



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
LETTER
FROM
A GENTLEMAN IN IRELAND,
TO
AN ENGLISH MEMBER OF THE UNITED PARLIAMENT,
CONTAINING
STRICTURES
ON
A PAMPHLET, ENTITLED

"Thoughts on the Protestant Ascendancy in Ireland."

WITH SOME
FACTS AND OBSERVATIONS,
CALCULATED
TO THROW A LIGHT ON
The Catholic Question.

"Nothing extenuate, or set down aught in malice."
SHAKESPEARE.

8.

PRINTED BY J. HUME,
FOR
J. HATCHARD, BOOKSELLER TO HER MAJESTY, 190, OPPOSITE
ALBANY-HOUSE, PICCADILLY, LONDON.

1805.





LETTER TO _____

Dublin, April 18, 1805.

DEAR SIR,

IT gives me much pleasure to find that you approve of the Pamphlet* I sent you. I hope to see it re-printed in London, and, that with the observations on Catholic Emancipation, which you have sent me, it may be extensively disseminated.

One of the greatest evils we have to dread in discussing this measure of Catholic Emancipation, that I may still use that watch-word of sedition, is the ignorance of the real state of the question, of which I have so often complained to you in our correspondence, as incapacitating almost every Englishman I have ever yet conversed with, from

B

forming

* Melancthon's Letter to Dr. Troy.

forming a just judgment of its object, or its consequences.

Great pains, I see are taking, and various instruments are employed, to perpetuate the evil. The nearer the period for submitting the measure to the United Parliament approaches, the more exuberantly does your Press teem with publications calculated to impose on and mislead the public mind in England. The stock-purse of the Irish Popish Committee pours out its rich contents with unlimited profusion. It deals largely in the purchase of bold assertions, false statements, and insidious reasonings. I am well assured, and, if it be true, it is a curious fact, that the persons employed for these purposes work, not more for hire than from principle; and that with few exceptions, the Editors of your newspapers are all Irish Papists.

In setting such instruments to work, two different descriptions of persons are zealously engaged. They who are interested in the final accomplishment of the measure, as conscientiously attached to their religious party, and the inveterate enemies to all connexion with England. The former pursue their object, for itself, and without any views hostile to the Government, or to their native country; the latter, in their eagerness to effect the dissolution of a connexion, against which they
have

have sworn eternal hatred on the ensanguined altars of the late Rebellion, assume every mask, make common interest with every faction in the State, that promises to excite those internal discontents, and civil commotions from which alone they promise themselves success. Under the guise of anti-unionists, they labour to promote the glorious work of separation; and in the character of warm Catholics, or liberal Protestants, they outstrip the zeal of the most ardent Papists, while by an under-plot, they act on a settled system with the Irish traitors in France; and, through a regular correspondence, of which the Government here has been frequently apprized, concert with these traitors the measures that are most likely to promote the cause in which they are jointly engaged.

Since I last wrote to you these zealots have made a rapid progress in the respective parts they have undertaken, and great events connected with the subject have taken place.

With you a Petition, pretending to be the Petition of the whole Roman Catholic Body of Ireland, although signed by not one hundred out of three million, which, if you are to believe their advocates, is the amount of their population has been presented to both houses of Parliament. With protestations of loyalty; the secret of which,

with one or two splendid exceptions, they have hitherto carefully concealed in their own breasts; with an appeal to oaths, which they have given no proof of their having ever taken; and with threats of their numbers and their strength, and the power they possess either to excite or suppress all public commotion, and to invite or dissuade our inveterate enemy in his menaces of invasion, they pray to be admitted to all the privileges of His Majesty's most favourite subjects. Discountenanced by the Minister, without the most distant hope of success, and seeing no possible object to be answered by it but to irritate and inflame, their Delegates persist in forcing the measure upon Parliament, and the cause of this *loyal, peaceable, submissive, and grateful* people is pointed into an additional *thorn in the King's side*, and adds to the catalogue of difficulties and embarrassments in which the Executive Government is engaged.

With us the great drama of the late Rebellion is again rehearsing. From the old hot-bed of sedition at *Mulnahack**, additional agitators, educated

* The part of Dublin in which the mercantile house of Byrne and Randal M'Donnel is established. Byrne was chairman of the Roman Catholic meeting of Delegates that preceded the Rebellion, and that sat in Back-lane. Ryan, one of the present Delegates, and who with M'Donnel, was the person who has forced on this measure at this crisis, in opposition to all the peaceably disposed Catholics in Ireland, was a clerk in this house of Byrne and M'Donnel.

educated in all the politics of the Back-lane Committee, have been brought into activity. They have improved on the work of their predecessors. A coalition, despaired of by those great masters of intrigue, has been effected, between the Popish aristocracy, and the leaders of the Popish populace; and this union has been lately announced, and hailed as perpetual, from a declaration on the part of the former, that they will never again separate themselves from the great Catholic Body.

From every part of the island the old phalanx is mustering. In every quarter the old arms are furbishing; the old leaders collecting; rebellion is on "*tiptoe*;" the prospect of seeing an army of Catholic missionaries, bearing the standard of the great champion of revived Catholicity, join their native forces, is brought nearer to the hopes of the United Irish; and the ferocious spirit of that sanguinary Banditti, to use their old cant phrase, is once more *up*.

Believe me, my dear Sir, the fears with which this aspect of affairs fills us, are not visionary. Fatal experience has not more infallibly taught the inhabitants of those unsettled climates, in which such convulsions of the elements are frequent, to prepare themselves for the approach of an hurricane, than the recollection of past sufferings,

ferings renders us clear sighted to discern the return of rebellion, and to anticipate the renewal of horrors that have been so familiar to us.

I trust that it is among the blessings of the Union, that it is not under the irritation necessarily produced by such fears that this momentous question is to be discussed. I should mistrust myself, if under my present impressions, I were called on to decide on it. I have often observed to you, in the course of our correspondence, that under proper regulations, and with all necessary stipulations, and provisions, I was willing to persuade myself that Catholic comprehension might answer the most salutary purposes. From what I have since then observed and learned, I almost tremble to think that I should have formed such an opinion. I shrink from my own thoughts, while I perceive their bias still leaning that way.

May it not be, that in the dread of an immediate impending evil, I am tempted to catch at the first expedient that is offered to me with pretensions to prevent it. In my anxiety to preserve myself and my family from a repetition of the dreadful scenes, from which we have been rescued as if by a miracle, may I not be weak enough to acquiesce in a measure, proffered to me by my enemies, and that will only encrease the evils against which I am impatient to guard?

I am

I am persuaded that, seated in Dublin, many Members of our Parliament would be biassed, as I fear I may be biassed, by impressions of this tendency. Even within your walls, it is not unreasonable that some may be impelled to act under them. Nor is the opposite evil less to be dreaded. Faction, as you see, will not sleep on such an occasion. It will rejoice to enrol under its standard the — and the —, and the indignation of former days, and the evils which the ominous voice of these men will call to recollection at once, and forebode, may be expected to produce much Irish vehemence on the loyal benches.

But the great majority in both Houses, will deliberate on the momentous question calmly and dispassionately. They will consider it in all its bearings, without any personal irritation from past sufferings, and past injuries; without the prejudices of men, *odia in longum jacentes*, and led away by hereditary antipathies, or by habitual anticipations of future feuds. They will look to it merely as it may affect the fundamental principles of that Constitution, which they are pledged to the people of England to maintain inviolate, and as it may affect in its immediate or remote consequences the general safety of the United Kingdom.

In

In addition to this, you tell me that the people of England begin to take an interest in the question. I hope they will not be diverted from attending to it by the artifices of those, who in the storm of factious politics that now rages among you, may wish to smuggle it on Parliament. The nearer, and the more distinctly it is placed under their eye, the more generally and warmly will that instinctive feeling of their true interests, that belongs so peculiarly to that wise people, impel them to watch it through all its stages. No faction from this country, however powerfully supported in either House, will venture to precipitate a measure, in which the best interests of the people of England, as well as of Ireland are so essentially involved. No Minister will venture rashly, or inconsiderately on an experiment, that is to change a system under which the people of England have risen to the highest pitch of glory the British empire has ever attained, and to pull down one of the main pillars, on which their wise ancestors seated the throne of the Brunswicks with such happy auspices to their subjects.

The great point is to guard them against misinformation and misconception, on a subject so little understood by those who are called upon to decide it. The anxiety you discover to remedy this evil, as well for yourself, as for your Constituents,

tients, is highly honourable to you, and I cheerfully comply with your wish, that I should convey through you, to the public, all that I can contribute towards so desirable an object.

To follow some method in the observations I mean to submit to you, and to embrace the principal circumstances connected with the subject, I will take up the Pamphlet you sent to me containing "Thoughts on the Protestant Ascendancy in Ireland."

I am not surprized to hear that the Romish agents are so active in dispersing this Pamphlet at their own expence. It contains the essence of all that has been written on this ominous question by the whole herd of their writers. The Author is a very knight-errant in the cause. Among all the champions that have entered the career of deception with the most dauntless hardihood, he brandishes his pen without a competitor. In the impetuosity of his zeal, he embraces and maintains a doctrine, which has been invented for him by Plowden, self-convicted of venality, Hay, the pardoned rebel, and Gordon,* who with the plundered palace of his Bishop under his eye, and treading on the blood of his slaughtered brethren, has become the advocate of their assassins

and

and plunderers. But this is not enough for him, his own invention supplies the deficiencies of his reading; and he has added to the facts he has selected from these venerable authorities, and refined on their reasoning, as best suited his purpose, without the least regard to truth in the one, or consistency in the other. †

I would first call your attention to an extreme of insolence, which I can scarcely find terms strong enough to reprobate, that is common to this Pamphleteer, with all the above-mentioned writers. Ireland, with him, is exclusively *Popish* Ireland. The *Irish*, exclusively the *Papists*. With the most signal effrontery he expatriates the entire body of His Majesty's Protestant subjects, whether of Irish or English blood. With all their numbers, their property, their influence, and above all, their loyalty to their Sovereign, and their attachment to England, he leaves them neither consequence nor interest, nor footing in their own country. They form no part of the Irish people, "on whose affections England ought to set some value, and to whose prosperity she is not to be indifferent."

Nor

† It is evident that he is not an Irishman, No Irishman could commit himself so barefacedly as he has done, on points of the most unequivocal notoriety.

Nor does he, or Scully, or Plowden, or M'Kenna, or any of the fraternity, treat the Roman Catholic Body less opprobriously, (I am persuaded that the great majority of them think it opprobrious treatment) as they do the Protestants. Whenever they deplore the sufferings of the *Innocents* who were engaged in the late Rebellion, they uniformly designate them by the name of the *Irish*; excluding from this favoured description, all, no matter of what blood, or of what religious opinions, who either refused to join the rebel ranks, or who resisted or took up arms against them. "The days of anxiety, and the nights of terror, the waste of the wealth, and the depopulation of Provinces," all was, exclusively, the cruelties of the barbarous and savage *English*, inflicted on the *Irish people and nation.*" The loyal of old, and the loyal of English descent, loyal Protestant, and loyal Roman Catholic, all are equally comprehended within this sweeping exclusion. So that in future, to deserve the honour of being received as a true born Irishman, or a genuine denizen of Ireland, we must write rebel on our foreheads, and get our names enrolled on the registry of treason.

Indeed, if the sanguine wishes of this worthy English gentleman are to be gratified, or rather if

if his calculations do not deceive him, no other class than that of Irish, in his acceptation of the word, will be left to pollute the soil of this Land of Saints. He consoles himself for all the past, and grounds all his hopes for the future "in the daily reducing numbers" of all of a contrary description: and "in the rapid decay and hastening decline of their power," he anticipates golden days in the extinction of that religious zeal by which they *alone* are actuated, and which "alone poisons with its noxious venom, the wholesome source of national prosperity."

It is a pity to destroy these soothing dreams of this eloquent advocate for liberality—this avowed enemy of all exterminating persecution. But out of what stuff these dreams have been formed, it is not easy to guess. His historical oracles will, indeed, tell him that the number of the Catholics are rapidly increasing, while the Protestants are in the same proportion decreasing. But even supposing that loyal and Protestant are synonymous terms, which I have a pride in asserting, and Catholic and United Irishmen, which I should be unjust to admit, still I can assure this worthy Gentleman, that he will be disappointed in the sanguine hopes he entertains of seeing the country so speedily cleared of all but his favourite *Irish*. I assert, without the least fear of having
my

my assertion disproved, that in the general encrease of the population of Ireland, the number of the Protestants, including the Dissenters, rises in a great, if not greater proportion than the number of the Roman Catholics. This is not a matter of mere assertion. It can be brought to the proof; and it would be wise in the Government to put an end to all the bold assumptions on this subject, in which, on the false returns of such men as Mr. Hay, who long exerted all his treasonable industry, to carry on this deception for the purpose of intimidation, such writings as this Pamphlet before me abounds.

I have seen authentic returns made annually, by the established clergy of one of the most extensive Diocesses in Ireland, without any political view, or feeling of party, and the number of *Communicants*, excluding, of course, all Dissenters, are in every Parish, except two or three at the most, stated to be *increasing*. I have no doubt but an order from the Government or the Legislature to number the people, distinguishing the two religions, would prove the same encrease of Protestants in every part of the Kingdom, but most particularly in the North. It may have been hitherto, wise and right to have discountenanced all such numerations. In a general view, they can answer no salutary end. But what may be
 impolitic

impolitic in itself, may from circumstances become safe and prudent, and it might be desirable in Government to deprive the disturbers of our peace of this *argumentum baculinum*, as I remember one of their priests seriously called it, as tending to command by force, what they might be denied by petition, and to shew to what a degree it is unfounded.

