hearth-money tax by exempting a certain class of the inhabitants from the payment of it on account of their poverty. It was then stated to the House, on calculations made from the books of the hearth-money collectors, as I have before mentioned, that there were two millions one hundred thousand inhabitants in this kingdom, who ought to be exempted from that tax on account of their poverty. This tax, on a house, or rather cabin, having but one fire hearth, was no more than two shillings and two pence, yearly, that is one halfpenny per week, computing the inhabitants of these houses or cabins, having but one fire-hearth each, at five to a house, the number of householders in the whole kingdom, so poor that they could not without the greatest distress pay a tax to the state of one halfpenny per week, amounts to four hundred and twenty thousand, the remaining householders inhabiting houses having each two fire-hearths, or more, amount, by the same mode of calculation, to about three hundred thousand, and by the bill for reducing the hearth-money tax, all houses having but one fire-hearth, were exempted from payment of that tax, the owner performing certain requisites specified in the bill, and they were chargeable with no other; so here are four hundred and twenty thousand householders in Ireland exempted from all taxes on account of their poverty, and who by your scheme are each to have an equal right of voting

voting for representatives in parliament, with each of the other three hundred thousand householders occupying houses with two fire-hearths and upwards. And of these three hundred thousand householders, a great proportion are persons of very small properties, yet by your scheme the beggar occupying a cottage, the working artizan, or labourer, inhabiting a house with two fire-hearths, one half of it perhaps let to another family, were to have an equal right of voting for representatives in parliament, with the men of large real and personal property; and if such a man happened to have two houses, one in a city and one in the country, in the same department, he was not to have a vote for each house, but a vote for one only: And as the number of householders inhabiting cabins with one fire-hearth, so wretchedly poor, that they cannot afford to pay one halfpenny per week, as a tax for the support of the state, exceeds the number of all the other householders in the nation put together, and as amongst the householders inhabiting houses with two fire-hearths or more, the number of poor artizans procuring their livelihood by manual labour, and of other poor persons, infinitely exceed the number of wealthy householders; two hundred and eighty members of the House of Commons would, by your scheme, be elected by the beggars, the labourers, the artizans depending for their existence on their daily labour, and by other indigent classes of the community, and the only representation of all real and personal property in the House of Commons would consist of sixty-four members, the representatives of counties. By your scheme the Romanists are to be admitted into both houses of parliament without the test, and to shew that by your scheme the infinite majority of the electors of two hundred and eighty members of the House of Commons would be Romanists, I shall resort first to the authority of your colleague Mr. Tone, in his aforesaid state of Ireland, drawn up for the use of the French convention, and secondly, to your own authority. Mr. Tone writes thus: "The Catholics, *the great body of the* " *people*, are in the lowest degree of ignorance, the whole " peasantry of Ireland, the most oppressed and wretched

" in

“ in Europe, may be said to be Catholic. In Ireland, the  
 “ name of England and her power is universally odious; the  
 “ Catholics are enemies to the English power from a hatred  
 “ to the English name. The interest of the Irish aristocrats  
 “ (that is, the Protestants and gentry possessed of estates) is  
 “ adverse to that of the people, their own tenantry would  
 “ desert and turn against them.” And now, sir, I shall  
 quote your own authority to establish the same point. You  
 assert in your address that three fourths of the inhabitants of  
 Ireland are Romanists: (I admit two thirds are so) as all the  
 inhabitants must occupy houses, and as the Irish cabins, the  
 most numerous class of houses, contain in general but one  
 family each, the number of houses in the kingdom inhabited  
 by Protestants and Romanists must be in nearly the same  
 proportion, if the ratio, in favour of the Romanists does  
 not exceed; as the inhabitants of cabins, holding only one  
 family each, are almost entirely Romanists; hence by your  
 own calculation the Romish electors would exceed the Pro-  
 testant in proportion of three to one at least. In the present  
 state of the elective franchise, the Protestant electors infinite-  
 ly exceed the Romanists, for the landed estates are mostly  
 in the hands of Protestants, and the corporators are almost  
 all Protestants; your scheme therefore is calculated utterly  
 to root out the Protestant interest in Ireland, as the prelude  
 of your project of separation. Thus it is clear as well from  
 your own authority, as that of your colleague Mr. Tone,  
 that the great body of electors of two hundred and eighty  
 members of the House of Commons, would consist of beg-  
 gars, labourers, and poorer artizans of the kingdom, all Ro-  
 manists, who according to Mr. Tone, hate and abhor the  
 English name; that is, as I have before shewed, all Protec-  
 tants; it could not be expected, or hoped for, that such elec-  
 tors would elect Protestant representatives, they would to a  
 certainty elect Romanists, and such only as manifested the  
 greatest hatred and malevolence to Protestants; and for the  
 most part men of desperate fortunes, your *popular and ener-*  
*getic Romanists*, the leaders of the murderous association of  
 United Irishmen; and in short, the chiefs of the Catilinarian  
 gang



