

BIOGRAPHICAL, LITERARY,  
AND  
POLITICAL  
ANECDOTES,  
OF SEVERAL OF  
*THE MOST EMINENT PERSONS*  
OF  
THE PRESENT AGE.

NEVER BEFORE PRINTED.

WITH AN  
APPENDIX;  
CONSISTING OF  
ORIGINAL, EXPLANATORY, AND SCARCE  
PAPERS.

BY THE  
AUTHOR OF ANECDOTES OF THE LATE EARL OF CHATHAM.

---

HISTORIAM, OMNIUM SECRETORUM MEMORIAM DICO.—*Cicero.*

---

IN THREE VOLUMES.

VOLUME III.

---

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR T. N. LONGMAN, AND L. E. SEELEY, IN  
PATER-NOSTER-ROW.

1797.

~~THE~~

# CONTENTS

OF THE

## THE THIRD VOLUME.

---

A —	The Whig, by Junius. . . <i>from page 1</i> to	36.
B —	Defence of Lord Chancellor Hardwicke. . . . .	36 to 52.
C —	The Country Gentleman, by the Bishop of Ossory. . . . .	53 to 122.
	Major Cartwright's Letter. . .	108.
	Mr. Burke's Answer. . . . .	114.
D —	Papers on Sir John Dalrymple's Memoirs of Great Britain. . .	123 to 146.
E —	Letters on the Sale of Places. . .	146 to 151.
F & G —	Two Letters on the Political Conduct of Lord Mansfield, by Messrs. Burkes. . . . .	152 to 176.
H —	Letter on the Seizure of Papers, by Lord Temple. . . . .	177 to 195.
I —	Letter from Albemarle Street to the Cocoa Tree, by the same. . .	196 to 214.
K —	Principles of the late Changes, by the same. . . . .	214 to 234.
L —	Origin of Hereditary Nobility. . .	235 to 236.
	b	M —



M —	Account of the Duel between Mr. Whately and Mr. Temple, now Sir John Temple; with the Letters which passed be- tween them, and their friends. . .	236 to 273.
	Dr. Franklin's Letter on that sub- ject. . . . .	255.
N —	Account of the Duel between Lord George Germain and Governor Johnstone. . . . .	274 to 278.
O —	On the management of the London Gazette, by Messrs. Burkes. . .	
	Of the Duel between Lord Townf- hend and Lord Bellamont. . . .	278 to 302.
P —	Sir George Savile's Letter to the Gentlemen, &c. of the County of York. . . . .	303 to 314.
Q —	Proceedings of the Chamber of Manufacturers. . . . .	314 to 361.
R —	The Yorkshire Question, by Messrs. Burkes. . . . .	362 to 384.
S —	Case of the late (Henry) Lord Holland, with the Papers. . . .	385 to 398.
T —	Mr. Burke's Speeches at Bristol: not in his Works. . . . .	399 to 410.

---



---

### ERRATA.

Vol. I. Page 17, line 14, *for* 1791, *read* 1781.  
Vol. II. Page 48, line 7, *after* were, *add* not.

APPENDIX,  
CONTAINING  
EXPLANATORY AND SCARCE PAPERS.

---

[*The six following papers were published in one of the London morning news-papers, when Lord North was Minister, in the months of November and December, 1779, and in the months of January and March, 1780.*]

---

THE WHIG.

TO THE GOOD PEOPLE OF ENGLAND.

*"I will call to my Country loudly and con-  
stantly."* LORD CHATHAM.

I TRUST that neither my name nor principles are obsolete; though I am aware that the name is not in such respect, nor the principles yet so active, as at the period of the Revolution. But, if I did not feel myself warranted, in the hope that I address a powerful body of my countrymen, when I call on my brethren of *The Good Old Cause*, I would not waste my labour on a desperate theme, nor profane the doctrine of liberty, by discussing it to unanimous slaves.

Whiggism we have seen triumphant in America. Whiggism we see preparing her triumph in Ireland. Let us hope, let us prove, that her sacred flame is not extinct in England.



If a slave of power shrink from the mention of the good Old Cause, or, in the callous impudence of servitude, presume to vilify it, I pity his wretchedness, I despise his insolence; but I would punish his treason to the constitution.

The good Old Cause is the cause of the people. Simple and obvious is this consideration; *that the Cause of the people is successful exactly in proportion to the energy of their original power.* Such energy, acting through the classes of the constitution which the people made, preserves their liberty as a people, and their power as a nation; for it watches integrity, and provides ability, in the persons they permit to administer their affairs. Various and intricate, on the contrary, are the means conducive to *their* cause, ambition, avarice, or sloth, would enslave, impoverish, or lose their country. Rectitude has only one direction, but the obliquity of treachery is infinite.

The direction in which the people of this country act, when they act rightly, is, through the parliament which they have elected, to the throne which they have raised. If wickedness or weakness be found in the counsels or counsellors of the crown, parliament is the instrument appointed to punish or to dismiss; but if the instrument fail, the land will exert her native strength. The people, of original right as a free people, will vindicate the country, correct their parliament.

ment, and reform their throne. I know this was not the law of Jeffries, I know it is not the law of modern Westminster; but I know it is the right reason of the constitution. I would not violate the manes of the Revolution, by quoting Locke against Lord Mansfield, even if it were a question of argument; but human authority or reasoning, however illustrious or forcible, were superfluous to demonstrate what God hath written in our hearts.

Public guilt being capable of such diversification, it is evidently the duty of public virtue to exercise various attention to the several assaults that may be made by power, and will be ever made in some degree, against the interests of the community. Innumerable are the modes in which hypocrisy may deceive, tyranny oppress, corruption debauch, or negligence squander; any one of which crimes, unchecked, would run to general ruin. But if, in monstrous and unheard-of conspiracy, they should all unite against the liberty and glory of a country, throughout all the betrayed trusts of the public; active indeed ought to be the exertion of the people against such danger. The Whig spirit existing in the country must collect and co-operate. If compressed in small compass, its spring will be the stronger. The public traitor may insult falling Liberty with the reproach that



all her spirit is extinguished ; that no public virtue remains ; that every man is base and wicked as himself ; but the reproach will operate as it ought. It will give vigour to strength, and activity to resentment. It will sharpen public spirit, and point the virtue of the patriot with the honour of the man.

Vigilance should be in proportion to danger. If we have been remiss, and if public danger have, in consequence, encreased, let us now double our watch, and redeem our negligence.

*In England every man is a politician.*—This maxim hath incurred ridicule, only from the imperfection of its observance. It is exactly constitutional, and strictly true in theory ; but it becomes ridiculous, because it is only theoretical. It ought to be demonstrated in practice ; and then it would not be answered with a laugh. “ The British Constitution, Lord Bolingbroke well says, is the *business* of every Briton.”

The British Constitution hath changed its form, and is losing its spirit. Some magic has metamorphosed the ancient pyramid into the deformity of a Chinese Pagoda. The beautiful strength of its order is gone ; and we now tremble for the narrowed base ; oppressed by the middle ; with monsters at the top !

How to recal the spirit that hath fled, and how to raise that which remains ; how to restore

restore external stability, and by what best means to purify into its ancient vigour the interior of the constitution, is the *business* which now demands the active vigilance of all—for the danger is universal and imminent.

As a member of the public body, I offer to my country all my exertion towards the public weal, in the humble but laborious office which I undertake. It is humble; for it professes little more than the representation of fact. It will be laborious; for the endeavour will be to represent the mischiefs of the times.

It is not easy to select from multiplicity; but in guarding against dangers, *foreign* and *domestic*, the conduct of their Representatives in Parliament seems to challenge the first and instant attention of the people: for it is the malignity of this enormous mischief, like skepticism in religion, that it fights the forms against the substance. Faith is above reason; and the people are paramount to their servants: but the infidel blasphemes in very regular syllogisms; and the Minister betrays his country exactly according to *order*, and with perfect preservation of every form of Parliament. Of this, the public shall have damning proof;—irrefragable proof;—undeniable—except by Lord North,—for it shall be the proof of FACT.

November, 1779.

THE



APPENDIX.

THE WHIG.

---

*The King can do no wrong.*

WHEN a Prince of the House of Hanover wears the crown of Great-Britain, the WHIG is not ashamed to confess his prejudice. He would presume, from the former Princes and principles of that House, to the present; and his predilection is anxious to believe, in the full extent of the maxim, personal as as well political, *that the King can do no wrong.*

But when a monarch in this country, sprung from whatever line, adorned with whatever hopes from the glories of his ancestry, or his own original virtues, persists in counsels that do grievous wrong, and threaten instant ruin; affection is lost in duty. Duty to the country demands discussion of a maxim, which, if the construction of the court were permitted, would sanctify every public crime, and establish public calamity. Duty to the Prince, as part of the constitution formed by the people, enjoins constitutional explanation to him of a phrase, which flattery has rendered fatal to tyrants.

When it is truly said, that the King can do no wrong, the office is intended and not the

the person; and this true construction is the perfect praise of our admirable constitution. The King of England can do no wrong; for it is not the office of the King *to do* any thing. The cautious wisdom of our policy will not permit the King to act. It not only supposes, but requires, that ability shall be selected from the people to execute the active duties of the state. Even in the selection of such active ability for public service, the King, as we are now considering him, cannot do wrong. For the consideration supposes him in his constitutional public character; a character conferred on him conditionally by the people. The condition of his royalty is a wise and honest administration of the state. It is impossible, therefore, in constitutional contemplation, that a *King of England* should appoint incapable or unworthy men to administer public affairs; or, if appointed, that the *people of England* should permit them to be retained; that a free people should sacrifice their original rights and constitutive power to such abuse of the kingly office. The unfairness of arguing from such abuse is evident. The kingly office so abused would no longer belong to the constitution. It is a monstrous case, and out of the supposition of fair reasoning.

Such being the genuine sense of the maxim, the corollary observation that is formed upon



it appears equally just and necessary; that the Ministers of executive power are responsible to the people: and their responsibility was formerly through the medium of parliament.

The office of King being thus considered, I trust with due respect; for I think it receives the highest when defined as part of the constitution; it remains to remind the person appointed to that office, that he is a man;—that in his personal capacity he may, he must *do wrong*; for error is essential to humanity. It remains to remonstrate to him, that whoever confounds his person with his office, is a fatal enemy to both; for that they are so perfectly distinct in their nature, attributes, and interests, that the abuse of the one is expiable only by the punishment of the other. The constitution will not admit that *the King* did wrong; and the law says, that *the King* never dies: but *Charles Stuart* was an obstinate tyrant; and *Charles Stuart* lost his head.

No more then let a maxim, founded in the very bottom of our constitutional liberty, be forced to a construction which would shake and endanger it. No longer let the law of the constitution which would preserve sacred the office of the King, be perverted to the destruction of the man.

Another tenet of court-craft, new in the  
politics

politics of this country, is not less dangerous to its professors than the perversion of the royal maxim that has been considered. As kings believed they could not individually do wrong, ministers now flatter themselves that *majorities in Parliament can make wrong right*; and from them they hope, not only their own exculpation, but perfect establishment of their arbitrary system.

It will not be difficult to demonstrate the folly, as well as the wickedness, of such a principle; and to prove, to the utter despair of arbitrary men, that the seeds of *revolution* have been more immediately sown, and with more certainty of instant growth and effect, by the Ministers of the present King, than by any instruments of tyranny in former times.

The position which I maintain, and shall prove, in direct contradiction to their parliamentary confidence, is this; *that majorities in Parliament are certainly ruinous to the Sovereign and his Ministers, in proportion to the support they are induced to give them, in persisting against the sense of the people.*

I shall, in my next paper, consider the fact, as it has occurred in America and Ireland; and then, if *our Whig-spirit* be not extinct, and if similar causes produce similar effects, *let the executive power tremble in Great-Britain.*

December, 1779.

THE



## THE WHIG.

*This glorious spirit of WHIGGISM, animates millions in America, who prefer poverty with liberty to gilded chains and sordid affluence; and will die in defence of their rights as men, —as freemen, —What shall resist this spirit? —Ireland they have to a man.*

Jan. 20, 1775.

LORD CHATHAM.

HOWEVER congenial his mind to the spirit triumphant in a neighbouring kingdom, emulous of the glories as she was participant in the injuries of the western empire, grievous yet is the pang which every lover of his country feels in this degraded island. For the triumph of Liberty is now the disgrace of England. America is victorious and free. Ireland, without the trouble of victory, enjoys all its consequence and glory. She displays the banner of independence; her armies appear; and England surrenders at discretion.

England, the arbitress of empire, —England, the dispenser of the power and guardian of the rights of nations; —England, the wonder and terror of the world—what art thou now! Disabled, dishonoured, fallen; desperate of assistance from friends, for you have none;

or of success against enemies, for you failed when you were stronger, against adversaries less numerous or powerful:—too little for consideration in a scale of the balance which you once held and adjusted; and remembered only in the ridicule of Europe: vanquished by your Colonies, to whom you sued in vain for mercy; and subdued even by the aspect of Ireland, to her absolute command.

Love of our country cannot be extinguished in the hearts of Englishmen; and care of what we love compels us to save it from utter destruction. Though the sense of glory were dead throughout the people, yet, if the common and first principles of nature, self-defence, and self-preservation, be not extinct among them, the period of revolution and revenge is at hand. The public sense was dull to the distant mischief; but present calamity strikes strongly and suddenly.—Three months nursed the American lie; but the Minister cannot falsify Ireland. Three days detect him, and demonstrate the glories of that country and the disgrace of this;—her independence and our submission. We feel her torn from our side, and we bleed at every vein.

Such feeling is too poignant for patience. It rouses to action every remaining nerve of our strength, to rescue from instant loss the little that is left;—to preserve domestic security,



rity, though we have thrown away empire ; to entrust the sacred relick to hearts that know its value, and hands that can defend it ; and, above all, piously to perform the rites of the constitution : appeasing, by exemplary justice, the indignant manes of our power and our glory.

But in this necessary course of national justice, much difficulty is to be encountered from the generous prejudices of Englishmen. In favour of Ministers? No man will imagine it, in a reign, which has rendered synonymous the odium of the country and the favour of the crown. The fate of such favourites as have never before stained the annals of any reign in any country, will be unparalleled in history. Unqualified by any sentiment of respect for talents, admiration of magnanimity, or pity of any one virtue, the public execration that spares them not in their power, will overwhelm them in their fall ;—the contempt that pursues them now will inspire peculiar indignation then, that such usurpers of power should have been enabled and permitted so to fall ;—with the blind despair, but without the strength of the strong man, so to drag into ruin the mighty fabric of the British empire.

But difficulties of an high and delicate nature will arise in effecting the revolution of our liberties. They have arisen elsewhere ;

but the necessity of the commonwealth has surmounted them. Founded, however, in the generosities of ancient attachment, I know they are found in the heart of every Englishman.

Eighteen years of tory-rule cannot have entirely detached THE WHIGS of England from the house of Hanover. The memory of an illustrious ancestry, and gratitude to their virtues, must qualify resentment of present wrongs, with an affectionate kind of sorrow; and sorrow, in generous minds, soon grows to pity. Crimes then are lost in misfortunes; or if remembered, we wish to reclaim rather than to punish. Or even, if obstinacy be irreclaimable, we have still some hope in the future, from our knowledge of the past. A dishonoured reign may pass away in our annals, like a cloudy day in summer; and if the day be not too long, nor the tempest too violent, the glories of the succeeding morning may answer our hopes and renew our happiness.

But to tranquilise, if possible, the present scene, by reconciling our affection to a particular family, with our duty to the country, let us endeavour to win attention before we force it. Let us convince by reason rather than by power; and try to prevent the mischief by the example of others, rather than correct it by our own.



It was proposed in my last paper to consider the fact of disunion from this country, as it has occurred in America and Ireland, in demonstration of the maxim that I there advanced against the parliamentary confidence of arbitrary men. From the fatal example of those countries, I undertook to prove, *that majorities in parliament are ruinous to the Sovereign and his Ministers, in proportion to the support they are induced to give them against the sense of the people.*

In America the people were unanimous against certain powers claimed by their late king, and attempted to be exercised by his ministers: but the monarch persisted against his people; and has lost his American throne. So far the fact stands undisputed. Now let us consider whether his ministers and their majorities in parliament have not affected the ruin of his royalty, while they flattered his ambition, and seemed to support his power.

It is beyond any common calculation of obstinacy, that the American war would have been persisted in, if the monarch had not been infatuated by those monstrous majorities which his ministers, by every monstrous means, procured in parliament. I say, by every monstrous means: for besides the court-corruption that prevails in all cases, new and unheard-of wickedness prevailed in this. Fal-  
sification

sification of fact was not indeed new in the minister; but in the magnitude of this instance, it took peculiar criminality. Suppression of every truth, universal fraud, and basest misrepresentation, blinded the reason of men; while every seductive and inflammatory art perverted and poisoned their passions. Without such impulse, no monarch, however blind or obstinate, would have persisted in such a war; without such support, he could not have drawn the sword from year to year against his people.

But even if such had been the situation; if without the fiction of parliamentary sanction, the royal standard had been erected against the liberties of America, he could not have lost his American Crown more absolutely than he has by act of parliament. I believe he would not have lost it so certainly. America would have conquered the King, and more speedily perhaps than she conquered the King and Parliament; but her magnanimity might have forgotten the idle ambition of a foolish Prince; though she will never forgive, in prudence or in spirit, the formal tyranny of a grave Legislature.

My reader may have been surprized and shocked, when I asserted the fact of Ireland being now disunited from this country; because he may have listened to the tales of Ministers, and the impudent inventions of  
their



their advocates. But I assert again and again, that Ireland is at this moment in an actual state of disunion from us ; disunion of commerce, disunion of finance, disunion of military strength, and disunion of national affection. Such is the fact ; and therefore I expect to hear the Minister assure Parliament of the contrary.

If Parliament continue any faith in the wisdom or truth of the man, whose folly and fallacies misled them to cast America from us, the present disunion of Ireland, which their marked servility to him at the close of last Session has already produced, and their preposterous support of him at the beginning of this has already strongly confirmed, will be ratified for ever. I state the fact of their resentment, without now going into the discussion of their wrongs : but their resentment is expressly and pointedly against the British Parliament. They exhaust all their eloquence against it in their debates ; and when they want terms to express its tyranny, its avarice, its insensibility to every thing honourable or just, they say that the British Parliament and the British Minister are synonymous.

*December, 1779.*

THE WHIG.  

---

*To the Right Honourable EDWARD Lord  
Baron THURLOW, and Lord High Chan-  
cellor of England.*

MAGNUM *virum facile dixeris*; BONUM  
*libenter.*

I Have acknowledged your rank, my Lord, and your high titles, with the pleasure that every liberal mind feels in doing justice to an eminent character. Every man is ready to confess that they have been earned by abilities as superior, as the independence and honour ought to be, which alone can dignify their nature or justify their tenure. But there, my Lord, on that cardinal point, the public judgment has been long suspended. If I add that the scale is now rapidly descending against you, and that the wonder of your talents avails only to give weight and acceleration to the censure of your conduct, your Lordship will confess the justice of your country, when you recollect yourself, and look round on the men whose cause you condescend to plead.

One of that public who delighted in ad-  
VOL. III. C miring,



miring, and who now exercise with pain their right of judging you, I yet offer myself to your Lordship as your friend. And though the friendship of honest reproof be in general equally thankless and fruitless, I rely on the manliness of your mind for its public effect in this instance, and even for your Lordship's gratitude.

Before our correspondence proceeds, let me clear its way to your understanding and your approbation.

This letter is written, and unless rendered unnecessary, more shall be addressed to your Lordship, not as a public man who influences public affairs, but as the Dictator of the State who decides them; I do not say immediately in council, but certainly in effect. Your Lordship already understands me, and so will the people before our correspondence closes. In the mean time I state myself to your Lordship and my country, not alone justified but impelled to represent you to yourself and explain you to the public, in all your present power and all its fatal consequence; impelled, by what your own nervous eloquence too consciously describes, "the abundant danger and exigence of the time."

I do not argue unfairly with your Lordship, when I assume the fact of our misgovernment for the last ten years. *I know*  
the

the contempt with which the superiority of your mind has looked down to the wretchedness of the administration.

I admire the emphatic zeal for your own dignity with which you have ever disclaimed all fellowship, even personal acquaintance\*, with the Prime Minister. And it was in these sentiments that I hoped, and the public expected, my Lord, you would have disdained all continuance of public connection with him. A man of spirit, it was concluded that you would not devote yourself for ever to pusillanimity and dishonour; a man of activity and vigour, it was deemed impossible that you should be rivetted to indolence and lethargy, and that the only exertion of your great talents should be in defence of ignorance and insensibility, which they had attempted in vain to inform and animate.

Such, my Lord, was the persuasion of a people who were willing to confide at least in your magnanimity: and even yet it is hoped that you will not thwart your nature, because

\* Lord Thurlow has taken many opportunities of vindicating himself on this subject. "I have no habits with the Minister"—"I do not know Lord North,"—are his expressions (*verbatim*) on those occasions. But, in a more public scene, his determined silence on Lord North's character, is still more decisive. He cannot, indeed, rescue him from the eloquence of Lord Shelburne; but it is the very malice of contempt to leave him to the praises of Lord Hillsborough, and the Duke of Chandos.



it happens to concur with your duty ;—that the natural exertion of your character will not be weakened, from the consideration that it would save your country.

It is not my present purpose, my Lord, to write the history of Mr. Thurlow ; for my object is purely public. Totally, therefore, rejecting every *private* anecdote, let us contemplate your present public capacity. If turning the telescope for a moment, I descry, through the distant and diminished retrospect, an accidental advocate at a country quarter sessions, it is only to prepare my mind with due wonder for the contrast of your present magnitude. If I recollect the first fortuitous step to the house of Queensbury, it is to admire—sincerely, Sir, to admire,—the strides of your genius, mounting now above the House of Bedford. The inferiorities of the portrait are beneath the public interest and the public eye. *Ex capite Herculem.*

At the opening of this session, the general state of the kingdom, and the empire, became, as usual, the subject of parliamentary consideration. The particular topics since selected for especial discussion have been the conduct of our Ministers, with respect to the kingdom of Ireland, and their management in regard to the public finance.

In all these great considerations and discussions, you have stood forth the only champion

champion of the present Ministers. For of their own defences, I would in decency say nothing. Besides their being the culprits, and disentitled to any credit in their assertion, its meanness were sufficient to disgust us and condemn them. Accuse them of public crime, of the danger of our islands, or the loss of our territory ; they declare, with the most ridiculous solemnity, that it is not the fault of *those who conduct public affairs as they are*, but of *those who labour to make them otherwise*. For their own part, they call God to witness, *they know nothing of the matter\**. Demonstrate their public peculation ;—they deprecate justice in the same spirit of the Old Bailey ; in the very language, indeed, of a profligate convict :—*We have robbed the public, but we have squandered the spoil ;—don't punish us, for we shall not be able to maintain our families†*.

I ask pardon from my reader for descending to such misery ; rendered worthy of public notice, only from your singular support. No Nobleman, except your Lordship, has stooped to it ; no Englishman, except yourself, has so insulted his country. Even in

\* Lord North (*verbatim*) on the state of Ireland, and the Jamaica papers ; and Lord Stormont, on every subject ; especially the *American* question, " For he was Ambassador at Paris."

† Lord Hillsborough (*verbatim*) in the House of Lords.



the House of Commons, none but Scotch Lawyers were found hardy enough on that day to insult this kingdom. And even they, with all the fervility of their country, and venality of their profession (Mr. Adam indeed is but a young practitioner) were forced to confess “the *sluggishness* of Lord North.” They did not post from Scotland to applaud the Minister, whose irresolution has renewed rebellion in their kirk, and whose continued power will add depopulation and famine to their country. No, my Lord, they are too discreet. They crossed the Tweed, according to the distinction suggested by their countryman, and pretty steadily adopted since, not to defend *Ministers*, but to support *Government*.—And the doctrine is now established in practice, by an immediate proficient from Lord Mansfield’s school;—*that the only mode of supporting Government is to slander the people*; to demonstrate that we have neither virtue, talents, or spirit among us; that we ought therefore to endure defeat and disgrace, as our necessary lot, and hew our wood and draw our water without repining.

The exclusive infamy of such auxiliaries were itself sufficient to drag down the dignity of any character. Firmer fame even than yours, if it risked such ruin, could not escape it. When the Lord High Chancellor of England descends from his presiding seat  
in

in the assembly of the nobles, to mix with impudent mercenaries in a cause which every man of honour shrinks from, he forfeits every reputation, and his glory will set more rapidly than it rose. *Descent and fall*, which, with the spirits of Milton, we thought *adverse*, at least to the magnanimity of his character, will grow natural, necessary, and instant, to its abasement. He sinks for ever.

January, 1780.

---

### THE WHIG.

*Alas, from what high hope, to what relapse  
Unlooked for, are we fall'n!*

THE facts which have long tended and now combine to give perfection to the arbitrary influence of the crown, may be distinguished into two classes: the *ancient opportunities of abuse in government*, unremoved by an imperfect revolution; and, the *modern inventions of power*. It ought not to be wondered at, that the former, which escaped the wreck of James's tyranny, survived safe and forgotten through the glorious and happy reigns that followed. But it is as much to be lamented, as it is sensibly felt, that dor-



mant as they seemed to have been in the reigns of popular Princes, they were, in fact, acquiring size and strength, sufficient to arm the hand of modern power with instruments more dangerous to liberty, than the coarser times of James or Charles had furnished. Those opportunities, and temptations to despotism, seem to have attained their full maturity at the commencement of the present reign. The septennial act of suicide, abhorrent certainly from the popular nature of parliament, and destructive of its due independence on the crown, had been long perpetrated. Military power and civil influence united to enable the Prince, if he were so disposed by nature or education, to oppress and corrupt the people, whose property and power was lessened, exactly in the proportion that the crown had gained weight and force, by the establishment of a standing army and a national debt. But, above all, the time of his ascension to the throne was full of such peculiar circumstances of popularity, as gave him unlimited, because unsuspected, power. Into that auspicious moment was crowded all the promise of his youth; founded in the fond memory of all the virtues of his ancestors; of his youth, rising, as it seemed, to renew the race of glory that they had run, even up to the recent goal of universal conquest. Nature and fortune conspired to give the

the young Monarch of that day an empire the best and most permanent that Monarchs can enjoy, if they wish to maintain it,—an absolute power in the hearts of his subjects.

Such was the power and the opportunity of exercising it with which his present Majesty ascended the throne. If it had been the counsel of his reign to improve it into the perfect and reciprocal happiness of himself and his people, the way was not steep nor difficult. The virtues of his royal grandfather, the talents of Mr. Pitt, and the genius of England, called into action by them, had surmounted the difficulties of war and faction, and corruption; and nothing remained for a Prince that wished an honourable and happy reign, but to pursue the path that his ancestor had trod, with new facility and ascertained success.

But if other counsels were introduced, and other objects proposed than the mutual interests of prince and people, different then must have been the means to attain those different ends. Then, instead of cultivating the salutary fruits of wise and happy government, the old weeds of tyranny would be carefully cherished and disseminated, till a new harvest should arise, adapted to the season, and to the tastes of men, less loathsome, but more poisonous and fatal. The unextirpated abuses of former times, mel-  
lowed



lowed now by age, would be refined into a new and more subtil spirit. Then would appear, in superaddition to the ancient opportunities of misgovernment, unremoved by the old Revolution, *the modern inventions of power*, to be removed and annihilated only by a new one.

I will not say that the counsels early inculcated into the mind of the young Prince, and the young King, were other than doctrines of the purest liberty; for I never heard the constitutional lectures, which Lord Bute delivered in the closet. But every Englishman will assert what he feels, while freedom of speech and sense of feeling remain to him; that whatever those principles were, the effect of them has been extension of royal influence, and violation of popular rights: and every man of common sense will conclude in argument, that as falsehood cannot flow from truth, so the political effect that has been stated as generally felt, cannot be the result of the most perfect constitutional principles.

The distinguishing characteristic of the present reign seems to be the new spirit in which the Members of Administration must severally live, move, and have their being. Formerly, Administration was a body actuated by one spirit that pervaded the whole; its members were distinct, not separate: the particular

particular function of each was enforced by the corresponding authority of all; and the general object was compassed by consent of parts, giving the additional effort, as nature and reason dictate, of united force. Now, our mangled government is in a perpetual state of fevers and disunion; and, like the Polypus, each wretched part crawls about without power, name, or significance.

But weakness alone were not a sufficient qualification for a modern minister. He must be actively contemptible, if he expect honour at court. So constant encouragement is extended, and always a ready audience to all the little slander of office against office; to the whisper of the Treasury against the American department, or to the lye of the Admiralty against them both. Occasions are studiously contrived to bend and subdue the spirits of men; and those are advanced the highest in the service, who have best learned the discipline of disgrace. There should be little wonder, that commanders in such a service are sought for from the ranks.

Virtue, we are told by an admired authority, is the principle of government in republics; and honour, in a monarchy. In a government, therefore, supposed to unite, and almost to identify the properties of both; where the power of the monarch is the consent of the people, and popular concurrence

is



is regal strength; we might hope for the combined principle of honourable virtue. But if, in fact directly contrary, we find a principle that counterplots and counterworks the best and noblest affections of humanity, and would annihilate all moral duty and natural connexion; a principle that severs friend from friend, and seduces brother from brother; that hugs and betrays and destroys; that drives honour to despair, and leaves no alternative to virtue, but infamy or suicide; it will not be a very unlogical or uncharitable conclusion to infer, that such a government is neither in the spirit of a republic or a monarchy; that such a principle cannot be supposed to be enforced in mere wantonness, and without an object; for vice is not its own reward; and, therefore, that despotism alone is the spirit of that government, where such principles and practices prevail.

Besides the separate and dishonoured capacity in which modern politics require Ministers to depend, not on their viriues or talents, not on popular favour or honourable connexion, but on *something else* directly opposite; towards perfectly establishing the new system on the ruins of the old, particular innovation of disgrace was necessary in that department of administration, which the courtesy and the success of former times had denominated *the first*. The Prime Minister was now to  
be

be the prime object of contempt. Instead of the dignified and official consequence in Parliament, which naturally and constitutionally would attend a Minister of spirited talents and popular virtues ; our *novus homo* must submit to the new penance of his place : deriving no honour from victory, for every man was to know him only as the Adjutant of the troops ; but lest he should imagine himself more, or grow by mistake into any reputation, he was studiously to be exposed in situations of disgrace and disappointment : in contemptible minorities, without a friend to support or pity him : (I speak of former occasions, when the court power was supreme ; for *now* the management of parliament is not quite so optional to the spirit of St. James's ;) so that when the parliamentary Minister seemed to sail on the full tide of power "to bring America to his feet," whether by Scotch bills of *starvation*, or *his own* conciliatory propositions, he was to find himself carried away by some under-current, out of his latitude and contrary to his reckoning. Real pay indeed was to compensate the futility of nominal rank ; but the private favour was precarious, and the public odium certain. He was to be the Minister or the Messenger, as the arbitrary whim of the minute should dictate or permit ; to have authority enough to effectuate every mischief  
that



that should be commanded, but no power whatever, if by chance he should be inclined to prevent any; justly responsible for others crimes as well as his own, because their willing instrument; the devoted victim of their ambition and his own meanness: he was, in fine, to represent *the pawn* before the person of *the King*; advanced and protected for a time; but when no longer able to divert or sustain the attack, to be swept away from the board for ever, the *enfants perdu* of a desperate party.

March, 1780.

---

## THE WHIG.

— *his own Minister.*

WHEN the planters and merchants of Jamaica demanded from the first Lord of the Admiralty some assurance of protection from the fleet of England, Lord Sandwich informed them, "that his was merely an *executive* department." When they waited on the Secretary of State for America, to solicit some attention from government, Lord George Germain acquainted them, "that every thing had been done that *he* could do." When they called upon the Prime Minister for some exertion to save the island, Lord  
North

North told them, “ he did not know it was in danger ; but if it were, *he* could undertake nothing positive for its defence: that Lord Sandwich was perfectly right in his politics ; for that the first Lord of the Admiralty, the Secretaries of State, and first Lord of the Treasury, were merely *executive*: the *cabinet must determine*.”

Omitting for the present the characteristic conduct of these noble persons on that occasion ; the insolent levity, the hollow politeness, and the laboured nothingness ; I desire to fasten my reader’s attention to the singularity of this subject. It is the only article of political communion among the Ministers. In no one sentiment of politics do they agree but this, to dissemble their respective responsibility, and to load their common master with the guilt of all his servants :—you cannot say *that I did it: the King is his own Minister*.”

If it were possible to add to the guilt of men who have plundered the property, and openly assail the liberty of the people, this additional contempt of the constitution of their country would crown their crimes. It is notorious, that they have recourse to it on every criminal and penal part of their conduct or their neglect. It is their constant boast of impunity. I enquire not whether such a libel on the government of England—a libel  
so



so false, my Lord Mansfield, and so seditious in necessary consequence against his crown and dignity, be stamped with the royal *imprimatur*; or whether, as I wish may be the fact, it be the forgery of the men who have surrounded and betrayed him. They are the publishers, if they did not invent or dictate it; and they will soon be tried by God and their country.

In this short sentence is wound up and compressed all the mystery and mischief of modern politics. *The King is his own Minister*. That is, the whole executive power and administration of the State is to be placed in hands superior to controul; too strong for ordinary resistance, and too sacred as is supposed for punishment. In effect, therefore, whenever people can be subdued to the practice of such theory, this principle amounts to perfect and complete despotism. For what is the power of the most arbitrary despot on earth, other than possession of the whole executive strength of the State without check of resistance, or fear of punishment? —What truer description can apply to an arbitrary Monarch, than that he is the uncontrolled Minister of his own ambition and caprice, in the unjust violences of war, and the corruptions and follies of internal government?

I had occasion in an early paper to discuss the

the trite and misunderstood maxim in the polity of England, *that the King can do no wrong*. While the English constitution is preserved, it is in its true sense a wise and useful maxim; but if the monstrous innovation were tolerated, *that the King is his own Minister*, it becomes nonsense or tyranny. If he makes no use whatever of his ministerial power, it is absurd to call him his own minister, as it would be superfluous to say that he can do no wrong who does nothing. But if he exert the executive power, personally invested in him by this tyrannous doctrine, and if that exertion be unpunishable and unquestionable *because he can do no wrong*, I know no more complete description of arbitrary sway.

The old Utopia of the controlling care of Parliament, of the grand inquest of the nation, and the hereditary council of the crown, is very pretty reading, and it is no more. We may amuse ourselves with looking at these venerable family-pictures of the constitution, the works certainly of eminent masters, and admire the unfading colours of their fame. But are they more than objects of curiosity, or, at best, of empty admiration, out of all modern taste and resemblance? In the portrait of Godolphin do we trace the features of Lord North? Was Somers the prototype of the Earl of Mansfield? Is the



present usurper of Blenheim, a Duke of Marlborough?

In truth, whoever would now go about to talk of whig-principles in government; inspired and established by the honour of the peers or the virtue of the commons, must be a more impudent knave than the majority of either house can produce. To prove that the sun shines at midnight is a difficulty too arduous even for "the forehead" (as he himself *modestly* expresses it,) of the Earl of Sandwich. A more practicable and more wicked course is pursued. It were desperate to appeal to the reason of mankind against their senses; but appeals to their malignity against their reason may be attended with success. Thus the few advocates who can be induced to plead in such a cause, never shock the common sense of their audience by endeavouring to prove their friends able or honest: they think it decent, and perhaps they have hitherto found it politic, to argue that all other men are equally destitute of talents and virtue. This infamous language, chastised as it has been in parliament by eloquence and refuted by example, would little deserve the revival of public indignation; if it were not one of the immediate tenets of that schismatick heresy in politicks, *that the King is his own Minister*. All popularity of character, and honourable connexion, whether of nobles

In a state, or of those talents and patriot virtues which constitute true nobility, are eternal bars in the way of the arbitrary system which, it has been proved, must result from that favourite principle. The early exclusion of Mr. Pitt and introduction of the Earl of Bute, were the first bitter waters of that fatal fountain which has almost deluged the rights and power of the people. The early and continued spirit of slander against every thing virtuous and honourable, first went forth from the new cabinet against that great and popular man: because his greatness and popularity stood in the way of the new principle, *that the King was to be his own Minister*. The persecution and proscription from royal favour of the Whig families and connexions of England, has been uniform; unless in one or two exceptions, the short period of which has only served to prove the rule, that Whig principles are inconsistent with the new Toryism, *that the King is his own Minister*.

It is necessary for the people of England, rising as they now are with yeoman-virtue throughout the country, in vindication of their ancient rights in their property and liberty, to beware of the full extent of this malignant principle. In its full extent, it subverts every security of public liberty, while the forms of the constitution remain. If the King be his own Minister, and if those who



fill the offices of state be, as Lord Sandwich and Lord North affirm, merely *executive*; all due and regular responsibility is lost. Thirteen provinces and the fleet of England may be sold to France; the people must submit to poverty, and hug their eternal chains; for no change of counsel can recover their empire, their power, or their liberty. They can infuse no popular support, nor popular success in consequence, into a new Administration;—for, *the King is his own Minister*. *Obstinate* adherence, therefore, to such a principle, induces the inevitable alternative of slavery in the people, or the personal responsibility of Majesty. The latter has a precedent in our history; the former has no example.

March, 1780.

---

*To the Printer of the Public Advertiser.*

I Have lately read a bulky performance, which professes to discuss many law points of great importance. It is entitled “A Letter on Libels, Warrants, &c.”

What stopped me first in reading, and shall alone engage my animadversion now, is a long passage early in the book, in which the author goes wantonly out of his way, without the least call from his argument,  
merely

merely to introduce his character of a very great person, who is only not named, who is but lately dead, and whose memory will be ever dear, not only to all that knew him personally, but to all honest and good men of whatever denomination.

In this character some few commendations are affectedly introduced ; but the particular censures, which make the much greater part of the passage, are so utterly inconsistent with those few and sparing praises, that it is no breach of candor and charity to suppose, that the former praises were inserted only to point the censures which follow with a more malignant rancour.

The great person alluded to is here pronounced to have approached nearer, in his political and legal conduct, and in every other respect indeed, to the Earl of Clarendon than to Lord Somers :—and what then ? It is always invidious to compare characters, and would be impertinent and ungenerous to raise a monument to the fame of either of those great men on the ruin of others. The world is now agreed in acknowledging the abilities and merit of both ; but it is well known to all, who were acquainted with this noble person, that he constantly made Lord Somers his first and avowed model ; and that this eminent Statesman, with the Lord Chief Holt, were the two characters in the long robe,



robe, whose conduct he always wished and aimed to express in his own. Yet this writer calls him 'a Prerogative Lawyer.' We all know what these words will be generally understood to imply; and it is sufficient to answer, that not this pamphleteer only, but all others are desired to give one single instance of the late Lord Chancellor's having at any time, in any place, or upon any occasion, attempted or aimed at any extension of the prerogative; nay, it may be said, for it is well known, in some prosecutions which he was to conduct as Attorney-General in very ticklish times, he managed with such ability and candor as at once to give the most entire satisfaction to the Administration, whose directions he enforced, and even to extort the esteem and admiration of the principal leaders of the Opposition, who were most immediately interested in the event of those prosecutions.

But 'he leaned in his notions too much towards aristocracy.' I should be glad to ask this writer, whether the Bill for abolishing the heretable jurisdictions, and the other Bills for the reformation and civilizing of the Highlands in Scotland, which every body remembers to have been projected and conducted by this great person, are not the strongest proofs of his zeal for the liberties of the community in general on the truest principles,

principles, and his not being biassed by any undue attachment to aristocracy?

The account of his Lordship's speech on the preliminaries, in December 1762, is not only a very rude and unmannerly one, (these are peccadillos with political writers,) but is absolutely false and contrary to fact. I say this with the more confidence, because I have seen very faithful and accurate notes of this speech; and I do affirm, that the single objection to the preliminaries, which this author pretends to quote from it, viz. about the boundaries in North America, made no part of the speech, nor was so much as mentioned in it. The truth is, the noble Lord acted in this matter upon the most honourable and temperate principle. He had been just then dismissed from the Cabinet, and could only in the House of Lords deliver his sentiments on this great national measure. He acknowledged readily his approbation of many things; and those which he disapproved, he objected to with such propriety, and with such weight, that some of them were actually corrected in the definitive treaty; and others would have been probably, had we had the good fortune to carry on and conclude our negociations for the peace with the same national unanimity with which we set out.

And this naturally leads to a question, which this father of candor, as he calls himself,



himself, has affectedly put and left undetermined; "whether his Lordship understood foreign affairs or not?" Those who want yet to settle their judgments in this matter will rather be directed, I should suppose, by the opinion of such as had frequent opportunity of hearing him in the House, or at the Council Board, than by the crude conceptions of this malevolent writer.

We are next instructed concerning his Lordship's conduct, and the motives to it, in regard to the militia, the habeas corpus, and the marriage acts. In his speech on the first of these, which I well remember, he averred of himself the very reverse to what this man affirms of him, *ultri creditis quirites?* And, after urging his objections to the plan then sent up from the Commons, he declared himself in favour of a well-regulated militia; and proposed such alterations in any future scheme as were all adopted the next year, were approved in both Houses, and received the Royal Assent.