After having with a popish zeal worthy of St. Patrick himself, cleared the Holy Island of what he considers to be the serpents, vipers, and venomous reptiles that infest its atmosphere, he proceeds to reprobate *the defective policy of England, and that deplorable system, still PERSEVERED in*, that have plunged *the once polished and civilised natives* into that *ignorance and barbarism*, which, even in this enlightened age, continue, he says, to characterise them.

This observation has not even novelty to recommend it. So long back as the reign of James I. Sir John Davis, than whom no Englishman ever was more partial to the Irish character, takes notice of a similar imputation, which, he says, "a vulgar error had cast upon the state of England."—Was this error, an error of religious growth? In the days to which Sir John Davis refers, was there any difference of faith,
any

any religious oppression to divide or to barbarise the *polished and civilised* inhabitants?

But, it seems, this of religion is an *additional charge* that attaches to "those, who in an enlightened age, continue narrow-minded and selfish, and bring back to our indignant recollection, the dark and gloomy prejudices of the Twelfth Century."

Mr. Scully, one of the present Delegates, in his address to the Irish people, that is, as you, if you were to read it, would conclude to the Irish rebels, calls King William "a Dutch invader." This adept in his school, and pupil of his manner, brands the illustrious characters, who invited that Great Man, to whom to labour in promoting the general cause of freedom throughout the world, was meat and drink, to settle and secure that Constitution, the admirable principles of which the Roman Catholic Petitioners "contemplate with rational and decided predilection" and "to the full enjoyment of the benefits of which," they most ardently desire to be admitted, with the foul and opprobrious name of "a faction in both countries." He talks of the kingdom's being separated into two distinct casts by this wicked faction, and that this impolitic distinction was the effect of religious zeal, by which that faction was actuated.

Nothing

Nothing can be contrary to the evidence of history as these assertions, with which our ears are so incessantly stunned. The real distinction of those days was Orangist and Jacobite. The former almost all Protestants; it is true, the latter, in Ireland, whether of old or English blood, all Papists; but actuated by no *additional* rancour against each other, from any speculative opinions in religion, or any difference in their acceptation of the doctrines of Christianity on which they disagreed. It was no more in the nature of King William, than it is in the spirit of the United Church, to *persecute* for mere doctrinal opinions.

This man has, himself, inadvertently and inconsistently admitted in page 12, of his Pamphlet, the real causes that separated the Kingdom at the period of the Revolution into two distinct classes. He admits that it was from "the party they had espoused," and from "the *political tendency*" of their religious principles, and "least they should endanger the civil liberties of the realm," that the Roman Catholics were deprived of all political power. He knows that an unfortunate separation into two distinct casts had convulsed the Kingdom for centuries before the voice of genuine Christianity had, through the Reformists, awakened the
 rage,

rage, and armed the resentments of the Popish superstition in any part of Europe. What had religious differences to do with the Houses of York and Lancaster, or with Henry VII. of the House of Tudor? yet he deplores the *defective policy, the fatal system*, that in the days of the Kings of these three Houses, proscribed the unhappy natives as savages, in strains equally pathetic, as he deplores the policy and the system of later days.

It comes out then, that it is not religious zeal that is chargeable with having originated the dissensions and divisions of this ill-starred country. It comes out that the *unhappy natives* had been *ensavaged and barbarized* ages before the laws which he ascribes to religious zeal, and religious animosities, had been added to our Statute Books.

But, says he, the Reformation was a new æra to Ireland. What! a new æra as separating the Kingdom into two distinct casts? the only novelty that can bear him out in the style and tone of invective he has assumed. No, he rejoins, but the new Faith was a new mark of distinction between the oppressors and the oppressed. It appears, then, that the tyranny of the oppressors, and the sufferings of the oppressed had preceded all religious distinctions. "Days of anxiety and
c " nights

“ nights of terror; the waste of wealth, and the
“ depopulation of provinces” had been the cruel
lot of the unhappy Irish people long before that
faction, that perfected the Revolution had existed,
or reminded us, by its religious “ zeal of the
“ dark and gloomy prejudices of the twelfth
“ century.”

But, it seems, “ all the ancient inhabitants re-
“ tained the Religion of their Catholic ancestors;
“ the Reformers were the English settlers.”

It requires some command of temper, and res-
pect for oneself, to abstain from branding such
assertions with the epithets they deserve. This
man must have fallen from the moon to hazard
them. There is no fact in our history more no-
torious, than that “ ancient inhabitants,” the Irish
of the old blood, were much more numerous
disposed to embrace the doctrines of the Refor-
mation than “ the English settler.” To this day
the descendants of the English “ settlers” conti-
nue to be the most bigotted of our Papists. Read
the list of names that are subscribed to the Ca-
tholic Petition. There are not more than twenty*
of

* I observe two men of the name of Scully among these Petitioners. But notwithstanding Mr. Scully the Pamphleteer and Delegate's boast of his old Milesian descent, I cannot find, from a very strict enquiry, from persons well acquainted with the old Milesian families, that the name of O'Scully was never heard of among them. I am assured by those who
know

of them of the old Irish blood. The rest are all the descendants of "English settlers," and, what ought not to pass unobserved, they are, with the exception of nine from the whole province of Connaught, and seven from that of Munster, the great Roman Catholic provinces, all from the disaffected counties, that were the most completely organized in the late Rebellion.

I could produce many proofs to bear me out in this representation, of the comparative attachment to Popery, in the old Irish and English inhabitants of this country; one remarkable instance I will select from Sir John Davis. He tells us, that in the indentures of submission to Henry VIII., in the thirty-third year of his reign, *all the Irish Lords* acknowledged Henry VIII. to be their Lord and King, and desired to be accepted of him as subjects. *They all confessed the King's supremacy in all causes, and utterly renounced the Pope's jurisdiction;* "and this," says he, "I conceive to be worth the noting, because when the Irish had once resolved to obey the King, they made no scruple to renounce the Pope." But when he relates the

c 2

part

know the Irish language, that his name proves his origin. *Scullogue* in that language means a *Boor*, the name by which the Irish still designate an English farmer of the class of Mr. Scully's father.

part "the English settlers" performed on this occasion he has only the names of Desmond, Barry and Roche in Munster, and that of Burke in Connaught to produce.

I quote this passage for two reasons. It is a proof that I have not followed the example of this Pamphleteer, nor hazarded an assertion, without respectable and universally admitted authority, when I said that the old Irish were more generally inclined to relinquish Popery, than the "English settlers." It is a proof that as well in those very early days of the Reformation, as at this hour, as well when Sir John Davis was attorney-general, as when Lord Redesdale is chancellor, adherence to the Pope, and loyalty to the King were held to be incompatible, and that as soon as the Catholics of Ireland became loyal to their Sovereign, they made no scruple to renounce the Pope.

When this Gentleman asserts that it was in the spirit of hatred to the *Church of Rome* that the laws against Popery were made, every Protestant will agree with him. It is saying that hatred to Popery dictated the laws against Popery. But what connexion has this truism with "the stain of religious persecution that sullied times which excited hopes of a more humane and liberal policy." They were those tenets of Popery which

which we have the public testimony of the whole Body of the Catholics of England, to consider as hostile and dangerous to all civil government*; tenets engrafted on the religious creed of Catholics by *ill-advised Popes*, as the respectable Committee that represent that Body and speak their sentiments, lament; tenets, peculiarly dangerous to this country, under the circumstances in which it was placed at the Revolution, that provoked these laws. How stood the case? After the extinction of the Irish faction that opposed the settlement of the crown on King William and Queen Mary, a policy was observed, common, and to be expected on all similar events. The adherents of the successful Monarch, were rewarded by forfeitures from the vanquished supporters of his antagonist. Every measure of precaution was adopted, to deprive the discontented of all means of further annoyance or resistance; all power of disturbing, impeding or subverting the newly-established government was withdrawn.

The abdicated King had made himself the martyr of Popery. He lost three kingdoms for a mass, says the sarcastic Voltaire, meaning to sketch his character and his misfortunes with one stroke

* See the observations of the Catholic Committee on the Evangelical Letters of the three Vicars apostolic.

stroke of his pencil. Popery (I speak of Ireland) became the peculiar badge and distinction of his adherents; the laws made against those adherents, were, therefore of necessity laws against Popery; and to mark out the objects of those laws with precision, it was essential to recite in the statutes that contained them, the tenets and doctrines that peculiarly distinguished the Irish Papist.

Whether these laws "deviated from" the rules of sound policy or not; whether they were or were not contrary to "natural justice," is not the present question. I am tracing them to the spirit from which they emanated, the principle on which they were founded, and the object they had in view. I have only to shew that when the Irish, at and after the Revolution, were required to abjure Popery, under severe penalties, it was that to renounce Popery, was to renounce Jacobitism; and that without exacting this pledge, the government and the legislature conceived that the "*civil liberties*" of the realm, as secured by the Revolution, "must be endangered." These laws, therefore, did not originate in the spirit of the reformed religion, abstractedly considered, and, merely, as a rule of faith; and if they bring back our indignant "recollection to the dark and gloomy prejudices of the twelfth century," (a period

period when the Reformation was yet in the decrees of God) it is because the darkness and the gloom that in that and the two following centuries, overspread the face of Europe, continued to hang over this ill-fated land: It is because the tenets so dangerous to all civil society, and so inimical to all civil authority and rule, which in those ages were of the essence of Popery, continued to be professed and cherished by its ignorant and bigotted inhabitants.

This Gentleman is peculiarly unfortunate in most of his references to past times. He discovers the persecuting spirit of English Protestants in the "dark and gloomy prejudices," against which they protested; and in pleading for the unlimited establishment of Popery, he calls to our recollection those disgraceful days, in which the cruel and relentless genius of that superstition, deluged the face of Germany with blood, and led its crusades to a war of extermination against a peaceable, and unoffending people, whom it was pleased to brand with the stigma of Heresy, because they renounced its own blasphemous innovations in religion, and the tyranny it exercised, as well over the conscience, as over all civil authority.

I should suppose that the author of this Pamphlet, is one of those enlightened philosophers

phers of the present day, who from an indifference to all religion, has *liberalised* himself into so strenuous an advocate for the Irish Catholics, as that, to support their pretensions to political power, he boldly sets himself above all restraints of truth and consistency. He does not appear to be an English Catholic. If he were, I have what he must receive as the most respectable authority, to prove that it was not from religious *prejudices* that the legislature of England or Ireland attributed to the professors of Popery, inhabiting these realms, tenets dangerous to the society in which they lived, and inimical to the Government of their country, or that they required them to renounce these tenets.

In a protestation, which I have but lately seen, signed by all the Bishops and Clergy, and all the Laity of any consequence of the Roman Catholic communion in England, we find the five following propositions;

I. That Princes excommunicated by the Pope, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects.

II. That the Pope can absolve subjects from their allegiance.

III. That the Pope hath a civil jurisdiction within the realms of other Princes.

IV. That the Pope is infallible.

V. That

V. That a breach of Faith with a person may be justified, under pretence that such person is an Heretic, or an Infidel.

The principles and tenets contained in these propositions are set forth by a Committee, consisting of the most distinguished Clergy and Laity of English Catholics, in their address to three of their Vicars apostolic, as the principles and tenets of the papal Church of Rome. They represent to their Vicars apostolic that they have been and are enforced, as articles of Faith, by the head of that Church under the severest penalties his spiritual power can inflict; that they have been propagated and defended as articles of Faith by persons appointed by the Pope to that special purpose, and that a succession of Popes have fulminated their thunders, at different periods, against all who do not avow them to contain doctrinal matter, which the Faithful were bound to profess: In the face of these thunders they came forward to renounce such tenets, as well for themselves, as for the Body of English Catholics whose trust they execute.

What followed? three Vicars apostolic, acting in obedience to a mandate of the papal Court, and in contempt of their own signature affixed to the protestation, interfere with their spiritual authority. They issue an Encyclical Letter, in which

which they condemn an oath, framed on the precise terms of the protestation, and renouncing in an immediate appeal to God, what the Subscribers had before renounced by their protestation; they declared this oath to be deserving of the censures of the Church, and they forbid the faithful to take it.

Do these bishops, in this Encyclical Letter, deny the position of the Committee that these tenets were the tenets of the Papal Church of Rome? The very reverse. They condemn the oath that renounces them; they declare it to be *unlawful* and *deserving* of the censures of the Church because it does renounce them. Does this require any comment.

