



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.

4

A

PROTESTANT LETTER,

ADDRESSED TO

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

L O R D S O M E R S,

BARON OF EVESHAM.

BY

GEORGE ISAAC HUNTINGFORD, D.D. F.R.S.

BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER.

NOR CAN THEY, UPON REFLECTION, BE ANGRY WITH US,
BECAUSE WE CANNOT CONSENT TO A PROPOSAL, WHICH
AT NO TIME OR PLACE WAS EVER MADE BY ONE SET
OF RELIGIONISTS TO ANOTHER; NAMELY, TO WEAKEN
THEMSELVES IN ORDER TO STRENGTHEN THEIR RIVALS.

Bishop MILNER's "*Instructions addressed to
the Catholics*;" in 1811. p. 47.

London:

Printed by Luke Hansard & Sons,

FOR MESSRS. CADELL AND DAVIES, STRAND;

MESSRS. HOUGH, GLOUCESTER;

AND MR. ROBBINS, WINCHESTER.

1813.



A D V E R T I S E M E N T.

THE same sense of Duty, which suggested the propriety of delivering "A Charge" on the Catholic Question in the year 1810, dictated the necessity of writing the following "Letter." Lord SOMERS is Recorder of Gloucester. In September last, his Lordship in that City caused to be printed and published his "Speech and Supplemental Observations," which contend for the Admission of Roman Catholics into the British Legislature. In consequence of that Publication; in consideration of the Place where it appeared and attracted notice; in knowledge of the respect justly paid to the name and character of the Noble Author; it seemed incumbent on the Bishop of the
Diocese,

Diocese, in which Gloucester is the Cathedral City, to adduce some reasons, on account of which it cannot be desirable, that Roman Catholics should Legislate for Protestants, more especially for Protestants in Ireland.

The words "Catholics" and "Catholicism" are used, not in the sense which strict propriety requires, but according to the acceptation in which they are commonly taken.

As the same subjects are more than once introduced into the "Speech and Observations," they are unavoidably noticed more than once in the "Letter."

Dec. 31. 1812.

TO
THE RIGHT HONOURABLE
JOHN LORD SOMERS,
BARON OF EVESHAM.

MY LORD,

IT is at all times an occasion of regret, that there should be any cause for differing in opinion from the virtuous and good. Dissent from persons of that description is then more particularly to be lamented, when civilities politely and kindly conferred may justly claim attention from him, who has been honoured by them. Your Lordship however has more generosity than to wish that any one, however indebted to you for favours received, should pay to your sentiments, whether correct or erroneous, implicit deference. It will not therefore excite your displeasure, if those, who cannot allow the

B

Arguments

Arguments in your “Speech and Supplemental Observations” to be all valid, should openly express the grounds of their disapprobation.

To your Lordship’s character is attached respectability in the true and most dignified sense of that word. But the very circumstance of your being holden in high esteem creates the necessity of some comment on the principal parts of your late Publication. For, if the Reasonings contained in them were to pass uncontroverted, those who know your upright intentions and exemplary conduct might believe those Reasonings were unanswerable. Whether or not they are so, may perhaps appear in the following Remarks; which, omitting to discuss what you advance on points of subordinate consideration, will examine what you urge when you contend for that, which in Catholic Petitions is the * chief object desired;

* “It must surely be admitted, that the principal disqualification they pray you to remove from them, is that which renders them incapable of sitting and voting in Parliament.”—Lord Somers’s Speech, p. 8.

“And yet, my Lords, the right of sitting and voting in Parliament, or rather with respect to Irish Catholic Peers

sired; viz. "The Admission of Catholics into the Houses of Parliament, as Constituent Members of the British Legislature."

Section 1. After a brief preface, you enter on your subject with these words;

"If what is asked of * us by the Roman Catholics can be shewn to be detrimental to the Whole, to the Public at large, the Petitioners can have no claim of justice upon us. *Salus populi, suprema lex.* If the advantage of a part of the People consist in that which is detrimental to the Community at large, it ought not to be granted. But having in fairness and in truth admitted thus much on one side, I must contend with equal decision of sentiment

Peers and Catholic Commoners, the capability of being elected to do so, is obviously the most essential and serious right, or capacity, you are petitioned to restore to the Individuals of that Religion."

Ibid. p. 10.

* It is proper to mention in this place, once for all, that when the word "Us" is spoken by Lord Somers, it means "The Lords assembled in Parliament." When the words "We" and "Us" occur in the Author's reply, they mean—Protestants in general Parliamentary or not Parliamentary, who dissent from Lord Somers's proposal.

ment on the other, that if that which is for the advantage of a part (and especially of a very large part) of the people is not detrimental to the Whole, there ought to be no hesitation in conceding it: it ought to be conceded as a matter of justice and of right*.”

If from the first clause of this paragraph it were possible to exclude the idea, that in reality you intended to establish a position directly the reverse to what is expressly stated, we should applaud the sentence as perfectly unexceptionable, because perfectly true. But consistency of thought requires us to understand you as meaning to intimate, “If however what is asked of us by the Roman Catholics *cannot be shewn* to be detrimental to the Whole, to the Public at large, then the Petitioners *have* a claim of justice upon us.” It is impossible to avoid objecting to the condition of your hypothesis, so unreasonable is the demand which it tacitly implies. What is the demand? Nothing less, than that in a case confessedly dubious and difficult, we should demonstrate how a
measure

* Speech, p. 3, 4.

measure will end, before the measure itself is adopted ; we should demonstrate the admission of Catholics into the Legislature will not be dangerous, before that admission has taken place. A demand of this nature is equally inconsistent with philosophy and with prudence. With philosophy it is inconsistent ; for it calls on us to shew Effects before the Cause exists ; to shew the result of an Experiment before the Experiment is made. It is inconsistent with prudence ; for, whereas the dictate of common prudence is, “ if we reasonably doubt, whether great injury may not ensue from a particular mode of acting, we ought *not* to act in that manner ;” You in substance teach us, “ although it may be doubtful whether injury may not ensue, yet unless it can be *shewn beforehand* that such injury will *certainly* ensue, we *ought* to act in the manner concerning the result of which we entertain doubts.” There may be times, seasons, and situations, which may justify departure from the line of common prudence ; as in Military Operations. But, in the ordinary concerns of life, if a course of proceeding be hazardous,

a wise man will not think it a sufficient reason for him to pursue such course, merely because it has not been antecedently demonstrated to him that the termination would be evil. The Merchant will not enter on a precarious speculation; the Pilot will not steer his Vessel into a strait which he conceives perilous; the Commander of a Citadel will not admit into it an enemy; on the mere principle, *that it had not been previously made evident*, to the one, that he would certainly be ruined; to the other, that he would certainly strike on a rock; to the third, that the enemy would certainly seize his garrison. The sound and allowed maxims, by which the conduct of human affairs may well be regulated, are those of Caution suggested by reasonable Presumption; of Presumption warranted by Experience; of Experience, which having been collected from the Past, by reflection and comparison calculates on the Future. To him, who is guided by these, which for Deciding and for Acting are the legitimate Maxims, no blame is imputable, be the issue what it may. He, who on the contrary rushes
into

into "wild or speculative* theories, inconsistent with practice and founded in air," may indeed excite astonishment at his bold temerity, but will not be commended for having proceeded with judgment, even though he should be successful. Whether your Lordship may not be somewhat theoretical in your persuasion, that Legislative Power may be delegated to the Catholics of England and of Ireland without fear of detriment to the Community at large, appears so questionable, that before they coincide with you in sentiment, persons of experience must pause and deliberate. Is it asked, "By what Experience, in the case before us, we of the present generation can be instructed?" The answer is obvious; by Historical Experience. Whoever will study the Works, which most faithfully relate transactions inimical to Protestantism, in the reigns of Queen Mary and King James the Second; or at a period so recent as that of the † Irish Rebellion, since which event

not

* See p. 47. of Lord Somers's Speech,

† See Sir Richard Musgrave's "History" of that Rebellion—and his "Observations on the Reply of
4
Bishop

not sixteen years have yet passed ; will find awful warnings, which should caution him against precipitancy. in allowing it is *proper* to invest a numerous body, professing Romanist Tenets, and of course influenced by them, with Power to Legislate for Protestant Christians.

2. The *propriety* however of admitting Catholics into the Houses of Parliament occupies in your mind but a secondary place of consideration. You call for their admission, in the first instance, as for a measure imperative on the Legislature, a measure of obligation on the principles of Justice. Influenced by that notion, you decide with great dispatch on the point of *Justice* and *Right*. But, my Lord, with submission; does not the promptitude, with which you pronounce judgment, arise from some little misapprehension, some little want of discrimination? You seem not to have distinguished sufficiently between Rights Natural, and
Rights

Bishop Caulfield :” also, Dr. Duigenan’s “ Nature and Extent of the Demands of the Irish Roman Catholics,” p. 7. 122. 132. In p. 143. Dr. Duigenan’s vindication of Sir R. Musgrave, and animadversion on Dr. Caulfield,

Rights Positive, and the Claims which respectively grow out of them. To Life and Liberty Man has an absolute Claim; they are his Natural Rights, indefeasible, unalienable. To protection of his Person, secure possession of his Property, impartial administration of Law on occasions of appealing to it, every Man who lives inoffensively in Civil Society has an absolute Claim; they are his Social Rights, for the enjoyment of which he contributes his share towards promoting the chief ends of Society. But superior authority, and more especially that kind and degree of authority, which shall enable him to Legislate for others, and thus in effect bind others to Obedience, no Subject of a Free Constitution can claim as a Right Natural. If he has any claim to it, the authority can be due to him only as a Right Positive, originating in some Law recognized by the Constitution. Now where is the Law, which gives to Catholics, who will not Qualify, the Positive Right of voting in Parliament? That no such Law, and consequently no such Right emanating from Law, at present exists, is evident; for,

for, "whether or not the Legislature shall enact a Law conferring such Positive Right?" is the very point on which we are at variance in our opinions. Until such Law is enacted, Catholics can have no Positive Right, and assuredly they have no Natural Right to be our Legislators. The idea therefore of their Right to admission into the Houses of Parliament must be relinquished as founded in misconception.

The Laws, which to Subjects of the British Constitution convey Positive Rights, with great wisdom make such Rights dependent on certain Qualifications and Conditions. By annexations thus cautious, the Constitution doth but act on the principle of self-preservation. Where Individuals aspire to the high Power of Legislating for the Community, every State has the inherent Right of prescribing to them, as to its Subjects, the Qualifications and the Conditions which shall be requisites for being invested with that Power. That the Qualifications and Conditions should be to Individuals as little inconvenient as possible, ought undoubtedly to be in the contemplation

contemplation and among the provisions of each State. At the same time however it must be admitted, a State would be deficient in the Duty owing to itself and to its Subjects, if in considering the Terms on which it should delegate so important a Trust, if in prescribing the Qualifications and Conditions for Legislative Power, it did not pay full and adequate regard to that, which involves in it the continuance of Public Welfare, viz. the Stability of its Constitution, where such Constitution is Free. Whether the Qualifications and Conditions for Legislative Power, be or be not well conceived and settled in our own State, is a Question to be tried on the ground of Expediency. You contend for alteration in them. Others, more in the letter and spirit of the Constitution, are earnest and anxious to retain what was deliberately, manfully, and wisely appointed by their Predecessors, who were Men taught by experience to be circumspect in guarding and provident in transmitting Protestant Freedom, Civil and Religious, to their latest posterity. Between those who would surrender, and those who would
maintain

maintain the Existing Constitution, there is this material difference on the side of the latter; that whereas you can proceed only on conjecture; they can support their opinions by Precedents for more than a Century past; Precedents from which if the Legislature should swerve to the extent of admitting Catholics into the Houses of Parliament, the hearts of many more than * Four Millions doubly counted would sicken with grief, at the near prospect of Catholic Ascendancy in Ireland; at the certain, though gradual, advancement of Catholic Influence on the Councils of England.

3. In the course of your Speech and Observations occur these passages †; “Let the Protestant be the only Established Religion in these Islands.”—“Which word (State) includes its Civil and Religious Establishment.”—“Let therefore the Established Churches of this Kingdom, as part of the Constitution of the State, remain
and

* “Is it no benefit to our Country, to do away a just cause of dissatisfaction from upwards of Four Millions of your Fellow-Subjects?” p. 13. Speech,

† See pages 7. 25. 41.

and be firmly supported."—On a comparison of these with your expressions "detrimental to the Community at large"—"detrimental to the Whole;" (in p. 4.) we ought to infer, that in speaking of the "Community at large" and of "the Whole," you had in view its Religious no less than its Civil Concerns. In combining those interests; in considering the Civil and Religious Establishment as constituting one and the same Body Politic, one System in the Whole, comprising several branches in its Parts; you agree in opinion with the ablest Writers on that subject. By what mode of thinking and reasoning any Statesman who is prudent, is well acquainted with the history of Mankind, is thoroughly experienced in the Principles which influence human Conduct, and is really attached to the British Constitution, can possibly be persuaded that the Question of admitting Catholics into Parliament stands distinct and remote from all consideration of the National Religion and National Church by Law established, it is difficult to conceive. For, let us suppose such a Statesman to be an Atheist. Yet,
if

if he is prudent, though he has no religion himself, he will for his own interest wish that others may have some religion. For, if they too are Atheists, what can he expect from those about him but every act of improbity, injurious to himself, advantageous to them, if it can escape detection? He will also wish there should be some sense of religion on the Public Mind: for otherwise, what can he reasonably expect from Men in Official Departments, but falsehood, dishonesty, speculation, breach of trust, and that series of corruption and iniquity, which will disgrace a Nation, and which must eventually work the ruin of a State? Then again, in his knowledge of History he must be assured of the Fact, that through all ages of the World the States best policed have established some Public Religion; and that for the better support and observance of it, they have allowed none to hold Public Offices of high Trust and Authority, but those who professed the Public Religion. If motives of self-interest, if regard for his Country, if the sentiments and institutions of the wisest Legislators, if the usage of the

the most renowned and flourishing Empires, ought to have any weight in the deliberations of a Statesman, Atheist although he may be himself, yet he should admit the expediency of some National Religion. If the expediency of some National Religion is admitted, the next point for consideration is, "What Religion shall be the National Religion?" It is not very probable that a British Statesman should vote for establishing the Religion either of Moses or of Mahomet, or of Confucius. Nor would one, whose Mind had never been impressed with a sense of Religion, employ time or thought on examining the multiplicity of doctrines received among Christians, as they appear divided into different religious Communities. The task would be incompatible with his public engagements, and disagreeable to his taste, not formed for serious and deep inquiry into the grounds of sacred truth. Therefore, without appearance of precipitation, we may at once conclude he would establish Christianity as taught and practised either by the Church of Rome, or by the Church of England. With the tenets of
either

either Church, so far as they relate merely to doctrines of Faith, and do not affect Practical Conduct, an Atheistical Statesman can have no concern. But, with any Principles, which either Church may hold, whether more or less favourable to the Civil Government in themselves or in their effects, as a Constitutional Statesman he is deeply concerned. For, as a Constitutional Man of rank and authority, he is bound to preserve the Constitution: and with a view to such preservation his policy will be to prefer the Church, the Principles of which are more favourable, to the Church with Principles less favourable, to the Civil Government. Now it is evident, that the Church of England, which acknowledges the Royal Supremacy in both parts of the Constitution, i.e. in the Ecclesiastical as well as in the Civil, must in its Principles be more favourable to the Civil Government, than the Church of Rome, which allows the Royal Supremacy in one part only. To the Church of England therefore the Constitutional Statesman, even though he be an Atheist, should give the preference, if he would act consistently with

with prudence and with regard for the Constitution. In proof and support of such preference, he should secure that Church from being brought to a level with the Church of Rome. To such equality however the Church of England will be brought, if Catholics legislate for its Protestant Establishment. The Constitutional Statesman therefore, if he will be true to his own political professions, will dissent from any proposal for admitting Catholics into the Houses of Parliament, where they will legislate for the Church of England.

The Arguments drawn from prudence, patriotism, and policy, which might reasonably be supposed to weigh with a Statesman Atheistical, can lose none of their force when suggested to a Statesman Deistical. From a Deist indeed it might be expected, that he should be influenced in his judgment by additional motives; by considerations in their nature more high and serious. In his inquiry concerning the Churches of Rome and of England, it will be natural, because consistent with his persuasions, to ask, Which of the two maintains Principles most consonant with

C

his

his ideas of the Divine Attributes Justice and Mercy? Which allows the greater liberty for investigating sacred subjects; the greater freedom in temperately and soberly discussing religious tenets; the greater degree of discretionary power with regard to usages, which in themselves are perfectly indifferent? Though he will know, that for expressing inward sentiments some outward Forms are necessary; yet he will ask, Which in its Forms approaches nearest to the simplicity of spiritual Worship? Though he will acknowledge the propriety of introducing some Ceremonies into offices of Devotion prepared for Human Beings, constituted as they are in their nature with senses to be engaged as well as with minds to be exercised; yet he will ask, Which of the two Churches is most devoid of superabundant Ceremonies? It may be conceived of a Deist that he will put these questions, because if he is a reflecting Man it will be but consistent with his character that he should put them. Now, if partiality does not mislead the Members of the Establishment, they will not err in concluding, that so far as relates to all these

these points, he will find in the Church of England strong reasons for preference; reasons, which on his own principles should bind his conscience to guard that Church from being depressed, in any part of the United Kingdoms, either directly or indirectly, by Catholic Legislators.

What will be the inquiries of that Statesman, who is firmly attached to the existing Constitution, and who in his profession of Christianity, as taught by the Church of England, is serious and sincere; when he deliberates on the Expediency of admitting Catholics to Legislate for Protestants? It will be natural for him to ask; Has it arisen only from prejudice, vulgar and unfounded in any just cause, that the names of Philip, of Mary, of James the Second, should have been so detested by British Protestants? Was it merely from caprice and desire of change, that after the Monarchy had descended in the * old line

* "Thus ended at once, by this sudden and unexpected vacancy in the throne, the old line of succession, which from the Conquest had lasted above six hundred years." Blackstone's Comment. Vol. 1. p. 211. Ed. 7.

"They were too well acquainted with the benefits

line of succession for six hundred years, the Legislature departed from that line, and vested the Royal Dignity where it would be accepted on the express Condition, that whoever wore the Crown should be a Protestant Member of the Church of England? Did the jealousy, which prompted enlighten'd and wise Legislators to annex such a Condition, proceed from ideal fears? Were they but trivial, insignificant, unimportant errors in Religion, which Bradford, Cranmer, Ferrar, Hooper, Latimer, Philpot, Ridley, * Rogers, Rowland Taylour, having opposed and renounced, refused to embrace again, even though refusal was to be punished by a painful death? Are not the grounds, on which we separated from the Church of Rome, the very same now, which originally justified separation, so far as they relate

of hereditary succession—to depart any farther from the ancient line, than temporary necessity and self-preservation required." Ibid. p. 214.

* This Protomartyr, in Q. Mary's reign, having published an English Translation of the Old and New Testament under the name of Thomas Mathewe, was condemned as "John Rogers alias called Mathewe."

relate to Articles of Faith? From the decrees passed by the Council of Trent, has the Church of Rome rescinded any one Canon pointed in its anathemas against us Protestants? Does the Church of Rome concede any one tenet or usage, with a view to establishing a religious * Union between us? If Truth and Fact demand a negative answer to all these questions, he will then ask,—Consistently with the sense in which he understands the Doctrines of the Gospel; consistently with the sacred duty which, morally speaking, obliges him to act conformably with that sense; can a Protestant Christian encourage a measure calculated for the ascendancy of Catholicism in a part of the British Empire, so nearly situated, and so immediately connected with us, as the Kingdom of Ireland?

* “ This plan (i. e. of re-union with Protestants) never was proposed to them by those Catholic Writers (Bossuet and Du Pin) upon any other footing, than that they should admit the authority of the Catholic Church, the Pope’s supremacy, the seven Sacraments, the sacrifice of the Mass, the invocation of Saints, &c. In a word, we would give our lives to unite in religion with our Countrymen, on the plan of Bossuet.” See Note in p. 13. of Bp. Milner’s “ Instructions addressed to the Catholics ” in 1811.

Ireland? Can it be equally safe for a Protestant Church to have for its Legislators some Catholics and some Protestants; as to have them all Protestants? And, to the Catholics, who will not for our satisfaction concede one single principle, is it reasonable that we should surrender our Constitution? He will be told, the Catholics “disclaim, disavow, and solemnly abjure, any intention to subvert the present Church Establishment, for the purpose of substituting a Catholic Establishment in its stead*.” This he will hear, and will give them full and unqualified credit for the present sincerity of their hearts and the present purity of their designs. It will be asked; “Why then hesitate about making them Legislators?” For these reasons: “It is natural for Man to favour his own Cause, if opportunity be given him. The possession of Power to effect a measure has often created, what did not before exist, a Will to effect that measure; effect it too by Means not antecedently conceived in the mind. Success, attained in one degree,

* See the “Oath and Declaration” taken and made by Catholics, according to the Irish Act of 33 Geo. III.

degree, stimulates a desire of attaining success in farther degrees. As the approach to a great and desirable object is more near, the exertions used for securing that object are proportionably more strenuous, and the efforts more bold. A beginning once made, in itself apparently unimportant, has often terminated in disastrous consequences, which on no calculations of probability, on no grounds of conjecture, could have been expected." Therefore, although he will entertain not the slightest mistrust of honour and veracity in Catholics, so far as they mean and can promise for themselves according to circumstances existing at the time of making their unfeigned declaration; yet, knowing and lamenting the flexibility, with which even in Men of the best intentions, whether Protestants or Catholics, the judgment is warped; and having experienced the success, with which, through refined construction of Words, Political Debate can mislead even the most upright persons; he will conclude, that the safer mode by which to guard against future and unforeseen contingencies, will be that

the Power of Legislating for Protestants should be delegated to none but Protestants.

