



# 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.

**Letters  
addressed to  
Lord Grenville  
and Lord  
Howick, ...**

**Edward Cooke**



---

T. Gillet, Printer, Wild-Court, Lincoln's Inn Fields.

## P R E F A C E.

---

**THESE** Letters, having attracted general attention, upon their successive appearances in the **Morning Post**, are now collected and republished, from the same motive with which they were originally written, an ardent and zealous desire to vindicate His Majesty against the false insinuations, which had been circulated respecting the cause of the removal of His late Ministers from His service, and to prove to a loyal and attached nation, that, under circumstances, publicly, the most critical, and personally, the most trying, His Majesty has, with firmness and dignity, asserted the just rights of his crown, and protected those establishments which are the foundation and the safeguard of the Constitutional Liberties of His People.



# LETTERS, &c.

---

## LETTER I.

TO LORD GRENVILLE AND LORD HOWICK.

MY LORDS,

YOU stand arraigned before the British Nation, for having brought forward in Parliament a Bill, for the entire and complete abolition of the Test Laws with regard to the Army and Navy, and for having brought forward that Bill under colour of the Royal approbation and consent, which consent and approbation you had not received.

2. That, upon His Majesty's signification of His Royal displeasure at this conduct, you and your Colleagues have consented to withdraw the Bill, but that you have, at the same time, insisted upon reserving to yourselves and your Colleagues, a discretionary right of bringing forward the same subject at a future period; and also a discretionary right to support the claims of the Catholic Petition by your speeches and votes, which Petition claims the repeal of the Act of Supremacy, and of the Test Laws in all cases whatsoever.

3. That by adopting this line of conduct, you and your Colleagues have imposed upon His MAJESTY the absolute necessity of dismissing His Ministers under the present critical circumstances of Europe, or of reducing Himself to the unfortunate state of humiliation, either to appear to His Protestant subjects that He acquiesced in the principle of surrendering the Test Laws, contrary to His conscience and repeated declaration, or that He is obliged to retain a set of ministers in His service, who claim the right of disseminating and maintaining principles, and of countenancing and abetting measures, which His MAJESTY feels to be violations of His conscience, repugnant to His Coronation Oath, and subversive of His title to the throne.

These are the charges for which you are arraigned. It is no light charge against any set of men, that in times of difficulty they endeavour to make an appeal against their Sovereign to the nation, and to set up the Sovereign's conduct for personal investigation and trial at the public bar of the empire. It is, however, the line your Lordships have taken; it is an investigation you have wantonly and insultingly forced; and I trust, as the nation is reluctantly compelled to a decision, they will not shrink from a duty to which they are so improperly called.

There are two principles upon which, it is said, your Lordships may risk your defence. 1st. Your oaths, as Privy Counsellors, to give the best advice in your power to the Sovereign. 2d. Your rights, as Members of Parliament, to bring forward what measures you please.

The last excuse I admit to the fullest extent, provided you act in the simple capacity, and with the simple authority of Members of Parliament, and do not clothe your conduct with the assumed influence of Ministerial, or, in other words, of Royal Authority.

The first excuse I also admit in the fullest extent, provided, upon your receiving the disapprobation of your Sovereign, you either acquiesce in that disapprobation as satisfactory, or provided, upon considering it dissatisfactory, you retire from the Royal service.

Those circumstances of your conduct, therefore, which are limited within these provisions, no man can ever blame, nor can the Sovereign censure. But I beg leave to state, that your conduct on the present occasion does not fall within these limits, and that it cannot be justified upon either of the principles I have stated. You have acted not as mere Members of Parliament, but as Ministers; and secondly, having proposed a measure obnoxious to the Sovereign, you have not receded from His service upon His disapprobation, and proposed it to Parliament as simple Members of the Legislature; but you have adopted a line of conduct essentially different, and which neither your duty as Members of the Legislature, nor as Members of the Privy Council, can by any construction authorise or excuse.

I take it for a principle acknowledged and established, that whenever a Minister brings forward, as *Minister*, any measure for the adoption of Parliament, he brings it forward under the supposed and admitted sanction of the Royal pleasure. Ministers are by the Constitution the KING's servants (the very words I have used are synonymous); from the very necessity of the thing it must always be presumed, that wherever the Minister acts, he acts by the approbation of his Master or Sovereign, for wherever he appears in his official capacity, he is clothed with the influence, power, and authority, of his SOVEREIGN, and every thing he proposes or insists upon, comes recommended by the supposed concomitance of the Royal approbation. It inevitably follows from these considerations, that whenever a Minister introduces a measure into Parliament, which is repugnant to the Royal feelings, and does not, upon proposing it, make that repugnancy understood, he betrays his duty to the Crown and the Parliament. In the first place, he insults his SOVEREIGN by obtruding a measure under the colour of His authority, for which authority he has no warrant; and in the second place, he deceives the Parliament, by making them believe, that the measure is sanctioned by the SOVEREIGN, when in reality He condemns it.



Such conduct is evidently contrary to the principles of common sense, and every idea of the British Constitution. The very possibility that a Minister could with propriety act with his Sovereign's authority, not only without receiving that authority, but after an express refusal of it, annihilates, upon the very face of the statement, the essential character of an Independent Sovereign. From the moment that the position is laid down and adopted, that Ministers can act with sovereign authority against the will of the Sovereign, from that moment the Monarchy is in fact at an end; the King is reduced to a phantom, a pageant, a cypher; he is a King of Mahrattas, not a King of England.

When I have so broadly stated, that it is the acknowledged principle of the British Constitution, to consider that every measure brought forward by a Minister in Parliament has received the previous sanction of the Sovereign, it was hardly necessary to state the policy of this principle; since it is notorious that its great object is to prevent the use of the Royal negative, and to obviate the dangers which might arise by the exercise of this prerogative after any measures shall have received the sanction of the two Houses of Parliament. To prevent these dangers, and the collisions which might arise between the different branches of the Legislature, Ministers are not Commissioners to attend Parliament, but are actual Members of both Houses of Parliament, and chiefly originate all the measures in which the Crown and Government are concerned. The sanction of the Crown being thus in effect and substance, though not formally, given, to every measure which the Crown wishes to carry, there is little likelihood in general of the Royal Dissent being necessary: and when in any extraordinary case the wishes of the Crown fail of success in Parliament, and the sentiments of the Legislature, adverse to the Crown, prevail, the ultimate concession of the Crown becomes nearly unavoidable: because, after the King's Ministers are defeated, and the Parliament is pledged, the Crown is left with little resource.

I now come to the last and main point of the charges against you, viz. your consent to withdraw your measure, upon this sole condition, that you may, should you judge it necessary, bring it forward again, and that you shall be at liberty to speak and vote in favour of the Catholic Petition.

I have admitted, and again admit, the duty arising from the Privy Counsellor's oath, which is, to give the best advice to the KING; but the inference I draw is this, that if the advice be rejected, the Ministers should, if the point be of importance, resign: but the inference your Lordships endeavour to establish, is of a far different nature. Your Lordships insist, that you act up to your duty, provided you obey the KING's pleasure on the instant, yet stipulating for permission to disobey Him on the first occasion you can make favourable.



This stipulation is, I conceive, an insult upon the understanding and authority of the Monarch: for I must reduce your Lordships to this dilemma; either you mean to make use of this stipulation, in order to carry hereafter the disputed measure, or you do not. If you do not, the demand of the stipulation is a mere unqualified, useless insult. If you do, does it not follow, that you intend to make use of all the influence and all the authority of your situations, that is, of the Royal influence and the Royal authority, to effect your object on a future occasion? and, otherwise, you could not be sincere. Your stipulation therefore with your Sovereign is this: The King, having objected to a measure you have proposed, and having determined to resist it with his constitutional energies, you insist that he should retain you in his service, and at the same time allow you to use all His power, all His prerogatives, in order to defeat His wishes, and to overturn His decisions, as soon as you are enabled. I suggest to your Lordships, as men of feeling and honour, whether a proposition more insulting or degrading could be proposed, and which could possibly place your Royal Master in a more contemptible and humiliating situation?

I here reason abstractedly, and upon an abstract case, but if my reasoning be unanswerable, as it applies generally, what must be its effects, when applied to the case at issue, which is nothing less than the Independence and Supremacy of the Crown, the preservation of the guards for the Protestant Religion, the Title of the Crown, and the Coronation Oath? If the Sovereign be really persuaded that the measures your Lordships have proposed entrench upon these fundamental points, would not His Majesty abandon his duty to His People and to His Family, and would he not be a traitor to His own conscience, if He should suffer men to be armed with His influence and authority, in order to effect these measures, which, without that influence and authority, they could never hope to effect. The stipulation, therefore, which you have required from your Sovereign, as it would be dishonourable in him to concede, it is insulting in your Lordships to demand. It is in effect merely to remove, for the moment, the fatal instrument from the bosom of the Sovereign, in order to keep it perpetually suspended over his head: it is demanding the Royal Power, in order to defeat the Royal Will: it is claiming the confidence of the Sovereign, in order to betray it: it is extorting the means for forcing the Royal Conscience, because the King has refused to surrender it: it is a direct attack upon the Sovereign's Independence by his Ministers: and if His Majesty were to concede to the demand, it would be a virtual surrender of the Crown; and whatever George the Third might remain *de jure*, Lord Grenville and Lord Howick would be *Kings de facto*.

I shall state to your Lordships, in a future Letter, the extent of the demand you have made upon your Sovereign, in most of its leading details. I am, &c.

A PROTESTANT.

## LETTER II.

TO LORD GRENVILLE AND LORD HOWICK.

MY LORDS,

I find your Lordships' writers are making other grounds of defence for your conduct than those which I supposed in my former Letter. We are now told that the King had required of you a renunciation, under your hands, of your political principles, and demanded an assurance from you, which exacted the surrender of your duties as his Ministers; and that His Majesty having thus imposed upon you these unprecedented conditions, you had refused to subscribe to an abdication of your duty, and had left His Majesty to take such measures as he should think right, since, after such a conduct, you were determined not to resign.