But what was the conduct of the Committee? Professing the most unshaken attachment to the religion of their ancestors, they assert, that in renouncing these tenets, “ they renounce tenets that
 “ *would hinder them from discharging the du-*
 “ *ties of honest men and peaceable subjects, and*
 “ *that would render them unworthy of civil*
 “ *liberty, and the protection of the State.* They
 “ maintain that the oath by which they propose
 “ to renounce them, offers no violence to their
 “ faith: They protest solemnly before God
 “ against the circular letters of these Vicars apo-
 “ stolic that inhibit the Catholics of their district
 “ from taking such an oath, and against every clause,
 “ article,

“ article, determination, and matter therein con-
“ tained. They declare *such an inhibition to be*
“ *arbitrary and unjust as it encroaches on their*
“ *natural, civil, and religious rights; as it in-*
“ *culcates principles hostile to society and go-*
“ *vernment, and the Constitution and Laws of*
“ *the British empire, and as it derogates from*
“ *the allegiance they owe to the State and the*
“ *settlement of the Crown.*”

What will this Protestant advocate for popery say in answer to this authentic document of his own day? Will he maintain in contradiction to the English Vicars apostolic, and to a Committee of the Roman Catholic clergy and laity of England, that the papal Church of Rome maintains no such tenets as those contained in the Protestation? Will he maintain in contradiction to the public declarations of that Committee that such tenets are dangerous to society, and inimical to the Government under which we live? And that none but a wicked faction, fired with religious zeal, and inflamed by a persecuting spirit, required the subjects of these realms to renounce them? The tenets to be renounced by the oath of the Committee, were the precise tenets which the Roman Catholics of Ireland in the reigns of King William and Queen Mary were required to renounce. Yet the whole body of the English Catholics.

Catholics, speaking through their clerical and lay representatives, declare that this oath is no violence to their religious principles—and that to maintain that it is unlawful for the English Catholics to take such an oath, is to declare hostility to society and to the Government, to the Constitution, and to the laws of the British Empire, and to derogate from the allegiance they owe to the State, and to the settlement of the Crown. What, then, becomes of this Pamphleteer's "additional charge" of religious persecution against the "wicked faction" that achieved the Revolution? On what ground can he attribute to religious persecution the tests which the legislature and government of Ireland required, or continue to require from the Roman Catholics of this Country, as a pledge of the "allegiance they owe and ought to bear to the State and settlement of the Crown."

But in this part of his Pamphlet, I might concede to this Writer all he requires. The penal laws of Ireland may have been dictated by a furious and vindictive spirit of religious zeal. The Protestants of King William's and Queen Anne's days, may have persecuted the Roman Catholics merely from a hatred to their speculative opinions on the articles of Christian faith, in which they differ from the Protestants. But what

what has all this to do with the days in which we live? Here again this Writer follows the example of all the advocates of Irish popery. They depreciate all recurrence to past times, in judging of the Irish papists. They are indignant at the crying injustice of calling them to account for opinions maintained in the days of their fathers. They require that their religious principles should be sought for, only in their own declarations, and in the enlightened spirit that distinguishes them in this philosophic age.

But what is a rule for the Protestant, must not be a rule for the Popish advocate. The liberality their writers require, they most insolently deny when required from them. Every page of their writings, whether as historians, or as writers of postscript Prefaces, or as Pamphleteers, voluntary or purchased, vomits forth the most inflammatory declarations against the cruelties and indignities exercised in times past on the Irish, either as distinguished from the English settlers previous to the Reformation, or from the Protestants subsequent to that event.

Thus the Writer before us fills pages of this Pamphlet with a review of those laws, that formed, according to him, "the most perfect system of proscription, which, statesmen, playing the parts of inquisitors, have hitherto in-
vented

vented for the degradation of mankind." Granting the system to be such as he paints it; granting the source to which it can be traced, to be what he asserts it was, how can the statesmen, or the legislature of this day be implicated in the charge? He acknowledges himself that from the last years of the reign of George II. down to the Twenty-third of the present King, a system of relaxation and concession has been progressively pursued, that as far as it affects the great body of the Catholics, has expunged from our Statute Books, every vestige of that code which as I have seen it somewhere observed, a stern necessity, and an instinctive principle of self-preservation, and not any perverted spirit of religion, devised and perpetuated, till the danger that provoked them ceased to exist. From the moment that all fears from a popish pretender to the throne, were removed by the extinction of the family of James II. the liberal spirit of the Established Church gained its *ascendancy*. Cautious and guarded in its proceedings, it returned in a steady and unaltered course to the point, from whence, if left to its own unmixed and genuine feelings, it never would have swerved. Pure as when it first revived, it glowed in the heart of our beloved Sovereign. In following its humane and liberal dictates, he found a corresponding sentiment

ment and feeling in both his Parliaments. In that of Ireland, penalty after penalty, disqualification after disqualification was removed, till at this hour, the Roman Catholic clergy and laity of Ireland enjoy the full exercise of their religion, and follow the tradition of their father's in faith, in worship, in discipline, as freely and as safely as in the countries where their religion is the religion of the state.

Where then, in our day, is the destructive religious zeal, which awakes the indignation of this liberal advocate of this most liberal Sect, whose sufferings under Protestant persecution he so pathetically laments? Windmills and giants, which a brain distracted by his incessantly poring over the Romances, that so lamentably rehearse the distresses of this poor oppressed Damsel of ours, Old Ireland, conjures up before him.

But in this his Quixote progress, after adventures with imaginary bigots and persecutors, I will direct him where, alone in Ireland he is to look for any real vestige of that religious zeal that burns with intolerance, and riots in exclusions—has he never turned the eye of his philosophy to ghostly persecution? has he never examined, with that touch of exquisite feeling he affects, the spiritual racks and wheels, on which the ghostly persecutor and tyrant stretches his wretched

wretched victims? Has he never searched that code of spiritual pains and penalties, which a domineering faction in the Christian commonwealth has enacted, not as "accidental indulgences of a tyrannic spirit, or to gratify momentary resentments," but fixed and unalterable as the hatred these spiritual tyrants bear to all who deny their jurisdiction or their authority, and for the perpetual exclusion of all without their pale, from all the distinctions and privileges secured to his followers by the great assertor of Christian liberty.

If ever he has heard of these abuses, if he feels indignant wherever he discovers a vestige of them, let him read the pastoral Letters of Hussy and Troy, this *par nobile fratrum*. Let him read the comment on these Letters in every confession box, every chapel throughout the spiritually enslaved country, of the internal state of which he proves himself so grossly ignorant. Let him view an unhappy culprit, convicted of having passed the limits between orthodoxy and heresy, as marked by his ghostly tyrants—let him view him as he stands arraigned by the priest, clad in his holy vestments, holding in one hand the instrument of our redemption, and with the other touching the tremendous altar, on which he draws down the eternal Son of God, and sacrifices him
anew

expiations, and absolutions. But this enormous sinner has had communion with heretics—he has been detected reading an heretical Bible—he has occasionally assisted at the service of an heretical church, or listened to some moral exhortation from an heretical minister; he has attended the family prayers of an heretical master or mistress, who wish to have their children, and domestics join themselves in praying and thanking that God in common, whose blessings they enjoy in common, and in such forms of prayer as every Christian may adopt; he has sent his child to receive a better education at the school of an heretic, than he conceives he can procure for him from the orthodox teacher whom his priest has provided. This is the ground *taboed* by the Hussey's and the Troy's, which he has dared to tread; against guilt like this, all the thunders of the Church are pointed. For him, who after warning, persists in it, there is neither penance nor remission. The criminal must be cut off from the body of the Faithful, consigned to hopeless condemnation, and branded with a mark of guilt, like the murderer Cain, that all true Christians may detest and shun him.

I am prepared, my dear Sir, to find you doubt even my accuracy and strict regard for truth in this representation. Judging of the pa-
pists

pists of Ireland, and their customs from those Catholics with whom you are acquainted in England, you suspect me of overloading the picture. It is not overloaded. Such is excommunication, as it is practised, whenever these crimes provoke it, in that most degrading to reason and sound religion of all places, a Popish chapel in Ireland.

I relate what I know of my own knowledge. In a southern diocese, a poor House-painter, was denounced to his parish Priest for having a protestant Bible in his house, and occasionally reading it to his wife and children. He was further accused of frequenting at times the parish church, and attending to the sermon. Admonished by his priest against such impious practices, he answered, that he saw no harm in reading the word of God, or hearing a Christian exhortation from a very worthy clergyman, whom he never heard drop a word against his own religious principles. He was excommunicated with all the forms I have described—he was interdicted from fire and water; shunned and expelled from all intercourse with society. The few Protestants in the neighbourhood could not supply him with work, and with his wife and his children, he was reduced to beggary.

You shudder at this; yet be assured, that there is not a part of the kingdom in which the same
 execrable

execrable tyranny is not exercised over the poor ignorant and bigotted inhabitants, with a notoriety that could be verified in a Court of Law. It always attaches on breaches of the commandments of the Church; never on the violation of the commandments of the Decalogue. The whole occupation of the Priest is to watch his flock, in what he represents to them to be the greatest risk of damnation they run*.

For the tranquility of the country, for the peace of every Protestant family, in which the excluding spirit, leagued with that of proselyting, sows perpetual discord and alienation, I could wish that all this might be disproved as demonstratively, as this Pamphleteer can be convicted of misinformation, in what he states in his 20th Page. He there roundly asserts that the Catholic soldier is either obliged to renounce his religion, or to refrain from the exercise of what it commands. And in the next page, he execrates, with all becoming horror, "the shocking alternative that is offered to three millions of people, forcing them either to refuse their assistance to their

* All this is natural if it is not Christian. To diminish the flock, is to affect the shepherd's livelihood. If he does not carefully fence it, he may starve. Shame on the policy that exposes any Minister of the Gospel to such temptation.

their country, or neglect the duties which their religion strictly enjoins."

Where can this man have received his information? There is not a station for country quarters in Ireland, that does not exhibit proofs of its falsehood to the public eye. Officers and soldiers in whatever regiment they serve, all repair in regimentals and side-arms to their Chapels. Where the Roman Catholics are in any number, as in the militia regiments, they are regularly *marched* to Mass, and only join in parade with the rest of the regiment when the public service of the Church is over. But this man read Doctor Hussey's pastoral Letter, in which that turbulent incendiary incites the King's troops to disobedience and mutiny on this very pretext, and he makes no further enquiry: *Verbosa et grandis Epistola venit a Capreis; bene est; nil plus interrogo.*

He is equally misinformed and equally credulous in the assertions he hazards in a note to this passage of his Pamphlet. There is not a county in Ireland, in which there is a Roman Catholic of property and character to qualify him for the station, and desirous of it, who has not been appointed a Justice of the Peace. They are found in every county, particularly in Connaught and Munster. Yet this writer ventures to assert,
that

that notwithstanding the repeal of the law prohibiting the nomination of Catholics to the situation of Justice of the Peace, few have been as yet appointed.

As to the cruelty and insults still offered to Catholics on the anniversary of the battle of the Boyne, he and his historians are called upon to produce a single instance of the kind. But it seems the Protestants of Ireland have still the insolence to solemnize that glorious anniversary. Let the people of England judge from this single *accusation* to what a height of arrogance the indulgencies lately granted to the Papists encourage them, and their agitators to proceed.

The event that finally crowned the glorious effort to rescue these *kingdoms from slavery*; the event from which we are to date the æra of recovered freedom, that secured to the generation of that day and to their posterity, the blessings of that Constitution which every Englishman contemplates with pride, and which raises every Irishman, who shares it, to a level with him, must not be celebrated in Ireland, because the Irish papist of this day does not chuse it should be celebrated. —The Irish papist comes forward with his Petition, and tells the English nation that it is the first wish of his heart to be “admitted to the full enjoyment of the benefits of this constitution;” yet amongst the *instances of insult, offered to the unhappy Irish,*

is the joyful celebration of an event that finally secured these *benefits* to the three kingdoms! One hundred years ago this victory over arbitrary power was atchieved by a Protestant army; it, must not, therefore, be celebrated, least the descendants of the Irish families that remained in Ireland after the capitulation of Limerick, should be reminded of the defeat of their ancestors. I knew, indeed, one high spirited descendant of one of these families, who gave a better reason for his disliking the celebration of that anniversary. He was ashamed to be reminded of having had ancestors who could have opposed such a King as William, or fought for such a King as James.

It is painful, and even disgusting to trace this writer, and the authorities on which he risks his character, and his reputation for truth, through their misrepresentations and falshoods. It is impossible to descend to them all; we must therefore, select those that are of the greatest magnitude, and pregnant with the greatest mischief.

In attributing the late Rebellion, and all the miseries it drew after it, to the recall of Lord Fitzwilliam; he echoes as usual, the apologists of that Rebellion, and adopts the idle tales with which they amuse their British readers. No man acquainted with the transactions of that
time

time will deny, that the authors and fomentors of the Rebellion, derived the greatest advantages from the flame that was raised by this circumstance. The seeds of disaffection, cast into the old soil, by the Back-lane Committee, and their agent Mr. Burke, junior, and fostered by the French Revolution, were, doubtless, ripened into fruit by it at a much earlier period than the most sanguine among the Rebel leaders would have hoped. You will, probably, be surprized to see the name of Burke coupled with the French Revolution: But such are the contradictions in the human character which are so frequently discernible to those, who placed, themselves, out of the vortex of politics, trace the aberrations of the brightest luminaries through that *ever-versed* space.