To what cause, next to the Blessing of Divine Providence! can be ascribed the tranquillity, with which Protestant Christians of every denomination enjoy the free exercise of religious worship, each according to their respective mode? It is owing to the wise Constitutional Provision, that none but Protestants should Legislate for Protestants. To whatever degree such Provision is annulled, for the avowed purpose of admitting Catholics into the Legislature, in the same proportion will Separatists from our Church have less security for their religious freedom. Catholics abhor the religious Principles even of us in the Church of England: much more do they abhor the religious Principles of those, who are removed from them at a wider distance, in their tenets and usages. That it will be as safe to give them opportunities for shewing the effects of such abhorrence, as it will be to withhold from them opportunities, on the maxims of common prudence cannot be pretended. Therefore

fore a Protestant Christian Statesman, though not in Communion with the Church of England, should object to the incorporating of Catholics into the Legislature, out of regard for his Brethren Sectaries. On the same account too he should endeavour to secure the Church of England against the influence of Catholics exerted to the disadvantage of the Establishment. Progressive attacks, whether covertly or openly made, might at length be extremely detrimental and even ruinous to the Establishment. If that were overthrown, the immediate consequence would be a repetition of those horrible miseries inflicted on our Forefathers in the Seventeenth Century. What in this Kingdom might be the result of sanguinary struggles for religious ascendancy, it were presumptuous to pronounce, though not difficult to conjecture. But with respect to Ireland, there could be no doubt that Catholicism would predominate in that Quarter over our Protestant Brethren ; Brethren whom we should always remember with a lively sense of affection ; Brethren for whose undisturbed and undiminished happiness in
the

the full enjoyment of Religious Liberty we should anxiously provide.

So momentous in itself and so inseparably connected with our National Religion is the Question before us, that it has excited in the mind an irresistible desire to place and see it in every point of view and in every shape, under which it can be examined, so far as it may affect the Members of the Established Church or other Protestants, with regard to Religion. That impulse has for a short time suspended immediate attention to your Lordship's Speech; but a return to your Publication shall now be made.

4. Pursuing the idea of "Justice and Right," you proceed thus;

"It is but fair to the Catholics of Ireland to add, that if their claims are founded on this broad basis, and it should also turn out, as I have been informed is the Fact, that they were induced to promote the Union between Great Britain and Ireland not merely on implied but on express intimations from high authority, that both as the price and reward of their support and as the
natural

natural and legitimate consequence of success in the cause to which that support was requested, their then and present claims should be accorded ; if this is so, my Lords, as I have been confidently assured, and we have all strong reason to believe, why then surely the result of our investigation of these points must be, that the Irish Roman Catholics are entitled to the admission of their claims, as a matter of strictest justice*.”

Your conclusion would be good, if your premises were sound: but before we admit the one, we must examine the other.

The negotiation, to which you refer as having actually passed, must have been extraordinary in its nature. No words can too fully express our conviction that you have stated it precisely as it was communicated to you. Since however you mention it, not as a Fact concerning which you can speak from your own personal knowledge and personal engagement in it, but as one of which you have “been informed;” we are at liberty, without intending or giving cause for offence, to receive the circumstance as a matter reported only. Now

* p. 4. of the Speech.

although

although the authority, from which a Report emanates, may be highly creditable, yet it is possible there might have been some degree of misconception in the Author. In a case too, where the production of some written Document, substantiated and attested, might reasonably be required in proof, Report alone is not sufficiently valid to be allowed as Evidence incontestable. The transaction, to which you allude, is a case in which we might be justified in requiring the production of some written Document, substantiated and attested. For it is not probable, that when a proposal of such magnitude as the transferring of its Parliament was made to the Kingdom of Ireland, there should be no written Specification of Terms from this to that Country: nor, if such Specification of Terms ever existed, and the granting of Legislative Power to Catholics was one of those Terms, is it probable that no well authenticated Copy of it, containing that among other Terms, should still exist among State Papers. Such Copy however has never yet been laid before the Public, nor even has appeal to it ever been made;

although the Promise, reported to have been given, has repeatedly been discussed.

But, to grant you every advantage possible, it shall be admitted as Certain, that as a condition of their acceding to the proposed Union, there was given to the Catholics a Promise of admission into the British Legislature. By whom could such Promise be given? By none but the Ministers of Public Affairs for the time being. My Lord; with every disposition to pay Ministers the utmost respect, which personally and officially is due to them, an independent mind cannot acknowledge the word of Ministers to be the Law of the Land, nor the Promise of Ministers to be binding on the Nation. Until they have been submitted to the judgment, and sanctioned by the approbation of Parliament, they are without force in the contemplation of the Public. Produce to us, my Lord, any formal Act of the Legislature, by which, in consequence of a Ministerial Promise, and because the Catholics of Ireland had promoted the Union of the two Kingdoms, it was ordained that henceforth Catholics should be admitted
into

into the Houses of Parliament, equally as Protestants; then without a moment's hesitation we will say, "For the honour of British Faith, admit the Catholics into Parliament, according to the solemn covenant of the Legislature." But you can produce no such Act; no Act with any Clause of similar import. On the Nation therefore, the Ministerial Promise, even if made, could not be deemed obligatory, because not sanctioned by the Nation through its Parliament.

The surest mode by which to ascertain what really was or was not promised at the period of forming the Union, will be by reference to the Act of Union. The design of every Act may best be collected from its preamble. The preamble * of the Union Act is this;

"Whereas in pursuance of His Majesty's most gracious Recommendation to the two Houses of Parliament in Great Britain and Ireland respectively, to consider of such Measures as might best tend to strengthen and consolidate the Connection between the two Kingdoms, the two Houses of the
Parliament

* See Preamble to 39 & 40 Geo. III.

Parliament of Great Britain and the two Houses of the Parliament of Ireland have severally agreed and resolved, that in order to promote and secure the essential Interests of Great Britain and Ireland, and to consolidate the Strength, Power, and Resources of the British Empire, it will be advisable to concur in such Measures as may best tend to unite the two Kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland into one Kingdom, in such Manner, and on such Terms and Conditions, as may be established by the Acts of the respective Parliaments of Great Britain and Ireland” —&c. &c.

You have here the substance of what His Majesty recommended; the subjects on which the English and Irish Parliaments deliberated; the purposes which they had in view, and for the attainment of which they agreed on certain stipulated Articles. Did His Majesty recommend, was it a subject of deliberation, was it among the purposes to be attained, that Catholics should be admitted to Legislate for Protestants?

But let us proceed to the Article, which

requires compliance with certain Conditions, from those who would be Legislators. In the Fourth Article then it is Enacted,

“That every one of the Lords of Parliament of the United Kingdom, and every Member of the House of Commons of the United Kingdom, in the first and all succeeding Parliaments, shall, until the Parliament of the United Kingdom shall otherwise provide, take the Oaths, and make and subscribe the Declaration, and take and subscribe the Oath now by Law enjoined to be taken made and subscribed by the Lords and Commons of the Parliament of Great Britain.”

If there be any thing remarkable in this Enactment, it is the Reserve, “Until the Parliament of the United Kingdom shall otherwise provide.” But what can fairly be deduced from that Clause, saving though it be? No ingenuity can thence extract any thing like a *Promise*, that there certainly *should* be a change of Parliamentary Qualifications. The utmost, which can be elicited from those words is an intimation of *Possibility*, that there *might* be

be some change. That Possibility however is Contingent in its nature, because it is left dependent on the Will of Parliament. It is also Indefinite as to time ; for no period, at which even an attempt should be made for carrying the Possibility into effect, is in the most distant manner specified. In truth, if the whole Transcript from the Fourth Article be taken together and duly examined, it will be evident that in its general tenor it meant to maintain and confirm the Requisites, prescribed by the Laws already existing, as Qualifications for admission into Parliament.

To the Act itself let us again appeal ; and transcribe from it an Article, which deserves more close and serious attention, than what has commonly been given to it by the Parliamentary Advocates of Catholicism. It is this ; “ That it be the Fifth Article of Union, that the Churches of England and Ireland, as now by Law established, be united into one Protestant Episcopal Church, to be called, *The United Church of England and Ireland* ; and that the Doctrine, Worship, Discipline, and Government of the said United Church

D

shall

shall be, and shall remain in Full Force for ever, as the same are now by Law established for the Church of England; and that the Continuance and Preservation of the said United Church, as the established Church of England and Ireland, shall be deemed and taken to be an essential and fundamental Part of the Union."

Mark the expressions, "shall remain in Full Force for ever"—"the Continuance and Preservation of the said United Church shall be deemed and taken to be an essential and fundamental Part of the Union." Can words be more plain, unequivocal, strong, direct, absolute? How then, so soon after passing an Act thus explicit, guarded, circumspect, can the British Parliament, consistently with Public Faith, encourage and sanction a Measure, the obvious tendency of which is to impair the Force, to shorten the Continuance, to counteract the Preservation, of all that is essentially conducive to the tranquillity and permanency of the United Church? "The Justice and Right," which you think demand fulfilment of a Ministerial Promise never proved to have been given, and
even

even if given not binding on the Nation, in reality support our Claim to scrupulous observance of those Conditions, which were solemnly ratified by Law. If to the letter and to the spirit of those Conditions the Legislature adheres not, the Protestants of Ireland may with reason accuse us of having practised on them the grossest deception. Can your Lordship forget that memorable and interesting * Debate of the Irish Parliament, which was protracted for nearly twenty hours? Can you forget that the Proposal for admitting Catholics into the Irish Legislature was negatived? And what induced the Protestants of Ireland to blend themselves so entirely with the English Parliament, as that the summoning of an Irish Parliament should thenceforth be superseded? It was the hope, that the Cause of Protestantism would thence receive a great and powerful accession of Parliamentary strength, which might render ineffectual any future designs of admitting Catholics to Legislate for Protestants. If that hope be frustrated, through concessions made by the very

* In the year 1795.

Legislature with which they coalesced for a contrary purpose, and on which they relied for protection against Catholics; how sadly will Irish Protestants be disappointed in their just and reasonable expectation!

5. Your * Speech introduces Lord Sidmouth. Those, who have observed the long and honourable career of that Noble Lord in Public Life, will anticipate this remark; that an opinion proceeding from his Political Experience, his Knowledge and Love of the British Constitution, should have great weight on all subjects of Parliamentary Discussion. To the Catholic Question, and to every branch appendant to it, no one has given more ample, frequent, serious, and dispassionate thought than his Lordship. The "Veto" was designed to be, and by the supporters of it was judged to be, a Measure of Conciliation. They were actuated by the sentiments of their own minds: Lord Sidmouth claimed the same privilege for himself. The "Veto" to him did not seem an Expedient fit for adoption. Your Lordship mentions some grounds of his disapproba-

* p. 6.

tion :

tion : probably there were others. It could not but appear objectionable to him on account of these tendencies ; viz. It would have lowered the Sovereign in the eyes and estimation of his Protestant Subjects, if they had seen the Head of the British Empire stooping to ask the Pope's permission for him to interfere, in the slightest degree which could possibly be conceived, in the external Church Government of the Catholics. It would have degraded the Sovereign's dignity, by humbling him to a compromise of Prerogative with a Person, who though venerable, is nevertheless a Foreigner. It would have reduced the Sovereign to a virtual recognition of what the Law does not recognise, the acknowledgment of an Ecclesiastical Supremacy distinct from that, which is vested in the Sovereign, whether King or Queen,

6. When you have endeavoured to demonstrate and support the Claim of Catholics to Legislative Power, as to a matter of Right, you make particular mention of the Irish Catholics, and acknowledge
 “ that since the Rebellion was crushed,

they have been sometimes violent, and sometimes have appeared unreasonable*." This confession does indeed prove your Lordship's candour; but it does not strongly recommend them as peculiarly fit to Legislate for Protestants. Excessive impatience under legitimate controul, most commonly foreshows extreme intemperance in the exercise of Power, at no long period after it has been attained.

7. When you enter on the policy of the measure proposed, you express a confident hope and pronounce a favourable judgment, for which thanks are returned you :

“ The Right Reverend Lords opposite to me I trust ever to see, when I am doing my duty in this house, in the full and free possession, occupation, and enjoyment of seats and votes in it. A more respectable Body of Men we can no where meet with ; and so with reason think the bulk of Englishmen †.” That we merit your approbation, we dare not say ; for we should be deemed presumptuous. But, that we study and labour to deserve your good opinion, we may venture to affirm, without incurring

* Speech, p. 5.

† Ibid. p. 7.

incurring the charge of arrogance. Your hope is conceived in the true spirit of a just Legislator, prepared to maintain the Parliamentary Rights of Bishops on * Constitutional Grounds; it is too with the judgment of an experienced and reflecting Observer, who well knows the propriety with which are asked these forcible † Questions, “ Will that Usurpation, which extinguishes the Hierarchy, stop short in its career to spare the Peerage? Will that Violence, which tramples on sacred Institutions, pay respect to human Ordinances? Will the Impiety and Iniquity, which

* See Appendix 2d. in Hume’s History of England, in the Section which treats of the Feudal Parliament, p. 116. Vol. 2. Ed. 1. References to Sir Edward Coke’s Institutes, in Vol. 2. p. 263. col. 1. and p. 483. col. 2. of Collier’s Ecclesiastical History. See also p. 797. col. 1. p. 800. col. 1. p. 803. col. 2. p. 807. col. 2. of the same Work.—See Sir W. Blackstone’s Commentaries, Book 1. Ch. 2. S. 2. and Note by Mr. Professor Christian, Vol. 1. p. 156. See 13 Car. II. Ch. 2. St. 1.

† See p. 49. Ed. 2. of a Visitation Sermon, replete with seasonable and interesting Remarks, preached by Rev. William Stanley Goddard, D.D. to whom this Nation is much indebted for the unwearied and successful assiduity, with which, when Master of Winchester College, he promoted the cause of Learning, Morality, and Piety.

which defy the Laws of God, be overawed and controuled by the Laws of Man?" What reply should be made, we cannot doubt; for, "the * Answers to these enquiries will be found in the Records of our own History, where they are written in characters never to be erased †."

8. In the disk of the Sun we sometimes discern spots; along the blue horizon will pass a small cloud; and in works, the language of which is for the most part luminous, we sometimes find obscurity. Your Lordship seems to have been less than usually perspicuous in the following passage:

"But notwithstanding such their opinion, I doubt whether my Lords the Bishops in their respective Dioceses find us Country
try

* Dr. Goddard's Sermon, *ibid.*

† As we are on the subject of Hierarchy it may be remarked, that whatever may be thought of the Episcopal Office, yet the Tenure of privileges attached to it should be viewed without jealousy, being of a nature altogether Republican. For, it is in the very Essence of a Republic, that privileges should not descend in a Family, but be transferred to a new line, at the decease of the person on whom by actual appointment they had been immediately conferred.

try Gentlemen remarkably anxious to increase the fines we have to pay them; or that they hear from the Parish Priests under their respective jurisdictions, that we, or the Yeomen of the Country, are over-forward or desirous to pay more or higher tithes than heretofore. If the Catholics are men like themselves, give them what they ask, and they will not quarrel with you to enrich their priests *."

An honourable mind will pardon in others some jealousy on account of their honour. In the combination of "fines," and "tithes," and "quarrelling with Bishops to enrich their priests," there seems (though perhaps it may be only in appearance and through misconstruction) there seems to be some latent idea, that Bishops either are or can be influenced by mercenary considerations, in their judgment and conduct on the momentous Question before them. If such be the idea, the page which conveys it is exceedingly unfortunate. Beginning with handsome compliment, but soon proceeding to disrespectful

* Speech, p. 8. A passage in p. 31. of the Supplemental Observations refers to the passage here noticed.

ful suggestion, it resembles the two * Fountains in the Troad, or Mount Hecla of Iceland, where we meet with the two opposite qualities of heat and cold in close proximity.

The bare supposition that the words are meant to insinuate, what when often examined they are conceived to imply, should put us on the defensive. Here then it shall be declared, without fear of contradiction founded in truth, that there is not a single Bishop, whether inclined or disinclined to admit Catholics as Legislators for Protestants, who is guided by any but the most pure, dignified, and best intentioned motives. One, who episcopally is placed in near relation with a very respectable City, where your Lordship bears high † Office, because he is so placed will explicitly

* Iliad, B. XXII. 147.

† Lord Somers is Recorder of Gloucester. That eminently distinguished Statesman, "who was a sincere professor of the Protestant Religion; preferred its general tenets to those of the Roman Catholic; and knew it intimately connected with the Liberty and Civil Constitution of the State;" (p. 43. Supplemental Obs.) the First Lord Somers, then Sir John Somers, is mentioned, in the Rev. Mr. Rudge's interesting and entertaining History of Gloucester, as Recorder of the same City. He was elected Aug. 29, 1690. See p. 86,

explicitly tell you the Principles, which deter him from assenting to your proposal.

The first Principle is Consistency.

The Bishops of Gloucester have all owed the independence of their See to that * Monarch, who for himself and Successors claimed Supremacy, in concerns Ecclesiastical equally as in Civil, within his Realm. How then, consistently with the due regard, which he in particular ought to have for the maintenance and continuance of that Prerogative whence his Diocesan Jurisdiction originated, can a Bishop of Gloucester vote for introducing into the Legislature any Persons whatever, who on religious Principles are bound to † deny the validity, and who on favourable occasions

* "In 679, that extensive See (of Lichfield) was divided into Five, by the decree of Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Gloucester was incorporated with the See of Worcester, which was one of them, and so continued till 1541, when it was erected into a distinct Bishopric, by Henry the Eighth." Mr. Rudge's History, p. 199.

† Bishop Milner speaks the language and sentiments of all sincere and real Catholics, when he says, "God knows, there never was an instant in my life, since I came to the use of reason, in which I would not

occasions would probably impede the exercise, of such Ecclesiastical Supremacy?

It were vaunting to speak in the language of a poetical * Character: but it should not give offence if a Successor in their See professes himself desirous of adhering to the Principles, which actuated the minds of † Halifax, ‡ Warburton, § Benson, Fowler,

not have lost my life rather than be concerned in giving either Power or Influence over any part of the Catholic Church to any Uncatholic Person or Persons whomsoever." Instructions addressed to the Catholics, p. 42. Ed. 1811.

"It is their Union with the Successor of St. Peter, as their visible Head here upon Earth, which does keep, and ever has kept the members of the great Catholic or Universal Church, spread as it is all over the Universe, in one Faith and one Communion." Inquiry, and Letters from Ireland, Ed. 3. in 1810, Letter 16. p. 179.

* Turnus in *Æn.* L. XII. V. 649.

† See his "Twelve Sermons on the Prophecies concerning the Christian Church, and in particular concerning the Church of Papal Rome."

‡ Bishop Warburton founded the Lectureship, at which Bishop Halifax preached his Sermons.

§ The publications of Bp. Benson were Three Sermons; viz. A Spital Sermon; a Sermon before the Society for Propagating the Gospel; and a Sermon on Jan. 30, 1737-8. In the latter Discourse, he vindicates the observance of the Three Anniversaries, and points out the reasonableness of their being instituted,

* Fowler, † Nicholson, ‡ Miles Smith,
§ Hooper.

The second Principle is Honour.

For creating the virtual existence of a Promise, it is not always necessary to use Words. A Promise is often Tacit; implied, though not expressed; the result of unanimity, mutual understanding, reciprocal confidence. In what Cases the existence
of

as they severally remind us, either of the atrocities produced by excessive enthusiasm; or of the evils resulting from rancorous bigotry; or of the happiness enjoyed under a limited Monarchy, and a Protestant Establishment. This Discourse is very copious in matter; and written with equal judgment, fairness, and vigour. From the few specimens left by Bp. Benson, we may collect he had mental abilities adequate to the greatest occasions; and may conclude he was a companion fit for persons so distinguished as Secker and Butler, not only on account of his dignified manners and exemplary piety, but also for his intellectual talents.

* In the "Collection of Cases" by some Divines of the City of London, is a Discourse on the "Church of England," written by Bp. Fowler.

† Bp. Nicholson published "An Exposition of the Apostles' Creed." Wood, in his *Athenæ Oxonienses*," gives a brief account of him.

‡ The Preface to the Folio Edition of King James's Bible; and a volume of Sermons; were written by Bp. Smith.