As to the habeas corpus, there was indeed a bill with a very specious title carried through the House of Commons in 1758, with the full tide of popular eloquence: but it should be remembered, that some of the most distinguished lawyers in that House strenuously opposed it; and when it came up to the other, the subject underwent a more deliberate  
and

and solemn discussion. The judges' opinions were taken upon the leading principles of the bill; and they gave it as their unanimous opinion, that the writ of habeas corpus was of right and not of course, and that some affidavit or allegation of probable cause was necessary to found the demand upon. In the debate which afterwards ensued, so many inconveniencies were pointed out in so masterly a manner by the noble Lord here aspersed, supported by a noble Lord of the same learned profession, that the House was convinced of the great impropriety and unfitness of the Bill, and rejected it without a division. The protest which followed was only signed by one solitary Lord.

With regard to the marriage act, we cannot but remember how long some provisions of this kind had been called for; and, without entering into a discussion of all the points, or indeed of any, which may be disputed on this argument, we may affirm with a truth, that the bill did not take its rise from this noble person, but from a motion made by another, with whom he was not connected in business; that the bill prepared by the Judges was by every body deemed inadequate, and the noble Lord on the wool-pack unanimously requested to prepare a more effectual one. This he did with the firmest persuasion, which he retained to his last hour, of the  
general



general reasonableness and fitness of what is there enacted; yet withal constantly professing an entire readiness to concur and assist in framing any reasonable amendments, to meet with any real inconveniencies, which the present bill had been found to occasion.

To pronounce concerning any man's secret motives, is in the highest degree presumptuous; but if this be in all cases hazardous, and in most cases ungenerous, what shall we say of a writer who with equal folly and assurance supposes, that "a perfectly good Judge, a truly wise magistrate, a person of natural good temper, and of the soundest understanding in matters of law and equity;" all of these qualities usually proceeding from sound principles, and tending to produce upright conduct, should yet not deserve the appellation of "a true Patriot;" should have joined in opposition, merely from private and personal dissatisfaction; should have acted frequently and repeatedly with an utter ignorance of our national interests, both foreign and domestic; and should, in one case particularly, (that of the marriage act,) have gone upon a view, which, far less circumspection, experience, and knowledge of the world than his Lordship is admitted to have possessed, must convince any man is the most absurd, wild, and irrational, that can be entertained or imagined, viz. "The perpetuating

perpetuating a fortune or family once made, &c." The diversity of family characters, in a very few generations, or even in one and the same often, and the ceaseless fluctuation of events in the same family, must satisfy every body, that no man of good sense in worldly matters, which is graciously allowed to this noble person, could amuse himself with such a visionary and romantic idea. *Vitæ summa brevis spem nos vetat inchoare longam.*

As to the many petulant and malignant insinuations thrown out in various parts of this pamphlet on the descendents from this great and excellent person, I am persuaded, they all of them as much and as thoroughly despise them as they little deserve them. I shall therefore say nothing at all to any thing levelled at them; nor should indeed have written what I have in defence of their noble father, so illiberally and wantonly attacked, if I had not always, on the justest reasons, entertained the highest reverence for his person and virtues, and had not been really affected with an honest indignation at seeing his ashes, scarce cold yet, trampled upon in so disrespectful a manner, and his excellent character so unnecessarily and so rudely calumniated. I say calumniated; for I cannot help retorting on this writer his own idea, and pronouncing his performance (as far as relates to the part here animadverted on)

a libel



a *libel* in all its forms ; that is, according to his own definition of one, both *false* and *malicious*.

December 15, 1764.

---

*To the Printer of the Public Advertiser.*

THE extraordinary demand for a pamphlet, entitled, “ A Letter concerning Libels, Warrants, &c.” owing partly to the nature of the subject it professes to treat, and not a little to some other ingredients with which it is seasoned, having brought it to a fourth edition ; I had endeavoured to persuade myself that the author or authors, convinced by the information they must have received through several of the public papers, of the gross and wilful mistakes they had been guilty of in respect to some memorable facts, as well as some characters which deserved a different treatment, would have so far listened to the calls of truth and justice, as to have expunged several passages which appeared in the former editions, containing the most injurious reflections on the dead as well as the living ; reflections not warranted in any manner, nor to be accounted for or explained, except upon the amiable motives of envy, jealousy, and a spirit of faction.

But

But as I find upon looking into the third edition, that instead of acting as became friends to truth, or even generous adversaries; instead of retracting falsehoods or mistakes however palpable, they have not only repeated them again and again, but at the same time accumulated new injuries and new calumnies; I think it incumbent upon those who have any knowledge of the real characters and facts, which these worthy assertors of liberty and the constitution of their country have so traduced, to stand forth, and not suffer the unprejudiced part of mankind to be deceived by the gross partiality and flagrant malice of such writers. It is with this view alone (detesting as I do the warfare of newspapers and party pamphlets) that I have been induced to undertake the drudgery of pointing out and exposing some of the false imputations, which have been heaped with such peculiar virulence, upon the memory and public conduct of the late Earl of Hardwicke, in the later editions of this bulky libel.

Some strictures having already been made [The preceding paper addressed to the Printer of the Public Advertiser.] with great truth and propriety, upon the injurious and malicious attempt towards a character of this noble person as it stood in the first edition of this performance, I shall wholly confine myself



myself to such alterations and additions as have since appeared in it.

In the first place, this *Father of Candour* has thought fit to stigmatize some proceedings in his late Majesty's reign against a certain V. C. of Oxford, as being very oppressive, and in the same breath to impute them, without the least hesitation or ceremony, to Lord Hardwicke's advice and direction; not casting the least censure upon the late Sir D. Ryder, then Attorney-General, who conducted the prosecution as far as it went, and who had too much experience and ability in his profession to want advice or direction; and was by principle and education too zealous a Whig, and of too humane a temper, to lay the heavy hand of power upon any subject, however *worthless*, where the Law and his duty did not fully authorize and require it. But why then is it charged upon this Noble Lord? Does it appear, or can it be pretended with the least truth, that he was even asked his opinion about it, much more that he gave any such advice or direction to the Attorney-General? Does merely holding the Great Seal then, and assisting at the Cabinet Council, make a man responsible for an Attorney-General's execution of his office? If so, why is not the Noble Lord who at present fills that station, arraigned throughout this libel for every step of the proceeding

ing against Mr. Wilkes, instead of the two Secretaries of State, and the late and present Attorney-General.

The next thing which presents itself is a modest assertion (introduced into a long and laboured passage, which is intended, I suppose, to pass for a complete character of his Lordship) of his having once *affected* the title of Earl of Clarendon. A more absurd piece of falsehood was never invented, nor one less probable in the case of a man, who had for so many years ennobled his own name by the force of his own genius, nor less suitable to the judgment, modesty, and whole behaviour of that noble person. The truth is, he more than once declined the honour of the advancement itself; during which time a report being spread, that his late Majesty was graciously pleased to intend it for him, it was several times inserted in the Newspapers, that he was to be created Earl of Clarendon. This is literally the whole foundation there ever was, or could be, for such an idle tale, unless one could suppose it was designed to give uneasiness to the family and descendents of that celebrated Minister.

He then proceeds to give a most false account of Lord Hardwicke's speech in the House of Lords upon the Preliminaries. I don't mean to dwell upon such insinuations or expressions as have already been animad-  
verted



verted upon; but it is impossible to let such notorious falsehoods be repeated and aggravated day after day, without expressing a just indignation at such shameless profligacy. He was so far from objecting to the Boundaries between the British and French Colonies in North-America, settled by that treaty, that he thought them the best imaginable. This the author has been already told in print; notwithstanding which, as if determined to bear down even truth itself by mere effrontery, he has added a particularity to the supposed objection as foolish and as false as all the rest.

What opinion their Lordships entertained of his speech that day, I shall not presume to determine: Sure I am, however, that he retained the powers of his mind too perfect even to the last to give the least colour for the low comparison, under which the prejudiced and vulgar ideas of this malignant Writer have thought fit to represent him.

He felt perhaps as few of the defects of age as most of his contemporaries, and yet he has been known to say of himself in that Assembly, *Non eadem est Ætas, non Mens.* But let those who remember the part he sustained for so many years at the Bar, upon the Bench, and in Parliament, during the warmest political contests against the ablest speakers, recollect the light in which he  
always

always appeared ; his grace, strength, and dignity of manner ; quickness and comprehension of thought ; and let them say if they can, that he had neither imagination, wit, or eloquence ; that he betrayed on any occasion a want of the ornamental and graceful accomplishments of literature, in which he had the felicity to be better grounded, and to have more accuracy and extent than almost any man who had engaged so early and so long in public business ; or that he gave any marks of that *Plainness* of education, which this polite, ingenious, and accomplished writer, with as little regard to truth as decency, is pleased to bestow upon him.

The reflections cast upon his speech on the first draught of the Militia Bill sent up by the House of Commons in 1756, have been so fully answered in a former paper, that I shall say but little to them. I must however observe, that though he suggested many and weighty political objections to that Bill, he made none of a *religious* nature, unless the author is absurd enough to call disapproving the mode, prepared in that Bill, of exercising the men on Sundays, a religious objection. So far from enervating the scheme, by proposing to reduce the number to one-half, he made it by that means a practicable measure ; and whoever will attempt to increase the number, will have



enough to contend with in answering the complaints of the country upon such an augmentation. So far from contriving to defeat the execution of it in his particular county after it became a law, the most punctual obedience was paid to the Act in every particular by the noble person who was then, and is now, his Majesty's Lieutenant in that county; the Militia of which was actually raised and disciplined for two years together during the war, and is now on foot again, and was called out to their annual exercise in May last.

There is but one thing more which truth compels me to take notice of, and that is, what this well-informed writer thinks proper to say, with regard to the judges who were called to that important station, whilst the Great Seal was in his hands. Can any one who looks round Westminster-Hall at this hour, forget who recommended many of the ablest who now sit there? as able and as upright men as ever administered justice in any age or any country. Can he forget or affect to treat with contempt the names of *professional* merit of some who are dead, or retired, Reeves, Lee, Ryder, Strange, Wright, Burnet, Foster, Clarke, and others, who might be mentioned? Or will he venture to assert, that these men obtained their seats upon the bench by *ministerial*, not *professional*, merit. Though

Though I perceive that the subject has carried me farther than I at first designed, yet before I have quite done with it, I think some notice should be taken of the many scattered passages in this curious medley of factious politics, extravagant law doctrines, and personal abuse, inserted with the generous purpose of depreciating, by this virulent libel, the honour and reputation of the family and descendants of the noble person above mentioned. But as there happens to be one among them, whose talents, eloquence, learning, and integrity, have raised him to a height in the profession of the law, which in the general esteem of the Bar, and in the public voice, gave him just and regular pretensions to the first honours in it; who filled, for many years, two great stations, with as much capacity and reputation, as any man whatever; and who lately resigned one of them, so as to assert his own honour and sentiments with the most weight and freedom, at the hazard of every thing which can be called profit or ambition; who is too knowing to be dictated to on points which concern the law and constitution; too sagacious and honest to be made a fool; too wise and temperate in his public conduct to please the selfish, the interested, and the violent; too free and independent in his situation and fortune, *to lay himself* (in the language of this

writer).



writer) *at the feet of any man*, or to cast his opinions into any ministerial or popular mould, because it may happen to suit with the times, or with his own interest: He is therefore peculiarly marked out for vengeance,—his conduct in Parliament misrepresented and traduced, where in truth it gained him much credit in all the instances alluded to; and his good name to be branded with every ill-natured epithet, and false reflection, which the insolence, the injustice, and the private views of others can suggest.

After all, let me appeal to the zealous admirers of this libeller, whether he who wantonly sacrifices the truth of facts, and characters above suspicion, to the dark purposes of calumny and envy, has the least claim to the applause or confidence of any party.

Law dispensed by such writers, is like a sword in the hands of a madman; it will stab indeed, but it will stab in the dark, the friends rather than the enemies of the Constitution; and thus it may become a terror to innocent and worthy citizens, instead of an instrument of justice against profligate Ministers and lawless subjects.

January 30, 1765.

THE

## THE COUNTRY GENTLEMAN.

February 3, 1780.

FROM the spirited proceedings of the petitioning counties, the nation has already gained one great advantage. It has had the fairest opportunity of trying the different pretensions of those who professed to have its welfare and glory at heart. Private interest and public utility have erected their several standards. The mercenary bands of the one have been driven to the necessity of separating themselves *publicly* from the friends of the other. The great *party* of the nation stands gloriously distinguished from the *factional retainers* of a corrupt Administration.

The imputation of the selfish views of ambition and avarice, so artfully thrown out against the opposers of the present disgraceful system, has at length been unquestionably brought home to the supporters of that system; and opposition has gained that confidence from the people, to which their patriotic exertions had so long, and so justly entitled them.

An event so desirable is not more to be ascribed to the conduct of the petitioners, than to the measures pursued by the few who  
oppose



oppose them. We are indebted, I hope, to the goodness of Providence for the selection of these men. Zealous without knowledge, abilities or discretion, they have been betrayed into an avowal of the secret designs of their employers. Transported by an eager desire of recommending themselves, they have divulged the dark mysteries of the court, and explained its deep laid schemes and arbitrary doctrines, to an assembly of British freeholders.

These doctrines, it is true, we have seen artfully inculcated, for several past, in all the venal productions of the ministerial prints. From the learned Pensioner, [Dr. Samuel Johnson.] whose talents were once happily employed in the service of his country, down to the writers of daily essays, and newspaper paragraphs, not a mercenary pen but has insinuated them more or less covertly. But the formal and authentic confession of them was reserved for the daring and intrepid spirit of Mr. Smelt.

Emboldened by the boundless favour he enjoyed with his Sovereign, that gentleman thought himself authorized to speak without fear or restraint. With that familiarity to which he has been so long admitted, *he snatched away the veil* the petitioners had respectfully drawn round the throne. He boldly produced the person of his royal friend,  
and,

and, to a set of men who pointed their censures only at his Ministers, held him up as an object of the justest terror, and the most alarming apprehension.

For what were his words? Did this bosom confident of the King of a free people hesitate to represent him to his distant subjects in the light of an Asiatic despot? to seat him amid the blaze and *unapproachable splendour of majesty*, self-honoured, self-beloved, and self-enjoyed. Did he hesitate to propose the creature of the constitution to the adoration of the public, as the first animating principle, the great informing spirit, the essence of that very power to which it owes even its existence? Did he not even make his boast of the indignation with which he was fired, when he heard his royal protector styled *the servant of the people*? A title which the most despotic monarchs, at least, *affect* to glory in, as the surest to enthrone them in the hearts of their subjects, but which, it seems, is considered as an insult on a descendant of the House of Brunswick! To whom, then, is that Prince indebted for the crown he wears? To the people asserting their rights. To whom does he owe the preference given to his line over the elder branches of the House of Stuart? To the people. Why is he not at this instant buried in obscurity, confounded among the petty Princes who are subsidiary to the  
the



the throne, to which the subversion of the doctrines of his favourite, paved him the way? Why, but for the people asserting their rights, and delegating a power which it was theirs alone to confer? And shall it be a disgrace to this Prince to be styled the servant of that people? Shall the man, whom he has taken to his bosom, declare the very *idea to be narrow, little and mean, unworthy of a King of England?*

The public and authentic avowal of the doctrines of the Court produced the effects it was natural to expect among the descendants of the revolutionists. Whigs and Tories equally took the alarm. The whole body of the freeholders of York, whom their distresses had assembled, with a view of examining into the cause of their grievances, were convinced by Mr. Smelt of the necessity of concurring in the measures proposed to them by the promoters of the petition. For at the very moment they were complaining of the *secret* influence of the Crown, they were insulted by an open declaration of its ambitious and unconstitutional views. While they were expressing their fears at an encrease of a dangerous power, purchased under hand by the money of the public, they heard it declared by unquestionable authority, that *in the doctrine of the Court* this power required to be *encreased greatly*, beyond even its  
present

present encroachments. They were beseeching their representatives to adopt the most steady and effectual measures for relieving the country from the enormous weight of taxes with which it was oppressed, and they were told that in the doctrine of the Court this country could never be *properly* governed, till those taxes should be rendered perpetual, and till the nation should be precluded from every hope of relief. Even those who had attended the assembly with an intention of opposing the petition, were compelled by such alarming discoveries to join in the prayer of it ; and all the fruits produced by the effusion of this *very loyal zealot*, were to give unanimity to the meeting, and to unite all parties in one great constitutional cause.

If the nation has derived so great an advantage from the rash and impetuous zeal of Mr. Smelt, it is no less indebted to the conduct of the persons employed by the Minister in another county, (*Hertford*.) Nature has been very sparing of her gifts to the young nobleman, (*Salisbury*) whom he has placed at their head. But his Lordship endeavours to make up by zeal what he wants in abilities. It fills us with indignation to hear of the infamous arts employed to mislead the ignorant, and intimidate the dependent, whom the agents of that nobleman, and of his pensioned assistants, induce to sign the  
Hertford



Hertford protest. A protest against the proceedings of a meeting, at which they did not even assist, and of which they must, consequently, be utterly ignorant. A protest, the very first clause of which is no less an insult on their understanding, than an outrage on their feelings as Englishmen. It renounces one of the most sacred rights they enjoy. It disclaims a privilege which their ancestors bequeathed to secure, and which they transmitted to their posterity, as a dear bought and invaluable inheritance.

Infatuated people! while they put their hands to their own condemnation; while they sign the instrument of their own slavery, and encourage their hard task masters to encrease their burdens, the men by whose interested arts they are duped and misled, reap the fruits of their folly, and fatten on their spoils. The leaders, whom they blindly follow, are the very men who enjoy the enormous salaries and unmerited pensions, which the sounder part of their fellow-freeholders require to be converted from the enriching of individuals to the service of the State. Even now the golden reward hangs ready to the grasp of their Lord Lieutenant, (*Salisbury*,) and animates him to perseverance. The lucrative employment (*Treasurer of the Household*,) so generously resigned by a virtuous young nobleman, (*Carlisle*,) who scorned  
to

to owe any part of his splendor to the sufferings of the people, he claims as his due. He counts it as earned by his services in the favourite cause of corruption. He triumphs in the gains he has made from the credulity of the deluded instruments of his growing ambition, and maintains that he is invited by themselves to share in their plunder.

---

### THE COUNTRY GENTLEMAN.

*To the Earl of H——GH.*

*February 17, 1780.*

MY LORD,

WHEN the defection of the house of Bedford compelled the interior cabinet to seek for fit characters to supply at the Council-Board the furious and vindictive spirit of that party, they naturally cast their eyes upon your Lordship. The principles which have invariably directed your political conduct, and the temper and dispositions you had manifested at a former memorable crisis, fully justified their choice. It promised as favourably to the interests of their system, as it boded ill to the happiness of this country, and alarmed the friends of the constitution in proportion to the satisfaction expressed on  
your



your appointment by the creatures of the Court.

For my own part, I am free to confess, that I by no means felt all that terror and apprehension which your return to office diffused amongst most ranks of men. If your abilities, indeed, could keep pace with the wishes of your heart, I should think that Heaven, in its utmost displeasure, could not inflict a heavier curse on this nation, than to suffer you to take a part in the direction of its councils. But in the weakness of your understanding, I thought I saw a resource against the depravity of your principles, and the malignancy of your designs. I even conceived some hopes of public advantage from the effects of your administration. A rash and ungovernable zeal, that excluded all prudence and discretion, and disdained all restraint, might not, I imagined, prove unserviceable to the cause of the people. Your conduct at the commencement of the American dissensions was fresh in my recollection. The illiberal and ill grounded censures, and the violent and unconstitutional proceedings by which you drove the colonies into rebellion, and tore asunder all the bonds that united them to the parent state, gave me no room to mistake the line you were likely to follow in our present domestic distractions. I looked for a repetition of the same impo-

litic

litic councils. I could entertain no doubt that the same insolent and intemperate measures were meant to be pursued. The public would necessarily be struck with the resemblance, and the sad lesson they had been taught by the result of those measures among the colonists would naturally put them on their guard against them, when they saw that they aimed immediately at their own peace and happiness, and would open their eyes to the real intentions of government.

Your conduct has fully justified my suspicions. In the violent resolutions lately adopted in the cabinet against the favourers of the petitions, the people evidently discovered the traces of your character. You may rest assured, my Lord, that they give you entire credit for them. You may expect at their hands the fullest retribution, and the justest recompence. But if they could have entertained any doubts on the subject, you have taken care effectually to remove them. You have declared yourself their professed enemy, in one of the most delicate and essential points. You have confessed yourself to be one, at least, of the Ministers who labour to alienate the affections of his Majesty from a majority of his most loyal and affectionate subjects.

If their humble and dutiful petitions to be eased of the oppressive burdens under which they



they labour, have been misrepresented to their Sovereign as *factionous*, and *founded merely in a spirit of violence and party*, your Lordship acknowledges yourself to be one of the authors of such misrepresentation.

If their constitutional meetings to collect the sentiments of the public, and legally to convey them to the representatives, to whom that public has delegated the guardianship of its rights, and the defence of its property, be misrepresented at the foot of the throne as *dangerous, disloyal, seditious combinations, evidently tending to rebellion*, your Lordship acknowledges yourself to be the author of such misrepresentations.

If the freeholders of England be denied the privileges that have been acknowledged to belong to other subjects of the empire; if the *armed* associations of Ireland have had the sanction and approbation of the Minister, and if their *peremptory* demands have procured redress, while our *humble* and *submissive* representations have been branded as *seditious and tending to rebellion*, to your Lordship they are *particularly* indebted for the insulting distinction.

If his Majesty has been counselled to dismiss from the government of counties, (Lord Pembroke, &c.) men of the first character and property in his dominions, for exerting the privileges reserved to them in common

common with the rest of their fellow-subjects, by the same power to which he is indebted for his own title to the throne, your Lordship acknowledges yourself to be one of the authors of that council—you pledge yourself to persevere in the *resolution and firmness necessary to subdue* those men—to punish, *without pity*, the petitioners and their supporters, and all who dare maintain the legality of their proceedings, or their right to represent their grievances, and call for redress.

Has your Lordship weighed well the consequences of this open attack on the majesty of the people? What preparations have you made to meet their collected indignation? In other questions between them and the different members of Administration, they may content themselves with supplicating for redress. In this they must call aloud for *vengeance*. In vain will you have recourse to the state device of confounding your own cause with the cause of the crown and constitution. You may procure the willing votes of a *corrupt majority in parliament* by holding up every attack on your administration as an attack on the state; but to the feelings of the freeholders of Great-Britain, whom you have insulted, vilified, and traduced, and on whose rights you have trampled, such arguments will only prove an aggravation to your guilt.

Believe me, my Lord, they are fully



aware of your designs. They have little reason to forget the transactions of your former administration. They recollect that the *very terms of that black hand-writing*, by which you first denounced the vengeance of administration against the devoted Colonists, were the same that fell from the transports of your furious zeal in the late debate in the House of Lords.

In that fatal instrument of irrevocable proscription, you represented a measure perfectly legal, perfectly constitutional, a measure that tended solely to lay the grievances of the subject before the throne, as *inflammatory in its nature, tending to create unwarrantable combinations, and calculated to inflame the minds of the people*. You exhorted the creatures of government to defeat so *flagitious an attempt, and to treat it with the contempt it deserved*. You denied it to be the *resolution of the majority of the people*, but of a set of *factious designing men*; and you afterwards procured a *protest* from the inhabitants of the village of Hatfield to prove your assertions. You threatened the *authors and supporters* of such proceedings with *punishment without pity*; and you warned them that *proper care* should be taken to maintain the *dignity of government*. The result has proved what that *proper care* was designed to have been; and thus did you drive a loyal and submissive people

people into all the excesses of rebellion, which you falsely laid to their charge.

High and honest minds can ill brook unmerited suspicions. Resentment at the undeserved imputation of the guilt they abhor sometimes precipitates them into the actual commission of that very guilt; and when insolent and false accusations are followed by intemperate violence, and arbitrary persecution, they seldom fail of this effect. The great Condé tells us, that he went into the Bastile the most loyal and dutiful subject in his Sovereign's dominions, and that he came out his most implacable enemy. History could furnish a thousand similar examples. Your Lordship has added to them one of the most fatal and instructive that ever stained its page. That you have not profited either by your own experience, or the experience of others disqualifies you from governing the affairs of men, who are at all times actuated by like passions on like trials. In accounting for your conduct, your Lordship and the public will think very differently. Your best friends excuse you at the expence of your understanding. But whatever the present times may determine, you may hope that posterity, though it will never look up to you as a pattern to imitate, will at least propose you as an example to deter.

In this time of your ambition you must  
VOL. III. F however



however be content to have driven one country into rebellion. By your misrepresentations of the designs of the Colonists to the English nation, you armed them against each other, and steeped their hands in kindred blood. But you cannot misrepresent the intentions of the freeholders of this kingdom to themselves.

They have taken their stand within the hallowed circle of the constitution, as it is marked out by the venerable hands of their ancestors; nor can all the forceries and blandishments of the Court entice them, or all your official menaces and insolent imputations drive them, beyond that sacred line. They will do themselves *justice*; but they will do it with the temper, moderation, and steadiness that become their cause. They will stand up for the *majesty of the people*, and they, who shall dare to prove traitors to that majesty, must become *the objects of their jealous vengeance, having sinned WITHOUT PROVOCATION, they must expect to be punished with justice but WITHOUT PITY.*"—See Lord Mudgrave's speech in the House of Commons.

## THE COUNTRY GENTLEMAN.

---

To the PETITIONERS.

March 2, 1780.

ONE of your principal objects of complaint is the misapplication of the national revenues in pensions, unmerited by public services, and lavished by the Crown in the purchase of an undue influence in both Houses of Parliament. You have petitioned your representatives to enquire into this abuse; you have prayed them to remove it, if it should be found to exist, and to appropriate the savings that might be made by such a reform to the exigencies of the State.

In compliance with this part of the instructions of his constituents, Sir George Savile has moved for a list of pensions, specifying the names of the persons to whom they are paid, and the amount of the sums they respectively receive. Without such a list it would be impossible to remove your doubts, or to gratify your wishes. No other rule of discrimination could be set up, by which your representatives could judge of the several titles of the pensioners; there were no other means by which they could



gain a certain knowledge of the sums squandered away in that scandalous traffic, or of what the public could save from its suppression.

But what was the conduct of the Minister? —He neither had the virtue to acknowledge the justice of the motion, nor the courage to reject it. We had never formed a hope that he would pay the least attention to the prayer of the people; but at least he might have come forward, like a man, and disputed the point with your friends, on the grounds of impolicy, inexpediency, or danger. We might have looked for the plausible reasonings of an able Minister, and he insulted us with the pleadings of an Old-Bailey advocate. It was the *people of England against corruption*. Every low evasive art of cunning and sophistry was put in practice, by this tricking council, to mislead the jury, and to plead the cause of his favourite client. He did not dare to give an absolute and unqualified negative to the prayer of your petitions. He was desirous of giving some colourable excuse to his creatures for adhering to him; he therefore moved an amendment which seemed to pay some attention to your requests, but which in fact totally defeated their object.

He is called upon to submit to the consideration of Parliament a list of *all* pensions; and he proposes to produce two, which he  
affirms

affirms must *content the people*. What are those lists? The one is a list of pensions payable at the Exchequer; the other is the private pensions, or what he calls Lord Gage's list. The amount of these, he tells the House, has been already presented to Parliament, on an application for an encrease of the civil establishment. He will not produce the separate sums, as paid to individuals. The total amount must satisfy Parliament; and from this amount it will appear, that, notwithstanding all the present clamour, the sums paid in pensions are so trifling and inconsiderable, as to be beneath reformation. They are no object. They should be less than nothing in the estimation of a *great and wealthy people*! If there be any abuses, if any undeserving persons, or sums improperly granted, be to be found on either of the lists, let the gentlemen of the Opposition point them out, and not *suspect* where they cannot *arraign*.

These were what the noble Lord was pleased to call his unanswerable arguments against the motion. By these he laboured to evade the prayer of your petitions. Your representatives, agreeable to your instructions, call for information. He tells them they shall have it; that is, such information as they have already had, and which they do not want. This he condescends to give at  
the



the request of the people of England. This is what was done on an application of his own for an encrease of the Civil List. But the information which alone can satisfy your doubts, and answer your expectations—the information that alone can bring to light what, or if any individuals enjoy *sinécure places, efficient places with exorbitant emoluments, and pensions unmerited by public services*, that you shall not have.

But urge him still farther—Why not produce the names of the private list? It would not be right, it would not be delicate, all his feelings are alive, every nerve of his trembles for the honour and peace of mind of his pensioners; for you he has no feelings.

If the names on that list be such as must command the approbation of the public: if they be such as have the most indisputable claims to the gratitude and liberality of a generous nation; if there are no fears that any should be found among them who blush not to add to their princely fortunes some miserable stipend, drawn from the toils and sweat of the people; if there are none who receive the infamous wages of a silent vote, without the shadow of a merit, or even a pretence of public service; if there are none whom we can suspect to be hired to libel every friend of the people, to turn every thing that should be held sacred and venerable by  
Englishmen

Englishmen into ridicule, to brand all pretensions to patriotism or the love of one's country with mockery and scorn, openly to attack the most invaluable liberties of the subject, and to revive, under the reign of a Brunswick, the arbitrary doctrines and high prerogative principles of a Stuart—if he has no fears of this nature, why not produce the list?—you will be undeceived. The odium that was meant to be brought upon his immaculate administration, will recoil upon those who devise it. But he has denied it—he fought in the last dyke of his power rather than give it up. The conclusion is self-evident.

But he goes on—"The sums are trifling; they are beneath the attention of a great and wealthy nation." To what does this argument tend? To the giving a negative to every separate article, as it occurs in the detail of this important business, and so effectually defeating the general reform, which is the object of your warmest wishes, and most anxious expectations. "The sums are trifling."—How has he proved this? has he dared to aver that these are the only lists which ingulph the treasures of the public? where is that list, drawn up in darkness, and under all the terrors of shame and guilt, which is no sooner presented, approved, and discharged, then it is committed to the flames, and the very ashes of it scattered abroad to

Englishmen the



the winds, the list of those Members of Parliament who, at the end of every session, receive the wages of their treachery to their constituents? where is the list of *secret service money*? where is the list paid from the privy purse? are the sums to which all these amount trifling, and below the attention of a *great and wealthy people*?

Or is the amount of these sums the only consideration that induces you to demand a general reformation? Does the abolition of that dangerous influence which the Minister purchases by these pensions, trifling though they were in the great scale of national expenditure, form no part of the county petitions? Was the sum to which Mr. Hampden was taxed for his portion of ship-money the only motive that induced him to resist the unconstitutional imposition? Where should we now seek for our liberties, if that great man had thought as his descendants think; if he had acted on the present principles of his degenerate family?

---

### THE COUNTRY GENTLEMAN.

April 6, 1780.

A FREE constitution has little to apprehend from the open attempts of power. If the constitution is attempted by assault, it mostly

mostly happens that the crude councils of precipitate violence defeat their own ends ; and if such invasions on the rights of mankind are undertaken with all the previous arrangement and complex apparatus of arbitrary power, then the alarm precedes the danger, and the friends of liberty are found in a state of preparation : and therefore such contests (with the intervention of some confusion) have commonly ended in the execution or the expulsion of the tyrant. The free constitution has been known to rise out of the ashes of civil dissension with renovated vigour ; and after it is confirmed and fortified by the experience of its own strength, it stands upon a more secure and confident foundation.

I do not know whether to attribute it to the good or evil fortune of this country that no such attempts have appeared in these times. If at the beginning of his Majesty's reign his advisers had thought proper to avow their intentions, and determined to come to a direct issue with his people, the contest between despotism and legal government might have been long ago at an end. We might either coolly have argued the question, and settled it on the principles of reason ; we might have put it to the vote, and decided the dispute by numbers ; or, at worst, we might have had recourse to arms, and abided by the decision of



of the sword. Whatever had been the event, we should have had this advantage,—we should have known our situation. If legal government had prevailed, the executive power would have been forced to govern the kingdom on the principles of freedom. England might have possessed in security her celebrated constitution, and remained a free, a happy, and a flourishing nation. On the other hand, if the people had been subdued, ingenuity might have discovered some topics of consolation. Every species of government is said to possess some peculiar excellence; and I persuade myself, that by length of time and assiduity, our Sovereign might have conquered his natural affection for the rights of his subjects, and accommodated his talents to an arbitrary throne. His dutiful people would then have acquiesced in the involuntary possession of the few and dear-bought advantages of slavery.

The present situation of our country renders it the duty of every citizen to desire, that a decision should take place, which has been delayed, though I hope not precluded, by the peculiar circumstances of the times. The ambition of the present day is not sustained by the stern, manly and decided character which dignifies the face of tyranny. An insatiable appetite for power, that hereditary distemper which is never to be purged out of  
6 the

the blood of royalty, may lurk under the false gloss of a plump, ruddy, unsuspicious, unmeaning countenance. Ambition will vary her conduct and her engines, as easily as she changes her aspect. Those who have not courage openly to assail, may form the hope of undermining the constitution. There are ways by which, without the aid of one single quality of eminence, without integrity, magnanimity, industry, or capacity, by observing and cultivating the natural corruption of human things, it is possible to accomplish the destruction of the noblest system of freedom. All the enemies to liberty have the same object. But the silent progress of this insidious sap is attended with one peculiar evil; it strikes at our liberty through the greatness and prosperity of our country.

A principle of despotism in the closet, struggling with the forms of a free constitution, which it is obliged to use while it is endeavouring to corrupt, and which it has neither spirit to annihilate nor wisdom to guide—This repugnancy between the component parts of government—This war between the genius and the mortal instruments, is the true and only cause of our present deplorable situation. The calamities we have already suffered by its malignant operation, are too many, as well as too evident, to enumerate.

Misfortunes



Misfortunes daily accumulate; and all the consolation we receive from our worthy Ministers, is an assurance, that the justice of our cause improves, as our situation grows desperate. In the mean time Provinces are lost, Just quarrels succeed to unjust, Enemies increase, Resources diminish, Wisdom is a stranger to our councils, Experience and ability are banished from every service with the Keppels and the Howes. A sort of accelerating calamity has come to be the natural condition and habit of our affairs.

An ingenious mind might find an agreeable employment in calculating to what extraordinary velocity of decay the nation will arrive in a given time. But the people, whose organs are too gross to have a perfect relish of these sublime and philosophical speculations, and who pay all the cost of the experiment, are fully satisfied with its present progress. To speak plain English, they are weary of taxes imposed without skill, and without end. The moment for the immediate and constitutional interference of the people is arrived, when every means to avert the consequences of a systematic design to corrupt the constitution had been tried in vain. The people have at last come forward to vindicate their own cause. They have acted with spirit and with prudence. They are aware that the cursed and abominable principle of despotism

has secured itself from their vengeance by a too elevated situation. They look, therefore, for the instrument of it. They have found the influence of the crown; and in a truly constitutional spirit, revering the sacred character of the master, they seize upon the Minister, and drag him to justice.

The work is well begun, but is not ended. *Perseverance* and *consistency* are necessary to complet it. Let the people remember, and let it sink deep into their minds, that the object of their meetings, their committees, and their associations, is **TO RETRENCH THE CORRUPT INFLUENCE OF THE CROWN.** Let the people beware not to suffer the designs of their enemies, seconded by the mistaken zeal of some of their friends, to waste that energy which ought to be employed in an active prosecution of the great, immediate, and practicable object, in idle and wordy discussions about *unalienable and indefeasible rights*, and such other pompous, unmeaning sounds—Not to start speculative questions and moot cases for dispute sake, in order to divide themselves—Not to place humbling blocks for the feet of their best friends—Not to deceive and entrap themselves by erecting inadequate or false standards for judging the friends of the constitution.

Upon these points I shall, perhaps, trouble the public (if it is found necessary) on some  
future



future occasion. At present I turn myself towards the enemy. I shall employ the remainder of this paper to expose a parliamentary artifice which has been employed in obstructing the desires of the people. The minions of the court, assuming the character of friends to the revolution endeavour to persuade the people that they preserve one of its institutions, by defending the corrupt influence of the Crown.

It has hitherto been the invariable policy of the present system to conceal its intentions, and to carry on in silence its attacks on the constitution. But the stratagem of the present moment is to deceive us by a pretended affection; to betray us with a kiss; and to stifle us with its embraces. The Treasury Bench has of late afforded a scene of some novelty. The good, old, plain, simple-hearted, unsuspecting, honest Tories, stand aghast at the unusual fallies of those, whose suppletory understandings having purchased with their money, they esteemed their own, and imagined entirely devoted to the cause. The Scotch Advocate, with the pompous swell of his barbarous diction, chaunts forth the praises of King William, and calls up the ghosts of departed Dundas's to testify his attachment to the Revolution. The ingenuous offspring of the disinterested Hertford, rises into an unusual strain of eloquence, while

while he enforces (for once without hesitation) the tenets of the revolution. Even the Secretary at War, the faithful trustee of the principles and power of the Earl of Bute, is filled with pious horrors, lest the constitution of that glorious æra should be abandoned in the reign of George the Third. There is some reason to apprehend that the enthusiasm of liberty, which in the year 1768 and 1769 (I cannot say warmed but inflamed Mr. Wedderburne) will now be quite exhausted by that fury of declamation, which, to use Milton's expression, "burns froze, and cold performs the effect of fire."

The ardour of affection with which these gentlemen oppress the revolution, throws some suspicion on their sincerity. What they *say* will never obliterate the memory of what they *were*. The people of England are not to be taught to love the revolution, and to defend its institutions by its new converts from the other side of the Tweed, or the other side of the water. We know the true value of the revolution; but we should pay a poor compliment to those great characters who have bought with their blood the rights which we enjoy, if we despised and rejected the principles on which they acted: if we sacrificed to their institutions, or to any institutions, those maxims in which consist the life and spirit of freedom. In  
all



all constitutional questions let us consult the practice of those very men. They left the constitution in form and shape, as it stood before them: they propped the old walls; where time and neglect had bent the mouldered sides into decay—they let fall the plummet and restored the original perpendicular. But quitting the allusion, I shall only observe, that of positive institution they added little, because they knew and despised the corruptible nature of all human institutions. But they introduced, or at least they revived in the constitution a principle which, with proper attention, will keep it for ever alive. They taught to the world, a great, and to all kings a terrible, and to us their posterity in particular, this useful lesson;—that government is not made for the sake of preserving its own forms;—that it is not made to be the instrument of caprice, ambition, vanity, cruelty, treachery, and all the other vices into which certain situations will collect and foster every particle of depravity which exists in the human breast; but that all government was instituted, solely, for the happiness and prosperity of mankind. They instructed us as a duty, and a moral obligation, not to suffer a divine institution, to be perverted into an instrument of misery and slavery. They confirmed the whole by an example—not bloody as in the furious  
and

and fanatical days of Charles; zealous, yet wise; temperate, yet effective. They sent him to supplicate at the feet of his enemies; a royal fugitive to wander through the courts of Europe in misery and contempt. That example is not held out to us as an object of imitation; God forbid! It was intended, and I hope it will answer its end, to establish in the constitution, what cannot be obtained by any institutions, an effective and durable principle of freedom.

If the influence of the Crown, pervading and corrupting every department of the state, is suffered to render parliament, ministers, army, navy, revenues, lives, liberties, and every thing that is near and dear to us, subservient to the absolute will and caprice of one man, *the principle of freedom* is forgot, and the revolution is fundamentally subverted.

It is perpetually dinned in our ears, You must not contract the influence of the Crown, because the Revolution created it. I will not endeavour to interrupt the ingenious advocates of the court system in their attempts to persuade us, that the oppression of the day is to be borne, because at some other time, and in some other circumstance, it was not felt as an oppression. Men will throw off in the dog-days those superfluous and cumbrous cloaks, which were no more than sufficient to maintain the vital heat in another season of



the year. But I leave these gentlemen to kick against the pricks, and to argue down the universal sense and feelings of mankind. I speak to the enlightened consciences of the Whigs of England; and I tell them, that if corrupt influence is indeed a creature of the revolution, and if it thwarts the purposes of the revolution, the way to worship the revolution is to destroy the influence.

There is a natural imperfection, and principle of decay woven into the texture of man, and all his works. He who sows the corn, sows the tares along with it. But shall we suffer the noxious weed to stifle the wholesome plant, because the same hand sowed them both?—We shall show a true veneration for our patriot ancestors, by respecting in them what they respected in themselves. They placed but little confidence in institutions: let us do the same. They cultivated a principle of freedom: let us do the same. Let us testify our obligations, not by a blind and superstitious adoration of their useless reliques; of their mortal, perishable, corruptible, and imperfect parts; but by infusing into all our thoughts and actions those enlarged and liberal ideas, which form the incorruptible essence and immortal soul of the Revolution.

While our ancestors were resisting prerogative with the same spirit that we oppose

to influence, we may be sure that the courtiers of that day defended their abuses by the example of some great character, from whose hand prerogative received its origin, as well as its increase. The Russels, the Devonshires, the Lockes, the Somers's, and the Godolphins, then answered. We honour the wisdom of those patriotic legislators, who supported, in feudal times, a principle congenial to the feudal system. They encouraged prejudices, perhaps not more than necessary to soften the fury of barbarous ages. It was perhaps impossible, at that time, to keep society together, without surrounding the throne with the mysterious uncertainty of an undefined and undefinable prerogative. The reasons of these institutions are long since gone: let the institutions perish with them.