While Mr. Burke, with all the resistless powers of his eloquence, was successfully spiring the English nation into a detestation of the crimes and enormities to which the frenzy of a deluded populace had given rise in France, he was, by his Letters, and his friends, inflaming the populace of Ireland into the same frenzy. He was putting into their hands, the very arms by which the Petions, the Brissots, and the Robespierres, achieved the French Revolution, and inflicted all the miseries on their country, and through her,
on

on such a large portion of Europe, which this eloquent advocate of subordination and social order paints in such affecting colours. Besides his Letters to Lord Kenmare, and Sir Hercules Langrishe, which afford their mottos, and their arguments to all the Popish Apologists, we have the authority of our Pamphleteer copying Plowden, he says, for another Letter of his to Dr. Hussey, whom he had recommended to Government to send to Ireland, for purposes very different from those, which that intriguing Priest had in his own contemplation. In that Letter he writes, " Nothing can save you but a Committee
 " of this kind. I wish something of the sort re-
 " established. Your enemies are embodied;
 " what becomes of you, if you are only indi-
 " duals?"

The Committee which Mr. Burke thus wishes to see re-established, is the Back-lane Committee. It had nearly perfected the work of rebellion, under the management, and direction of his own Son, whom the Catholics had invited over as their agent. Full of ardour in the cause; unacquainted with the instruments with which he was to go to work; heedless, or unaware of the mischief he was to produce, it was he who first advised an appeal to the people. He advised that they should be regularly associated
 in

in one general plan for *enforcing* the Catholic claims, and that they should contribute by a poll-tax to a national purse, for carrying on the great purposes of the Committee: In pursuance of this advice, a personal inscribing of names and marks at the different altars through the kingdom, was procured by the priests; and I mention this circumstance to you, to give you some idea of the character of the unfortunate people, who, through the whole series of their history, appear to have been the dupes of every incendiary, and whom a characteristic restlessness, and an ignorance that would seem to be entailed on them, have so frequently betrayed into the hands of every political or religious deceiver.

On the subsequent raising of the militia, this device recoiled on some of its contrivers. The people conceived that the inscribing of their names, instead of having any object of advantage to them in view, as was pretended, was devised for the purpose of their being afterwards enrolled for the militia. "The priests," they said, "had sold them to Byrne*, and Byrne to the King." Under this conviction they, in many places shut up the chapels, and expelled the priests. In the county of Roscommon their indignation ran so high, that

* The notorious Chairman of this Committee.

they half hanged some of these objects of their absurd suspicions, and in all places they loaded them with contumely and abuse. Of this violent commotion, and the spirit of revolt and insurrection which, after a sleep of one hundred years, had by these appeals to their passions and their prejudices, been revived among the middling and lower orders of the people, a party, that has since been but too well known, and some of whom were of that Committee, availed themselves. They soon gave a different turn to this wildness of discontent that scarcely knew to what object it was to be directed.

From subsequent information we know that at the period of Lord Fitzwilliam's administration, this party had infused all its own principles into the great mass of disaffection, which the Catholic Committee and its agents had prepared for them. We know that at that period, the spirit of the French Revolution had been universally diffused through the lower orders; that the Rights of Men, an universal Equality, an agrarian Law, a release from the English yoke, and an independent Republic, modelled on the French plan, and to be formed by French co-operation, were the avowed objects, for which a numerous force, officered, and regimented, and ready organised for action, had been raised.

The

The chief actors in this conspiracy were not unknown to Lord Fitzwilliam's government. Information of the treasonable practices of the Man who has since been publicly recognized as having been its chief contriver, and the soul by which it was animated, were conveyed to that government shortly before its dissolution; and at the very moment that Mr. Tone was employed as secretary to the Catholic Deputation of that day, they had reason to suspect that he was the traitor which he afterwards acknowledged himself to be.

These are authentic facts, known to the whole nation. They rest not on private whispers, or on the communications of secret correspondence. Tone's manifesto has been published. In that precious morsel of treason he discloses how limitedly the real actors in the conspiracy admitted, at that time, the brawlers for Catholic Emancipation into their secrets, and how little, except as a collateral object, they had it in their contemplation.

They rejoiced in the measures that were pursuing for its accomplishment, as forwarding their own views. They applauded, and flattered, and encouraged its promoters and abettors, both in and out of parliament. They resolved to stay by them as long as they went the same road with themselves. Their virulent, and incessant invectives
against

against England; their charges of persecution, cruelty, and oppression against the English government were auxiliaries, on whose powerful co-operation towards the independence and the separation they meditated, they congratulated each other. But the only service in their own cause to which they could admit these brawlers, and their tools and emissaries, was to irritate, and inflame, and madden the people; and this service they completed on the recall of Lord Fitzwilliam. Never can Ireland forget the address that a few days before his departure exhorted the entire body of the Catholics *greatly to emancipate*, and to avail themselves of that golden opportunity to extend their views far beyond their own exclusive interests.

Whether subsequent to that period the suspicions that were entertained of a closer union, and a more intimate and confidential communication were or were not founded; or what credit was due to Neilson's depositions that led to the dismissal of the great Hero of Emancipation who is once more to appear as its champion in parliament, from the Corporation of Dublin, and from the Council Board, I am not prepared to say, I am not sufficiently informed to venture to give you any information on the subject. But our Pamphleteer has passed over the history of this whole

whole period, between the meeting of the Back-lane Delegates, and the arrival of Lord Fitzwilliam, to hurry his readers to the recall of that nobleman, from which he dates the origin of a Rebellion that is known to every man the least acquainted with the internal state of the country, to have been ripe for breaking out, in the manner, and through the instruments I have described to you, before that nobleman ever set a foot in Ireland. He is so eager to pay his tribute of tears to the sufferings of the *Irish people*, and of the thousands of them, who perished in that wanton and unprovoked contest with an obnoxious faction, “ that wasted their wealth, and “ depopulated their provinces, without being able “ to subdue them,” that he looks to *nothing* but to the event to which he supposes he can most immediately trace the commencement of “ their “ calamities.”

• Never did Jewish prophet pour out louder lamentations, or tune his harp to sadder strains to bewail the sufferings of his country. But for the loyal of that disastrous period, whether Protestants or Catholics he has not a single tear. They, it would seem, were on beds of roses. They knew “ no days of anxiety, no nights of terror.” It would be a misprision of loyalty in this writer and his associates, to suffer the British nation to waste

waste itself on such abominable wretches as the whole body of his Majesty's Protestant subjects, or even the Catholic who traitorously refused to qualify himself for the sacred distinction of being an Irishman by drenching himself in the blood of "an obnoxious faction." The Bridge of Wexford, the Barn of Scullabogue, the Church of Castlecomer, present no horrors to the patriotic eye of this liberal Protestant, and enlightened Englishman. The once peaceful and hospitable mansions of the Wexford clergy, men of the most liberal principles and humane conduct; or the habitations of almost every loyal subject in the organised counties, assailed by a banditti of ferocious savages, and infuriate women, without a moment's warning, either for flight or defence, and flooded with the blood of their unoffending, unsuspecting inhabitants of every age and sex: the favoured domestic introducing the midnight assassin into the bosom of our domestic comforts; the shrieks of the devoted victims, mingling with the savage yells of their murderers.—What claim can these scenes of terror have on the compassion and sympathy of the English nation? The fate of the poor Irish, either gloriously falling pike in hand against an English King, or martyred by the usurped power of an English Government, alone deserves their commiseration. — Self-defence; his
tening

tening to the voice of nature, in the choice between killing and being killed; opposing the sword of Loyalty to the pike of Rebellion—what horrid cruelty! And as to their sufferings, “what a clamouring,” says Killpig to Pig in the Epigram,* on the American war, “can’t you be still, and killed a little?” What have we to contemplate in all these sufferings. “but the decline of the “power, and the reduced numbers of the faction “that completed the Revolution, and cemented “the settlement that followed,” which our pamphleteer anticipates with such exultation. For, after all, what is all that this wretched faction have suffered, or may yet suffer, but “the settling of the “long account, which the Irish people have to “bring against the authors and instruments of “former miseries?”

But alas! although so many thousands of these *Innocents*, generously regardless of all the concessions made in their own favour, and listening to no selfish calls of gratitude for their own complete emancipation from all that in their own classes, and their own rank of life they had to complain of, fell in thus avenging the sufferings of their ancestors, and fighting the quarrels of past times, yet, exclaims this writer, “the result is

* A Dialogue between Pig and Killpig.

is not submission, nor is the fruit obedience, nor are the Irish subdued. "They are rendered desperate in the melancholy prospect presented to their view by this same execrable faction. In "their present lamentable condition," these unhappy men feel more keenly than ever the distinctions between them and their fellow-subjects."

Would you not conclude, Sir, that the result of the last rebellion was to re-enact the whole code of penal laws? Would you not conclude that the triumphant *faction* had resumed all its original ferocity? That the Government, and the Legislature had revived the old plan of rendering this wretched people *barbarous and ignorant*, by a recurrence to those cruel measures that were formerly adopted and enforced "with that view?" You will expect to hear nothing less than,* that the whole body of Catholics have been disarmed; that they are once more incapacitated from purchasing lands; that the entails of their estates are broken; and that they may gavel among their children; that if one child of a family abjures his religion, he inherits, although he be the youngest; that if the son abjures the Catholic religion, the father becomes tenant for life, while the son becomes tenant in fee; that a Catholic can not only

E

make

* This author's enumeration of the sufferings of the Catholics under the old penal laws.

make no purchase of lands in fee simple; but is debarred from holding a lease in perpetuity, or for lives; or for any longer period than thirty-one years; that he has no vote in elections; that a priest who celebrates mass may be transported; and if he returns he may suffer death.—Doubtless, this cruel code of *the laws of discovery*, is restored to our statute books.—No, Sir, not a vestige of that code remains. In every *immunity* enjoyed by a Protestant subject; security of property; security of a person; equal protection from equal laws; the elective franchise; the power of realizing the fruits of his industry, and transmitting his property to his heirs, to be held by them according to his own will and pleasure; the *privilege of having no law enacted, no tax levied on him without his own consent through his Representatives*; the free and undisturbed exercise of his own Religion, and the inviolableness of the person of his priest. All that an Englishman enjoys, all that he most values and takes pride in, the Irish Roman Catholic enjoys, and may value and take pride in to the fullest extent, and in the most perfect security.

Yet such writers as this Pamphleteer, will make the press groan with volumes of abuse and invective against the government and the legislature, as still harassing, and oppressing, and persecuting, and keeping in bondage *this unhappy people*. Yet

they shed rivers of tears over “ the *sufferings and calamities* they continue to endure, the desperation to which they are driven, the revival of their feuds, and the nourishment of their discontents.”

GOD forbid, Sir, that I should be such a bitter enemy to my Roman Catholic fellow-subjects as this man, and all who, with him, draw this picture of their country prove themselves to be. GOD forbid that I should be so unjust, to confound the whole body with these restless Popish agitators, and separatists, who are ever on the watch; who catch at every hope of working upon “ that promptitude to revolt, that ear that is open to every delusive tale, that eye that is turned to every enemy,” which Mr. Theobald M’Kenna laments, as characterising that class and rank of Irish Catholics, to which, he acknowledges, “ every privilege is conceded,” and “ who are perfectly out of the reach of all disabilities.” I respect the loyal amongst them; I have a tear for the deluded and misled. Left to themselves, allowed to apply themselves to their industrious pursuits, enflamed by no incendiaries, and irritated and fretted by no interested priests, who keep their minds in a constant political and religious fever, by infusing into them a hatred of the English nation and Government, an abhorrence of
the

the religion of the state, and a detestation of the faith, the service, the ministers, of the established Church.—Thus left, I say, to themselves, I am fully warranted by my own observation and experience to assert, that the great mass of the middling gentry, and of the trading and farming classes of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, would remain in perfect tranquility; satisfied with their political situation, and sensibly alive to the mischiefs of commotion. Mr. Theobald M'Kenna,* who knows them well, and what pains it cost that meeting, of which he was the secretary, to raise the flame, the embers of which are still smoking, acknowledges, “that there is not on earth a people more averse from political interference, unless it be forced upon them,”

He does them nothing more than justice. An entire century had revolved over their heads without a single symptom of a rebellious spirit, notwithstanding all the restraints and disqualifications under which they laboured. The manners of that period gradually counteracted the spirit of the penal

* This Gentleman in his late metaphysical effusion takes up an entire page to explain why the Papists of Ireland continued Jacobites until the reign of the present King. “There is no enigma in it,”—most certainly not. *There was no JAMES left.* But why so many became *Revolutionists* after they had ceased to be *Jacobites*, is an enigma which we will thank him to unriddle.

penal code. The law became a dead letter. For the last fifty years there is not upon record a single claim, a single penalty, a single proceeding, under any one of the statutes against Papists-Disturbances and insurrections, no doubt, distinguished some parts of that period in the Southern and Northern counties; but there were no other pretexts besides Popish disqualifications. That string of discord was first struck by Byrne and his Committee, and broke the peaceful slumbers of nearly one hundred years. The work, however, could not be completed without an associate and leader from the priesthood. It is a justice due to Doctor Troy, and his brethren to say, that they declined this post of honour. But the ambitious and intriguing Hussey, hot from the Escorial and the Propaganda, presented himself, and to him was the decisive commission assigned, with the approbation of the Holy Father. Pursuing the tract traced for him by his predecessor in the legatine-office, the fiery-spirited Rannuccini,* he brought forward the tremendous artillery of the Church. He snatched the torch of discord from the Vatican, and casting it amidst the already-agitated populace, drove them once more into religious madness.

The

* Nuncio to the Kilkenny Parliament at the time of the great rebellion in 1641.