§ It is sufficient only to name Bp. Hooper.

of a Tacit Promise is a real Fact, can be determined by none but the Parties themselves concerned, on appeal to their own hearts. But, where it is admitted as Fact, there the Obligation of it is forcible, and should be inviolate. If you grant a favour to a person, on whom you rely for acting in conformity with your Principles; and if that person has the strongest reason for believing you did confer the favour because you relied on him; then he is bound in honour so to act; for his thus acting was a condition implied on your part, accepted on his. In like manner; if the Sovereign, being himself a Protestant and sworn to maintain Protestantism, graciously nominates for Episcopacy a Presbyterian, on whom he depends for unalterable attachment to the Protestant Cause; and if that Presbyterian conceives and is persuaded, that the Sovereign did nominate him under such reliance; then he is bound in honour not to disappoint the expectation of the Sovereign. Whether he may, or may not, be mistaken in his persuasion, is another point. But, on the supposition that he did so conceive and was so persuaded
at

at the time, he is bound to fulfil what in his mind he tacitly engaged to perform, i.e. to be true in his attachment to the Protestant Cause. So again; whether to vote for introducing into the Legislature any persons whatever, whose Religion will prompt them to erect a Spiritual Interest contrary to Protestantism, be or be not a mark of true attachment to Protestantism, by some may be disputed. But a Bishop, who thinks such a vote cannot be a proof of true attachment to Protestantism, on a Principle of Honour will dissent from the measure.

The third, and most dissuasive Principle, which deters him from assenting to your proposal, is that of Conscience.

Every Deacon, who is to be Ordained a Priest; and every Priest, who is to be Consecrated as a Bishop, according to the *Rites of our Established Church, solemnly promises, "that he will be ready, with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines." By the very import of his appellation, as
it

* See Rites, &c. annexed to the Book of Common Prayer.

it is now understood, a Protestant Minister declares his opinion that in the Church of Rome are taught “erroneous doctrines.” He has no other means, he wishes to have no other means, by which “to banish and drive away” such doctrines, than by maintaining, what he believes to be, Gospel Truths, in his Preaching; by force of Argument, in his Writings; by * Conduct exemplary and such as shall bespeak disapprobation of the tenets rejected, and discouragement from embracing them. The exertion of endeavours for introducing Catholics into the Legislature can never be deemed a line of conduct indicating disapprobation and discouragement of Catholic Errors. Consciousness therefore of that sacred engagement, which binds
him

* We pray in the Litany, that it may please God to “illuminate all Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, with True Knowledge and Understanding of His Word, and that both by their Preaching and Living they may set it forth, and shew it accordingly.”—Again we pray, that God would “bring into the way of Truth all such as have erred.” What says our Nineteenth Article? “the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of Faith.” Can a Minister, thus praying and thus declaring, assist in recommending Catholicism to National approbation?

him to a very different course of proceeding, must impede the exertion of any effort towards investing Catholics with the Power of Legislating for Protestants.

Every Deacon, and every Priest, when they are each respectively to be Ordained; every Clergyman, when he is to be Instituted to a Benefice, or Licensed to a Curacy; every Bishop, when he is to be Consecrated; all these declare, and by * Oath attest the sincerity of their declaration, that “no Foreign Prelate hath or *ought* to have any Jurisdiction, Power, or Authority, Ecclesiastical or Spiritual, within this Realm.” After such a declaration, how can any Clergyman aid and assist in advancing Catholics to Legislative Power, without involving himself at least in contradiction, if not in perjury? For, what does Legislative Power include? Our Liturgy was settled by the Act of Uniformity, i.e. by an Act which had the sanction of Legislative Power. That single Act therefore is sufficient to prove there is included in Legislative Power a considerable degree of Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction.

* Oath of the King's Supremacy.

E

Now

Now if we give that Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction to Catholic Legislators, we give it in effect to a Foreign Prelate. For, Catholics are under the Supremacy of a Foreign Prelate, who through them does already exercise Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction out of Parliament; and who, if they are made Legislators, will through them exercise it in Parliament, so far as Catholics can find opportunities for promoting his Spiritual Jurisdiction. In every System, in every Class, if that which is Inferior has Power, that which is Superior must also have Power: the consequence is unavoidable. If the mechanical force of any one spring, wheel, or lever of a Machine be increased, so far the force of the Machine itself is augmented; and in the same proportion facility of executing his work, whatever it may be, is made greater to the directing Artist. Genuine Catholicism and Papal Supremacy, in cases Spiritual, are indissolubly united. If we introduce a portion of the one, we cannot avoid introducing a portion of the other. Whether the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction derived from Papal Supremacy, so far as it may affect

affect this Realm, be *little*, or be *much*, is nothing to the purpose: our declaration is, it ought to be *none*; and Conscience bids us regard that declaration.

The first guide of Conscience is Divine Command. The next, Human Precedent. Why, according to his interpretation of Divine Command, a Protestant Bishop cannot aid a measure calculated to encourage Catholicism in England and give it ascendancy in Ireland, need not be explained. For Precedent, where can he look with so much propriety as to his own Order? What line of conduct can he pursue with equal safety, as that which most of his Brethren think it their duty to follow? the line which was followed by Bishops, with whom it will be a glory to err, if they did err. Douglas; Horsley; Porteus; Dampier; Law; were Men whose names will long be revered! They were Men, who witnessed the same political difficulties, which we witness; and therefore suitable examples to imitate, on the recurrence of circumstances similar to what they experienced: Men, sagacious in discerning the Whole Extent of the Catholic Question in *all* its bearings,

bearings, and therefore capable of pronouncing how far concession, unqualified and unconditional, might or might not be a source of unhappiness and insecurity to Protestants. The sentiments of Bishop Law weigh with particular force. He was endued with great strength of understanding. Situated, as he was at Elphin, he had opportunities of making observations in Ireland itself. He availed himself of those opportunities; formed his judgment; and was convinced the Catholic Claims were inadmissible.

My Lord, in trivial affairs we may follow the impulse of the moment. In common occurrences we may proceed without much thought. But in concerns grave and serious, and those of Religion are most grave and serious, it is reproachful to Man if he decides and acts without premeditation. From long and frequent reflection have resulted the Principles, which have been laid open to you. On account of the reasons in which they originated, the Principles themselves perhaps will be censured by your Judgment. But, until demonstration has proved them wrong, Adher-

ence to them will not be condemned by your Integrity.

9. In order to satisfy us there can arise no mischief from the admission of Catholics to vote in Parliament, you tell us, the Catholic Peers will be “very few in number;” the Catholic Members, Irish and English, in the House of Commons, not more than “Sixty or Sixty-two;” of whom Fifty will be returned for Ireland, and Twelve for * England. It has been calculated, that for Ireland alone would be elected Sixty-six Catholic Members, even according to the state of Property, which now exists in that Kingdom. We will however take your own number, and compute the whole at Sixty-two. Doubtless, many of them would be moderate Men. We cannot however suppose that All would be of that description; because you inform us, there are in Ireland “most violent † Demagogues, whose object is mischief really, and who by their mischievous influence produced the last Rebellion.” Now, if those Demagogues

* Speech, p. 8. 9. 10.

† Ibid. p. 16.

gogues have such ascendancy, and if to them “the leading and guiding of the popular mass has * fallen,” it is more than probable that some of them would ensure success at the election of Representatives. If that should be the case, then among the Sixty-two we should find some Gentlemen, who according to your account would not be very moderate: perhaps they might be some of the “incorrigibly restless,” to whom your † Observations allude. We will conceive the Parliament assembled. Business would proceed for some time, without much interruption; it is not good policy to begin at once with conduct intemperate and suspicious. But, in due season, the Turbulent would open and unmask; and even in the Moderate would be wrought a change. It would then be seen, that new situations suggest new projects; that the very idea of having obtained political strength will call forth energies before inactive, and give reality to such strength; that however Men may differ on other topics, and on other occasions, yet when the raising of their Religion,

* Speech, p. 16. † Observations, p. 44.

gion, and with their Religion exalting of themselves into a higher degree of public estimation, is the object in view, they will coalesce, and be united by the strongest of all possible bonds. The last remark is particularly applicable to Catholics: for, much to the praise and credit of their Fidelity, they are True to their own Religious Profession, and co-operate in advancing the interests of their Church. Your Sixty-two Catholics will form a compact phalanx, which even of itself must carry weight. Its weight however will receive accession of force, derived from English and Irish Protestant Members who will join the Catholics. For, that English and Irish Protestant Members will join them may be collected from this circumstance; The Catholics already, though not in Parliament, have great influence on English and Irish Members; far greater then might they be expected to have, if they were themselves Constituent Members, present to see and hear what was passing in Parliament, active in application to all around them, competent to exercise their own personal power, many by delivering suit-

able speeches, and all by giving effective votes.

On a Question of Religion, even your Sixty-two Members, with their connexions in Both Houses (for the Catholic Peers would be neither dormant nor insignificant) might be enabled to create embarrassment. But can you conceive, if the Catholics were once admitted into the Legislature, that their interest in Ireland would be stationary? that only Fifty would continue long to be the number of Catholic Representatives returned from that Kingdom? Do you quite exclude from your calculation of future events, the possibility and the probability of an increasing interest and of proportionate Representatives, resulting from an expectation so well founded as to be little short of absolute certainty, that the Catholics, when Members of the Legislature, will advance in their Claims? will make their first Claim, for a Catholic Lord Lieutenant; their second, for a Catholic Government in Ireland; their third, for placing the Catholic Church in Ireland on an Equality, at least, with the Church now Established? Success to these

these Claims would indeed be gradual ; but in the mean time, the very prospect of their being in contemplation and progressively to be advanced, would accelerate the attainment of success. For, whilst opportunity yet remained, and advantageous sales could be made by transfer to Catholic Purchasers, who for the sake of concomitant influence would give more than the intrinsic value of what they bought ; the Protestant Gentlemen of Ireland would dispose of their Estates ; and like prudent Navigators, who make for the port before the storm bursts, would leave that Kingdom and settle in England. The zeal which is shewn for the Irish Catholics, and the comparative apathy for Irish Protestants, would be continually operating as a sentence of exile pronounced on the Protestant Gentlemen ; and in the interval, the Landed Interest would be passing into the hands of Catholics, who would naturally employ whatever means are attached to that Interest, for the return of Catholic Representatives. Gentlemen of their Church have not yet imbibed that generalising spirit, which shall prompt them to prefer

prefer those, who widely differ from them, to those who agree with them in religious opinion ; those, who are of another Communion, to those who are of their own. Steady and warm in their attachment, they will think, (and as honest Catholics they ought to think) a Catholic more eligible for their purpose, than a Protestant. Thence your Fifty Irish Catholic Members would at every vacancy in a Borough or County be acquiring additional strength ; and the end would be, that nearly the Whole of the Irish Representatives would be Catholics. The artful and designing among the Catholics know this. It is one of the points at which they are aiming. Do not suppose the clamour raised by the Demagogues about admission into Parliament is merely for the name and honour of the thing : there is in view an ulterior object, which in the present stage it is wise to conceal. Seat in the House of Commons nearly a Hundred Catholic Members, and mark the effect. In all great and extensive Empires there must be times of Difficulty. Difficult times require strong measures. The carrying of proposals for
strong

strong measures can often be accomplished only by Parliamentary Concessions. These will be the seasons for the Catholic Body to offer its Terms to the Leading Men, who may be either friendly, or adverse, to the measures proposed. Accordingly as Concessions are made to their Demand (for such it will be) in favour of Catholicism, so will be the success, or failure, of proposed measures. To whatever side such a Body shall throw its weight, that side will preponderate. Retrospect on transactions in the Thirty Years past, will warrant conception of the events, in which the admission of Catholics into the Legislature will terminate, within the compass of Thirty Years future. And as those events will be detrimental, if not to the Whole British Empire, yet certainly to the Protestant Subjects in Ireland a very material and estimable part of the British Empire; the hope of averting from them Banishment, if they must leave their Native Country; or Degradation and Deterioration, if they must remain in it; will justify Precaution taken in a way the most mild, yet the most firm possible; taken
where

where it can and while it can be adopted ; that is, by voting in Parliament against your Measure whenever it is again proposed.

The force of any objection made to your proposal on account of consequences, which might be expected to result from the influence of your Sixty-two Members avowedly Catholic, you elude thus :

“ It has always appeared to me, who sat many years in the other House, that Irish * Protestant Members elected by a great number of Catholic Constituents (and theory in this case would premise what practice proves) have almost invariably voted on Questions of Catholic Claims, precisely as we should expect (or fear, if you will,) that Catholic Representatives would do.”

Having remarked, by the way, that through the † operation of Laws which
 now

* Speech, p. 10.

† “ Operation of Laws ;” this expression is studiously introduced, because there is no direct Law, which prohibits the election of a Catholic, considered merely as a Catholic, to be a Member of Parliament. If when elected he cannot enter the House of Commons as a Member, it is because he chooses to maintain Tenets, which will not allow him to Qualify as the Law requires. See 30 Car. II, Stat. 2,

now exist (and may their existence be * prolonged) it would have been but a nullity if the Catholics had elected Catholic Representatives; and therefore the election of Protestant Members was no special mark of regard for them; we will follow you to a † passage, where you suggest it is not quite “impossible for Catholic Electors to find a Protestant Representative, who” if he did not “agree with them in opinion on the subject of Catholic Claims,” would “for the sake of representing them be induced to vote as if he did.” With your permission, we will consider the similarity and the difference; the similarity in positive act, the difference in relative adjuncts and consequences, between a Vote given by Constraint, and a Vote from full persuasion that the measure supported is perfectly

* Towards the conclusion of his Speech to Parliament, Cardinal Pole says, “The meane whereby you shall receive this benefite, is to revoke and repeale those Lawes and Statutes, which bee impediments, blockes, and barres, to the execution of my Commission.” The remark of Foxe is, “The Pope’s Keyes can not worke in England, before the Locke of Good Lawes be changed.” p: 1343. col. 1. of the Second Vol. of Foxe’s Martyrs.

† Lord Somers’s Observations, p. 30.

perfectly right ; between one who votes because he is so instructed, and one who votes because he is anxious about success to his Cause. A Vote given by Constraint is cold and formal, unaccompanied with any concern about the ultimate decision, unassisted by any exertion for gaining advocates. On the contrary, a Vote which proceeds from entire conviction of the propriety and importance in the point to be carried, is ardent and cordial, attended with solicitude lest the determination should be unfavourable, aided by all the powers which can possibly be derived from expedients usually tried on such occasions. Thence it will happen, that although so far as the verbal expression of assent or dissent extends, the Votes may be both alike ; and although in the simple act of declaring either approbation or disapprobation the persons who give the Votes may concur ; yet in the effects which they will produce through collateral and concomitant circumstances, they will carry with them very dissimilar degrees of weight and influence. It is by yourself suggested as possible, that of the Protestant Members

returned by Irish Catholics, some may have voted for the Catholic Claims, not because they thought such Claims just, but because their so voting was a Condition of their being elected, a Condition which like Men of honour they fulfilled. But bring into the House of Commons Fifty Members from Ireland all Catholics, and you will find, that not only their Votes will be similar, but that to a Man they will be, as they certainly ought to be, unwearied in the use of all fair means to secure a Majority, on any Catholic Question; and the result of their Votes and exertions combined will be much more in their favour, than if the same number of Votes had been given by Protestants, who in part had voted merely to gratify their Constituents and keep their promise.

At our "fears, apprehensions, and horrors," Your Lordship is disposed to laugh, when you call the danger of acceding to your proposal, for admitting Catholics into the Legislature, "the Shadow of a *Shade." We have our fears most certainly; but they are of a description not quite so evanescent,

* Speech, pp. 11. 7. 8.

nescent, and proceed from a cause not quite so unsubstantial, as you seem to imagine. Our fears are, lest by a vote, indiscreet according to our views of the subject in all its branches and bearings, we should do wrong; wrong to the Constitution, to the British Empire, to the Protestants of England, to the Protestants of Ireland; wrong in the sight of Man; wrong to the Purity of Christian Religion; wrong before God! These are fears, which inspire Political Courage; Courage neither to be abashed by your very innocent raillery; nor to be intimidated by the menacing language of certain Catholic Writers, who do every thing but tell the Catholics, in plain terms, they should force their way into the Houses of Parliament as Legislators.

10. Your Arguments, for the Justice and Policy of removing Parliamentary Disqualifications, are followed by a * paragraph from which it appears, You would have Parliamentary Catholics be considered as *capable* of accepting appointments to all Offices of State; you would leave it to

* Speech, p. 11.

the

the Sovereign's Discretion whether or not such *capacity* should lead to *actual appointment*; you protest strongly against the Sovereign's being partial to Catholics in the exercise of his Discretion *. In that paragraph, those three points are evident. There is however a fourth point, material to be ascertained for a full view of your Measure in all its consequences; a point, which you do not distinctly specify, and which therefore we must collect from the general train of your ideas and tenour of your publication. It is, "Whether or not you mean, that if Parliamentary Catholics are Men able in talents and good in character, they also, equally as Protestants, ought to be admitted to high Offices of State?" That you do mean this is probable; because otherwise you will have done nothing for the Catholics. If you tell the Catholics "they shall be *capable* of receiving appointments, but never shall *actually be appointed*," you take away with one hand what you had given with the other. Still farther; the whole purport of your Speech and Observations goes to that end. For, you

* Speech, p. 12.

say, "Let Laymen enjoy equal Rights*" — "Disqualifications of Laymen on account of Religion should not be permitted †" — "Let no Christian Laymen be disqualified on account of Religion ‡" — "I contend it is decidedly right and wise to concede to our fellow-subjects what they now ask of us §." Those passages exhibit true specimens of the principle and spirit, which pervade your publication. It will not therefore be ascribing to you a meaning, which you never intended, if we understand you as intimating your opinion, that in State Offices, Catholics, if they have sufficient mental abilities and are of characters respectable, should participate equally as Protestants. Let us follow up this idea; and without indulging visionary speculation, see in what it may terminate. It cannot be impossible, it will not be improbable, that in the Cabinet may be at least one, if not more than one, Catholic State Officer. According to your own mode of thinking and reasoning, it would be a just cause of complaint to the Catholics, if after having been admitted into the

Legis-

* Speech, p. 7. † Ibid. p. 25.

‡ Ibid. p. 41. § Ibid. p. 51.

Legislature, they as well as Protestants should not sometimes be admitted also into the Cabinet. Consistently with your own principle you could not, and most probably you would not, draw a line of exclusion : for, wherever that line be drawn, there will begin a supposed Grievance, and the imposing watch-word “ Emancipation ” will again be heard with renewed clamour. All the Law Offices, the Offices of State-Secretaries, the Prime Minister’s Offices, all must be open to Catholics, and in due proportion must be filled by Catholics. You must allow this, or you will militate against your own arguments. We shall have then in the Cabinet of a Protestant Sovereign, one or two Catholic Confidential Ministers. Now, considering that extraordinary predilection for Catholics, which in many of our Parliamentary Legislators already supersedes due regard for the Protestants of Ireland, we cannot conceive it to be a case unimaginable, that there should then be made a greater effort for Catholicism in Ireland, and that a Catholic Question should be proposed for serious deliberation in the Cabinet. Into what a deli-

cate and distressing situation will you thus bring the Sovereign a Protestant and his Minister a Catholic? The very prospect of realising such perplexity and difficulty must surely tend to prove, what a Solecism it must be in Politics, to have a Sovereign of one persuasion and his Confidential Minister of another persuasion on subjects of Religion, which either may think much connected with the happiness of a People, if not intrinsically important in themselves.

By leaving the appointment of State Officers to the Discretion of the Sovereign, you act Constitutionally. In order however to do this effectually, you should proceed farther. You should take care that the exercise of Royal Discretion may be perfectly Free; because otherwise, it is possible that the Prerogative may be rather nominal than actual; more in appearance than in reality. Your Lordship is conversant with the best Authors ancient and modern. You will recollect the passage whence originated a proverb, which in substance said, "I have done this spontaneously; but against my Will*." The cases

* Hom. II. IV. 43.

cases are not uncommon, in which, so far as the expression goes, Consent is Free: but if the inward Thoughts could be discerned, the exercise of that Freedom would be found mixed with great reluctance, and that the Consent was rather extorted than given. Her Majesty Queen Anne had been many years Sovereign, at the period when these events happened; "The Queen was generally applauded for asserting her just prerogative, and setting herself Free from an Arbitrary Cabal, by which she had been so long kept in Dependence. The Duke of Beaufort went to Court on this occasion, and told her Majesty he was extremely glad that he could now salute her Queen in Reality *." You will smile perhaps, and call this the salutation of a Tory. It may be so; for at the time to which the Historian alludes, the principal persons of this Nation were divided into Tories and Whigs. Your accomplished Ancestor the First Lord Somers entertained a more correct sense of propriety, and was habituated to more polite manners, than ever
to

* Smollett's History of England, Vol. 2. Ch. 10. S. 18. in the year 1710.

to offend his Sovereign by Dictating*. But with regard to Tories and Whigs in general, after examining their characters and proceedings as represented for several years in the Eighteenth Century, the result seems to be that we may describe them thus; The Tories wished to govern the Nation, but they would do it through the Influence of the Sovereign whom they always treated with due respect; The Whigs wished to govern not the Nation only, but the Sovereign also, whom they occasionally treated with comparative disrespect, and to whom at those seasons they did not allow the Free exercise of Royal Discretion.