Such is the Defence which your Literary Supporters have published, with the addition of high encomiums upon the dignity and independency of your conduct.

If you really wish to merit from the nation the fulsome praises these venal Encomiasts shed upon you, is it not astonishing that you should permit them to circulate such a scandalous misrepresentation?

I ask then this question, and call upon your Lordships to answer it in the face of the Nation and the Parliament. Who made the first attempt to exact conditions, to extort terms? Was it His Majesty from his Ministers, or his Ministers from His Majesty?—Whatever reply your Lordships may venture to make, I have no hesitation to state to the Public, that it was your Lordships who stepped forward without provocation, without necessity, with attempts to degrade the character, and force the conscience of your Sovereign, and to impose upon Him conditions which no Ministers ever before ventured to impose upon their Royal Master.

I state, my Lords, *without hazard of contradiction*, that after much discussion with your Sovereign upon the subject of the Catholic Bill, you admitted that you had misunderstood the nature and the extent of the concession which his Majesty had made upon the question; that you found the altering your Bill, to bring it within the limits of His Majesty's concession, would not make it effectual to your views of the subject; and that you would therefore urge it no further, but withdraw it.

But mark this, my Lords,—“ You trusted that His Majesty would see the **INDISPENSABLE NECESSITY** of your expressing, on withdrawing the Bill, the strong persuasion you felt of the benefits which would result from a different course of policy to the Catholics of Ireland;” and you further stated, “ that it

“ WAS INDISPENSABLE TO YOUR CHARACTERS, that you should  
 “ openly avow these sentiments, not only on the present occa-  
 “ sion, but in the event of the Catholic Petition coming for-  
 “ wards :” and you further insisted, “ that your present defer-  
 “ ence to His Majesty might not be understood as restraining you  
 “ from submitting, from time to time, such measures as circum-  
 “ stances might require respecting the state of Ireland.”

I further state, that this insulting demand, thus conveyed in the affronting tone of dictatorial superiority, was signed by seven Members of His Majesty's Cabinet, and delivered to His Majesty, as a Cabinet Minute, on the 15th of March.

I further state, that you made this insulting demand upon your Royal Master and Sovereign, previous to His making any requisition upon His Ministers, or signifying to them His pleasure, that they should consider themselves as limited or restricted in any degree with respect to the counsels they might think right to suggest to Him.

If there has been any requisition of any kind whatsoever, tending to restrict or confine the intentions and operations of your Cabinet, I state, in the broadest and most unequivocal manner, that this requisition has been forced and extorted by your Lordships' endeavours to usurp upon the Royal authority; to expose your Sovereign to the odium of a part of his people; to represent yourselves as the only patriots, at the expence of your Sovereign's character: by your wish to prove, that your Sovereign was a slave to prejudices, which you rejected and despised, as antiquated and contemptible; and that you had a right to call on the nation, in the situation of His Majesty's Ministers, to give their countenance and support to you, and to withhold and withdraw it from their King: that, in short, it arose from your endeavours, virtually, to divest your Sovereign of all power to guard the title to His Throne, the rights of His Family, the security of His conscience, and to engage the nation, with a Catholic mob at their back, to force your Sovereign to surrender His sentiments, His will, His principles, His oath, to your absolute and unqualified disposal.

I shall now proceed to dissect your Manifesto to His Majesty, in which you treat Him, not as a superior, not as an equal, but as if He were a grovelling inferior character, who, you conceived, dared not look you in the face, but was obliged to crouch under your ministerial mandate.

What, my Lords, is your language to your Sovereign?—You trust *He will see the indispensable necessity, &c.*—INDISPENSABLE NECESSITY!!! Is this a language, in a matter of difference, for Gentlemen to use to Gentlemen; much less for a Minister to use to his Royal Master? What private Gentleman, of the slightest feelings of honour or punctilio, would condescend to stoop to any terms leading to accommodation, when, whatever he might possibly wish to concede, were dictated to him upon the insulting and degrading terms of *indispensable necessity*?



If your Lordships were either of you engaged in a private dispute, touching your honour, with an equal, and were to direct your second (I suppose him to be a man of honour), to carry a message desiring any preliminary point to be conceded, as a *matter of indispensable necessity*, your second, were he of the character I have supposed, would refuse to carry a message couched in such domineering terms. How then have your Lordships acted? You have treated your Sovereign in a manner which you could not justify to your equals? You have used language, of which no second in a private quarrel would condescend to be the bearer, to which no gentleman receiving such language could reply but with scorn and defiance.

But let us see what is to be this *indispensable necessity*, which His Majesty is to be forced to admit. He is to admit the *indispensable necessity of allowing* "his Ministers to state to Parliament and the Nation, the strong persuasion they felt of the benefits which would result from a different course of policy to the Catholics of Ireland!" Amiable, moderate, conciliating, requisition! "We humbly implore Your Majesty to permit us to state, as Your Majesty's confidential servants, that Your Majesty is totally ignorant of the interests of the empire; that we are exclusively right, and Your Majesty totally wrong; that we are governed by superior wisdom, and that Your Majesty labours under the most mistaken, silly, and fatal prejudices: it is a matter of *indispensable necessity*, that we Your Majesty's Ministers, should appeal against Your Majesty's judgment, and use our influence and abilities before the Nation to expose Your weakness, and set up the superiority of our Counsels."

I have some force of feeling, but I have not force of expression, to expand, in proper amplification, all the taunting insinuations of this unexampled (can I use a softer term), of this unexampled insolence!

Let me put the case again, as between gentleman and gentleman. What must be the inference, what must be the result, upon an unfortunate difference between two individuals in respectable stations of life, if one of them should send to the other, that it must be admitted as a matter of indispensable necessity that he should state to the public, to the world, that in the whole affair he was right, his adversary wrong; he was supported by justice and truth, and his adversary the victim of error and prejudice?—Would not such a message be heaping insult upon insult; would it not be a new cause of quarrel and resentment; would it not tend to ulcerate a wounded feeling, and to render reconciliation impracticable?

I proceed to your second requisition to your Sovereign, wherein you state—"it was indispensable to your character that you should avow your sentiments, not only on the present occasion, but in the event of the Catholic Petition coming forward."

What! *indispensable to the character of Ministers* to expose their Sovereign, not once, but repeatedly? To state to the world, that they are in a perpetual state of difference with their Royal Master; that they are consistently right, and He obstinately wrong; they perseveringly consulting the good of the empire, and the Sovereign pertinaciously bent on its destruction; they, the honourable and patriotic instruments of Catholic Emancipation, and His Majesty the bigoted slave of Protestantism and the Church of England, and rivetted to all the prejudices of those dark ages (as Lord Temple calls them) when the glorious Revolution of 1688 was effected, and his Protestant Family called to the Protestant Throne of the Empire?

I believe I need not expatiate to your Lordships further upon this second conciliating demand, yet I think you would wish me here to expatiate for ever, if you could stop me from proceeding to examine your third requisition on your Sovereign, still more goading, more contemptuous than the former. Your Lordships' request, "that your present deference to His Majesty might not be understood as restraining you from submitting *from time to time*, such measures as circumstances might require respecting the state of Ireland."

Here we see, in its fullest array, the true climax of Ministerial usurpation. You withdraw your Bill on three conditions—First, the King is to admit, as matter of *indispensable necessity*, that you shall represent the present policy to the Catholics, as fundamentally wrong.—2d. That it is your *indispensable duty* so to state, not only on the present occasion, but on the Catholic Petition.—3d. That you shall be allowed, *from time to time*, to renew your measure, till you can force it against His Majesty's conscience; for I ask your Lordships, if you have any truth or honour left, what can be your meaning in demanding the liberty of giving such *counsels from time to time hereafter, respecting Ireland, as circumstances may require*, except that you mean, *from time to time* to be at liberty to press His Majesty on the Catholic Subject? You would lose your character for any thing like honour and truth, as you have lost it already for any thing like decency or respect, as Subjects, were you to deny that such is the meaning.

Now, then, I ask your Lordships, not in a tone of indignation, but with a tone of moderation and firmness, whether it is possible for the human imagination to conceive a conduct more directly insulting from subjects to their Sovereign, than this stipulation, which you have endeavoured to extort?

You know, and have long known His Majesty's decided sentiments respecting the Constitutional duty which His Majesty conscientiously believes to be imposed upon Him, by the Revolution of 1688, by the Coronation Oath enacted at that period, by the declaration He is obliged to subscribe under the Bill of Rights, by the Provisions of the Act of Settlement, and by the Act of Union

with Scotland ; and that He feels Himself obliged to take no step, directly or indirectly, for surrendering the Guards provided by the Act of Supremacy, and the Test Acts, for preserving the settlement of the Protestant Church of England and Ireland, and the statutes made previous to the Union with Scotland, for their preservation, which are stated in the Act of Union to be essential and fundamental parts of the Union for ever.

Your Lordships are aware, that under this conscientious feeling, His Majesty thought it His duty to check the precipitate measures of Lord Fitzwilliam for repealing all the Test Laws in Ireland. Your Lordships are equally aware, that His Majesty hesitated not between His sense of obligation to His people, and His regard for His invaluable servant Mr. Pitt, and the powerful Administration over which he presided. Your Lordships are also aware, that Mr. Pitt, guided by that high sense of duty by which he was ever actuated, did, after the sense of His Majesty and the nation had appeared adverse to the repeal of the Test Laws, demand an audience of His Majesty ; and with that true loyalty of spirit which dictated all his actions, express his concern for having given His Majesty's conscience so much anxiety and pain, did give his solemn assurance that he would not again trouble and importune His Majesty on the subject ; and that he afterwards signified to the Leading Catholics the part he had taken : and your Lordships equally know, that the Leading Catholics were not disposed to press upon His Majesty's conscience, till they were urged and provoked by party. Your Lordships further know, that there was a signal and general expression of the national Protestant will, respecting the demands of the Catholics, at the time of Mr. Pitt's resignation ; and your Lordships are further apprised, that the sense of the nation was again taken, and the sense of Parliament again declared decidedly on the subject, upon the Catholic Petition, in 1805.