The Rebellion followed. I have already unfolded its progress to you;—the auxiliaries that joined in it; the additional principles that were infused into it; the new legislators that methodised it; and the leaders that organised and disciplined its forces. But this storm had happily blown over. The rebel forces were discomfited, The rebel leaders were cut off: Cut off not in the field, for few of them had the spirit to perish there, although they had led so many thousands of their deluded victims to the slaughter: They fell by the hand of justice; or, with a lenity unparalleled in the annals of Rebellion, except at the Revolution; they were suffered to transport themselves beyond seas. Their French allies, under Humbert, were equally discomfited. The last spark of the conflagration was extinguished at Balnamuck; and I again and again assert, that if the Irish traitors in France, their associates in Ireland, agitating democrats, of their own communion duping them by their accustomed arts; a desperate faction, the wings of whose ambition were clipped, and whose hopes of availing themselves of our endless internal factions to effect their own aggrandisement, were extinguished by the Union, were not encouraged from existing circumstances, to endeavour to rekindle the flame, the present application to Parliament, and the revival of this portentous question

question of the Catholic Emancipation, would have never taken place.

Look at the Popish Petition. Out of three million of Catholics it is signed by less than one hundred. And who are they? I have already partly described them to you. Are they the Catholics of the old blood, whom our Pamphleteer would represent as forming the entire mass of discontent and disaffection? Their names, with the few exceptions I before specified, speak their English descent. Are they from the provinces in which the Roman Catholics chiefly reside, and where they possess the greatest property? With few exceptions they are from Dublin, the great focus of the late Rebellion, and from the disaffected counties of the old English pale, nearest to be influenced by its politics. With still fewer exceptions, including the Peers in the exception, they are names familiar to the Back-lane Committee, the cradle of the late Rebellion, and conspicuous in the lists of treason in 1798.

It was to the men of this description that an invitation to revive the Popish claims, and to bring them into Parliament was first sent from your side of the water by a Member of the Opposition, I have heard the name of this wicked disturber of our peace, But I might be arraigned of *scandalum magnatum*, were I to repeat it. I have

have the authority of persons much in the confidence of the principal Roman Catholics to assert, that the agitators and separatists from the old school of *Mulnahack* were for months preparing their arrangements, and laying their schemes before they communicated the most distant idea of their having such a business in hand to the nobleman who is now at the head of the Deputation, or to any Catholic of his consequence.

With what views, or on what grounds, this nobleman has changed his opinions, and with his change of opinions changed his conduct, I cannot pretend to inform you. But I have the same authority to assure you, that in his anxiety to preserve the peace of the country, and influenced by that loyal spirit that has ever distinguished him, he, for many weeks, made every exertion to defeat the intrigues of the M'Donnell and Ryan faction. Was he properly seconded by the government here? Was he left to himself, and to the friends he confided in? And was he borne down by the factious agitators? Is it from the same loyal motives that have ever influenced his conduct, and with a view to prevent any consequences mischievous to the country, that he has consented to join his name with those of Scully and Ryan, who, by an under intrigue, which did not discover itself till the very last day of the meeting of the
Catholic

Catholic Committee, were added to the delegates that had been first in contemplation? Why did he consent to go to England, to advocate the introduction of a question into parliament, which under all the circumstances of the times, he thought it dangerous to agitate? Of all this I am ignorant; nor would it be necessary to dwell so long on those circumstances, connected with the Petition, but to prove to you that the present attempt to force this question upon parliament is entirely a measure of faction; that the design originated with some individuals of the opposition on your side of the water; that the persons first employed to promote it on this side are the same that gave rise to the last Rebellion, and either covertly or openly abetted it in its progress; that the Roman Catholics of old landed property in the provinces of Connaught and Munster, with the exception of the few whose names appear affixed to the Petition; and all who are employed in the pursuits of industry, except that same Dublin and M'Donnell faction, together with the whole North, were as ignorant of the conspiracy that first set the project on foot, as they are indifferent to the success of the measure itself, which they deprecate as having no other tendency than to agitate and disturb the country.

But

But at the same time that I think myself perfectly warranted to make this representation, I am aware that the aspect of things may be rapidly changed. I have already told you what instruments are at work on both sides of the channel. Besides the veteran troops that fought in the ranks of Rebellion; that have been discomfited, and dispersed but not disorganized; that still know, and are still known by their leaders, and are ready to range under their old banners, whenever any flattering prospect of success to their cause shall be opened to them, there are other descriptions of persons, and they not few in number, through whom the revival of this question, and the methods employed to promote the success of the measure, may awake and communicate a spirit of dissatisfaction and revolt, and renew all the horrors of civil dissention. The question once revived, and the measure brought forward, not to engage in the prosecution of it, or co-operate towards its success will be represented as treason to the great Catholic Body, and a desertion from Catholic principles; and the Devil of discontent having once returned to his old abode, and finding the house swept and garnished, there is no saying with how many Devils worse than himself he may again enter on possession

session, or how far the last state of this ill-fated country may be worse than the first.

Many circumstances that operated in our favour during the late disturbances, are now changed. I have already mentioned to you a report, industriously propagated here, that an alliance despaired of by the old agitators of the Back-lane Committee, has taken place between the Roman Catholic aristocracy and democracy; and that the former are pledged to separate themselves from what they then conceived to be a faction, pursuing measures destructive to the country, but which they now dignify with the name of the great Catholic Body.

In the late Rebellion, although many of the Popish Clergy were found amongst its most active leaders, yet their bishops, and a great number of their priests, either took a decided and zealous part in checking its progress, and abating its horrors, or waited the event in a prudent neutrality. Even these neutrals were disposed by the circumstances of that day to think more favourably of the Royal cause. The Revolution that in France had buried the altar and the throne in one common ruin, and, in the general abjuration and proscription of Christianity, had extinguished the national Religion and Church, was then raging at its height. The popish Clergy

gy in Ireland could not foresee the glorious revolution that the versatile ambition of Buonaparte, has since found it politic to affect. From his very first entrance in the brilliant career that has led him to the throne, he was the persecutor of the Holy Father, the oppressor of the See of Rome, the avowed enemy of the name and the religion of the Son of God. The priests had, therefore, nothing to expect from the success of a cause, that had so widely diverged from its commencing point in Back-lane, and which from the accession of other agents, and the infusion of other principles, rested its final hope of triumph on the co-operation of the atheistical government of France.

All this has been changed. *The strictest union* now subsists between the Papal Court and the Imperial Court of the Thuilleries. To speak more correctly, Pius the VII. is the creature, the vassal of the King of Italy. The persecutor of all *the faithful*, the murderer of Pius the VIth, is the Pope's beloved son in Christ; the anointed of his Holiness, who seated him in the throne of the Bourbons, as a reward for the protection which he has vowed to extend to the whole Catholic Church throughout the world. All despotic as he is, he dare not lay his pious hands on the plundered property of the Church in France; he dare
not

not venture to rescue it from the gripe of its present possessors to restore it to the bishops and clergy. But other confiscations will amply gratify the leaders of his triumphant army in this ancient land of saints, without trenching on the possessions to which the zeal of the Popish clergy may lay claim as their natural reward. O'Connor and M'Nevin will then hold the *feuille de benefice*, and on the mandate of their imperial master to his Holiness, the disposal of hats and mitres, and stalls, will exclusively depend. I leave it to your own knowledge of the human heart to draw the conclusion.

These are most serious and imminent dangers. You ought to be prepared for them; but how are they to be guarded against? Will this talisman of emancipation accomplish the miracle? Will it check the returning spirit of revolt and rebellion? Will it destroy the hopes of co-operation that may encourage our inveterate enemy to select this vital part of the British empire for his long threatened invasion? Will it lay a solid foundation for internal tranquility and content? Our Pamphleteer, of whom we must not lose sight, tells us, as all the co-fraternity tell us, that complete emancipation *will* effect this miracle: "Re-move, says he, without delay all the remaining " disqualifications, and restraints.—Substitute a
 " political

“ political instead of a religious test, and endeavour to make the people forget that a contrary one had ever been proposed,” and the work is done.

But on what grounds is this gentleman authorised to hazard this opinion? He will tell you. “ The religious tenets dangerous to the civil power, and hostile to the British Government are no longer maintained by the enlightened Catholics of this day. As they have ceased to maintain such tenets, why persist in requiring a religious test of them to give them political power. Let the test be of the same nature with the trust, and you will have all the security you ought to require.”

This is the substance of his argument; and if the assertions on which it is founded could be proved, the inference might be just and safe. But let us see how far he is warranted to hazard such assertions.

The first tenet he mentions as objected to the Catholics, is the acknowledgment of a foreign power as head of the Catholic Church. This accusation, he asserts, is founded upon what were, and not on what are the tenets of the Catholic religion.

This is a curious assertion, indeed— would ask him what Catholic, lay or clerical, has ever told

told him that he does not to this hour, maintain as an article of faith, that the sovereign Pontiff of Rome is the head of the Catholic Church? No Catholic, lay or clerical, could ever tell him so. I would ask him then if this Pontiff of Rome be not a sovereign prince even in our times? at least is he not as much a sovereign prince as the king of Spain, or the queen of Etruria, or the States of Holland, may be allowed to be sovereign princes? I would ask if the exercise of his power, be not the exercise of a foreign jurisdiction? And if this jurisdiction be not exercised in Ireland at this moment to as great an extent, with as high an authority, and in as many instances that admit of its interference or controul, as in the days when the papal usurpation was at its height in Europe.

If he has the least candour he will answer, that he knows nothing of the matter. He only knows what Plowden, and Hay, and Gordon, and Grattan instruct him to say on such subject. But the Popish Bishops can answer me; and their authority I should think, ought to outweigh the decisions even of Dr. Grattan. - This great casuist will not think himself as competent to decide on such a question as his friend Dr. Troy. He is too modest to set his opinions in opposition to his most learned Oracle of Popery. He will not deny that to
be

be fact which Dr. Troy asserts to be fact; nor will the people of England prefer his information; or that of our declaiming Pamphleteer to the pastoral addresses of this Catholic Arch-Bishop, conveying to the clergy and laity of his archiepiscopal diocese the unalterable decrees of the Catholic church; the irrevocable dogmata of the Catholic faith. In these pastoral addresses he unequivocally and uniformly asserts the supremacy of the Pope.* In which of them? In what other avowed publication of his? Before whom has he ever denied that, by virtue of this supremacy, the Pope has not only a supreme direction in matters of faith, but as Bellarmine with all the *Popish* doctors, maintains, and as is taught to this day in the schools of the different *monasteries* belonging to the order, of which Dr. Troy is a member; and as he himself learned and maintained there in his *Theses*, an actual direction over all the members of the Catholic Church in *temporal* concerns?" When and where has he ever denied

* The Jesuit Canisius, says the candid author of the modest Apology for the Catholics of Great Britain, defines the church to be the visible congregation of one Christ, and one supreme pontiff, his Vicar on earth, by whom it is governed and kept in unity. A nefarious innovation, he says, but which was readily adopted by the retainers of Rome and gradually slipped into almost every catechism.

ned that “ if princes* be not in subjection
 “ to the Pope as to their temporal concernments,
 “ his power is an insignificant title, and he cannot
 “ be called the Universal Pastor over the Church
 “ of CHRIST?”

Is this Pamphleteer to be told, that those doctrines have been promulgated in various councils; particularly in that Council of Lateran, to whose “ terrible decrees” he himself refers? Now Dr. Troy will tell him at this day, amidst all the blaze of light which this gentleman supposes to have dissipated every cloud that “ superstition, and the “ love of political power” had raised in ancient times, that Catholics are obliged to adhere implicitly to all decrees and canons of the Church assembled in general council, and confirmed by the Pope as *Rules of Faith*. The doctrine above stated continues, therefore, to be a Rule of Faith.

F

General

* The doctrine of Bellermino defending the conduct of Pius IV. fulminating his bull of deposition against Queen Elizabeth. “ The common doctrine held by the sycophants of the Court of Rome,” says the author already quoted, is—“ that all ecclesiastical authority resides in the Pope as in its source; that he alone has a right to decide questions concerning faith, and that all the faithful are blindly and implicitly to submit to his decisions, because they are infallible; that he alone can make such ecclesiastical laws as he pleases, and dispense, without giving a cause with those already made, that he judges all mankind but cannot be judged by any; that all power whether spiritual or temporal, is directly or indirectly lodged in him, and that he can dispose of crowns as well as mitres, depose Sovereigns, and absolve their subjects from their oaths of allegiance.”

General councils, confirmed by the Pope, have declared it to be so ; and Dr. Troy, pronouncing his irrefragable decisions, from Divine authority, declares that all acts of such councils are binding on the faithful now and for ever.

The same decision extends to all the other points to which this writer alludes, as arguments with Protestants against admitting Papists to any share of political power, and to others on which he has not touched.—It extends to their doctrine of the Pope's infallibility ; of exclusion from salvation against all who are not Members of the holy Roman Church, "*the only ark of salvation,*" as the very Pope of this day, in his famous allocution, pronounces it to be ; of deposing heretical sovereigns, and absolving *their subjects from their allegiance* ; of nullity of oaths to heretics, and of the extermination of heretics.—These have all been promulgated, and maintained by what Dr. Troy holds to be general councils, confirmed by the Pope.—And are the assumptions and assertions of this Protestant layman, or of Plowden, or Lord Fingal, although Papists, to weigh with the Legislature, or with the the people of England against so high a church authority? Because this Pamphleteer chuses to tell us with all becoming gravity, all the fullness of his rounded periods, that it is at present maintained by all Catholics
that

that the poper or papal authority hath no where any such power as these doctrines attribute to him, must we believe him in preference to Dr. Troy, delivering the unalterable opinions of his own Church as taught by it this day, and to be taught by it for ever.