Your

* "The Leaders of the Tories began to insinuate to the Favourites, the necessity of the King's changing his Ministry, in particular of removing Lord Somers, who as he was now considered as the Head of the Whigs, so his wise counsels, and his Modest way of laying them before the King, had gained him a great share of his esteem and confidence; and it was reckoned, that the chief strength of the Party lay in his credit with the King, and in the Prudent Methods he took to govern the Party, and to moderate that Heat and those Jealousies, with which the King had been so long disgusted in the first years of his Reign." p. 241. Vol. 2. Fol. Ed. of Bp. Burnet's "History of his own Time."

Your Lordship “sat many years*” as a Member in the House of Commons. You have been in Parliament “upwards of thirty years †.” You know, that “in the present order of things, the Public Prints convey to the People the individual sentiments,” and the rumour’d councils and transactions “of their Legislators ‡.” You from experience, others from reading, have been taught to believe, we need not go quite so far back as the days of Sir Robert Walpole and Lord Bolingbroke for information and conviction, that among the chief Men of the British Empire have sometimes been formed Parties, have sometimes been made engagements, the operation of which has superinduced Political Force on the Royal Discretion. What has occurred, may occur again; unless the wisdom of the prudent and the magnanimity of the disinterested, who will rather protect the Sovereign’s Prerogative, than grasp at Power and expose the Sovereign to the danger of experiencing Party Constraint, should interpose judicious and seasonable prevention. It is conducive to
the

* Speech, p. 10. † Observations, p. 26. ‡ Ibid.

the Liberty of the Subject, that the exercise of Royal Discretion in appointing Ministers should be preserved Free; because otherwise, both Sovereign and People may be under the Domination of an Aristocratic, an Oligarchic, or a Democratic Faction. Of that Prerogative you, my Lord, are a Guardian; hereditary, by a wise Constitutional Provision; but deriving your honours, in the first instance, from a Power inseparably connected with that Prerogative. You therefore and the Peers of the Realm are more especially bound to keep the Royal Discretion Free from infringement by Political Force. With that view, remove from it, as far as you can, the Possibility of its being assailed with a New Demand, a Demand claiming the admission of Parliamentary Catholic Ministers into the very Cabinet of a Protestant Sovereign. There yet remains competency for you to obviate the Possibility of such a Demand: lose not the opportunity.

In strong language indeed do you protest against the indulgence of partiality for the Catholics, in the exercise of Royal Discretion.

tion. It is in the true spirit of him *, who strenuously contended for the Abdication and maintained the Legality of Convention. Your idea of King James the Second's character, and of his devotedness to the Roman Catholic Religion, is more correct, because more consonant with the general testimony of Historical Writers, than the novel opinion that he became Catholic with the view of being thereby Despotic. Either persuasion however will militate against investing Catholics with Legislative Power. For, if on the one hand he was sincerely a Catholic, he gives us reason to suppose Catholics will use their Power in favour of Catholics, rather than in favour of Protestants. If on the other hand he aimed at Despotism under the cloak of Catholicism, it is evident he thought Catholicism better suited than Protestantism for imperious Domination. It is remarkable that King James should have covered his real design with the specious pretext, that "since the service of all his subjects was due to him by the Laws of

* Mr. Somers, afterwards Lord Chancellor Somers.

of Nature, he declared them all equally * capable of employments, and suppressed all Oaths or Tests that limited this." When in favour of Catholics a similar doctrine of Equal Capability is again advanced, it cannot be entitled to a hasty reception.

11. The chief object claimed by the Catholics, and more especially by the Catholics of Ireland, is Participation of Legislative Power. The chief source of their discontent is the existence of those Constitutional Laws, which by requiring an Oath of Abjuration to be taken and a Declaration solemnly to be made, impede attainment of the object claimed. And it is to that alleged grievance principally, though not altogether, your Speech adverts, when it asks, "Is it no benefit to our Country, to do away a just cause of dissatisfaction from upwards of Four Millions of your fellow-subjects, a great proportion of whom are now shedding their blood in your cause, and fighting your battles by land and by sea; to whom therefore

* See Bishop Burnet's "History of his own Time," Vol. 1. p. 714. Fol. Ed.

therefore not only gratitude is due in point of justice, but also confidence in point of policy? Will no benefit arise from satisfying, in what is reasonable, not merely such great numbers of your fellow-subjects, but also numbers, whom the fact proves you are obliged to trust and to employ *?" Your Question shall be considered and met.

The feelings and language of dissatisfaction are then only justifiable, when the cause of it is reasonable. The cause of dissatisfaction is then only reasonable, when the object sought may with reason be required and in reason be expected. Now we deny it may with reason be required and in reason be expected by the Catholics, that to them who are inflexibly determined not to concede one tittle for accommodation with Protestants, Protestants should surrender their Constitution. For if the Laws, which relate materially and essentially to the Ecclesiastical Supremacy of the Sovereign, the present state of the Legislature, and the security of Protestantism, are to be altered at the Will of the Catholics, it is a surrender of the Constitution,

* Speech, p. 13, and 46.

stitution. When the alliance was formed between Church and State in the days of Constantine, the Civil and Religious interests were united by compromise. In the instance before us, one Party is to grant every thing; the other, nothing. This is not treating with us on fair Terms, nor in that spirit of conciliation with which the Christians of the Fourth Century conceded to their Christian Emperor much * Power in Ecclesiastical Concerns. If the Protestants were no more than equal to the Catholics in number and influence, they would be warranted in expecting some Condition should be proffered, to compensate the sacrifice of Legal Securities. But
in

* The eighth Book of Hooker's "Ecclesiastical Polity," either in the Entire Work or in Collinson's judicious Analysis of it; and Bp. Warburton's "Alliance between Church and State," either as published by that Author, or as Abridged in a Tract, entitled "Remarks on the Alliance between Church and State," by a friend now alas! no more; but who for the suavity of his temper, the constancy of his attachment, the soundness of his understanding, the rectitude of his judgment, will ever be dear to those who were intimately acquainted with him, the late Rev. Mr. Richard King; those Works are well known. Less known, but strongly to be recommended, is a Work entitled
"The

in population, the Protestants of the Empire far exceed the Catholics; and in political weight undeniably preponderate. Yet a Demand is made on them without any Condition proffered. It is therefore unreasonable; and as such is its nature, disinclination to comply with it ought not to be considered as a just Cause of Dissatisfaction.

It shall be allowed, that the Catholics are Four Millions in number. For the greater part of this aggregate Body we must look to the Natives of Ireland. What is the disposition of those Natives? and in what degree of esteem is Ireland to be holden? Truth shall speak. A writer of History would not do them justice, if he
did

“The Spiritual and Temporal Liberty of Subjects in England;” by Anthony Ellis, D.D. Bishop of St. David’s. It was published in 1765. The pages, from 107 to 114 inclusive, elucidate the principles on which Church and State are and should be United. Bishop Jewell enlarges on the Ecclesiastical Power of Jewish Rulers and Christian Emperors, towards the conclusion of his “*Apologia Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*.” For a new Edition of that “*Apologia*” illustrated with Notes, and for a republication of the Greek Version of the “*Apologia*” made by John Smith in 1638, many thanks are due to the Rev. Mr. Archibald Campbell of Pontefract. See Section IX. in Mr. Campbell’s Edit.

did not describe the Natives of Ireland, Catholics and Protestants, as a People generous, open-hearted, brave; in the relations of private life much to be loved; in their National Character much to be respected. And of Ireland itself he would be bound to assert, it is one of the brightest gems in the Crown of the British Sovereign; it is infinitely more than * Corinth was to Greece, it is one of the brightest Luminaries in the wide hemisphere of the British Dominions. Solemnly and seriously; Ireland and its People are endeared to us by every tie, which can bind heart to heart; and no Briton of right mind and right affections will ever cease from devoutly wishing them prosperity and happiness. The Catholics however are entreated to consider, that being incorporated into the Whole Body of British Subjects, they bear to the Population of the British Empire the proportion only of Four Millions to Twelve Millions. It is therefore no disparagement, no mark of
 - disrespect,

* Cicero calls it "Totius Græciæ Lumen." Orat. pro Lege Manil. Florus, "Græciæ Decus." Lib. 2. C. 16.

disrespect, no act of disregard towards them; if whilst we hope that whatever can be said in praise and favour of Catholics, can be said with equal truth of Irish and British Protestants; if whilst we conceive more is due to a Larger than to a Smaller number of British Subjects; we think it reasonable, in calculating the interests and adjusting the claims of Catholics and Protestants respectively, to decide on what is beneficial to Four Millions, certainly so far as that number goes in its relative proportion; but not so far as that the Benefit of Four Millions shall supersede what is owing to Twelve Millions. Unhappily, the Advocates of Catholicism reverse this Principle of calculation, adjustment, and decision. They say in effect, "Gratify the Four Millions to the fullest extent of their demands, at all adventures; and leave the present happiness and future security of the Twelve Millions to hazardous uncertainty." On this point, the Supporters of Protestantism and the Advocates of Catholics are not agreed. In their variance, both are entitled to the credit of the best intentions; but both have not

the same grounds on which to rest their arguments. For, we reason from consideration of the Maxims and Usage commonly adopted by mankind in Civil Society; from the occasions which made necessary the Laws enacted by our Forefathers; and from Experience of Facts within our own remembrance. You can argue from nothing but speculation and hope; guides of conduct not so infallible, as those which we take for our directors.

“ Be the event what it may, One and Common shall be our * Danger, One and Common shall be our Safety,” is the principle on which the United Kingdoms should ever co-operate against a foreign Enemy. Indissoluble is our connexion; inseparable is our welfare. When therefore your Lordship is speaking of the Catholics, who are in the Army and Navy†; would it not have been more correct, because more consonant with the relation subsisting between Great Britain and Ireland, if your mode of expression had been, “shedding their blood in the
COMMON

* Virg. Æn. II. 709. † Speech & Obs. p. 13. 46.

COMMON CAUSE, and fighting the battles of the BRITISH EMPIRE by land and by sea?" From the manner, in which you now mention them to the Parliament and People of England, as "shedding their blood in *your* Cause, fighting *your* battles by land and by sea," a reader unacquainted with our close Union might be led to suppose they were mercenary troops and mercenary sailors, without concern, without interest, in the final issue of their military engagement. Whereas, in fact, there is not a single Man indifferent; there are many Thousands most deeply concerned, most deeply interested; ALL are anxious that the termination of the War should be successful conjointly to Ireland and Great Britain. Perhaps however the word *Your* may have been designedly introduced, for the purpose of giving your sentence a rhetorical turn calculated to excite emotion and to swell the measure of gratitude in your Audience. With honest pride and thankfulness we may aver, the sterling sense and generous disposition of a British Senate require nothing more than a plain statement of valorous deeds, to

G

call

call forth its gratitude. British Subjects give cordially, reward liberally; so far as may be consistent with National Prudence. Beyond the extent of National Prudence, neither should Parliament be expected to confer, nor should an individual wise, good, and patriotic, wish to be compensated with remuneration.

That there are in His Majesty's Army and Navy many Thousand Catholics, is a fact which needs not be disputed; it is rather a source of gratulation to the Empire. To whatever part of the Continent, or of the Ocean, may be their destination, thither our hopes and fears, our anxieties and affections will always attend them. We read of their victories, with exultation; of their distresses, with regret; of their wounds, with sorrow; of their deaths, with affliction. Longer could we have dwelt on the many circumstances, which being connected with recollection of our Army and Navy come home to the bosom of every Briton: but we are compelled to defend ourselves against the charge of being ungrateful and unjust towards our gallant fellow-subjects. Reluctantly dragged from

indulging the sympathies of generous minds, like the * Arcopagites of old we must leave topics affecting the passions, and return to the more rigid task of controverting your arguments. We proceed then, by observing; As the Military and Naval Catholics form part of the Four Millions, so the Military and Naval Protestants form part of the Twelve Millions. If the former are noble and meritorious for their exploits, the latter are equally noble and meritorious on the same accounts. Whatever representation you can make in favour of Catholic Soldiers and Sailors, the same without diminution of force will apply to Protestant Soldiers and Sailors. Whatever may be required of us in token of gratitude, or dictated to us as a line of policy, in consideration of services rendered by the Catholics; the same may be required, the same dictated, in consideration of the services rendered by the Protestants in Army and Navy. Thus your
Argument

* See Lucian's "Anacharsis;" from which Dialogue we learn, that in the Court of Arcopagus the Judges silenced the person speaking, if he began to introduce what was foreign to the subject, with a view of raising compassion.—See Aristotle's Rhet. L. 1. Ch 1.

Argument gains nothing by the introduction of that extrinsic point. Disproportion between Four Millions and Twelve Millions still remains. And the Question, "Is it Justice, that to the solicitation of Four Millions should be yielded up the happiness and security of Twelve Millions?" recurs and meets you at every turn. Does any one ask, "What motives then can induce the Catholics to brave dangers, if to their Body is not conceded Capability of admission into the Legislature?" This question is put, because really some persons talk as if they thought the Catholics neither would continue, nor ought to continue braving dangers, unless Capability of sitting in Parliament be conceded to their Body. Let such persons know; the Catholics will enter the Army or Navy, will acquit themselves in their several duties with fidelity and zeal, actuated by the impulse of very different, and one might almost say superior Motives; Motives, to which no one, (be his religious persuasion what it may) no one, who feels like a Man will be insensible; Motives, by the force of which no mind would be stimulated
more

more powerfully than the mind of your Lordship. They are; Natural Affection for * Parents, Wives, Children, Friends; Invincible Love of Liberty, Honour, King, and Country.

“ Dear is the tie, that links the anxious Sire
 “ To the fond Babe that prattles round his fire;
 “ Dear is the love, that prompts the grateful Youth
 “ His Sire’s fond cares and drooping age to sooth :
 “ Dear is the Brother, Sister, Husband, Wife ;
 “ Dear all the Charities of social Life :
 “ Nor wants firm Friendship holy wreaths to bind
 “ In mutual sympathy the faithful mind.
 “ But not th’ endearing springs that fondly move
 “ To filial duty, or parental love ;
 “ Not all the ties that kindred bosoms bind,
 “ Nor all in Friendship’s holy wreaths entwin’d,
 “ Are half so dear, so potent to controul
 “ The generous workings of the patriot soul,
 “ As is that holy voice, that cancels all
 “ These ties, that bids him for his COUNTRY fall.
 “ At this high summons, with undaunted zeal
 “ He bares his breast, invites th’ impending steel,
 “ Smiles at the hand that deals the fatal blow,
 “ Nor heaves one sigh for all he leaves below †.”

Cold indeed must be the heart of him,
 who does not burn with patriotism, on
 reading

* Hom. Il. xv. 661.

† See in the “ Oxford Prize Poems,” p. 27. Verses on “ The Love of our Country,” by Christopher Butson, of New College; who is now Bishop of Clonfert.

reading these spirited verses. Whilst with all the animation of an ardent genius the Author was describing the sensations of himself and of every Briton, he was at the same time delineating in lively colours the universal feelings of that People among whom he now resides.

12. Whoever would live in Civil Society, should endeavour to adapt his thoughts and wishes to the circumstances inseparable from that state. In the Polity of a numerous and widely-extended People there must unavoidably be intermixed some Disadvantages. But if the Benefits are prepollent, in consideration of enjoying those Benefits, and for the sake of the Whole Community, a rational, prudent, and moderate Mind should be content to bear the Disadvantages. One Disadvantage in Civil Society is the introduction of Disqualification. And yet, for the greater improvement of Arts, for the more effectual discharge of Duty, for the more constant preservation of Order, for the more permanent stability of Government; Disqualification, in some shape or another, always

always has pervaded, and always will pervade a System of Polity well arranged; nor will it be uniformly excluded from a System of Polity ill arranged. Even in Revolutionary France, the National Assembly decreed, “No Deputy to the National Assembly shall be admissible into the Ministry, until Four Years after the expiration of the Legislature of which he is a Member*.” Licentiousness itself resorted to Disqualifying Provisions. These remarks were suggested by your Question, “Is it not the nature of Man to be dissatisfied and mortified with a Disqualification †?” You ask the Question in a way so general, that your interrogation seems intended to lay it down as a Maxim universally acknowledged to be true. The position however, that Disqualification, merely in itself abstractedly taken, is or should be a source of vexation, may well be controverted. If it hath been the irreparable
misfortune

* See p. 11. of a Work entitled “Historical Epochs of the French Revolution,” by H. Goudemetz; which Dr. Randolph humanely translated, and by an interesting Preface introduced to public notice, for the benefit of the Emigrant Author. It was published in 1796.

† Speech, p. 14.

misfortune of any one, that in his early days he should have been habituated to the indulgence of wayward caprice and restless desire; if in his youth he has been inflated with false and fantastic ideas of his own self-importance; if in manhood, succeeding such pampered adolescence, the pride of his heart should conceive all privileges of all ranks and stations are to be at his command; then indeed he will find continual cause for misery, in the Disqualifications which on every side will surround him. For, he will make but few efforts towards gratifying his arrogance, before he will meet with an obstacle in Disqualification. But, happily for themselves and for the Community at large, the Sons of most persons, except those in the very lowest Classes, are soon taught to know their own condition; are accustomed to stand on their own level; are made sensible of the restrictions arising from circumstances either local, or professional, or political; are prepared to acquiesce in what they perceive cannot be removed, without subjecting the Whole of Society to greater Evils, than those which Individuals partially bear.

If

If you would see the extent of Disqualification, and be convinced that it attaches not to Catholics only, look into our Four Professions, Army, Navy, Law, Church. Whoever continues to pursue any one of these lines, is disqualified for holding rank in the other three. Again ; Whence is it that Thousands cannot follow the diversions of the Field ? That Thousands cannot give an Elective Suffrage ? That Thousands cannot propose themselves as Candidates for the Parliamentary Representation of Boroughs ? and are still farther removed from Capability of representing Counties ? Why cannot Parliamentary Members of one House be at the same time admitted as Members of the other House ? Disqualification is the impediment through all these Cases. In fact ; Gravitation and Attraction do not operate more generally or necessarily in the frame of the Universe, than Disqualification does and must operate in the arrangements of Civil Society. Let not the Catholics be encouraged to think Disqualification lies on them only. To a greater or less degree, we all participate in Exclusion arising from the principle

ple of Disqualification, some in this way, some in another. Yet, the wise and good complain not. Wherefore? Because they are convinced these Maxims are true;

1. "It is the Duty of a Citizen to sacrifice Private to Public Good." And,

2. "He hath advanced far towards the attainment of happiness, who has learnt not to desire things incompatible."

The Catholics hold Tenets, which in effect disqualify them for admission into the Legislature. They have a Right to hold such Tenets, if their option is to hold them. But then they are not to expect, that for their gratification the Law of the Land should abrogate Disqualifications enacted and continued for Public Good. Where is the Reasonableness in making such a Demand? You will say, "But here is a Disqualification on account of Religion." True; and why not on account of Religion, which Man *does* choose; as well as on account of Insufficient Property, which Man does *not* choose for himself? Why is Disqualification on account of Religion more mortifying, than Disqualification on account of Insufficient Property? You would

would find it a difficult task, if you undertook to prove there was more of grievance in the former, than in the latter case. On the contrary, if this were the place in which to discuss that point fully, it were easy to demonstrate that the latter hath more of grievance in it than the former. Yet the Laws, by which persons of Insufficient Property are affected, continue in force. And for this best of reasons; because on a view of all circumstances connected with those Laws, and of all consequences which would follow a repeal of them, the Legislature judges it most expedient and most conducive to Public Good, that no alteration should be made in them.

13. With every sentiment, which should be conceived by Britons, when they hear what redounds to the honour of Ireland; with every emotion, which should be felt by Protestants, when they are told what testifies the Loyalty of Irish Catholics; were read the passages, in one of which you assert "a great proportion of them are now shedding their blood, and fighting battles
by

by land and sea *," against the Enemy ; and in the other you declare, that " the best and wisest of them, even with these restrictions, are heartily attached to their Protestant King and his illustrious Family †." That your assertion is true, our Army and Navy will bear witness. That your declaration is correct, we are fully convinced ; for otherwise it had not been made by your Lordship. But how with that assertion and that declaration are we to reconcile what you insinuate in these Questions? " Will you, when you can adopt the side favourable to your own interests, with perfect safety in all respects, as I have shewn you can in the case before us, hesitate, whether you shall endeavour to render millions of your fellow-subjects in the contest hostile or friendly to Him (i. e. the Enemy) or to yourselves ‡?" — " Would Lord Somers have argued for continuing them (i. e. the restrictions) when the best chance the arch-enemy of this Country has to disturb our quiet, or endanger its happy Constitution, is our denying to the Roman Catholics

* Speech, p. 13. 44.

† Obs. p. 44.

‡ Speech, p. 17.