gang of assassins and robbers, who now infest the country, would be the persons elected: and pre-eminence in every kind of wickedness would be a certain title to the suffrages of such electors. Thus four fifths, if not five sixths of the House of Commons, would consist of Romanists, men of small or of no property, of assassins, and robbers, enemies of the British Empire, their animosity against Protestants inflamed, as well by bigotry, envy of their prosperity, and avarice, as by the received opinions of them all, that their Protestant fellow subjects are usurpers of the estates of their ancestors: and rendered more desperate, dangerous, and inclined to war, by their ignorance, semi-barbarity, and poverty, according to Mr. Tone. The principle of the constitution, and on which borough representation was originally instituted, viz. That property, not numbers, ought to be *actually* represented in the House of Commons, would be completely overturned; numbers would prevail over property, and the purse of the nation, exclusively trusted to that House by the constitution, would be torn from the custody of the opulent, from whose coffers all its treasures are collected and recruited, and delivered over to the indigent and needy, whose poverty not only disables them from contributing one mite to its contents, but would most certainly invite and induce them to speculation and plunder of the public, to supply their wants and gratify their avarice and all other vices: The immediate consequences would be, the overturning the Protestant establishment in church and state, public distress, murder, banishment, plunder, confiscation, and a rebellion to sever this country from the British Empire. Your coadjutor Mr. Tone could not have devised a better engine for carrying on his project of separation, than your scheme of reform, if carried into execution; which induces me strongly to suspect, as I have already hinted, that it is not entirely of your own invention, but that you had the benefit of his assistance at least. In vain would the legal authority of the crown and the House of Lords struggle against the desperate enterprizes of such a House of Commons; every one acquainted with the history of his own country in the slightest degree,

degree, knows the immense powers in the state claimed, acquired, and exercised by the House of Commons since the extinction of the line of Tudor; and the limitation and reduction of the prerogative of the crown. It is very clear that the House of Commons, considering its present powers, if all influence of the crown, peerage, and aristocracy, was excluded from it, and if it was guided and ruled by turbulent and ambitious men, might easily overturn the present frame of the constitution; and that such a House of Commons, as your project of reformation offers to the nation, would not only be free from all influence of the crown, peerage, and aristocracy, but would be composed of the meanest and most intemperate members of society, in desperate circumstances, ready (to use your colleague Tone's language) for any change, because no change could make them worse, flagitious, ignorant, and bigoted, and therefore the tools specially adapted to the execution of the daring projects of wicked and ambitious demagogues; they would consider the higher classes of society as their natural enemies, and endeavour to hunt the aristocracy from the country by every species of violence and outrage, and to found a democratic Romish republic, separated from the British Empire, on the ruins of the monarchy, the peerage and the aristocracy in general. As to the change of the national religious establishment, you have furnished convincing proofs, you have even been at great pains to demonstrate, that it would give you no uneasiness, nay that it would meet your hearty approbation; to a modern philosopher, a mosque, a pagoda, a Romish chapel, a dissenting conventicle, and a Protestant church, are equally acceptable, as places of worship; the politician who derides all religion as priestcraft, will affect to be of that religion most palatable to the party he espouses, or which espouses him: and you have displayed such symptoms of your attachment to republicanism on the French plan, that no treasonable person can doubt your easy acquiescence with such a revolution in this kingdom, as has been effected in France; most people indeed conjecture, that you would not be long contented even with such a form of government, unless

less you should be elected one of the directory; nor indeed with any form of government, if the chief management of the public purse, and public administration was withheld from your insatiable avarice and ambition.

Exclusive of the radical wickedness of your scheme of reform, there are some absurdities in it, which deserve notice; not to aggravate its political and moral turpitude, that is impossible; but to expose the folly of the projector in some particulars, and to shew that folly and mischief may be co-partners in the same house. The kingdom is, by your scheme, to be divided into departments, each department to contain five thousand houses; local population in this and in every other kingdom is of a fluctuating nature, cities, towns, villages, and large tracts of country, which were heretofore very populous, are now but thinly inhabited; in England some towns, such as Manchester, Liverpool, and Birmingham, have swelled in a few years to ten times their former bulk, their inhabitants encreasing in that proportion; whilst other ancient towns and cities, such as Lincoln, have decreased; similar has been the revolution respecting the inhabitants of large tracts of country, and the republican faction in England, whose *understrapper* you are here, and their and your great apostles, Paine, Price, and Priestley, found their arguments for a reform of the representation of the people in England, on the inequality of it, arising from these changes in the state of local population: and your arguments for a reform in Ireland, are founded in a great measure on the same principle. If such changes in local population have taken place in England (a country for ages enjoying the sweets of a regular government) in short spaces of time, some of them within the memory of persons now living; much greater changes of that nature are to be expected, and are in fact experienced, in Ireland, a country not yet two hundred years reclaimed, for the most part, from a state of barbarism, and during that space of time twice in a great measure depopulated by intestine war. I can remember the city of Dublin, one fourth less than it is at present; the village of the Black Rock near Dublin, fifty years ago, contained three houses  
only

only, it now with its environs, contains five hundred, if not more. The town of Belfast, that hot-bed of sedition, infamous for its turbulence even in the time of Cromwell, as may be seen in Milton's Works, has been nearly doubled in size within half a century; whilst the ancient town of Carrickfergus has been diminished in the same proportion: and the town of Belfast itself is now on the decline by the decay of its trade, owing to the restless disposition of its factious inhabitants. Revolutionary principles do not foster commerce—trade is nursed in the cradle of peace and tranquillity—the changes in local population in Ireland constantly visible, must require a constant variation in the limits of your proposed departments, and at every election of representatives, there must be, to preserve your equality of representation, a new division of the kingdom, into departments; the immense increase of the number of electors, from less than eighty thousand, the present computed number, to seven hundred thousand and upwards by your scheme, and these for the most part semi-barbarians, would of itself cause very great, if not irremediable, confusion in the elections of members of parliament. The undefineable limits of the departments for any length of time, would render such elections utterly impracticable. The desperate ruffian, who alone could propose himself as a candidate for a seat in parliament, for any department, with any probability of success, could never know with certainty what set of electors to solicit for votes; previous to each general election, to preserve equality of representation, a new division must be attempted: the election must immediately follow the division, because every day might cause a change in the local population: the shifting of the departments must be attended with inextricable confusion; the party views of active demagogues, living in different departments, would create insurmountable difficulties in every attempt of a new division; the very nature of the proposed divisions would render them impracticable in many instances. Suppose one department to decrease, after the limits of it were first defined, from five thousand houses to half that number, or to increase in the same proportion, before a new