As respectable names as those to whom we owe the revolution, at this day, will answer—Though our ancestors were well aware of the unconstitutional tendency of the influence of the crown, they were obliged to avail themselves of the interested disposition of mankind, in order to maintain the revolution. *A foreign King, and an unsettled government,* compelled them to become the supporters of a corrupt influence, for whose extirpation they relied on the virtue of their posterity. And shall we, who have the happiness to



enjoy the blessings of the present reign, insult a Sovereign, who, *born and bred amongst us, glories in the name of Briton*, and who sits enthroned in the affections of his subjects, by an injurious supposition, that such base, extrinsic aids are in the least necessary to support *his* government. I hope the repose of our Sovereign is not disturbed by any such reflections. If it is, I offer that great personage my humble recommendation, to relieve his royal mind from the anxious cares which obstruct the free operation of his patriotism, in the contemplation of this undoubted truth:—That not all the honours, and all the bribes of a prodigal court; that not all the douceurs of all the establishments, which the prolific abuses of successive ages have accumulated; that not all the sums, with which his dutiful Commons have over-strained their own venality, to inflate his treasuries, are of power to extract from the hearts of his loving subjects one prayer more, for a long continuance of that glorious order and series of happy years, which has followed his ascension to the throne of his ancestors, and with which a new æra has begun to take its course in the history of the British nation.

## THE COUNTRY GENTLEMAN.

---

 TO LORD N—H.

MY LORD,

April 10, 1780.

ARE you to be told that the repentant vote of the House of Commons (of April 6,) which acknowledged *the increased and increasing influence of the Crown* was the sentence of your *final* condemnation. Such was it considered within doors, as such was it received, in all the extravagance of joy and mutual congratulation by the people at large. It acknowledged that *now*, at this advanced period of your administration, *it was necessary* for the salvation of this country; *necessary* for the preservation of all that your councils have left of the empire; *necessary* for the protection of our rights and privileges; *necessary* for the very existence of our constitution, to declare to the people that the accusation they had brought against your system of government was just and well-founded;—that the influence of the Crown had *now*, under your actual and immediate auspices, encreased to such an alarming height, as to require an immediate and effectual check—such a check as the petitions of one hundred thousand

free-



freeholders, lying upon the table, supplicated at the hands of their representatives.

We are *now authentically* put in possession of the mighty secret by which you have succeeded for a series of years past in defeating every salutary attempt to rescue this country from ruin. The cause is *confessed* that has enabled you to enforce the destructive measures by which you have brought us to our present disgraceful and desperate state. If Parliament have servilely acquiesced in all the rash and impolitic councils which you proposed to their consideration, previous to the American war, and which drove the colonists to arms—if they have betrayed the trust reposed in them by their constituents, and given their sanction to the frantic schemes by which you have hitherto conducted that unnatural contest; if, in opposition to the many *acknowledged* proofs of your duplicity and breach of faith, to the repeated *confessions* of your ignorance, and want of foresight, of information, of becoming diffidence and caution in trusting to the professions of our ancient and natural enemies, they have constantly professed to place an implicit confidence in all your assertions; if they saw that your whole study, your whole business in Parliament, was to make daily apologies for daily errors, daily to defend your conduct against the attacks which the accumulated  
6  
losses

losses and defeats that invariably disgraced all your plans of operation, daily brought upon you from the friends of the constitution and state, and yet voted that the government could not be placed in better hands; if they continued to lavish the public treasures in satisfying your unbounded extortions, without requiring either measure or account; if they set their faces against every attempt to examine into the public expenditure, and scouted every information that could lead to a detection of your criminal prodigality, notwithstanding the damning proofs that were repeatedly laid before them; if these and other numberless instances of their tameness and acquiescence have so long struck the public with astonishment and indignation, we are now, from their own *confession*, satisfied of the cause. They have acknowledged the powerful charm by which you contrived to fascinate their understandings, to blind their judgments, and to blunt their feelings. For this acknowledgment the public give them credit. They receive the atonement as far as it goes; they accept from their hands the scape-goat that is presented to them for expiation, and are content that you alone shall bear all their sins and offences on your devoted head.

The House of Commons have taken part with the people against you; even your  
very



very life-guards, the creatures of your corruption, who owe their existence to your prodigality, waver in their attachment. They cast many a longing look towards the standard of your enemies. The freeholders of England anticipated the sentence of their representatives; they dictated the very expressions that have been adopted to stigmatise your administration: and yet you hope that you shall escape unpunished! not only hope to escape unpunished, but you brazen the public in all the security of office; trusted, caressed, employed by your Sovereign, as his confidential servant, and admitted into a closer intimacy, and a higher degree of favour, from the general detestation that pursues you.

Beware, my Lord, I have once before hinted to you in the course of these letters, that your hopes of support from the throne must terminate in disappointment; as long as there appears a determination in the royal breast to keep you in office at all events, you will not fail to find numbers to join you upon questions that do not notoriously clash with the petitions of the people. But it is the advice of scripture—"Put not your trust in Princes." Can you flatter yourself that your gracious master will risque—I tremble to mention what he must risque—in taking a decided part against his subjects with a Minister

Minister whom they execrate, and a government which they abhor? Can you flatter yourself that he will obstinately persevere even to the last stake, in a contest in which he has every thing to lose, and nothing to gain?

The vote of last Thursday (*April 6*), should at length open his eyes; it should convince him how ineffectual that power, which he has been advised to establish by system since the very commencement of his reign, must ever prove against the declared sentiments and peremptory demands of his subjects. He should learn from it which voice the representatives of this country must, in the long run, be forced to obey; the voice of their constituents, or that of the chief magistrate, when their interests are unfortunately placed in competition.

The experience of that day, and temper of the present moment, should teach him the fallacy of that maxim which he has so long heard inculcated to him, "*that it is no matter who is Minister: let him but choose one, and it is of little consequence whether the creature of his choice have any connexions with the sentiments and opinions of the people or not.*" By continuing you in office after the result of Thursday's debate, his subjects suspect that he means to come to issue with them upon that alarming question. Your appearance



ance in the House of Commons still entrusted as first Minister, gives jealousies that this unconstitutional maxim is, at this very hour, upon trial. Would to God he may reflect in time that its truth or flattery may be finally determined, not by cabinet whispers, not by courtly doctrines, not by the cunning suggestions of flatterers and sycophants, but by the feelings, but by the innate conviction and spontaneous determinations of an insulted people.

At their honest tribunal your Scottish advocate will find but little credit for his metaphysical distinctions. He will gain but few proselytes by his quibbles between questions of fact, and questions, that from their construction, may be considered as abstract and undefined. No war of words, *no shuffling, bribing there*; his sophistry will be as unintelligible to the understandings of English freeholders, as his barbarous accents would be harsh and grating to their ears. It is some consolation to them, my Lord, to hear that the only man who *steps forth* to defend your cause must employ another language, besides the English, to defend it, and that his terms are as foreign to the idiom of our native tongue, as his tenets are to our constitution.

But perhaps your Lordship's great hope is founded in another favourite maxim of your administration; to divide the people; to set  
the

the national party at variance with itself. You flatter yourself that appearances justify this hope. The promoters of the petitions began by attacking your administration; they now begin to be divided among themselves, and are proceeding rapidly to open opposition.

Here again I will venture to assure your Lordship, that you will find yourself deceived in your expectations. However the friends of the constitution may differ in *speculative* opinions as to the *modes* of reformation, they are all perfectly agreed as to the *necessity* of a reformation—of an immediate, effectual reformation, extending to all our grievances, competent to the cure of all our inquietudes.

In this *one essential point* the views of all center. And surely, my Lord, you have reason to tremble at the process of their efforts to attain that point. They have begun by discovering the source of the evil—They have authenticated it by the voice of Parliament—They have sat down before it, and will stick to it till they have removed it effectually.

—THE CORRUPT INFLUENCE OF THE CROWN *now* acknowledged to have worked its way into every department of the State, into every corner and cranny of the kingdom, was the primary object of all their meetings—it is still the chief object of all their associations. No artifice, no cunning of their enemies can distract their attention till that influence shall  
receive



receive an effectual, permanent check—TILL THE GOVERNMENT THAT HAS SWELLED ITS SOURCE, AND ENCREASED ITS CHANNELS TO THEIR PRESENT DESTRUCTIVE DIMENSIONS AND EXTENT SHALL BE FIRST REFORMED, AND ITS MEMBERS REMOVED.

---

## THE COUNTRY GENTLEMAN.

TO LORD NORTH.

MY LORD,

*April 13, 1780.*

THE table of the House of Commons has presented, for some days past, a spectacle that cannot fail of being grateful to every Englishman. At length, we see it purified, and restored to the pious uses to which it was originally consecrated. It is become once more **THE ALTAR OF THE PEOPLE**. Piled with their sacred instructions, their Ministers look up to it as to the shrine from which we all expect our salvation. They attend to them with awe, with veneration, with deference; and, animated by their inspiring voice, are strenuously demolishing the idolatrous groves, and polluted temples, which concealed the accursed rites that have drawn upon us the wrath of Heaven.

Still, however, you continue to hold your  
seat

seat on the Treasury-Bench ; still you appear determined to brave and set at defiance the unabating zeal of your constant opponents, no less than the repentant virtue of your former associates.

Your friends make this their boast ; all good men fear it, and tremble at the consequences. The people are insolently told, that they must not think their triumph complete. They may pull down the temple of Corruption ; but the high-priest bids them defiance. Not a hair of your head shall be touched. We shall carry what questions we please, provided we keep clear of every direct attack on your sacred person.—*Atrox in plebem, et implacabilis, plebeiorum, magistratum jus libimet arrogas, nec SACROSANCTUM tete dubitas effere.* If once we venture upon that daring attack, we shall find how vain are all our hopes of success. We shall see what numbers of those, in whose assistance we place our reliance, will abandon us, and crowd to your support.

Those sanguine friends of your Lordship have already proved false prophets. In this instance, also, I will venture to set my poor power of divination in opposition to theirs. I have better signs to augur from than selfish hopes and interested wishes. I have the honour, the feelings, the sense of shame, and the pride of consistency in the two hundred and thirty-three members who sided with the  
people



people against you on the 6th of this month. Is there a man of that number who can have the face to support you after the vote of that day?

How stand they pledged as gentlemen, as members of parliament? They have acknowledged that *now*, under your actual direction and immediate auspices, the corrupt influence of the crown has encreased to so alarming a height as to require an immediate and effectual check. With what face, then, can they support the minister who, under the pressure of that vote, must stand condemned of having squandered the public treasures, and plundered the people in acquiring and diffusing that influence?

Is there upon record a single instance of so flagitious a charge being brought home to any administration, of so ignominious a sentence being passed upon any minister in all the annals of our history? And can the men who confirmed that charge, and pronounced that sentence against the system of *your* administration, be the men to support you in office?

But should we be deceived in the good opinion we have formed of them—Should they refuse to honour that credit which the public has thus generously given them for their late proceedings, still, my Lord, we are far from relinquishing our hopes of success. The bitter consequences of a temporary and fallacious

fallacious triumph must, in the result, prove your Lordship's portion. They can never fall on the friends of this country. THE DETERMINED VIRTUE OF THE PEOPLE asserting their OWN CAUSE IS OUR SHEET ANCHOR. To their spirited interference we are indebted for the concessions that have been already made, and for the formal confession of the great evil against which they framed their complaints. To that interference we expect to be indebted for the redress of that evil, and for the removal of the wicked Ministers, under whose management it hath arisen to its present alarming excess.

In similar struggles between the spirit of the constitution, and the profligacy of the court, that interference never failed of success. It has sometimes reached beyond the sacrifice of Ministers. It has forced its way in blood to the throne. Left to your own councils; indulged in the full prosecution of that system, which from your continuance in office, we have but too just reason to suspect, is now professedly adopted in a quarter, from whence alone you derive your support, there is little doubt but you would shortly renew that tragical scene, with all its concomitant horrors. But here again our great hope is in the *determined virtue of the people*. Their manly perseverance in the legal, constitutional, and peaceful struggle they have commenced, will



will prove our surest safeguard against the pernicious consequences of your rash impolitic councils, and of the fatal predilection that seems determined to pit you against the people.

This shall be our only armour of *defence*; and is it, my Lord, in the native indolence, weakness, and inconsistency of your character, is it in the recorded cowardice of a G—e, in the ignorance and imbecility of a H——h, in the craft and timid subtlety of a M——d, in the luxurious, debilitated profligacy of a S——h, or in the concealed machinations, and lurking assassin-like plottings of a B—e, to reduce us to circumstances that could force us from our moderation, or drive us into excesses subversive of our internal quiet and happiness?

---

### THE COUNTRY GENTLEMAN.

May 2, 1780.

**I**T is not surprising, that the situation of this country, and the rapid progress of our domestic dissensions, should spread such universal terror and apprehension throughout the kingdom. A fearful expectation of immediate, impending evils is universally gone abroad, and men begin to prepare their  
minds

minds to meet them in their worst forms. Suspicions of the despotic intentions of Ministers are every hour giving way to proofs. What was yesterday surmise becomes this day certainty. We can no longer solace ourselves with even the negative consolation of doubting the dangers with which we are threatened. From covert wiles, and secret machinations, the enemies of the constitution have proceeded to the most daring acts of avowed hostility. They scorn the little war of ambush, undermining and stratagem, to which they have hitherto confined themselves. They feel themselves in force to meet us on our strongest ground, and confident of their powers, seem determined to cut off all hopes of accommodation, by infusing into the quarrel, between king and people, all the poisonous fermenting mixtures of insult, contempt, and mockery.

The breach widens every hour. Obstinacy on one side swells in proportion to just resentment on the other. Rash, precipitate, imperious, arbitrary Counsellors, regardless of the fatal examples of former times, unmindful of the recent calamities they have themselves, by a similar conduct, entailed upon their country, surround the throne, and shut up every avenue to experience, wisdom, moderation, self-interest, decency.

The prayers of the people find their way  
VOL. III. H into



into Parliament only to provoke additional mortifications and insults. Their complaints are admitted to be just and well founded only to be denied redress. Their petitions are snatched from the hands of the honest members who introduced, cherished, and supported them, and are insolently taken up, under pretence of complying with their object, by a set of men who have repeatedly spurned and contemned them as factious, and the base spawn of sedition. No measures originating from the friends to the petitioners, however adequate to their object, or consonant to our wishes, must ever hope for success. They alarm the *integrity*, they shock the *patriotism* and *public spirit* of government. Ministers, in their *great love for the people*, appropriate to themselves the care of lessening the miseries they have brought upon us, and expect that we shall rest contented with the assurances they have condescended to give us, that something *may yet be done* to afford us content. North takes the place of the Burkes and the Dunnings. The Sicilians must look for redress to Verres.

By whom, then, are our prayers henceforth to be attended to? By those who from the first have reprobated them as the dictates of party and faction. By whom are our grievances henceforth to be redressed? By those who have contended, and who still contend,

contend, that they only exist in the distempered visions, and frantic ravings of popular madness. Who is to enquire henceforth into the public expenditure? Who is to correct the crying abuses and enormities that have impoverished the State? The very men who stand accused of these enormities, and upon whom they have been proved by irrefragable testimonies. Who are henceforth to abolish the sinecure places, unmerited pensions, and exorbitant emoluments of office which absorb the public treasures, and embezzle the funds that should be appropriated to the exigencies of the war? The very men who enjoy those places and pensions, and who fatten on the spoils drained from the confined, crippled, exhausted industry of the people. Who is to restrain the corrupt influence of the crown, to which we owe all our sufferings? Who is to prevent the ruin with which the very existence of the empire is threatened from its acknowledged increase? The men who have proved themselves the most abject slaves, the very vilest drudges of that influence; who by their consistency in venality and corruption have opposed the public conviction, and denied its existence, or who by their base, treacherous, disgraceful tergiversation, by their breach of public faith, and the sacrifice of every thing that is held sacred or binding in society, have proved its baneful power

H 2

beyond



beyond all former prostitution, beyond even the memorable vote that confesses their recorded infamy.

These are the men to whom we must now look up for redress. In their hands alone is our safety, our happiness, our redemption. Their word is the breath of our existence. Their will is our fate. No other interference, or intercession, can avail us. No virtue, no abilities, no integrity, no independence, no confidence on our side, no fidelity on the part of our approved and entrusted friends. This would be idolatry against those gods of government. An invocation of the martyrs and confessors of liberty, against which they point all the thunders of the cabinet\*.

If this solemn mockery on our understanding, this outrage on our best feelings, could receive any aggravation, it would be from the circumstances that attended this triumph of the Minister over the people of England. He chose the brightest moment of our hopes, he availed himself of the very vote of the 6th of April, to impress us with proper sentiments of the strength and power of the Crown, and of the slavery to which he meant to make us bend our necks.

\* This appearance of something popish in the proceedings of the petitioners has alarmed the Chairman of the Protestant Association, and is said to be the cause of his defection to the Minister.

Our complaints had that night been acknowledged to be just and well founded. Our representatives confessed that the influence of the crown had increased to the extent and danger we had represented, and that it called aloud for that immediate and effectual check which was the object of our petitions. The expectations we conceived from this appearance of the returning integrity of Parliament, were confirmed by repeated votes of the House. With the most unsuspecting confidence, the counties began immediately to assume a milder tone. They withheld their associations, and adopted less resolute measures in the certainty of procuring redress from the faithful guardians of their freedom and possessions.

But a single day convinced them that all this was mockery, collusion, the blackest confirmation of all their suspicions, a hopeless assurance that all expectations from any power but their own must end in disappointment. The Minister entered his VETO against all further proceedings in their favour, and neither the sense of duty, the pride of consistency, the calls of honour, the upbraidings of conscience, nor the remembrance of the faith they had solemnly pledged to their constituents, to one another, each of them individually to himself could influence the



the apostates from the majority of 233 to give it opposition.

The infamy was not confined to the Lower House. Orders were issued to the Lords to assist in this scandalous attack on the constitution, which it was the pride of their birth-right, and the boast of their independence to maintain in its proper balance and proportion. A majority was found among them base enough to make atonement to the *King's friends* for the momentary virtue of the other Assembly. They consented to bear the odium of with-holding from the people that redress with which their own representatives had consented to gratify them, and by that denial held themselves up to the contempt and scorn of the world as slaves purchased by the treasures of their country to support that influence against which their country had constituted them guardians by inheritance.

Thus are the people reduced at once to absolute desperation. Every tongue that could plead for them is silenced. Every friendly hand that could rescue them from destruction is fettered and disarmed; they are told that they have no resource under Heaven in which they can trust, except the *generosity and candour* of their professed enemies. If they look to their representatives, they meet with mockery and insult. From their hereditary guardians they have still less to hope.

They

They find themselves in the deplorable state of their oppressed ancestors, the Barbarians drive them to the sea, the sea forces them back upon the Barbarians. The servants of the crown make a spectacle of their distresses. They taunt while they crucify them, "ye have trusted in others, can they save you?" And then, in all the fulsome strains of Court adulation, call upon them to trust to the patriotism, to the love for his people, to the anxiety for their welfare and happiness, to the feeling for their distresses, to the willingness he has at all times testified to receive their complaints, and redress their grievances that distinguish their amiable Sovereign, at the very instant that they stretch all his authority and influence to the utmost, in opposing their wishes, and violating their rights.

From these considerations, which naturally suggest themselves on a review of the facts that have taken place within this last month, the well affected to the peace of this country find reason to form the most alarming apprehensions; on one side they see an obstinate invincible determination in the Court to establish their system, at all hazards, on the sufferings of the people; on the other they see the ancient spirit of the nation rousing itself, slowly indeed, and cautiously, but with a steady resolution and deliberate purpose, infinitely



infinitely more formidable than the most violent starts of sudden and momentary indignation.

A comparison between the present and former days, and the recent transactions of our own period, serve to encrease those fears. The Ministerial advocates need not take such pains in their speeches to remind us of the commencement of our civil dissensions in the reign of the obstinate and infatuated Charles. Their own conduct sets those unhappy times in prospect before us in colours infinitely more forcible, and of a blacker hue than all the descriptive eloquence of their new proselytes, or their hoary veterans. They have hitherto represented the bloody scene at a distance. The fifth act promises to bring our own mangled rights on the stage, and to close the tragedy.

I am not one of those who presume to sit in the throne of Providence, and account for his decrees. I do not dare to specify his punishments, or pronounce his visitations to be the consequences of particular crimes. But if ever he inflicted national calamities as a judgment on national violence and injustice, he now threatens to bring the curse to our doors. AMERICA had long patiently borne the grievances with which she was oppressed. Not all the tyrannical essays of the then newly established system of despotism

despotism could force her into excesses destructive of her allegiance. After a martyrdom of years, she at length ventured to speak her grievances: she bottomed her conduct on the principles of the constitution: she *petitioned* in all the humble forms of loyalty and affectionate obedience: she only claimed the acknowledged rights of British freemen: she too received a partial hearing. An extorted enquiry was made into the grounds of her complaints; witnesses were called to the bar of Parliament to prove the justice of her prayers—but the whole ended *then as now* in *mockery and insult*. Her complaints were rejected with contumely; her grievances were doubled. She was driven to make her appeal to the Supreme Lawgiver, and to bare her bosom to the sword, and her head to the scalping knife, in defence of her rights. It is the boast and plea of the Minister, that this war on the liberties of our fellow-subjects was a *popular war*. The opposition who reprobated it was an *unpopular* opposition. It had the sanction of the *Country Gentlemen*, it had the voice of the people. If he be authorised to make this boast,—if the English nation be party in his cause, I have only to add the observation of the poet, *Neque lex est justior ulla, quam necis artifices arte perire sua.*

Against these horrid apprehensions, I confess,



fess, I see but one resource. If we find it at all, it must be in the cool, deliberate, but inflexible virtue of the people. Fortunately the circumstances of the times are favourable to our hopes. All our expectations *within* Parliament, are now at an end. The rejection of Mr. Dunning's motions, with the circumstances that attended that rejection, and the fate of Mr. Burke's bill, have shut those doors against us for ever. All our exertions must henceforth be made *without*. The general election is at hand. It will then remain with the people to redress themselves by a choice of proper representatives for a future Parliament. Let them be but true to themselves on that occasion, and there is as yet no power in this kingdom to break or disturb their peace, much less to triumph finally over their liberties.

In the mean time they must not suffer themselves to be divided or split into parties. To divide first, and then to conquer, is the maxim on which their enemies ground all their hopes of success. Amongst these there is the most perfect unanimity. To continue to govern by influence and corruption, is the chief point they have in view, as that on which their whole system hinges. To secure it against every actual attack, they crowd round it with all their force, without quarrelling about the means to secure it in future.

Speculative

Speculative men, of warm fancies and honest intentions, but little conversant in the world, and judging all things easy to their wishes, from their inexperience of the difficulties and oppositions they must meet from the passions and interests of mankind, and from diversity of opinions, even among the best, are often apt to injure the cause they mean to advance. Their hot and fiery zeal, disdaining the curb of discretion or experience, darts beyond the line. It hurries them on imperceptibly; and they would rather renounce the prize they contend for, than not carry it all at once.

In every system of reformation we must proceed by slow and cautious steps. We cannot hope all at once to cut away the cords of prejudice and habitual attachments, that bind many well disposed persons even to abuses that have had the sanction of time. We must gain men over by degrees. We must begin by the most obvious and acknowledged evils, till having carried our approaches gradually to the great fortresses of corruption, we may batter them down with greater certainty and ease, and then in peace together, and with joint deliberation erect the duly harmonized and well proportioned fabric of lasting reformation.

[The



[The last paragraph but one, in the preceding Paper, gave great offence to Major JOHN CARTWRIGHT, who had written several tracts upon the subjects of Annual Parliaments, and Universal Suffrage; and had been, with Dr. JOHN JEBB, and others, one of the principal founders and supporters of a Club, who called themselves The Society for Constitutional Information. Mr. Cartwright thought proper to write an answer to this paragraph. —The following is a copy of his Answer.]

May 6, 1780.

“MUCH as I respect the principles, and admire the talents of THE COUNTRY GENTLEMAN, I cannot but feel some little doubt as to the application of, and entertain some fears of ill effect from, the latter part of his letter. If he would point out that description of persons whom, amongst the opposers of the present wicked Ministers, he designs by “speculative men, of warm “fancies and honest intentions, but little “conversant in the world,” and enter into a temperate, candid discussion of those *opinions* he attributes to them, as a source from which he seems to apprehend a division amongst the friends of the people, possibly it might promote that union he recommends, far more than a profound silence upon the supposed points

points in dispute, accompanied by imputations of "hot and fiery zeal, disdaining the "curb of discretion and experience," to those from whom he differs in sentiment.

As he had only *binted*, I shall stand excused if I fall into any error, in imagining the "speculative men" he alludes to, are the present *open* and steady advocates for *annual parliaments and an equal representation*. If I have erred, I am ready to apologize; but as I conceive those are the persons pointed to, with his permission, and with as anxious a wish for *unanimity* as can inspire his or any bosom, I will once more offer my sentiments upon the subject.

With much submission, I cannot see how that thread-bare observation, "To divide first, and then conquer," can in the present instance be applied. It is not the *Minister* who causes this division between the contenders for annual parliaments, and those amongst the opposition who are for a longer term. How then is the observation applicable? Do the many "well disposed persons" who are bound "by the cords of prejudice "and habitual attachments to abuses" in our government, that is to say, to septennial or triennial parliaments, and a mock representation, think it reasonable that the sincere friends of reformation should suffer themselves to be tongue-tied, and to sacrifice per-  
haps



haps the only opportunity that may ever occur for saving their country, for the sake of unanimity *with men attached to the very abuses which have proved our ruin*, however strong their prejudices may be? And are these men who are thus *bound by the cords of prejudice*, and so *attached to these abuses*, to be held up to us, as the oracles by whose wisdom and virtue we are alone to be saved? And are those who sacrifice every prejudice, and who make a manly and honest appeal to *the constitution of our country*, and that which was the salutary *practice* of our ancestors for *many hundred years*, to be sneered into contempt, as “speculative men little conversant in the world, whose hot and fiery zeal disdains the curb of *discretion* and *experience*, and who would rather renounce the prize they contend for, than not carry it all at once?”

I know not with what intentions THE COUNTRY GENTLEMAN writes; I hope with the purest: but I must observe, that this language appears to me only calculated to serve a party, by the very extraordinary proposal, that THE PEOPLE OF ENGLAND, and every unprejudiced friend of the constitution, shall sacrifice the only security they can have for their freedom, to the prejudices of that party and its attachments to ruinous abuses; and upon these terms unite in raising them

them into power. For my own part, I never shall be silenced by such arguments, nor will I ever consent to such terms ; and highly as I estimate many of the party alluded to, for their abilities and many virtues, yet I have not a conception that there is not wisdom and virtue enough in this nation, completely to reform its rotten government, and recover its freedom without their assistance, if they will not cast away those prejudices in favour of long parliaments, rotten boroughs, and ministerial influence over a House of Commons, notwithstanding such abuses “ have “ had the sanction of time,” which make the only blemish in their public characters that I know of.

With respect to the carrying of the prize we contend for *all at once*, that I maintain to be the only mode of proceeding that will turn out either *prudent*, *politic*, or *practicable*. Had the friends of freedom at the Revolution done their business *all at once*, we had now been in as great danger of despotism, as they were in before they expelled James; and if our work be not done *all at once*, it will not be done at all. By *all at once*, I mean, that all that is *essential* to secure *the freedom of the people*, viz. a complete representation in annual parliaments, together with their proper securities, must be gained by the people's *first effort*, or they will not be gained in this century,



century, and probably never. This must be *one step*, because *no representative body will make such a reform*, and it must be the act of *the people*. It is not for a great nation, roused to do itself right, to mince and fritter its reforms into scraps and unfinished fragments, but, what is *essential*, to do *all at once*. This is *the first step*, the foundation of necessary reformation. This, effected by themselves, their representatives may then, *and not till then*, be trusted to perform the rest, and then they will, because they *must*, perform it.

Unanimity upon such ground as seems to be recommended by THE COUNTRY GENTLEMAN, would *not* answer the hopes of *the people*; such unanimity would not restore independency to Parliament, nor terminate in erecting “the duty harmonized and well proportioned fabric of lasting reformation;” neither do I believe that it would be for the interest even of the very party whose advocates so warmly recommend it. They are proscribed at court, with an inveteracy which nothing but *the unanimity of the people first, and the independency of parliament afterwards*, can conquer. Were they even to succeed in obtaining that unanimity in their favour, it would avail them nothing, if they vainly trusted to *the management* of a House of Commons, by their ministerial influence, for preserving their power. Nothing but a perfect

fect independency in that house, and a full conviction out of doors, of their being the friends of the people, could possibly support them against a rooted love of despotic sway, and a settled hatred of the principles they profess in the interior of interiors.

Let them, then, shew their desire of unanimity, by joining the *millions*, instead of requiring the millions to join them. All the *people* desire, is to have their constitution restored to them; so that, by the free uninfluenced suffrages of *all*, and *annual* elections, they may henceforth hold their property, their lives, and their freedom, by the equal laws of their country, and not at the *discretion* of even the best and wisest men alive. And it is even an insuperable objection to the people's exerting themselves to place certain men in power, that when they were last in that situation they could not hold it, for want of the means which I have pointed out; so that, to do that alone, would only be to expose them to be again betrayed, and to delude ourselves.

*A SPECULATOR in a Great Chair."*

[*This letter of Mr. Cartwright's raised the choler of Mr. Richard Burke, the Son (not the brother) of Mr. Edmund Burke. He*



wrote the following Reply to Mr. Cartwright's letter.]

May 9, 1780.

“A Writer who signs himself, A Speculator in a Great Chair, seems displeased that THE COUNTRY GENTLEMAN should describe in the following manner a set of persons who call themselves advocates for EQUAL REPRESENTATION AND ANNUAL PARLIAMENTS: He calls them, “speculative men of warm fancies and honest intentions, but little conversant in the world.” I will give another description of these persons, which will strike them more forcibly, though it may not please them better. They are

“A set of persons, unknowing and almost unknown by the world; few in number, and contemptible in character; without fortune, rank, or public estimation; having never stood in any situation of public trust, because no man would ever trust them. Supplying the defect of ability and experience, by self-sufficiency, arrogance and obstinacy, they pursue A scheme of government which never did nor ever can exist, and which is fundamentally opposite to the principles of the English constitution. Grown in a manner frantic and wild with desperate malignity, they are determined, to trample upon all the ability and virtue of England, and to sacrifice the peace, the happiness, the dearest interests, and even the constitution of their

their country, to the chimeras of their own extravagant imaginations.

“ Here is a character which the world will recognise whenever natural insignificance is superseded by the restless and active insolence of vice and folly. To endeavour to counteract the baneful operation of evil industry, to illustrate, to exemplify, to prove, to make out all the parts of a character whose outline I have traced, is a task no less useful than it is laborious.—Indignation will inspire when ability is wanting.

“ A list of those persons who arrogate to themselves the title of The People, and who with so much modesty claim the disposal of honour, profit and power, will be highly entertaining to the public. When laughter subsides, the people will rise up in anger to punish the audacious temerity of those who have dared to assume such a respectable name.

“ Those who have sacrificed every motive of interest, and even honourable ambition to an attachment to duty and a love of their country; who are proscribed at Court on account of the people; who are martyrs to the cause of the people, have too long permitted their characters to be slurred, and their reputation to be pilfered by men who have sacrificed no ambition, and had none to sacrifice. The head has too long been guided by the tail.—A blind adder is little qualified



to lead the generous spirit of an injured people. Are there no men capable of serving the State with fidelity to the constitution? If there are, why should virtue be ashamed? Let honest men boldly come forward, to claim *the reward of virtue*, which is *public confidence*; the people will open their arms to receive them.

“ *A Friend to honest Men.*”

[*After this altercation, The Country Gentleman wrote only one letter more; which was the following.*]

---

### THE COUNTRY GENTLEMAN.

May 28, 1780.

THE temper of the times is such as to discourage every man, who does not find new incentives for perseverance in the fruitlessness of his labours, from continuing to plead the cause of the public. When the people abandon themselves, it implies an imputation of knight-errantry to attempt to preserve them. Who but La Mancha's Knight would undergo the toil and danger of forcing battlements, and bursting open prisons, when he knows that the captives within will hug  
their

their chains, and reject the liberty that is proffered them?

What insults and indignities, what solemn mockery, and formal scorn have not the people of England submissively borne within these three last months? A recapitulation would be as irksome and mortifying as it is unnecessary. The marks of the ignominious stripes are yet raw upon our backs. They are kept open and bleeding by reiterated blows. Not a single day passes without adding to their number and ignominy, yet the people slavishly acquiesce; they even court the hand that smites them.

The spirit of our ancestors seemed indeed to rouse itself for a time to a promising exertion. A sudden ray of hope burst upon us. We began to augur the happiest consequences from the transport with which all ranks of men seemed to hail its appearance. But it sunk again as suddenly, and a train of evils succeeded, such as it was natural to dread from an unsuccessful attempt to resist the encroachments of despotism. Our oppressors were but the more encouraged in their tyrannical system of governing with a rod of iron; the friends of the people were discouraged, dispirited, dispersed; their enemies triumphed, they increased in their numbers, they acquired a consistency and permanency of power, which their most sanguine



fanguine votaries could scarce have dared to anticipate by their warmest wishes.

Oppressed with these considerations, I had determined to relinquish the cause. I found, besides, that a set of men had engaged in its defence, whose misguided zeal and furious spirit blasted every rational hope of success. Intemperate zealots, hurried away by their fanatical attachment to abstruse dogmas, established in the gloom and inexperience of idle speculation—Men, who perhaps might have made excellent Ministers under the solitary Kings whom they profess to *admire*, who perhaps would have figured as great statesmen and profound politicians of the parliamentary oaks, which covered the tumultuary meetings of a barbarous people, collected from the thinly-scattered settlements among the wilds and deserts of Britain.

These violent partizans soon began to divert the attention of the people from the great substantial objects of reformation to subjects of curious disquisition, and speculative politics, on which the best friends to the liberties of this country *were known* to be divided in opinion. The very instant they perceived the efficacy of a settled union of all parties against the corrupt system of government, that instant they started a question, which they must have foreseen would

would prove fatal to that union, and destructive of all our hopes.

It was not possible that they could be ignorant of the unhappy consequences.— They had only to look back to their own experience. They had played the same game on former occasions, and the event was fresh in their minds. It was not, therefore, without a strong colour of justice, that they were accused by many honest men of being actuated by the worst motives, and that their conduct was suspected to originate from some baneful and malignant cause, which it was not in the stores of general information to trace.

I by no means wish to discuss this odious subject. One thing is evident. They and the Minister seemed to vie with each other, who should most effectually destroy the foundation that had been laid for the redemption of this country. Their very language was the same. The most virulent and abusive runners of government never poured forth a fouler torrent of invective against a set of men, whom they have cause to dread as their most dangerous and steady opponents, than those gentlemen who profess themselves to be equally the enemies of that government. Whoever presumed to dissent from their exclusive doctrines was anathematized with all the malice and virulence  
of



of *infallibility*. An agreement in essentials was no plea to their indulgence. It was nothing that we joined with them in admitting the *text*; there were some who presumed to have an opinion of their own in the *interpretation*, and they were instantly secluded from the pale as damnable heretics, actuated by the worst of motives, and deserving of tortures, fire, and gibbets. The common enemy, in their estimation, was not half so dangerous. They were suffered to escape and to triumph, while all the efforts of those furious sectaries were turned against the party with which they had set out on a last vigorous attempt to rescue the country from the hands that had brought it to ruin.

And what has been the result? Let them cast their eyes back to the fatal point of separation, and see whither the road they have been pleased exclusively to take, has led them. They have fallen into the very snare the Ministry had spread for them. They have divided, and lost that strength, which union alone could give them. They have disgusted the most hearty friends of the cause they wish to maintain. As far as their testimony can operate, they have confirmed all the infamous imputations with which the creatures of the Court have laboured to brand the characters of men, who for seventeen years together have braved all the malice and calumny,

calumny, as well of ministerialists as of *false brethren*, in defending their country to the best of their judgment; they have consequently assisted Ministry in destroying their reputation, and by holding them forth in the most odious and contemptible colours, have robbed them of that credit and confidence which it was necessary for the general good that the people should place in their integrity. They have given the moderate a *reason*, and those who screen their slavish wishes under that character a *pretext* for relinquishing the defence of the people, and giving up the field entirely to the enemy. They have broken the spirits of the sober and well meaning among all ranks; they have filled their minds with doubts, perplexities, and apprehensions; they have forced them to despair of ever finding a determined and steady hand to rescue the nation from the gulph of destruction into which our present rulers have plunged it.

These are the mighty feats they have achieved. I wish them much joy, and as far as they are concerned, will leave them to reap the happy fruits of their penetration and judgment. I will leave the *speculators* to dream in their *great chairs*; I will leave the *admirers* of the infancy of our constitution to search their musty prints, and trace its unformed lineaments while it was yet in the grizle.



grizzle. The doubts they are pleased to express of the honesty of my intentions, I shall freely forgive, in the hopes I entertain of the sincerity of theirs, and shall at least give one proof that I mean well to the cause, by avoiding their example, and not prosecuting a controversy from which none but the Ministry can reap any advantage. These gentlemen may continue to serve them as they have done; I assure them, that however I lament their folly, I shall have more charity in judging of their views and motives, than they have manifested in pronouncing sentence upon those who differ with them in opinion.

I have again taken up the pen to address myself to men of a very different character, whom yet, I fear, their arts and representations have misled. I wish to call upon those from whose name, rank, and abilities, the nation expects its deliverance, to try if this unhappy breach cannot yet be made up, and the attention of the people brought back to the original object of their petitions.

All the hopes of our enemies are placed in our divisions. By these alone they triumphed in their last struggle with the people. If once these can be reconciled they will tremble once more; nor can any thing avert the fate they have so long merited, but an obstinacy in enforcing the subjects that have given rise to our dissensions.

FROM THE PUBLICK ADVERTISER.

TO SIR JOHN DALRYMPLE.

*[This Letter was written by William Burke, Esq. who was Under-Secretary of State to General Conway.]*

SIR,

March 15, 1773.

A PERSON of your name, age, and stature was about seven years ago turned out of an office, which he held in the Excise in Scotland, for corruptly taking money in the execution of that office.

Pray, Sir John, was this you?

Because if it was, your being so disgracefully turned out by Lord Rockingham's administration, the only body of men that have hitherto not humbled themselves before the King and his favourite, will easily account for the extraordinary pains which you both have taken to traduce the fair fame of the ancestors of those ministers, and will relieve many persons from the difficulty they now are under of being obliged to suppose this attempt to have no other foundation than that blackness of heart which dictated the book of Lauder against Milton, or that impotent



potent spirit of revenge, which, during the reign of James the Second, glutted itself in the richest blood in the country.

As I learn from Thursday's Public Advertiser that you can condescend to write letters in the News-papers, pray send me an answer to this query through Mr. Woodfall. If you are silent, I shall take for granted my information is true, and that you are that John Dalrymple, and I shall then soon trouble you with another letter upon this subject.

I am,

Your very humble servant,

DOUGLAS,

---

*March 17,*

ON the 15th instant there appeared a letter, which charges Sir John Dalrymple with having been dismissed seven years ago, by Lord Rockingham's administration, from a law office in the excise of Scotland, on account of corruption in office, and with having invented his late historical discoveries against the ancestors of his Lordship's party in revenge for it.

It is very true that Lord Rockingham's administration gave an office which Sir John (then Mr. Dalrymple) had, to another gentleman; but it is as true that Mr. Dalrymple, upon hearing that the change in the office had

had by some people been connected with his character, upon account of a complaint which two years before had been made against him by an Excise Officer, sent a memorial to the Treasury, in which he prayed justice to be done him in this last respect. The memorial was presented to the late Lord Chancellor Yorke in person; and that Treasury of Lord Rockingham, which had taken the office from Mr. Dalrymple, were so just to him as to make an order upon the memorial, which contained these words: "Acquit Mr. Dalrymple of any charge of corruption in office, and even of the suspicion of it."

*[The truth of this pretended quotation is doubted. To have shewn the purity of Sir John Dalrymple's character, the writer should have published the report made by the Officers of Excise in Scotland against him:—How long it lay secreted in the Treasury by means of his friend Mr. T. Whately during Mr. Grenville's administration:—What applications were made to Lord Rockingham by Mr. Yorke, (who was known to have more influence over his Lordship than any other person,) to get him restored:—and the whole of the minute of the Board of Treasury upon it.]*

March



March 5, 1773.