Catholics in the British Empire what he with truth can tell them he grants to Protestants in his own *?" Unless you apprehend what your first statement does not warrant you in supposing probable; unless you apprehend what the National Character of the Irish People forbids us to think possible; unless you apprehend the Irish Catholics Naval and Military will either lay down their arms, or actually join the Enemy; unless you apprehend the "Heads of some of the oldest Families, Men of great landed property, Men of undiminished honour and integrity †," will encourage an Evil which must recoil on themselves; between what you assert and declare as being *now* the facts; and what you intimate *will* be the case, if we concede not the Catholic Claims, there can be no correspondence or consistency. Here then you are to make your option; whether what you say most creditable to the Catholics; or whether what you say most discreditable to them, shall stand as expressive of your opinion. It will be most in favour of their Claim for admission into Parliament, that you should leave on the
Public

* Obs. p. 44.

† Speech, p. 9.

Public Mind the impressions made by your representations of their fortitude and zeal in a Good Cause. For, of all the Qualities, of all the Dispositions, which imagination could conceive to be powerful recommendations for admission into Parliament, Wavering Fidelity and Divided Affections inclining only in part to us, but in the other part devoted to a foreign Enemy, must be the least efficient, the least conducive towards introduction into the British Legislature, so long as that Legislature shall retain one atom of Self-Respect, Firmness, and Independence. It will also be most in proof, and most to the credit of their own right Understanding, deep Reflection, and solid Judgment, that the Catholic Nobility and Gentlemen of Ireland should even stand appalled at the idea of resorting to Commotion, or to the aid of France, if their Claims are not conceded. They have been blessed with good Education, and have read for practical improvement. Their study has been History. History is the Mirror, which reflects the Image of past transactions; and whoever will contemplate that Image, will see what.

what he may with reason expect from a particular mode of conduct. Is it certain, that he who applies a spark to accumulated combustibles incurs the greatest danger of perishing in the explosion? Not less certain is it, that if the Noble and Opulent lead the way to Anarchy, they will be soon sacrificed to the lawless outrage and rapacity of their Followers, because they will furnish the most abundant spoils for insatiate plunderers. The annual income of the Duke of Orleans exceeded £. 300,000. Mark his progress and end. In the year 1790; on Jan. 1. as Philip Egalité he "was ill received at the Tuilleries." On Dec. 9th he assumed "the title of French Citizen." In 1793; on April 2. with his "Son, his Sister, and the Prince of Conti, he was conducted as a prisoner to Marseilles." On Nov. 1. of the same year he was "guillotined upon the scaffold, to which he had brought his unfortunate King*." Do the Noble and Opulent see in his example nothing which should deter them from appealing to Ochlocracy for redress? Then, on the subject
of

* See p. 51. 22. 37. 50. 73. of Goudemetz's "Historical Epochs."

of soliciting the aid of France, do many States on the Continent read them no lesson? In modern France Terms have changed their Meaning, which Men of Experience have learnt and understand. The embrace of Fraternity is the Clasp of Oppression; Armed Assistance is Entire Subjugation. To imagine Incompetency for Legislating in England would be deemed by them a greater Evil than submission to the Yoke of France, would be to suppose what is irreconcilable with the Nature of Man, unless he prefers Slavery to Freedom.

14. Enactment of Laws originates in some occasion requiring those Laws. Application of them coexists with that occasion. When the occasion ceases, enforcement of them ceases. Thence it is, that in your Statute Books are many Laws, which are become dead letters. The Test-Act is nearly such. At a period almost fifty years antecedent to the present time it was said with truth, "If he (i. e. a Dissenter) behaves modestly, prudently, and quietly, there seems to be no disposition in the Governors, either Civil or Ecclesiastical

siastical, to encourage informations or legal proceedings against him. He may continue in his opinions, and yet enjoy his Property, his Liberty *." Since the Age, in which that Observation was made, our Civil and Ecclesiastical Governors have shewn a gradually increasing disposition to protect all persons indiscriminately, in the free exercise of their religious worship. The fact asserted appears evident, from the various Laws successively passed, in favour of all who separate from the Establishment. You will perhaps ask, "Why then is not the Test-Act repealed?" That Question shall be met by others. When the Morning has brought back clear light, do you throw away the locks of your doors, and bars of your gates? When the flood has subsided, do you remove your sea-banks? When peace is proclaimed, does the Nation break up all its shipping? Virtually however the Test-Act is repealed every year, before the close of each Parliamentary Session, by the Bill of Indemnity. What, in effect, do our Legislators say by
that

* "The Spiritual and Temporal Liberty of Subjects in England;" by Bp. Ellys; published in 1765. p. 258.

that Bill? They say this; "Our object, in still retaining the Test-Act, is not that it shall injure any one; but that it shall continue, as heretofore, to secure the Protestant Establishment Civil and Religious from possible contingencies. You, Gentlemen Dissenters, have neither by your conduct nor by your principles evinced any thing incompatible with the security proposed; and therefore we shall provide, that although the Test-Act is not abrogated, yet it shall not injure you." But here you interpose triumphantly, "It remains in force Three Months out of the Twelve*." The Dissenting Gentlemen will have no reason to thank you for that observation. So far is it from serving them, that it only tends to counteract the benevolent designs of the Legislature. You have however by that observation and a remark, which grows out of it, exceedingly favoured our Argument. For, you say of the Act, "It remains in force Three Months." That period you would not have mentioned with the view of diminishing the protection given by the Indemnity Bill,

* Speech, p. 20.

Bill, if you had not thought the Test-Act continued in force much too long. Yet, during all that long period of full force in the Test-Act, by your own acknowledgment "Not one Man can be found to attack his fellow-subject upon it *." Thus your own words completely prove how very innoxious the Test-Act must be in its operation. If it be thus innoxious, as you have shewn it to be, in its general effect, it is still more so with regard to the case of admission into the Legislature. For no Protestant Christian is thereby impeded from being a Constituent Member of the British Legislature, when duly elected for that purpose.

15. You urge the propriety of admitting Catholics into our Protestant Legislature, by appealing to a Country where Protestants may be admitted into a Catholic Senate or Council. "When a Protestant Layman in Despotic France and its vast Dependencies enjoys the same Privileges as a Catholic, must not a Catholic in Free Britain repine, when he finds himself

* Speech, p. 20.

himself under Disqualifications*?" If the Government of France and the Government of England were similar, there would be more force in your Analogical Reasoning. But as they are very dissimilar, your Analogy fails; because the things compared are in their nature and in the consequences resulting from that nature, entirely unlike. The Government of France is Despotic. Under a Despotic Government, it is very immaterial what religious opinions a Member may carry with him into a Conservative Senate, or Deliberative Council. He cannot, by debate corresponding with those opinions, produce any influence on Public Measures. He is required, at the peril of losing his rank, and perhaps his liberty, to consult the Will of the Ruler; to speak as the Ruler speaks; to act as the Ruler dictates. In the Ruler, a Word is Law: in the Subject, Passive Obedience is the Duty. Thanks be to Divine Providence! not such is the case in England. The Government of England is Free. Whoever shall go into the British Parliament, will claim for himself

* Speech, p. 21.

self the ancient and allowed Privilege of Parliament; and so long as he confines himself to decorous language, he will speak unreservedly on all topics whatever. If into Parliament he carries with him Catholic Opinions, by Arguments deduced from those Opinions he will contend for Measures partial to those of his own Communion; he will endeavour to work on the Public Mind, by every legitimate effort which he can possibly exert, in favour of his own Religious Persuasion and for the greater benefit of all, who agree with him in that Persuasion. On Questions of Religion, he will labour to promote an interest, separate from that of Protestants; he will be zealous for a Cause, which in many essential points, is at least unfavourable, if not decidedly adverse, to the Cause of Protestants. In England therefore will be occasioned material difference, by the admission of Catholics into the British Protestant Legislature. In France, no difference can arise from the admission of Protestants into a Catholic Conservative Senate, or Deliberative Council. Hence the Cases are not alike; and being not

alike, they afford you no ground on which to argue from what *is* done in France, to what, as you conceive, *ought* to be done in England.

16. You contend, that the Principle which on past occasions induced the Legislature to make concessions, should now lead to an unqualified grant of every thing claimed by the Catholics. “ You have gone too far to recede towards granting these so much disputed claims of the Catholics: you have admitted a Principle, that ought necessarily to carry you further * ”—“ The Principle, on which we have conceded so much, would be absurd, unless we concede more †.” The Principle, to which you allude, is found in this passage; “ You have avowed to your Country and to all the World, that the reasons which rendered the old Disqualifying System requisite, exist no more: for you have yourselves broken its Barriers down ‡.” If, according to your idea, the Legislature proclaimed to the World, there was no longer occasion for the *old* disqualifying system; did it
proclaim

* Speech, p. 22. † Obs, p 31. ‡ Speech p. 21.

proclaim there was no occasion for continuing disqualification in *any* mode whatever? If so, how comes it to pass that some disqualifications are still remaining? that some Barriers are still standing? If the Legislature had heretofore meant to say, "No degree of restriction whatever will henceforth be necessary," it would at that time have repealed *all* disqualifying Laws. Some however it did not repeal; and of course it never meant to say *no* restriction was necessary. It meant to say this; "Although the *same degree* of restriction is not now necessary, which was once necessary, yet *some degree* is still requisite, and therefore *some* disqualifying Laws must remain unrepealed." Your argument will apply to the Laws which were abrogated; but it will not apply to Laws still retained. The reasons, for extending disqualification into so many branches, might cease to exist; but yet there might remain, there did remain reasons for continuing disqualification on a more contracted scale. It is not a necessary consequence, that because restriction could be removed in *part*, it could therefore be removed *altogether*. It is not

a necessary consequence, that because partial concessions were made, concessions unbounded should be made. It might be wise to concede something; but highly injudicious and improvident to concede every thing.

You illustrate by "Barriers." Does it follow, that because "Barriers are broken down" on the Frontier, Fortifications in the interior places of a Country are likewise demolished? Let us illustrate farther. You draw up a sluice to irrigate your Meadow. Are you, for that reason, to open all your floodgates and deluge your grounds through the Whole of your Estate within the reach of inundation? From a Building you may safely remove two buttresses or two pillars: but does it follow, that with equal safety you may remove all? The consequence you deduce from Part to Whole, from Less to Greater, is so evidently inadmissible, that nothing but respect for your Lordship should have occasioned even brief examination of your argument on such a plea; for it might have been confuted by this one axiom, "From particular

ticular premises you cannot draw an universal conclusion."

17. You intimate the Catholics are disappointed, in not seeing those * expectations realised, which they had hoped a certain important political event would soon have substantiated. Plain Men, who are rather distant spectators, than close examiners of public affairs, have proposed these questions :

Is it quite clear, that within the course of the last two years, there has not been observed among the Catholics of Ireland any † Act of Insubordination to the Civil Government? there has not been heard any ‡ Language, less respectful than it should be, towards "the Illustrious Person in whom now vests the executive Authority of the Kingdom§?" If any such Act has been observed, if any such Language has been

* Speech, p. 23.

† See p. 12. 23. 24. 51. 57. of "Substance of the Speech of the R^t Hon^{ble} Will. Wellesley Pole," in 1812.

‡ In the Resolutions of the "Aggregate Catholic Meeting," holden in the Summer of 1812.

§ Speech, p. 23.

been spoken ; are those precisely the kinds of recommendation, which are exactly calculated for obtaining Royal Favour and Parliamentary Concession ?

Again ; However Theory may have discerned no impediments, yet may not Practice find many ? May not the success of an attempt to accomplish a purpose be retarded by difficulties insurmountable ? An experienced Statesman makes this Remark ; “ A Scheme, however happily imagined, may by the nature of the obstacles, which oppose it ; by the difference of the genius and character of the People ; by the force of those Laws which they have adopted ; and by long Custom, which as it were stamps a seal upon them ; become alike chimerical and impracticable *.” He might have added ; “ And by all those, who expect not impossibilities, it will be thought wise to relinquish such a scheme ; because the circumstances, which obstruct its being carried into effect, require it should be relinquished.”

* Memoirs of Sully, when he is speaking of Brissac's plan for new modelling the government of France, Book 6. p. 288. Vol. 1. of English Translation in 1761.

Some of your expressions lead us to apprehend, a considerable degree of displeasure is mingled with the disappointment subsisting among the Catholics. Acquiescence in measures Constitutional would have been more decorous. It is however one of our natural infirmities, that our opinions should be misled and our conduct misguided by self-partiality. Thence it happens, that those who wish to see the adoption of a measure, favourable indeed to themselves, but in itself Wrong ; are displeased with him who proceeds as Duty directs, and under a sense of Duty perseveres in doing Right. And herein lies the very proof of real fortitude and of unshaken firmness ; that no temporising consideration shall induce Man to swerve from Rectitude. Nor will such Virtue lose its Reward. When a broad Constitutional Line has been distinctly marked out for the Head of an Empire, and when the Person invested with Regal Authority pursues that Line with undeviating step, the Public Mind will be impressed with feelings, which will dictate
and

and call forth the language of approbation, in terms like these ;

“ We deem it right to lay these our sentiments, by Petition, before both Houses of Parliament; and, in the most respectful manner before His Royal Highness the Prince Regent, whose genuine Patriotism, beneficent Views, and true and tried Magnanimity, have endeared him to our hearts, and inspired in our minds the most unbounded confidence towards Him*.”

18. As your Lordship proposes in your Supplemental Observations to enlarge on some topics discussed in your Speech, it corresponds with your design again to introduce your leading idea, “ That Disqualifications of Laymen on account of religion should not be permitted by the Legislature of a State to exist in it, Unless absolutely necessary to the security of such State, which word includes its Civil and Religious Establishment †.” The Exceptive
Part

* One of the Resolutions passed “ At a Meeting of the Protestant Inhabitants of the Town and County of Sligo;” on Wednesday, Aug. 12, 1812. R^t Hen^{ble} HENRY KING in the Chair.

† Obs. p. 25. 41. Speech, p. 7.

Part of this sentence involves the very material point, concerning which we differ in our opinions. You contend, "*All* restrictions may safely be removed." We contend, "*Some* restrictions are still necessary for the safety of the State." We are justified in our sentiments and proceedings on the Case, by the authority of intelligent and respectable Protestants, Natives of Ireland, Residents in Ireland, competent therefore, beyond the ability of those who are not Natives, who are not Residents, to foresee and ascertain what consequences will ensue, if the Measure, which you support, should be adopted to the full extent you so earnestly desire. Hear what they declare; "It appears to us, that the Unqualified Repeal of those Laws (i. e. Laws which create Disabilities) would not be consistent with that perfect *safety* to the Constitution which we feel we have a right to require; but would eventually substitute in their place a Roman Catholic *Ascendancy*, which would proceed to a *Domination*, necessarily subversive of the *Protestant Settlement* of this Country, on the *Preservation* and Strength of which

we

we firmly believe the *Connexion* between the Two Countries, and ultimately the *Security* of the Empire, to depend*.” Do we need, can we find better Instructors? What say they?—BEWARE!

National prejudice may possibly create in us undue partiality, when we are examining the wisdom of our National Provisions. Let us look therefore to another Country; a Country where Learning, Arts, and Sciences have been long and successfully cultivated; a Country, the Inhabitants of

* The Third Resolution passed at Sligo in August last. In unison with this is the language of the Protestants of Westmeath County; who petitioning against the Catholic Claims, address His Royal Highness the Prince Regent, in these words—“We dutifully and gratefully address Your Royal Highness as our Guardian and Protector.” Then having noticed the “unmodified extension of every privilege” claimed by the Catholics, and the refusal of Catholics to “submit their Establishment to the wholesome ties by which ours is connected with the State;” the Petitioners add, “We deem it our duty to declare, that such extension of privilege is absolutely incompatible with the spirit and security of the British Constitution, especially as tending to subvert the Protestant Settlement of this Country, on which we are convinced the *Connexion* between Great Britain and Ireland, and ultimately the *Security* of the Empire, depends.” Copied from Mr. Cruttwell’s “Bath Chronicle” for Thursday, Dec. 10, 1812.

of which are deficient in no intellectual and mental powers, requisite for sound Judgment. An Author, unwearied in his endeavours to promote Literature and to communicate information connected with Religion, has lately published a Work, which seasonably gives us this apposite passage ; “ The conduct of Sweden affords to the Papists of this Empire (not an obsolete example, but) an existing proof of the Duty of Conformity to the Constitution of their own Government. The King of Sweden has adopted a Papist for his Successor. But the Crown Prince was not admitted to the high post which he holds, till he had abjured Popery, and Conformed to the Protestant Religion *.” The fact contained in the concluding sentence deserves particular attention. It proves the British Nation to be not singular in cautiously guarding against any attempts to injure Protestantism ; not singular in exacting of Laymen Religious Qualification before they are admitted to Legislative Power. And
if

* See p. 49. of a “ Letter to the Clergy of the Diocese of St. David’s,” by the Right Rev. THOMAS BURGESS, Bishop of St. David’s, Published in November 1812.

if the Catholics may learn from Sweden that Religious Conformity and Appointment to Civil Authority are reciprocal ; their Advocates may find in it an instance, which will countervail many Arguments against Religious Disqualification, abstractedly taken, as a Principle of Exclusion from Power.

19. Unanimity gives weight to the decision of a Legislature. It is an object desirable, in proportion as the measure to be sanctioned is in itself and in its consequences important, Towards the attainment of Unanimity it will be conducive that there should exist in the Members of a Legislative Body the least possible difference of sentiment even internally conceived. For however at some seasons the real inward thought may be suppressed, and for a time may yield to considerations then influencing ; yet in general, difference of sentiment will naturally lead to diversity in whatever shall be spoken, or whatever shall be voted, on any case under immediate deliberation. The speeches and the votes of Legislators will indicate the complexion

plexion of their Minds, as Waters will shew the several Ores over which they have passed, and by which they have been deeply tinged.

From diversity of opinion, and from debate thence occasioned, concerning the practical conduct of Civil Administration; and on those topics, which are comprised under the head of Political Economy; little more than Inconvenience commonly arises. But when Legislators are resolved to maintain Principles diametrically opposite, which on the one hand correspond with the Constitution, but on the other are inimical to its permanency; then the Nation may with too much reason apprehend the superinduction of those Evils, which usually proceed from struggles in the Parliament and from convulsions in the State. Does the experienced Painter mix colours which will not harmonize? or the Chemist compound ingredients which will not amalgamate? Should a Politician, who would see Unanimity prevail, advise introducing into the same Assembly, where free and unreserved deliberation is holden, Members who entertain opinions irrecon-

I

cilably

cilably adverse, on many Points which even form the basis of the Constitution, Points inseparable from its essential Nature? Among many other objections to the proposal, for bringing Catholics and Protestants into the same Legislative Body, one is, the Certainty of their Disagreement on subjects intimately connected with the present and future happiness of each respectively. What resulted from the mixture of Catholics and Protestants in the * Diet of Poland? Did it ultimately promote the honour of the King, the dignity of the Council, the peace of the Community, the strength of the Nation, that the Legislative Assembly should have been composed of Members, who although alike Christians, were nevertheless opposite in their Sentiments on many articles of religious faith? At the periods 1733 and 1735 do the Catholics seem to have been actuated by a spirit of conciliation towards the Protestant Dissidents? Or rather, must

* See Vol. 2. p. 530. of "The Rise, Progress, and present State of the Northern Governments," by J. Williams, Esq.—Also, Vol. 1. p. 27. of "Travels into Poland;" by Rev. W. Coxe, A.M.

must not the enactments then passed and ratified have been the effects of hatred long conceived? If Catholics and Protestants are serious and earnest in their religious profession, it is morally impossible that they should not disagree on Ecclesiastical Subjects, so long as their Creeds are much at variance. For what is real and vital Religion? Is it a matter of barren speculation? or, doth it not operate to corresponding practice? It interests the heart, inclines the Will, and impels to action. That Jew should be partial to Jew; Mahometan to Mahometan; Catholic to Catholic; is a prejudice founded in human Nature and strengthened by Religious Principle. Whether that Principle be Right or Wrong, is not the Question. As a Principle it leads to partiality; and no experiments made on the Constitution of Man's Mind will ever be able to eradicate the seeds, or totally suppress the growth of partiality thence arising. However this position may in the judgment of some appear to bespeak in our Nature an infirmity, which they will not allow to exist, the truth of it nevertheless is sup-

ported by Facts, and by the Propensities of Mankind through All Ages of the World. But if between Catholics and Protestants, who are equally Christians, there will often be disagreement; we may be assured, that between Christians of any specific denomination on the one side; and Jews and Mahometans on the other; there will be greater discordance; because the Jews and Mahometans abhor the Religion of all Christians, be their particular persuasion what it may. Judiciously therefore have you now come to the insertion of a term, which confines your grant of Civil Power to CHRISTIAN Laymen only. You propose, removing, “as far as possible from Laymen of every sect of CHRISTIANITY, every disqualification*.” The limitation is highly proper in itself; but your Lordship will be pleased to pardon the Remark which follows. By that Limitation, you have departed from your own leading Principle;—viz. That “Laymen should enjoy equal Rights †”—“Disqualifications of Laymen on account of Religion should not be permitted ‡.”—Consistently with that Principle,

* *Ob.* p. 25. † *Ibid.* p. 7. ‡ *Ibid.* p. 25.