N election,

election, or during any given period; and suppose the departments surrounding it on every side, had neither increased or decreased, or in a much less proportion during that period, a case which would often happen, where the departments were partly composed of cities, towns, and populous villages; how would the limits of the enclosed increased or diminished department be ascertained on a new division? If its population increased, its limits must decrease, and vice versa, must the limits of all the adjacent surrounding departments, be pushed in, and pushed out, according to the nature of the change of the population of the enclosed department? and must a progressive convulsion of compression or dilation be circulated in a ring through all the departments of the state, and all their inhabitants? The idea brings to my mind the soporific operation of the lecture in the Dunciad on the assembly of attendant dunces,

So from the midmost the nutation spreads,  
Round and more round o'er all the sea of heads.

In short, the absurdity of your scheme for procuring a permanent equality of representation as to number of electors, is glaringly ridiculous; and as to its folly and impracticability can be only rivalled by the projects of the professors in the Gulliverian academy of Lagado; and yet it fully and sufficiently manifests the spirit of most dangerous innovation in the projector. Thus, sir, I conclude my strictures on your projected scheme of reform: trusting that I have dissected your proposed *felonious representation* (to use a phrase of your own in debate) as surgeons dissect malefactors, as well for public benefit as public example.

The question whether any and what kind of reform in representation is necessary, discussed.

And now, sir, I shall consider the questions, whether any reform is requisite in the present mode of representation of the people in parliament, from actual or supposed abuses in it; and whether the existing laws of the land, with small additions to them, do not afford full and adequate means for the correction of such abuses as may have crept into it. The present mode of county representation, you have in your proposed scheme

scheme of reform, allowed to require no amendment, as it is by your scheme to remain on its present footing; against the present borough representation it is objected that the seats in parliament for many boroughs are sold by necessitous and corrupt men, who have obtained a domineering interest over their fellow corporators; that others of them are under the patronage of great noblemen, or of powerful and rich commoners, who control and command the votes of the corporators so far, as to procure persons of their nomination to be returned to parliament, as members for such boroughs; and that both the sale of, and nomination to, seats in parliament for such boroughs, are procured, either from the faulty original constitution of them, communicating their corporate rights to a very small number of persons, in some cases, to twelve burgessees only; or by the exertion of the interest of the aforesaid patrons of these boroughs, in procuring such persons only to be admitted members of these corporations, as have engaged always to vote as they shall direct; and in excluding many persons from admission, who from the fair construction of their foundation charters are entitled to be admitted members. It is also urged against borough representation in general, that it confines the election of representatives of the Commons in parliament to a very small number of persons, excluding the great mass of the people from the privilege of voting for members of parliament. I shall consider these objections seriatim. As to the first, the sale of seats in parliament for boroughs, I admit it is an abuse, but it is not an abuse of any great magnitude. I have carefully examined the state of the borough representation in the last parliament, and have found that the members who were generally reputed to have purchased seats in it, did not amount to more than thirty, if to so many. A great proportion of which were barristers, so that the purchasing members did not amount to above a tenth part of the House. Many boroughs, reputed venal, returned a purchaser for one seat only, the other seat being filled by the patron, or by one of his immediate dependants. And of all the subjects of this kingdom you, sir, have the least reason to complain of such venal representation. Every member of the last parliament, who exercised his ora-

Objections  
 against the  
 present  
 state of bo-  
 rough re-  
 presentati-  
 on confi-  
 dered.

torical talents under your auspices, sat in the House, as representative for a borough most notoriously venal, three gentlemen excepted, and two of these sat as representatives of boroughs under the influence of patrons; and the third, for a corporate town; they were all barristers. The ill success of some of your adherents in the trade of parliament, and their inability or disinclination to repurchase, owing to their ill success, you have pathetically lamented in your address, as I have already noted. The existing laws, if properly enforced, afford some remedy of this venality of seats in parliament; and if they do not afford a complete one, it is very easy to devise laws, whose operation would prevent, or detect and punish, such corruption. Tests, abjuring all corrupt means of obtaining seats, may be imposed on all members on their taking their seats. The penalties of perjury, exclusion from, and perpetual disability to sit, in parliament; and deprivation of, and perpetual exclusion from, all corporate privileges, may be inflicted on the corruptor when detected, and special means of detection of all such corrupt bargains may be prescribed. When venality is detected, the corporators guilty of aiding, or abetting, the corruption, may be disfranchised, and otherwise heavily punished, and provision made, for transferring and extending the franchises of the corporation to other persons, and to greater numbers, by the grant of a new charter, or by special authority of parliament. Such wholesome regulations will prevent the abuse of the franchises of boroughs by the sale of seats in parliament, without altering or subverting the present frame of the constitution. Greedy adventurers in the trade of parliament will by such means be for ever excluded; and must betake themselves to honest employments; and I do not know any one person in the kingdom, such laws will operate against, with so much effect, as against yourself; when they shall be enacted, you must shut up your shop, close your books, abandon your hitherto most lucrative trade, and live on your ill-gotten acquisitions. You have sufficient penetration to discover, that the enacting such laws would operate to your own disadvantage; and therefore though you declaim against the abuse of venality in borough representation, you mean only,