[*This Paper was written by John Wilkes, Esq.*]

IT is very curious to observe the singular pleasure, with which the new publication of the second volume of *Sir John Dalrymple's Memoirs* has been received by all the Scots among us, by the English Courtiers, and their master. They openly exult and assert, that all public virtue is an imposture, and the very pretence to it ridiculous, since it is now proved, as they say, that *Lord Russel intrigued with the Court of Versailles, and Algernon Sidney took money from it*. The pretended discovery has afforded a *solid satisfaction* to the Royal mind, and Sir John Dalrymple's friend and patron, Lord Mansfield, for many months has made these subjects the favourite topicks of his conversation. He dwells with rapture on the discovery. The inference is clear, the application evident. Is any man held forth as a great model of public virtue and spirit? The courtiers' reply is prompt, *Lord Russel intrigued with the Court of France*. Is a patriot applauded, who has dared and suffered every thing for his country? The placeman shrugs up his shoulders, and says, *Algernon Sydney took money from France*, and indirectly hints he believes the same of every other

other popular character. A treachery of so black a nature is most readily adopted by every man, who is conscious that in similar circumstances he would have acted the same part. In all probability he has secretly wished for the like offer. A Prince likewise, whose first aim is the destruction of a free constitution, believes himself, and carefully propagates, the doctrine, that all mankind are knaves, and may be easily made slaves. He finds something in his own breast which suggests this to him, for the souls of tyrants and slaves are congenial. Almost half the volume of Dalrymple consists of papers supplied by the present king. Kings too generally judge in the most superficial manner, and merely from what falls under their own view. The Prince therefore, and the keeper of Newgate, think themselves equally justified in declaring all men rogues. A *Bute* and a *North* are continually before the one, a *Macquirk* and a *Kennedy* before the other. But virtuous men unwillingly suspect the wickedness of great characters, who have long enjoyed a nation's esteem, and require the most satisfactory evidence of any degree of baseness in those, who have bravely died for their country, whose reputation has been sealed with their blood, and consistent and uniform in their last moments, have given the most trying proofs of a sincere and noble patriotism.



patriotism. Let us now examine the proofs against the two martyrs of liberty. I find no kind of evidence in the whole volume but the despatches of *Barillon*, the French ambassador here, which Sir John Dalrymple says, are in the *Depôt des Affaires Etrangères et Versailles*, and of whose existence we want better evidence than his assertion. He declares “ from comparing the notes which I took in  
“ France, with the copies of the papers sent me  
“ from thence, I find, in some instances, a  
“ difference in the *dates* between us, owing,  
“ probably, to my oversight ; but in all other  
“ respects, the copies agree with the notes.” *Dates*, Sir, are as easily copied as words ; and a man, who can mistake, *in some instances*, in figures, is very likely to mistake, in other instances, in letters and words. *Records* have, we know, been *altered*. Such a confession of a want of accuracy must be fatal to any work, and the public will naturally expect a more faithful copier of public records than Lord Mansfield’s friend, Sir John Dalrymple. Do you ask other proofs, or wish to examine these pretended originals ? Neither the immense collection of English records and memoirs at the British Museum, nor the numerous manuscripts at either of our Universities, contain a single line of such an infamous suggestion against the sacred memory of the two English heroes ; but a  
Scottish

Scottish Baronet, under the patronage of a Scottish Lord, has given, as he says, an extract of a French dispatch, which he asserts may be seen in the *Depôt des Affaires Etrangères at Versailles*, should the Duke d'Aguillon permit you, as he did Sir John, with *liberality of sentiment*, if you are disposed to believe him. It is indeed extremely remarkable, that this same Duke d'Aguillon, who was guilty of all the unjust and inhuman proceedings against Monsieur de la Chalotais, who was the principal in the plot to fix the famous *forged letters* on that excellent French patriot, is now lending his assistance to Lord Mansfield and Sir John Dalrymple to ruin the well-earned reputation of two patriots of our nation, and to blast the glorious laurels, purchased with the best blood of our island. It seems a fresh conspiracy of the French and Scots against us. The cause and the men are indeed well worthy of each other. But England looks down with contempt on these mean and base arts, and continues to revere the memory of her Ruffel and Sydney:

Dear as the ruddy drops that warm the heart,  
They dy'd amidst their dying country's cries;

and are now in possession of that supreme reward, a virtuous fame, which they enjoy unenvied by all the wise and good, reviled only by the courtier and the slave. Their



enemies now attempt in vain with sacrilegious hands to overturn their temples, and destroy their altars, to give us idols of their own kirk, more ridiculous than ever Egypt worshipped. But Ruffel and Sydney will remain the great objects of a nation's veneration and love, while the names of Bute and Mansfield will ever be uttered with contempt and abhorrence.

What *Burnet* says of Sydney is equally applicable to Ruffel, and may serve for a clue to the conduct of both. "He (Sydney) did all "he could to divert people from that war (with "France): so that some took him for a pensioner of France: but to those to whom he durst "speak freely, he said, *he knew it was all a "juggle; that our Court was in an entire confidence with France*, and had no other design "in this shew of a war, but to raise an army, "and keep it beyond sea till it was trained and "modelled."—Bishop Burnet's History of his own Time, 8vo. edition, vol. 2, page 362.

Sir John Dalrymple in the preface says, "His Majesty—justly considering history to "be the science of Kings, and willing that "the actions of other Princes should be tried "by that *tribunal of public enquiry*, which, "he trusts, will do honour to his own."

Do you believe this, *Sir John*? I will confine myself to two particulars. The *tribunal of the public* has already judged the Sovereign for the horrid massacre in St.

George's

George's Fields, on the ever memorable tenth of May 1768, the letter of thanks, &c. —The result need not be told—it is well known.—When the circumstances of the death of the late Chancellor Yorke, and of the four preceding days, come to be fully known, (and they shall be told,) every soul will be chilled with horror; tears of virtuous pity shall flow for the deceased, and the base, hypocritical, and barbarous author of his unhappy fate be held in eternal execration.

JUSTICE.

March 26.

To the real EDITOR of Sir J. DALRYMPLE's  
*Memoirs.*

SIR,

I SHALL not complain of the old law of the historian, *ne quid veri dicere non audeat*, but on the contrary would in plain English say to him, *You shall speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God.* It is not my intention therefore to trouble you upon this occasion with the common, obvious question of the moralist, "What good do you propose by this publication? Is it to shew that there is no more virtue in one party than another, and that the *Whig* is not an honest man or better patriot than



than the *Tory*? Or is it to teach the youth of the present reign this general lesson, *liberty and the love of one's country are mere pretences at all times, and in all men*? Can any good consequence flow from the establishment of such doctrine?" I will answer for you, *truth is truth, and a true picture of human nature can never be unuseful*. But then, Sir, I hope you have published the whole truth, and concealed nothing out of favour or affection to any body. Excuse the plainness of my phrase, who am a mere country gentleman, and borrow the language of the bar to witnesses on a trial. I am used to juries. My reason for the putting the question is, that a friend of mine has in his last letter informed me from town, that a report is there circulated of your having suppressed some letters contained in the trunk at Kensington. The story is, that the suppressed letters are from the Princess Sophia to the abdicated and proscribed James the Second, in the year 1689, and that they contain a correspondence for the purpose of restoring him to the English throne. It is said that you have published the letters in the before-mentioned Trunk, (with an exclusion of one other perhaps,) excepting these letters from the Court of Hanover; I therefore desire to know the motive you had for this suppression. It cannot be a tenderness for K. William, because it is well understood that he

he knew of this intrigue between the family of Brunswick and Stuart, when he procured the settlement of the Crown of England upon the former; but that he overlooked it, because upon the whole he was of opinion the settlement of the Crown there was the best that could be made for the security of the protestant religion, and of the liberties of this country, and of all Europe in general. He was not deceived in the principles of the Hanoverian Court, but acted upon larger and more generous motives. There would therefore be nothing ungrateful to the memory of this wise, disinterested *Dutchman* in such publication. Why should you then, a Revolutionist, separate these letters from the rest, and withhold them from the world? They are curious, and relate to a family that hath pleaded as much merit, religious and civil, as that of *Sydney* and *Russel*, and to a family which hath reaped as much benefit from the Revolution as they did. An English Dukedom is not a greater reward to an English Earl, than the British Crown is to an Electoral Prince. Is it then more extraordinary or reproachful for private subjects, afraid for their liberty and religion, to unite with France, and to take French money, and use French power, in order to get rid of their tyrant and prosecutor, than for a Sovereign Protestant Prince, labouring under no difficulties,



culties, voluntarily to offer assistance to a Popish Tyrant to replace him on the throne of a free people, who had just expelled him, and thereby to destroy their liberties both civil and religious? *Sydney* and *Russel* availed themselves as politicians of foreign power and money for noble and laudable ends, which they saw then no other means of compassing. They did not intrigue for the sake of subjecting this kingdom to France, nor enter into any engagements destructive to England. On the other hand, I doubt not, that the Court of Hanover, not foreseeing their own accession, in consequence of the Revolution, to our mighty Throne, acted on some little political motive, or perhaps out of affection to their second cousin James the Second, without regarding the religious or civil rights of mere English subjects. Now, Sir, as impartiality is impartiality, and equality is equality, I long to know why these curious letters, by way of political anecdote and authentic history, were withdrawn and not published? Is a regard to the memory of the Princess Sophia preferable to a regard to the characters of those men who voted the English Crown to her; or would the law of gratitude be more broken by your publishing letters that might reflect upon such an ancestor than upon such benefactors? If truth, pure truth, be the rule of your conduct, why have

have these letters alone been secreted and withdrawn? I put these questions for the sake of clearing away unjust surmises, which I dare say your answer will do. Being here for the air, I know little of what the town says, but being a plain speaker, I put a downright query, when one occurs to me.

I am, Sir, always the same man, and

Your humble servant,

*Lyme, March 20.*

HOLLES.

---

*May 1.*

TO SIR JOHN DALRYMPLE, BART.

LIKE a hardy Knight of old, you seem to delight in desperate achievements. To tear the rooted laurel from those tombs, on which the universal and strong hand of the nation had planted it; was an enterprize of no common mark and magnitude. Whatever be its success, the very attempt will place you second, at least, in the lists of fame, to that intrepid Blood; who dared to wrest the Crown of England from its strong hold. The worthy Prince, whose diadem he thus invaded, was pleased to take the robber to his bosom; to pension and protect him.

Perhaps,



Perhaps, Sir, you may meet with the same favour from a pious Prince; after having endeavoured to subvert the principles which support his Throne.

Give me leave, Sir, to say, without being suspected of flattery, that your associates, in this enterprize, were chosen with singular sagacity. Let us review them. They will not indeed furnish quite such variety of character, as the heroes associated in assailing the walls of Troy. But it is more to your purpose that they should be as uniform in character, and as unanimous in sentiment, as the Kings of Brentford.

In your list we find a Scotch Chief Justice, whose long line of ancestry was never stained with one constitutional principle, or sentiment of liberty; and of whose notorious attachment to the House of Stuart, he has *solemnly* avowed himself the zealous inheritor—an English Lord, who having been converted from that faith which ennobled his ancestors, to the new court-creed, will lend himself to any work, that may best prove the sincerity of his conversion—a French Ambassador, whose infamous profession was to pander vice, and corrupt virtue—a French Duke, who has proved himself an implacable and unprincipled enemy to the very name of Patriot; and is execrated, even in his own country,

country, as the most devoted instrument of arbitrary power.

Such are the characters of your chosen auxiliaries in defaming the dead. I flatter myself, they will fully justify the approbation I have given your sagacity in the choice.

In one thing, however, you are less fortunate than those who arraigned the persons of Ruffel and of Sydney. The Crown cannot pack a jury to try this question. Indeed I can conceive but one way of procuring a jury, before whom your accusation would have any chance of succeeding. It should be drawn from among the citizens of Edinburgh, (the most loyal place in Scotland,) who, before his present Majesty's virtues had atoned for the former principles of his House, and made him popular in North Britain, were accustomed to assail the loyal few, who assembled annually to drink his health, with curses, stones and fire-brands.—A scene, which no doubt you, Sir John, have often dwelt upon with delight. Unhappily however for you, the opinion of those honest Scots will not decide the present question. The candid public must determine upon the truth of your accusation. This they will do, by weighing all the facts and circumstances on which it is founded. It cannot be expected that your opponents can inspect the depôt from which you pretend to have drawn this evidence



evidence of Ruffel and Sydney's treachery. No one will imagine, for instance, that an enquirer, whose professed purpose was to vindicate the virtuous characters of the friends to liberty and the people, would have the cordial recommendation of Lord Rochford, or the polite assistance of the Duke D'Aguillon. While you therefore, Sir John, enjoy every advantage which royal and ministerial favour can give you, we must be contented with reasoning from the evidence of those truths which are uncontroverted, and those facts from the depôt with which you may have thought it safe to furnish us.

But there is one truth which he who would judge candidly on this question, ought ever to keep in mind : That Scotch politics, like the Romish religion, hold that the end will always justify the means. Suppose for example, Sir John, that you and they who employ you, should think it a desirable object to discredit and defame the very name of Patriot, though the blackest falsehoods and forgeries were necessary to the purpose, the infamy of the means would, in your minds, be atoned for by the innocence of the end. For the truth of this principle I may appeal to every North British bosom ; for an illustration of it, Sir John, give me leave to refer to your own book. You there tell us, that the non-jurors in Scotland having entered into a conspiracy  
against

against King William, to cover their designs took the oaths of allegiance; [Vol. I. p. 420.] and the Scotch Peers, who were fawning at Whitehall, procured the Earl of Arran's enlargement, who had been committed on suspicion, by assuring the King that he, together with them, would immediately swear allegiance to him. They accordingly retired to Scotland, took the oaths, and privately joined the conspirators. You tell us, Sir, that some of them said, "it was no shame to do a wrong thing in a right cause; and others, that they would play at the game of blindman's buff in Parliament, by which means William would not find out his friends from his foes."—[Ibid 421.]

The deepest and most deliberate treachery, with the most solemn appeal to God, was regarded by these honest Scotchmen, as a very sport, or a covert and convenient seeming, under which they might, without imputation, effectuate their flagitious purpose. Such are the principles, and such the practices of Scotchmen, which those who are unhappily connected with them, will find to prevail not only in their political measures, but in every other transaction in life.

Your charge against Sydney, is founded on this article in Barillon's account of his disbursements, to *Algernon Sydney* 500*l*.

If the fact of his having received this money



money were ever so undeniable, still it would be but candid to judge, from his character and conduct, that he did it, not for his own emolument, but more effectually to support an opposition to the arbitrary view of the Court. For it must be remembered, that we are speaking of that character, which Milton has commemorated in these honourable terms: *Atque fiducium—quod ego illustre nomen, nostris semper adhesisse partibus, gratulor.*

Shall such a reputation be touched, by an unvouched extract, made by a single and suspected hand, from a depôt into which the originals might have been foisted, and those falsified a thousand ways, containing a charge that ultimately rests on the authority of a very infamous person, whose interest was concerned in making it? Shall the names of Ruffel and of Sydney, which have been sanctified by their sufferings, in the most glorious of all human enterprizes, the redemption of public liberty, sustain the smallest diminution of that high reverence we owe them, from an accusation so weak and wicked?

And now, Sir John, I must take leave to tell you that there is not the least colour for your charge—that it is most malicious in its aim, most suspicious in its manner, and most impotent in its issue. Retire then and seek consolation in the candid bosoms of that high  
and

and chosen pair, who have actuated and aided your attempt. As they meant to participate in its success, let them at least share the infamy and opprobrium that will inevitably attend it.

I have many pardons to ask of the English nation, for reviving that national jealousy; which however necessary, is always painful to generous minds. I am conscious of having done it, not to gratify any little or malignant passion. Nor could I help endeavouring to vindicate, from the malice of men as high in place as they are base in principle, those patriots, to whose noble efforts and illustrious sufferings we owe that free constitution, which I hold the most inestimable of all earthly blessings, and for which I would willingly lay down my life.

HOLLES.

*To the Printer of the Public Advertiser.*

*Vitam impendere vero.*

ROUSSEAU.

SIR,

May 27, 1773.

NO one who wished well to society would endeavour to represent the best of characters in the most odious lights, and in a long detail of men and manners, not let to public view



one great and worthy example.—Had the same diligence been exerted to trace out virtuous actions that has been used to imagine and rake up vice, the author of the *Memoirs of Great Britain* would have been esteemed and enrolled among the illustrious writers who promote public virtue, instead of being detested and reproached for propagating falsehood and infamy. It has been proved that he is interested and partial; his authorities of no weight, resting on a single evidence, and the truth and honesty of that evidence strongly suspected, and all against the general tenor, practice and principles of the men who maintained them with their blood. His relations and comments, compared with facts, prove his disingenuity, and want of candour and truth. Sydney's return to England was not obtained by the court of France, but by Henry Saville, the English Embassador at Paris, as is evident by a letter from Sydney to him. [*Sydney's Letters*, 4to. p. 104.] Mr. Pelham, at the trial of Sir John Fenwick, asserts, that Mr. Algernon Sydney was a man who had that love for liberty and the good of his country, that he would not have said, "that the law of God and man require two witnesses to proceed against a man," even to save his own life, if he had thought it inconsistent with either of them.—[*Sydney's Trial*, 131.] Barillon says, the services I draw

draw from Sydney do not appear, for his connections are with obscure and concealed persons.—[*Memoirs*, vol. II. 287.]

In another letter, Mr. Sydney is one of those who talks to me with the most force and the most openness on the article of maintaining the liberties of England and Holland separate.—[*Ibid*, 313.]

It is a common and base practice to fix obnoxious names, and thereby ruin a character in the public esteem, though with the discerning few, names prove nothing; the names of Heretick, Deist, and Self-murderer, with the generality of the world, are odious and reproachful.

The writer asserts, that Sydney, Essex, and Hampden were determined deists, and that they believed they had a right over their own lives.—[*Ibid*, vol. I. 21.]

This assertion is void of all truth and justice; for how does he attempt to prove it? By the most dissingenuous and unnatural turn of a passage in a most excellent letter of Sydney's, to a friend who pressed his return home.—Shall I renounce all my old principles, learn the vile Court arts, and make my peace by bribing some of them? Shall their corruption and vice be my safety? Oh! no—I hope I shall die in the same principles in which I have always lived, and will live no longer than they can preserve me. I have in my



my life been guilty of many follies, but I hope of no meanness. I will not blot and defile that which is past, by endeavouring to provide for the future. I have ever had in my mind, that when God should cast me into such a condition as that I cannot save my life but by doing an indecent thing, he shews me the time is come when I should resign it.—[*Sydney*, p. 16, 4to.] The plain and candid sense is sure no more than a firm resolution to maintain his principles, and to submit to the part allotted him by Providence. His being a deist is equally void of truth. Burnet says, he seemed to be a Christian, but in a particular way of his own. He thought it to be a divine philosophy in the mind.—[*Burnet*, 538.] At his condemnation he exclaimed with energy, O God! O God! sanctify these sufferings unto me, and impute not my blood to the country nor city through which I am to be drawn. Let no inquisition be made for it; but if any, and the shedding of innocent blood must be revenged, let the weight of it fall upon those that maliciously persecute me for righteousness sake. In the paper at his execution he refuted the testimony of guilt, and prayed for his country. Lord forgive these practices (THE PACKING OF JURIES), and avert the evils that threaten the nation from them; and though I fall a sacrifice to  
idols,

idols, suffer not idolatry to be established in the land. Bless thy people, and save them; defend *thine own cause*, and defend those that defend it; stir up such as are faint; direct those that are wavering. Grant that I may die glorifying thee; that at the last thou hast permitted me to be singled out as a witness of thy truth, and even by the confession of my opponents, for that good old cause in which I was from my youth engaged, and for which thou hast often and wonderfully declared thyself.—[Sydney, 196, 4to.]

To the King instead of applying for mercy, he demanded only justice. He says, some through fear have deflected, from the integrity of their principles; but I think there are many who have kept their garments unspotted, and I hope that God will deliver them and the nation for their sakes. God will not suffer this land, where the gospel of late has flourished, more than in any part of the world, to become a slave of the world, but will stir up witnesses of the truth, and in his own time spirit his people to stand up for *his cause*, and deliver them; and in his goodness he did deliver them at the most glorious and happy revolution.

I know my Redeemer lives, and as he has in a great measure upheld me in the day of my calamity, hope that he will uphold me by his spirit in this last moment, and



giving me grace to glorify him in my death, receive me into the glory prepared for those that fear him when my body shall be dissolved.—[*Apology*, 198.] Are these prayers agreeable to the principles of a deist which are dictated by the belief of a particular Providence and divine interposition?

Oh! shame to letters, ingenuity and truth!

I had rather my son had turned his back in the day of battle than have injured the characters of Sidney and Ruffel.

As constitution might occasion the one, the other has no excuse but mere depravity of mind.

TIMOLEON.

#### LETTERS ON THE SALE OF PLACES.

July 16, 1769.

HAVING just now read a letter containing, by evident insinuations, a most audacious attack upon my character, printed by you, in your paper of Friday last, asserting a gross and infamous lie from beginning to end; I do hereby publicly call upon you to name the person from whom you received the account you have presumed to publish. If you are either unable or unwilling to do this, I shall most certainly treat you as the author, and, in justice both

to

to myself and others, who are every day thus malignantly and wickedly vilified, I shall take the best advice in the law if an action will not lie for such atrocious defamation, and if I may not hope to make an example of the author of it.

The scurrility in general which has been of late so heaped upon me in the public papers, I have hitherto treated with the contempt my friends and myself thought it deserved, and suffered it to pass with impunity; but this last is so outrageous, and tends so much to wound my character and honour in the tenderest part, that I am determined, if practicable, to see if a jury will not do me and the public justice against such a libeller, and whether they will not think the robbing an innocent man of his character is a robbery of the most dangerous kind, and that the perpetrators of it will stick at nothing.

For the present, I must content myself with only laying before the public the two following letters, which will explain to them all the knowledge I had of the detestable fraud, which has been taken advantage of to charge me with corruption; a crime, which, of all others, I hold the most in abhorrence. I defy the whole world to prove a single word in your libellous letter to be true, or that the whole is not a barefaced, positive, and entire lie—That it is so,



I do assert, and I call upon any body, if they can, to disprove what I say.

GEORGE ONSLOW.

---

COPY OF A LETTER TO MR. ONSLOW;

RECEIVED THE 27TH OF JUNE.

SIR, *New Bond-Street, June 25, 1769.*

I BEG you will pardon my thus addressing you, a liberty I could not think of, was any thing less than my family's bread at stake—Some weeks past my husband paid a large sum of money (which gave us inexpressible sorrow to raise) to a party, who protest they are empowered by you to insure him, in return, the collectorship of Piscataway in New Hampshire. I have been told this day one Hughes is in possession of the same, and the treasury books confirm the news. I beg leave most earnestly to intreat you will inform me whether Mr. Hughes is under any engagement to resign, or whether we are duped by those who have taken our money.

Mr. Burns has had the strongest recommendations from persons of undoubted veracity, and I believe, on all accounts, will be found to be perfectly capable and worthy of the employment.

Once

Once more I intreat, good Sir, you will excuse this trouble, which is caused by a heart almost broken with the fear and terror of a disappointment.

With the profoundest Respect,

I am, Sir,

Your most obedient,

Humble Servant,

MARY BURNS.

---

MR. ONSLOW'S ANSWER.

MADAM, *Ember-Court, June 27, 1769.*

YOUR letter was brought down to me hither only to-day, or I should have answered it sooner. Without having the honour of being known to you or Mr. Burns, it gives me much concern that any body should be imposed upon as you have been, and as much indignation that my name should be made so infamous a use of. I should have been under an equal degree of surprize, had I not this morning had some intimation of the matter from Mr. Pownall and Mr. Bradshaw, and made some enquiry into it of Mr. Watkins at Charing-Cross, with a determination to sift this shocking scene of villany to the bottom, and which I shall now be encouraged in by the hopes of getting you your money restored to you, as well as the



the earnest desire I have to bring the perpetrators of this roguery to the punishment and shame they deserve.

For this purpose, might I beg the favour of Mr. Burns to meet me at my house in Curzon-street about ten o'clock on Friday morning, I will go with him to Mr. Pownall's, of which I have given him notice; and I wish Mr. Burns would bring with him Mr. Watkins, or any body else that can give light into this unhappy and wicked affair.

Till this morning I never in my life heard a single word of either the office itself, nor of any of the parties concerned: you will judge then of my astonishment, and indeed horror, at hearing of it to-day from Mr. Bradshaw.

I am, Madam, &c.

GEORGE ONSLOW.

Since the writing of the above letters, more of this fraud has been detected, and further enquiry is making, in order to bring the actors in it to justice. A woman of the name of Smith, who lives near Broad-street, is the person who appears to be principally concerned in the fraud, the money being, it seems, for her use.

HAVING observed, in a news-paper of the 28th of July last, that it is insinuated, that I have been the detector of a supposed  
6 crime,

crime, imputed to the Right Hon. George Onslow, Esq. I do think it an act of common justice to declare, in this public manner, that I am intirely ignorant of the said supposed crime, and all circumstances relative to it; except that I have heard the story mentioned in common conversation, and constantly treated as a calumny propagated to injure Mr. Onslow's reputation.

*Hanover-square,*

*Aug. 2, 1769.*

HILLSBOROUGH.

IT having been suggested, in a letter addressed to the Right Hon. George Onslow, Esq. published in a news-paper, dated the 28th of July last, that I was, together with Mr. Bradshaw, sent to Mr. Onslow, on the subject of a scandalous transaction, in which Mr. Onslow is, in the said letter, stated to be concerned; it is become necessary for me, in justice to that gentleman, to declare that I never was sent to Mr. Onslow on that, or any other occasion; but having heard this story, I thought it but common justice to communicate it to Mr. Onslow, which I did through the channel of Mr. Bradshaw.

*Whitehall, Aug. 2, 1769.*

J. POWNALL.

[BY



## [BY MESSIEURS BURKES.]

---

*Tuesday, Sept. 6, 1776.*

**L**ORD Mansfield has been lately left alone in the House of Lords. "All the obliged have deserted, and all the vain." He, who but a few days before, and with such decided authority, had passed a bloody sentence upon whole nations, has not been able to regulate the trial of one old woman.—[Alludes to the remarkable controversy between Lord Mansfield and Lord Lyttelton, on the mode of trying the Duchess of Kingston; the House adopted Lord Lyttelton's plan in preference to Lord Mansfield's.]—His judicial conflict was with a boy; and he was baffled. These indications of some odd change, though they appear in slight matters, are warnings which a wise man will not disdain to take. They ought, in some measure, to abate the pride of power, and the confidence in favour. They ought to supple the heart, and to make it susceptible of the soft contagion of our nature. They ought to dispose it towards a favourable hearing of millions of people, lately flourishing, opulent, peaceful and happy, but now doomed to be the harassed and persecuted objects of eternal piracy, rapine, and devastation.

If Lord Mansfield should be found thus softened towards an unfortunate, rejected branch of the English race, perhaps in some moments of humiliation so favourable to clemency, he might turn his eyes on the English stock itself. He might begin to suspect, that the sufferings of war cannot be confined to one side only ; and that our own share of these calamities may be worthy of some consideration. He might feel the glory of burning the petty fishing town, Falmouth in New England, balanced by the taking of *St. John's* ; he might think the stealing by Lord *Dunmore*, of a dozen or two of little, honey-combed, iron ship guns from a deserted wharf in *Virginia*, of not quite so much importance as the loss of *Canada*. Though it is undoubtedly some comfort to insult the few Provincial Officers we take, by throwing them with common men into a gaol ; and some triumph to hold the bold adventurer, Ethan Allen, in irons in a dungeon, in Cornwall ; yet it may be thought not quite so pleasant on the other hand, to have the corps of English Fuzileers prisoners of war by capitulation, in Connecticut, though under the tenderest treatment from a mild, humane, and generous conqueror. The famine of Boston, (which will vie in history with that of *Perusia*, *Perusina fames*,) the waste of camp distempers, the slaughter at Bunker's-Hill, the



the dispersion of transports, the ocean covered with wrecks, our Hanoverian allies perishing on the coast of France, before the eyes of those whom they had lately helped to defeat ; the miserable ruin of the finances of this kingdom, and that back-sliding, which after twelve years' peace, has let us down into that condition of debt, in which we were left at the end of a war with half Europe.— All these considerations may, at a calm hour, rise in an awful series before Lord Mansfield; and, forcing one natural sigh for the distresses of humanity, may dispose him to listen to an humble plea for peace. They may, perhaps, incline his ear to sober enquiry, whether even an imperfect authority is not more eligible than a compleat war? and whether, all things considered, the spoils of America will be, in reality, so much a better thing than its commerce?

Lord Mansfield's argument against the *present* Colonies, from the votes of *one* of them in time *past*, was examined in my last letter.

I shall now take this business in another point of view. For a while I will go along with his Lordship. He shall have granted to him not only all, but much more than he assumes. I will allow that the Journals, not of *one*, but of *all* the assemblies, are full of factious resolutions. Having for argument  
admitted

admitted this, I must beg leave to accompany my concession with a matter of *fact*; which, though it will not at all excuse such contumacy in the Americans, it may abate some degree of that astonishment and indignation, which it seems to excite in a veteran politician, who has breathed the air of seventy winters in our climate, of clear and unclouded virtue.

The Twelve United Colonies have twelve popular assemblies. The number of Members they contain may be as large, within a trifle, as the Parliament of Great Britain. They are probably about five hundred persons. Will his Lordship ask, what *douceurs* are distributed among the whole body of these Representatives; I do assure him, on the strictest enquiry, I do not find that the *twelve* American Parliaments, and the whole *five hundred* men who compose them, receive among them all one *fifth* part of the value of what is held by *one* single gentleman, whom I could name, in the House of Commons.

It is not that the soil of the plantations does not yield the constitutional staple of lucrative employments. But these employments are almost all, with much more propriety, bestowed in aid of a contracted English civil list, and as a support and security to the independence of a British Parliament. They are certainly better bestowed; for I have constantly observed, that all those gentlemen  
who



who hold American employments, have been the most zealous of all others against the insolent claims of the Colonists, and the most determined resisters of that factious and interested spirit, which dares unnaturally to insult so gracious and beneficent a government.

If we did not know to a certainty, that not a shilling is spent in England upon elections; and that the emoluments, so liberally distributed in Parliament, have no share in producing any part of that complaisance to government, which distinguishes our age, and puts to shame the stubborn spirit of our ancestors, we might, instead of being astonished at such instances of opposition, be rather surpris'd, how it has happened, that in popular assemblies so little managed, the opposition to government has not been greater, more frequent, more fierce, and more extensive. So much rich compost is laid upon the highly dressed, and productive soil of a British Parliament, and such attention is bestowed on its thorough cultivation, that these remote parts have been neglected, and suffered to shoot out all the wild weeds of a vigorous, but uncultivated nature. Except insulting reproaches, angry prorogations, sudden dissolutions, rejected petitions, with now and then a challenge to dispute on the origin of government, (Vide Governor Hutchinson's famous speech,) I can find nothing that has  
been

been practised to “tame the genius of the stubborn plain,” or to mollify the hereditary spirit of independency, that is charged upon the American Assemblies. Under such indolent neglect, and such churlish attentions, I could not positively answer for the mellowness and tractability even of a civilized British Parliament. I should not however conclude, from some sour humours in our Houses of Parliament, that a barren *independence* was the object of their wishes; but that, like peevish virgins, they longed for something else.

Opposition to the authority of acts of Parliament is not a thing new in the dependencies of this empire, nor confined to America. A denial of that authority in much greater extent, had once been very popular in Ireland. *Molineux*, one of their most celebrated authors, (a great natural philosopher like Doctor Franklin,) a friend and a correspondent of Locke, wrote a book which is still in request. The object of this book is to prove, that England had no power to make *any laws whatever* to bind Ireland. The assertion is not limited to taxes; it is as broad and general as legislature itself on the largest plan. That book indeed was burnt by the hands of the common hangman *here*; but the doctrines gained so much ground *there*, that the Judges who admitted appeals to England were persecuted by the Irish Houses  
of



of Lords and Commons with the greatest rigour and asperity, and obliged to fly in a body to England.

In consequence of this a declaratory act was passed, asserting the supreme legislative authority of Great Britain. Nothing further was done. No troops were sent, or employed to enforce obedience. Time was given for the public ferment to subside. The appeal to the House of Lords in England, was left to find its own way by its own utility; and utility effected that which force could not have effected. The Irish suitors found an advantage in a judicature removed from local affections and local prejudices. At the same time the Irish Parliament was *soothed*, instead of being *bullied*. The leading interests were gained. The stubborn were softened, and the angry pacified. By degrees, as it was natural, the storm was blown over. The Irish Parliament kept its resolutions. England received its appeals. No harsh laws were passed for the purpose of a *test*. No *tax* was imposed for a *trial* of obedience. The question of the right remains to this day open for the declamation of any gentleman in the Irish or English Parliament, and is frequently used with great innocence, as the interest or whim of the orator on either side directs him.

In Ireland it was not only in votes and resolutions of Parliament, that the authority  
of

of Great Britain has met with opposition. The resistance to the trade laws by tumultuous violence, has been frequent and often successful. Wool was and is carried off in great quantities; and great mobs have frequently destroyed imported goods in one of the principal cities of that kingdom; while other mobs intimidated officers from preventing an export of prohibited manufactures in the other. It is not long since the exportation of live cattle to England was prevented by violence; a violence at which the Magistrates of Ireland thought proper to wink. Parliament thought proper to wink in its turn, at that violence and that neglect.

But if Parliament, on hearing of these disorders, had directed the offending Irish ports to be blocked up, until the King should think proper to open them: If, on the neglect of Magistrates (full as chargeable on Ireland as America) an Act of Parliament had violently subverted the corporate rights of their cities: If, on the votes of the Irish Parliament, derogatory to the authority of the supreme legislature, they had violently changed the constitution of the secondary Parliament: If they had refused all peace to Ireland, until the banished Judges had reassumed their function, and until full compensation was made to them for their losses,—there is no doubt that war alone would have settled



settled our controversy with Ireland, as it must, if we persevere in the present measure, settle our controversy with America.

To this hour the degree of subordination which Ireland owns, is altogether unascertained. Ministers complain that America, in denying our right to tax, has not stated clearly the submission which she admits to be due to the authority of Parliament. But has Ireland ever recognized half so much as America does in her letter to the people of England? Is it true, that in the mean time she is quiet, dutiful, and obedient; and she is so, because this recognition never was required? Her late most extraordinary complaisance to the Clerk of the Pells, and to the Vice Treasurers, those *profitable* servants of the public, shews that, in spite of her Journals, and the petulance of her progenitors, she can prove as subservient as can be wished to the convenience of administration.

[Charles Jenkinson, Esq. Henry Flood, Esq. Lord Clare, and Welbore Ellis, Esq. by a late vote of the Irish Parliament, have 3500l. a-year each, over and above their expences. The first for life.]

Ireland gives largely to all public services; and what is infinitely more important, to all private jobs.—Why? Because it is she that *gives*, and not we that *take*.

Administration has lately furnished a signal proof

proof of their own opinion of the wisdom of enforcing all the rights of the supreme legislature. It was but the other day (the beginning of this session) that government applied to the Irish Parliament for liberal grants, in order to supply very large deficiencies. One would suppose, from the doctrines of Lord Mansfield and his colleagues, concerning America, that the Minister in the Irish House of Commons, in order to succeed, must have opened his Budget by an high assertion of the rights of the English Parliament to tax Ireland; and that he had concluded by desiring them, on the plan of Lord North's *conciliatory* motion, to furnish such a contingent to the support of empire as Parliament here should think proper. The proceeding of that successful Minister was the direct reverse. Instead of getting the Irish House of Commons to acknowledge this right, he *himself* in effect disclaimed it. He even denied, that the English Ministry ever had asserted it; and he described the speeches on that subject in the English House of Commons (though made by men in the greatest offices) "as nothing more than the rash language of inconsiderate individuals." (Mr. Rigby and Mr. Charles Jenkinson.) Having very wisely disclaimed authority, the Irish Minister succeeded by intreaty. If he had held the language there, which English Ministers



here to the English Colonies, the Parliament of that kingdom would hardly have been persuaded to lend their troops in order to subdue Ireland in America. The only dependent part of the empire which is at peace, is at peace by Ministry's *disclaiming*, not by *enforcing* our right.—The only revenue which is obtained, is obtained where the power of imposing is renounced. So different, so very different, is unsubstantial theory from found practice!

I flatter myself I have shewn, that the opposition to the extent of parliamentary powers has not been confined to America. I have shewn, that the denial in Ireland was of a *larger* extent than that in America; and therefore a denial of a *less* extent (confined to the right to tax) could be no proof of a formed design of independency, on the part of the Colonies, if denial in a *larger* extent cannot convict Ireland of the same offence. I have shewn that the Parliament of Ireland never made any formal acknowledgment of the power of this legislature to bind that kingdom; that the power of England there arose from our not pushing every point; and that the astonishing obsequiousness of Ireland at this hour, is owing to our not having made use of any one of those methods of asserting authority, which have been recommended and used in America.

America. All this forms at least a presumption against the utility of such methods.

I hope indulgence a little longer in this humble plea to Lord Mansfield, on the trial of America, for *mispriſon of independence*. If in the end (what I will not imagine) the Judge ſhould give a harſh charge, the Jury of the public may poſſibly prove as refractory to the authority of Lord Mansfield, as the Houſe of Peers has been on a late occaſion; and though he directs them to convict, they may ſtill with ſome remains of Engliſh firmneſs, bring in the priſoner Not Guilty.

VALENS.

---

(BY THE SAME.)

Thursday, Nov. 2, 1776.

IT ſeems to be in the natural courſe of things, that men are very rarely brought to a ſenſe of guilt or folly, but through the medium of ſuffering. We are obliged to the Miniſtry for having placed us in this ſchool of wholeſome diſcipline.

The miſconduct of the preſent war will by degrees lead the nation into a diſpoſition to enquire into the juſtice of it. Never was a war more open to an impartial examination of its merits. No Glare of falſe glory in the execution of our American meaſures, has hidden the defects, or gilded over the errors



of the original plan. We have only to pray, that our instruction may not come too late for our amendment.

I cannot easily quit the opinion, that however bitterly we may quarrel, there is still such a bottom of good nature, generosity, and good sense, both in the European and American part of the English nation; as will at length incline the one to hold out unequivocal, solid, *honest* terms of accommodation, and induce the other to meet those terms (though late and ungracious in the offer) with a cordial and dutiful acquiescence.

“The Americans are at war,” (says Lord Mansfield, the great assertor of the plan of hostility) “they are acting on the *offensive*—“whether we were *right or wrong*, we must proceed—we must add violence to violence, rigour to rigour—we are not to discriminate the innocent from the guilty—if we do not kill them, they will kill us.”

It is really singular that a man in the cool decline of life, bred through the whole course of it in a profession of peace, a Civil Magistrate, a Judge, covered to the chin with judicial purple, and bloodless unspotted ermins, should be distinguished above all others, for a character of hazard and desperateness in his counsels. Lord Mansfield's politics always stand upon a precipice. When he acted with others, in advising the late coercive

coercive measures, he alone was under no delusion. His eyes were broad open to the consequences. Knowing that those measures led inevitably to Civil War, he used the fatal expression and auspice of Cæsar, when he stood on the execrated brink of that stream, the crossing of which brought ruin on his country. He told the House of Lords in plain words, that "they had now passed the *Rubicon*." This Year he exhorts them to push on that Civil War, in a manner scarcely different from the precedent of Cæsar's speech before the battle of Pharsalia. But we are not yet hardened by this inflammatory eloquence into such black and decided enmity, as to unfit us for a temperate examination of his cause and arguments. "Kill them, or they will kill us!"—Alas! my good Lord, Englishmen cannot chearfully accept this alternative, which you are so good to offer, until we are thoroughly convinced, that to kill them is not mortally to wound ourselves.

This military adage, "Kill them, or they will kill us," is as proper in the field of battle, as it is misplaced and dangerous in council. When men have the bayonet to each other's breast, there is no time for reasoning. But men deliberating at their ease, are not in that desperate situation. It is not therefore necessary that they should be animated with these desperate sentiments.

The



The business of the Statesman, and that of the General, ought never to be confounded. It is the Province of the latter to consider only how War is to be *made*. It is the duty of the former sometimes to consider how war is to be *ended*. Reconciliation, treaty, negotiation, and concession enter into the plan of the Statesman, though not in the operations of the General. If Lord Mansfield's sentiments should prevail as maxims of policy, it would follow, that when men, upon whatever grounds, are driven to draw their swords, there must be no peace until one party or the other is exterminated.

That learned Lord rests much on the *offensive war* undertaken by the Americans, in (what is called) the Invasion of Canada. This he adduces as a proof of their design of independency. If war had been as much Lord Mansfield's study, as it seems to be his inclination, he must have perceived, that it never was, nor ever could be confined to strict defence. The very idea is full of absurdity. When war is once begun, the manner of conducting it, will be such as bids the fairest for success. It concludes nothing concerning the original motive for hostility, nor concerning the propriety or impropriety of making peace.

These Things stand upon grounds totally different; the desire of independency, like every

every other motive to war, must be judged of by the proceedings to that event.

For instance, I can conceive a case in which *Scotland* might take up arms: *Scotland* might defend the terms of the treaty of Union, even against the unlimitable authority of Parliament, which that treaty, by "a preposterous parade of civil arrangements," certainly does *affect* to limit. I can conceive in argument, that acts of parliament might pass to exclude the sixteen Peers of *Scotland* from their seats in the House of Lords—or to alter the present happy establishment of the Church of *Scotland*—or to change her laws for those of *England*—or on the plea of her increase of trade and wealth, to raise the proportion of their land-tax. I can conceive too the possibility, that many *Murrays*, many *Humes*, many *Campbells*, many *Stuarts*, many *Wedderburnes*, many *Dundas*, and many *Elliotts*, might take up arms in favour of those limitations of the power of Parliament, which the act of Union affects to establish; and not contenting themselves with defending *Sterling*, and blocking up *Edinburgh*, they might enter *England*, and lay siege to *Berwick*, or penetrate to *Newcastle*. But I should not therefore infer, that our Northern Kinsmen, who thus took up arms, were aiming at an independency, which would deprive so many of them of the well-earned emoluments,



emoluments, which are the consequence of their connection with England.

If such a case were to happen, I venture to assure Lord Mansfield, that I, and many Englishmen of far other consequence, would hear him plead in favour of peace, and for *those* rebels in 1776, with as much approbation, as we felt when he pleaded for justice against *other* rebels in 1746. If any Lord, heated with faction, or intoxicated with Court favour, should then tell him in debate, that Englishmen were not to look at the justice of the cause—that we must not distinguish the innocent from the guilty—that his countrymen had acted on the offensive—that if we did not kill them, they would kill us!—we might pardon such a Lord his prejudice, from our indulgence to his zeal; but we could never be brought to approve of his temper, or to adopt his opinions.