Principle, how can Jews and Mahometans, if Britons, be left under Disqualification? If the Catholics set up a Claim to Power on the ground of Right, it must be on the ground of Right resulting from Natural Law. Claim on the ground of Positive Right they can have none; for, at present there exists no Law, which can give them Positive Right. Now the Law of Nature considers Man as Man, abstractedly from all regard to religious profession; and thence Jews and Mahometans, if not aliens, will by the Law of Nature have exactly the same claim for admission into high superiority of Power, as Catholics and Protestants. The claim of all will be similar; as good for one, as for the other. Though, in reality, if you ask, What that Claim is? it must be acknowledged, None whatever. For, by the Law of Nature, no Man has Claim to pre-eminence in Rank and Power, beyond the limits of his own Family. If you still continue to think, Jews and Mahometans should not be admitted into the Legislature, you will think rightly, because it would be a most gross political Solecism to allow persons, who abominate Christianity,

I 3

tianity, to Legislate for a People professing Christianity. But in retaining that opinion, unfavourable to Jews and Mahometans, you are actually supporting the propriety of Religious Disqualifications, the existence of which is the very point you have been reprobating.

20. When you have asserted, "our Principle requires us to preserve the Ecclesiastical Establishments as they are precisely, so far as relates to Clergy;" you immediately subjoin, "In saying this however, I desire it may be understood, that I enter not into the question of Tithes*." This exceptive clause seems to intimate a doubt in your Lordship's mind, whether Tithes should "continue as they are †." Under such hesitation, it is possible you may hereafter think it advisable to debate on that subject. Previously to entering on discussion of a topic so extensive and complicated, so pregnant with effects which would certainly be momentous, perhaps privately and politically ruinous, it may be somewhat useful to recollect and consider

* Obs. p. 31.

† Ibid.

sider these strong circumstances. 1. The general Right to Tithes is founded on the Law of the Land*, sanctioned by prescriptive usage of nearly a thousand years past. 2. If in many particular Cases they have been conferred by Royal Grant, † Right to them stands precisely on the same ground, as Right to any Landed Estate, or to any Beneficial Appointment, be the description what it may, conferred on the Laity by Royal Grant; the resumption of which by the Crown, or by the Parliament, would be resented and resisted by the Heirs of the Grantees, as an act of Oppression. 3. If in other instances, (and indeed those are more numerous than what many Writers have been accustomed to consider) if in other instances they have been given by private Benefactors, they are equally claimable on the ground of Right, as other Possessions bestowed by Donors, or demised by Testators. 4. If Tithes in succession are to devolve on a
 Person,

* Blackstone's "Commentaries," Vol. 2. p. 25. Ed. 7.

† "Tithes have at this day all other incidents belonging to Temporal Inheritances." See Sir Henry Guillim's "Collection of Acts and Records respecting Tithes," Vol. 2. p. 652.

Person, who shall stand in a particular relation to some Parish; they are in that respect analogous to an entailed Landed Estate, which also is to devolve on a Person, who shall stand in a particular relation to some Family. 5. The purposes, for which Tithes are possessed by Ecclesiastical Persons, are upon the Whole substantially answered. Partial exceptions on the side unfavourable should not in fair judgment preponderate against Considerations more general, more numerous, and more weighty, on the side favourable. 6. It will be impossible to violate Right to Tithes, without * shaking the foundation of Right in every species of Property existing in

* In his Work, which is replete with Antiquarian Research and interesting Ecclesiastical Memoirs, entitled, "History of the Origin and Progress of the Meeting of the Three Choirs," Mr. Lysons objects to a modern plan for improving small Vicarages, in these words; "Desirable as it would be, that all poor Benefices should be augmented, so as to produce a competent maintenance for their Incumbents; it is much to be doubted, whether the good intentions of the Author would be so far fulfilled by the proposed plan, as to compensate the evil consequences which might arise from any measure, which should lead to the precedent of invading private possessions, or unsettling claims to property, in any way by Parliamentary authority." p. 101.

in this Empire. If Right can be violated in one case, by parity of reason it may be violated in another. We may perhaps hear it said, "The Power of Parliament can change any system." The answer is obvious. However great may be the Power of Parliament, yet it can only be a Power to do what is Just. For, neither the British Parliament, nor any Assembly of Men upon Earth, is MORALLY competent to do what would be Unjust. But Violation of Right would be an act of Injustice. A change therefore, which could be produced only by defiance of Rectitude, is not MORALLY within the Power of Parliament; nor ought it to be attempted. For, if ever the day should come, that the Parliament of England should presumptuously conceive itself authorised to do Wrong; and in the most * perverted abuse of Delegated Trust should † forcibly take
from

* See p. 236. of Mr. Morgan Cove's "Essay on the Revenues of the Church of England;" in which there is much information, and able defence of the Right which the Church hath to its maintenance.

† Commutation, more especially by Corn-Rents, with consent of all Parties concerned, is not forcible
Deprivation,

from Orders and Bodies of Men those means of decent subsistence, which the wisdom, munificence, and piety of Ancestors provided for them; which the good sense, integrity, and religious spirit of * Legislators through many Centuries have continued and confirmed to them; it will be mockery to tell us we are living under a Constitution, the boast of which, from the time of the Revolution has been this Principle, "Property is Sacred."

As a plausible reason for change it may perhaps be urged, "Persons of very different religious persuasions pay Tithes for the maintenance of a Church Establish-
ment,

Deprivation, and of course does not violate Right to Property in its original state, or in compensation given, though not equivalent.

* "We may venture to assert, that experience evinces, by the most decisive proofs, the wisdom of our Legislature; which actuated by views of the most liberal and enlightened policy; a policy in all points according with the genuine spirit of Christianity, has not withheld from our Church the means of sustaining her dignity, and of administering with energy and fidelity, every department of the extensive province intrusted to her charge." See p. 20. of "A Sermon preached at Lambeth" in 1802 by Professor Howley; from whom it is to be hoped the Public will hereafter receive many Discourses.

ment, who nevertheless do not belong to that Establishment." But they belong to the Empire, for the Moral, Political, and Religious Benefit of which, that Church is established. And therefore, although at first appearance it might seem objectionable that they should pay for the maintenance of a Church Establishment abstractedly taken; yet when it is recollected that such Establishment is an essential Part of a Whole System constituted for the Good of the Empire at large, the objection is done away*. Millions contribute towards the

* To the consideration of the Fraternity, which he had lately quitted, a Convert from Quakerism recommended this argument; "It is observable, that though the Apostle Paul in his first Epistle to the Corinthians enjoins those Christians strictly *not to eat things sacrificed to idols*, and is somewhat copious on the subject; yet he never so much as once prohibits the Church, either in this Epistle or any other, from paying the National Taxes to the Heathen Priesthood for their maintenance, and the support of their temples and worship; and that some such were established in the Roman Empire, is not to be doubted. But it is a fact still more surprising, that he does not forbid the payment of Tithes to the Jewish Priesthood, by the Christians of Judea; no, not even to those very Priests, who had imbrued their hands in the precious Blood of Jesus Christ." p. 10. of "An Essay concerning Tithes as appertaining to the Clergy of the Church of England;" by Robert Applegarth.

the support of the Army ; Navy ; Law Department, who are totally unconnected with either. They contribute also towards the support of various Public Institutions, from which however they derive no other advantage, than what accrues to all of us in a general way from the prosperity of the Empire. With a view to that prosperity, which they are zealous to promote, they hesitate not to contribute their share towards the Establishment of a Catholic Seminary at Maynooth ; an Establishment from which Protestants most assuredly will receive no private Benefit. It is however clearly for the Advantage of the Empire that there should be a Naval, Military, and Legal Establishment. The Legislature (for Individuals may doubt) the Legislature hath also decided it is for the Advantage of the Empire, that there should be a Seminary for Catholics at Maynooth. Public Good then is the Object in all these Cases. But Public Good is also the Object, and for many Hundred Years has been conceived to be the Object, of an Ecclesiastical Establishment. If then contributions towards Army, Navy, Law,

and various Institutions, are to be paid on the ground of Public Good ; they should be paid towards the maintenance of a Church-Establishment, on the same ground of Public Good. And your Lordship certainly will not disallow this mode of reasoning ; for it is on the ground of what you conceive to be Public Good, that you are contending for nothing less than a radical change of the Constitution.

21. You caution us against “ continuing unnecessary disqualifications *.” The disqualification, which excludes Catholics from the Legislature, is continued as Necessary. Necessary, for preserving Uniformity in our Constitution, which in every feature and character, in every provision and appointment, is altogether Protestant. Necessary, for promoting Unanimity in the Parliament, and in the Councils of the Sovereign. Necessary, for removing solicitude from the Minds of English Protestants. Necessary, for securing the exercise of Religious Worship and the undisturbed enjoyment of their Possessions, to the Protestants in Ireland. Necessary, for uphold-

* Obs. p. 35.

ing

ing a Protestant Government in Ireland. Necessary, for perpetuating the Connexion and Union between Ireland and Great Britain.

22. Your Lordship will deserve and receive the approbation of all serious and well-principled Men, for your correct views of the influence produced on human conduct by the expectation of a future state. "The day is but just past, when a mad democracy attempted to abolish all Religion, proclaiming eternal sleep after death; thereby equally endeavouring to root up every rational principle of Morality as of Religion itself. Have we already forgotten this so recent, so unparalleled, so horrible an attempt *!" At a period, when unhappily for this Nation the most extravagant ideas of Religious Liberty are again conceived, and doctrines equally wild and pernicious have again been propagated; it will not be unseasonable to make your observation introductory to a passage, which

* Obs. p. 35.

It was on October 17, 1793, that the Fanatics in Atheism proclaimed this doctrine, inhuman and degrading, as it is false and impious.

which is not only consonant with your own sentiments, but which also depicts in the most striking manner the horrible effects resulting from Atheism and Infidelity.

“ It was late before the Atheism of Epicurus gained footing at Rome, but its prevalence was soon followed by such scenes of Proscription, Confiscation, and Blood, as were *then* unparalleled in the history of the World; from which the Republic being never able to recover itself, after many unsuccessful struggles, exchanged Liberty for repose, by submission to absolute power. Such were the effects of Atheism at Rome. An attempt has recently been made to establish a similar system in France, the consequences of which are too well known, to render it requisite for me to shock your feelings by a recital. The only doubt that can arise is, whether the barbarities, which have stained the Revolution in that unhappy Country, are justly chargeable on the prevalence of Atheism. Let those, who doubt of this, recollect that the Men, who by their activity and talents prepared the minds of the people for that great change,

Voltaire,

Voltaire, D'Alembert, Diderot, Rousseau, and others, were avowed enemies of Revelation; that in all their Writings, the diffusion of Scepticism and of Revolutionary Principles went hand in hand; that the fury of the most sanguinary parties was especially pointed against the Christian Priesthood and Religious Institutions; that their atrocities were committed with a wanton levity and brutal merriment; that the reign of Atheism was avowedly and expressly the reign of Terror; that in the full madness of their career, in the highest climax of their horrors, they shut up the temples of God, abolished his worship, and proclaimed death to be an eternal sleep; as if by pointing to the silence of the sepulchre, and the sleep of the dead, these ferocious * barbarians meant to apologise for leaving neither sleep, quiet, nor repose to the living."

23. When

* See p. 47. of "Modern Infidelity Considered," in a Sermon preached at the Baptist Meeting, Cambridge; by Rev. Robert Hall, A. M. in the year 1800. It is a Work of extraordinary merit, for the accuracy with which it traces the progress, and the truth with which it describes the baneful effects of Infidelity.

The

23. When you profess you "know not whether there are more Protestants or Roman Catholics among Christians *," you must of course be understood as speaking with reference to the state of Christianity throughout the World at large. But our Case lies within a more narrow compass.

It

The style of it is for the most part strong and energetic.

The dementation of "infidel philosophers" in France has suggested some thoughts on the decline of "Papal Power," which are seriously and impressively delivered in p. 159—161. Vol. 2. of "Discourses," by Mr. Archdeacon Daubeny; whose name should never be mentioned without praise from Individuals and gratitude from the Public, for his exertions towards building and attentions in serving the Free-Church at Bath, the area of which is appropriated to the Lower Orders of People.

To every friend of Morality and Christian Religion, the sight of a Church newly erected must be highly gratifying. A Church of that description was very lately Consecrated at East Witton in Yorkshire. The design of it was conceived at the memorable period, when a Public Jubilee was solemnly holden, on His Majesty's commencing the Fiftieth Year of his Reign. The Right Hon. Thomas Bruce Brudenell Bruce, Earl of Ailesbury, is the Nobleman, who "in commemoration of that Event," built a handsome and commodious Church; leaving thereby a lasting Monument of his Munificence, Loyalty, and Piety.

* Obs. p. 37.

K

It limits us to the consideration either of the British Empire in general, or of Ireland in particular. In the British Empire, the Protestants are so much more numerous, that an endeavour to obtrude on them Catholic Legislators is irreconcilable with every idea of propriety. In Ireland, the Catholics far exceed in number. But, for that very reason, Justice, Policy, Affection demand it of the British Government, that a proportionate degree of attention should be paid towards securing the happiness of the Protestants in Ireland. That security will be greater, or less, according to the greater or less distance at which Catholic Domination is removed from them. For, however correct may be your observation, according to circumstances at present existing, "that humanly speaking there are much too many of each persuasion ever to be * forced into subjection or converted by the other;" yet from Catholic Domination may arise an evil, which does not seem to have entered into your conception. The condition of the Irish Protestants may be so much altered to their

* Obs. p. 37.

dis-

disadvantage, that those who have competency for changing their place of residence, may think voluntary exile preferable to continuance in Ireland. If the protection, which is now given by the more opulent and powerful Protestants, should thus be withdrawn from Protestants of the Middle and Lower Orders; and if Catholic Domination should supersede Protestant Government in Ireland, which most assuredly will be the case if Catholics are admitted into the Legislature; then if we may not doubt the correctness of your observation in its full extent, yet at least we may doubt whether some attempts would not be made to “force” the Protestants “into subjection.” Our apprehensions for the Middle and Lower Orders of Protestants, when deprived of the protection now given them by the Superior Order, are not visionary forebodings. They originate in your own Speech; are raised by your own language; are justified by your own description. We cannot forget that you tell us, the Catholics “have sometimes been violent, and sometimes unreasonable *”—that Men “the

K 2

highest

* Speech, p. 5.

highest in rank and weight have lost much of their most useful influence by their moderation*—that “in order to retain the remainder of their almost lost weight and authority, they have been obliged, in great measure to follow, instead of to lead and guide †”—that “the consequence has been, the leading and guiding of this mighty popular mass has fallen into the hands of the worst of men, the most violent Demagogues, whose object is Mischief really ‡.” If the Catholic Demagogues are already so prevalent, that even Catholic Gentlemen yield to their violence; what may we not fear for the Middle and Lower Orders of Irish Protestants, when there shall be a Catholic Lord Lieutenant, a Catholic Government, a Catholic Church Ascendancy in Ireland? You bid us not “Rake the Embers §”—nor, “Rouse the sleeping Serpent ¶.” We have been scrupulous, almost to an excessive degree, lest we should say or do any thing contrary to your advice. The information however, which you give us, creates a suspicion, that whenever they can find an opportunity

* Speech, p. 16. † Ibid. ‡ Ibid.

§ Obs. p. 35. ¶ Ibid p. 38.

opportunity for gratifying their “inflamed passions*,” the “popular Mass,” of which you have been speaking; the Catholics, who not by us, but by you are stigmatized as “needy and desperate Men, Rebels and Traitors †,” will rekindle your “Embers” till they burst into a flame; will awaken your “Serpent,” and direct it to the infliction of a deadly wound.

It was an insinuating way by which the Ancients conveyed instruction under the envelopement of Fable. Your allusion to the “Embers” and the “Serpent” seems to bespeak a partiality for that mode of suggesting advice. Perhaps you may not be displeased with the following Apologue ‡; though after the fashion of our age, which would have every thing new-fangled, it has
been

* Speech, p. 14.

† Ibid. p. 16.

‡ Factâ bipenni, quidam ab arboribus petit,
Darent manubrium e ligno, quod firmum foret.
Subitò jusserunt omnes Oleastrum dare.
Accepit munus : factumque aptans manubrium
Cœpit securi magna excidere robora.
Dumque eligebat, quæ vellet, sic fraxino
Dixisse fertur quercus; “ Merito cædimur.”

p. xv. of the “Præfatio” to a Work entitled
“Fabularum Æsopiarum Libri Quinque;”
printed at Oxford in 1757.

been forced to depart from the simplicity of the original, that by change of character and insertion of speeches it might be more closely adapted to modern times. The Apologue is this: An ingenious Woodman formed some metal into an Axe, the edge of which was well sharpened. He wanted a Handle. He petitioned the Trees of an adjacent Wood to grant him a stick sufficient for his purpose. The Veteran Oaks were not inclined to favour his petition. "We have heard," said they, "from tradition, and we know by our own experience, what devastation former Woodmen have made in the Forests." The younger Trees were not much disposed to profit by the wisdom and counsel of the elder. Their language was, "The Veterans are bigotted to antiquated notions, in conceiving it possible for an enlightened Woodman to act as others did in past years. They are narrow-minded and illiberal in consulting the safety of themselves; and in their precaution for us, who are confident our petitioner is more generous than ever to injure us for his own benefit. They are unjust in withholding what the Woodman may claim

claim as a Right. He, like us, is a production of Nature: he may ask for what he chooses: and if it is not conceded, he has a Right to take it by force." The aged Oaks were out-voted by numbers. A stick was granted. A handle was prepared. After no long time the Woodman laid about him. The younger Trees would have remonstrated, but they perceived it would be in vain, for it was now too late. Oak after Oak was felled to the ground; and the Woodman ceased not till he had cut down all his opposers; and threatened even his friends if they murmured at his proceedings.

24. Your "Supplemental Observations" are enlargements on your Speech. Your Speech was delivered in the House of Lords. Consequently the Lords, who dissented from your Measure, must be considered as the persons, to whom you direct this Apostrophe; "Beware therefore ye religious alarmists, ye abhorers of Popery, lest by your Madness and Folly ye change this so natural, so praiseworthy a desire, into the most furious and rancorous
K 4
hatred."

hatred.*" It is the part of those, who have done an act of kindness, to forget that they have conferred a favour. It is the duty of those, who have experienced such act, to remember the favour. The former province shall be left for your Lordship; the latter shall belong to us. We thank you for having placed us on a ground which gives us an advantage over you. The advantage is, that in return for reproach, we shall say to your Lordship nothing but what is respectful. Some however perhaps may be disposed to think, you have endeavoured to make us as odious as possible to the Catholics. Some may observe, "If the Advocates of Protestantism are thus assailed even before the Catholics are admitted into the Legislature, what words will they not hear, if they oppose Catholicism, when the Legislature shall have in it a hundred Catholics?" Others may suggest, that when a controversial opponent descends to the language of exacerbation, it is commonly a proof that sound Argument begins to be exhausted. Others may remark, there is a similarity between the style of your

* Obs. p. 37.

Lordship,

Lordship, and that of Bishop Milner, who exclaims, "Do not tell me, as many do, of the wisdom of the Legislature in devising those tests for shutting Catholics out of both its houses, and for preventing them from serving their Country in other respects. For it is a notorious fact, that these tests were enacted, not in the wisdom, but in the folly and downright madness of the Legislature and of the Nation *."

In the well-grounded hope of receiving approbation from correct Judges, a † Poet, familiar to both of us in our youth, disregarded censure, which he had not deserved. The same hope may console those, whom your Lordship addresses in terms of reprehension. Each of them will have the satisfaction of recollecting, that with his opinion concurred the sentiments of innumerable Persons, all competent to decide properly on the Catholic Question. Such for instance were the great Officers of State, and the ablest Lawyers, who in both Houses of Parliament were adverse to your proposal, and All who shewed their dissent by speaking

* Bishop Milner's "Inquiry into certain Vulgar Opinions;" p. 246. Ed. 3. in 1810.

† Horace, Book I. Sat. 10. V. 81—89.

speaking and voting. Such too as Authors, equally as Legislators, were the Bishops Barrington, Burgess, and Tomline; and such was a Temporal Peer, Lord Kenyon, whose "Observations*" demonstrate that preponderance of Argument drawn from Law, Fact, and Expediency, neither is on your side of the Question; nor can it be, till Law and Fact are totally altered. Such also, as Writers, whose Works are before the Public, and are therefore open to the Criticism which pronounces their Authors to be Men distinguished for much knowledge of Catholicism, for strong understanding, for sound reasoning; such are these Gentlemen; by name, Churton, † Coker, Daubeny, Duigenan, Elrington, Faber, Freston, Kett, Kipling, Le-Measurer, Nares, Napleton, Reeves, Rennell, Ryan, ‡ Sharp, Van-Mildert. All the
Persons,

* "Observations on the Roman Catholic Question;" by the Right Hon. Lord Kenyon. Fourth Edit. in 1812.