to

to deceive and inflame the vulgar by such declamations: You do not intend correction or improvement. Your aim is utter subversion, not reformation of the constitution, and your project manifests it. So far as such corrective and preventive laws may be said to be a reform in parliament, I admit the expediency of such reform. But what reasonable argument can you ground on so partial an abuse easily curable by the application of proper remedies, for the annihilation of the whole borough representation, of all the corporations in the kingdom, cities, towns, and boroughs sending representatives to parliament? Is the whole representative body to suffer political death, because a limb of it is affected by a disease easily curable? what opinion would be entertained of the mental sanity of a surgeon, who because a man's arm was slightly bruised, would prescribe the shooting him through the head as an effectual cure? or of an architect, who should propose to demolish the whole building to repair a flaw in the parapet? It is almost impossible to give such sort of arguments any serious answer. As to the second objection against borough representation, arising from the patronage of boroughs vested in noblemen and commoners of great property, and chiefly acquired by them by the situation of their estates, lying within, or adjacent to, the precincts of boroughs, it cannot be supported on the ground of venality. Such noblemen and commoners receive no pecuniary advantage from such patronage; on the contrary, the support of their interest in these patronized corporations, is attended by considerable trouble and expence; and they recommend to the seats in parliament, men strongly connected with themselves, and under their influence. You state, sir, in your address, that the patronage of a borough is sometimes sold to a rich nobleman or commoner for the sum of sixteen thousand pounds, which, if true, shews, that no person except such as possess very large properties, can obtain or retain the patronage of such a borough. The annual legal interest of sixteen thousand pounds amounts to nine hundred and sixty pounds, and to this must be added the cost of maintaining the interest in the borough, which must annually amount to a considerable sum; hence the retaining the patronage of such



Such a borough, must stand the patron in the annual expence of above one thousand pounds, an expence which octennial and other contingent sales of the seats would never defray: consequently, if views of advantage from the sale of the seats, were the inducements to the purchase, the purchasers must be idiots indeed! but as I have above stated, the seats for these boroughs are never sold; and respecting such boroughs, no reform is necessary. The true source of *actual* parliamentary representation is property; the House of Commons judges and decides on the sums necessary to be levied on the subject for defraying the expences of the state, they will not suffer the least alteration of their decisions on that subject to be made by the other branches of the legislature. The necessity, the quantum, and the expenditure of the public supplies, are under their peculiar cognizance and jurisdiction. This superintendence has bestowed on that House all the rest of its powers and privileges, which it has gradually acquired since its first formation in the reign of Henry the third: It is therefore highly consistent with the original principles of our constitution, that the members of society who have most property, should have most influence in the House of Commons: They who contribute most largely to the public expence should have most interest in that House which raised the funds for defraying it, and directs the expenditure. The nobleman or commoner whose property amounts to ten thousand pounds yearly, should have a greater sway in the House of Commons, than the poor person, whose property amounts perhaps only to the value of the garments which cover him; because the one contributes largely to the expences of the state, the other little or nothing. The rich nobleman, though he is taxed by the House of Commons in proportion to his property, yet cannot himself sit in it, he is therefore entitled to influence in that assembly, which he can no otherwise possess than by substitution; most of what I have here urged will apply to the rich commoner, patron of a borough; the principle, on which his claim to influence in the House of Commons rests, is the same; he indeed may sit in that House, and generally does, for one of the seats of his patronized

tronized borough, a privilege which the nobleman does not enjoy; but the magnitude of his property entitles the commoner to more interest there than one seat can confer upon him. The great stakes of both the rich nobleman and commoner in the state generally secure their attachment to it; and engage both themselves and their adherents to support the real interests of their country; because by so doing they support their own. And this mixture of aristocratic influence with the democratic part of our constitution, is admirably adapted to the correction of excesses and of errors incident to both, and harmonizes that unrivalled constitution. You do not, sir, urge the objections against that part of our parliamentary representation, which proceeds from such patronized boroughs, as are not venal, with a good grace; you never would have sat in parliament, if such representation had not existence in our constitution; neither your family, fortune, or acquirements could give you any rational hope of such a distinction. Until the last parliament, when the citizens of Dublin were so far deceived by your preceding conduct, as to return you one of their representatives, you never had a seat in the House of Commons, except for a patronized borough, and whilst you sat in parliament, as the substitute of a nobleman, by whose interest you were returned, we never heard of your present desperate project of pretended reform, nor what you now stile emancipation; the support of the protestant *ascendancy*, a term coined by you, was then your cant; your patron, if you had then disclosed your malignant designs against the church and state, might have discarded you. Yet notwithstanding your original admission into the House of Commons as representative for a patronized borough, which I shall always consider a public misfortune, I must at the same time avow my approbation of that mode of representation in a qualified degree, as well for the reasons I have given, as because I have known some of the greatest ornaments of their country, and men who have done the most signal services to it, introduced into that House by such means.