What ought I then to call that unparalleled conduct in your Lordships, when, after your full persuasion of His Majesty's fixed, unalterable, conscientious feeling respecting the repeal of the Test Laws ; after Mr. Pitt's honourable relinquishment of the measure as unattainable, without public convulsion ; after two complete and decisive expressions of the national Legislative sentiment, in conformity, and in support of His Majesty's conscientious opinion, you claim it as a matter of *indispensable necessity*, to have a right of condemning the decisions of the nation, of the Parliament, of the Sovereign ; you claim it as *your indispensable duty* to repeat your sentiments in favour of the Catholic demands ; and, lastly, make it the condition of your momentary submission, that you shall be allowed, *from time to time*, to harass His Majesty's conscience, till you can force Him to abandon those principles to your dictation and menace, which His Majesty feels most intimately connected with His duty, and which the



Nation and the Legislature have twice solemnly sealed with express and deliberate sanction!

Having thus freely unfolded the nature of the severe and degrading conditions which you endeavoured, without the slightest provocation, to impose upon His Majesty, let me ask your Lordships, upon cool reflection, whether I have not placed them in a fair light, and given them a just construction? I submit to your Lordships, I submit to Lord Moira, who is supposed to be a Nobleman of high punctilio, whether you would, in your private capacities, as Noblemen, submit to such language as you have used to your Sovereign, if addressed to you from your equals? I think you would not, I am sure Lord Moira would not. Can you then possibly imagine that Parliament will stand by you and vindicate your outrage; or that the nation will support your contumelious conduct? Believe me, my Lords, your love of power, your zeal to dictate, your impatience of controul, have led you too far. Be satisfied with having insulted your Sovereign: do not attempt to insult the nation too. When Ministers treat their Sovereign with indignity and mockery, and call upon the people to justify the outrage, let them beware, lest the people be made to understand the insult, which is offered not only to their Sovereign, but to themselves.

I am, &c.

A PROTESTANT.

---

### LETTER III.

TO LORD GRENVILLE AND LORD HOWICK.

MY LORDS,

SINCE I obtained the perusal of your Lordships' protestation to His Majesty of the 15th of March, the leading points of which I stated in my last letter, the subject has never passed from my mind. The unbecoming insult it conveys upon my Sovereign, has hourly pressed upon me: and I feel unhappy till the whole nation shall be fully informed of the proceeding, and rise to vindicate their loyalty.

I say to myself, if Ministers can have a right to demand from their Sovereign, as a matter of *indispensable necessity*, as a concession *indispensable to their characters*, to state in Parliament (whilst they stand in the situation of His Majesty's Ministers and Servants, clothed with His authority, and armed with His prerogative and power), that their Sovereign's Counsels are pernicious, and their own Counsels the only means of national salvation; and if, on such a demand, the Sovereign be obliged to surrender and capitulate, the Royal authority is no more; we are no longer under the

reign of George the Third, but under the despotism of Lord Howick and Lord Grenville.

My Lords, forgive me this wrong, but I cannot shake off my allegiance to my lawful King, and become your Lordships' subject and vassal. Every dictate of my understanding, every feeling of my heart, every throb and pulse of my frame, vibrate against the disgusting idea. I am not, and will not be your subject; I spurn your encroachment, and rebel against your usurpation.

Nor is this, my Lords, an idle effusion: the Parliament and the Nation, when once truly informed of your conduct, will be as sensibly alive to it as myself: they will not drive their Sovereign into the dungeon of despair, in order to dress Lord Grenville and Lord Howick with the plumes of fallen Majesty.

Let me examine again your tender mercy to your Sovereign. You will, forsooth, retract, for the present, the Bill which you endeavoured to pass upon His conscience, by unworthy collusion; but you are to be allowed, as a matter of indispensable necessity, to stigmatize in Parliament your Sovereign's opposition to your views; you are to claim His permission, as indispensable to your characters, to renew your attack on your Sovereign whenever the Catholic-Petition appears; and you are to be allowed, from *time to time*, to fret and torture your Sovereign's conscience upon the same subject, till you wear down His frame and temper with vexatious importunities, and *bring His grey hairs with sorrow to the grave!*

As for you, my Lord Howick, you have been many years in personal opposition to your Sovereign's measures, and you may have no very anxious disposition to consult His feelings, whatever obligations Lord Grey, your father, may owe or feel to his Royal Master.

With you, my Lord Grenville, it is a different case: yourself, your brother, your family, are indebted for almost every thing they possess to His Majesty's gracious protection and bounty. Your Lordship and your connections have been enjoying offices and emoluments under His Majesty's patronage, exceeding 50,000*l.* a year. Your Lordship and your two brothers will recede from the Ministry with salaries for life, exceeding 30,000*l.* a year; your brother has been raised to the Marquisate, your lordship to the Peerage, your cousin to the Peerage.

Surely, there is some small return of acknowledgment due for such unexampled accumulation of favours and honours upon your race, however meritorious. Surely, such a continual course of kindness from a Sovereign to a selected family, might reasonably demand something which had the appearance of gratitude. I do not say, it should have diminished your freedom, or shackled your independency, but it might have at least conciliated respect and courtesy, it might have claimed the kindness and attachment of a friend, or at least procured the civilities and decency of a gen-

tleman. Such a profusion of bounties, lavished with a confiding prodigality on a single family, would not have been overpaid by the refusal of disrespect, or an abstinence from insult.

I have digressed too much ; but when I see an attempt made to displant my Sovereign, to uproot his authority, and to place the Crown on a Cabinet Cabal, it is pardonable to yield to the torrent of indignant feelings.

I shall detain the public no longer from some statement of the reply which was reluctantly drawn from His Majesty, by your insulting manifesto. From the statements of your Lordships' Newspapers, which kindly represent, that His Majesty was waiting to find an opportunity for dismissing His Ministers, it was to be expected, that His Majesty's answer would have been resentful and severe ; and that, as He must have felt the insult, He could not have suppressed His indignation. If I be rightly informed, and I believe that I am not misled, His Majesty's reply to you was framed in the kindest and most conciliating mood. I understand, " that He made the most condescending acknowledgments to His " Cabinet, for their deference to Him in giving up the Catholic " Bill : He lamented the conditions which had been tacked to the " submission of the Cabinet ; He thought, as Ministers agreed to " give up the Bill, and to resist the Catholic Petition at present, " there was no necessity for their menacing stipulations. His Ma- " jesty thought these stipulations would place, not only Himself " but His Ministers, in the most embarrassing situation, and he " trusted they would *be withdrawn* ; and He concluded by ex- " pressing a hope, that as His mind was unalterably made up on " the Catholic subject, He might receive such assurances as would " relieve Him from all future apprehensions."

I think that, after the tenor of your manifesto, your menacing expressions of *indispensable necessity*, your stipulation for leave to bring up the Catholic subject *from time to time*, such language from a Sovereign was the fullest testimony of good-will, and of a cordial disposition to His Ministry.

I acknowledge, that it is not a concession to your insolent demand ; it is not a surrender to your dictatorial menace : but it seems to be one of the most courteous hints to subjects who had grossly offended, and whose offence was overlooked, that can be imagined. When you hurled at your Sovereign's head an insulting demand, could he do less than request you to withdraw it ? When you claimed a right to harass Him upon a point, on which He had repeatedly told you He could not concede, was it too much to express a hope that you would relieve Him from future apprehensions ?

I again admit there was no concession to your demand : but let me ask, could His Majesty have made a concession ? You knew His fixed determination not to capitulate to the Catholic claims. Could He then possibly give you an unqualified licence

to urge the justice of these claims, and the injustice of refusing them; to encourage the urgency of demand in proportion as you had ascertained His determination of resisting them, and to keep His mind in perpetual agitation upon a subject, which His conscience forbade Him to concede?

We now come to your rejoinder to your Sovereign, which I have been admitted more than once to peruse. You lament, of course, that your Sovereign does not concur in your representations; and you next state that you had entered into His service unfettered, and that you would not have accepted office under any restriction: you then conclude, "that it is not possible for you, consistently with any sense of those obligations which must always attach on the sworn Counsellors of His Majesty, to withdraw a statement which was not made without the most anxious consideration of every circumstance which could be suggested by your earnest desire for His Majesty's ease, comfort, and happiness, or to give assurances which would impose upon you a restraint incompatible with the faithful discharge of the most important duty which you owe to His Majesty."

Upon this rejoinder, the matter and the manner require separate remark. The general purport of it, under the circumstances to which you had reduced yourselves, is natural and fair. It was obvious, when you endeavoured to force upon your Sovereign your three *indispensable* conditions, that if His Majesty did not accede to them at once, He must take precautions to prevent the repetition of the outrage, and demand to be relieved from the apprehension of future attack. His Majesty having declined to surrender to your conditions, you think it right to decline retracting; having tried to play the *Déspot*, you hesitate to play the *Servant*; having fancied yourselves *Maires du Palais*, you cannot return to be simple Ministers, and you assume the old motto, *Aut Caesar aut Nullus*.

All this is fair and natural; but could you not have been contented with the mere refusal of complying with the request you had forced your Sovereign to make? Why should you take leave of him with the most taunting expressions? Was it necessary for your Lordships to inform your Sovereign, that all your disobedience to His wishes was merely *for His ease*? that your indispensable conditions were only meant *for His comfort*? and that your stipulations for liberty to torment His conscience on the Catholic claims, were calculated with the sincerest views *for His happiness*? You might have felt yourself obliged to oppose your Sovereign, and to recede from His service, but I cannot see that it was called from you as an act of public duty, when you were retiring from His Majesty's presence, to turn round and insult Him.