† See "Remarks on the Considerations of Sir John Throckmorton;" by John Coker, Esq. in 1806. This Work is sound in principle, close in argument, perspicuous in style.

‡ Granville Sharp, Esq. a worthy descendant from the Arch-Bishop of York. In all his publications,
Mr.

Persons, to whom reference has been made, whether in Parliament or out of Parliament, whether directly or indirectly, are competent to decide properly on the Catholic Question considered either in a Political or Religious point of View. And, if in confuting the doctrines of Catholicism; if in anxiety for the undisturbed enjoyment of Protestantism in England and among their Brethren in Ireland; if in maintaining it is unreasonable to say, Imperfect Allegiance is entitled to full participation of Privileges, which are rather to be sought as matters of Favour, than claimed as matters of Right; rather grantable by the
Power

Mr. Sharp has shewn himself earnest in the support of Civil and Religious Liberty. Zealous for Gospel Truth, he derives proofs of Our Lord's Divinity from the Uses of the Definitive Article, in a Work entitled "Remarks on the Uses of the Definitive Article in the Text of the New Testament," published in the year 1798.

If this Letter should be perused by the respective Authors of these Works; viz. "Substance of a Speech which ought to have been Spoken" on May 25th, 1808 — "Thoughts on the Catholic Question" — "Hints calculated to aid the Irish Catholics" — "A Refutation of the Statement of the Penal Laws which aggrieve the Catholics of Ireland;" all published without name; the Authors are desired to accept thanks for much information, just Remarks, and zealous exertion in behalf of Protestantism.

Power enabled to give, than demandable by the Party wishing to receive; if in adherence to the Principles on which was founded the Union between Great Britain and Ireland, to the Principles of the Revolution, to the Principles of the Reformation, to that which combines the Principles of the Union, Revolution, and Reformation, The British Constitution; if in these things there is blame, if in these things there is crime; All to whom we have referred, and Millions of others in the British Empire are prepared to take their share with the Members of Administration, in such blame and crime; and with them stand responsible for whatever may be occasioned by a calm and serious denial, that the admission of Catholics as Legislators for Protestants can be a measure either wise or expedient. Such confession of our equal culpability, and such declaration of our readiness to participate in the result, have been rendered necessary by your telling us, "the best of the Irish Roman Catholics look with animosity to the Administration only*." Why to them alone? There is a host of Protestants

* Obs. p. 38.

involved

involved in the same guilt, supporters of Ministers on the Catholic Question, and equally determined to abide the consequence. Valuable indeed and desirable would be the good-will of those Catholics. But if they are displeased because we choose not, for their accommodation, to alter the Whole System of the Empire Civil and Religious, we can but lament. "To the Constitution we cling; with it we commit ourselves to stand or fall*."

25. When even King John exerted himself to repel Philip of France, who menaced carrying into effect the sentence of deposition pronounced by the Pope: when the Protestants of the Low Countries revolted, because the Catholic Duke of Alva persecuted them without mercy: when Queen Elizabeth prepared her Naval and Military forces by sea and land, to resist the Armada of the Catholic Philip from Spain: when the venerable Bishop Hough asserted the authority of his Collegiate Statutes, against the encroaching mandate of the Catholic King James: when the Seven Bishops petitioned the same King not to insist on

* Resolution at Sligo. their

their reading an illegal Declaration? when your incomparable and truly Protestant Ancestor Lord Somers pleaded the Cause of those Prelates (for which disinterested and spirited act may Heaven bless his Posterity!) on each of those occasions, to which party should be imputed the charge of disturbing peace? to the party aggressing; or to the party which did but act on the defensive? This question is put to you, because our case bears some resemblance to those adduced. What they will attempt hereafter, the Catholics already give us to understand, by the imperious tone in which they dictate to us and demand unqualified submission. What do we in return? Nothing more than stand upon our guard. To say that in so doing we "encourage and promote war and dissension in religious concerns*," is to pervert the meaning of words and misapply language. You introduce the term "War." We reject and disclaim it. We feel not, we know not any the slightest emotion of animosity. We wish the Catholics should enjoy the exercise of their religious worship without

* Obs.-p. 39.

without molestation : and we desire only to be unmolested ourselves.

26. Your next paragraph reads us a lecture on “ kindness and moderation *.” Are then the Members of the Established Church to be deemed Unkind, and censured as Intemperate, because they vindicate Protestantism? But so it happens. If we do not defend our Religion, we are reproached as Supine: if we do defend it, we are stigmatised as Bigots. Conceive rightly, my Lord ; this is mentioned only as an observation on Fact ; do not mistake it as though it were the effusion of a querulous mood. . Complaint is Weakness. Difficulties should stimulate resolution. We must stand firm to Protestantism, and support it by all the Arguments, which Truth and fair Reasoning will warrant ; and by all the exertions, which Law and Charity will authorise. “ If the Reformation was worth establishing, it is worth maintaining †.”

You

* Obs. p. 40.

† This Apophthegm, compendious in words, voluminous in substance, is in p. 437. of “ Sermons and Charges,” by Bishop Barrington. They were collected and republished in 1811.

You exhort us to be "Mild and Gentle." We should have thanked you for that Advice, if the manner in which you introduce it had not betrayed your doubt of our having even a scanty portion of "Mildness and Gentleness" in our disposition and conduct towards the Catholics. You insinuate there is such a total and deplorable absence of these amiable qualities, that sending us to France for instruction, you bid us take the Ruler of France as our example, and like him be "Mild and Gentle," from policy*. "Condescend (say you) to imitate in this respect the prudence of the French Ruler, and be Mild and Gentle, because it is politic †." If policy be the ground for proceeding, perhaps it will be more politic, because more safe, not to look quite so far abroad, nor into that above all other Countries upon Earth, for a perfect model of humanity, meekness, and wisdom. Let us rather contemplate our situation at home, and consider the utmost extent to which "Mildness and Gentleness" ought to be exercised. It may seem paradoxical; but nevertheless
it

* Obs. p. 40.

† Ibid.

it is true, that "Virtue may sometimes be to ourselves and others, if not in itself, yet at least in its effects, Detrimental; and so far Culpable." On that subject occur thoughts, which expressed at length would fill a Volume. But to avoid unseasonable digression, what we have now to say shall be comprised in these very few sentences;

The Will of God is the source of Natural and Revealed Law. As in both it is uniform, under both it must be obeyed. The Passive Virtues are unquestionably the characteristics of Revealed Law. Yet, if they are carried to excess, instead of obeying they would counteract the Divine Will, by infringing the first precept of Natural Law, legible in the Constitution of Man, the Law of Self-Preservation. Now that Law is obligatory alike on Nations, as it is on Individuals. States are bound to provide for their Political Existence, as Individuals are for their Personal Safety.

Mildness will be shewn in the manner most compatible with Public Welfare, if the Legislature gives the Catholics every assurance of protection to their Worship; it will be shewn in a manner most friendly to

L

the

the Catholics, if the Legislature dissuades them from offering violence to the Public Mind by pressing Claims disallowed by the Empire at large. Under the idea of policy will it be said, "Grant their Claims, and they will be quiet towards you, but disunited among themselves?" It is the very proposal of our Enemy; "Rescind and renounce your Maritime Laws, and the Continental Confederacy shall be dissolved." An unreasonable Demand imposes the necessity of a positive Refusal.

27. Let us put the Case of two Writers on the British Constitution. Both shall agree in representing the component parts of our Legislature to be King, Lords, and Commons. They shall agree in maintaining "The Great Charter" is the basis of English Liberty. But let us suppose one of them inclined to stretch the Royal Prerogative farther than could correspond with the Act of Settlement and Bill of Rights; and in his partiality for the houses of Stuart and Tudor defending the exaction of Ship-Money and Benevolences,

the institution of the Star-Chamber and High Commission Court. It would not be unreasonable to conclude, that however you might have admired such a Writer's abilities, whilst he was dwelling on the Foundation of the British Constitution; yet you could not possibly admit his erroneous opinions concerning points incompatible with our Liberty. Between us and the Catholics the case is somewhat similar. We agree in asserting the Gospel to be the Basis of our Religion. We agree in Twelve Articles as confessedly Scriptural. Would that we agreed farther! but here we part. For, they would obtrude on us superadditions, which we can no more allow to be consonant with the Charter of our Faith, than you can allow the obnoxious acts of arbitrary extortion and the odious instruments of despotic oppression to be consistent with the Charter of our Liberty. And because we cannot allow them, in one passage you intimate we desire "to revive animosities between systems of religion grafted on the same stock and agreeing in the most essential Articles of belief*;" in another, you ad-

* Obs. p. 36.

monish us "to respect the agreement in their respective tenets*." Some words in those sentences arrest our attention; and it may be observed,

1. The Stock may be good, but not so the Cion. The Stock may be of the sweeter Apple; the Cion of the sour Wilding. The Stock may be of the Olive Cultivated; the Cion of the Olive not cultivated.

2. If the Catholics would acknowledge Twelve Articles only to be Essential, then we should be agreed. But, if you will consult the most approved Writers among them, they will tell you the Articles superadded by Synods and Councils, more especially by the Council of Trent, are also Essential. In acknowledging them to be Essential we are not agreed. And since for that reason we are solemnly anathematized, it is evident our unanimity on Articles most Essential does not avail sufficiently for our being regarded by them with Christian Affection; such affection they reserve exclusively for Members of their own Communion, because those Members alone will submissively adopt and implicitly obey all the Decrees, which

* Obs. p. 39.

attach indispensable obligation to Doctrines, by us thought unnecessary. Yet we hold not the Catholics in disesteem. As proofs of that assertion may be adduced these instances. We affirm they have all the Essentials of a Christian Church. We admit the validity of their Consecration to Episcopacy; of their Ordination for Priesthood; of their Marriage as a Contract sacred before God; of their Baptismal Initiation into the Christian Church. Then in private Life; no Protestant of common sense ever diminishes those civilities and that intercourse, which should obtain between persons living in vicinity; or lessens confidence and esteem where friendship has been contracted; merely because Catholicism creates difference of opinion. As a farther proof of our respect, you demand for them (not Individually but in their Aggregate Body, and there lies the insuperable difficulty) you demand for them competency to exercise Legislative Authority over Protestants. To this we demur; and ask; Has the Aggregate Body of Catholics, in the Kingdom of Ireland, shewn towards us a disposition, which should

induce us to concede Legislative Power? Did the conduct of the Catholic Laity in 1811, though palliated by your Lordship as an ebullition from “feelings of disappointment and anger* ;” did the language of the Catholic Laity in 1812, bespeak a cordiality towards the Protestant Government of Ireland, and sentiments of Duty towards a quarter, where such Duty ought to have been paid? Have their Clergy descended one step from their high pretensions to superiority over Protestants? Have they “abjured infallibility in Man,” or do they cease to charge it on us “as a fault and crime,” that we have abjured what we know belongs not to Man? You tell us otherwise in your “Observations † :” and their own Bishop Chaloner, in a popular Tract ‡, which is circulated among the lower Classes of People, asks this question; “What security can she (i. e. the Church of Protestants) give her Followers, that she is not actually leading them on in the Way of eternal Damnation?” Have they softened

* Speech, p. 6. † p. 41.

‡ See “A Roman Catholic’s Reasons, why he cannot conform to the Protestant Religion.” It is in the 13th Article, and 10th page.

softened their language when speaking of occurrences and of persons, coeval with Centuries now so remote, that a Mind disposed to forget and forgive, might have imagined all words of asperity on the original causes of our past discordance, had long since grown into disuse? Hear Bishop Milner; “If the Catholic Clergy were not deeply persuaded that the change of religion and breach with the ancient Church, effected by Henry VIII. and Elizabeth, were undertaken upon * Unjustifiable Grounds, and that their Church still continues to be the True Church of Christ, they would certainly be, not only the most wretched, but also the most foolish of Men, to suffer what they do suffer, for adhering to it and serving it.”——“In this (i. e. the Code of Catholic Institutes) there is no mention of the numerous and revolting blasphemies and immoralities with which the works of Luther and Calvin abound; no notice of the perfidy, treason, and † rebellion, taught and practised by
Cranmer,

* p. 24. of Bishop Milner's “Inquiry into certain Vulgar Opinions.” Ed. 3. in 1810.

† Ibid. p. 269. See the Reformers vindicated in Vol. 1. Sermon Eighth, by Rev. Mr. Van-Mildert, who

Cranmer, Ridley, Knox, and every other Patriarch of the Reformation in the several Countries where it has prevailed." On these passages suffice it to remark, they were published not longer ago than in 1810! and they demonstrate the justness with which, by changing only a single word, to Catholics of the generation now existing may be applied your observation made in behalf of their Ancestors, "What we consider as Reformation of Religion, they imagine to be Rebellion against the most sacred Rights*."

It was in 1810 that the Father of our English Prelacy stated the Grounds, on which he conceived might be effected a "Catholic Union †." They rested on the hope, that after calm discussion the Catholics would accord with us in disallowing the

like his Predecessors in Mr. Boyle's Lectureship hath done great credit to the Institution, by the application of much historical knowledge to the support of Revealed Religion.

* Obs. p. 33.

† See p. 442. of "Sermons, Charges, and Tracts," by Bishop Barrington. "The Charge," to which reference is here made, was delivered at the Visitation of the Diocese of Durham; and published in 1810.

the Civil and Religious propriety of urging those points, on which the Churches of England and Rome have materially differed. In 1811, what says Bishop Milner? "We would give our lives to unite in Religion with our Countrymen on the plan of Bossuet*." And what account does the Bishop give of Bossuet's plan? "This plan was never proposed to them (i. e. the Protestants) upon any other footing, than that they should admit the authority of the Catholic Church; the Pope's Supremacy; the Seven Sacraments; the Sacrifice of the Mass; the invocation of Saints, &c." This declaration does not very strongly invite us to a great Constitutional Change in their favour; because we cannot forget that zeal for these Articles of Belief has been the occasion of deeds very unfriendly to Protestantism. It would be insulting to the Catholics of the present day, if we were to suppose them actuated by less ardent zeal, than the Catholics of former years: and it would be irrational in ourselves if we did not think it possible
and

* p. 13. of Bishop Milner's "Instructions addressed to the Catholics;" Note.

and probable, that from the same Principle, applied for the attainment of the same object, would result similar Conduct. Zeal is a most powerful incentive to Energy. Laudable, or illaudable, it is in character, according to the circumstance in which it is engaged, the manner in which it is directed, the end which it proposes to accomplish. Of what character must be that zeal, which could inculcate this doctrine? "The Souls of all Protestants, immediately on their departure from their bodies, are plunged into hell, there to suffer eternal torments*." Of what description must be that zeal, which in the true spirit of those who maintained it was a † Damnable Sin to be present at the divine service of Protestants, ordains it should be a question put by the Priest to the person confessing,

put

* See p. 209. of a Work, entitled, "The Nature and Extent of the Demands of the Irish Roman Catholics;" by Dr. Duigenan; who affirms, "this uncharitable doctrine is inculcated into them from their infancy, as may appear from the Catechism, published by Dr. Butler, titular Arch-Bishop of Cashel."

† See a Work entitled, "The Sincere Christian Instructed;" Vol. 2. p. 366. where Bishop Hay quotes and commends the observation made by the Rhemish Translators of the New Testament.

put if not in express words yet at least in substantial meaning, “ Since your last Confession, have you entered an heretical house of worship * ? ” Of what description must be that zeal, which could bid the Catholic Servants of a Protestant Minister † discontinue joining with their Master in Family Prayer? Is there nothing of indignity offered to Protestants in deeming it thus criminal to hear our Public Prayers? Have Protestants nothing to apprehend from the workings of a Principle, which holds it sinful for Catholics even to assemble in the same room with us and to unite with us in devotional worship to the same Great CREATOR ! the same Gracious PROTECTOR of us ALL ? If not towards
the

* See p. 13. of a Tract entitled, “ Hints calculated to aid the Roman Catholics.”

† Ibid. Note p. 12. “ One of the most respectable Clergymen in Ireland, beneficed in the Diocese of Cashel, and resident in his Parish, has been always in the habit of reading Morning and Evening Prayer in his Family. A few years back, his Roman Catholic Servants of a sudden discontinued their attendance at prayers. This worthy Man enquired into the cause, and the servants excused themselves, by mentioning “ it was by the orders of Doctor Bray, titular Archbishop of Cashel.” [The Tract was published about two years since.]

the persons, yet certainly towards the Religion of Protestants, such Indignity and such a Principle must excite contempt and abhorrence in the Mass of the People; and must create strong prejudices in the Minds of the well-Educated. If from any portion of those prejudices carried into the Legislature your Lordship is confident there can arise nothing unfavourable to Protestants; in your speculations on Cause and Effect, in your conceptions of human perfectibility there must be a degree of Refinement, more consonant with French than with English Philosophy.

All that is farther suggested by your introduction of "Stock and Graft," of "Articles and Tenets," shall be given in the words of a Writer, whose Work on the Apocalypse is much to be commended, for the cautious reserve with which it expounds and applies Prophecy.

"When Protestant Writers attribute such descriptions to the Papal Church, they must not be understood as uttering a censure on the Individuals of that Body; numbers of whom are known to have been as pious and good Christians, as perhaps
may

may be found in any other Community.—
 The power of Papal Rome has declined,
 and with it her means of extensive and
 domineering violence. But it is to be
 feared, that the seeds and principles of
 such unchristian domination yet remain in
 her. And she is ever to be regarded with
 a Jealous Eye, till she solemnly renounces
 them in profession and practice. Her be-
 ginnings were gentle, as, it seems, are in
 some degree her latter times: but how many
 Centuries does History hold up to view,
 rendered dreadful by her enormities * !”

28. The panegyric †, pronounced on
 your “ great Ancestor ‡ ” Lord Chancellor
 Somers, is not more just in itself, and
 naturally to be expected from You his
 descendant, than it is gratifying to us. No
 eulogy can exceed his merits. In the Legal
 Department, the Mantle of his Office, like
 the prophetic Mantle of old, with no small
 degree of his spirit has fallen on one, who
 like

* Note in p. 358. of a Work entitled, “ The Apo-
 calypse, or Revelation of Saint John, Translated ; ” by
 John Chappel Wodehouse, A.M. Archdeacon of Salop.
 It was published in 1805.

† Obs. p. 42. 43.

‡ Ibid. p. 28.

like Lord Somers has witnessed perilous times. Happily for this Country, as there was in Lord Somers *, so there are in Lord Eldon, and in All our upright and venerable Judges, a complete knowledge and an ardent love of our Constitution, combined with Purity and Impartiality of Decision, delivered in the Courts over which they respectively preside. However he may have incurred your Lordship's displeasure †, yet in no capacity, whether as a Lawyer or a Statesman, is the present Lord Chancellor accustomed to reason illogically. If he concluded your Ancestor would not grant what the Catholics claim, he argued on a fair ground; he argued from Greater to Less. He was warranted in presuming, that a Statesman who had been active and zealous in excluding even a Monarch from the Throne, because he was a Catholic; would, on his own principle, exclude the Petitioners from seats in the Houses of Parliament, because they are Catholics. Your Lordship conceives otherwise. You contend he would now admit the

* " We all agree that he understood the Constitution of his Country; that he loved and revered it."

† Obs. p. 27. 42. 46.

the Catholics into Parliament, for he would not have “thought it just to persevere in restrictions on Roman Catholics, when no longer necessary to preserve the Constitution in Church and State* ;” nor would he “have judged the continuance of an Oath (i. e. the Oath of Abjuration) now necessary to the safety of the Sovereign or People †.” Not to dwell on what, throughout your Work, is the most striking feature in your mode of Argumentation, viz. the assumed Right of taking for granted what ought to be proved ; a Right which you do assume in six passages ‡, where you either gratuitously assert or clearly intimate there is no longer any necessity for Disqualifications or Restrictions ; we will remind you of some preceding words in your Speech. In them you observe, the “Veto” would “have constituted an indecorous Union in the appointment of Roman Catholic Bishops, between our Protestant King and that Person (Potentate he cannot now be called) to whom the Roman Catholics look up as the Head of their

* Obs. p. 44.

† Ibid. p. 46.

‡ Speech, p. 10. and 17. Obs. p. 25. 35. 44. 46.

their Church*." Evidently then, by your own confession, the Catholics do look up to another Person, distinct from our Sovereign, and also a Foreigner, as to their Spiritual Director. It is also their own acknowledgment recently avowed in this declaration; "As we are at present precluded from any intercourse with our Supreme Pastor, we feel ourselves utterly incompetent to propose or agree to any change, in the long established mode of appointing Irish Roman Catholic Bishops †." Now the Oath of Abjuration is purposely framed for the exclusion of that Person, from all "jurisdiction, power, and authority, Ecclesiastical or Spiritual, within this Realm." This Clause however, material though it be, seems to have escaped your recollection, when you contend the Oath of Abjuration is now not necessary, because there is now no "Popish Pretender ‡." Pretender to Sovereignty in Temporalities
there

* Speech, p. 6.