The objection, that many persons well intitled to the freedom of corporations, are notwithstanding excluded by electi-  
oneering

oneering intrigue, is fully answered by stating, that they have their legal remedies for such injustice by writs of mandamus, and all abuses in corporations except the venality above mentioned, and that too in some degree, is remediable by the due course of the existing laws of the land, by writs of quo warranto, and informations in the nature of quo warranto, and require not any new species of reform whatsoever; the existing laws duly exerted, and which it is in the power of all injured parties constantly to resort to, and to demand their effectual exertion, securing the pure and undefiled exercise of the rights conferred on a borough at its original creation.

It is objected, that the original constitution of some boroughs is vicious, in conferring the whole privilege of electing representatives in parliament on a sovereign and twelve burgeses; it is to be remarked, that very few boroughs in this kingdom are so constituted, the charters of an infinite majority of the corporations in this kingdom, confer the privilege of voting for representatives in parliament, on the sovereigns, burgeses, and freemen at large; and with respect to such as are so constituted, it may be urged, that the investing the principal inhabitants of some boroughs with the privilege of electing representatives in parliament for such boroughs exclusively, was by no means an unreasonable exertion of the prerogative of the crown, but is well warranted by that principle of the constitution, which directs, that the representation of the people in parliament should be regulated, not by numbers, but by property and respectability; the principal inhabitants or landholders in such boroughs are *actually* represented in parliament, the others *virtually*, and such constitution may be peculiarly adapted to the circumstances of some boroughs. The exclusion of the great mass of the people from interfering in the election of representatives in parliament, or from the elective franchise, by the present state of borough representation, I consider as the bulwark, and not as a weak and faulty part, of our constitution. From the first dawn of the English constitution to the present day, the members enjoying the elective franchises in England never amounted to one sixtieth part of the people. The case has been the same in Ireland since the communication

nication of the English constitution to this country, and it must always continue so, whilst the *actual* representation of property and respectability, and *virtual* representation of numbers, continue to be principles of the constitution. In Britain, a country whose inhabitants are mostly of the same religious persuasion, which has been long subject to a regular system of laws, a due administration of justice, and where the laws meet with due reverence and submission, a dilation of the elective franchise, in some moderate degree, perhaps might not be attended with any destructive convulsion; the situation of this country is the very reverse of that of Britain in all the above particulars; and if projects of reform are rejected in Britain, as tending to anarchy and revolution, there are reasons for rejecting them here a thousand fold stronger than the reasons which have decided their rejection in the sister country; and how very ridiculous is your argument, or rather declamation, against the present parliamentary constitution of Ireland, *calling it a borough parliament, and stating that it was adequate to the management of Ireland whilst it continued a province, but absurd and inapplicable when that province became a nation!* Ireland though a kingdom with an independent legislature, is still, and I hope ever will be, a province of the British empire; and its parliamentary constitution is the very same with that of Great Britain. The boroughs in England are as numerous in proportion as the boroughs in Ireland, nor are they a whit more independent, more chaste, or more incorrupt; if Ireland has a borough parliament, so has Great Britain; the latter is a nation, at least in as large a sense of the word, as the former, that parliament has been found adequate to the management of Great Britain, and a similar parliament has been found, and I trust ever will be found, adequate to the management of Ireland, whether it be a province, a nation, or both; and both it may be, and is. I trust I have already shewn, that your project of pretended reform, built on the principle of extending actual representation to the mass of the people, that is, of regulating it by numbers, not by property, teems with destruction, subversion, and rebellion; that like Pandora's box, it is a composition of all the plagues with which the human race was ever afflicted;

afflicted; and consequently that it is the true interest of every lover of his country, of all the inhabitants of Ireland, whether Protestants of the established church, Dissenters, or Romanists, (notwithstanding your deceptive seductive arts to enlist the latter class under your political standard) to join as one man in support of the present constitution of their country, and in maintaining the present mode of parliamentary representation, as they tender the preservation of themselves, their properties, their wives, their children and the future welfare of their posterity in general; that they ought to consider, that all the classes of people in a state, form but the one state, and that the lower and poorer classes, though excluded from the elective franchise, yet are represented in parliament by members elected by the richer and more respectable classes; inasmuch as such members are representatives of the inhabitants of the whole state, which during the existence of a regular government is one and indivisible, and not barely, of the persons who elect them, who are but part of the state: that the lower poorer classes, not participating of the elective franchise, are nevertheless *virtually* represented, the richer and more respectable classes, enjoying the elective franchise *actually*: and that *virtual* representation confers as much benefit on the represented, as *actual*; because the representatives are bound to consult and guard the interests of the whole community equally; that such has been, and from the nature of things must be, the principles and practice of every representative government on earth: and that the extension of the elective franchise to the mass of the people indiscriminately, would render all representative government impracticable, and would bury civil liberty under its cumbrous ruins. In short, a wise people will always consider avaricious, greedy, importunate, insatiable, projecting, ambitious, demagogues, clamorous mendicant orators, and sham patriots, as the most destructive, detestable *pests* of civil society.