I have thus shortly, but fairly stated, and I appeal to your Lordships whether I have not truly stated, the material parts of the transactions which recently passed between your Lordships



and His Majesty, and which have inevitably produced the late rupture.

Every constitutional point in your favour I admit in its broadest latitude, and ever will maintain.

I maintain that, as you entered unfettered into His Majesty's Cabinet, you had a right to submit to His Majesty whatever measures you thought expedient on the Catholic subject, as upon all others.

I maintain that when His Majesty objected to your proposals, your retiring from His service, and endeavouring to effect them through the medium of Parliament, would have been truly constitutional.

I maintain that had you thought right, upon explanation with your Sovereign, to withdraw your measure for the present, without any stipulation upon your part, your conduct, had you remained in office, would have been unobjectionable.

The points on which I fundamentally differ from your Lordships are these : You had no right to demand stipulations from His Majesty, as to His future conduct ; you had no right to impose upon His conscience conditions which it was impossible for Him to admit, without arming you with His Royal authority to force His opinions ; much less had you a right to do so in a manner, and with a tone, which is not admissible between equals, and which one Gentleman would not bear from another, and which, if submitted to by His Majesty, would leave Him, in fact and reality, divested of His constitutional authority, and in every legitimate consideration dethroned.

A PROTESTANT.

---

## LETTER IV.

TO LORD GRENVILLE AND LORD HOWICK.

MY LORDS,

THE indignation which I felt on perusing the statement of your disrespectful behaviour to my Sovereign, has delayed my design of placing before you, and before the people of this realm, the peculiar situation of the King as the Protestant Sovereign of this Protestant empire ; His duties and His obligations ; and, secondly, your Lordships' corresponding duties and obligations, as His Protestant Ministers and Privy Counsellors.

In order to pronounce a correct judgment upon what has recently passed, this view of the subject is indispensable, and I

request your Lordships' particular and close attention to my statement.

I beg leave to state, that the constitution of these realms rests upon the two great pillars of the Reformation and the Revolution: the one supporting our Ecclesiastical and Spiritual Liberty, the other confirming it, and at the same time establishing our Temporal and civil Freedom; and these two pillars of our free Constitution, it is the bounden and sworn duty of the Monarch to maintain.

The Reformation gave rise to that charter of our independency, the Act of Supremacy, by which all foreign ecclesiastical or spiritual pre-eminence or authority is abjured; the abjuration of this foreign power is also imposed on the subjects of these realms, by the Convention Parliament of 1688, as one of the fundamental principles of the kingdom; and by the 1st of George the First, it may be imposed upon any subject in the kingdom, not specially excepted.

Is not then His Majesty, whose title to the throne originated in the compact contained in the Bill of Rights, justified in defending against His Ministers the maintenance of that supremacy, which their present Bill was intended to abrogate?

I know that Dr. Troy, the Titular Archbishop of Dublin, declares, in his Pastoral Letter of 1793, "that the People were  
 " enslaved, when the Sovereign declared himself head of the  
 " Church of England; Parliament, Nobles, Clergy, all ranks  
 " became the servile flatterers and slavish instruments of a dis-  
 " solute, capricious, and arbitrary Monarch. The nation was  
 " enslaved when schism was introduced by that brutal and dis-  
 " solute Prince. The same despotism was exercised by his suc-  
 " cessors, till the accession of the House of Stuart to the  
 " Throne, when it was corrected."—It may be possibly conceded to Dr. Troy thus to represent the independency of our Church, as the effect of despotism and slavery in the reigns, not only of Henry, but of Edward and Elizabeth; and to praise the attempt of the Stuarts to reconcile us to the bondage of Rome: but surely, if such attempts be pardonable in Dr. Troy, it cannot be absolutely criminal in George the Third to dispute the doctrines of the Titular Primate, to stand by the faith of His Protestant subjects, vigilantly to guard their liberties, and to protect those Statutes which the Stuarts endeavoured to abolish, and which the Bill of Rights and the first act of His August Family have made the fundamentals of the realm. If it be not disrespectful in His Majesty to protect His subjects from the doctrines of Dr. Troy, it cannot be criminal in Him to have opposed the suggestions of His Ministers.

Nor do I think that when Dr. Troy is allowed to assert, in defiance of the laws, "that the Pope of Rome has a Spiritual and  
 " Ecclesiastical Primacy of Divine Right, not only of honour and



“rank, but of real jurisdiction and authority, in this kingdom,” that His Majesty is censurable for not concurring with His Ministers, in giving the commands of His Fleets and Armies to those who support Dr. Troy’s illegal and unconstitutional doctrine, or for not dispensing with the grounds of the Constitution, in order that they may be enabled openly to maintain a *foreign* jurisdiction.

There is a second circumstance attending the situation of these Independent Kingdoms, resulting from the Revolution of 1688, which ought to make a strong impression. The statute which confirms the Bill of Rights, stipulates, on the part of the people, as the means of preserving to them in security the full enjoyment of the Protestant Religion, that the Kings or Queens of England for ever after, upon their coming to the Crown, shall subscribe the “Declaration against Transubstantiation, and that “worship of the Virgin Mary, or any other Saint, and the sacrifice of the Mass, as usual in the Church of Rome, are “superstitious and idolatrous.” His Majesty has made this solemn Declaration in the face of His People, and at the same time it was enacted, that all persons holding employments under the Crown, or Commissions in the Army and Navy, should be bound to make the same Declaration. I cannot think His Royal conduct impeachable, if He did not encourage His Ministers to deliver his Subjects from the necessity of subscribing this Declaration, before His Subjects required Him to renounce what He had subscribed Himself. I know not that when He had, on accepting the Crown, been obliged to declare against the superstition and idolatry of the Church of Rome, His Majesty should not stand excused before His Protestant subjects, if He did not facilitate their introduction and propagation.

There is a third peculiarity respecting His Majesty’s situation, viz. that He is King *because He is Protestant*: He is not our Sovereign by mere hereditary right, but He is our Sovereign by *Protestant* hereditary right. Under the Act of Settlement, His Crown is *ipso facto* forfeited, and *His subjects released from their allegiance*, should He at any time be reconciled to the Church of Rome. Protestantism is an essential ingredient in the title of the King. It is the *tenure* by which His family have a right of succession to the Throne. Surely, it ought not to have occasioned such violence, such indignation in your Lordships against your Sovereign; if He felt scrupulous upon a subject which related to the title of Himself and his family to the Throne of these kingdoms.

A nice and scrupulous attention to any proposition of Ministers, which, in the slightest degree, affected that title, can hardly be considered as a provocation to insult.

What would you, my Lord Grenville, say to any insolent Conveyancer, who would attempt to persuade you to give up the

Title Deeds of the Camelford Estate, in order to have them new modelled, by inserting a demise from an attainted ancestor?

The next peculiarity respecting the situation of the King, is His Coronation Oath, under the act of William, and the act of Union, by which He has sworn to maintain the true Protestant Religion of the Church of England, and the settlement of the Church, existing at the time of the Union. Here is another principle directly binding upon the conscience, enforcing the utmost caution against agreeing to any measure, which, by any construction, can weaken the security to the Church and the Protestant Establishment.

An additional peculiarity in the situation of the Monarch, is, that he is Guardian of the Union with Scotland, and it is therein enacted, that not only the act for "Ministers of the Church to be of sound Doctrine, but the Act of Uniformity, and all and singular other acts then in force, for the preservation of the Church of England," shall remain, and be in full force for ever; and it is declared, in the 10th of Anne, that the Test Act, which was made in the 30th C. II., was enacted for the preservation of the church.

Having shortly stated the situation of the Sovereign respecting the ecclesiastical supremacy of the Crown, His Protestant title, His abjuration of Popish superstitions, His duty under the Coronation Oath, and the Act of Union, I think the conclusion to be drawn from the whole is this; that in all points tending to weaken the guards of the Protestant Faith, to supersede the Test Acts, to get rid of the Act of Supremacy, and to facilitate the extension of Popish superstition and idolatry, the King is bound by duty and conscience to use His Royal influence directly and indirectly, to prevent any change or innovation; and that He should resist every suggestion of His Ministers on the subject, till it be brought forward and enforced by the almost unanimous will and Petition of His Protestant subjects, repeatedly declared.

Having considered the situation of the King, let us advert to the duty of His Ministers. These Ministers, as holding offices under the Crown, must, like the Monarch, have taken the oath of Supremacy, and signed the declaration against Popish Superstition, and as Privy Counsellors, they must have sworn, that "they will, to their uttermost, bear faith and allegiance unto the King's Majesty, and shall assist and defend all jurisdictions, pre-eminences, and authorities granted to His Majesty, and annexed to the Crown by Act of Parliament, or otherwise, against all Princes, Persons, Prelates, States, or Potentates, and generally in all things they shall do as faithful and true servants ought to do to His Majesty." Such is the concluding part of the Privy Counsellor's Oath; and be it remembered, that the part of the oath relating to the *jurisdiction, pre-eminence, and authorities of the Crown*, was erased in the Popish Reign of James the II<sup>d</sup>., and restored in the Protestant Reign of William the III<sup>d</sup>.

It appears that His Majesty is thus bound by every tie, which human ingenuity can devise, from adopting any measure which can tend to weaken the Independency of the Crown, or the Constitution in Church and State, or to admit any Foreign Jurisdiction, or encourage any Popish superstition. It further appears, that your Lordships are equally bound as Ministers and Privy Counsellors, by the same ties and restrictions as your Sovereign.

Have I not then outstepped the bounds of the case, when I have granted you, as Ministers, the mere *right* of proposing to His Majesty the Repeal of the Test Laws? But under what casuistry you can feel (after the oaths which you and your Sovereign have taken), that it is your *bounden duty as sworn Counsellors of the King*, to press the Repeal of those Laws, and upon His Majesty's refusal, to renew your importunities for permission to encourage Catholic demand, and to create general irritation upon the subject, is utterly beyond my capacity to comprehend.