If another Lord, at the expence of his candour and judgment, should chuse to display his knowledge in history, and recapitulate all the ravages of the Scotch from the earliest times; their natural adherence to our natural enemy, France; their fierce struggles for independency, notwithstanding the well-proved rights of our ancient Kings—If a third (for such a load of calumny would be too great for the shoulders of any two ordinary orators) should carry down the story

to the present day; if he should state the design of a separate settlement of their crown in favour of the Pretender, from which their Chiefs were brought off with so much difficulty, and at so great an expence; if this odious remembrancer should then revive the memory of the two rebellions since the act of Union, for the purpose of destroying that union, all this might sound plausible to some prejudiced ears; but I think in well-disposed minds, it would excite the strongest indignation. I should rejoice to hear the thunder of that eloquence which Lord Mansfield would certainly hurl at the unfeeling sophistry of this unjust, invidious, and plausible kind of argument against peace. He would have the hearts and applauses of all true Englishmen. True Englishmen would not fear that Scotland would be made ungovernable by our lenity; they would readily trust to the fraternal affection of our Scotch brethren for a restoration of lasting peace; and with it, the rich Commerce of that country, and the service and society of those few of its natives, who might not think fit to repass the Tweed, to enjoy at home the sweets of that liberty which their valour had purchased for their country.

In this manner I should reason on a Scotch rebellion growing from such a principle. I mean a rebellion for preserving themselves  
in



in a state of freedom; not a rebellion for the purpose of reducing themselves and us to a common slavery. I cannot avoid applying the same reasonings to America. I would endeavour to make peace with both on the *avowed* ground of the war; and I persuade myself, that whatever the language of a few North-Britons about the Court, or expecting to get about the Court, may be, the body of the Scotch nation think and argue as I do.

I have no right to endeavour at discovering by divination the secret motives of any man's conduct; whilst the ostensible are such as may fairly influence an honest and a reasonable man. To support in argument, that independency was the original object of American resistance, we must assume, or prove, that they had no colourable complaint or grievance. Lord Mansfield has too much honour and good sense to assert, that there was nothing colourable or plausible in their objection to their being taxed, in their circumstances and situation, without their consent. The practice on our side may, for aught I know, be reconciled to principles of strict formal *law*; but we all know it can never be reconciled to any principles of *liberty*. The question is then, whether an attempt to govern them contrary to the principles of liberty, could be a real cause  
of

of quarrel, or was so idle and frivolous, as to oblige us to search for some other ground of their conduct.

Whatever the first cause was, or whatever disorders arose from it, the Americans did not go to extremities upon *that*. It is some proof of their not having premeditated a scheme of independency, that they waited for several other grievances before they took up arms.

Boston lost its port, and the Colony of Massachusetts Bay forfeited its charter—justly says Lord Mansfield, but certainly without charge, evidence or hearing. Men consider the right of being heard, as of some import in justice; if it be not, Lord Mansfield's office must become a sinecure. Among other human frailties, men have a natural love for their local constitutions and particular privileges. We must allow that (however merited) the loss of a favourite form of Government will be considered and felt as a very great hardship. Nations have thought an arbitrary and compulsory change, even of habits, to be grievous. A form of government changed, is a matter of somewhat more consequence than the compulsory deprivation of a flapped hat at Madrid, or being stripped of the plaid, and forced into breeches in the Highlands.—[The reader need scarce be told, that in the year 1766  
the



the attempt to oblige the Spaniards by force to leave off a flouched hat that was in use among them, created such a disturbance among the people of Madrid, as obliged the King to fly from his capital, and made it necessary for him to send his favourite out of the kingdom, who has never returned since. Much less do we suppose it necessary to inform the reader, that the permission of quitting his breeches, and resuming his plaid, is at this moment held out as a bribe to allure the Highlanders into the new levies against America.]

The bringing the persons of the Americans to trial in England, by a revival and extension of a statute of Henry the VIIIth; and the sending them by an original act of George the III<sup>d</sup>. to England, to look for justice on any soldier or Custom-House Officer who should commit murder on their relation,—these have also something of the air of a grievance. I shall say nothing of the Act for preventing their fishery, or of that for prohibiting all intercourse between Colony and Colony,—all these have surely so much the air of hardships (I mean to those who suffer under them) that I should be much less surpris'd to find a people at length provoked to independency by such acts, than I am to hear them accused of originally scheming that independency be-  
cause

cause they resisted them. Men are not always ready to humble themselves even before their Creator, and to acknowledge his punishments for tokens of loving-kindness. With men they are more inclined to dispute; and the arguments which perfectly satisfy those who are in haste to inflict punishment, are not quite so convincing to those who are to suffer it.

All those laws (which look severe even in cold reading) preceded the commencement of hostilities, offensive or defensive. It is not true, that a desire of free subjection is in nature the same thing with a scheme of independence; and we may suppose men earnest to preserve privileges, without rejecting government.

The Colonies, like others who have engaged in wars with their Sovereign, had therefore their grievance. But there the likeness stops; for there are perhaps no instances on record of a people in such a situation, who have persevered with such a pertinacious humility, in repeating their supplications for redress. There are few or no instances of men in arms against the ordinary authority, who have so long confined their applications solely to their own sovereign. Scarce any, where they have religiously avoided all caballing and tampering with foreign Powers. None where they have so nobly paid their debts



debts to the commerce of that power, with which they were at war. Whatever power we have of subsisting without them, or of acting against them, is owing in a great measure to their desire of avoiding a final rupture with us. Men aiming at independency could never have acted in this manner.

Why, in common sense, should we be more irritated against the Colonist than against other nations? or why should we use other rules to prevent pacification, than we use towards a foreign power? I should be glad to know whether this mode of reasoning concerning old delinquency, or modern ill design, was adopted at the late treaty of Paris? Did the late Duke of Bedford's instructions oblige him to a discussion of the motives of France and Spain for half a century back? I don't find that our Court has received any satisfaction on that head. If the zeal and industry of Sir John Dalrymple, or Mr. Macpherson have made any discovery in this curious mode of negotiation, they will favour the world with a new quarto volume for the information of future statesmen. In the mean time, I must think, that I do justice to the late Duke of Bedford (a man of sense, and a good practical man of business) in supposing that he troubled himself with no idle enquiries that could obstruct the work of pacification. I do not  
hear

hear that Lord Mansfield has ever accused that Duke of a neglect of duty.

But we must not treat with Rebels! What history is it that supplies us with this maxim? Lord Mansfield will allow, that the war against Charles the First was a rebellion; Lord Clarendon, I believe, styles it by pre-eminence the *great rebellion*,—does the history of that time supply us with no treaty between Charles the First and the people in arms against him? Go to earlier times. How was the contest between Stephen and Henry? Stephen was considered as an usurper, and perhaps he was so. He treated Henry's partizans as rebels; but these harsh names of Rebel and Usurper never prevented negotiation. Treaty and battle went on, as it were, hand in hand; and at last the contest ended in a compromise.

The short and violent rebellion of Wat Tyler, short as it was, yet afforded time for treating, and that too by the King in person. Does the Scotch history supply no instances of treaties between the rebellious Lords and their Kings? All histories are full of them. Government often finds it safer to treat with her subjects, and to yield too, than to risk the uncertain event of arms.

But in all wars foreign or civil, in all disputes public or private, it is utterly impossible



possible to terminate a controversy while one of the litigant parties chuses to assume a sort of supernatural talent of discovering the motives of men's actions; and loftily tells his adversary, "I don't value your offers and professions. I know you mean what you don't say; and I will not treat with you on the avowed and apparent cause of the quarrel, until my curiosity is satisfied upon the ground of a suspicion which I am resolved to entertain." I am persuaded that this learned Lord would not argue so inconclusively, or waste his breath upon a point not in issue, if the real object of Ministry was to terminate the dispute. What his Lordship's object is, I who take the liberty of complaining of his faculty of divination, and who am, by no means, provided with the endless line of his sagacity in fathoming the motives of men, do not at all know,—and certainly dare not guess. But the effect of the conduct of his friends in pertinaciously continuing and weakly conducting a war without an object, will inevitably operate to the dismemberment of the British Empire.

VALENS.

EXTRACT

*Extract from a Letter to the Secretaries of State, on the SEIZURE OF PAPERS. Dated May 19, 1763.*

**I** SHALL take the liberty of offering my thoughts upon that great article of SEIZING PAPERS, which, I own, strikes me in a very strong light.

Bail will deliver every man from imprisonment before conviction, for any offence, not capital. An illegal commitment may be corrected by the summary interposition of the king's courts; and even personal restraint, at the worst, can only to any great degree affect the single person who suffers it. I have not yet heard of a *Habeas Corpus* to redeem papers from captivity. Commissions of gaol delivery do not extend to them, nor can they petition for trial, in order to force their liberty. It is not *He only* whose papers are seized who is distressed by it, but every person in the least connected with him, may by the most accidental circumstances imaginable be involved in the consequences. These go to the friend and the friend's friend, and, in short, it is impossible to say what may be the extent of their influence.

I doubt not but there is some legal method  
VOL. III. N of



of recovering papers, as well as any other goods, which are unlawfully detained from the right owner; but I am sure the remedy must, from the nature of the thing, be very ineffectual, if it was less tedious and troublesome, than I dare say it is, as well as all other proceedings at law. The mischief and damages occasioned by the seizure of papers must in every case be very great, in many infinite, and irreparable; such as no consideration, no restitution can compensate, no satisfaction indemnify.

Papers relate to the affairs of business and property; the advantages, title, and security of which depend upon them; but that is not all. Every man, who has papers, has his secret and confidential correspondences; his private studies, researches, and pursuits, whether of profit, entertainment, or improvement. His *papers* contain all these. The merchant has his secrets of trade; the philosopher his discoveries in science. Every accurate man has the impenetrable secret of his circumstances; the state of his affairs. Many have their *WILLS*, *settlements*, and dispositions of their estates, sealed up in silence, not to be broke, but with their own heart-strings. These are to be found among their *papers*. A man's riches may be there in things known to none but himself; and his poverty may  
from

from thence *only* appear, the unseasonable discovery of which may involve him in irreparable ruin. *Papers* are the depositories of our fortune; the trustees of our credit, character, and reputation; the secretaries of our pleasures. They are our closest confidants; the most intimate companions of our bosom; and, next to the recesses of our own breasts, they are the most hidden repository we can have. Our honour and fame, our estates, our amusements, our enjoyments, our friendships, *are*, and even our vices *may be*, there: things that men trust none with, but themselves; things upon which the peace and quiet of families, the love and union of relations, the preservation and value of friends, depend. Secrets that may cost a man his life; secrets (of which there are many) that tho' they can neither affect life nor liberty, yet some men would rather die than have discovered; the revealing of which may render life insupportable, may dissolve every tie of nature, loosen every bond of society, and put an utter end to the comfort of existence.

It is for these reasons, that wise men not only keep their papers with the greatest care, but at convenient seasons purge their repositories, and destroy those that ought not to be preserved, after the immediate purposes of them are answered. They have above all,



a special care into whose hands their secret papers shall come, after they are dead: a precaution that every man owes not only to himself, but to his family and friends, perhaps to his country.

But what need is there to enlarge upon such a topick? Every man's own mind will represent the thing to him in a stronger light, than any language can convey. Let any person, the most private and the least employed, or concerned, in business, study, or correspondence, pause only a moment, and consider if he would choose to have his closet ransacked, his most private repositories rifled, his papers carried he knows not where, and exposed to he knows not whom. Let him likewise reflect, that in this matter every man is dependent upon another, in a singular, but unavoidable manner, to an unspeakable, but inextricable degree; and that every person may in a great measure, or to an equal effect, suffer the same inconveniencies from the misfortunes happening to his friend, as if it had befallen himself: so that in proportion to the extent of a man's connections, and correspondence, is he exposed to this hardship, and to all the mischievous consequences of it.

The most superficial thought upon these things will supersede the use of any argument to convince mankind of the important mischiefs attendant on a SEIZURE OF PAPERS, or to satisfy

satisfy them, that personal liberty itself is not an object of greater concern than the security of repositories is to most men.

Is it not then abundantly provided for? It is to be hoped, that it is by the law of the land; but it would seem the present practice of the Secretaries of State's Office pays no regard at all to it; if what has been published to all the world be true. It has not been contradicted; on the contrary, it is acknowledged.

The Parliament, to make private correspondence sacred, has enacted that a single letter shall not under the highest penalties be opened at the Post-office, without an express warrant in writing from a Secretary of State, in whom that particular power is lodged, as one of the first Ministers of Government. What shall we say then, when we hear that a person (it is of very little consequence who, but it does not lessen the importance of the consideration, that he is a MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT) has had ALL HIS PAPERS SEIZED, without information upon OATH, by virtue of a VERBAL ORDER of a Secretary of State, whose powers as a Magistrate (in which character only he acts in this instance) are no higher it seems, than those of a Justice of Peace: an ORDER which the Secretary of State commanded to be carried into execution at MIDNIGHT, though the messenger had either too much humanity  
or



or too little confidence in his authority, to obey that part of the order; or perhaps had a greater value for his life, than to expose it in so mad an exploit, as a midnight entry into a man's house without so much as the pretence of a warrant *naming the owner*.

THE PAPERS have been carried to the Secretary of State's Office; and there (as your own letters intimate) they have been thoroughly examined. The news papers have already published some of the privacies contained in them. Is this LAW? Is it LIBERTY? Is it GOVERNMENT? Or is it TYRANNY and OPPRESSION? If it is LAW, where is LIBERTY? If it is NOT LAW, where is the VOICE of LIBERTY?

BUT can there be SUCH LAW, in this FREE COUNTRY? One cannot surely read it in the CONSTITUTION; and if it is in the statute book, or in the record of any court in the kingdom, it ought not to remain a moment longer capable of being quoted to disgrace the BEST form of GOVERNMENT, and disquiet the FREEST PEOPLE. No Englishman till he sees it read or is informed of it, can believe that there is such a law in this LAND OF LIBERTY. SLAVERY itself could hardly endure it. It must be the HEAVIEST BONDAGE, everywhere there is no FREEDOM.

To explain the mischievous nature and oppressive tendency of such a law, if there

were

were any such, is past the power of words. To exaggerate the enormity of such proceedings, would be to insult the lowest understanding in this country, where the GENIUS OF LIBERTY reigns. Such acts are little short of SACRILEGE.

We are however told by one Person in your office that every step was taken by the *attorney and solicitor general's* advice. THAT cannot be; for the most ignorant constable in Westminster could have instructed your Lordships that a VERBAL ORDER was a warrant for NOTHING; and it is inconceivable how you yourselves could have thought otherwise. Another champion of power, who calls himself a *moderate Whig*, vindicates the whole proceeding by saying with a perspicuity peculiar to his own stile, "The length of time and several precedents  
" *may not* constitute an act strictly legal, which  
" *may not* be literally so, (*these are his own*  
" *unintelligible words,*) yet it will acquit those  
" who act conformable to precedents before  
" uncontroverted, and believed to be legal,  
" from any design of acting illegally, in the  
" opinion of every honest man."

How there can be a precedent, unless in unauthentick memory, for a *verbal order*, is not so easy to be understood. This instance will make none; for no body doubts of the illegality of it. The precedents of the  
secretary



secretary of state's office however, if there was a cart load of them, are of no authority. If they have never been controverted, then it only appears that they have not yet been judicially disputed. Hitherto, it is to be feared, it has been too much *fragili quærens illidere dentem*, now it may be found to be *offendet solido*. The register of Sir John Fielding's warrants deserves to carry more weight with it than the book of the secretary of state's office. If *that* was sent to your office for a copy book, your Lordships, or at least your successors, would not hereafter cause any person to be apprehended by a WARRANT that NAMES NO BODY; which of itself is an offence for which a Chief Justice in a former reign has been impeached.

This ridiculous talk of precedents is shocking to the first idea of a FREE GOVERNMENT. They ought not to be once mentioned. They must at the name of LIBERTY shrink back into the gloomy caverns of tyranny, where such vulcanian thunder-bolts only could be forged; as spectres retreat to their dismal shades at the words of a true exorcism.

There is indeed hardly any thing so wicked, or unconstitutional, but a precedent may be found for it, if the records of the star chamber, or the memorials of tyranny, are resorted to as authorities. The great AL-

GERNON

GERNON SYDNEY, whose valuable blood prepared the soil for receiving the seeds of the GLORIOUS REVOLUTION, was executed for high treason; and the overt act for which he died on a profane scafold, was that precious MANUSCRIPT found in his closet, which never had been published, and was not completed; the hand writing of which was not proved, a fiftieth part of it not produced, nor even the tenth part of *that* allowed to be read at the trial.

But *in whose* reign was this cruel tragedy acted? In the BLOODY reign of a *Stuart*, Charles the Second, an unhappy prince, who sacrificed the lives of the very people who called him from exile, to the fury of his despotism, and who sold the honour of his crown for a pension to support his infamous pleasures. — Who condemned the noble MARTYR of liberty? That arch traitor of his country, the most infamous instrument of regal tyranny, and a very butcher of his own species, Lord Chief Justice JEFFRIES of ROTTEN MEMORY.

Look to the reigns of a glorious WILLIAM, who nobly rescued and happily restored, and of the ILLUSTRIOUS GEORGES, who to their immortal honour, have built up, this INVALUABLE CONSTITUTION; PRINCES who have read the value of ENGLISH LIBERTY in the lustre of the Crown which



IT placed upon their heads ; PRINCES who have established the security of the PROTESTANT SUCCESSION in their own august family upon the same basis with the ENVIED FREEDOM OF THESE NATIONS ; the pillars of which are not to be shaken.

From *these* reigns can there be produced a precedent of *legal* authority for such a SEIZURE OF PAPERS as has happened lately ? Do their days so much as furnish an *allowed* example of the fact to the same extent ? It may be doubted if in the very worst of times, when arbitrary principles were rising to the top of the precipice, from which at last tyranny fell head-long with its own weight, such things were *avowedly* practised under the *shew* of authority ; whatever *mere* power, or rather *force*, as irregular in its acts, as unconstitutional in its foundation, might perhaps do.

But what was the pretence of this late violation of rights so sacred in their nature, this invasion of property, in a critical point, which comprehends every valuable interest a man can have ? A person is suspected of being the author of a printed paper, which, in the judgment of the Secretaries of State, was a seditious libel, and the proof of the fact is to be sifted out of his *own* papers : for your Lordships have said in your letter, which is published, that such of the papers seized, as  
tend

tend to make out the guilt of the owner are to be kept, and used for that purpose.

The reason is most inadequate, and must appear so to every man, who is not beat out of his senses by the jargon of lawyers, or confounded in his own ideas with the quibbles of legal nonsense.

If there is a circumstance that can aggravate the injury, which is in itself too great almost to be conceived, it is this use that is to be made of the papers; and nothing can so much add to the ALARM which the practice of SEIZING OF PAPERS must give to every man.

When a person is brought upon his trial for any offence, he is not bound, nor will any Court suffer him to give evidence against himself; but by this method, if allowed, though a man's tongue is not permitted to bear testimony against him, his thoughts are to rise in judgment, and to be produced as witnesses to prove the charge. A man's WRITINGS lying in his closet, NOT PUBLISHED, are no more than his thoughts, hardly brought forth even in his own account, and, to all the rest of the world, the same as if they yet remained in embryo in his breast. When ALL a man's PAPERS are seized, he is at the mercy of his prosecutors. Some may be used to prove a charge, when others, which are *suppressed*, would clearly exculpate him



him of guilt. It was thus in the infamous proceedings which robbed that hero of patriotism, the great SYDNEY, of his life. *Scraps* of an *unfinished manuscript* were the evidences upon which he was condemned, when the rest of that very writing was not produced.

The rack itself is hardly a more inhuman mode of accusation, or tyrannical method of proof. Both are equally against the first laws of nature; and nothing can be more unlike the benign spirit of our happy constitution.

In cases of treason papers are seized, though even *then* it is always done with much circumspection, and under many restrictions as to the use to be made of them; but *that* proceeds upon a quite different principle, a principle of sense and reason.

Treason, in the general nature of it, must be the crime of *many*. It implies plots and conspiracies, which are carrying on by correspondence, and are to be discovered by *papers*. The safety of the State, which is superior to every other consideration, makes it necessary, to use all possible means to unmask the machinations of *treason*, that the dreadful effects may be prevented. *Papers* therefore may be seized, and letters intercepted, as arms, ammunition, and other warlike stores may be secured, that the sinews of rebellion may be cut. This is the sole reason,

reason, and end of seizing *papers*, in a *treasonable* case, although they may afterwards be used as proofs of such *overt acts* of *treason* as they are connected with, or bear relation to, so as to make them be considered as a part of the prosecution of the same *treasonable* purposes ; yet surely it cannot be law even in cases of *treason*, nor (we hope) ever was law, with any but such a judge as Lord Chief Justice *Jeffries*, that *papers* found in a man's closet, *not published*, and unconnected with any thing but themselves, can constitute a crime, or be brought as a proof of guilt.

What *does* however hold in *treason*, will not take place in other cases. There is a certain necessary rigour and severity in the laws of *treason*, which would be cruelty, if extended to other crimes. Many things are allowed in the case of *treason*, that, if applied to other matters, would be more mischievous in their consequences than the things they were intended to prevent.

It is *treason* to compass or imagine (as it is called) or, in plain English, to contrive or intend the death of the King, if it can be proved by any overt act ; and it could be no more than *treason* actually to put the sovereign to death. It is not however murder, *in foro humano*, to intend, or even to attempt to kill another man. There is therefore



therefore no example to be drawn from what *is* or *may be* done in cases of *treason*, to any other case; and none can be more unsimilar to it than that of libels.

Publication is essential to a libel, and the criminality is intrinsic in itself. The offence, and the effects of it, both stand upon the libel *alone*, unconnected with any other thing whatsoever. There is not therefore the least colour of danger, or necessity, to plead for breaking through any right, or any privilege of the subject, for the sake of discovery or prevention, in such a case; much less to trample upon those rights that are the most sacred and inviolable, and the consequences of injuring them pernicious beyond expression. The evil is great; the mischief apparent. The utility and good is nothing, or so inconsiderable, as to be no object at all.

To the mercy of *any* government, even convicts may have some claim; the benignity of *ours*, guilt itself cannot forfeit. Its suavity, and mildness, in prosecutions and trials, can be denied, or interrupted to none. Suspicion, or accusation, do not annul the rights of innocence; nor rob the subject, either of the protection, or *favour* of the laws. The *lenity* of justice is, in England, its *dignity*. Fair trials, and *gentle* prosecutions, are the peculiar glory of this country;  
and

and no man should be deprived of any benefit, or advantage, his own silence, or the secrecy of papers *not published*, can afford to protect him against conviction. As he can keep his mouth shut, so his privacies ought to be sacred, and his repositories secure.

But if the partitions of a man's closet, (which is but another bosom,) are to be wantonly broke down, on every slight pretence, or trivial occasion, and what lies there locked up in secrecy, things that the world never saw, and no man has a right to look upon, are to be exposed at the humour or malice of every, perhaps trading, justice of peace, (for so far it goes,) let the most partial determine what must be the consequences. There is an END OF LIBERTY, an end of confidence amongst mankind. A severe restraint is laid upon friendship and correspondence, and even upon the freedom of thought. In short, a FATAL BLOW is given to the most precious and valuable rights of mankind; to the fairest privileges of society. The thing is big with mischiefs innumerable, and inconceivable; the least of them not to be laid in the balance with all the danger of any *libel* the most seditious that can be published, or with any thing less than *high treason* itself, which does, and justly ought to overcome all rights  
what-



whatsoever of any individual, be the consequences what they may. If care is taken in that case, that no harm be done which can possibly be avoided, nor any unnecessary hardships inflicted, it is all that can be expected, and as much as ought to be required.

Precedents of seizing the *papers* of printers, and publishers, are comparatively scarce worthy having any notice taken of them in a just and accurate consideration of this subject. The papers and repositories of every private person stand upon a very different footing. If amongst *these* any distinction can be made, it is due to the case of MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT, for the sake of their TRUST, and of the interest their constituents have in their freedom, security, and independency. On these all our valuable rights depend; and they cannot be exposed to a greater or more dangerous INFRINGEMENT than an undue SEIZURE OF PAPERS. It has always, for this reason, been the GREAT OBJECT of the HOUSE OF COMMONS, to protect the Members of Parliament from such illegal invasions.

The public may, perhaps, be thought to have some more power over those, who are a sort of servants of the public than over *private* persons; and professed publishers (in the case of publications) are a sort

sort of public persons. Their shops and offices, therefore, are in some sense, and to a limited degree, the houses of the public.

These kind of people, however, all the world knows, are soon frightened, and intimidation speedily checks them. Ministers know it; and therefore they use it without scruple, and without mercy, when *they* think fit. How far that is consistent with the LIBERTY OF THE PRESS, or for the advantage of the public, is another question.

The authority of a secretary of state, even a hint from the office, and much more apprehensions, examinations, and menaces, will soon conquer these poor men's ideas of liberty, and make them fond to redeem themselves. They are very ready to purchase exemption from a hard, expensive, and dangerous prosecution, directed by power and carried on from the public purse, at the expence of submitting to acts illegal, and oppressive, for which a court of law, and an English jury, would give ample redress and satisfaction. No stress whatever can therefore be laid on such instances, if any can be cited; but, at any rate, precedents of *fact* are not at all, or in any case, to be regarded. LEGAL PRECEDENTS are those whose authority stands upon trial, and judicial decisions of courts of law, in TIMES OF LIBERTY, and JUSTICE.



If there have been any examples of undue *seizure of papers*, so far from being precedents to *justify*, or even to *excuse* the practice, they afford the strongest reason in the world for giving a timely and effectual check to it; that it may no longer continue to be the *grief* and *burthen* of the subject.

Precedents which have the *shew* of authority, from the sanction of courts, though of arbitrary and unjust judges, in times too of tyranny and oppression, can only be mentioned to be scorned, and inveighed against, in days of LIBERTY and JUSTICE; or to be set up as beacons to warn against the shipwrecks, which the rocks and quicksands of arbitrary power have occasioned, in former ages.

But in the halcyon days of LIBERTY, when JUSTICE is administered with PURITY, care will be had to avoid precedents of *seeming* authority, to give to proceedings that are *arbitrary*, and oppressive, the appearance of being *legal*. It is the more necessary to do it, because precedents of such times will have weight from the character of the times. Bad and illegal precedents of *fact* cannot be too soon, nor too severely corrected; not only for the honour of the government, and the present security of the subject, but that they may not remain to be quoted in succeeding,

succeeding, and in worse times, if such shall ever be the curse of this country, except as authorities *against* any attempt to imitate the practices formerly condemned, and effectually to prevent their being renewed or repeated.

EVERY TRUE FRIEND OF LIBERTY therefore will anxiously desire to see this question have a fair trial, that he may know exactly how the law stands, and be fully apprized of his danger; so that all may provide against it the best they can. If on every pretence or suspicion of a libel, or of what not only a secretary of state, but the lowest magistrate of the peace, may please to deem one, in which POLITICS, PARTY, PREJUDICE, and RESENTMENT, will always have a great influence, OUR HOUSES, and our FRIENDS' HOUSES, are to be OPEN at all hours and under all circumstances to every prowling officer of the crown, actuated by curiosity, interest, design, or revenge, he will be the wisest man that corresponds the least with others, and the most prudent who writes very little, and keeps as few papers as he can by him. None but a fool in this case will have any secrets at all in his possession.

That no such BADGE OF SLAVERY does yet exist in this country, is still believed. That it never may exist will naturally be the wish of every ENGLISHMAN.



*Extract from the Letter from Albemarle-  
Street to the Cocoa-Tree.*

EVERY good man wishes the whole nation were agreed in Revolution principles; and if we are one, in that respect, our name must be one. The fire of contest might then, without preying on the vitals of national happiness, waste itself in the diversity of political attachments, and struggles for power; the disputes about which, are the natural offspring of a free constitution, and generally conducive to its vigour, as changes in it are oftentimes necessary to promote the public good.

In a country like this, when men of sound principles contend for influence, (and if they do not, it can only be because there is a penury of great statesmen, which is a sign of stagnation, rather than a mark of health, in the political body;) they must not only be rivals in abilities, but emulate each other in zeal, and attention to the general welfare; which is the fair road to elevation, and the only stability of preferment, in popular, and mixed governments.

Our national parties sprung up, with their unhappy names of distinction, in days when the encroachments of the Crown threatened the subversion of the constitution. James I.  
taught

taught a system of prerogative, consistent with nothing but slavery; and his descendants, corrupted with his false principles, obstinately pursued his perverse plan, to their own ruin. The unbridled attempts of arbitrary power necessarily produced opposition, then resistance, and at last ended in the expulsion of a race of tyrants; a succession of which had disgraced the throne, and all but destroyed this country, when their own family fell the miserable victim of their irreclaimable attachment to despotism.

If there are yet amongst us any wretched remains of those parties, they are the tattered rags of a direful warfare, between the stretches of prerogative and the defence of liberty; between the faithful friends of a limited, mixed monarchy, and the traitorous advocates of absolute, and arbitrary sovereignty: a dispute, one should think, too unnatural now to be brought back from the dead.

The disagreeable distinctions that heretofore have prevailed, must be placed to the account of the times, and the circumstances of the nation; but the fortunate change in these should now soften into general harmony all former animosities, and eradicate unnatural, and destructive prejudices. If there is a distinction, let it only be between honest men, and those who do not deserve  
the



the name ; between those who will do any thing for something, and those who will not, on any account, do what ought not to be done. Let the honour and interest, the glory and prosperity of the nation, the just power, and true dignity of the crown, and the rights of the subject, be, as in truth they are, the common cause ; and the principles of allegiance, and liberty, the cement of adherence to it. Those who, from any motive, can desert that cause, or deny those principles, will, with their country, stand in the light in which their own criminal and contemptible conduct so justly places them.

If the House of Commons should relinquish the right, or decline to exercise the power of *resolving* with the dignity, and authority of parliamentary declarations, upon points of high concernment to the liberty of the subject, and essential to the preservation of our freedom, especially in the case of violations in the persons of their own members, they would cease to be the grand inquest of the nation, and surrender one of their highest trusts.

For parliamentary resolutions are not like the words of a *drunken porter*, say so who will.—[In the debate on General Warrants, Sir Fletcher Norton said, he should pay no more regard to a resolution of the House of Commons,

Commons, than to the words of a drunken porter in Covent-Garden.]—One should think ENGLAND could not have bred a man, I had almost said a —, who would talk in so ridiculous a manner: and no body has more reason to stand in awe of parliament, than such as are capable of holding a language so disrespectful to IT, so derogatory to the great SECURITY of the NATION. It must proceed from ignorance of the constitution: and to confute the nonsense, would be supposing it is not what it really is. Lawyers, who are generally fettered with the trammels of their profession, may say, as they sometimes have said, that votes of the commons are not considered as laws—“Nevertheless, (as the author of the best constitutional history of England says,) such is their effect, that *few persons are so hardy* as to act directly contrary to these decisions of the commons, since it is, in some measure, to oppose the sentiment of the people whom they represent. Besides, an action directly contrary to a vote of the house, is liable to be questioned, when least expected, and draws upon the actor the indignation of the house.” It may also be remembered, that there are not wanting instances of parliaments declaring things done against liberty, *heinous crimes*, even in an *Attorney General*.

The object in view was not barely to condemn



condemn general warrants without name: for that the House of Commons did, even in the reign of Charles II. and impeached a Chief Justice of England for granting them; though the revival of the practice loudly called for a fresh check to so dangerous an evil.—Depriving the subject of his liberty without a charge upon oath, or something as strong, is equally illegal.—Close confinement for a bailable offence; arbitrary evasions of the habeas corpus; and above all, the unwarrantable seizure of papers; were objects highly worthy the weightiest interposition, and an adequate punishment.

We desired resolutions to vindicate the principles of the constitution, and invigorate the nerves of liberty; to shew that a due sense, and a becoming regard to it, inspire the representatives of a free people: that the just apprehensions of those who choose them, to be their defenders and protectors, are not to be treated as the dreams of fancy, or the murmurs of sedition; nor the voice of freedom disregarded as the language of riot, or curbed as the petulance of faction: that the fundamentals of liberty are not to be taken up, only to be laid aside as things of no moment, and shuffled into the heap of unimportant, and impertinent matter, that composes the dreg of public consultations, and the refuse of free debate.

Judicial

Judicial resolutions of Parliament, seasonably interposed, in vindication of the constitution, not in gratification of men's passions, partialities, and resentments, upon great and general doctrines of magnitude sufficient to draw out its supreme jurisdiction, are the known, the natural, safe, and (notwithstanding the bold scorn of any officer of the law, however high), the most operative protection of liberty. These rescue, and restore things to their right condition: they do not create, or enact, but actuate, and ascertain what already has a real existence, and ought to be in full vigour: they brighten, and illustrate the principles of the constitution, that threaten to languish, and fade; they quicken, and enliven those that are in danger of decay, and annihilation.

You, the WORTHY gentlemen of the Cocoa-Tree, have honourably distinguished yourselves among the friends of liberty. Your country, with gratitude, proclaims your merit; and the voice of liberty will loudly sound your praise. Welcome into the bosom of a free people, and to be numbered amongst the best CITIZENS! You have followed the example of the venerable heroes in the cause of liberty, to whose courage in the senate, and the field, we owe the preservation of the constitution, the maintenance



maintenance of our freedom. You have but to persevere in the same glorious path, and your fame will be recorded with their immortal renown.

Could you desire a nobler testimony to your services than one you have? You share the large applauses of so many brave patriots, who on the same trying occasion, with undaunted boldness, contended for the just rights of their country. Amongst the foremost stands a gallant general, pointed out for supreme command, by the unanimous voice of his grateful country; in whose manly spirit, a well-tempered mixture of generosity, and frugality, secures the foundations of true dignity: renowned for his prowess, more distinguished yet by his patriotism; who truly possesses that *ANIMUS IN CONSULENDO LIBER, neque delicto, neque libidini obnoxius*: a brave son of Mars, who follows not alone, but accompanied by many, his spirited companions of the war, wherever liberty leads; who pleads her cause at home, with the same ardor that he fought her battles abroad; wreathing the laurels of the camp with the garlands of the senate; who thinks, and shews, that honour is not confined to military service, but is equally sacred in all situations, and in all capacities. There is fortitude which despises danger, and defies  
*dismission;*

*dismissal*; the independent spirit that makes the MAN; the magnanimity which crowns the HERO;—the bold soldier, the intrepid senator, the fine gentleman, the warlike advocate for liberty! England has a CONWAY, the powers of whose eloquence, inspired by his zeal for the object, animated with the fire of true genius, and furnished with a sound knowledge of the constitution, at once entertain, ravish, convince, conquer.

Such noble examples are the riches of the present age, the treasure of posterity.—*Sæpe audiui civitatis nostræ præclaros viros solitos ita dicere, CUM MAJORUM IMAGINES INTUERENTUR, VEHEMENTISSIME SIBI ANIMUM AD VIRTUTEM ACCENDI.—Scilicet non ceram illam neque figuram tantam vim in sese habere; sed memoria rerum gestarum, eam flammam egregiis viris in pectore crescere, neque prius sedari, quam virtus eorum famam atque gloriam adæquaverit.*

The honest, and spirited, conduct of the sound part of the Cocoa-Tree, has done much towards reducing the state of parties to that ground on which a division cannot long subsist, or effect great harm. The banner of prerogative, which was wont to be the much-loved regal ensign, will not now triumph over the standard of liberty, which always was the favourite ensign of the people.

If



If honest men, that have been called Tories, are upon the same bottom, and of the same principles with honest men who act like Whigs; the ignominious remainder of either name may call themselves, or be called by others, what they please. Their conduct will stamp their character, the original of which is of an older date than any party name now existing, and will continue long after time has blotted out the remembrance of the worst of them.

For the last fifty years, the Tories have called themselves the patrons of the people; and the Whigs thought they were the defenders of liberty, the support of the protestant succession, and the pillars of the constitution. If the characters were real, the difference between them was to seek. But unfortunately they differed in their opinions of each other, not without cause, or they might long before now have been happily united, and the names of distinction annihilated.

Two reigns of the House of Brunswick have not, that I know of, afforded a debate upon any real question concerning the liberty of the subject. The reason is obvious that the favourite object of their government was more amply to secure it.

An important question of liberty, however, brings characters to the test, and tries the sincerity

sincerity of former professions ; it elucidates principles, and unmarks pretences. Those who stand forward in that glorious cause, are the true patriots, the sound whigs, come from where they will, and whatever name they go by. They breathe the spirit of the revolution, and strengthen the bands of our security. Formerly the only distinction has been, (but it must no longer continue to be so,) between *country gentlemen* and *courtiers*: it is now betwixt *the friends of liberty*, and *the slaves of power*. Arthur's, or the Cocoa-Tree, Albemarle-street, or St. James's, are not able to confound *things* under a *Babel* of *names*. St. Stephen's Chapel itself cannot christen those that are against liberty, *Whigs*, or those that are for it, *Torys*, as long as we can read the principles of the revolution without the help of treasury-opticks. The distinction between Whigs and Tories was founded in the struggle between prerogative and liberty ; a Tory therefore who befriends liberty is a contradiction ; the character, excluding the name: by parity of reason, a nominal Whig, who is against liberty, is equally inconsistent, the conduct being incompatible with the appellation.

A rank Tory is bad ; but a rotten Whig, if possible, is still worse. The first has the credit of consistency, if it is his original principle, and he has never quieted his

scruples



scruples with the profits of compliance. The other is a renegado, who renounces his convictions ; forsakes his first love ; and cuts off the breasts that nourished him. With whom these gentlemen should associate, I am at some loss to know. Their only fit companions seem to be rotten Tories, who retain their principles, or rather their prejudices, and make gain of changing their professions. Let rotten Whigs and rotten Tories then, go together ; and who will envy their society ? But an Administration, supported by such a confederacy, must indeed be of a very black hue ; and its continuance may be judged of from the rottenness, fragility, and incoherence of its props. Nor need any that comes after be afraid of wanting the same assistance, if they have a job to do, which better men will not undertake. Those of such flexible tenets, and pliable dispositions, will always be help at hand, ready to offer their support, upon proper terms, and easily turn with the tide ; being *very accommodating in their nature.*

The favourite cry has, of late, been, to abolish all party names. But managed as it is, I know nothing, that has tended more, than this very cry, to revive, and keep up, what most people were very ready to forget. I own, however, I am for the proposition, but I wish to go a great deal farther. For  
extinction

extinction of names will go a very short way to a coalescence of parties. It is beginning at the wrong end. The axe must be laid to the root of the tree. Let us cut up the foundation of the difference: names will, like the shadow, follow the substance. Till we have but one principle, we cannot be of one name.

No body, I dare say, ever thought; and no friend to his country ever could think, of proscribing men for a *name*; or of barring the conversion of the rankest Tory that ever existed. I am sure the practice has been the contrary. Witness the list of honours, and offices, in the last reign; witness how many, who had been called Tories, not to say even real Jacobites, were well rewarded for coming into court, where their descendants now flourish, with the additional comfort, of daring to avow, and act, upon the same principles of prerogative, and arbitrary power, which their ancestors were paid for pretending to renounce. The fathers, by a seasonable hyprocrisy, made their own terms; and, like the prodigal, always got the best garment.

The great minister, who conducted this country to a pitch of glory it never saw before, made it the labour of his administration to extinguish parties, as well as names: and it is a merit, that cannot be denied him, that he was more successful in the patriot design,  
than



than perhaps any of his predecessors were, or than any but himself will, for a long time, be.

When he was at the helm, there seemed to be but one heart, and one mind, in the nation. His conduct commanded an unanimity so astonishing in degree, and so amazing in its effects, that those who are now disposed to find fault, though their own acquiescence made part of the general consent, can only call it an *intoxicated unanimity*: a reflection which does as little honour to themselves who now pretend to murmur, and did not before remonstrate, as it does justice to the true spirit of the nation, which then was satisfied, and still is content with what was before universally approved. Unhappy is it for this country, that some of the labourers fainted before the harvest was gathered!

Honest men did then as they do now; for integrity is a consistent character. On the same principle of love to their country, they supported her liberty against foreign enemies, and defended it from domestick violations. In the days of concord, even the rank Tory, and the reprobate Whig;—the most rotten-hearted of either name were dragged along with the standard of liberty, as the trophies of a triumphant administration, the measures of which stifled the voice of opposition, and silenced the whispers of complaint. Men of  
all

all denominations and characters went one way, because there was not another road open. When an opportunity offers, principle and pay screen the multitude: the sound and the sordid, the sycophant and the sincere, then part: prospects, promises, and provision, draw away the hungry, the greedy, and the gaping: virtue can only carry the virtuous and upright. When those who carry the *bag* shew the way, the *feeling* interest will always be on that side.

Mark, however, the importance of the character of conductors; the greatness of the difference between Tories when compelled to follow a Whig Leader, and when making a true Tory system. We have seen Tories, under Whig conduct, supporting Whig measures, and adopting Whig maxims: if suffered to act on Tory principles, we perceive liberty can only be safe, by keeping out of their reach. Tories, when they take the lead, will wound, not protect her, if she comes in their way.