Having thus, sir, shewn what amendments and corrections our present system of parliamentary representation may stand in need of, and how they are to be elected; and having shewn, that the abuses which time may have introduced into that system,

tem, are very easily remediable; that the correction and prevention of such abuses are not what you call reform, that such reform is not only inexpedient, but ruinous; and that no general reform is necessary; and having in a preceding part of my answer, exposed the destructive and fraudulent tendency of the first part of your reform which you call emancipation, and that your projected reform of the representation of the people in parliament *would not give a constitution to the people, nor Catholic emancipation a people to the constitution*, as you quaintly and dogmatically express yourself; I shall proceed to consider your alleged grievance of the influence of the English cabinet in Ireland, which influence you call a *foreign yoke, the legislative usurpation of a humiliated and a tame tyrant!* I am glad, sir, that you admit the English cabinet to be a humiliated and *tame* tyrant, that is, if I understand you right, a tyrant deprived of power, and conscious of its impotence, and if this foreign cabinet is deprived of power, and conscious of its impotence, it cannot retain a galling influence in Ireland, the influence of such a reduced tyrant must arise either from the folly of those who submit to its dictates, or from their consciousness of the wisdom of its counsels, and the salutary effects of its measures; if its influence were pernicious and destructive, even the folly of those who had for a time submitted to it could not insure its duration, its existence must be transitory, as it would be only during pleasure, and even idiots cannot be long pleased with that which is destructive and painful; but if its influence arises from the propriety, the justice, the wisdom, and beneficence, of its measures, its duration might be protracted, and if such be the nature of the influence of the English cabinet in Ireland, I hope it will long continue. But first, sir, I must explain your precise meaning of the words, *Influence of the English cabinet, and its legislative usurpation in Ireland*; it is this, that the measures proposed to the Irish parliament for adoption by the lord lieutenant of Ireland and his chief secretary, (always Englishmen appointed by his majesty with the advice of his cabinet counsel in England) are previous to their being proposed here, devised and digested by his majesty, and his cabinet council in England, and that the influence of the servants  
of

of the crown in the parliament of Ireland is so great, that such measures are generally adopted here. Your complaints on this head, sir, amount to this; that it is a public grievance that his majesty should interfere in the government of his kingdom of Ireland, part of his empire, inseparably annexed to his imperial crown of Great Britain; it is the duty of the king, by his ministers, to propose for the adoption of parliament such measures, as he with the advice of his cabinet council shall deem necessary or conducive to the safety and prosperity of his empire: he has by the constitution an undoubted right to deliberate on those measures; he is resident in England, and is it reasonable to suppose that he will approve of such measures as may be recommended by his servants in this kingdom, as proper to be proposed for the adoption of his parliament of Ireland, a kingdom inseparably annexed to and dependant upon his imperial crown of Great Britain, without consulting with his cabinet council in England, on the propriety of such measures, and in their tendency to promote the general welfare of the whole empire? any person who maintains the doctrine, that the British cabinet council ought not to interfere with their advice to our common sovereign on such measures, is an enemy to the connexion of the two countries, and to the unity of the empire; the English cabinet council giving their advice to his majesty on Irish measures, are so far an Irish cabinet council, and to cut off all interference of the English cabinet council in advising his Majesty, with respect to Irish measures, is in effect to cut off all interference of his Majesty in the government of his kingdom of Ireland; because he is resident in England, and cannot constitutionally act in measures which regard his kingdom of Ireland without consulting the Cabinet Council in England, as such measures ought not to operate exclusively for the benefit, either of Ireland or Great Britain, but for the benefit of the Empire in general; and no one measure of government can operate for the benefit or detriment of Ireland, which does not operate for the benefit or detriment of Great Britain, when the interests of both countries are rightly understood: If his Majesty, assisted by the advice of his Cabinet Council in England is not to interfere

interfere with the government of his kingdom of Ireland, he must approve all measures, transmitted to him by his cabinet council in Ireland, or reject them, without consulting with the ministers in England, with whom he consults on all business of the Empire, and without hearing them debated, or in any manner exercising his own judgment upon them, and this would in fact completely separate the two countries to the ruin of Ireland, whose welfare, as I have already shewn, depends on her connexion with Britain; he might remain nominally King of Ireland, but he would be only nominally so; the very appointment of his lieutenant in Ireland, now appointed with the advice of his cabinet council in England, would be torn from him by the doctrine, that the English cabinet ought not to interfere with the affairs of Ireland; the measures respecting Ireland recommended by the English cabinet, through the medium of the Lord Lieutenant and his Secretary, to the Irish Parliament, are generally first devised and digested by the cabinet council in Ireland, and thence transmitted to England, for the approbation of his Majesty: And I do not find that such measures receive any greater countenance or patronage from the parliament of Ireland, than the measures of government in Great Britain receive from the parliament of that country; such measures are freely debated, varied, approved, or rejected, in both parliaments. And the cabinet council of England, or rather his Majesty, (for it is his Majesty's lawful influence with his Irish parliament you really mean, when you talk of the influence of the English cabinet in Ireland, and it is the lawful exertion of his Majesty's prerogative as sovereign of this realm you mean to exclude) has no more influence in the Irish parliament, than in the British. To shew it is his Majesty's lawful authority you mean to abolish in this kingdom, when you talk of extinguishing the influence of the English cabinet, it is to be observed, that his Majesty never exercises his kingly office in the general affairs of government, and particularly in devising political measures to be proposed to his parliament for their approbation, without first advising with his cabinet council; and you state precisely, *that the unconstitutional influence*