In my opinion, no Minister can be bound in duty to outrun the feelings of the Protestant part of the Nation. Our present Constitution was made against the claims of Papists, and to preserve the kingdom from Foreign Power and Foreign Jurisdiction. If the Protestant people of this realm should, by a clear, indisputable, and decided majority, express their opinions, that the removing the present guards of our Establishments would increase rather than diminish their security, it might possibly be allowable for Ministers to act in concurrence with such a sentiment: but, after the repeated recent declarations, both of the Parliament, and the People, and the Sovereign, in favour of preserving those guards, I boldly and confidently maintain, that it is *not the sworn duty* of Ministers to attempt their abrogation, that counselling their Monarch to that purpose, is *absolutely against their sworn duty*, and that menacing their Sovereign with a repetition of their importunities, in order to extort consent, is a violation of every duty which they owe to the People, to the Sovereign and their own conscience!

A PROTESTANT.

---

## LETTER V.

TO LORD GRENVILLE AND LORD HOWICK.

MY LORDS,

I HAVE nearly gone through the leading arguments respecting the question of your late rupture with His Majesty. It appears that my observations have attracted your notice, and obliged you to a Parliamentary explanation of your conduct.

What real and cordial pleasure have I not received from your Lordships' speeches, which go unequivocally to prove, that all the



base insinuations circulated among your partisans, and repeated in your newspapers, are utterly destitute of foundation! The manner in which you so strongly and eloquently express your sense of His Majesty's kindness and confidence during the whole period of your Administration, and your statement respecting the progress of the Catholic measure, are unequivocal proofs that there was every fair disposition in His Majesty to retain you in His service, if you would have permitted it. But the real case seems to be, that by mismanagement, or something worse, you had engaged yourselves to obtain for the Catholics what you were not justified to promise; and you were forced to make a plunge to recover a false move. You failed, for His Majesty could not be reduced to surrender his conscience into your hands, that you might place it in the possession of Mr. Keogh and the Catholic Committee.

You complain, however, of having been misrepresented in mutilated and garbled extracts: yet I can only find that I have omitted a single expression, which if inserted, makes no difference in the sense. I stated, that you had stipulated for leave to bring forward the Catholic subject *from time to time*: you complain, that I omitted the words "for His Majesty's *decision*." I trust my readers will, if they ever revert to the passage, insert them, and if they can find they make any alteration in the sense of the passage, their ingenuity must be greatly superior to my own. But, my Lords, it is not any mutilation of your Cabinet minute which gives you pain; it is its publication that stings you: and the cause of that publication is to be traced to your Lordships and your friends. I had myself, in common with others, heard a far different story from that which now appears, and is proved, to be *true*, and which your Lordships' own statement confirms, although you have naturally endeavoured to shade it with a favourable gloss. Stories were circulated among your Lordships' friends and partisans, calculated to make an impression the most advantageous to your Lordships, the most disadvantageous to your Sovereign. They were producing great effect upon ignorant and timid minds. Under such circumstances, was it not a duty in a man who feels loyally and ardently, to undeceive the public? to gain access if possible, to the original sources of the truth? and to lay before the public as much as might be sufficient to stop the current of a false belief, and draw forth authentic explanation?

I have done so; and I certainly do not repent of my conduct. It has given your Lordships a fair occasion to come forward, and make the best of your case. Your statement, my Lord Grenville, has been most candidly and temperately discussed; yours, my Lord Howick, was made at a less happy, or perhaps a more happy time, for there was no possibility that you should be answered.

In looking to your respective speeches, as they are reported, every point, and more than every point that I have stated, is

completely established, with exception to the marked disrespect of your manifesto to the King, which you of course suppressed.

It appears, beyond the possibility of a mistake, that the first point submitted to His Majesty was the mere extension of the Irish Bill of 1793 to this kingdom. Lord Sidmouth's fair declaration, exclusive of your correspondence with His Majesty, places the subject out of doubt.

The next circumstance proved is, that His Majesty, having reluctantly consented to any proceeding on the subject, never intended to permit any measure of a greater extent; and Lord Sidmouth most fully and honourably corroborates this fact.

The third point is, that from an ambiguous expression, used in a dispatch to the Duke of Bedford, respecting *Catholics having promotion* in the army, your Lordships drew this conclusion, that His Majesty having omitted to notice the phrase, you were justified in promising the Catholics the highest ranks in the army and navy, whilst His Majesty conceived that the expression related merely to the promotions allowed in the Act of 1793.

I do not like to draw conclusions; but as His Majesty had *previously* expressed his determination not to suffer any concession *beyond the Irish Act of 1793*, and as your Lordships wished to make *unlimited* concession, I shall leave the inference to a loyal public.

The next point admitted is, that your Bill is as different from the Act of 1793, as light from darkness; that the former is a moderate relaxation of the Test Laws on the principle of toleration; the other a total unqualified repeal of the Test Laws, with regard to the Army and Navy, comprehending every religious sect now existing, or that might arise, in the country.

Another point admitted is, that a hint from His Majesty on the subject was not sufficient to produce the delay of this measure, and that His Majesty was obliged to express his sentiments in the most decisive terms; upon which you admitted, that you had *misconceived* His Majesty, and stopped your measure.

I own this statement does not please me; because I think that Ministers, in an affair so nearly concerning His Majesty's conscience, and on which he had expressed such strong reluctance to concede at all, ought to have taken care that there should be no misunderstanding. A Sovereign, when He has expressed His pleasure *once*, ought not to be put to the necessity of repeating it every day. He is justified in supposing, that His Ministers, having received His decision, will acquiesce in it entirely. If they do not, it is their especial duty to take care that their Sovereign be accurately informed of every the slightest deviation they propose to make from His opinions, and be acquainted with the reasons for it. The necessity for this is the greater, because such explicitness on the parts of Ministers can be attended with no ill effect, and the want of it may produce incalculable mischiefs.

If your Lordships wished to be informed of your Sovereign's sentiments, how easy would it have been for you, when you sent your new clauses, or your new bill to the King, to have added a short note, saying — "These clauses are not limited to the provisions of the Irish Act of 1793, but go much farther. They repeal the Test Laws entirely with regard to the Army and Navy, and substitute a common oath of allegiance for the present qualification oaths; as your Majesty's Servants are of opinion, that all religious tests for military or naval commands are no longer expedient."—There certainly would have been no difficulty in sending such a note to His Majesty; and I believe nothing would have prevented you from doing so, but your absolute conviction, that under such a fair and honest representation, His Majesty would have negatived your proceeding. Now what I wish to inculcate is this, that any proceeding short of such complete and full explanation, in a subject so near His Majesty's feelings, was neither kind nor dutiful, nor, let me say, quite honest. It seems, and will ever seem, from your defect of explicitness, as if you trusted to something like a want of attention or vigilance, in His Majesty; as if a half assent could be taken for a whole assent; reluctance be construed into compliance; or inadvertency and silence, into positive agreement and command.

Before I proceed I cannot help smiling at those terrific pictures which are held up at Catholic discontents, which your bill could alone remedy, when this very bill you consented entirely to withdraw.

Nor can I desist from adverting, that you had also determined to resist the Catholic Petition; that the bill you proposed was merely meant as a temporary soporific, and by no means as a final remedy for their discontents; that you meant to keep the great Question, of what is called Catholic Emancipation, at a proper distance, ready to start up on some favourable emergency.

This last admission of your Lordships claims praise for its candour. Will you then permit me to hope that you have acted with equal candour to His Majesty; that you have told Him, that the concessions you were endeavouring to extort from Him were not to be final; that they were to be mere preludes to further demands, and further concessions; and that you were resolved to play this policy, till you had radically altered the Constitution in Church and State, and left no difference, civil or religious, between any sects whatever? I believe, however, you never made such an explanation to His Majesty; and I am sorry you have now made it in Parliament, because I conceive, that you have imprudently made the surrender of the whole Catholic Question an indispensable condition of returning to His Majesty's service.

Having endeavoured to lay down principles which seem to render it impossible for your Lordships, under the declared sense



of the Parliament, the People and the King, to re-enter the Cabinet, you appear now to be taking measures for preventing His Majesty having any Government at all.

You refuse to serve His Majesty, unless He surrenders His conscience to your dictation, and lays His sceptre at your feet : and then you will use every exertion to prevent His forming an efficient administration in your place.

I suppose you mean to pursue, with systematic consistency, the respectful conduct you have already shewn to His Majesty. You will declare, that your efforts to embarrass the public business are solely for *his Majesty's ease* ; that every attempt you shall make to prevent the establishment of a new Ministry, is with a view to *His Majesty's comfort* ; and if your Lordships and your friends should be betrayed into any factious and inflammatory measures, you will of course inculcate, that they are intended to promote *His Majesty's happiness*.

In concluding at present, allow me to point out a distinction between the principles of your Lordships' conduct and those of His Majesty's.

His Majesty, in resisting the repeal of the Act of Supremacy, is upholding the great characteristic feature of the Reformation ; your Lordships, in your Bill, were undermining it. His Majesty, in refusing the repeal of the Test Acts, is maintaining the principles established at the Revolution, and the Union with Scotland ; your Lordships, in attempting their repeal, are endeavouring to remove them. Your Lordships are for altering, His Majesty for preserving the Constitution ; your Lordships are for introducing, His Majesty is for preventing *innovation*. His Majesty's conduct vindicates his Title to the Throne, your Lordships' principles shake that title ; lastly, His Majesty acts in direct conformity to His Oaths and Obligations ; your Lordships act, if not in violation of them, at least in contradiction to their original meaning, tendency, and object ; for, as your Lordships know that the Oaths you have taken, as Ministers and Privy Counsellors, were framed to prevent Roman Catholics from holding Offices of Power and Trust in these Protestant Realms, all attempts to force them into power, whilst you are under the obligation of those Oaths, are in direct inconsistency with that obligation.