† See "An Address from the Roman Catholic Prelates, to the Clergy and Laity of the Roman Catholic Churches in Ireland;" dated Nov. 18, 1812. The words are copied from Mr. Cruttwell's "Bath Chronicle," for Dec. 10, 1812.

‡ Obs. p. 46.

there is indeed none ; but a Pretender to Sovereignty in Spiritualities there unquestionably is, according to your own statement. It is because we cannot think it consistent with the Prerogative of the Crown, or with the security of Protestantism, more especially in Ireland, that we feel ourselves bound, in allegiance to our Sovereign and in vigilance for our Religion as contradistinguished from the Catholic System, to resist the pretensions made by that Foreign Person to Power of any sort or kind, in any shape or degree, over British Subjects. And that we may resist it the more effectually, we maintain it is necessary that those who Legislate for us should be bound to unite with us in resistance. The very act of solemn Abjuration is in itself a strong act of resistance ; with that Oath therefore Protestants cannot judge it wise to dispense.

Your Lordship commands ample possessions and a numerous retinue. What might you not naturally and reasonably say, if any neighbouring Gentleman were to assume the privilege of intermeddling with your oeconomic arrangements, and

M

of

of prescribing to those around you the line of duty, which they should follow, the measure of obedience which they should pay, towards You their Master? Change but the terms, and it is the case of our Sovereign, his Subjects, and the Person, who considers himself as the Head of Catholics in Ireland and England. He is a Foreigner. Now putting Religion out of the question, and taking the matter abstractedly; That a Foreigner should arrogate to himself the Power of interfering in the Government of British Subjects, and of dictating to them "in this you may, in that you shall not obey your King, or Queen, on pain of my anathema," is in itself an act of Presumption, and to the Sovereign it is an Insult. Being an Insult; who best support their Sovereign's independence *,
 who

* King Edward I. in his dispute with the Primate Robert de Winchelsey, and Henry II. in his contest with Thomas à Becket, shewed a spirit, which would have asserted the Independence of the British Monarchs on the See of Rome, if the times had not been unfavourable.

On a Canon decreed in the Eighth Century, it is observed by Dr. Henry, "This remarkable caution in the language of this Canon is a sufficient proof, that the Clergy of England were not as yet disposed to bend

who are most zealous for their Sovereign's honour? those who resent, or those who condescend towards perpetuating that Insult? The Statesmen of the Seventeenth Century averted such Indignity from the House of Nassau. Loyalty, gratitude, National Pride, demand it of Statesmen in the Age now present, to avert the same Indignity from the House of Brunswick.

29. As you apply the sentence "Salus Populi, Suprema Lex" in a general way, and understand it as importing, "Let the
Good

bend their necks to the intolerable and ignominious yoke of Rome." Henry's History of England, Vol. 3. p. 226. The same Historian mentions "Robert Grosted Bishop of Lincoln, a person of uncommon learning for the age in which he lived, and of such unfeigned piety, untainted probity, and undaunted courage, as would have rendered him an ornament to any age." In the Thirteenth Century, having received from Pope Innocent IV. a Bull, which made an unreasonable demand, and contained the Clause of "Non-Obstante," he "sent the Pope a letter, in which he exposed the injustice and impiety of it with the greatest severity." Vol. 8. p. 10.

We know not the influence of Papal authority, because we feel it not. But the Catholics know and feel it, or else why not reject it? The submission, under which they live, should make us anxious to preserve our own Spiritual Liberty; which we shall do by maintaining our Sovereign's Independence.

Good of the Community be the Rule of Conduct for the Governing Magistrates," we cannot wonder that a Maxim so just and noble should frequently recur to the upright and elevated Mind of your Lordship, and should be thrice * brought forward by your Publication. We will, if you please, insert some new terms, and enlarge the extent of the Maxim still farther than you have carried the sentence, as it stands in the Original Work from whence it was taken †. "Let the Good of the Community be the Object of the Governing Magistrate; of All Legislation; of All Public Proceeding." On that ground we argue thus;

It

* In the Title Page as a Motto; in p. 4. and p. 47.

† The words occur in Cicero's Dialogue "De Legibus." B. 3. S. 3. Ed. Davis. He is prescribing Laws for his imaginary State. He ordains there should be Two Consuls uncontrouled by any power, in concerns of War. "Militiæ Summum Jus Habent, Nemini Parento: Ollis Salus Populi Suprema Lex Esto." But as Public Good should be the Foundation and Chief Object of All Public Authority, the concluding sentence is with propriety taken as a general Maxim. And therefore Davis illustrates the Original by this passage from Ammianus Marcellinus; "The Utility and Safety of those who Obey, is thought to be the End of Just Command."

It is for "The Good of the Community"

1. That in every State there should be some Form of Government, for the purpose of excluding the Evils of Anarchy. And the Form of Government should be that, which is most acceptable to the State itself.

2. That to prevent the inconveniencies arising from frequent changes, the Form of Government should be defined and settled into a Constitution.

3. That the Constitution should establish a * Public Religion ; because Public Religion diffuses and sanctions those Principles of Morality, which are the Sources
of

* Remarkable are the words of Hobbes and Harrington on this subject. " Natural Reason directs us to worship, not only in secret, but also and more especially in public before Men. For, unless this be done, we lose what in worship is most acceptable, the effect of exciting others to devotion. But since a State (in its Collective Body) is one single Person, it can offer to God but one single Form of Worship commanded by the Laws." Hobbes's Leviathan ; Latin Edition, p. 171. " It is no wonder that Men, living like Men, have not been found without a Government ; or, that any Government has not been found without a National Religion ; that is, some orderly and known way of Public Leading in Divine things, or in the Worship of God." Harrington's " Oceana," p. 420. Ed. 1771.

of Private Virtues, of Social Order, of Security to Life, Property, Character.

4. That the Established Religion should be of the most Pure Kind, which can be found ; because, in proportion as the Public Religion is Pure, the Principles of Public Morality will be Pure.

5. If from any Religion proceed two Systems of Opinions ; of which, One System is in perfect Unison with the Constitution of the State ; the other has in it some maxim of Resistance to the Constitution of the State ; then it is for the Good of the Community, because it is for the greater Peace of the Community, that the System in Unison with the Constitution should be established in preference to the System not so in Unison.

6. If one mark of Resistance is the Refusal of promising either Complete Obedience to the State in All its Parts, or Perfect Allegiance to the Head appointed by the State, in All things Constitutional ; then it is for the Good of the Community, that whoever refuses to promise such Complete Obedience and such Perfect Allegiance, should not be invested with
 1 Power,

Power, as one who shall carry into effect the Constitutional Provisions; because, as he will give no pledge that he will obey and execute All the Constitutional Laws of the State, or Commands of the Head acting by virtue of those Laws; he leaves room for supposing it possible he may on some occasions turn the Power, with which he is invested, into an instrument of Resistance; and it cannot be for the Good of the Community, that he should be enabled to resist with the greater force, by aid of the very means which were given him to support the Constitutional Laws and the Chief Magistrate. This cannot be for the Good of the Community, because eventually it may create Confusion injurious to the Community.

Now all these positions would in their own nature have been either true, or false, even if we had never heard of Christianity. If true; then they are not less true merely because Christianity has been received among us. It was never in the contemplation of Christianity to counteract true Maxims of Human Polity; nor did it mean that Kings and Emperors by be-

coming Christians should be in a worse condition, with regard to Authority, than they were before. Christianity meant to influence their Hearts and amend their Morals; to bind the exercise of Justice and Mercy, and the encouragement of pure Religion, on their Conscience; and induce them to do on Christian Principles, whatever good they had been accustomed to do on Heathen Motives, as Temporal Rulers. It designed * not to diminish whatever Power the Constitution of any State had antecedently given them †. Any Doctrine
contrary

* "The Doctrine of Jesus is plain; that no State of the World, receiving Christianity, is bound to resign lawful power; but it still continues of the same force in all Causes whatever. What Kings might do, and did, in matters of false religion, being idolatrous and superstitious Kings, the same they are now fully authorised to do in affairs of true Christian Religion." The Author is speaking of Chief Sovereignty. See p. 374. of "An Analysis of Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity;" by Rev. Mr. Collinson. The Entire Work of Hooker is for the study of those who have leisure. The "Analysis" may be read with much advantage, by those who are busily occupied.

† With judicious selection, clear arrangement, and apposite illustration, Mr. Robert Harry Inglis, Son of Sir Hugh Inglis, Bart. has given from the MS. Papers of Mr. James Morier, the Narrative of "A Journey through Persia." Of the Persian Prince it is said,
"He

contrary to that idea, will tend to set up a Power superior to the State. And in fact, that is the very Power, which the Catholics do wish to set up in this Empire. Extremes meet in the same point. Who in most respects could be more opposite, than the
Fifth

“ He combines the three great qualities of the ancient Persians, which Xenophon (read, Herodotus, I. 136.) enumerates; Riding; Shooting with the Bow; and Speaking Truth.” p. 281. Now if under him, when he becomes Emperor, Christianity should be established; and if nevertheless the Persians should still acquiesce in Despotic Government; his Political Power would not in itself be diminished; but under the influence of a better religion, as a real Christian, he would exchange the ferocity and sensuality of Mahometanism for the Mildness and Purity inculcated by the Gospel. His Power would remain Absolute, because it was made so by the Laws of the Country. But he would soften its rigour with clemency, and use its force with equity, because he would be taught to do so by the Laws of Christianity. The Apostles were not commanded to bid Emperors and Kings lay down their Political Power; nor did even the Apostles, though immediately commissioned by OUR LORD himself, ever inculcate doctrine of that tendency. On the contrary they say, “ Let every Soul be subject unto the higher powers”—“ Put them in mind to be subject to Principalities, and Powers, and to obey Magistrates”—“ Submit yourselves to every ordinance of Man for the LORD’s sake; whether it be to the King as Supreme, or unto Governors, as unto them that are sent by him.”—Rom. xiii. 1.—Titus, iii. 1.—1 St. Pet. ii. 13.

Fifth Monarchy Men and Robert de Winchelsey or Thomas à Becket? Yet the Disciples of John Huss and those two Catholic Prelates were zealots for a Power superior to the Temporal State. Robert de Winchelsey to King Edward 1st. refused payment of taxes; he pleaded conscience; and produced the Bull of Pope Boniface * who had forbidden the Clergy to make such payments, and threatened them with a sentence of excommunication, if they disregarded his prohibition. Thomas à Becket is proverbially known, for his insuperable turbulence, and insufferable insolence to King Henry II. In the conduct of both those Prelates we see what consequences may possibly result from that nice Discrimination of Allegiance in all things Civil, but in nothing Ecclesiastical. "Who can draw the exact line between the Spiritual and temporal power †?" Unquestionably; among themselves and as a Private Body, the Catholics have a Right to choose their own Form of Church Discipline. But when they come forward

* See Vol. 8. of Henry's History of England; p. 25: and Vol. 2. of Hume's History; p. 296.

† See Note in Vol. 6. p. 423. of Hume's "History of England," Ed. 1767.

forward as Candidates for Places of Public Trust and Public Power, they subject themselves to the obligations of certain Duties growing out of appointments to Places of Public Trust and Public Power. Concerning Duties we may affirm, it is not more true that Generation and Corruption, Life and Death, Light and Darkness, Ebb and Flow, are correlative, than that Duties are correlative. Discharge of Duty, on one side, supposes and requires reciprocal Discharge of Duty on the other. To come to the point: It is the Duty of the Sovereign in this Empire to summon a Parliament. When he has done this, it is the Duty of the Parliament convened by his summons to promise him, as the Chief executive Magistrate at the head of the Constitution, Complete Allegiance. This Duty is not only ordained by Positive Law, but it is created by the Fitness of the Thing itself and is founded on the very nature of the Case. For, if the Parliament will not promise him complete Allegiance, he cannot be assured that between himself and Parliament there will be such mutual confidence and mutual co-operation,

co-operation, as may be necessary for supporting all the Principles, the energy of which may be essential not only to his own Political Existence in capacity of Chief Magistrate, but also to the permanence and vigour of the Constitution, which in all its Enactments and Provisions he is most solemnly bound to defend. Consistently with that his own Obligation, neither can the Sovereign ; nor consistently with due regard for its own Preservation, can the State represented by its Parliament, admit into Complete Legislative Authority those who will not give unqualified assurance of Complete Obedience to the State and to the Sovereign of the State in all Lawful and Constitutional Cases.

Catholicism forbids giving such assurance; it allows only partial Obedience. Protestantism does give full assurance, and makes no reserve for exclusive privileges not clearly recognised by the Constitution. The Thirty-seventh * Article of the Irish and

* See an explanation of it in Vol. 2. of "Elements of Christian Theology," by the Bishop of Lincoln, Tomline, late Pretyman, whose "Charge" on the Catholic Question carries with it conviction.—More particularly see "Tract VI. The Nature of Supremacy

and English United Churches judiciously expresses the sense of all who are in Communion with them, and indeed nearly of all Protestants in the British Empire. That to the extent specified in that Article, the Sovereign should exercise Supreme Authority, we are justified in conceding by the examples of similar subordination in the best periods of Jewish Polity, and by precedents derived from the Fourth Century of the Christian Æra. Our concession in that point is also warranted and supported by the most correct reasonings on the Nature of Government and the Means of preserving Social Union. Let us hear Hooker and Barrow.

“ With respect to supreme power in ecclesiastical affairs, the Word of God nowhere directs that Kings should or should
not

macy in Matters Ecclesiastical vested in the Crown,” p 259. in the Work entitled “ The Spiritual and Temporal Liberty of Subjects in England,” by Anthony Ellis, D D. Bishop of St. David’s. Published 1765. The Editors say in their Dedication to His present Majesty, “ This Separation (i. e. of Supremacy from the Church) would necessarily produce opposition ”—“ To the exercise of this Power, under God, it is that we owe our Spiritual Liberty.”

not have it: and therefore it seems to stand entirely by Human Right*.”

“ That Kings should have Supreme Authority over all Men, we hold to be requisite, as well for the regulation of Spiritual as Civil Affairs †.”

“ It has never been proved to be repugnant to the Law of God or of Nature, that All Supremacy of External Power should, in Christian Kingdoms, be granted to the Kings thereof, for Preservation of Quietness, Unity, Order, and Peace ‡.”

“ It hath ever been deemed reasonable, and accordingly been practised, that the Church in its Exterior Form and Political Administration should be suited to the State of the World, and Constitution of Worldly Governments, that there might be no Clashing or Disturbance from each other §.”

Hooker and Barrow were Men of Masculine Understandings and Deep Penetration.

* Collinson's Analysis of Hooker, p. 358.

† Ibid. p. 376. where reference is made to a precedent in 2 Chron. xxiv.

‡ Ibid. 365.

§ See p. 253. of “ A Treatise on the Pope's Supremacy,” by Isaac Barrow, D.D.

tion. Their judgment will have weight with those who know the Copiousness of their Matter, the Reach of their Intellect, the Force of their Reasoning. For others shall be given, as a passage final in the way of discussion, the sentence in which Mr. Hume expresses his opinion :

“ The Union of the Civil and Ecclesiastical Powers serves extremely, in every Civilized Government, to the Maintenance of Peace and Order: and prevents those mutual incroachments, which, as there can be no ultimate Judge between them, are often attended with the most dangerous consequences*.”

AND now, my Lord, have been considered the principal parts of your “ Speech and Observations.” Your Publication was received with that attention and respect, which are due to whatever has the sanction of your Lordship’s name. It is hoped there will have been found no trace of impatient abruptness in the pages addressed to you. If any thing of that description has obtruded itself, your candour will impute

* See Hume’s “ History of England,” in the reign of Henry II. Vol. 1. p. 416. Ed. 1767.

pute it to inadvertence. It is still to be regretted there must remain between us a wide difference of opinion. It doth not yet appear to the contrary, but that Decision may proceed and be made on a high degree of Probability ; and well-grounded Apprehension of Injury from adopting, may be sufficient reason for rejecting a Measure. More arguments seem requisite for proving, that the Catholics may demand admission into the Legislature, as a matter of Right. Nothing yet said has been sufficiently cogent to produce conviction, that it will be a measure of sound Policy to admit the Catholics into the Legislature ; or, that Protestants will enjoy the same degree of security, tranquillity, and happiness, under a Legislature partly Catholic and partly Protestant ; as that with which they are now blessed under a Legislature entirely and purely Protestant. On the contrary it is to be feared, that if Legislative Power should be conceded to the Catholics, it would operate to the introduction of perplexing difficulties in the Cabinet, and of discordant confusion in the Parliament ; it would tend to disturb

Pro-

Protestantism in England, and erect Catholicism in Ireland; it would indirectly banish the Superior, it would certainly entail Misery on the Middle and Lower Orders, of Irish Protestants. All this Evil the Admission of Catholics into the British Legislature is calculated to create: and such Admission would moreover seem to be in defiance of the Union Act between Great Britain and Ireland; in defiance of National Faith pledged by that Act of Union to the Irish Protestants; in defiance of the Claim which the Irish Protestants have on us for our utmost and undiminished support; in defiance of the Provisions circumspectly and intentionally made for perpetuating the Connexion between the two Countries; in defiance of the Reformation; in defiance of the Revolution; in defiance of every Principle Civil and Religious interwoven as Essential, incorporated as Vital in the Constitution; in defiance of the Gospel itself as understood by Protestants in their rejection of Doctrines, which as they conceive to be irreconcilable with any Creeds of Protestants however specifically denominated,

so on that more than on all other human accounts they anxiously petition Parliament not to encourage. Thus objectionable appears the Proposal for granting to the Catholics the supereminent power of Legislating for Protestants. You cannot therefore be surprised that success to such a Proposal should be deprecated by one, whom Divine Providence has conducted to a situation exacting vigilance combined with Prudence, and exertion tempered with Christian Charity, in the Cause of Protestantism. The event of all our counsels and of all our proceedings is at the direction of God! Entire submission to the Dispensations of that Almighty and Benevolent Being, who ruleth the Universe with perfect Wisdom and perfect Goodness, is for the comfort and for the piety of Man. Yet Resignation exempts not from Obedience to the Divine Will and to Human Laws conformable with that Will. It is an act of such Obedience to discharge Duty. Consciousness of endeavours used for that end gives peace to the Mind. The recollection of having maintained, that for a Protestant People there should be a Legislature purely

Protestant; the remembrance of having contended for the prevalence of Gospel Truth as proclaimed by the Fathers of the English Church; will be sources of satisfaction through mortal life, and of consolation when the last hour capable of reflexion, in this state of existence, shall have come to him, who has the honour of subscribing himself,

MY LORD,

Your Lordship's
most obedient
and humble servant,

GEORGE ISAAC GLOUCESTER.

Winchester College,
Dec. 31, 1812.

F I N I S,

Lately Published,

By T. CADELL and W. DAVIES, Strand :

1. THE PETITION OF THE ENGLISH ROMAN CATHOLICS considered ; in a Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Gloucester.

By G. I. HUNTINGFORD, D.D. F.R.S. Bishop of Gloucester.
Second Edition, 8vo. price 2s.

2. A CHARGE delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Lincoln, in May, June, and July, 1812; in which the Claims of the Roman Catholics are discussed.

By GEO. TOMLINE, D.D. F.R.S. Lord Bishop of Lincoln.
Second Edition, 8vo. price 2s.

3. THE CLAIMS OF THE ROMAN CATHOLICS considered with reference to the Safety of the Established Church, and the Rights of Religious Toleration. Second Edition, 8vo. price 5s.

4. AN ANSWER TO WARD'S ERRATA OF THE PROTESTANT BIBLE. To which is added, an Appendix, containing a Review of the Preface to the Fourth Edition of the Errata. By the Rev. RICHARD GRIER, A.M. Master of Middleton School. In one vol. 4to. price 1l. 1s. in boards, or on inferior paper, price 15s. in boards.

5. THE ALLIANCE BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE; or, the Necessity and Equity of an Established Religion, and a Test Law, demonstrated. In three Books, 8vo. By the late WM. WARBURTON, D.D. Bishop of Gloucester. The 4th Edit. corrected and enlarged, price 10s. 6d. in boards.

Also, the following Works,

By G. I. HUNTINGFORD, D. D. F. R. S.
Bishop of Gloucester.

1. A CALL FOR UNION WITH THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH, addressed to English Protestants. 8vo. Second Edition, price 5s. in boards.

2. PREPARATION FOR THE HOLY ORDER OF DEACONS: or, the First Question proposed to Candidates for the Holy Order of Deacons. Elucidated in a Charge, delivered previously to an Ordination. 2d Edit. 8vo. price 2s. 6d.

3. PREPARATION FOR THE HOLY ORDER OF PRIESTS; or, Words of Ordination and Absolution, explained in a Charge, delivered previously to Ordination. 8vo. pr. 2s. 6d.

4. A SERMON, preached before the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, on Friday, May 25, 1804. Price 1s. 6d.

5. DISCOURSES ON DIFFERENT SUBJECTS. 2 vols. 8vo. price 12s. in boards.

6. AN INTRODUCTION TO THE WRITING OF GREEK; in Two Parts: for the use of Winchester College. 8vo. price 7s. in boards.