*fluence of the crown, and what you falsely stile, the proscription of the Catholics, are the fundamental causes of the discontent and jealousy of Ireland; now what you here stile the influence of the crown, you in other parts of your address stile the influence of the British cabinet in the parliament of Ireland: and in truth throughout the whole address, the most abusive effusion of malice I have ever read! you make use of the words Ministers of the Crown and British Cabinet, to signify the Crown and the King himself, by way of a little quibbling defence against legal prosecution. Whenever you mention any of our deceased Monarchs, the abuse of whom is not by law punishable, you call them, as well as their Ministers in plain terms, murderers, robbers, and cheats; it would be as yet, you well know, somewhat dangerous to apply the same opprobrious Billingsgate language to the reigning Monarch. What you stile unconstitutional influence of the crown, or of the British cabinet in Parliament, is nothing more or less, than the influence in parliament which the laws give to the reigning Monarch, and without which he would be no sovereign whatsoever; in short, you mean his prerogative, as conferred and defined by the laws of the land, which is his constitutional influence, and the depriving him of which would in fact be his deposition.*

The reform you proposed and whose constitution you in some measure explain in the Litany with which you conclude your address, would banish from the House of Commons, all kingly and aristocratic influence, and would render all Monarchical government impracticable; it would in fact extinguish the Monarchy, and substitute in its place a democratic republic, and all your rant of bombastic figurative nonsense, calculated to blind the intellectual vision (to use your own phrase) of your readers by the dust of the rubbish, "*such as*" "*self-legislation, baptizing the House of Hanover with royalty,*" "*the people being sponsors for their allegiance to the liberty of the*" "*subjects. Kings are but satellites, your freedom is the luminary*" "*that has called them to the skies,*" and above all that conclusive effort of your sublime and poetic genius, for which you certainly merit rank amongst authors, the quotations from  
whose

whose works illustrate the precepts contained in the *art of sinking in poetry*, in which you so happily blend the ideas of the spindle, the distaff, and the school-boy's top, with that of the revolution of the planets round the sun from the principle of attraction, in the following elegant effusion! “ *Re-* “ *form is a principle of attraction about which the King and peo-* “ *ple would spin on quietly and insensibly in regular movements,* “ *and in a system common to them both ;*” all this rant I say, is thundered forth pell mell on the reader, with a view the more effectually to conceal the hideous aspect of your gorgon project, and to prevent and obviate the terrors and detestation it would create in the minds of all people, if it were seen in all its native horrible deformity !

Having, sir, thus examined and exposed the nature of your pretended grievances and proposed remedies, I shall proceed to the epitome of your principles as set forth in this address. You state that the Minister of the Crown has endeavoured “ *to render the King in Parliament every thing and* “ *the people nothing*, that such attempt renders him, the Minister, more a traitor to the constitution, than the people “ would be to the King, if they should advance in arms and “ place their leader on the Throne, because in them it would “ be only rebellion against their creature, the King, but in “ the *other* it would be rebellion against *his Creator* the people,” by the word *other* here you do not point out the Minister, but the King: Because by the word *other* you mean the person created by the people, that is, as you state it, the King. There is indeed a sort of juggling confusion in the whole paragraph, which demonstrates, that when you use the word Minister of the Crown, you really mean the King; and that you frequently resort to this species of quibbling from the cautionary motives already mentioned.

From this paragraph it appears, you deny that the King and his Parliament conjointly compose the supreme power of the state: that is, the King, Lords and Commons acting in a body: but that there is a power infinitely above them, vested in the people at large: and although the people compose one estate of the Parliament, by their representatives duly elected,

elected, yet that the mass of the people still remains the supreme power in the state, (as there must be some supreme power in every state) and are not bound by the ordinances to which they consent by their delegates. This is a novel doctrine unknown to the British Constitution, extracted from the modern French Code of Jurisprudence. By the British Constitution, the King in Parliament, that is, acting in conjunction with his Parliament, acts in conjunction with his people, and therefore to assert, that the King in Parliament can be every thing, and the people nothing, would be a blunder, if you did not mean to assert, that the mass of the people, though represented in parliament, yet remain the supreme power of the state. A second novel principle, avowed in this paragraph is, that no act whatever committed by the people against the king, can amount to rebellion, even though they should advance in arms, and place their leader on the throne, because as you state, the people is the *creator*, the king the *creature*, and the *creator* can never commit rebellion against his *creature*: It follows also as a corollary from this doctrine, that the people, the *creator*, may at their pleasure annihilate their *creature*, the king, because from the very nature of *creation*, the *creature* has no right to a longer existence, than it shall please its *creator* to limit, who may at any time justly put an end to that existence. A third novel doctrine contained in this paragraph is, that every attempt of the king and parliament to secure, or to exercise, a supreme authority in the state, is in the king a wicked rebellion against his creator, the people, for which he, and the parliament his abettors in such attempt, deserve the punishment of rebellion, that is, death and confiscation: and that the people inflicting such penalties on him and his abettors, are acting justly and constitutionally. This principle too is extracted from the French code. The French philosophers dethroned and beheaded their king, because a few of his adherents presumed to defend him from assassination in his own palace, by the mob, that is the people, and he and they therefore, according to the new French code, committed rebellion against their sovereign