His Majesty's line of duty is clearly pointed out by the Constitution, and by the Laws of England ; it is not easy to be mistaken, nor has His Majesty mistaken it ; while He adheres with unshaken constancy to that line which His Protestant People and Protestant Parliament have repeatedly approved and sanctioned, He will not desert His office upon the dictation or menace of any Ministers ; and when He is forced by them to a painful alternative, He will have the firmness to sacrifice His private regards to the public and superior considerations of His high trust and sacred duty.

A PROTESTANT.

## LETTER VI.

TO LORD HOWICK.

MY LORD,

I am absolutely obliged to continue, against my design, the task I have undertaken, by the appearance of your Lordship's Speech, on your removal from office, in an *authentic* form, in which you are pleased to give a statement of your conduct, during the whole discussion of the Catholic Question in the late Cabinet.

This performance seems calculated to create an impression, that His Majesty first gave, and then retracted, His consent to the measure proposed by His Cabinet; that He kept a dissembling reserve with His Ministers, and a captious silence, as if He were lying in wait to find His Ministers in the wrong, and eager to avail Himself of any false steps they might commit, in order to remove them; and that, on the contrary, the conduct of the Ministers was open and explicit, respectful and submissive, and not so anxious for their own consistency, as for His Majesty's feelings and happiness.

The impressions, however, upon my mind, are the reverse, not only from the close perusal of your Lordship's statements, but, upon a reference to the original documents belonging to the subject. I cannot, therefore, resist the duty of comparing them together, and drawing the public attention to the result.

I shall now, therefore, as shortly and distinctly as I can, set forth the points at issue with your Lordship.

Your Lordship acknowledges that the first basis on which you acted, in bringing forward the Catholic Question to His Majesty, was the Irish Act of 1793; and that when you submitted a draft of a dispatch on the subject, His Majesty expressed a strong dissent: Here is an admitted signification of His Majesty's disapprobation of bringing forward the subject, and your Lordship is sensible that never was disapprobation so forcibly expressed.

Upon receiving it, the Cabinet, as your Lordship states, made a second representation, pressing the expediency of concession on the point of general policy, principle, and good faith. Upon this you state, that His Majesty gave a reluctant, but a positive consent. Here I must accuse your Lordship of unfairness, in not completely stating what the nature of that consent was, and to what extent it was limited. I believe your Lordship knows it was stated by His Majesty, "*that however painful His Majesty has found it to reconcile to His feelings the removal of objections to*

“ any proposal which may have the most distant reference to a  
 “ question which has already been the subject of such frequent  
 “ and distressing reflection, He would not, under the circumstance  
 “ in which it is so earnestly pressed, and ADVERTING PAR-  
 “ TICULARLY TO WHAT TOOK PLACE IN 1793, prevent  
 “ His Ministers from submitting for the consideration of His Par-  
 “ liament the propriety of inserting the proposed clause in the  
 “ Mutiny Bill. Whilst, however, the King so far reluctantly con-  
 “ cedes, He thinks it necessary to declare, that HE CANNOT GO  
 “ ONE STEP FURTHER; and He trusts that this proof of His  
 “ forbearance will secure Him from being at a future period dis-  
 “ tressed by any further proposal connected with the question.”

Such was the nature of His Majesty's reply, and I accuse your Lordship of unfairness in not stating it; because it entirely destroys the possibility of all the misconception or misunderstanding, which, you pretend, arose on the subject; and which the tenor of this reply rendered impossible.

I defy any man, who is in the slightest degree removed from idiotey, to misconceive or misinterpret the nature of His Majesty's consent in this declaration: and the fact is, that there is Parliamentary proof that your Lordship did not misconceive or misinterpret it: for, on the 20th of February, you gave notice in the House of Commons, that in the committee on the Mutiny Bill you should move two clauses, one extending to England the Irish Act of 1793, enabling Catholics to hold *certain* commissions in the army; the other to secure to soldiers the free exercise of their religion. All ground, therefore, for any subsequent pretence of misconception is not more done away by His Majesty's answer than by your Lordship's Parliamentary conduct.

It seems, however, a doubt arose on the dispatch you had transmitted to Ireland; the Catholics claimed all Commissions in the Army and Navy, but Mr. Elliot doubted. Here I must ask by what accident did doubts arise? Was His Majesty's Declaration doubtful, or obscure? Was your Lordship's conduct, on the 20th of February, doubtful, or obscure? Why, then, was the dispatch couched in ambiguous terms? Upon what account, when Mr. Elliot's doubts, and the claims of the Catholics were received by the Cabinet, were not those doubts immediately removed, and His Majesty's determination more clearly and distinctly announced?

But, it seems, your Lordship transmitted, without observation to His Majesty, the dispatches from Ireland, containing Mr. Elliot's doubts, and the Catholic claims; and His Majesty expressed no uneasiness. - And let me ask your Lordship what ground was there for His Majesty to express uneasiness? His Majesty had twice conveyed his decided sentiments to his Cabinet on the Catholic subject. On his last decision they had acquiesced,

and your Lordship had acted upon it in Parliament. Upon what principle therefore ought His Majesty to suspect that His Ministers would depart from what He had resolved, and they had acquiesced in?

It appears, however, His Majesty trusted to the steadiness and obedience of His Cabinet, without sufficient reason. You appear to be alarmed at the Catholics, for it is certain they treated with contempt the proposal you had transmitted, and you endeavoured to make a new effort to appease them.

Instead of the limited measure which His Majesty had consented to, and to which alone He could be induced to consent, additional and new concessions are proposed and deliberated upon in the Cabinet; upon which Lord Sidmouth, in the most honourable manner, objected to any concession beyond the Irish Act; the majority of the Cabinet, however, persisted.

It is curious to follow your Lordship's statement: the Cabinet now determines to prepare a new dispatch to the Lord Lieutenant, inclosing "Clauses for the Mutiny Bill;" stating distinctly, "that they were in conformity with the general words of the dispatch which had been sent on the 12th of February, marking expressly, that the Catholics were to be admitted to hold *any* commission or appointment whatever, and observing, that a confirmation was thus given of Mr. Elliot's answer to the Catholic Deputies."

Let me now ask your Lordship, how it is possible that you can reconcile this conduct to the high feelings of honour by which I must suppose you are actuated? You will surely acknowledge, that your Sovereign's answer, which I have recited, is incapable of being misunderstood; you will confess, that your own motion in Parliament is equally clear and unambiguous. What then is your new attempt? Is it not to endeavour to force His Majesty to adopt your clauses for the Mutiny Bill, opening the Army to the Catholics *without any restriction*, upon the allegation that He had already given consent to the measure in the dispatch of the 12th of February; although by our own motion in the House of Commons on the 20th of February, it is plain you understood the contrary?

The Cabinet drew an ambiguous dispatch in pursuance to the clearest and most defined instructions, and then endeavour to swindle His Majesty into an assent to it, by alledging, that in not having noticed an ambiguous phrase, He was pledged to a construction in direct contradiction to his own express and repeated commands.

What would your Lordships say of an Attorney who had treated your express injunctions to him in a similar manner, and had endeavoured to cheat you by inserting in a deed expressions of a dubious meaning, and then had endeavoured to interpret their sense against your intention and interest?



You sent this draught of a dispatch, which must cover your Cabinet with eternal and merited disgrace, to His Majesty on the 2d of March. His Majesty returns it without an answer upon the 3d, and you send it off. You express your surprise that His Majesty made no remark on returning it. Let me ask, what answer could He send to such a swindling dispatch? If His Majesty had entered into the consideration of that dispatch, He must have dismissed the Ministers, who sent it to Him. Not wishing to part with His Ministers without absolute necessity, His Majesty overlooked the dispatch in kindness, and came to town on the following day, when He entered into the subject of the Catholic measure with your Lordship.

A new scene now opens upon His Majesty. The clauses in the Mutiny Bill are abandoned, and your Lordship discloses your intention of bringing in a separate Bill on the Catholic question; and when His Majesty asks whether it is to be confined to the Irish Act of 1793, you explain to His Majesty the extent to which you mean to carry the Bill; which is, to open *all Commissions* in the Army and Navy to Dissenters of all kinds, without restriction. On this explanation you state, "you must here acknowledge that His Majesty upon this occasion, did express a general dislike and disapprobation of the measure. I mean to state every thing frankly, but I did understand that conversation to conclude by words giving a consent, a reluctant consent, I admit; or, perhaps, it would be more correctly stated, as not withdrawing the consent which had been *originally* given; I conceived, therefore, that I had still sufficient authority for the introduction of the Bill."

Your Lordship here admits, that, upon a correct statement, His Majesty expressed his general dislike and disapprobation to your new measure; but did not withdraw His consent, which He had *originally* given. Let me ask, what was this *original Consent*? Was it not, my Lord, that He would merely agree to the extension of the Irish Act of 1793 to England, and that he could never be induced to *go one step further*? When, therefore, you acknowledge His Majesty comprised His *ultimate* assent within the limits of His *original* assent, and when you allow that the new Bill you proposed went infinitely further, and when His Majesty had expressed his dislike and disapprobation of this new Bill, how is it possible that your Lordship could thus make a confusion on a subject the most easy and clear, on which not only it was impossible to mistake His Majesty, but on which you state yourself, that you did not mistake Him. The truth is, you could not, under your own statement, have mistaken His Majesty; you merely acted in defiance of Him.

Here too I must confess, that you have treated yourself infinitely worse than you have your Sovereign. In endeavouring to work upon His Majesty's feelings to agree to a measure He con-

scientifically disapproved, you have shewn His Majesty throughout, decided, kind, and honourable; reluctant to concede in a measure near His conscience, but in His concession clear and explicit, and faithful to that concession once given.