But I only trifle with your time, and my own in arguing this point with our Pamphleteer from my own suggestions, or my own reasonings. I have already had occasion to refer to a document of your own day, which brings the question home to the feelings and to the conviction of every Englishman.—The English Catholic Committee in defending their conduct and their principles, against the three Vicars apostolic who officially condemned the oath, formed by the Committee out of the Protestation which these Vicars themselves had signed, declare it to be the doctrine and belief of Catholics, that the Bishop of Rome, successor of St. Peter, is the head of the Catholic church.

They prove by a reference to undeniable documents, that the doctrines set forth in their protestation, that is, the doctrines here in question, had been maintained, and still are maintained by the Church of Rome, and by some of the most eminent writers employed by the Pontiffs of Rome, and that they are declared to be articles of faith.

In

In "the modest apology for the Roman Catholics of Great-Britain," written, as I am assured by one of the ablest divines among the English Catholic clergy, we have an additional testimony, corroborating these declarations. Undeniable proofs are there produced that these tenets have been, and still are maintained by Roman Catholics—*The Pope's being head of the Catholic Church by all.*—The infallibility, the deposing power, and other doctrines alluded to in the declaration, by the whole Transalpine church, in whose doctrines the Popish clergy of Ireland, are *all* educated.

With these proofs staring him in the face, will our Pamphleteer still assert that the accusation of holding such tenets, or, as the Irish papists chuse to express it in their petition, *the imputation* of holding such tenets, is founded upon what *were* and not what *are* the tenets of the Catholic religion?

But from this authentic act of the Catholic Committee, consisting of clergy and laity, and from the testimony of a private clergyman of that communion, let me draw your attention to another still more decisive document on this most important point.—I mean the encyclical letter of these Vicars apostolic, to all the faithful in their respective districts.

The oath containing a renunciation of the tenets in question was, as I have already said, formed

formed on the protestation which these very Vicars had signed; yet in some months after, as the Committee forcibly and feelingly remonstrate, they unanimously condemn this oath as *unlawful to be taken; as containing doctrinal matter, in which the interests of the Church are concerned, and on which Bishops alone have authority to pronounce and decide, as they are by divine institution the spiritual governors in the Church.* In consequence of these observations they condemn in the fullest manner, the attempt of offering to parliament an oath including doctrinal matter to be there sanctioned, which has not been approved by them, the Vicars apostolic, and they exhort the faithful to oppose every attempt of this nature.

Now sir, how does this case stand? and how does it bear upon our present discussion? The Committee of Roman Catholics frame an oath, denying that they or the Catholics of England, hold any doctrines which can *hinder them from faithfully discharging the duties of honest men and peaceable subjects.* In their protestation, in which they had been joined by their bishops and clergy, they state what these doctrines are. They are the doctrines we are now considering. They admit that *if they did hold such unchristian-like and abominable tenets, such execrable and impious positions, the conclusions drawn from them*
by

by the Protestants against the English Roman Catholics, would be just! "They would," as they express themselves in their remonstrance to the Vicars apostolic, "*render them unworthy of civil liberty.*" They are, therefore, desirous and willing to renounce them by a solemn oath, as they had already solemnly protested against them. Yet no sooner is an oath, formed upon this protestation, proposed to be taken, than their bishops address a circular letter to all the Catholics within their respective districts, forbidding them, in virtue of that divine authority with which they have been invested by Jesus Christ himself, and under all the terrors of spiritual censures, to take this oath.

Now let us hear how the Catholic Committee remonstrate against this extraordinary and alarming conduct: "We followed the example of your lordships" say they, "in subscribing a public renunciation of the odious and pernicious doctrines, which, if we held, would render us unworthy of civil liberty and the protection of the State. The body of English Catholics concurred with us, and signed this protestation. The oath does not in any one particular essentially differ from the protestation. They form one and the same instrument. Yet, now, you condemn the oath as *unlawful*, without con-

descending

“ descending to point out what particular parts
 “ you judge to be reprehensible. You specify
 “ no reasons that make the oath *unlawful*, or an
 “ object of ecclesiastical censure; and we are
 “ lost in conjecturing why he should not give our
 “ country a solemn pledge of our principles, as
 “ men and as citizens. To refuse taking the
 “ oath, after laying the protestation before par-
 “ liament and the nation, will be received *as a*
 “ *demonstration, that Catholics in truth, give*
 “ *no security to a Protestant government.*”

In a subsequent part of this spirited and elo-
 quent remonstrance, we are further enabled to
 judge of the conduct of these vicars apostolic;
 acting by command of the see of Rome; offering
 to the papal throne the sacrifice of their own con-
 sciences, and their own principles; and exerci-
 sing their spiritual tyranny over the consciences
 and principles of the faithful:—“ The Vicars
 “ Apostolic,” says the Committee, “ being per-
 “ sonally called upon to declare, in what they
 “ thought the oath reprehensible. The Vicar of
 “ the Western district was understood to concede
 “ that it contained nothing *heretical*. This, how-
 “ ever he has since denied: but being urged to
 “ point out the passages, he declined it; and con-
 “ tented himself with *denying to the Assembly*
 “ *any right to require him to inform them of the*
 “ *parts*

“ *parts of the oath he thought censurable, or his*
 “ *reasons for thinking them so!* The Vicar
 “ Apostolic of the Middle district declared, that
 “ his objection was the alteration from the pro-
 “ testation in that clause which relates to the Pope
 “ or the Church, to interfere with the ecclesi-
 “ tical government of the country.”

What one Vicar Apostolic peremptorily re-
 fuses to explain; and the other only obscurely
 hints at, we can fully and distinctly discover in
 their encyclical address. It has been said, that
 to know the real and ultimate object of a letter,
 we must look to the postscript. In the last clause
 of this circular address their Popish Lordships
 sum up all they have advanced in an earnest ex-
 hortation to the faithful, to reject with detestation,
 “ some late publications which are schismatical,
 “ scandalous, inflammatory, *and insulting to the*
 “ *Supreme Head of the Church.*” Thus they
 disclose what was principally on their mind more
 distinctively than if they had spoken out at once.
 They refuse to explain to the Committee the te-
 nets in the oath, which they think proper to con-
 temn as unlawful, and deserving spiritual cen-
 sures. In this clause of their Encyclical Letter
 the mask drops off. They are the doctrines “ *in-*
 “ *sulting to the Supreme Head of the Church.*”
 For these they excommunicated the author of the
 “ Modest

“ Modest Apology;” and they threaten with spiritual censures, and the thunder of the Church, all who shall not renounce them.

With these proofs staring him in the face, will his Pamphleteer persist in maintaining that the accusations brought on these several heads against the Catholics, were founded upon what *were*, and not upon what *are* the tenets of the Catholic religion ?

But this is not the only point connected with our subject on which these interesting productions throw the most satisfactory light. It is not in this view alone of them, that they silence all the advocates of English popery, or shake the opinions entertained by so many sincere Protestants on the probable effects of Catholic emancipation in Ireland. Our Pamphleteer in his 84th page, gives his panacea, his infallible nostrum for the removal of every evil flowing from popish exclusion and disqualifications. “ Substitute” says he, “ a political to a religious test, and the storm of contention is hushed at once and for ever.”

The Vicars apostate do not acquire *implicit submission to their decrees, that no oath, no declaration, wherein the interest of religion are concerned, can be taken by a Catholic without the previous approbation of their bishops, more dogmatically than*
this

this lay-divine and political empiric requires the adoption of his theologo-political experiment.

But let the candid and enlightened Catholic Committee with the Rev. Mr. Berrington and Mr. Wilks at their head, answer him. The *“altering of the protestation into an oath”* they assert *“was the unanimous act of the Committee authorised by the Vicar apostolical of London. In their effects and their tendency they were nothing more than a mere profession of temporary allegiance, a solemn pledge of their principles as men and as citizens, and a renunciation of such tenets, as, if they held them, would render them unworthy of civil liberty, and the protection of the State.”* This oath they profess the whole Catholic body in England to be ready to take in the face of God and their country. The confidential servants of the crown declare themselves to be satisfied with such a test of their political principles. The happiest consequences are anticipated from having the sanction of the Legislature to this decision of the King's ministers. But this cup of joy, is, all of a sudden dashed from the hands of the Committee and of the whole Catholic laity. The Church interferes with her paramount authority she declares her will and pleasure through her divinely commissioned bishops, and the ministers

ters of the Crown and the Legislature, no less than the Committee, find all the expectations they had formed of the happiest consequences to the general interests of the empire from carrying this measure into *full* effect, blasted by the peremptory mandate of three Vicars apostolic, ordering all *faithful Catholics to oppose every attempt of this nature, and to hinder its being carried into execution.*

Was this the first time that such tyranny had been practised by the Court of Rome and its creatures? The Committee will tell us, “It is not
 “without pain and sorrow,” say they, “that we
 “recollect, that, if the Catholics of England have
 “often been oppressed and punished for a con-
 “scientious adherence to the faith of their Church,
 “they have sometimes also suffered from an im-
 “politic interference of ecclesiastical authority in
 “civil concerns.”

To support this charge, and to prove that their grief and concern are not without just cause, they proceed to mention the occasions on which the Church made them thus suffer by its rash and intemperate interference. “In the 11th year of
 “Queen Elizabeth,” say they, “Pius the Vth.
 “fulminated his famous bull *Regnans in Excelsis*;
 “in which he not only excommunicated that Prin-
 “cess, but declared her fallen from her sovereignty,
 “and

and her subjects absolved from their allegiance, “and forbad them, under pain of anathema, to obey her laws.” *Hoc fonte derivata Clades, in patriam populum que fluxit.* Here was the source of all that English Catholics have endured for so many years of disqualification and political exclusion from a penal code of laws. For “from this period,” says the Committee, “it has always been asserted that the English Catholics hold principles inconsistent with a Protestant government, and that they could never reconcile the duties which they owe to the supreme Pastor of their Church, with the duties they owe to their temporal Sovereign and fellow subjects.”

James the 1st. mild and tolerant in his principles, was willing, after the discovery of the Gunpowder Plot, to distinguish those, among his Catholic subjects who maintained principles hostile to the Civil Government of the country, from those who he had reason to think, detested and abhorred them. “With this view,” says the Committee, “he proposed an oath which he drew up himself, and in which, with the most elaborate and the nicest exactness, he separated spiritual from temporal concerns. His loyal Catholic subjects presented themselves with ardour to give this pledge of their fealty, exulting in an opportunity to reconcile at length
“ their

“ their political and religious obligations — Pius
“ the Vth. fulminated a condemnation of this oath.
“ He declared it to be inconsistent with faith and
“ hostile to salvation; another and another brief
“ succeeded, confirming the first, and Bellarmine
“ was employed to justify and support the Pope’s
“ proceeding.”

In 1548 the most respectable Noblemen and
Gentlemen of the English Catholics, subscribed
the negative of the following propositions:—

“ That the Pope or Church had power to absolve any
person or persons from their obedience to the civil
and political government established, or to be established
in this nation in civil and political affairs.

“ That by command of dispensation of the Church, it
is lawful to kill, destroy, or do any injury to any person
or persons living within the King’s dominions, because
that such a person or persons are accused, condemned,
censured, or excommunicated for error, schism or heresy.

“ That it is lawful in itself, or by dispensation from the
Pope to break promise or oath made to any of the afore-
said persons under pretext that they are heretics.”

“ But on this, say the Committee, as on every
occasion, the authority of the Court of Rome was
held out to deter the English Catholics from
thus

thus pledging their integrity as men and as citizens.’

In their Encyclical Letter the apostolic Vicars, themselves, refer to an oath proposed to be presented to parliament, which was of a similar tendency with all the others. This oath, they say, they then declared to be unlawful to be taken, and that their condemnation and declaration were confirmed by the apostolic See, and sanctioned by the Bishops of Scotland and Ireland.

To complete the series comes this oath of 1793, which, although approved of under another form by the whole body of the Catholics, clergy and laity, “ the Vicars apostolic pronounce altogether “ unlawful; and for which the Committee are “ charged by the Vicar apostolic of the Western “ district with attempting to injure Religion. And “ another Vicar apostolic talked of their infernal “ stratagems.”