We had a Minister; alas! that we have not him still; who has not only said, but shewn that it was the pride of his heart to humble the foreign enemies of his country, and who thinks he cannot spend the last remains of his health in a better cause, than struggling to maintain the great barriers of the constitution, assert the rights of the subject,



and protect their liberty against arbitrary violations. It was the singular commendation of that GREAT Minister's administration, not only to be assisted by all the zealous friends of their country, and of the constitution, but to be opposed by none. He studied to unite parties, without confounding principles; not singly to make names cease, but to get opinions to coalesce, upon the great foundation of revolution principles: and certainly he had the satisfaction to effect an unknown union and harmony, in the counsels and operations, the wishes and desires of the kingdom; no less honourable to himself than advantageous to the nation, and beneficial to all Europe.

*[After giving an account of the state of the national finances, as they stood at the time; the noble author concludes with the following observations.]*

The words *economy* and *reformation* having lost their meaning; or rather meaning only extravagance and corruption beyond example. The people justly alarmed for their liberties, attacked in their persons, their property, and even their houses; by the arbitrary violations of general warrants, and aggrieved by the most odious mode of excise.—The tools of power, oppressive in their prosecutions; more oppressive still when prosecuted themselves, and legally convicted—ransacking every detestable artifice for delay, every infamous chicanery,

chicanery, *essoign*, privilege, bills of exception, the frowns of power, immensity of expence, &c. &c. under all which discouragements, and hardships, the meanest of the people have had to contend, for almost a twelvemonth, and still must contend, with the greatest, who are one day encouraging and paying defamatory libels; the next, beat at their own weapons, *under frivolous distinctions*, flying to law; and, lest that should fail, to Parliament, for the means of suppressing and punishing what was only the blessed fruit of their own example.—Such is the candour and generosity of our reformers, such the liberty and licentiousness of the press.—

A set of men distinguished by nothing but publick and private blemishes, even in the excess of them—possess of the reins of government—and sweets of office, present and reversionary—presuming to give law to their sovereign in the most insolent manner—under the specious colour of delivering majesty from a pretended intention of the same kind of tyranny in others, who truly *feel* for the honour of their master, who never had in the late reign, or in this, a superiority of influence, but from superiority of talents and services to their King and Country, and who have scorned to give themselves even the trouble of contradicting that preposterous heap of absurd



fallhoods, palmed, so industriously, upon the public credulity; last autumn, certain that they would die, and stink, like their authors, in the nostrils of every honest man: a second session of parliament almost elapsed since the signature of the preliminaries, without so much as one step taken, however promised, towards ameliorating our revenue, or availing ourselves, by wise, and careful regulations, of those *cessions*, the utility of which has been so highly magnified; and which are only as yet known to us, by the accumulation of expence; or the solicitations we hear so much of, for proprietary grants of the most valuable of them, to gratify friends and favourites of power, astonished as they are at their own exaltation, they are content to drag on, like a wounded snake, a weak, disgraced, disreputable existence; when they are conscious there is but one set of men, who can give lustre to government, and in whom alone foreign Princes, the Bourbon confederacy excepted, will, or can take a just confidence.—What character for ability, weight, or credit, has, or how can such an administration be looked upon, either abroad or at home?

With a civil list of no less than eight hundred thousand pounds per annum, [1764.] the *crown* revenues of all our conquests, *all* the revenues, and *all* the interest of the late King's

King's riches, in Germany, now flowing in with the arrears, in what light of splendor does our Court appear in the eyes of the nation—in the eyes of Europe? I will not appeal to enumerations, which I am ashamed to recapitulate, and which a very *short* memory, indeed, can recollect.

If this be a true delineation, and you know it is, of the public situation at this time, where can such of you, Gentlemen of the Cocoa-Tree, who have shewn yourselves the strenuous and hardened supporters of such measures and such principles, look for a justification of your conduct?—Can you still hope to impose upon mankind? Or, rather, are you not discovered, and known to be the tools of prerogative, and enemies to the principle of revolution freedom?—Can you, after this expostulatory account of things, have the assurance to continue in your affirmations, that the present Ministers have as yet *done nothing wrong*?—Merit for them, I must do you the justice to acknowledge, you never have claimed.—Will your misrepresentations still presume to lay to the charge of the leaders of the friends of liberty, a thirst, like your own, after employments?—Men who have, almost all of them, filled, and sacrificed the greatest situations, to the love they bear their country—Will you continue to do this, when you know in your consciences,

the



the most probable fear is, that if the wishes of the public should succeed, an unhappy unwillingness will manifest itself, instead of an interested eagerness, to fill the high offices of the kingdom.

These important considerations are left with those of the Cocoa-Tree, who prefer principles to names, reality to professions; who are miscalled Torries, and are indeed friends to that system of liberty, which was founded in the expulsion of the House of Stuart, and secured by the accession of that of Hanover, under which their title being founded in freedom, it is our own fault if we are not free.

I am, &c.

---

*Extract from the Principles of the late Changes,  
impartially examined.*

[*A letter which appeared in the news-papers of the 20th of July, 1765, pretending to give an account of the change of Administration which took place at that time—The removal of Mr. Grenville, and the appointment of Lord Rockingham, after Lord Temple and Mr. Pitt had refused; gave rise to this tract.*]

OUR Author, speaking with the dignity of the plural number, gives us what he calls

our

our best intelligence of the causes of the dismissal of the late Ministers, and the choice made of the present Ministry: and to those who know any thing of the facts to which only he can allude, particularly as to the alledged faults of the late Ministry, which is the key to the whole; this cannot appear to be a misrepresentation of his true meaning, whatever his words are. “The late Ministers wickedly rebelled against Lord Bute, who claims the merit of making them, and expected from them the homage and obedience due to a *Creator*: their insolence became insupportable; their behaviour was such as could no longer be suffered; their provocations must be got rid of at any rate; therefore they were dismissed instantaneously, (which by the by is a great story, for it was long before it could be got done.) Now you their successors, you have yourselves been great transgressors, in refusing submission: but you are *pardoned* and received into favour, not indeed for your own sakes, but as necessary instruments to chastise those whose crimes were beyond forgiveness; having been found the only set who would come in, without which they could not be turned out. However, have a care: if you return to your old tricks, or tread in your predecessors’ steps, mark the end that is before you; therefore grow wise by example; and if you would escape their fate,



fate, in whose place you are come, follow not their evil courses. If you do, there will be found those who will do justice upon you also, if they should be brought from all the ends of the earth : rather than want hands to execute the provoked vengeance, there will be taken stragglers from all Parties, that is the most worthless of all men : for *in such a case, I hope, (says our Writer,) even those very Parties, which often owe their strength to strange and unnatural connections, would not be so destitute of men of integrity and capacity, as to deprive the King of all means of forming a Ministry on true principles of Patriotism, and consequently perfectly agreeable and conformable to his own.*"

I have no doubt, the man means that it is the *Favourite*, who is to form such a glorious administration as he speaks of ; and upon what *principles* it will be done *by him*, we have already had sufficient proof : but from such poison as *his* Patriotism has appeared to be ;—from Ministers, whose *integrity* consists in conforming to *his* principles, defend us !

Such, I say, is the real language of this Writer, and it is indeed the language of truth. I know he says, *the late Ministers flew in the face of their Royal Master* ; but that is only his manner of speaking. The facts decide here. Was there ever greater zeal than the late Ministers manifested, for what they called

called the honour of the King, though a great part of the nation thought it was no ways concerned in the affair? And perhaps they could produce very good proof, that they did not at that time contradict the Royal pleasure. They brought a load upon themselves, by the violent prosecution of that cause, which had well nigh overfet them. But can any man specify an overt act of the late administration, that was ever so much as insinuated to be a ground for the charge of flying in the face of the King, or in which his mind was forced, till the business of the Regency Bill came in hand?

That, 'tis true, brought to light some part of the dark scenes, and gave a peep through the curtain. But before that time, the heads of the administration had been suspected of submitting to the influence of Lord Bute: they were called his deputies and delegates. Their defence against that accusation, often made, was that they abjured him; and had even *stipulated his removal* not only from the King's councils, but from his *residence*, when they undertook his service in their own persons. They stated themselves to be in *reality* what they were *officially*, the King's Ministers, and *responsible* as such: they found themselves at last obliged to say, and they did it publicly, that they thought it was as necessary as fit, in order to carry on the public business,



business, that those who had the charge of it should have their master's confidence; and that it was neither decent nor expedient, that great measures of government, highly interesting to the commonweal, should be concerted and planned without the participation of those who, by their offices, are answerable both for the propriety and the success of the King's counsels. They believed something more was due to them than just to be *called upon* to execute and carry through what others, to whom it did *not* belong, and with whom they had no communications, advised, and projected. Can any one deny this to be the language of sense, and reason, and the nature of the constitution?

If the manner in which the affair of the Regency was produced, the history of which is now no secret, gave these Ministers room to think the King's confidence was not where it ought to be, the event has justified their opinion. But what was their conduct on that occasion? They would not reject a salutary measure, because they were not the first advised with upon it; they adopted the scheme with all that duty that it became subjects, as well as servants, to receive the motions of the King's paternal care of his people and family: they even admitted a part of it, which, whoever advised, gave bad and hazardous counsel to the Crown; and they

they are hardly to be excused for yielding, I dare say against their opinion, to a deviation from the only compleat model upon record, of the most recent and respectable authority, in suffering a proposition to be made for an unexampled encroachment upon the most inherent, most fundamental, and most essential rights of Parliament, and a dangerous precedent for an addition to the pretensions of the Crown, by entrusting to the sole and secret nomination of the Prince upon the Throne (who may not always be so worthy of confidence as his present Majesty) the appointment of the person to exercise the regal authority for, it may be, not only a long minority, but an unhappy succession of them. Will this Writer himself say that, in this instance, the late Ministers *flew in the face of their Royal Master*?

Does he then mean that they did it, by an amendment that was made upon the first draught of the Bill, and was authorised by a message signed with the King's own hand, only to give the Princes of the blood a *certain* place in the council of Regency, as the great offices of State do to those who hold them? This, I can conceive to have been thought a flying in the face of the Favourite, who was thereby put to wait till a vacancy should happen in the number, before he could be *named* one of the Council.



But as the amendment was an indispensable act of justice and of duty to the Royal Family itself: so for the present disappointment it occasioned to Lord Bute, of a *primary object* of the bill as *first concerted*, perhaps to be a sort of eventual entail of power or influence; I believe the late Ministers may, with great safety, take their trial by their country.

If the Writer of the Letter thinks there yet remains to support his charge of *flying in the face of the King*, the other amendment made to obviate a doubt started concerning the extent of the Royal Family, in regard to the capacity of being Regent, he may please to recollect, that the doubt which forced the amendment, did not spring from any member of the administration, and though the Secretary of State who brought in the Bill, did afterwards propose the amendment, which was unanimously agreed to, he did it not till after he could have, and certainly had the communications, which were understood to be his authority for offering the alteration; nor even quite so soon as he might, after he had these: for so far was *he* from being precipitant, that our Letter-writer may have information from Lord Bute himself, that he, sitting in the house, pressed Lord Halifax to propose the limiting words a day before he did it, and

and for this reason did he press it, as he himself said, that it would make an end of the debate, and because he knew he *then* had the authority for doing it. There is surely therefore, as little ground for the charge in this article; and if the amendment was afterwards considered as disagreeable any where, and therefore caused to be amended, perhaps, with more of *indelicacy* than of true *respect* both to the King, and his family, the Ministers shewed themselves ready and zealous to enforce and make effectual the supposed compliment to his — because it was urged under that notion.

The annals of the late administration do not furnish another act which our Author can charge to his purpose, except the removal of Mr. Mackenzie, the brother; and of Lord Holland, the coadjutor, and trusty counsellor of the Favourite, unless it be that they agreed all to go out together, rather than any one of them to enlist under Lord Bute's banner: which I fancy the Writer of the Letter has an eye to, as one of these *strange and unnatural connections to which Parties often owe their strength.*

These removals, and especially Mr. Mackenzie's, I have admitted was *flying in the face of the Favourite*: it touched him in the apple of his eye, and was both the sign and the completion of *Rebellion* against him



him: the Ministers thereby declared open war against *that* influence, and avowed they did so. But when was this done? Not till after the storm of Lord Bute's vengeance had broke upon their heads for daring to deny their dependence upon, and presuming to renounce allegiance and subjection to him. They had got their dismissal, though the counsels of the secret advisers were so preposterous, that no provision was made for a succession of the Ministry.

The Minister, as his reward for concluding the business of the session, was to forward his own removal, by an adjournment of the Parliament, till an arrangement of successors could be settled. Their places were brought to market: but they bore no price: there were no bidders. Then they were called back, and, if what is generally said be true, at the very moment that a treaty was still going on with offers of the administration to others, not closed, but even continued after the recall. Thus saved, if it could be so called, only because none were then found to take their room, they once more took a fresh lease, as they had done, after the like negociation, in September 1763, and the sacrifice of Mr. Mackenzie, sealed the new bargain, which was insisted upon for the declared purposes that have been mentioned.

They

They went no farther, and it was going no great length; far from carrying things with a high hand, when the humiliation must have been enough almost to admit of any thing. It was a sort of a further trial to enforce the *pacta conventa* against the Favourite's influence, the infractions of which they had seen and felt.

This, to be sure, had the appearance of giving a blow to the Favourite: but the wounded serpent, from the instant, rallied his strength, and returned to the charge; and one moment was not lost, from the time of the apparent reconciliation and re-establishment of the old Ministry, till their total overthrow was accomplished. The interim was a perfect *sede vacante*, nothing done, nor indeed could be done in such a situation, except giving away some things that fell, by the disposition of which the Ministers could not but see the power was departed from them. So that it may be truly said, Mr. Mackenzie's removal was almost the last act of the late Ministry.

For this fact, clearly, they were executed, when their reprieve expired. Neither their public conduct, nor the private characters of any of them, had the least hand in their destruction: They did not die for violations of liberty; to expiate general warrants, seizure of papers, restrictions of the



the *Privilege*, and *security* of *Parliament*; restraint on the *Freedom* of the *Press*, rigorous crown prosecutions; informations for *constructive contempts*; *essoins*, *privilege*, and other *obstructions* to the *course* of *justice*. These, with all their attendants and consequences, whether justly or unjustly laid at their door, does not matter to the present purpose, were blasts which they had weathered: and they could not with any reason come as charges, at least from the grand enemy.

It was not their *unpopularity*, nor *Canada Bills*, the *Manilla ransom*, the *Demolition of Dunkirk*, encroachments in the *fishing* of *Newfoundland*, or disturbances in the settlements on the coast of *Africa*, nothing of the *foreign system*, or *domestic management* of affairs, that hastened these Ministers to their end. They were not offered up to the *complaints*, the *cries*, nor the *wishes* of the *people*. Neither were they victims to the resentment of *foreign courts*, as sometimes has been the fate of Ministers: for the Ministers resident here, from those powers, whose aversion would not be a bad rule for our choice, were foolish enough at the time openly to speak out their apprehensions of a change, declaring, in a manner as insolent as indecent, but that should indeed give us a lesson, if we had ears to hear, that

that their courts would consider the re-instating of Mr. P. as little short of a declaration of war, and would prepare themselves accordingly.

The late administration had not failed in what is commonly called the King's service: one session was got over after another; a great and growing majority; deserters daily coming in; following the *loaves* and the *fishes*: and opposition dwindled into nothing, by the impatience, unsteadiness and incapacity of its rotten part.

If this be a true state of the case, and in truth it is, let any sound thinking person only ask his own mind, what reflections it presents to him? What comfort does a change of administration for such a cause, under such circumstances, and by such instruments, minister to the people of England? Can it give any satisfaction even to those who most wished for a change of Ministry? Men long to see government once more resume its wonted stability and dignity: even the foolish thirst of novelty has almost been satiated, we have had so many changes: I believe the seals have one way or other shifted hands eight or ten times within these two or three years. But at this rate nothing can be permanent.

There was a wish for a change of the Ministry: but a change on such a principle



as this has been made is only more to be regretted, than the continuance of the thing, that was itself disliked. Parties produce changes, and we expect them as the natural effect of a natural cause; nor do we desire to be without parties to occasion changes. I do not mean parties in *principle*, which are distress and ruin; but parties in *opinion*, in friendships, connections, and attachments. Parties of that sort are but ventilators to fan the constitution, and purify administration. They overturn one another by superiority of strength, excellence of system, or advantage in abilities: and while these things hold the balance of power, opposition will itself be a means of safety, and an instrument of the public good. The contest must both regulate and estimate the contenders: and the rise and fall of Ministers, in such a case, will most probably be for the true interest of the nation, as those will prevail who have the most influence, that is, stand best by their country, are ablest to serve her, and adopt the most approved measures.

But when a *Favourite* lords it over every thing, all Parties are lost in the vortex of his power, all alike debased and sunk. Nothing can shine but from the reflection of his favour: sycophants and parasites only ascend: all contention is occupied in studying his will, and courting his smiles. He chooses

chooses those who will best serve *him*: and instead of actors, we have puppets: the Ministers of the Crown are the slaves of a minion; obedience to whom is the only test of fitness, and suppleness the best qualification for employment. This we have seen fully verified before our eyes.

The fall of the late Ministry, proves what it was that made them stand so long against all the external shocks they suffered; it shews what will make any *other* undergo the same fate that they, at last, did. They lived by permission, and were extinguished by a puff of the same breath that gave them existence.

The best administration has less security against this *invisible power* than the worst; and there can be no good one that will not sin after the similitude of that offence which proved mortal to the last. This secret lever will move the strongest building that does not rest upon the odious foundation of *Favouritism*. In September 1763, one shake was given; but as there might then be hopes, the judgment was suspended, to try the fruits of that severe admonition to repentance: in May 1765, the stroke was more violent, because the iniquity was by that time come to a desperate height: and last of all, the measure being full, the execution of the sentence of excision could no longer be delayed.



There are Ministers whose energy the nation has experienced, and to them their confidence is attached. They desire to see the glorious names restored, that can give weight to our counsels, and force to our treaties: whose credit will engage the alliances of our friends, and their terror awe the dispositions of our enemies. These might preserve peace abroad, and bring back domestic tranquillity; settle things upon a sound bottom, and improve the state of quiet, to make provision for the evil day, when the clouds that are always gathering may chance to break. The remonstrances and representations of such Ministers would not need to be often repeated in any court in Europe. But while their inflexibility, and the Favourite's power continues, our hopes are cut off.

One might naturally enough ask here, what guarantee the present Ministers have got? Have they gone to the only office there is to ensure them? Or do they take the risk upon themselves?

This Writer tells us, those, now in the great posts of the kingdom, owe their preferment to Lord Temple's declining, and to the Duke of B—d's continuing in such a behaviour, as no private man could have suffered in any one of his inferiors.

So far I must agree with this Writer, <sup>that</sup> the

the choice of the new Ministry was *involuntary*. Certainly others refused before they had it in their power to accept. Even they themselves, we are (to speak in our author's style) *assured*, did refuse only thrice before they accepted: not indeed, it may be believed from any reluctance to batten upon the good things of government, but from a consciousness, that in these circumstances, it was likely to turn as little to their own account, as it seemed to be for any good purpose to the publick.

So often, if what is said be true, and it has not been denied, did the new Ministers decline; and, as it is added, they very earnestly pressed the first recusants to serve under the Favourite's undeniable lieutenant, who was originally held out as the general under whom they were to enlist. A better proof could not be given, that they only desired to profit of greater strength than their own, to secure a portion of office to themselves.

These things are by no means new. It is rarely we see men great enough to decline the employments of the State, when the means are not left of serving their country. But more commonly we find people out of office, only because they cannot by any means get into it: and *these* are always ready to run into Court on the first opening of the door; leaving behind them all they profess,



profest, when without, that they may be the more nimble for their new service. This was remarkably the case three and twenty years ago—[1742]—and has been often since, upon similar occasions. It is therefore no wonder it should be so now. It will always be the same, with the same persons, as long as they live, and with all of a like sort. The only maxim many are governed by, is to follow the carcase, as *all ravens* do. Weather-cocks and *stop-gaps*, even to a nick-name, are ever at hand: and the example of the old teaches the young:

*Sic placet. An melius quis habet suadere? secunda  
 — Ratem occupare quid moramur alite?*

Thus has an eagerness to *have* overcome the fears of *taking*, and the suspicions of not *being able to hold*: and thus we have got a Ministry *in spite of itself*, if I may borrow the words of the Letter: *a new Ministry* begot by the Favourite's resentment against the *old*, upon the *hunger* of their successors; and by many yet thought to be little better than *still-born*. It is however, the *form* of a Ministry, or will be, if it gets time to be compleated. How the *Promethean* fire is to be brought down from heaven to animate it, I know not.

Our complaint against the new Ministers is not for what they have done, but that nothing has ever been done by them, to  
 give

give us room to expect any thing from them; and that they have undertaken what they confess they are not able to do. At this rate, we may take half a dozen grenadiers out of the guards, and make Ministers of them, and with this sort of language amuse the people, till the nation is undone.

The tone was the same when Lord Bute took the lead, with his *chosen* Chancellor of the Exchequer. Give him but a trial; do not judge him before he has done good or evil. We have seen, and shall ever have reason to lament the effects of that *blessed* administration. But there is this difference too between the two cases: those who were hired to trumpet Lord Bute's praises, cried him up as a man of incomparable (though they were then unknown) abilities. He had formed the King, and none fitter to govern the State. These people are so much the more wonderful in their excess of folly, that they confess, and proclaim their own ability. They bear witness against themselves, and their witness must be true: out of their own mouths they are condemned.

Did they not refuse the administration over and over again, because they owned they were not equal to the charge? Whence got they their new light? Their language ever since they came into office, is a wish that Lord Temple and Mr. Pitt would relieve



relieve them of the weight they cannot sustain.

We have seen in our own day, the likest thing to an interregnum in administration, an absolute blank in the Ministry, the King keeper of his own Seals for three months: but as it was a singular incident, and marked a very extraordinary situation of affairs, so it produced indeed marvellous effects—an administration of unparalleled harmony, and the most firm and glorious that ever existed; the fame of which will resound to the latest ages, as long as there remains a faithful page of history to record its illustrious acts. There was at least as little hazard of late, as at the period alluded to, if an unaccountable fatality had again driven us to so uncommon a chasm. The wound would soon have closed, without leaving a scar where the shaft passed; and the consequences might have been desirable and happy, as in the former instance.

An ignorant or unskilful steersman cannot be less perilous, and will probably be more destructive, than the want of one altogether. Of the first the event shall tell: the last needed not at all to have been the case, and would not have been it long; though these generous-hearted gentlemen had not flown so hastily to the rudder. Little was required of them; it was only to let it alone; the fittest thing, at any rate, for them to have done. Had they been

been wise enough to have taken that part, it needs no divination to say, and it may without any doubt be affirmed, what would have happened. The malady would soon have worked its own cure: all obstacles would have been effectually removed; and an administration settled upon a sound bottom, satisfactory to the people, and for the real benefit of the nation.

We know the Cabinet has been poisoned with Lord Bute's system; and that this has been one of the great obstacles in the way of getting back to the public service, those Ministers to whom the eyes of all England look. Indeed the system was taken up, as the best method of expelling them, in order to compass Lord Bute's great object, of engrossing the whole power of this country into his own hands: and difficult as it might have appeared to be, to fall upon a system that could have inverted the state of this country, in the midst of the unanimity and success, in which Lord Bute found us, when he first came upon the political stage, he was wonderfully successful in his attempt, to get possession of the reins of government.

*For that* Lord Temple and Mr. Pitt were forced from the King's counsels, by an advice of which the declaration of war against Spain was a most ample vindication, though it was a laboured apology for opposing it. *For that* the



the Duke of Newcastle, after having been induced to concur in chasing away Mr. Pitt, was himself dismissed with ignominy, to leave in sole possession the Favourite, whom his Grace had thought fit, *by an act of his own*, to bring into a ministerial office, to counterbalance the weight of Mr. Pitt. *For that* we got a *glorious* peace, and *bought* from *ourselves* an approbation of it, *because* we were not able to carry on a war, the successes of which had almost made an end of its expence. *For that* we dissolved our natural alliances abroad, and renounced all connections with the common cause of Liberty, and the independency of Europe, *because* we are powerful enough to stand alone, against the most formidable union we ever saw of our enemies. *For that* a door was opened without distinction at home to all the enemies of the K—'s family, *because* that was the only way to root out Jacobitism, and to introduce into places, those who seemed to think the administration of a Stuart, to which their *new* loyalty was confined, was the next thing to a reign of that name. *And with all these* Lord Bute might, for ought I know, have yet been the Minister *himself*, if his want of courage had not done more for us than our own virtue.

ORIGIN

## ORIGIN OF HEREDITARY NOBILITY.

THE celebrated civilian, Francis Hotoman, who was one of the most learned men of his age, gives us the cause of making hereditary the order of Nobility in France. In his work, entitled *Franco-Gallia*, which is now very scarce, written in the year 1574, he says,——

“ We must not omit making mention of  
 “ the *cunning device* made use of by Hugh  
 “ Capet, for establishing himself in his new  
 “ dominion.—[Of King of France, *anno* 987.]  
 “ For, whereas, all the magistracies and  
 “ honours of the kingdom, such as Dukedoms,  
 “ Earldoms, &c. had been *hitherto*, from  
 “ antient times, conferred upon *select* and  
 “ *deserving* persons in the general conventions  
 “ of the people, and were held *only during*  
 “ *good behaviour* ; whereof (as the lawyers  
 “ exprefs it) they were but *beneficiaries* :  
 “ Hugh Capet, in order to secure to himself  
 “ the affections of the great men, was the  
 “ *first* that made those honours *perpetual* ;  
 “ which were formerly but *temporary* : and  
 “ ordained, that such as obtained them should  
 “ have an *hereditary* right in them, and might  
 “ leave them to their children.—Of this, see

“ Franciscus



“Franciscus Conanus, the civilian, comment  
“ii. chap. ix.”

It is singular, that this fact has escaped the notice of most of the French historians.

---

*Account of the Duel between Mr. WHATELY  
and Mr. TEMPLE.*

*From the Public Advertiser, of September 4, 1773.*

AS Mr. George Whately, the banker, has hitherto declined discovering how the letters of Messrs. Hutchinson and Oliver, Governor and Lieutenant-Governor of New England, were obtained by the Boston faction, (by which his conduct appears highly problematical, if he is innocent,) permit me to communicate, through the channel of your paper, the story he circulates in private, although he chuses, for reasons best known to himself, to withhold it from the public.

Mr. Secretary Whately died in June, 1772. In the October following, a native of Boston, resident in London, not a hundred miles from Great George-street, applied to Mr. George Whately for some letters he had formerly written from America to his deceased brother. The banker immediately produced several parcels, containing letters from different American gentlemen, particularly Messrs. Hutchinson

Hutchinson and Oliver. The wily Bostonian, who is an inveterate enemy to the above gentlemen (a circumstance then unknown to Mr. Whately) next asked his permission to peruse their letters, to which Mr. Whately, not suspecting any harm, readily consented. The Bostonian was then left in the room alone until he had satisfied his curiosity. Mr. Whately does not charge this Bostonian with having conveyed away any of the above letters, but he absolutely avers that no other person had access to them from the time of his brother's death to this instant. When therefore this Bostonian's *character*, as well as *former* conduct in life, his *inveteracy* to the letter writers, as well as his *close connection* with some of the leading men in opposition at Boston, are fully considered, I believe that no one will be at a loss to unravel this mysterious affair.

---

*From the same of November 25, 1773.*

To Messrs. BERNARD, KNOX and MAUDUIT.

GENTLEMEN,

**H**AD I not been in the country, the refutation of your joint performance would have appeared sooner. Though I was not the  
immediate



immediate instrument of bringing to light those letters which have opened a scene of villany almost incredible, yet I am so particularly acquainted with that transaction as to affirm, you have falsely and wickedly adduced Mr. Whately's authority, to charge it upon some gentleman living in or near Great George-street. Why you should fix upon a gentleman there particularly, I cannot conceive, unless it be that such a gentleman had the honour of detecting the malefactions of the corrupt Bernard, and bringing him to shame.

To put you to silence at once I affirm, that the letters which were sent to Boston, have not since his brother's death been in the possession of Mr. Whately, the banker, whom you ignorantly call *George*. Let him contradict me if my assertion be untrue.

If it would answer any public purpose, the gentleman, who really procured those letters, and whom, with all your little low united cunning you will never discover, would not hesitate to declare himself. At present he is content to enjoy in concealment the approbation of all good men, for having discovered the wicked authors of those incendiary informations which threatened the destruction of both countries. The subtle spies, the secret traitors stand now confessed; and the mercenary motives of their conduct are manifest. The Americans  
are

are fully satisfied, that the severe measures of this country arose from these misinformations, which, joined with a conviction of our having been imposed upon, has produced a mutual turn to reconciliation. These are the happy consequences of the detection of those letters; consequences which *you*, who have laboured equally with their wicked authors, *to arm the parent hand against the child*, most cordially lament.

The natural union will now be restored—England will return to her old good-humour, America to her former reverence and affection, commerce will again flourish, and we shall stand together the bulwark of religion and liberty against the world in arms. The Bernards and the Hutchinsons will be the propitious sacrifices to seal this union, and render it immortal.

To you, Gentlemen, these events are as hateful in prospect as they will be fatal in reality. You live only in the unnatural contention between the two countries. Your interests therefore, as much as your malignities, prompt you to stir it up; and to pursue those with unremitting rancour who endeavour to compose it.

Were it possible your industry could point out the man who really furnished to America those letters, from which such benefits will happily flow, it would serve only to fix the gratitude



gratitude of the public upon its proper object. The public would erect a monument to him, borne upon the servile heads of Bernard, Hutchinson, Oliver, and Knox. It would thus stand as a perpetual memorial, that his reputation was raised upon the baseness and turpitude of the common enemies to England and America.

A MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT.

---

*To the GENTLEMAN who signs* A MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT.

AS the Gentlemen, whom your Membership has thought fit to honour with your correspondence in the Public Advertiser of November 25, do not seem to think your composition worthy of an answer, I presume, from some knowledge I have of the matters on which you found your epistle, to address you.

You pretend indeed not to be "the immediate instrument," but only privy to it. But, say you, that privacy enables you to affirm that these letters were never in Mr. Whately's hands since his brother's death. Mr. Whately cannot positively disprove your assertion, for you know the very nature of the transaction precludes any positive evidence. Such evidence, however,

as the matter will bear, Mr. Whately has given in the following account, which, to the best of my recollection, corresponds in every material circumstance with the account which Mr. Whately's candour and politeness has induced him to repeat to such Gentlemen as have applied for information how these letters came to be published.

‘ Some time after the late Mr. Whately’s death, Mr. John Temple applied to Mr. Whately the Banker, telling him that he was a correspondent of his late brother, and has he had in the course of the correspondence expressed his opinion upon several regulations proposed in America, he wished to peruse them again, as he expected to be called upon by the Ministry to give his sentiments upon that subject. Mr. Whately brought into the room a large file, indorsed *American Letters*, and gave them into Mr. John Temple’s hands to look over, who said, “ I see here are letters from Governor Hutchinson and Mr. Oliver, and should be glad to see what they have wrote upon the same subject.” Mr. Whately gave permission, and being presently after called out of the room, left Mr. John Temple perusing the letters. After a short time, Mr. Whately returned into the room, when Mr. Temple thanked him for his politeness, and went away.’



Mr. Whately has also said, that no man but Mr. John Temple has had any access to this file of letters since his brother's death. I mean only to relate a plain story, and whether it is to be supposed that any of these letters have been taken out of the file or no, or whatever other consequences may be deduced from it, I leave to your Membership and the reader.

*New-England Coffee-house,* ANTENOR.  
Nov. 29, 1773.

TEMPLE

---

*From the* PUBLIC ADVERTISER.

HAVING read in your paper of this day an imputation upon my character under the signature of ANTENOR, I called on Mr. Whately the Banker, whose name is mentioned, to know whether he had authorised that charge, or avowed the truth of the pretended facts on which it is founded. Mr. Whately totally disclaimed them, and denied that he had authorised any person to use his name, or knew the writer. I then read to him the state of facts relative to me in the said paper; all of which he acknowledged were false, except that, about a year ago, he gave me some letters of my own, written to his late brother when  
Secretary.

Secretary to the Treasury; and that we had *together* read some other letters from Gentlemen in America, but none of those lately published of Messrs. Hutchinson, Oliver, Paxton, &c. which Mr. Whately assured me he had never seen till they appeared in print.

Anonymous attacks are not to be regarded; but if no notice were taken of them when names are mentioned, *concealed villains* might in some measure answer their infamous purposes.

Great George-Street,

J. TEMPLE.

Dec. 8, 1773.

---

*From the Same.*

I HAVE hitherto declined publishing any thing relating to the letters of Governor Hutchinson, Mr. Oliver and others to my late brother, and my intention was not to interfere in print on the subject, nor have I been privy to, or know the authors of any of the paragraphs or letters that have found their way into the papers on the occasion; but Mr. Temple by his publication of this day appears to me to make me a party in such a manner as calls upon me to state the proceeding between us, lest my silence should be construed as an assent to that publication.



publication. Mr. Temple began the conversation that passed between us yesterday by asking if I was privy to the letter under the signature of ANTENOR? I assured him I was not, nor did I in the least know the author. He proceeded to point out several particulars in the state of facts as contained in that letter, and to which he objected; such as his declining to re-peruse his correspondence with my brother, as having therein expressed his opinion upon several regulations proposed in America, and being expected to be called upon by the Ministry to give his sentiments upon that subject; whereas one particular letter from himself, with a paper annexed to it, was the object of his search; nor did he assign as his motive his expectation of being called upon by the Ministry to give his sentiments on any subject, and that the letters produced to him by me were said to be on a large file; whereas they were contained in several parcels; and that after a short time of absence, upon my returning into the room, Mr. Temple is said to have thanked me for my politeness, and to have gone away; whereas he stayed and dined with me. To these observations, on the part of Mr. Temple, I was far from making any objections; and that every one may form such judgment as may be thought proper, I beg  
leave

leave to relate every transaction between Mr. Temple and myself material to the present point.

Some time about the month of October in the last year Mr. Temple applied to me, and informed me that he wanted particularly to see a paper relating to the colonies he had formerly transmitted to my brother, with a letter from himself accompanying it, and that he believed some of the letters of Governor Hutchinson, Mr. Oliver, and others of my brother's friends in America, might probably afford some light into the object of his inquiry. Unknown almost as Mr. Temple was personally to me, I deemed the friendship my brother had constantly shewn him intitled him to every assistance in my power for the purpose desired, and I therefore made no scruple to place that confidence in him as to lay before him, and occasionally during his visit to leave with him several parcels of letters from my late brother's correspondents in America, in the exact state in which they had come into my possession; some regularly sorted, and some promiscuously tied together; and among them were several from Mr. Temple himself and his brother, and from Governor Hutchinson, Mr. Oliver, and others; and during the intervals that I was in the room with Mr. Temple, we did together cast our  
eyes



eyes on one or two letters of Governor Hutchinson, and I believe one or two other correspondents of my late brother. In July last I received information from Mr. Oliver of Boston, that several letters to my late brother had been laid before the Assembly of the province; upon which I waited upon Mr. Temple, and told him I thought myself intitled to call upon him to join his name with mine in asserting the integrity and honour of both of us; that he and he only had ever had access to any of the letters of my brother's correspondents in America, and that I was called upon to account for the appearance of the letters in question. Mr. Temple assured me in terms the most precise, that (except some letters from himself and his brother, which he had from me by my permission), he had not taken a single letter, or an extract from any I had communicated to him. I saw him twice afterwards on the same subject, and the same assurances were invariably repeated by him, and confirmed by him in the most solemn manner.

The facts as above stated with respect to Mr. Temple's perusal of my brother's letters I have related freely to whoever applied to me for information, and given every body authority to quote me on the occasion; and I have as freely repeated the assertions and assurances Mr. Temple has constantly given  
me

me with respect to himself; and there the matter at present rests. As to the publication under the signature of ANTECOR, I know not who is the author, I shall only observe, that it does state "that I did produce to, and leave with, Mr. Temple several letters to my brother from Governor Hutchinson, Mr. Oliver, and others of my brother's correspondents in America." That is a truth. The other circumstances, to which Mr. Temple objected, are, strictly speaking, liable to such objections; but I aver that I never did acknowledge that the state of facts relative to Mr. Temple in that paper are all false, except his having from me some letters of his own, and our having read together some other letters from Gentlemen in America.

*Lombard-street,* WM. WHATELY.

9 Dec. 1773.

---

*From the PUBLIC ADVERTISER.*

*Great George-street, 18 Dec. 1773.*

WHEN the malice of my enemies, by falsely impeaching my character, had put me to the hazard of my life, I flattered myself it would have rested silent and satisfied: But as I understand they are still busy with my reputation, and are endeavouring



vouring by a thousand misrepresentations to destroy that good name, which to me is inestimable, I am compelled to trouble the public with a detail of those circumstances which obliged me to appeal to the sword. I hope to shew that my conduct in so doing was proper, as far as complying with a custom, the tyranny of which, I confess, I have not fortitude to resist, can be justified.

It is with infinite regret I find myself obliged to mention Mr. Whately, and that sometimes in terms of censure. The part he took in the question made me feel myself aggrieved by him. He answered me in the field like a man of spirit and a gentleman. It is with pleasure I do this justice to his character.

When Mr. Whately was apprized of some original letters from Gentlemen in America to his late brother, having been sent over, and made public at Boston, he called upon me, read part of a letter from Mr. Oliver, complaining of the publication of his letters, and mentioned that he had given me access to some of his brother's letters from his correspondents in America. He accompanied this with a declaration, that he had not the least suspicion of me, and did not know that those published letters were ever in his possession; but he wished I would authorise him to say I had them  
not

not from him. I gave Mr. Whately every assurance that a Gentleman could give, that I had not taken any one letter, nor a line of one, from among those he shewed to me, but such as he saw and gave me leave to take, and which were all written by my brother and myself. I did this repeatedly, and in the most explicit terms. Mr. Whately appeared perfectly satisfied; and I own, I did not expect he would have mentioned that transaction again in any manner that could throw a possibility of suspicion on my character. For in my apprehension, when a Gentleman has pledged his honour to another, to insinuate, or countenance a suspicion of him afterwards, leads inevitably to the consequences which have attended this transaction. Some time after this explanation between Mr. Whately and myself, several paragraphs appeared in the Newspapers highly injurious and dishonourable to me. I was held forth as a monster of ingratitude, and as a villain, who, under the cover of friendship, watched for an opportunity when Mr. Whately's back was turned, to rob him of papers which were in confidence put into my hands. Of these things I took no public notice, not because they gave me no uneasiness, but because I knew not how to redress myself. A search after the authors of them I conceived would  
be



be vain. Such malevolent attacks could have been made by none but cowards, who would take care to conceal themselves. It seemed impossible that Mr. Whately could have had any knowledge of the authors, or could have given any countenance to such aspersions, after the solemn assurances which I had given him; nor should I have troubled him on the subject if his name had not been used as an authority to support these false and malicious assertions. These writers artfully suppressed three very material circumstances in their representations; that Mr. Whately did not know the letters sent to Boston were ever in his possession; that of those which he put into my hands none appeared to be missing, which could not have been the case if seventeen letters, and some of them very long, had been taken away; and that I had given him every assurance, which a Gentleman could require or receive, that no such letters had been taken by me. Without the use of Mr. Whately's name, the charge would have had no effect upon the public. That Gentleman suffered the unfair and injurious representations, under the sanction of his name, to pass unexplained. I did expect when he saw the purpose to which the men who gained intelligence from him were applying it, that he would in justice to truth,

truth, and to me, have stated the whole as above. If he had done so, I appeal to the judgment of the public, whether any suspicion would have rested upon me, or any serious consequences followed. I did not ask this of him, because I thought he ought to have done it unasked. There is an indelicacy in urging a Gentleman to do that which is his duty, and owes its merit to its being voluntary. The suspicion against me upon so unfair a state of facts, aided, I suppose, by the private slanders of those who raised it, secretly gained ground; and on the 8th of this month a writer, under the signature of ANTENOR, renewed the accusation of me by name, vouching it with a conversation which he seems to have himself held upon the subject with Mr. Whately.

Under so direct a charge, I thought it would not become me to be any longer silent. I went with the paper to Mr. Whately, and received from him, as I imagined, a satisfactory denial of those pretended facts which materially supported the suspicion. This I made public: Mr. Whately then came forward with his name. He omitted to state what was solely essential, that he did not know the letters in question were among those he put into my hands, and that none of those with which he  
had



had entrusted me appeared to be missing; but related the matter in such a manner as strongly to corroborate the anonymous charge, and gave me, to my understanding, the lie direct. They who have any feelings of honour will not wonder that I was impatient under such an imputation, and thought every moment miserable till I had called upon him, from whom I received such an affront, for honourable amends. The Public is acquainted with the sequel: But the circumstances of that affair have been so falsely represented to my dishonour, that I am obliged to beg a moment's indulgence till I state that transaction fairly.

The Gentleman who waited upon Mr. Whately with my invitation, told him he would attend me as a second if Mr. Whately would have one on his part. Mr. Whately declined having any second, and therefore I brought none. He appeared at the place appointed with a sword only. I gave him one of my pistols. We discharged them mutually; mine being, at his request, the first, without effect. If his was not directed at me, it escaped my observation. I then drew my sword, and approached him, who had also unsheathed his, with a persuasion, grounded on his coming with a sword only, when the choice of weapons was in him, that I was to encounter an adversary much  
superiour

superiour to myself in skill. I soon found my mistake; and, as far as I could reason in such a situation, determined, by wounding him in the sword arm, to end the business without a fatal stroke. But my skill was not equal to my intention; it soon became a struggle, instead of a regular combat, and I could only avoid making a full lunge, which probably would have wounded him mortally. The contortions of my antagonist's body, during the struggle, exposed parts, which in a regular encounter could never have been touched. When he turned himself to seize the blade of my sword with his left-hand, I supposed he received the wounds in his left-side; and in some violent effort his shoulder must have been exposed. The extreme smallness of the wound in that part being, as I am well informed, a mere puncture, proves it to have been accidental. Had my purpose been unfair, I should have taken the life that was in my power; had it been mortal, every wound would not have been superficial, and one only dangerous, not from its depth, but its direction. I understand it has been said he was down. In such circumstances it is as impossible to account for every thing that happens, as to remember every thing that passes. But of this I am very sure, that though he slipped once, he never fell.