On the other hand, you represent yourself as starting doubts upon points the most clear. Even after you had shewn that you had no doubt whatever, by your Parliamentary conduct, you state yourself as endeavouring to fasten a constructive consent on your Sovereign; and you urge His consent to a measure He approved, as a sanction for your bringing forward the measure he rejected.

I confess I should not like to array myself in such colours as these, and then to make an appeal to the British Nation.

It seems you wish to draw an inference from His Majesty's silence to Lord Grenville on the subject of your conference; but surely an unpleasant communication with one Minister in a day was a sufficient pain to His Majesty's feelings.

It seems you further wish to draw an inference from His Majesty's silence for six days after you moved your Bill, in direct defiance of His orders. What could His Majesty say? You had placed Him in the hard alternative, either of surrendering His independence to His Ministers, or of summoning you to relinquish your measure. It was not easy for His Majesty to bring Himself to a decision at so important a crisis. Yet, my Lord, I believe you were aware, in the interval, of His Majesty's feelings, and that He must have wished some measure to be taken by you to make an explanation unnecessary. Recollect, my Lord, the dilemma attending an explanation. It was a capitulation on the part of His Majesty to His Cabinet, or their submission; and the refusal of submission upon your part, unavoidably led to your removal. I conceive, therefore, that when you had thus driven your Sovereign to the wall, His endurance of your positive disobedience to His orders for a week is a forbearance entitled to your praise, not a subject for insinuation.

His Majesty seems to have had the soundest reason for His silence, for it opened a line for reconciliation. Lord Grenville having seen the King on the 12th, your Lordship postponed the second reading of your Bill, and on the 13th you waited upon His Majesty, to lay before Him "the reasons which had induced you to believe, that you was not, as His Minister, acting in opposition to the Royal pleasure." And now, my Lord, let it be considered, how did His Majesty receive your submission? You state fairly and candidly, "that He was pleased to express His conviction, that what had happened had arisen from an erroneous conception on your part, and acquitted you most graciously, but most unequivocally, of any intentional disregard of His opinion."

It might be imagined, that after such affectionate oblivion of



the past, all cause of difference between His Majesty and His Ministers would have terminated. At least it was to be presumed, His Ministers would not industriously create a new ground of offence. But, unfortunately, you find that the limited concession agreed to by His Majesty would not answer your views, and that it would be better to withdraw your Bill altogether, than cut it down to the measure of that concession.

I acknowledge, as your Lordship states, that this was a painful predicament to you; you had held out expectations to the Catholics, which you were obliged to disappoint; you had made yourself liable to invidious remarks in Parliament and out of Parliament, for having abandoned a measure you thought necessary for the safety of the State, in order to keep your office. I acknowledge fairly the inconvenience of your position. But who was to blame? merely your own disingenuous and uncandid conduct. The question then arose whose feelings were to be made a sacrifice! your own or your Sovereign's? and most loyally you decided for sacrificing the latter. Accordingly you announced to your Sovereign that you withdrew your Bill upon this condition, that His Majesty would submit to your three famous stipulations (which I have stated in my Second Letter) as matters of *indispensable necessity*.

Here I leave your Lordship and your Speech, and it rests for the Public to determine;

1. Whether His Majesty's expressions, that He would consent to a Clause in the Mutiny Bill, agreeable to the Irish Act of 1793. but that He could never be induced to *go one step further*, be intelligible or ambiguous?

2. Whether your own conduct in giving notice, on the 20th of February, that you would move a Clause for enabling Catholics to hold *certain* Commissions, be not an indubitable proof, that your Lordship had no doubts on the subject of His Majesty's declaration?

3. Whether your afterwards stating doubts and trying to obtain His Majesty's assent to a dispatch, granting an unlimited concession to the Catholics, on the allegation that it was conformable to a *former* dispatch, was a fair and honourable conduct for a British Cabinet to hold?

4. Whether your introducing your new Bill into Parliament, after His Majesty had expressly disapproved of it, and your construing His *original* consent to a *limited* measure, as a consent to this new *unlimited* measure, be upon any ground defensible or excusable?

5. Whether your coupling the measures of withdrawing your Bill with your three insulting stipulations, did not render your remaining in office incompatible with the independency of the Monarch?

Lastly: Whether the whole together does not form such a se-

ries of conduct, as made His Majesty's removal of your Cabinet absolutely necessary to preserve a shadow of Royal Authority? and whether it does not merit the decided and marked disapprobation of the Parliament and the Nation?

I conclude with this quotation from your Lordship's Speech:—  
*"I certainly feel that I ought not to have introduced a measure of this description, without the sanction of His Majesty's authority, and I should think myself reprehensible in the highest degree, and deserving all the censure that is endeavoured to be cast upon me, if I had proposed this Bill to Parliament without believing that I had His Majesty's consent."*

A PROTESTANT.

---

## LETTER VII.

TO LORD HOWICK.

MY LORD,

Several persons, well attached to your Lordship and the late Administration, have been so struck with the statements in my letters, as fully to admit, that if those statements be not refuted, your vindication is impossible. I have, therefore, revised my letters, to examine whether there is any fact against you which I have overcharged: and I have referred to your Lordship's speech to see whether there is any fact in your favour which I have omitted.

Upon this re-consideration of the subject, it appears to me that the case I have produced is much understated, and by no means brought up to its true bearing.

For instance, I have omitted to state, that the Cabinet, on their second Representation, in order to induce His Majesty to soften his negative to their first proposal, limited their arguments to the Irish Act of 1793, and to that alone. The passage I allude to in Cabinet Minute is as follows:—

"They can assure your Majesty, with the utmost sincerity, that it has been their anxious endeavour so to frame the proposed instruction, as that it might be entirely free from the difficulties that might attend other parts of the subject, on which (as your Majesty knows) a difference of opinion prevails among the persons whom your Majesty has been graciously pleased to call to your Councils, and on which they are all aware of the sentiments which your Majesty has at former periods expressed. They had persuaded themselves, that in the clauses to be proposed in the Mutiny Bill, your Majesty would be of opinion, that they were

E

only fulfilling the engagement which had been *formerly* entered into under your Majesty's authority, and carrying into effect a principle which has *already* received the fullest and most formal sanction, by the Act passed in the Irish Parliament in the 32d year of your Majesty's Reign. That Act enables your Majesty's Catholic Subjects in Ireland to hold Commissions in your Majesty's Army, with no other restriction *than is there pointed out*; and if a similar provision be refused with respect to this part of the new United Kingdom, it appears obvious, that the grace thus conferred by your Majesty on that large body of your People, must be rendered wholly illusory."

If many of your friends were convinced by my former letters, what will be their sentiments after reading this extract? And how will those sentiments be confirmed, when they are informed that Lord Sidmouth was selected as the Member of Cabinet to lay this Minute before His Majesty. Every man must see, that the selection of Lord Sidmouth on this occasion, was with a view to remove every possible jealousy from His Majesty's mind, that any attempt was ~~making to draw from His Majesty~~ a concession beyond the limits of the Irish Act. It is clear that Lord Sidmouth understood the precise nature of the minute, how far it was intended to operate, and within what limit it was restricted; for your Lordship candidly owns, that, when upon your hearing the doubts of Mr. Elliot and the Catholic Committee, you projected a more extensive measure, Lord Sidmouth decidedly refused his consent, seceded from your Cabinet on the Catholic Question, and offered to resign.

When therefore it appears in your speech, that you sent a draught of a dispatch to His Majesty, wherein the *admission of Catholics and Dissenters to all ranks in the Army* is suggested, and wherein it is alleged, that His Majesty's consenting to this unlimited concession, is in conformity to the limited concession made to the above representation, in acceding to which, His Majesty expressly stated, *He could not be induced to go a step further*; when, I say, these things appear from your own speech, and from Cabinet minutes, and from Lord Sidmouth's conduct and speech in Parliament, have I made an overcharged accusation in saying that you endeavoured to swindle His Majesty out of his consent. You alledged his Majesty's acquiescence in a measure which you knew, positively knew, to be *limited*, as a ground to force his consent to a measure in its nature *unlimited*; and you endeavoured to argue, that in his *first* consent he had actually assented to an *unlimited* concession, although your Cabinet Requisition was restricted to the measure of 1793, and again restricted by His Majesty's answer, and again restricted by Lord Sidmouth's interpretation and conduct, and again restricted by your own motion in the House of Commons, of the 20th of February.

Unless your Lordship shall bring forward far different proofs and documents than appear in your Lordship's speech, you must yourself admit, that a direct attempt was made by the Cabinet to over-reach the King. Your first dispatch, containing a concession on the Catholic subject, went to the extent of the Irish Act of 1793, as far as the army is concerned, and no further. Your second contains expressions (I quote your words), "*marking expressly, that the Catholics were to be admitted to hold any commission or appointment in the Army,*" and incloses clauses to this effect; and it further states, that *these* "*were in conformity with the general words of the dispatch, which had been sent on the 12th of February last.*" What is this but endeavouring to force the King to admit that he had signed his assent to an *unlimited*, when he had only meant to sign it to a *limited* measure? and to force His Majesty to allow, that by a *qualified* assent to a partial concession, he made an *unqualified* surrender as to the Catholic question.

I shall now consider what is the extent of your Lordship's defence: "*I am bound to say,*" (these are your words), "*that it has since appeared the measure had not been distinctly understood; not only His Majesty, but some of the Members of the Cabinet had not been fully aware of its extent; and I must confess, that I had not sufficiently attended to the distinction between it and the Irish Act.*"

This is your apology for submitting the second dispatch to His Majesty, and stating it to be in conformity to the first.

I must beg pardon, my lord, for asserting, that this is the worst possible defence that you could make for your conduct.

For let us see the force of it. It appears clear from the Cabinet Minute, the King's reply, and your Lordship's notice in parliament, that the concessions intended to the Catholics *were to be conformable to the Irish Act of 1793*. The expressions, however, in the dispatch to the Lord Lieutenant, were liable to some doubt; and, as I have said, Mr. Elliot doubted, and the Catholics contended for unlimited concession.