If the Catholics of England are thus to be subjected to the spiritual despotism of the see of Rome, whenever the bishop of that see determines to interpose with his authority, through his Vicars apostolic, and to discountenance and frustrate their efforts to meliorate their civil condition; if they can have no settled or unalterable standard for their religious opinions, as connected with their civil duties and rights; if what their bishops and

and clergy declare one day to be doctrines of the Church on these points, is to be wantonly and capriciously retarded the next; and the most implicit submission is to be required to this charge, without any explanation, or any reason assigned; if the tests which these his Majesty's subjects are anxious to give to their Sovereign and fellow-subjects, of their entertaining no religious opinions that are dangerous to the State, are to be condemned as *unlawful*, on the ground that such tests include doctrinal matter, on which the bishops alone have authority to decide; if this enlightened body of men, the English Catholic Committee, who have nerve of soul and mind equal to assert their privileges and their consistency; and are so far Rome-proof as openly to accuse the papal See * “ of injustice and oppression in as much as
 “ while the proceedings of the prosperous Church
 “ of France, denying the Pope's *temporal power*
 “ were tolerated, the same proceedings were
 “ uniformly and severely condemned among the
 “ afflicted

* When shall we see the day when the Catholic Noblemen and Gentry of Ireland will thus shake off the ignominious trammels in which they and their ancestors have been so long bound? when they shall thus cherish the principles and speak the language of men and Christians? Then should that *accursed thing* Popery, be cast out from amongst us, and discontents and jealousies, and mutinies, and the judgments of God should no longer be known among our tents,

“ afflicted Catholics of England and Ireland;”
 if men who can appeal to the conduct of their
 ancestors even *before the Reformation*, and boast
 that “ these ancestors never ceased to maintain
 “ that the Crown of England was a sovereign,
 “ imperial, and independent crown; that the
 “ laws of England could never be altered but by
 “ the legislature of England; that all encroach-
 “ ments of foreign powers, whether civil or *eccle-*
 “ *siastical*, ought to be resisted, and consequently
 “ that the spiritual authority acknowledged by
 “ Catholics to reside in the church, could not
 “ affect nor interfere with the prerogatives of the
 “ crown, or the personal rights of the subject.”
 If in England, I say, and with these unanimous
 declarations from the delegates of the whole body
 lay and clerical, a mandate from the court of
 Rome shall, as on every similar occasion in for-
 mer days, despotically interfere, and through any
 number of bishops, appointed by that court, shall
 require the faithful to renounce doctrines and
 opinions, which these bishops had themselves
 countenanced them in professing to be the doc-
 trines of the church, and thus confirm the doubts
 and suspicions of their Protestant subjects “ that
 “ Catholics cannot in truth, ever give security to
 “ a Protestant government,” how is it to be in
 Ireland, how is it to be with a Catholic laity, who
 have

have no other religion but that of their priests? The very leading man of whom, and who must be supposed to be one of the most enlightened*, declares that he must leave it to the heads of his church to settle the points that are imputed to them, as hostile to the government of this country; who if they refer to the example of their ancestors, and search their history, will find nothing but a series of degrading instances of the blindest submission, to all the usurpations spiritual and temporal of the Papal Court, and of an abject surrender of their reason and their conscience to its missionaries, transmitted from generation to generation, beyond the example of any other people within the Christian common-wealth? What must it be with a body of bishops appointed, and educated as the bishops of Ireland are, and exercising the most despotic spiritual tyranny over their votaries, that ever disgraced the darkest ages of the church, so as to exact even adoration from them, and a bended knee whenever they meet them in the roads or public streets? What must it be with a clergy, paying implicit obedience to these their spiritual superiors; imbibing all their theological opinions

G

and

* Lord Fingal in his Letters to Lord Redesdale.

and doctrines of faith from the Transalpine schools, such as they are described to us by Dr. Geddes, and delivering and expounding from the confessional tripod, or from the altar, the infallible oracles of the Roman church.

The whole tribe of lay-advocates, employed in the defence of Popery, amuse us with references to the Catholic clergy in other countries, where the national church has triumphantly resisted all the civil, and many of the ecclesiastical encroachments of the see of Rome. They talk to us of the liberties of the Gallican church. They direct our attention to the "*antipapistical Sorbonist*," "stemming the tide of Transalpine doctrines," says Geddes, "as often as the papal workmen directed its course to Gaul. But, alas! how are we benefited by the Gallican church, or by its liberties? We have only to do with the popish clergy of Ireland, as forming the popish church of Ireland; and to the missionaries of Rome in the heart of our country. The question with us is, do *they* resist the tide of Transalpine doctrines, that from the legendary days of St. Patrick, broke in upon this land of saints, and swept before it the primitive Christian clergy established there, and all genuine Christianity, with its primitive faith, its primitive principles, its primitive morals, and with them the peace it ensures.

I have

I have been assured from indisputable authority, that even the priests, have had their theological education in France, and might have breathed the air of this Gallican liberty, were carefully immured in colleges and seminaries of their own national foundation, where not a ray even of the light that shone on the Gallican church was suffered to penetrate: Where the course of theology had never admitted the least change from our Pamphleteer's "days of dark" and gloomy prejudices, learned only in the "cumbrous trash of metaphysical theology." I have been, indeed, told that some of their *best subjects* as they call them, frequented the schools of the Sorbonne to qualify themselves for divinity degrees: But at the threshold of their own college, they shook off the dust of these schools from their feet. By their own internal professors no lectures were ever delivered but in the spirit and letter of genuine unmixed Popery. The very ceremonies they practised, were not those of the Gallican, but of the Roman church. Their missal was the Roman missal. Their breviary was not the breviary as purged by the Gallican church; that they considered as little better than heretical: It was the Roman breviary; and four times a day they were bound in the most awful obligation, to store their minds with all "the
 e 2 " wretched

“wretched trash of that wretched compilation,” as the author of the modest apology does not hesitate to call it.

What pledge have they given that the Popish groves of Lombard and Douay, and the Propaganda, in which they thus sought the truths of Rome,* have not been transplanted to Maynooth? What protestation have they signed in conjunction with their disciples, and with the *faithful*, that can give an assurance that they have renounced for themselves; and that their professors no longer teach to their theological students, or enjoin them when the “go out on the mission,” to inculcate to the people those doctrines which the Catholic Committee of England, lay and clerical, declare to be hostile to Society and Government; to the Constitution and laws of the British empire; to the State, and settlements of the Crown?

Their laity came before Parliament, and ostentatiously appeal to oaths which they pretend to have taken, renouncing and abjuring some of the doctrines contained in the Protestation of the English Catholics. But, have any of their archbishops, or bishops, or mitred abbots, or clergy, or friars, black, white, or grey, signed this petition? Where is *their Protestation*? By what record

* Inter silvas academi quaerere verum.

record in the possession of Government, or of Parliament, or promulged to the United Kingdom, have they, in imitation of their brethren in England, declared what our Pamphleteer asserts for them; that these doctrines were the doctrines of the Church of Rome, but that they are no longer the doctrines what they maintain, or inculcate to his Majesty's Catholic subjects?

Does the respected Nobleman, whose absence from his Majesty's Councils at such a crisis as this in which we are engaged, you and I and every real friend of the country, deeply regret; and who, I am persuaded, from the best motives, has undertaken to bring the Popish Petition into the House of Lords. Does he think the question is as yet ripe for discussion? Have the wise precautions taken by the Ministry, with whom he acted on the application to the Catholics of England for the removal of some of their disqualifications, been stipulated and observed on this occasion? Has it been required of the clergy of Ireland to communicate in the same cup of loyalty with the laity, as the English clergy did, and that jointly, and at the same altars, they should give their country a solemn pledge of their principles as men and as citizens?

If, with the protestation of the English Catholics, subscribed by six bishops, and more than two hundred

hundred of the clergy, as well as by all the laity of any consequence in the kingdom, and laid before Parliament, and the nation, as the authentic act of the whole Catholic body, a mandate, issued clandestinely from the Court of Rome, to these very subscribing bishops is “to give a demonstration that Catholics cannot in truth ever give security to a Protestant Government, does his Lordship feel satisfied in being the instrument of laying before Parliament, and supporting by his great talents, and his still greater character as a safe ground to proceed on, a renunciation of what he is told from such authority, are *doctrinal matters*, on which “the bishops alone can decide; and on which “*the opinion of the lowest priest in the Church* is declared “*to be preferable* to that of the most unlearned of the laity*,” without a single signature of any bishop, or priest of the Hiberno-papistical hierachy.

The Committee of English catholics complain that to support the Vicars apostolic in their demand of *implicit submission* to their decree “that no oath, no declaration wherein the interests of religion are concerned (alluding to and condemning the oath that renounces the doctrines renounced by the Irish oath)” can be taken by Catholics without

* See the address of the Catholic committee to the Vicars apostolic.

out the previous approbation of their respective bishops, does the noble Lord feel satisfied in calling upon Parliament to receive with the fullest confidence, and to give implicit credit to declarations unsanctioned and unapproved by a single bishop? Will he venture on the strength of these declarations, to change the fundamental laws of the Empire, and try an experiment from which the wisdom of all past times have shrunk.

Will his Lordship stake his credit with the people of England that, at the mandate of the Papal Court, enslaved as it is, and coerced by the tyrant who has sworn our destruction, and who looks to Ireland as the part where he is to give the mortal blow, the Irish Bishops will not by their pastoral instructions, and their directions to their Clergy declare the oaths, on the credit and strength of which the Popish Petitioners urge their pretensions; to be *unlawful*? That they shall not represent them as containing *doctrinal matters*, on which the laity were incompetent to decide; and that being *unlawful*, and contrary to the true faith, they are not binding upon the faithful; they absolve the faithful from their obligations.

But it is said in the Petition "The sacrifices
 " which the Catholics of Ireland have so long
 " made, and still make rather than violate their
 " consciences by taking oaths contrary to their
 " belief,

“ belief, are decisive proofs of their profound and
 “ scrupulous reverence for the sacred obligations
 “ of an oath.”

Here, again, let the documents from the proceedings of the Catholic Committee elucidate this point. “ In the face of GOD,” say they, “ and the nation the four Vicars apostolic (the ink scarcely dried with which they signed their names) “ con-
 “ demn us, and threaten us with spiritual censures
 “ for calling GOD to witness a repetition of four
 “ signatures.” What will our Pamphleteer say to this? Here is a living instance to prove, that where the authority of the See of Rome interferes, no pledge, however sacred in the estimation of all other Christians, can be relied on from Papists. For none of their casuists will dare to maintain, at least publicly, that in every moral and religious light the signature of that Protestation, laid with such solemnity before Parliament, and the nation, is not as binding as the proposed oath could. Those enlightened Catholics, clergy and laity, who protested against the Encyclical Letter felt it to be so.

I confess that I once thought it unreasonable and unchristian not to give credit to the Catholics, who were not only willing to take, but had actually taken oaths renouncing these doctrines. I thought it hard dealing, not to be satisfied with
 such

such pledges from them as men and subjects. But I should be blinded with more than their own prejudices, if with such a recent document before me, and with this breathing proof, I should not be shaken in my opinion. This encyclical letter throws me into a boundless sea of uncertainties and doubts, and suspicions, without a light to look to; without a compass to steer by. It is indeed, a momentous document.

Besides this, I have been led, by the very particular manner in which the Petitioner's allude to the oaths that are held so sacred by Catholics, and which they make so many sacrifices rather than violate their consciences by taking them while they scruple not, they say, to take the other oaths, to look more minutely into the nature of them. The result has been that I do not think that volumes of writing could more clearly elucidate the point at issue, than the tendency of these oaths, or more satisfactorily account for the difference that is made between them, and the oaths contained in the petition.

For what are these oaths? They are the oaths that deny the Pope's supremacy, and translation. In other words, the oaths that affect the very essence of popery, and the doctrines in which alone with that of purgatory, I may say it exists. Deny them, and the papal throne is fundamentally subverted,

verted. The whole fabric of its superstructure is, at once laid in the dust. All the other doctrines may be modified, and explained away, and accommodated to times, places, and circumstances. But these are as immoveable as the chair of St. Peter. They are the mysterious contents of the sacred ark, on which whoever lays his hand must perish. I can, therefore, easily conceive why indulgencies and dispensations, and absolutions for the renunciation of all other doctrines, may cost the Papal Court nothing to grant ; but that to renounce these, let me apply the words with reverence is the sin against the Holy Ghost, for which there is no forgiveness either in this world, or in the next.

Another consideration that has made a deep impression on my mind with regard to this supposed reverence for an oath, is a reference to the history of our Pamphleteer's *Irish people*, and to their character at this day. The observation made by Sir John Davis in his time of the Irish, being so little altered from the description given of them by Giraldus Cambreasis in the days of Henry II. It is equally applicable to this people at this very hour, particularly when we look to them in the lower classes. How often have they taken the most solemn oaths, and given the most solemn

solemn pledges to the Legislature and the Government, and broken them? How often both before both the Reformation and subsequent to it? What page of their history can you open without finding instances of the facility with which they enter into these solemn engagements and fly from them? At this very hour that I am writing, follow the judges through their circuits, and enter the courts of law, you will find so many instances of perjury as to be convinced, that perjury is amongst them, a national sin. I do not apply this to their gentry. God forbid! I am speaking principally of our Author's *Irish people*, the abject slaves of their priests in every thing that concerns religion. How can the British legislature or the British nation rely on the oaths of such men, when they have an instance upon record, even of a King of their own, educated in the same religious doctrines, violating his solemn declaration from the throne, when it was supposed to militate against the interests of his religion. "We have the word of the King," said they, "a word never yet broken." James broke it.—The religion of James broke it; that religion that is ever the same at all times, and in all places, and under all circumstances; that religion

ligion that continues, unaltered, and unmixed, the religion of the Irish papist*.

But I will suppose that the most implicit reliance may be placed on the inviolability of these oaths. I will suppose that the popish petitioners are deserving of all credit, in that, and every other assurance and assumption, and representation, contained in their petition, still I could venture to ask the noble Lord I have already alluded to, what good it is likely to answer; what temporary advantage even, it is likely to secure, to shake one of the main pillars of our constitution, by granting the demands of these petitioners, and to innovate on a system, in which our ancestors laid the foundation of a series of blessings, and a course of prosperity, unexampled in modern days? To what will it lead us to untread their steps? What end is it to answer to force our beloved King to venture on paths that led the unhappy monarch, that last seduced into them, to his destruction."