It



It is proper to apprise the reader, that I am unfortunately very deaf. If any words of accommodation, as has been represented, were really used by Mr. Whately, I did not hear them. They who expect coolness in the midst of such a conflict, and deliberation in the moment of a deadly point being at one's breast, require too much. It is well that the passion, which rises fast on such an occasion, did not alter imperceptibly my general determination not to push to forcibly as to make a deep wound. It is with confidence I can affirm, I was not guilty of any unfair action, because I never had an unfair thought—nor of a cruel one, because my purpose was the reverse.

I have received no bodily wound; but they whose minds can feel for consequences, which they could not with honour avoid, will understand me when I say, that I have felt those wounds which far surpass in anguish every bodily pain.

The anonymous assassins, who have been really the cause of this mischief, remain unknown; but time, I trust, will drag them forth to the punishment they deserve.

Of those to whom I am unknown, the candid and honourable are, I hope, convinced, that the injurious charges which have been brought against me are totally  
without

without foundation—With those to whom I am known, I flatter myself the constant tenour of my life has rendered a defence of my conduct unnecessary.

I have but a few words more to say upon the subject.—As Mr. Whately's narrative tends to confirm the suspicion of my having taken from him the letters which were sent to Boston, I do again most solemnly affirm, that I neither took from him those, nor any other letters, but such as were written by my brother and myself to the late Mr. Whately, and that with his knowledge and consent; nor had I any concern, directly or indirectly, in procuring or transmitting the letters which were sent to Boston.

J. TEMPLE.

---

*To the Printer of the Public Advertiser.*

SIR,

FINDING that two gentlemen have been unfortunately engaged in a duel about a transaction, and its circumstances, of which both of them are totally ignorant and innocent, I think it incumbent on me to declare, (for the prevention of farther mischief, as far as such a declaration may contribute to prevent it,) that I alone am the person who obtained  
and



and transmitted to Boston the letters in question. Mr. W. could not communicate them, because they were never in his possession; and, for the same reason, they could not be taken from him by Mr. T. They were not of the nature of *private letters between friends*: they were written by public officers to persons in public stations, on public affairs, and intended to procure public measures; they were therefore handed to other public persons who might be influenced by them to produce those measures: their tendency was to incense the Mother Country against her Colonies, and, by the steps recommended, to widen the breach, which they effected. The chief caution expressed with regard to privacy was, to keep their contents from the Colony Agents, who the writers apprehended might return them, or copies of them, to America. That apprehension was, it seems, well founded; for the first Agent who laid his hands on them thought it his duty to transmit them to his constituents.

B. FRANKLIN, *Agent for the House of Representatives of the Massachusetts-Bay.*

*Craven-street, Dec. 25, 1773.*

From

*From the PUBLIC ADVERTISER.*

*Cheam, 7th January, 1774.*

IT is with great reluctance on my part that I am again called forth into print by Mr. Temple; but the letters I now lay before the Public, render it impossible for me to remain silent. The following letter from Mr. Temple to me of the 28th of December was transmitted to me at this place the day following:

SIR,

THERE are some most villanous reports propagated against me. Your confinement, I suppose, must have prevented their reaching your ears. It is said that you fell upon the ground, and when in that situation, unable to defend yourself, that I stabbed you in the back, and in several other parts of your body. These stories you know to be false: You therefore are the proper person to remove the impressions which they have made on the Public. I ask no favour of you: my conduct requires none. The state of your health has hitherto prevented my making any application to you. As I am informed by your surgeon that you are now much better, I can no longer, in justice to myself, postpone it. What I have to desire of you is, that you



will inform the Public whether I did or did not in every respect behave to you like a Gentleman, and a man of honour.

I am, Sir,

Your most humble servant,

*Great George-street,*

J. TEMPLE.

28th Dec. 1773.

To WILLIAM WHATELY, Esq.

I desired my brother to return the following answer before I had seen Mr. Temple's publication, dated the 18th, but given to the Public the 30th of December.

SIR,

*December 29th, 1773.*

MY brother this day received your letter of the 28th December, in which you require him to inform the Public whether you did or did not in every respect behave to him like a Gentleman, and a man of honour. If on a cooler consideration you should inform me that you still persist in your desire, and mean to compel him to lay the affair before the Public, I am to assure you, that as soon as his health is sufficiently re-established, he cannot on his own account have any objection. At present he is at his surgeon's house in the country, and in too weak a state to attend to this, or any other business.

I am, your most humble servant,

JOSEPH WHATELY.

P. S.

P. S. A letter may probably come to my hand the sooner for being directed to me at my brother's in Lombard-street.

Mr. Temple's answer to my brother was as follows :

SIR, *Great George-street, 31st Dec. 1773.*

I REQUIRED that justice from your brother which one Gentleman has a right to expect from another. You have answered me with an insulting letter. Had your brother, when he saw my character attacked by a set of anonymous assassins, under the sanction of his name, stated to the Public the whole truth concerning me, neither my reputation would have suffered, nor should we have been forced into a personal contest. If he chooses to pursue the same conduct relative to the new falsehoods which have been with the most wicked industry circulated to my dishonour, the censure of it must rest upon him. As to compelling him to a publication, it is my wish that he should be under no compulsion, but that of a true sense of what is just and honourable. You speak of cooler consideration on what I have requested. Sir, upon the coolest consideration I repeat, that I ask no favour of him. I expected justice: He has denied it, conscious of my innocence. I therefore now set him at defiance, and am ready to meet his appeal to the Public whenever he pleases,



pleases, firmly relying upon that justice from them which he has thought proper to deny.

I am, Sir, Your most humble servant,  
J. TEMPLE.

Your letter was not left at my house till late last night, or it should have been sooner answered.

This letter makes it a matter of necessity with me minutely to relate the whole transaction.

It was about one o'clock on Saturday the 11th of December, that Mr. Izard called upon me in Lombard-street, and informed me that he waited on me on a very disagreeable affair relating to his friend Mr. Temple. He then produced the Newspaper containing my publication, and pointing out these words "that is a truth," informed me that that assertion was the part to which Mr. Temple objected and denied, and which he insisted on my retracting. I think I need scarce add that this was refused on my part; upon which Mr. Izard delivered me the letter containing Mr. Temple's challenge, and appointing the meeting to be at four o'clock that afternoon at the Ring in Hyde-Park. Upon my giving my answer into Mr. Izard's hands, he asked if I proposed having any friend to accompany me; and on my informing him I never chose to involve others

others in my own difficulties, we parted. I cannot help observing in this place, and whoever refers to the words of my former publication must agree with me, that I deemed myself called forth by Mr. Temple not for any representation given by me of our last conversation, but for an assertion originally and freely made by me from the beginning, and invariably continued, and which contained a fact I must necessarily (viewing the affair in any light) most sincerely wish had never happened, and which therefore nothing but a sense of truth could have induced me to declare. Unskilled, and altogether unpractised, as I make no scruple to declare myself in the use of arms, and the shortness of the time not admitting of any purposed preparation, I provided myself with the only weapon I had at hand, which is the reason, and the only reason, that I appeared on the spot with the sword only. Upon Mr. Temple's expressing himself that he presumed I had pistols about me, I told him I had not: but that if he was provided with fire arms, I was willing to share his arms with him; and upon his fixing upon the spot, he delivered to me one of his pistols, and bid me take my distance. I retired a small space, and desired to receive his fire, which he gave me without effect. I then pointed my pistol in a line with my antagonist's



antagonist's body, but purposely raised considerably above his head. Mr. Temple then drew his sword; I did the same. He soon took occasion to observe to me, that he perceived I was no swordsman, which I readily confessed. Early in the contest he seized my sword with his left hand, and bid me ask my life. I peremptorily refused, and a slight effort disengaged us. I very soon had him at the same advantage. I had his sword secured in my left hand, and my own sword at liberty; when I bid him not to ask his life, but to take it unasked. We were again disengaged, and soon I once more availed myself of another opportunity to seize his sword, and again I bid him take his life unasked. He proceeded on each of these occasions as not hearing me, at least he made no reply. I am far from unwilling to make allowance for the infirmity of my opponent. After this I made no further effort to seize his sword, but continued to act on the defensive only, though on several occasions many parts of his body appeared to my judgment to be unguarded, and, with security to myself, open to my attack. My conduct was so obviously defensive, that it was even noticed by Mr. Temple, to whom I made no other reply, than that I should defend my life. The contest continued; the countenance of my antagonist still sometimes bearing

bearing strongly the marks of passion and rage. It was, I presume, under some such unhappy, ungovernable influence, that late in the affair, and not long before we were parted, he declared he would put me to death. But in this part of my narrative let me add, that he never appeared to me to make any long lunge at me. One or two horsemen and some persons on foot were soon afterwards at no great distance, and making up to us, and my foot, in retreating, happening to slip, I fell first on my sword hand, and then on my left hand; and before I could recover myself, several persons were near to us. Mr. Temple stepped up to me, and said we should meet again, and even proposed then to withdraw. I do not recollect that I returned any answer; in a little time Mr. Izard came up to us, and now finding my loss of blood was considerable, and that my breast was affected in a manner that made me draw my breath with difficulty, I accepted Mr. Izard's offer to take his coach, which was then in the Park, and near at hand, to convey me to Mr. Sanxay's, or Mr. Davenport's, my surgeons. In our way to Essex-street on my mentioning to Mr. Izard some circumstances of the affair, and particularly my having twice hold of my adversary's sword, and the use I made of those situations, he suggested that it would  
be



be better to say nothing of the duel, alledging that Mr. Temple was a man of that violence of temper, that if any misrepresentations were to get abroad, which is always, more or less, the case, it might induce him to renew it. The only answer I could make, and the only answer I did make, was, that I had neither a motive or wish to conceal the duel. Mr. Izard stayed, and was present with me at Mr. Davenport's, during the greatest part of the time employed in dressing my wounds; and I took opportunities to declare that I did not pretend to be a judge of the points, which, in the eye of the world, constitute fair or unfair fighting, and therefore did not take upon me to accuse Mr. Temple of unfair proceeding, meaning by a declaration thus couched, to reserve to myself my own sentiments. Mr. Temple has called for those sentiments, and I mean they should be intelligibly conveyed in the narrative I have given, and the evidence accompanying it, with respect to such of my wounds as are singular, particularly one on my left side, a little above my hip, which I understand must have been in consequence, not of an oblique but of a direct thrust, tending to the center of the body, and one on the back part of my left shoulder. I declare, I know not when I received these hurts; I neither saw nor felt the sword at

the time they were given: I must therefore lay it before the Public, and appeal to the testimony of others, who happened to be eye-witnesses, or can give information of the transaction, and to the declaration of Mr. Davenport, who first dressed my wounds.

BEING called upon to declare the number and situation of the wounds which Mr. Whately received in a late duel, I do declare that there were five only which demanded the attention of a surgeon, or required dressings.

Three of these were in the front of the body, viz. one on the inferiour part of the right breast, one a little below the collar-bone of the left side, the third on the pit of the stomach; this last only was important.

With regard to the other two wounds, one was situated rather below the middle of the left side of the body; the other behind, about the center of the left shoulder blade.

*Essex-street,* R. DAVENPORT.  
*Jan. 2d, 1774.*

I have trespassed much on the reader's patience. I have only to add, that as all sort of intercourse (whether hostile or amicable) between Mr. Temple and myself, is at an end for the remainder of our lives,  
I hope



I hope and I trust, I shall never again have occasion to address the Public relative to this untoward event.

WILLIAM WHATELY,

*From the* PUBLIC ADVERTISER.

IT is my duty to declare to the Public, that Mr. Whately has mistaken my words. I have been acquainted with Mr. Temple many years, and never thought his temper violent; I therefore could never have said that it was. I have always thought him a person of the strictest honour, and possessed of such proper spirit, as to chastise any man who should presume to countenance the suspicion of it. Mr. Whately told me, that he received Mr. Temple's fire, and then discharged his pistol in the air; that Mr. Temple disarmed him, and desired him to ask his life, which he refused to do; that he then disarmed Mr. Temple, and told him to take his life unasked. I thought there was an impropriety in Mr. Temple's drawing his sword, after Mr. Whately had discharged the pistol in the air; and in his renewing the fight, after having disarmed his antagonist. I therefore desired Mr. Whately to be cautious of propagating circumstances

cumstances which might tend to throw any dishonour on my friend, as I was apprehensive it might be the means of compelling him a second time to call him to account. Mr. Temple has stated the whole transaction to the Public in so full and satisfactory a manner, that I hope he will give himself no more trouble about it. Conscious of the honourable part which he acted through the whole of this business, he has despised the reports which have been circulated. I confess they alarmed me; especially when I was informed that they were to be supported by affidavits. I had too good an opinion of Mr. Temple, to give the least credit to any injurious reports; but if two men had sworn that they saw him *stabbing Mr. Whately in the back, and in several other parts of his body, when he was fallen on the ground, and unable to defend himself,* (which were the reports circulated against Mr. Temple,) I fear that he would have borne through life, a character very different from the one he deserves. The trifling and ridiculous declarations, about a *fat large Gentleman, and a lean one,* have totally removed my fears. One of the declarations I know to be false: If therefore the rest contained any thing material against Mr. Temple, which is very far from being the case, the Public would judge what credit ought to be given



to them. I was at the distance of about three hundred yards from my coach at the time the pistols were discharged. The testimony of my servants will not, I trust, be thought necessary to support this circumstance. As Mr. Whately speaks of *having lost much blood* and of *his breast being affected in a manner that made him draw his breath with difficulty*, it may be imagined that he knew himself to be much wounded at the time I offered him the use of my coach. I declare, upon my honour, that I then asked him if he was wounded, and his answer was, he had a scratch on his face, and as there was some blood on the side of his shirt, he knew that he was wounded; but thought the hurt very trifling, as he felt no pain. This he repeated to me several times in the coach, but never gave me the most distant hint of his having fallen, or of receiving any unfair treatment from Mr. Temple. The unusual exercise which he had just been engaged in might probably have occasioned a shortness of breath.

When Mr. Whately was stripped at the surgeon's, and saw his wounds, he thought them of such little consequence, that he seemed only desirous of concealing the scratch on his face from his mother, in whose company, he said, he expected soon to be—I think that night. He spoke in perfect

fect good humour of Mr. Temple, hoped that he was not wounded, and desired that I would let him know whether he was or not. I told him that if Mr. Temple was wounded, I would inform him of it as soon as I went home; and if he did not hear from me that night, he might conclude Mr. Temple was not hurt. Mr. Whately was not satisfied with this, but desired me to write to him, and inform him whether Mr. Temple was wounded or not. When I arrived at my own house, I found Mr. Temple there, and had the satisfaction of hearing from him, that the only hurt he received, was a slight scratch in the hand. I immediately wrote to Mr. Whately; but as I thought the affair entirely at an end, I did not keep a copy of my letter. The following is the answer I received.

DEAR SIR,

11th Dec. Evening.

IT is with satisfaction I learn that Mr. Temple has received no hurt, and am obliged to both of you for your anxiety on my account. *I do not imagine there can be the least room for any apprehensions from the trifling hurts I received.*

I am, dear Sir,

Your most humble servant,

WM. WHATELY.

(Directed to Ralph Izard, Esq.)

I think it right to lay these facts before  
the



the Public, that they may form what judgment they think proper.

*Berner's-street, Jan. 8, 1774. R. IZARD.*

---

*From the Same.*

IT was not till I had seen Mr. Whately's last publication, that I could prevail on myself to think him any other at heart than an honest, well-meaning, though a weak man, under very bad influence. That publication has fully settled the matter in my mind. Having, with a sacred regard to truth and candour, already submitted to the Public a circumstantial account of the late affair between Mr. Whately and myself, it would be only an unnecessary repetition to point out the misrepresentations in his account of that affair. I shall only observe, that Mr. Whately might have spared himself the trouble of writing the last paragraph of his narrative; as it always has been, and still continues to be my determination, to have as little concern and intercourse as possible with any but men of truth and honour. His friendship and enmity I hold in equal contempt.

*Great George-street, Jan. 9. J. TEMPLE.*

*From*

*From the PUBLIC ADVERTISER, of*

February 10, 1774.

---

*To ALEXANDER WEDDERBURNE, Esq.*

**Y**OU stated as a fact, in your late speech before the Privy Council, that Dr. Franklin sent the letters in an anonymous cover, with injunctions of secrecy, written in a hand, however, well known there; not to the Speaker, as officially he ought to have done, but to private persons. From hence you draw a conclusion, that he was conscious of villany, and ashamed of having it known.

The weakness of this stating, were it true, would defeat the wickedness of the conclusion. How could you suppose a man would expect concealment from suppressing his name, if his hand were well known; or if, by some strange confusion of ideas, he did think himself concealed, to what end should he enjoin secrecy? Wherefore should he have wished for concealment? Was there such terror in the hatred of those he detected, Mr. Hutchinson and Mr. Oliver? Could he possibly have conceived that any set of Ministers would be so weak and wicked  
as



as to persecute him for a measure, which ministered to them the fairest opportunity of healing graciously those unhappy divisions with which they were perplexed in the extreme?

But what will your hearers, what will the world think of you, when I affirm, that the whole of what you stated was an absolute falsehood? I defy you to prove a word of it. I feel the harshness of the terms I use, but I appeal to every one who heard you, whether the language you uttered intitles you to be treated like a gentleman?

The letters were inclosed to the Speaker; that which accompanied them was signed by the Agent; nor was there a single injunction of secrecy with regard to the sender. He apprehended that the immediate publication of them would raise the popular indignation so as to be fatal to the writers. Out of humanity to them he desired they might not be made public.

Dr. Franklin's declaration was the next subject of your abuse. You enveighed against it as marking the most inhuman apathy that the imagination could conceive, made to insult over the distress, and aggravate the wounds which his villany had occasioned.

Let us state the fact, and see how far it will support the charge.

On the 8th of December a letter, under the signature of *Antenor*, accused Mr. Temple of dishonourably taking the letters in question from Mr. Whately, whose name was vouched for the truth of the charge. The next day Mr. Temple's accuser appeared, declaring Mr. Whately's concurrence with him in denying the facts on which the charge was founded. So far was there in this stage of the business an appearance of any quarrel likely to happen between these two Gentlemen, it seemed as if they were united in contradicting a malignant, anonymous accusation: But on the 11th Mr. Whately contradicted Mr. Temple, and at four o'clock that day the duel was fought. What time or opportunity was there here for the intervention of Dr. Franklin, especially as Mr. Temple's challenge was grounded on the other's flatly denying what he had given to the Public under his hand? The original cause too of the dispute was, Mr. Whately's having given rise to and countenanced a most false, unjust, and cruel accusation against Mr. Temple.



**DUEL** *between Lord GEORGE GERMAIN,*  
*and Governour JOHNSTONE.*

ON the fourteenth of December, 1770, Lord George Germain made a motion in the House of Commons for a better attendance of the Members; and said, that what he had been urging was for the honour of the nation, in which he declared he greatly interested himself. Governour Johnstone, in reply, said, that he was surpris'd the Noble Lord should interest himself in the honour of his country, after he had been so regardless of his own. Lord George did not hear the words spoken by Governour Johnstone, being gone out of the House, but he was informed of them by his friends; he was sorry, he said, that he had missed the opportunity of making an instant replication; but that, however, he would take proper notice of it.

On Monday the 17th of December, 1770, Governour Johnstone was attending the Committee, who were sitting on the petitions relative to the embankment at Durham-yard, when Mr. Thomas Townshend, (now Lord Sidney,) came to him, and desiring to speak with him, took him into another room,

room, where he told him, after making a very polite and gentleman-like excuse, as to what share he had in the business he came upon, that the reflection he had cast on the character of Lord George Germain, though not heard by himself at the time, had been communicated to him by his friends; and that in consequence, Lord George had begged of him to wait on Governour Johnstone, to desire he would retract what he had said; that, for his own part, he should be exceedingly sorry to have a quarrel happen between two Gentlemen whom he knew, and for whom he had a great respect, and therefore hoped, to prevent the consequences, Governour Johnstone would retract what he had said respecting Lord George. The Governour said it was very true, he had made use of such and such expressions in the House; that they conveyed his opinion; and that he would maintain and support it. Upon which Mr. Townshend said, in that case, Lord George demanded the satisfaction of a Gentleman from him; which the other declared he was ready to give his Lordship at any time. Mr. Townshend then said, Lord George was in an adjoining room, and if the Governour pleased they would go to him. The Governour assented; and Mr. Townshend conveyed him to the room in



which Lord George was waiting. Lord George repeated the cause of quarrel, and the demand of satisfaction, which the other acquiesced in; and desired his Lordship would appoint his own time and place. Lord George then mentioned the Ring in Hyde-Park; and, as in affairs of this kind, all times were alike, the present was, in his opinion, as good a one as any. Governour Johnstone entirely agreed with Lord George as to the place; but said, that as he was now attending his duty in a Committee, on a subject he had very much at heart, he hoped the meeting Lord George an hour hence would make no difference. Lord George said, no; and then spoke as to seconds, informing the Governour at the same time, that he had desired Mr. Townshend to attend him in that light. Governour Johnstone said, there was little occasion for seconds, and that therefore Mr. Townshend should stand in that light as to both of them. Governour Johnstone further said, that as he had at that time an open wound in his arm, and his legs very much swelled, he could wish they would use pistols; to which Lord George saying it was equal to him what the weapons were, they separated; and Governour Johnstone returned to the Committee. In this conference, as well as through the whole affair, both the  
Gentlemen

Gentlemen behaved with the greatest politeness to each other, as well as with the greatest courage. At the appointed hour, Lord George, and Mr. Townshend were in the Ring, and soon after Governour Johnstone, accompanied by Sir James Lowther, (now Lord Lonsdale,) arrived, whom he had happened to meet in his way, and had solicited to go with him. Lord George accosted Governour Johnstone, and desired he would mention the distance, declaring he was then upon his ground, and the Governour might take what distance he pleased. The Governour was taken back by the seconds, about twenty small paces. The antagonists having prepared their pistols, Lord George called on the Governour to fire, which the Governour refused, saying, that as his Lordship brought him there, he must fire first. Upon which Lord George fired, and then the Governour; neither of the shots took effect. Lord George then fired his second pistol, and as he was taking down his arm the Governour's second ball hit his Lordship's pistol, broke some part of it, and one of the splinters grazed his Lordship's hand. The seconds immediately interposed, and the affair was ended.

Governour Johnstone, afterwards declared to his friends, that in all the affairs of this kind



kind which he ever knew, or was concerned in, he never found a man behave with more courage and coolness than Lord George did on this occasion.

### MANAGEMENT of the LONDON GAZETTE.

[By Messieurs BURKES.]

Thursday, June 9, 1776.

AS all men have their virtues a little balanced by some failings, it is surely a good-natured part not to dwell upon the qualities they are deficient in, but rather to fix our attention on those points of their character, in which they evidently excel. I should think it the cruelest thing in the world to dwell upon Lord George Germain's conduct of the civil war; but I am happy to join with the world in applauding his Lordship's dexterous management of the Gazette.

Whilst under his auspices, and animated by his example, our commanders, by happily shifting of their position, by taking the resolution of *evacuating* towns, and by effecting *retreats* without loss, are (though quite in a new way) conquering Provinces abroad; his Lordship is employed, according

to the soundest principles of the best critics, in recording their great exploits at home.

Livy has been censured as diffuse; Sallust, Thucydides, and Tacitus, have been criticised for an affected brevity, bordering on the obscure. These general remarks favour of pedantry, and mere literary cant. To judge of the faults or excellence of the diffuse, or the concise, of the perspicuous, or the obscure styles, we must consider well the nature of the subject, and the design of the author. No universal rule can be laid down. Some things cannot be displayed too amply, and too minutely to the public curiosity. Others had better be just touched upon. Some should shine in a glare of light; others should be cast modestly into the shade. Some ought to be proclaimed by the sound of trumpet; others there are, in which silence is the real eloquence.

If you would know how well Lord George Germain has employed all these styles (and this no style) you must consider the end and purpose for which (besides fame and immortality) a Secretary of State condescends to become an author.

The world at large is not aware of the real object of our war in America. The sole drift and end of all our operations there, has hitherto been, neither more nor less, than to dispose of the sums of money that  
have



have been raised here. These have been vast; and the dispersion of them has not been so perfectly easy, as the common run of people might imagine. But, by the aid of our kind and disinterested friends, (the London contractors, and the German Princes,) the thing may be done. The facility, however, of the expenditure, may not always facilitate the supply. A great Statesman, like other ingenious artists, must tickle the ear, whilst he extracts the purse. The mob out of doors love a little good news, though it be at their own cost. A victory is worth a million; and a good bonfire compensates a tax. The wise Minister (like the industrious ant) forecasts the winter, and prepares the mind for the ways and means of the session, by the intelligence with which he entertains us during the recess. In the execution of this plan, he strictly follows the great masters of antiquity.

The polite critic of the Court of Augustus, Horace, was intended by that great Emperor (not so happy in obtaining obedience to his commands as our Sovereign) for the office of Secretary of State. Whilst that business was in agitation, he wrote those excellent rules for Gazettes, which have been unaccountably mistaken for the rules of dramatic poetry. A gross error! for what has a Secretary of State to do with *writing* tragedies?

tragedies? Or how can we imagine that Horace, after commanding a Roman legion, and distinguishing himself in war, should condescend to undertake the direction of the opera? The Gazette is the proper business of his department. Besides the observations on style that I have just made, and which I confess I borrowed from this great judge, he makes several others of moment. He advises his Gazette writer to mix his falsehood with some truth, *ita mentitur* (says he) *ut veris falsa remiscet*. And he gives his reason, and a very solid one,

*Primo ne medium, medio ne discrepat inum.*

He recommends it to them to put off, and to bring on matters, as may best suit political purposes:

*Ut nunc dicat jam nunc debentia dici,  
Pleraque differat, et presens in tempus  
omittat.*

But if facts prove so very untractable, as by no art of mixture or procrastination, to be made pleasant, why then he thinks they are to be totally omitted:

— *Que* —  
*Desperat tractata nitescere posse, relinquit.*

To exemplify in the most satisfactory manner his Lordship's skill in conducting his Gazette upon these rules, the reader may remember the ample account we had of the exploits



exploits of Lord Dunmore. No one captive piece was omitted of those miserable old cannon, which, until they were to "open their mouths, and shew forth his praise," had slept and rusted in neglect on the wharfs of Virginia. All the pompous display of Livy and Clarendon, were employed to decorate the triumph of this favourite General. After this great and decisive advantage obtained by Lord Dunmore (as far as we could discover from the Gazette) we had nothing to do, but to take possession of a disarmed Province. The gratitude of the nation was equal to the services of the General. His Lordship was immortalized in the Gazette. He was adopted into the sacred sixteen, levees, assemblies, coffee-houses, all agreed (and they were certainly right) that if every Governor had acted with the spirit of Lord Dunmore, we must have established our dominion in all the other Provinces, as perfectly as we had done in Virginia.

In the midst of all the joy that arose from such important victories as Lord Dunmore's, so amply displayed, an odd sort of an account arrived. A very brave officer, as brave and as intelligent an officer as any in the King's service, Major Fordyce, with a detachment of our best grenadiers, was sent by this heroic commander Lord Dunmore,

upon

upon a well-planned expedition, to which there were but two small objections. One, that it was perfectly impracticable; the other, that if it did succeed, it could be of no kind of use. Accordingly Major Fordyce was killed. The party was defeated; all the grenadiers slain or made prisoners.—What said the lately communicative Gazette? Not a syllable. The Secretary of State had wasted his stock of eloquence in his panegyric on Lord Dunmore. He had nothing left for the funeral oration of Fordyce. He was as silent as the grave in which that gallant officer and his brave soldiers were laid. And where was the necessity for much discourse? The man was dead; and what did it signify to put ourselves into an ill humour about what we could not possibly help.

This Virginian history is an instance of the diffused style of the Gazette contrasted with the opposite extreme of excellence,—the expressive and eloquent silence. The instances of a less violent, but equally judicious contrast, are frequent, and happily mixed in. I will endeavour to recal them to the reader's memory. Without such a retrospect it will not be easy to enter into the true spirit of this exquisite politico-literary performance, which is now the sole source of authentic intelligence, and the only vehicle of our summer's delight and information.

When



When the forts of St. John and Chamblé were taken by the Provincials, and upwards of 500 regular troops made prisoners, there was a demand for the compact, close, laconic, style. The Gazette did not altogether omit these events; but with a wonderful energy and brevity, related them in much fewer lines than the shortest article of the capitulation, by which those unhappy troops had surrendered prisoners of war. Of cannon and stores, not one word. These were left to the imagination of the reader. All accounts of the taking of cannon, in the explicit style, belonged, exclusively, to Lord Dunmore.

We may remember too, that when Arnold made the astonishing march, which will for ever immortalise his name, the Gazette was not absolutely silent. It gave to merit *one honest line*; and in the laconic brevity of Lord George Germain, "*one* Arnold appeared at Point Levi."

Of the taking of Montreal, which place with the whole strength of England and America conjoined, had formerly given glory and Peerage to Lord Amherst—on the part of the Gazette SILENCE;—Col. Prescott, his ships, his soldiers, his stores taken afterwards—SILENCE.

This uniformity of silence, however prudent, and even chaste eloquent, might seem

seem rather dull, and at length begin to disgust. People might learn an ugly habit of looking elsewhere for intelligence. In this distress an event happened, which justified the drawing up the floodgate, and letting out all that flow of eloquence which had been so long dammed in. *Montgomery*, an obscure man, of whom we had heard nothing before from authority, was killed at Quebec, and his troops repulsed. But unfortunately, even on this fairest of all occasions, we were again sadly at a loss. This happy opportunity was in danger of being wholly thrown away. The question arose, where is the authority for this good news? The conquering General was too closely blocked up, to send a messenger of the decisive victory he had obtained. To take intelligence from the Philadelphia newspapers, and to put at the foot of the account, "*Charles Thompson*," (not our *Sir Charles*,) "*and by order of the Congress*," was too much. In effect, it was to register a rebellious libel among the consecrated records of office. This was hard undoubtedly.

The difficulty staggered the American Secretary of State. In an hurry a council is called. The Attorney General, in his firm, sturdy, direct way, objected to the measure. He relied on it, that such a step might teach people to put some trust in rebellious



rebellious publications; and would, besides, totally take away the best, and sometimes only excuse we had for our prudent reserve on most of our defeats, viz. that we had them only from the narrative of the rebels. This had some weight. But Mr. Wedderburne, whose *forte* is dexterity and refinement, observed, that the Congress, as they are a raw, new government, and to that time unacquainted with disgraces, had not learned the art of glossing a misfortune, but had delivered "a plain, round, unvarnished tale" of their defeat. This advantage is not to be missed. Here (said Mr. Wedderburne) we may dilate at the expence of an enemy. The narrative, as far as it goes, is their own; and our imagination is at liberty to add full enough on this foundation. We cloath ourselves with the spoils of the enemy. We may dress ourselves "*à la Congress.*"

---

*Danaumq; insignia nobis  
Aptemus, dolus an virtus quis in hoste requirit?*

Lord George carried it for his friend the Solicitor's opinion. The Philadelphia Congress Gazette supplied the materials for our's; and here, (but at their expence,) we expatiated again. The stunted Gazette once more shot out into a full luxuriance of narrative.

This

This mode, however, of borrowing an enemy's account is too ticklish to be adopted as a regular practice. Then came in the great delicate point in all human affairs, "to know when to leave off." For, unluckily, those exotic Congress news-papers began to shoot out some things that would not bear transplanting, and were not at all adapted to flourish in the soil of the London Gazette. The taking, for instance, of Brigadier General Macdonald in North Carolina—the killing Colonel Macleod—the defeat of 1500 of our Highland troops, and the disarming of the whole party;—although all undeniably true—was not proper stuff for a London Gazette. The expedition of General Schuyler into the Indian country, although equally certain—the capitulation of Sir John Johnson—the making him a prisoner on parole—the submission and laying down their arms by 600 of our loyal subjects (Scots and Tories) and the compelling some of our natural allies, the humane Savages of the Five Nations, to lay down the hatchet—these accounts, one sees at first sight, could by no art be made fitting for the Gazette. Of these, therefore, nothing was said.

The end of writing is *et prodesse et delectare*. In a paper where the profit of Ministers, and the delight of the people, were to be the great objects, it would be a piece of downright



right absurdity to mention such things, as cannot possibly tell to the advantage of the one of the parties, or afford any sort of satisfaction to either of them.

Mr. Miller, I find it impossible to do justice to the merits of Ministers, as Historians of their own exploits, in a single paper. The subject grows upon me, as the matter rises in dignity and importance. Reserving, therefore, the inimitable beauties of the Boston narrative to another time, I shall for the present satisfy myself with remarking, that the naval part of the war, though probably it comes from another quarter, is related on the same principle, and with no less perfection than that, which is carried on upon the *Terra firma*.

One of our men of war returns home rather in a shabby condition. But, what does she come for? In reality to bring the news of her own escape from the Americans. Since our affairs are in that pleasant situation, that retreats are *happy shiftings of position*, and, that escapes are to take rank as victories, it becomes necessary to display this eminent advantage at full length; and it is accordingly related at large in the true technical style, and with all the elegant perspicuity of the nautical dialect. The Gazette, so lately on the reserve, here becomes prodigal of information. We have, on the escape  
of

of the Glasgow (for the first time) an account of Commodore Hopkins's squadron; the number of vessels; the number of guns; the number of men; an account as exact as if we were furnished with it from the Navy Office of Philadelphia. The state of the British Navy was refused on the motion of a Marine officer in Parliament, last session. Amends are now made by a precise detail (given gratis) of one of the American fleets. We have the satisfaction to find that this navy is in shoal water, (but safe enough,) in New England. In the late war, the escape of one of our stout frigates, built and furnished for war, from a little squadron, consisting of a decayed merchantman, with a sloop and schooner or two, hastily and ill fitted into privateers, would scarce have deserved a long laboured account in the Gazette. But things are altered; Mr. Pitt *was*, Lord George Germain *is*, Secretary of State.

In this last piece we are furnished at one and the same time with a curious example of the various excellencies of the full display, and of the judicious reserve. The Gazette, which knows so minutely every gun in Hopkins's fleet, and its weight of metal, says nothing at all of this fellow's carrying his convoy, and the military stores with which he was heavily laden, safely to the



place of their destination: Nor does it know, that he had taken a transport and tender in his Majesty's service. It even omits a piece of good fortune of the Glasgow, whose shot in the very first broadside damaged Hopkins's rudder in such a manner, that his ship lay for two hours incapable of pursuit or fight.

To compleat this account of the American Regatta, made for our special amusement; by the same use of light and shade in the narrative, we are informed, that a great number of ships and *vessels* have been taken. By this judicious choice of terms, the number is as effectually swelled by the seizure of a cock boat, as by the taking of the largest ship that ever sailed in the Virginia trade.

As to captures made on the part of the Americans, we might conclude from the prudent silence of the Gazette, that there were absolutely none. If it were not for an impertinent tell-tale in the city, called Lloyd's List, (who, in all good policy, ought to be silenced,) we should never have guessed that above FIFTY transport ships had been taken by the Americans; the ships themselves, exclusive of the cargoes, of as much value at least as the whole of the prizes taken from the Americans.

In a word, whether by land or sea, we

are scarcely intitled from *authority* to believe, that one misfortune has happened in the whole war. All is glory, success, and victory. Yet thirteen Provinces are lost. *VALENS.*

*Account of the Duel between the Marquis Townshend and the Earl of Bellamont.*

ON the 24th of November, 1772, Lord Bellamont employed Lord Charlemont to wait on Lord Townshend with the following paper, which he read to Lord Townshend. It will fully explain the nature of the offence given to Lord Bellamont at the Castle of Dublin in February, 1770, and was as follows:

“ I wait upon your Lordship by desire of Lord Bellamont: First, To return your Lordship his thanks for the recommendations to the King, with which you honoured him, and for which it was his intention to have thanked you in person, if you had done him the favour to receive him the last time that he attended by your Lordship’s appointment for private audience. I am further to acquaint your Lordship, that Lord Bellamont thought it his duty not to break in upon your Lordship at an earlier day, lest he should interrupt you in giving an account of your high commission to the King, or in taking an account of your own important affairs. But as your Lordship

ha



has now been twelve days in town, he conceives that he may with propriety remind your Lordship of the disrespect thrown upon him by the message delivered to him from your Lordship by your Aid-de-Camp, of which Lord Bellamont makes no doubt that your Lordship retains a perfect recollection ; it having been of that force as to have obliged him to resign his employment in the army, in order that he might be at liberty to call upon your Lordship for an adequate apology without incurring the King's displeasure. But lest your Lordship should not have a minute recollection of that transaction at this distance of time, Lord Bellamont has stated it as follows :

“ When Lord Bellamont, after several repeated attendances by appointment, on all which occasions he had been put off without seeing your Lordship, did again wait upon your Lordship by appointment, the Aid-de-Camp in waiting having gone down to your Lordship and returned, addressed Lord Bellamont in an audible voice, and acquainted him, that he need not stay any longer, for that your Lordship *would* not be at leisure to see *him* that day ; and at the same time turning to several other persons of different ranks and professions, he told *them* that your Lordship requested *they* would wait, as your Lordship *would* see *them*, however late it might be before you could finish with them, or words to that effect. Lord Bellamont replied to  
the

the Aid-de-Camp : His Excellency will be pleased to ascertain at what time he will see me. I have already waited several times by appointment, and have been sent away each time. To which the Aid-de-Camp brought back the following message to Lord Bellamont: His Excellency commands me to tell your Lordship, that he usually does military business on Wednesdays, and any other business on Thursdays: That if your Lordship comes on either of those days, and that his Excellency shall be at leisure, he will see you among others in your turn. To which Lord Bellamont replied, Sir, you will be so good as to inform his Excellency, that as a Peer of the realm I have a right to audience: but if his Excellency does not know what he owes to me, I know what I owe to myself, and therefore will not wait upon him here or elsewhere, I will write a letter to his Excellency, stating my business, to which I expect he will shew due attention, as it nearly concerns a respectable corps of officers. This, my Lord, is, as Lord Bellamont conceives, an exact state of the reciprocal messages which passed between your Lordship and Lord Bellamont: But as he did not take them down in writing, he cannot positively aver each syllable. This, however, he can positively affirm, that such was the matter of the message, and the terms



terms in which it was conceived, though manifestly softened by the Aid-de-Camp; that the idea which it conveyed to every person present was that of an intentional indignity wantonly cast on Lord Bellamont by your Lordship. Lord Bellamont conceives that an Aid-de-Camp is the authentic messenger of his superiour, and therefore that a message delivered by the one is as the *littera scripta* of the other. Lord Bellamont considers your Lordship alone responsible to him, and your Lordship the only person with whom he is to account. The injury is of publick notoriety, and therefore an affront upon record, which does not admit of any negociation.

Lord Townshend having asked what apology Lord Bellamont required, Lord Charlemont read the following article :

“ The only apology which the nature of the offence will admit of, is that of asking Lord Bellamont’s pardon. Lord Bellamont does not mean to hurry your Lordship in any thing, but expects your Lordship’s answer in a reasonable time, at all events one day at least before your Lordship leaves town.”

Lord Townshend made answer : I cannot ask pardon, as it would be an acknowledgment of an offence I never intended.

Lord Charlemont replied : I am not at liberty to take back any other answer to

Lord Bellamont than that your Lordship asks his pardon, or desires to take time to consider of asking it; I therefore intreat your Lordship will reflect before you lay me under an absolute necessity of delivering another message to your Lordship, which Lord Bellamont sends with the utmost regret, and which I shall deliver with equal reluctance.

Lord Townshend having persisted in his refusal, Lord Charlemont read to Lord Townshend the following message:

"I am enjoined by Lord Bellamont to tell your Lordship from him, that he considers you divested of every principle that constitutes the character of a man of honour."

Upon Lord Charlemont's delivery of this last message, Lord Townshend begged his permission to call in a friend to be witness of it. Colonel Frazer having come in, Lord Townshend requested that Lord Charlemont would again read this last message. Lord Charlemont thereupon read the entire paper a second time, and being requested by Lord Townshend to carry back an answer to Lord Bellamont, Lord Charlemont, conformable to his private instructions from Lord Bellamont, replied, that any message Lord Townshend might have to send must be sent by a messenger of his own.

On Saturday the 26th, at half an hour after eleven o'clock at night, Lord Bellamont received the following letter from Lord Ligonier:



MY LORD, *December 26th, 1772.*

“ I have a message to deliver to your  
“ Lordship from Lord Townshend, and beg  
“ to know when I may be allowed to wait  
“ on you. I have the honour to be,

“ My Lord,

“ Your Lordship’s most obedient,

“ Most humble servant,

*North Audley-street.* “ LIGONIER.”