vereign, the people, and were justly condemned to death : A fourth novel doctrine advanced by you, is that such attempt in king and parliament would be a wickeder act of rebellion in Ireland, more a rebellion in equity (*absurd combination!*) than in any other country, because, as you expressly state, such attempt *would be the* “ *introduction not only of a despotic, but a foreign yoke,*” and in another part you *state the king to be an absentee* : that is, though Great Britain and Ireland form but one empire, and though the king resides within that empire, yet as he does not reside in Ireland, he is a foreigner and an absentee, and Great Britain, as to Ireland is *a foreign country*. How much you intend to encourage loyalty in Ireland, and to foster the connexion between the two countries, by inculcating such doctrines, I shall leave to the public to judge, and they no doubt will do justice to your sentiments ; notwithstanding the impudent, hypocritical, and fraudulent ejaculations of qualified attachment to kingly power, and to that connexion, contained in the species of litany with which you close your address. You have officiously, zealously, and emphatically justified the inhuman Irish massacre of all the Protestants in this kingdom, which the popish rebels of 1641 could lay their hands upon, men, women, and children, as I have already shewn : you not only justify the present horrible assassinations and robberies, nightly committed throughout many parts of this kingdom, *by popular and energetick Romanists, United Irishmen*, but you applaud them—expressing yourself thus, as I have already noticed concerning them, they are the effects of “ *the spirit of political reformation,*” and even in these cases where charged to be carried to “ *confiscation, it is evident from the charge itself, that confiscation looks to political vengeance, not private plunder, it is a public cause, and let no man persuade you that it is not the cause of liberty on one side, and tyranny on the other.*” Confiscation means the seizing of the goods and property of felons and traitors, and securing them for the use of the public. Attend, ye citizens of Dublin ! Mr. Henry Grattan, who once sat in parliament as one of your representatives, publishes an address to you, in which

with most unparalleled impudence, he justifies and applauds the nightly assassinations and robberies of the United Irishmen! These murderers and robbers, whose atrocities make the very blood of every honest man in the kingdom run cold at the recital, he tells you, are all glorious patriots acting in the cause of liberty against tyranny! their robberies, he calls *confiscations*, that is, the lawful seizure of the property of traitors to be applied to the public use! According to him all your friends and relations slaughtered in their beds at night, have been justly put to death as traitors to the public cause of liberty, and their property has been justly seized by the murderers, to be applied to the support of the army of United Irishmen! The horrible massacre of your ancestors, according to him, was also a just exertion of public spirit in a similar glorious cause of liberty! Such, sir, are the contents of your address to your former constituents, an address I will venture to affirm, never yet surpassed, nay I may say equalled, in arrogance, impudence, falsehood, misrepresentation, rancour, and wickedness, by any publication, which ever made its appearance, and escaped with impunity, in any civilized country under the Sun; you know, sir, I have neither misquoted nor misrepresented you, and I recommend you very heartily to the patronage and protection of your masters, the Jacobins in Great Britain, and of their brethren in France and Ireland; they never yet met, and never will meet with any human creature more deserving of the countenance and protection of such a respectable society.

I shall now, sir, conclude my answer, by a sort of litany, as you conclude your address, first observing, that your last ejaculation—"However it may please the Almighty to dispose of *princes*, and of *parliaments*—may the liberties of "the *people* be *immortal*," openly teaches that a limited monarchy, a government founded on the joint powers of a king, lords, and representatives of the people, is not the best or only mode of securing the liberty of the subjects, that such liberty may not only subsist, but may be of so permanent a nature, as to be immortal under a government without king or parliament, that is under a *Jacobin Democratic Republic*,

*Republic*, with a fervent prayer for the establishment of which government, you conclude your address, and a very proper and consistent conclusion it is!

Now for my litany :

May the present constitution of the British Empire be immortal; and may the king always enjoy that influence in both houses of parliament, with which the constitution has invested him, and which is indispensably necessary for the good government of the Empire!

May the parliamentary constitution be immortal; and may it always be an operative part of the constitution, confining the kingly power within constitutional limits only; and may it never be able or inclined to encroach on the constitutional authority of the crown, but may that authority, be for ever able to maintain its own constitutional rights!

May the House of Commons flourish; may it ever be elected by the opulent and most respectable part of the people only; and may the whole community, and the common interest of the whole Empire, be the only objects of its care!

May the connexion between Great Britain and Ireland be immortal; may the British Empire be one and indivisible; and may the traitorous attempts, of all greedy, clamorous, sturdy beggars, mendicant orators, sham patriots, desperate projectors, French agents, and spies, and Jacobin incendiaries, to separate this nation from the British Empire, be abortive!

May all such traitors abjure the realm and depart (to use the phrase of Mr. Henry Grattan,) "*riding on the waves of the Atlantic*;" or may they meet the fate of Macheath's gang in the opera, and be all either *hanged or transported*!

May the Protestant religion, as now established by law, continue to be the established religion of the state, and the Protestant ascendancy in church and state be immortal; may all its professors be inspired with true christian courage, piety, and charity; and may all dissenters from that christian communion, of whatsoever denomination, be reconciled and converted

converted to it ; and until it shall please the Almighty, so to illuminate their understandings, as to work such a change in their opinions, may they enjoy perfect civil freedom in the fullest and fairest sense, but may all such of them as erroneously maintain doctrines subversive of the laws and constitution of the state, as points of faith, be excluded from all functions, offices and employments in the state, which would furnish them, with opportunity and power to subvert, or to attempt to subvert the constitution of the Empire ! May the perfect civil freedom of the subject, never be artfully confounded with the enjoyment, or capability of enjoyment, of the political power of the state ; and may exclusion from such functions, offices and employments, of all members of any sect of christians, which maintain as points of faith, doctrines subversive of the laws and constitution of the state, continue, as long as they shall persist in professing and maintaining such doctrines !

**PATRICK DUIGENAN.**

*Henrietta-Street, Dublin, }  
Jan. 20th, 1798. }*