With

* I have seen it pleaded in some newspaper, that reason why the Catholic clergy have not signed the Petition is "that they never meddle in politics." Worthy men! But while the Catholic laity of England assert that the Protestation which they signed, and the oath they offer to take, have a reference to mere political objects, the Vicars apostolic assert that they contain *doctrinal matter*, on which none but the bishops can decide or give satisfaction. The oaths contained in the petition, are in substance the same with that protestation and that oath.

With all that noble Lord's official experience, and his intimate knowledge of the events that took place in Ireland during his own administration, is he to be told that the mass of disaffection to which the separatists, and the associates of the Irish traitors in France look for co-operation, and that inspires the French tyrant with the only rational hope he can entertain in his scheme of invasion is, as well in its leaders as in their instruments, totally uninfluenced by this question of Emancipation? They will use it for their horn of sedition, as in the beginnings of the late Rebellion; but the noble Lord must know, that if the measure were adopted to the extent of all that the popish Petition demands, the forces of the United Irish would not be diminished by it. Composed, chiefly of those classes, upon whom the disabilities and disqualifications complained of, "impose no "privation," to borrow Mr. M'Kenna's language, "and who have no sympathy with the parties "affected by them," they would look to their old leaders; they would cleave to their own cause; and all that the chief conspirators would have to regret would be, that they might not for some time, perhaps, look for any extensive co-operation from the party that first awakened their hopes, and forwarded them so rapidly towards the objects they had, and still have, ultimately, in
view

view. Effectual to irritate and inflame, impotent to appease or conciliate, the Question may be debated, the measure conceded on any other ground, or with any other view than that, of lessening the dangers that threaten the empire from the spirit of the late Rebellion outliving its temporary defeat. For will the petitioning Papists themselves, that is, will that faction,* which has so long agitated and convulsed the Catholic body, rest satisfied with the concessions they now demand? What have all the concessions hitherto granted them produced, but discontents and murmurings, and menaces, and invectives, all encouraged by the very removal of former restraints, that rendered it dangerous for them to disturb the public tranquillity, under the lash of the penal laws, and encreasing in proportion to the willingness of the Irish parliament to co-operate with His Majesty in “enacting the laws for meliorating their condition, that have been passed during his paternal reign.” Have not their demands kept exact pace with the difficulties of the government? And what but the circumstances
of

* I beg clearly to be understood that in this appellation I do not include the petitioning Peers, or some few respectable names which I find among the Petitioners. I very much regret seeing them in such bad company.

of the empire, has encouraged them to adopt that tone of menace, that has been assumed by all their writers and advocates, and which they could not soften down even in their Petition to the United Parliament.

It is an indisputable fact, that while the popery laws remained in force, the great body of the Papists of Ireland were generally amenable to the laws, and universally submissive to the government. From the instant that the first act passed to mitigate the code, they became, through the restless machinations of their seditious agitators, discontented, clamorous, mutinous, and importunate. Every accession of security and consequence they acquired, served only to encourage these agitators to strain forward the more resolutely to the point from whence they could *extort** what they could not acquire by *negociation*. When the concessions were greatest, the *manner* of granting them was made a matter of fresh complaint. The value of the concession was carefully kept out of view; and the passions of the people were kept in a continual fret by declamations against the want of *grace* or *temper* in *yielding to the exigency*.† The parliament dared to deliberate before they conceded. They
proceeded

* See Mr. M'Kenna's last Pamphlet.

† Ditto.

proceeded gradually in the work of relaxation. This, Mr. M'Kenna assigns, as one great cause of discontent: "what would be received," says he, "as a boon at one period, was, when granted, not received as such, or as any act of kindness on the part of the Government, for the public mind had already passed to other expectations."

Thus every thing must bend to this faction. Not only the fundamental laws of the empire must be changed for them, but we must consult their humours, their passions, their prejudices. The King is to have no servant who has the misfortune to displease them*. Lord Redesdale must not remain chancellor of Ireland: Lord Camden must be for ever excluded from the King's councils. The former dared to express an opinion, agreeing with the declarations of the English Catholic Committee and Doctor Geddes, that Papists maintain some doctrines hostile to "the civil power, and to the state, and to the settlement of the crown." The other had the cruelty to adopt a measure that broke and disconcerted at once the plans of the rebel leaders; that brought the conspiracy to full light before it was ripe for action, or could obtain assistance from

* Vide Plowden, and the Author of the Thoughts on Protestant Ascendancy.

from France, and that in its final consequences crushed the Rebellion.

This insolent and over-bearing spirit; these claims growing incessantly out of concession; the Rebellion, to which the ferment they raised, paved the way; the present attempts to turn the public distresses to account, and from the dangers to which the empire is exposed, to work out their own distinct interests; an allegiance that must be bought at any price they chuse to demand for it, and the alternative of being either bullied into acquiescence with their extortions, or seeing such a scene opened by them as must "animate the hopes of the enemies of the British empire,* and encourage them to attempt the subjugation of Ireland which they meditate;" these are the claims this faction have to advance—these are the recommendations they bring with them to induce the legislature to admit them into a participation of power, denied to all other dissenters from the religion of the State. Already in possession of privileges withheld from the Catholics of England, who have no insurrections, no rebellions to plead, no flags of sedition to display, no menaces to throw out of joining the standard of our inveterate enemies,

H

and

* Vide the Petition.

and who bound the very utmost of their wishes to a similarity of treatment with the Protestant dissenters, this faction sets no value on any concessions that do not raise them above the level of these Protestant dissenters. They disdain to be put on a footing with this class of the King's subjects, all untainted as they are with that foul superstition, the last desperate struggles of which against freedom they united in crushing at the Revolution, and against which, we still look confidently for their support, should that superstition again make common cause with a French Tyrant, or effect its menace of encouraging his fleets and armies to visit our coast.

I have trespassed greatly on your time, and many pages of falshood and misrepresentation yet remain to be exposed in the Pamphlet, on which you desired to have my opinion. But it would be disgusting to return to them. *Qualis ab incepto.* They end only with his periods, and to the last line of his appendix, he preserves a consistency that proves his fitness for the task he undertook. Leaving it, therefore to your own judgment, to estimate what remains unnoticed in this Pamphlet, I shall only beg your attention to a few additional observations.

When I look to the Popish Petition, when I consider the period at which it is brought forward,

forward, and the various circumstances connected with it, I see the prevalence of two factions, that, with views finally opposite, join in effecting one common object. Of the separatists, who either avowedly, or under the name of anti-unionists, labour to dissolve all connexion between the two countries, and to establish an independent Republic or Monarchy united with France, it is unnecessary to make any observation. The danger from them is obvious. On the popish faction I have to observe, that in whatever view the Petition they have forced forward may be considered, they will be deceived who consider it in any other light than that of a contest for power. A contest that will only be fed by concession, and that will never end as long there is any thing to be demanded on one side, or conceded on the other.

Of the genius of this faction we may truly say, *Nil actum reputans, si quid superesset agendum.* They will never be satisfied until they establish a Catholic ascendancy, on the ruins of Protestant ascendancy; until the palladium of our liberties, and of our Constitution, *the price of the purest blood* of both countries, shall be taken out of the hands to which our ancestors committed the custody of it, and delivered up to those who, as well at the time of its first consecration, as in every subsequent period, all the dangers it has
 been

been exposed to, have proceeded as from the womb of the Trojan horse. To set their pretensions at rest, you must sacrifice to them* Church and State, the mitre and the throne.

It is the principle of being admitted to political power to as full an extent as the Protestants of the United kingdom are admissible. Give a legislative sanction to this principle, and it appears, to me that you virtually repeal the Statutes of the 1st of W. and M. and the 12th, 13th W. 3.

In their Petition, they leave no doubt on this subject. For there they give you to know the offices to which they claim to be admitted. Offices that are immediate emanations from the executive; that are the executive itself. The sheriff, executing the most appropriate and peculiar functions of the King. The office of Lord High Chancellor, the Keeper of the King's conscience, the guardian of his seals, by which he certifies his will and pleasure in all the higher matters of state. The Judges, who are the mirrors, says Blackstone, by which the King's image is reflected

* They say they have no intention to claim the Church. But what if circumstances should encourage them to claim it. There is not a principle on which you are told you ought to concede them the things they do claim, that will not apply to the Church Establishment. Your only security, therefore, is the assurance given in the Petition, that they do not now seek, or wish to injure or encroach upon, the privileges or possessions of the United Church.

flected in his Courts. The Attorney and Solicitor General, prosecuting as in his person for all public offences and breaches of the peace, he being the person injured in the eye of the law. These are the offices they claim, and to which they desire to be rendered admissible in the same manner that all Protestants are admissible.

Are you then prepared to cancel the Bill of Rights? To repeal the Acts of Settlement, and limitation of the Crown? To force your King to violate the coronation oath prescribed to him by the legislature? To offer up on the altar of popery as a sacrifice to appease the resentments, satisfy the ambition, and minister to the pride of a small popish junto, Mr. McKenna says, “but a couple of dozen at most,” that constitution, which having secured it for themselves, at all hazards, your ancestors gloried in transmitting to their descendants as an eternal inheritance?

But what will be the answer to their petition? The glorious answer of your ancestors, resisting papal usurpation? *Nolumus leges Angliæ mutari*. But what will be the consequences of a rejection of their claims? What the alternative? Nothing worse than what was offered to our ancestors at the Revolution: To maintain our liberties, or to perish in the last dike of the Constitution.

These

These may be impassioned suggestions. They may be the reflections of a mind agitated and alarmed; full of grief and abhorrence at scenes past, full of apprehension for the future. But within the walls of both your Houses of Parliament all such suggestions, all such reflections whencesoever they proceed, will be weighed with that calmness and coolness of deliberation, and that abstraction from every other consideration but the general welfare of the Empire, that the importance of the discussion so imperiously demands.

That GOD who has so signally favoured the pure portion of the Church of his blessed Son established in these realms, supported and supporting by that Constitution, the blessings of which we have enjoyed under his divine protection, will, I trust, still graciously watch over his own work. He will direct your councils, as he directed those of your ancestors, and work out the same deliverance for us and our children, which he wrought for our fathers, when their religion was exposed to greater difficulties, and greater dangers than it has now to dread.

POSTSCRIPT.

POSTSCRIPT.

ON reading over the whole of this Letter, there are some points on which I might be misunderstood. There is nothing further from my thoughts than to fix any general suspicion of disloyalty on the Roman Catholic Bishops and Clergy of Ireland. It would be unjust. It would be contrary to my own experience and my own conviction. They have had their Murphys and their Roches, they have their Coppingers and their O'Neils; but they have their Moylans, and many others of less celebrity, but equal worth and merit.

What I dread most is the education they receive; these "Tramontane principles" they imbibe that in the opinion of other Catholics, are so hostile to the Constitution and Government under which they live, and their being not only indebted for the situations in which they are placed, but strictly accountable for the discharge of the duties connected with those situations, to a foreign power, compelled at this moment to pay the most abject submission to every mandate from the Tyrant who breathes nothing but destruction to this country.

Mr.

Mr. Theobald M'Kenna is pleased to call the distinction between Papist and Catholic a fancy; a pure chimera. He so habitually wanders through the regions of fancy, and is so fond of amusing the Public with the dreams of his imagination, that there cannot be better authority on such a subject. But Lord Somers, who is not quite so fanciful a lawyer, saw the distinction and accurately defined it.—“ Those who adhere simply,” says this enlightened Statesman, “ to the Church of Rome, are good Catholics; those who adhere to the Court of Rome are *Papists*; enemies and traitors to the Realm of England, and utterly unfit for any trust in any Protestant country.”

But I will tell Mr. M'Kenna where he can see this Bi-form Being in actual, palpable existence. He may see it for half-a-crown, in what, I believe, the Catholics of England call the Blue-Book, he will see the manly, dignified *Catholic* Christian protest, the *formosa superne*, having the respectable names of a Stourton, a Peters, a Throckmorton, a Birrington, a Wilks, and the *turpiter desinens* of the Encyclical Letter, with the barbarous appellations of *Ramatan*, *Acaenthan*, and *Centurian*.

No less just than wise would it be for the administration to turn their thoughts a little more to that very important class of men, the Catholic Clergy of Ireland. Just and wise would it be in them, to make them a liberal establishment. I cannot believe a report that has been conveyed to me, that they would themselves decline it.

That

That, indeed, would be an alarming symptom ; a proof of determined alienation, and a rooted aversion to all approximation with the Government of the country, that would leave very little hope of its ever enjoying internal peace.

I have, in the course of this Letter, so frequently distinguished the noblemen, and some of the principal gentry who signed the Petition, from others with whom they have been prevailed to associate in the present attempt upon the Legislature, and separated the Popish faction, that desperately grasps at power, while it is indifferent by what instruments it can seize it ; whether by a British Parliament, or a French force, from the landed, farming and trading classes of the Irish Catholics, who wish only for peace, and to be suffered quietly to enjoy the privileges they have been admitted to, that I cannot dread any misconception on that head.

Upon the whole, as I “ have extenuated nothing,” so am I not conscious to myself of having “ set down aught in malice.”

FINIS.