Now what was the honest part to take in this juncture? Two lines presented themselves: one was to explain the doubtful expression according to the King's explicit instruction. The other was, if the Cabinet wished to make additional concession, to state to His Majesty the doubts of Mr. Elliot, and the hopes of the Catholics, and to propose to His Majesty an additional concession, with a full Cabinet explanation.

Either of these lines of conduct would have been fair and correct, and upon which you could form your justification.

But you do neither: you sit down to contrive a plan to out-wit and over-reach your Sovereign: and in order to satisfy Mr. Elliot's doubts, and the Catholic demands, you endeavour to make your Sovereign admit, that he had already assented to what he had



positively rejected; believing, or pretending to believe, that his Majesty had misunderstood his own act; believing, or pretending to believe, you had also misunderstood your own notice to Parliament, what is the step you take? do you state the doubt? do you try to gain consent from His Majesty to a favourable interpretation? neither one nor the other; but you adopt yourself, without doubt, the Catholics' interpretation, against your conviction; and having cheated your own understanding, you endeavour to cheat your Sovereign's.

Such is your statement, such are the natural and unavoidable inferences from your Lordship's speeches and motions, and from your Cabinet Minutes. And I have stated, that nothing can have exceeded his Majesty's kindness in overlooking this conduct. For had his Majesty noticed this dishonest attempt of his Ministers to over-reach him, he must have dismissed them. How his Majesty has been since treated for this affectionate forbearance by your Lordship and your Cabinet is notorious.

I dwell not on your new Bill, which you yourselves acknowledge His Majesty disapproved, and which, on the day of its disapproval, you brought forward. I dwell not on the speech with which you opened the bill; I hardly dwell upon your three insulting stipulations to which you endeavoured to bind his Majesty.

What exasperates my feelings more than all these points is, your attempts to persuade the Nation that His Majesty, without cause, tried to impose upon you an unconstitutional pledge, and your unjustifiable appeal to the people against your Monarch.

First, you attempt to force, by strong representations, his Majesty's conscience on a subject nearest to his feelings. Upon the signification of his dissent, you renew your solicitations with additional vehemence; a reluctant concession is thus extorted, with an intimation that His Majesty *cannot go a step further*: then follows a swindling attempt to extort an admission from his Majesty that he had given a consent which he never intended: afterwards, a proposal and bill from your Lordship, of a still more extensive nature, is suddenly produced; then, upon his Majesty's signification of his dissatisfaction, your Lordship introduces your bill in Parliament in direct defiance of his Majesty; next follows His Majesty's determination to resist the usurpation of his Ministers. The subsequent step is your withdrawing your Bill, accompanied with a direct attack upon His Majesty's Sovereign Authority, by the demand of *three indispensable stipulations*, derogatory to His Majesty's character, as an independent Sovereign.

After such a course of vexatious, tricking, encroaching, usurping importunity, and after the defence made by you and your Cabinet of misunderstanding His Majesty; let me calmly ask your Lordship, did He step beyond the limits of His Royal duty in requiring from his servants, that they should withdraw their stipulations,

pulations, and assure him in writing, *in order to prevent mistakes*, that they would not again harass him on the Catholic subject?

If, without these preceding measures taken by his Ministers, His Majesty had exacted any stipulation, any pledge from his Ministers as to their future advice, councils and measures, I can suppose, that such an exaction might be made liable to cavil, if not to complaint.

But I contend, that after all the preceding measures I have stated, such a requisition on the part of the Sovereign became absolutely and unavoidably necessary on account of his Ministers' conduct.

You drive your Sovereign, by unprecedented violence, to a step which was necessary, not only for his future comfort, but for his independence; and having forced him to the most painful alternative which can be imagined, you accuse His Majesty to the Nation for taking that very measure, which your usurpation alone obliged him to take, or to surrender his Sovereignty.

Measures are to be judged of by the impartial examination of all the facts and all the circumstances which produced them. I call upon your Lordship, therefore, as a man who has not lost all hope of standing well in the esteem of the present age and of posterity, to detail with the fullness and accuracy which I have manifested, the whole of the proceedings which took place on the Catholic Question.

My statement is *not mutilated or garbled*, but full and impartial. If it is false, the documents are in your possession which can alone refute it. You say, you have His Majesty's permission to use them; take the benefit of that permission; exert it to the uttermost:—you have most unadvisedly and undutifully called your Sovereign before the Tribunal of the Nation: and if you suppress, pervert, or misconstrue, in any degree, any part of your Sovereign's conduct, you must be sensible you will forfeit every claim to honour and loyalty; and when you have lost those great characteristics of an Englishman, I shall little envy what remains to Lord Howick.

A. PROTESTANT.

# BOOKS

*Published by John Stockdale, Piccadilly.*

---

## MAPS OF ENGLAND, SCOTLAND, AND IRELAND.

Mr. SOCKDALE respectfully informs the SUBSCRIBERS to the above Maps, that the First Part, containing Scotland, is ready for delivery, and earnestly requests Gentlemen to send for their Copies.—Price 2l. 2s.

The Subscription will continue open till the whole be completed.—Price 9l. 9s.

*Piccadilly, 1807.*

---

Dedicated by Permission, to his MAJESTY, and published by Subscription.

Parts I. to IX. illustrated with numerous Maps and Plates, price 1l. 1s. or on Fine paper, with coloured Maps, 1l. 11s. 6d. each, to be completed in Sixteen Parts, forming Four large Volumes, Folio, of

## BRITANNIA,

Or, a Description of the Flourishing Kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and the Islands adjacent, from the earliest Antiquity,

By WILLIAM CAMDEN,

With the latest Discoveries by RICHARD GOUGH.

The above Parts contain the County Histories of Cornwall, Devon, Dorset, Somerset, Wilts, Hants, Berks, Surrey, Sussex, Kent, Gloucester, Oxford, Buckingham, Bedford, Herts, Middlesex, Essex, Suffolk, Norfolk, Cambridge, Huntingdon, Northampton, Leicester, Rutland, Lincoln, Salop, Chester, Hereford, Radnor, Monmouth, and Glamorgan, together with several of the Scotch and Irish Counties, &c. &c.

N. B. Parts X. to XVI. are in considerable forwardness, and will be completed in a few weeks.

*Books published by J. Stockdale, Piccadilly.*

On Twenty large Sheets, Price 4l. 4s.

**A MAP of the COUNTRY Sixty-five Miles  
Round London, from actual Surveys.**

By J. ANDREWS and A. DRURY.

Also, Price 5l. 5s. neatly coloured and half bound, a New British Atlas; being a complete Set of County Maps, on which are delineated all the Roads, Cities, Towns, Villages, Rivers, and Canals, together with correct general Maps of England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland.

---

In three Volumes Octavo, illustrated with a Map, Price 1l. 11s. 6d.  
in boards, the Second Edition of

*The History of the Helvetic Confederacy.*

By JOSEPH PLANTA, Esq. F. R. S. Principal Librarian of the  
British Museum.

---

On Twenty-seven Sheets, in One large Atlas Volume,  
Price 8l. 8s. or coloured 10l. 10s. half bound,

**A GENERAL MAP**

Of the Empire of Germany, Holland, the Netherlands, Switzer-  
land, the Grisons, Sardinia, Italy, Sicily, Corsica, and  
part of Poland.

By Captain CHAUCHARD.

With a Geographical, Historical, and Political Description of,  
and a Gazetteer of Reference to, the principal Places,  
and Statistical Tables of all the States of Europe.

---

In Eight Volumes Octavo, illustrated with Maps, Price 3l. 3s.  
or on Royal Paper 4l. 4s. in boards, a new Edition of

**THE WORKS OF CORNELIUS TACITUS;**

With an Essay on his Life and Genius; Notes, Supplement, &c.

By ARTHUR MURPHY, Esq.



*Books published by J. Stockdale, Piccadilly.*

In One Volume, Quarto, illustrated with Seventeen Plates, price  
1l. 11s 6d. in boards, the Fifth Edition of

**'THE SPORTSMAN'S DICTIONARY,**

Containing Instructions for Riding, Hunting, Fowling, Setting, Fishing, Racing, Farriery, Cocking, Hawking, &c. with various Methods to be observed in breeding and feeding Horses for the Road and Turf; the Management of Dogs, Game Cocks, Dungenhill Fowls, Turkeys, Geese, Ducks, Doves, Pigeons, Singing Birds, &c. and the manner of curing their various Diseases and Accidents. Improved and enlarged

By HENRY JAMES PYE, Esq.

---

In Four Volumes, Octavo, price 2l. 2s. in boards, a New Edition of

**THE HISTORY OF THE CASES  
OF CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS,**

With an Introduction on the Jurisdiction of the House of Commons—Precedents—Constitution of Committees—and numerous Explanatory Notes,

By the Right Hon. SYLVESTER DOUGLAS,  
Lord GLENBERVIE.

Containing the following Cases:—Milborne Port, Morpeth, Westminster, Hindon, Downton, Bristol, Cricklade, New Radnor, Dorchester, Taunton, Pontefract, Abingdon, Shrewsbury, Helleston, Bedford, Sudbury, Wigtown, Poole, Shaftesbury, Haslemere, Clackmannan, Lanerk, St. Ives, North Berwick, Petersfield, Seaford, Peterborough, Ivelchester, Cardigan, Worcester, Derby, Southampton, and Fife.

With an Appendix, containing Statutes relative to Elections, Final Determinations, and General Index.

---

In Three Volumes, Octavo, illustrated with Forty Plates,  
Price 1l. 11s. 6d. in boards, a new Edition of

*Travels in Upper and Lower Egypt,*

Undertaken by order of the Old Government of France,

By C. S. SONNINI.

Translated from the French by HENRY HUNTER, D. D.