(*To the Earl of BELLAMONT.*)

---

To which Lord Bellamont sent the following answer:

“ MY LORD,

“ I this moment received the honour  
“ of your Lordship’s letter, communicating  
“ to me that you have a message to deliver  
“ to me from Lord Townshend, and desiring  
“ to know when I shall be at home to  
“ receive your Lordship. I shall not go  
“ abroad to-morrow, but will wait at home  
“ to have the honour of receiving your  
“ Lordship, and any commands you may  
“ have for me. I have the honour to be,

“ My Lord,

“ Your Lordship’s very humble,

“ And obedient servant,

*Curzon-street,* “ BELLAMONT.”

*Saturday night, half after 11 o’clock.*

(*To Lord Viscount LIGONIER.*)

On

On Sunday morning at eleven o'clock Lord Ligonier waited on Lord Bellamont, who anticipating Lord Ligonier, said, "Before I receive the message your Lordship has to deliver to me, I must beg leave to call in Lord Charlemont, in order that as Col. Frazer was present at the delivery of my message to Lord Townshend, Lord Charlemont may be present at the delivery of Lord Townshend's message to me; to which Lord Ligonier immediately consented. Lord Charlemont being called in, Lord Bellamont said, the transaction had, he supposed, been related to Lord Ligonier on the part of Lord Townshend. He wished it should be related by Lord Charlemont on the part of him, for he should be concerned to be misconceived by Lord Ligonier, for whom he had a high respect; and that from the moment that Lord Ligonier should have delivered Lord Townshend's message, he did not think it proper for himself or friend to speak another word; of which Lord Ligonier having expressed his approbation, Lord Charlemont read the paper to Lord Ligonier, which he had by Lord Bellamont's desire read to Lord Townshend. Lord Ligonier then addressing Lord Bellamont, said, "What will your Lordship say, when, notwithstanding the force of this message, I tell you I am authorized by Lord Townshend to assure your Lordship,



Lordship, he never meant to offend you?" Lord Bellamont, after a little pause, replied, "I confess, my Lord, this is more than I expected; but since then Lord Townshend's first care is to justify his intentions towards me even under his present situation, let him do it in such a manner as to justify me in releasing him from that situation. The apology your Lordship has now delivered to me is not yet entirely sufficient." Lord Ligonier desired leave to go back to Lord Townshend, and shortly returned with the following message: "Lord Townshend has already assured your Lordship he never meant to offend you. He further assures you he is sorry for the affair." Lord Bellamont then said, "Before I proceed any further, I must desire that Lord Ancram be sent for, as he has this morning accepted the office of being my friend in the field if I shall be called upon." Lord Ancram being arrived, and informed by the Lords Charlemont and Ligonier of what had passed, the Lords Charlemont and Ancram declared that nothing more could be demanded; and then with Lord Ligonier said, that Lord Bellamont could not surely require that Lord Townshend should ask his pardon for an offence which he had now in the most satisfactory manner declared he had never committed. Lord Bellamont made answer, "My

“My Lords, I feel as you do, that every thing is implied in this apology; but it is necessary that it be fully expressed;” and having desired leave to retire into another room to consider the matter more clearly, he returned with the following written paper, which he gave to Lord Ligonier, telling him at the same time, that he did not tie him down to the letter, but that was the purport of the only reparation he could receive, viz. “Lord Townshend does admit that the message delivered to Lord Bellamont by his Aid-de-Camp was highly offensive; he therefore disavows it as such, and declares that it was not in his intentions to give Lord Bellamont any offence, and that he is very much concerned for the mistake.” Lord Ligonier accordingly waited on Lord Townshend with the said paper, and brought back to Lord Bellamont an apology consonant to the full and entire purport of it, conceived in the most satisfactory terms. Lord Bellamont immediately requested Lord Ligonier would assure Lord Townshend, that as Lord Townshend had by that last apology done away the foundation of the message delivered from him to Lord Townshend by Lord Charlemont, he had very great pleasure in declaring it cancelled and annulled.

CHARLEMONT. (L. S.)

ANCRAM. (L. S.)

“I cannot



" I cannot refuse signing the paper delivered to me this morning without assigning my reasons for it ; and I flatter myself the motive of my declining it will justify me to the world.

" I assent to the facts and progressions as stated, but I was misunderstood if what I said relative to Lord Townshend was considered as a message from him. It certainly was not Lord Townshend's intentions it should be so, though I was authorised to say it from Lord Townshend to Lord Bellamont, which distinction I did not make to Lord Bellamont.

As I wished, from motives of humanity, to bring the affair to an honourable conclusion without coming to extremities, I proposed returning to Lord Townshend : my view in so doing was that of promoting an accommodation honourable to both.

" If I conveyed any other idea to the Lords on my return from Lord Townshend than a confirmation that his Lordship had intended no affront or injury to Lord Bellamont, and that he disapproved the manner of the Aid-de-Camp, I have to regret that I had not the good fortune to explain myself according to my own ideas and those of Lord Townshend.

" In justice to Lord Townshend, I must beg leave to observe, that whatever expressions

sions of concern he might make use of on this misunderstanding, arose from the regret every man of honour must feel under a supposition of having given offence. This is what I understood from Lord Townshend, and what I meant to convey.

“ I cannot but persevere in declining to sign the paper, as I find upon consideration that what I thought an explanation, equally honourable to both, may be construed into a submissive apology, which must appear humiliating to Lord Townshend.

“ What impressions may have been received from any expressions of mine in the many private conversations I have had on this painful event, I will not presume to determine; but I declare upon my honour, I have had no other view than to terminate this affair to the honour of all parties, and shall lament if my endeavours should be frustrated.

*Jan. 29th, 1773.* LIGONIER. (L. S.)

This is a true copy of the original in the hands of Lord Bellamont.

CHARLEMONT.

ANCRAM.

*February 2, 1773.*

This afternoon, between four and five o'clock, the long-subsisting difference between Lord Townshend and the Earl of Bellamont

was



was finally decided in Mary-le-bone-fields, when the latter received a ball in the right side of his belly, near his groin. They were armed with small swords, and a case of pistols, but it was agreed to use the latter first. Lord Townshend fired first, which gave the unfortunate wound, and Lord Bellamont discharged his pistol immediately after, without effect. The seconds were, the Hon. Mr. Dillon for Lord Bellamont, and Lord Ligonier for Lord Townshend. Lord Bellamont was immediately taken up, and put into a chaise, but, from the agony arising from his wound, he could not bear the motion; a chair was therefore immediately sent for, and he was with great pain put into it, and carried to his lodgings, where, when he arrived, he desired to be laid on his back. Mr. Bromfield, and other surgeons were immediately called in, who after some time, extracted the ball, and his Lordship recovered.

Their Lordships behaved to each other in the field with great politeness. When they had taken their ground, Lord Bellamont took off his hat, which was returned by Lord Townshend, who asked his antagonist which he chose should fire first. Lord Bellamont answered, he begged Lord Townshend would, which was immediately complied with.

Sir

*Sir GEORGE SAVILE'S Address to his  
Constituents, in the year 1780, is deserving  
of preservation. The following is a copy  
of it.*

---

*To the Gentlemen, Clergy, and Freeholders of  
the County of York.*

GENTLEMEN,

**I** VENTURE once more to make you a  
tender of my service in Parliament. Give  
me leave, at the same time, to offer you  
my cordial thanks for all the indulgencies  
you have shewn me; and for your kind  
acceptance of my endeavours to perform the  
duty I had undertaken. I look upon that  
partiality and favour as a most honourable  
testimony, because it proves that you enter-  
tain a conviction of the purity of my inten-  
tions, sufficient to make you overlook every  
thing amiss which did not proceed from  
the will.

In renewing my desire to continue in  
your service, I think it, however, my duty  
to confess to you, that it has not been  
without much serious consideration, and  
more than common hesitation, that I have  
determined upon it. I must not omit  
making you aware, that it is by no means  
probable



probable I should be able even to perform the mere duty of attendance as punctually as I have hitherto done; especially if the duration of Parliament should prove to be for seven years. By what I have in some degree experienced already, I have no reason to believe so long a continuance of such an attendance would be perfectly consistent with my health.

But there is something more serious I have to say to you on this subject. The satisfaction and honour of attending your business, has ever overbalanced the labour: but my attendance during the last Parliament has been something worse than laborious; it has been discouraging, grievous, and painful. Look back, for a moment, upon the things which have been done, or (being done,) have been approved of, by that body, of which I have been a constituent part. Compare the present with the past situation of public affairs. Whether glory, conquest, and riches; or peace, content, liberty, and the enjoyment of your constitutional rights, be your principal objects—In which of them have you been gratified? I have been, in my collective capacity, a party to all these changes, and to all the measures which have produced them: supported in this mortifying situation with one only consolation, a very great one indeed to my own mind, that of being

being able to assure you, that there has been no one measure, of all those which have proved so ruinous and fatal, which I have not, as an individual, resisted, to the utmost of my power. A poor, barren, ineffectual, negative; and a miserable claim to your favour, to have failed (as far as my poor and slender efforts are in question) almost in every point regarding those rights and that prosperity which I was specially chosen to cultivate and to maintain.

I return to you, therefore, baffled and dispirited, and I am sorry that truth obliges me to add, with hardly a ray of hope of seeing any change in the miserable course of public calamities.

On this melancholy day of account in rendering up to you my trust, I deliver to you your share of a country maimed and weakened, its treasures lavished and mispent, its honours faded, and its conduct the laughing-stock of Europe; our nation in a manner without allies or friends, except such as we have hired to destroy our fellow-subjects, and to ravage a country, in which we once claimed an invaluable share. I return to you some of your principal privileges impeached and mangled. And, lastly, I leave you, as I conceive at this hour and moment, fully, effectually, and absolutely under the discretion and power of a military force,



force, which is to act without waiting for the authority of the civil magistrates; for it is fit you should know, if you are not already informed, that an order issued in London, (at a moment when the violence of the riots and the remissness of the civil magistrate might render necessary an extraordinary and violent temporary exertion of the military,) that order, I say, has, as I have good grounds to believe, been extended to the whole kingdom; where neither of those causes existed in any degree sufficient to justify so decisive and extraordinary a measure; and I do not know of that order being recalled.

In this state of public affairs, and with this account to render of my commission, judge whether I can boldly and cheerfully, or supported by any rational confidence, boast to you as candidates are wont to do, of what I will do, and what I will undertake for your service.

For this reason, avoiding even the usual style of such addresses, and forbearing as well the forward promises as the superficial humbleness of phrase in use on these occasions, I make it a solemn duty to lay before you, without disguise or palliation, the present state of your concerns as they appear to me, and the gloomy prospect which lies before us.

Some

Some have been accused of exaggerating the public misfortunes, nay, of having endeavoured to help forward the mischief, that they might afterwards raise discontents. I am willing to hope, that neither my temper, nor my situation in life, will be thought naturally to urge me to promote misery, discord, or confusion; or to exult in the subversion of order, or in the ruin of property. I have no reason to contemplate with pleasure the poverty of our country, the increase of our debts and of our taxes; or the decay of our commerce—Trust not however to my report. Reflect, compare, and judge for yourselves.

But under all these disheartening circumstances, I could yet entertain a cheerful hope, and undertake again the commission with alacrity, as well as zeal, if I could see any effectual steps taken to remove the original cause of the mischief. “Then would there be a hope.”

Till the purity of the constituent body, and thereby that of the representative be restored, there is NONE.

While the electors sell their voices to the member, and the member distresses his fortune to buy them, Parliament will be the purchase of the Minister. Parliament-men will find ways of partaking other advantages than merely their share in common

with



with you, of those good measures which they shall promote, and of those good laws which they shall enact for your government and their own: and the modern-improved arts of corruption, by contracts, subscriptions, and jobs, is attended with this perverse and vexatious consequence; that their benefit is not only unconnected with yours, but it grows upon your distress. They feed on the expence; they fatten on every extravagance that art and ill-conduct can engraft on the natural disadvantages of a remote, rash, ill-fated, impolitic, and unsuccessful war. The Minister's direct interest (nay his safety) meanwhile, requiring him to push the desperate game, and even in self-defence, to encrease that very expence which is his crime; to intrench himself still deeper in corruption, and by headlong and unmeasured extravagance, to have the means of justifying, to the faithful Commons, his former mismanagement and misdeeds. — See where this ends, but forget not where it begins.

I am led here very naturally to speak upon the subject of certain regulations, which have been the object of your late assemblies and deliberations. Indeed, I have brought myself to this matter almost unavoidably, but not unwillingly. I gladly embrace this most public opportunity of delivering my sentiments,

ments, not only to all my constituents, but to those likewise, not my constituents, whom yet in the large sense I represent, and am faithfully to serve; not only to twenty thousand, my electors, but to hundreds of thousands in the county I represent, (to go no farther,) who are to suffer under the bad conduct of Parliament; and of declaring my intentions, regarding the two chief articles contained in the resolutions agreed to at your late meetings; I mean, rendering parliaments triennial, and adding to the number of county representatives.

I do not intend to give my voice, if I have the honour of continuing in your service, for the change of septennial parliaments. And this, not because I am so sanguine as some are, in a full persuasion, that it will be a cure for all our evils; no, nor even that I promise myself it will be attended with any such sure hope of considerable advantage; (at least, if unaccompanied by some other steps tending to purify the sources of election and representation;) but chiefly, because, on the best information I have obtained, I have reason to believe it is the mind and desire of a very large number of my constituents: this seeming to me to be the one point (at least with distinguished preference) on which the sender, not he who is sent, has the perfect right to judge; and that,



that, even if after all, I should have mistaken their general sense, it will be at least the safer error; since there is a manifest difference between the obtruding one's self for seven years on him who wishes to have his choice again at the end of three, and returning for his approbation at three; when he might perhaps have been well content to trust one for seven.

I have a momentary pleasure in adding (especially when supported by your opinions,) that I am willing to flatter myself, rather good than evil may arise from the change.

But I look upon restoring election and representation in some degree (for I expect no miracles) to their original purity, to be that, without which all other efforts will be vain and ridiculous. The tenant-right, or good-will of a lease of three years, is as saleable as that of a lease of seven. It will find its price at both the London and country markets. It will be bought, it will be sold. The member will be as manageable, if the constituent be as venal. And they will not be afraid to meet at market as often as you please.

The adding to the country representation, if by no means a perfect cure, seems yet to me to be the plainest, and best proposition for this purpose, that has yet come under my observation; I trust, likewise, it may be practicable.

practicable. I therefore embrace it, not only from a deference to your opinion, but with an approbation of my own. Yet not flattering you, that it appears to me one of those matters easy of execution, or to be done with a thought; on the contrary, it is more complicated (as it seems to me more effectual) than the first-mentioned alteration. But this is no time to talk of small rubs or difficulties. If something be not done, you may, indeed, retain the outward form of your Constitution, but not the power thereof.

For it is too serious a truth to be concealed, and, indeed, it is too late seriously to attempt to conceal it, that if the Electors forgetting the solemn duty they owe to the millions of their fellow-subjects, whose rights they are in the first instance intrusted with: if forgetting the sacred trust reposed in them, of choosing those who are to govern those millions; if forgetting that they are therefore a sort of representatives of all the people (who would be too numerous to vote themselves;) I say, if forgetting these things, and shamefully prostituting themselves, they are become so profligate as to sell themselves and their country; let them not wonder (nay scarcely can they complain without shame) if those whom they choose, imitating their conduct, retail daily those rights which they have bought, whether it be at the septennial, triennial,



triennial, or annual fairs and markets. We can converse thus without a blush.

Neither time permits, nor does propriety allow me to enter into arguments in support of a sentiment of which (much I think to your honour) you have declared your approbation; but although it suits neither the time nor the circumstance, to argue and debate, I trust you will not think I am out of the line of propriety, of duty, or of the respect I owe you, in thus making a public declaration of my opinions and intentions in matters concerning which, after the tender I have made of my service, you have an unquestionable right, as you must have a natural wish, to be informed.

When I began this paper, I had reason to believe the time pressed; I was soon confirmed in what I had heard. It was become material to address you quickly, if at all; but although what I have written has been the work of a few hours, do not think that the matter has not again and again been the subject of deliberate thoughts; I should not have dared to have presented you with crude and undigested ideas or the fancy of a moment; but on the other hand, so inattentive have I been to the advantages this address might receive, in its form, from the assistance of abler persons than myself, that I venture to submit it thus publicly to you, without the opportunity of communicating it  
to

to those whose principles, judgment, and line of conduct in the public walk, I have been habituated to look up to with high respect and esteem.

My business is not to write ably to you, but to write with sincerity. The relation that stands now between us, gives you a right, if I may so speak, to my unmeddled sentiments; and I willingly submit every defect to your censure, rather than be supposed to use management and art, or to consult what is conformable to personal or party considerations, instead of that which unbridled truth (according to my conception of it) requires of me. What further steps may be in contemplation towards obtaining the laudable object of our wishes, I do not know; but it is not probable that what has lately arisen will slacken the zeal of those who have already stepped forward in the business. With that idea upon my mind, it is impossible for me to conclude without expressing an earnest wish, that whatever is thought of may be pursued with that true spirit of firmness and moderation, which belongs to the cause of justice; and above all, that by every means that can be devised, a good understanding and union may be insured amongst respectable men of all ranks and descriptions, who agree in the main principles of liberty; although there may be



shades of difference in smaller points, or in matters not calling for immediate discussion. Indeed you will find it true wisdom, and a very honourable policy, to strengthen the cause of your country with every honest aid that can be obtained.—No public cause was ever carried by divided efforts.

Till I have the honour of meeting you in the exercise of the great and respectable function of choosing your representatives, I beg leave to subscribe myself, Gentlemen, with perfect respect, and a remembrance of all your kindness,

Your most obliged,

And faithful humble servant,

G. SAVILE.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Sept. 5, 1780.

*Proceedings of the GENERAL CHAMBER of  
Manufacturers of Great Britain, on the  
French Treaty. From the ninth of February  
to the twenty-seventh of March 1787.*

*Proceedings of a General Meeting held February  
10, 1787; Tho. Walker, Esq. in the Chair.*

The report of the Committee of the ninth of this month was read. The following is a copy of the REPORT:—

IN compliance with the orders of the General Meeting, held on the fifth instant,  
by

by which the committee is directed to enquire into the following points, viz.

I. What laws must be repealed to make room for the French treaty?

II. What articles were prohibited by the treaty of Utrecht, now admitted?

III. Does the French treaty put an end to the treaty with Portugal?

IV. Are any articles exported to Portugal not included in the tariff?

V. Also the committee are requested to get the most authentic information, respecting the doubts expressed on their minutes on various articles of the French treaty?

Your committee have referred to those doubts expressed upon the minutes; and it is with infinite concern they perceive, that no answer whatsoever has hitherto been inserted upon the minutes respecting them. It appears by the minutes, that the first Fourteen Articles of the treaty were read at a committee, held on the 21st November last; and the committee was adjourned.

On the 28th November, another committee was held, and the following doubts were ordered to be inserted upon the minutes, viz.

“ On reconsidering the Fifth Article of the treaty last concluded with France, the committee have some doubt, whether sufficient remedy be provided against artists or manufacturers



manufacturers being conveyed out of the kingdom, under the denomination of servants to subjects of France, leaving this country?

“And a doubt also arises, whether this Article does not in certain cases repeal the laws now in force against the exportation of sundry raw materials, tools, and utensils?

“And it is also doubted, whether any protection be afforded by this treaty against the importation from France of any articles, for the manufacture and sale of which an exclusive privilege is granted by the King's Letters Patent?

“It also seems reasonable to them, that if a drawback be allowed on the exportation of French wines, and other articles from hence; a drawback should be allowed on the manufactures of this country, when exported from France.

The first and second clauses of the above doubts appear beyond all other things most important to the welfare of this kingdom: And your committee, upon carefully perusing the words of the Fifth Article, and comparing them with the convention lately published, (which is totally silent on this point, although intended to remove other doubtful parts of the treaty,) have too great reason to apprehend, that consequences of the most alarming nature will ensue, when laws are made (as stipulated in the Fourth

teenth Article) to give effect to all parts of this Treaty. — If these apprehensions are just, the Fifth Article, protecting only in certain cases the prohibitions on the import trade, *leaves open the exportation* to France of all the raw materials of Great Britain at present prohibited — whether *wool, fuller's-earth, raw hides*, or any other material — and also, all the tools and utensils used in our manufactures; it exposes us likewise to the loss of our artists and Workmen of every sort, who may chuse to emigrate under the description of servants to Frenchmen leaving this kingdom; “any LAW privilege, grant, immunities or customs to the contrary notwithstanding.”

The first question of the General Meeting, viz. “What laws must be repealed to make “room for the French treaty?” is of so extensive a nature, that your committee have not been able to collect so full information as they wish to do: They have stated above generally, that the laws at present existing against the exportation of wool, raw hides, tools, and the emigration of artists must be repealed; (as agreed on in the Fourteenth Article;) otherwise the subjects of France, chusing to reside for a time in Great Britain, and then to return home to their native country, for the purposes of commerce and trade, cannot enjoy all the advantages granted them by the Fifth Article of the treaty.

But,



But, besides the laws restraining exportation, there are many others which, in favour of our own manufactures, prohibit the importation of foreign goods, as the 4th Edward IV. chap. i. by which no cloths wrought beyond sea, shall be brought into England, and set to sale; the 3d Edw. IV. chap. 3d and 4th; the 1st of Rich. III. chap. 12th; the 7th Eliz. chap. 7th; the 13th and 14th Charles II. chap. 13th; which contain a variety of prohibitions, on the importation of a great number of articles in the woollen, iron, copper and glass manufactures; every one of which laws must necessarily be repealed. And it has also been provided by a law, 1st of Rich. II. c. 9th and the 32d Hen. VIII. c. 15. "That  
 " no alien shall sell by retail, nor take any  
 " lease of a house or shop to trade in," which must by this treaty also be repealed, as the permission to sell by retail is not (as it was in the treaty of Utrecht) excepted. And it may be proper to remark here, that any relaxation of the laws, to prevent the clandestine landing of goods, will have a worse effect upon our manufactures, than even a direct importation upon certain duties; and your committee observe, that by the free approach allowed to French vessels upon the coast; and the time given by the treaty to make entries, and to correct them when made,

made, an alteration of the Custom-house laws (made as well for the protection of fair trade, as the collection of the revenue) must take place; from which they apprehend great mischiefs may ensue.

The 2d question, requiring an account of those articles of French manufacture, against the importation of which the treaty of Utrecht protected this country; but which are admitted under the present treaty, is also an important consideration. By that treaty we had permission to send many commodities to France, without opening our market reciprocally to them. Amongst others were *woollens, cutlery, and hardware*. In these articles we were protected in the possession of our *own market* by the treaty of Utrecht; but which by the present treaty is given up to France—and your committee cannot help remarking upon this head, that although the articles called *Sellerie*, are also admitted into this kingdom from France; yet they are not to become subject to any duty to countervail the excise originally paid upon leather in Great Britain, which amounts to 15 per cent.

But your committee cannot omit observing here, that the alteration of the laws against smuggling above hinted at, appears to them an object of most alarming consequence; not only with regard to the illicit introduction



introduction of goods importable into this kingdom under the treaty; but also in respect to the facility which various articles of the treaty afford the French of bringing into the kingdom a number of goods against the importation of which the prohibitions still remain—particularly all commodities of gold and silver, ribbons, silks, laces, gloves, &c. which lying in so very small a compass renders the facility of smuggling them perfectly practicable. With regard to Portugal, your committee have not been able to learn more than that it is generally understood, no new treaty hath been concluded with that kingdom; and that the Methuen Treaty, by which the importation of British woollen, and other manufactures into Portugal is secured, will be at an end, unless a diminution of the duty upon Portugal wines, one-third below its present amount, accompanies the lowering that upon French wines. If the Treaty now in force shall be discontinued, there are some articles exported to that kingdom not included in the French tariff, for which it may be difficult to find another market; and your committee leave it to every man to revolve in his own mind the consequences to the exports and imports of Britain, which will probably attend the stopping of this ancient and valuable trade.

It

It has not yet been observed, that no stipulation is made in the treaty respecting the allowance of drawbacks on the exportation of goods imported from the one country to the other.

There is no question but France will expect that England shall allow her wines, oils, cambricks, &c. to be passed through England with such a drawback of the duties paid on importation as the wines of Portugal, the oils of Italy, and the linens of Germany now are. By this means France will enjoy the privilege of supplying our colonies with these articles. This advantage ought to have some equivalent return from France, and she should allow our woollen, hardware, pottery, saddlery, and cottons, to pass in like manner through France into her colonies. Unless some arrangement of this kind takes place, there is no reciprocity in the treaty, as far as relates to the colonial trade of both nations—It is true that the treaty is confined to Europe in words; but it is not, in fact, unless England refuses to allow the same drawbacks on French wines, oils, and linens, as on those of Portugal, Italy, and Germany—If this can be done, a corner of our trade will be preserved for those countries from whence we may expect some return.

If *all* articles are open to exportation, the balance will be greatly in favour of France, as

the



the wines, oils, and linen, have no reciprocal articles to place against them; and therefore some English articles should be allowed a drawback in France, as woollens and hardware, against wines and linen; but woollens and hardware from France should not be allowed a drawback in England.

It is said that the matter of drawbacks is an affair of internal regulation, which each nation may settle to their own liking. If so, the collection of articles for colonial consumption is most unfortunate for this country, whose interests have not in this respect been considered in the Treaty. And there ought to have been either a fair regulation of drawbacks, or such a selection of articles as would not give so great advantage to France; who, by the present arrangement, will supply our colonies with wines, oils, and linens, to an immense amount, while she may, if she pleases, refuse to let a single article of English produce pass into her colonies.

*Resolutions, February 10, 1787.*

Resolved unanimously, I. That the fair equality of a Commercial Treaty does not consist in stating the specific articles of one kingdom against another, under reciprocal duties; but in admitting goods of nearly the same value or amount into each kingdom respectively, either duty-free, or under such duties

duties as shall effectually favour the consumption.

II. That in a Commercial Treaty between two countries, where it shall so happen, that the principal advantages on one side arise chiefly from an article or articles of which the other can never send any in return; in order to effect a real equality, this balance against the latter ought to be made up by the admission of such other articles as the latter can send to the former, either duty-free, or under duties which may effectually favour the consumption for ever.

III. That in a commercial intercourse between two countries, the advantages arising to one kingdom from the admission of a produce peculiar to its climate and soil, by the other kingdom, are durable and permanent advantages, which must always continue to operate in favour of the former against the latter; but that advantages arising from the present superiority in most manufactures are variable and transient; and that it is therefore expedient, in balancing such manufactures against such produce, to secure for ever to the former their present advantages, by means of low duties, and such other stipulations and provisions as may seem best adapted to the purpose.

IV. That the duties under which the manufactures forming such balance should be admitted,



admitted, ought to be lower than the duties on the same articles from all other foreign countries ; and so low as effectually to favour their consumption, even against the home manufactures of the same kind ; otherwise the fair equality is perpetually liable to be destroyed.

V. That it is much more indispensably necessary that such manufactures should be protected in their own home-market, by unequally high duties ; otherwise from the gradual proficiency of the other country in similar manufactures, it may happen in a little time, that the advantages, which were at first balanced against each other, may all shift to one side.

VI. That no fair equality can exist, if in one kingdom there shall still remain internal regulations partially favourable to their own, and oppressive to foreign manufactures, while in the other country no such regulations do, or from the nature of the constitution can, exist.

VII. That the Committee of this Chamber be directed to enquire how far the present treaty with France be constructed on these principles, and to report their opinion thereon.

VIII. That this meeting is impressed with the magnitude of the treaty with France, and sensible of the importance of its operation upon a variety of interests. That neither the report of their committee, nor the investigation

investigation of any individuals, has, in their result, furnished this meeting with sufficient information to warrant their pronouncing at this time any certain opinion upon its merits. That the prodigious complication of detail which it involves, and the acknowledged novelty of the plan, demand the most serious and deliberate consideration. That a due judgment of it may be facilitated by a perusal of certain accounts, which have been ordered by the Honourable the House of Commons, but which accounts, not being yet printed, cannot furnish the assistance necessary to a proper determination. That this meeting cannot hear without alarm, that the House of Commons intend to come to a vote which may be decisive of the treaty on Monday next. That if the treaty be found, upon a further review of its nature and tendency, to be really advantageous to this country, the meeting is apprehensive, that so great a good should rest upon the hazard of a single immature vote; but that the terrors of this meeting are augmented and aggravated, if upon more minute enquiry the treaty should turn out to be detrimental or pernicious, as a precipitate resolution may entail upon the nation the most fatal consequences.

That upon all these views, this meeting is of opinion it is indispensably necessary to petition that Honourable House, to postpone  
for



for some time, the coming to any resolution upon the principle or merits of the said treaty, which may be decisive, of either its adoption or rejection.

A draft of a petition was read, of which the following is a Copy :

*To the Honourable the HOUSE OF COMMONS;*

*The Petition of the several Manufacturers, whose names are hereunto subscribed, from their General Chamber of Manufacturers of Great Britain,*

*Humbly Sheweth,*

THAT your petitioners duly impressed with the serious and awful importance of the Treaty of Commerce, now pending with France, beg leave in all humility to represent,

That the said treaty, involving a vast complication of detail affecting a variety of the greatest interests ; and comprehending a prodigious change in the commercial system of this country, is an object of the most momentous consideration.

That your petitioners, after the most careful investigation, which such sources of information as they have been able to consult hitherto have afforded them, are not capable of forming any certain judgment of a treaty fraught with such magnitude, novelty, and variety of matter.

That

That your petitioners cannot but be seriously alarmed at hearing that this Honourable House have determined to come to a decisive vote upon the said treaty this day.

That your petitioners, remembering with gratitude the favour and indulgence which they experienced from this Honourable House on a former occasion, and the providential effects which were then universally allowed to have resulted from delay, humbly conceive, that they have at present still stronger reasons to request time for the purpose of enquiry and deliberation, before this Honourable House shall come to any resolution which may be decisive upon this great measure ;

And therefore your petitioners most humbly implore this Honourable House, to postpone the adoption of any such resolution—for the important reasons above stated, and for such time as to the wisdom of this Honourable House shall seem meet.

And your petitioners shall ever pray.

Resolved unanimously, That the same be signed by the Members present, and presented to the Honourable the House of Commons on Monday next.

THOMAS WALKER, *Chairman.*

*Pro-*



*Proceedings of a General Meeting, held February 17, 1787. Jos. Wedgwood, Esq. in the chair.*

Thomas Walker, Esq. reported that the Petition of the Chamber was presented to the Honourable the House of Commons, by Mr. Alderman Newnham.

Part of the report of the Committee of the 16th inst. was read, of which the following is a copy :

YOUR Committee having been directed by a general meeting, held on the 10th of this month, to enquire and to report how far the present treaty with France is constructed on certain principles then unanimously resolved, have proceeded with all diligence, to collect what authentick information they could, and in pursuance of their duty, beg leave to submit their opinions, severally and in order, on the respective heads referred to their consideration.

The first resolution is as follows : " That the fair equality of a Commercial Treaty does not consist in stating the specifick articles of one kingdom against another, under reciprocal duties ; but in admitting goods of nearly the same value or amount into each kingdom respectively, either duty free, or under such duties as shall effectually favour the consumption." And here your committee are sorry to observe in the very beginning, that on the face of the treaty they

do not perceive the least appearance of the fair equality, required by this Chamber. On the contrary they see much seeming inequality. While the wines, brandies, vinegars, and oils of France are to be admitted under duties, which will effectually favour the increase of their consumption here to a very considerable amount; the rest of the tariff consists wholly in that which this Chamber has repeatedly pronounced not to be a fair equality, namely, "in stating the specifick articles of one kingdom against another, under reciprocal duties. Your committee, however, do not mean to deny that under such reciprocal duties some advantage, for the present, may arise to this kingdom in certain articles; but in others, exclusive of the productions above-mentioned, the gain will be as decisive on the side of the French, particularly in glass, lawns, and cambricks, richly ornamented porcelain of Sève, most probably in superfine cloths of certain colours, and in light fabrics for summer wear, as well as in the extensive article of millinery; which, as your committee have been informed, comprehends not only caps, hats, bonnets, ruffles and such small articles, but neckerchiefs also, cloaks, aprons, and fancy dresses of every kind, size, and description. With respect to these articles which your committee have enumerated as advantageous to France, they observe that from the risk  
of



of introducing a commodity at once so brittle and so bulky as glass, they believe it not to have been smuggled into this country; and the premium of insurance on ready-made cloaths, clandestinely imported, being at 40l. per cent. a very small quantity indeed (though some little your committee are well assured) did find its way into our market. The same too may be said of all articles included under millinery from France. The danger, therefore, in these branches is wholly new; and consequently cannot be easily ascertained. Cambricks and lawns, it is true, were very generally smuggled, but the premium of insurance being so high as 16 per cent. on the average, our Irish and Scotch manufactures of these goods did notwithstanding increase, and the latter more especially, as your committee do know, was doubled in the space of four or five years from 1780 or 81 to Michaelmas 1785. But the duty of the tariff being very much below what the article would bear, and what was actually paid to the smuggler, the difficulty of the competition in the British market, is proportionably increased to the prejudice of our own manufactures, and a new danger incurred, which may probably be fatal to them. On the other hand, your committee presume it to be notorious, that most, if not all our articles which are now to be directly admitted, did before get into France circuitously

circuitously to a very great amount. Large orders were sent to this country from the free ports of France and the neighbouring territories; from whence your committee have good reason to be persuaded, that the goods were conveyed into the interior part of France by some clandestine means not particularly known to your committee; and as far as your committee could learn, the aggregate expences of this illicit importation did not enhance the price of the goods to the consumer in France, so much as the duties will under the present treaty: so that the French manufacturer will have no new difficulty of competition to apprehend. From the same causes too it will be found, that the extent of the advantages which England will receive, are subject to much uncertainty in any calculation. But those of France are sure in the articles above-mentioned, and especially in the encreased consumption of her wines, brandies, vinegars, and oils: and your committee must not forget to add, that in all these particulars, *France gains here a market more or less new, without the loss of an old one, while England at least hazards the lucrative markets of Portugal and Spain.*

To the second resolution your committee will not answer at large, as the essence of it is included in those which follow, and probably its chief object was to mark more clearly



clearly the connection of the latter, with a principle before sanctioned by the Chamber, in their resolutions on the Irish propositions. Your committee, therefore, will content themselves with observing that wines, brandies, vinegars, and oils, are undoubtedly “articles of which Great Britain can never send any return,” if she were permitted so to do, which she is not: but that on the other hand, “no articles which she can send, are admitted on such terms, as may effectually favour the consumption *for ever*,” consequently on the principle established by the Chamber in the resolution, “no real equality is effected.”

The third resolution your committee have more fully considered. They perceive the wines, brandies, oils, and vinegars of France, to be indisputably “productions peculiar to their climate and soil,” so as to be generally esteemed superior to the similar produce of every other country. It follows, therefore, that “the advantages which will arise to France from the admission of these articles here agreeably to the tariff, will be durable and permanent advantages, and must always continue to operate in favour of France against Great Britain.” It must also be recollected, that until Great Britain shall be perfectly acquainted with the ultimate fate of her trade with Portugal and Spain, she cannot deter-

mine

mine how much the advantages of these articles to France, may or may not exceed the amount of that boon which the negotiator of this country may have intended to give, or of the advantages which he may have consented to take for an equivalent: neither can it be known, what sacrifices of our own exports we may be compelled to make, by consequence of shewing this favour to France. On the other hand, your committee cannot but notice with regret, that no admission is given to the produce of our fisheries, which, under the faith of treaties more ancient than the convention of 1703, constituted so profitable a branch of our commerce to Portugal; if we ratify any act which that power may think a violation of that treaty, it is not to be expected that she will regard, on her part, her own prior engagements towards us. There is also one other omission which your committee must point out, the omission of a class of manufactures formed from a material for which this island was pre-eminently renowned from its first discovery; your committee allude to our manufactures of tin, which has of late been worked up into so many new shapes by the invention of English artificers. This omission is the more remarkable because *unwrought tin* is one of the articles admitted from England into France,



France, even by the prohibitory edict of July the 17th, 1785.

Your committee hope they shall not be deemed to have digressed from the purposes of the enquiry, entrusted to them, by thus remarking what is not in the treaty; since they have thus shewn how the principle resolved by the chamber, might have been carried into execution. They will now proceed, as they were directed, to examine what is in the treaty.

The only advantages which can be derived to Great Britain, must arise from her “present superiority in manufactures, which is variable and transient.” On looking over the tariff, your committee cannot discover a single manufacture, of which the raw material is exclusively our own. To all our first and second cloths, more or less Spanish wool is indispensably requisite; and if at any future time Spain should prohibit the exportation of her wool to us, and allow it to France under the family compact, which is established by the present treaty, in supercession of our two treaties of Paris in 1763 and 1783—all these branches of our great staple must be transferred to our rivals; nor are the kinds of woollens, which are made of our own fleeces, of a quality not imitable by the wool of other countries.

In regard to our cotton manufactures, we  
are

are dependant on foreign states for one half at least of the raw material consumed therein. For one eighth we depend on France herself, who is to be our competitor in her own markets; and for as much more of the finest sort, on Portugal.

If these supplies should be stopped, however we may still be able to satisfy our home demand, we shall certainly be incapacitated from pushing any advantages which otherwise may be supposed to be opened to us by the present treaty. And here your Committee are sincerely grieved to add, what they have heard on credible authority, that France has lately laid a duty equal to 4d. per lb. on the exportation of her own cotton wool; and is, besides, negotiating with Portugal, to obtain an exclusive right of purchasing all the cotton of the Brazils.

As to our hardwares, your Committee find in a summary of the evidence before the Lords on the Irish propositions (which was published by the General Chamber) that the iron annually imported into Great Britain, is no less than 55,000 tons, while only 30,000 tons are said to be made here. The duty on iron imported is 2l. 16s. 1½d, which appears to be absolutely necessary, "because  
" it is with the utmost difficulty we can  
" keep pace with the Russian iron, and  
" therefore it is impossible for us to lower  
" our



“our price.” In France, your Committee learn that the importation duty into the provinces of the Five Great Farms is no more than 12s. 6d. sterling per ton, including the 10 five per cents: iron is subject also in these Great Farms to a particular stamp duty, &c. amounting to 1l. 5s. per ton more, which makes in all 1l. 17s. 6d. But this stamp duty is not levied in a great part of France, that is to say, in all the districts dependent on the Parliaments of Aix, Bourdeaux, Rennes, Besançon, and Douai, as well as within the Supreme Councils of Perpignan, Arras, Colmar, and Nancy; this is a circumstance of consequence in settling the countervailing duties in France. And your committee think it not improper here to remark, the danger of our losing a considerable trade in anchors, which it appears we have with Portugal.

Your committee think it unnecessary to represent at length, that hemp and flax, leather, wood for cabinet ware, copper, silk for the fabrick of gauzes, clays for porcelain and pottery, and the raw materials for glass, are not peculiar to this island.

In respect to coals, with which we are supposed to be peculiarly supplied; your committee ought not to omit the information delivered by one of our members at the last General Meeting, “That having  
“lately

“ lately been in France, he knew there was  
“ a fine vein of coal in the neighbourhood  
“ of Boulogne.” There are coals also, and  
iron mines in various parts of French  
Flanders. To which your committee must  
add, that by the 7th article of the treaty,  
being intitled to all the indulgencies of the  
most favoured nation, the French may  
demand the benefits of the 31st Geo. II. c. 15.  
and the 13 Geo. III. c. 17. by which  
culm may be exported to Lisbon at one  
shilling 12-20ths of a penny the chaldron.  
And for every use of the furnace, though  
not of the forge, your committee have been  
told that culm is as serviceable as coal of  
any other description.

In none of these manufactures are the  
French intirely ignorant: and some of them  
we ourselves received from that country.  
But your committee are assured, that they  
have labour certainly one half-cheaper; and  
many of their most industrious provinces  
(particularly the whole of French Flanders)  
are very lightly taxed, not above twelve or  
thirteen shillings per head on the average;  
and some of their manufacturing towns have  
peculiar and extensive privileges; and above  
all, they are exempted from the “ bad policy  
and destructive effects of the excise laws,  
which render a large capital necessary for  
the manufacturer, greatly enhance the price



of finished goods to the consumer without producing an adequate remedy to the state; and subject the manufacturer to the vexatious controul of revenue officers; who being at the same time admitted into the secrets of his business, act as spies upon all his operations, communicate his improvements, which have cost him great labour and expence, to others, perhaps to *foreign rivals*; and thus effectually check the exertions of genius and invention." The danger of divulging the operations of the British manufacturer to foreign rivals is infinitely increased by the privilege given by the treaty to French subjects, who may now openly and avowedly commence similar manufactures in his very neighbourhood.

There remains then only the advantages of capital and skill. Comparatively free from taxes as France is, and low as is the price of her labour, considerably less than the capital employed *here*, will *there* suffice for the same operations. Nor is France in want of money, though her wealth has not hitherto been generally applied to the promotion of her national industry, from the prejudices of her nobility, who looked on all trades as dishonourable; prejudices, however, which are daily vanishing before the examples of the king and the princes of the blood, who are actual partners in manufactories of various kinds. The

The principal deficiency of France is undoubtedly in skill. But in this our rivals are making a rapid progress every hour. And here your committee cannot but refer the Chamber to their own apprehensions at the time of the Irish propositions, "from the vigorous efforts made by other European nations, both openly and surreptitiously, to transplant the British manufactures into their respective dominions," which apprehensions this Chamber is conscious, were chiefly excited by France. An evidence on the petition to the Lords, against emigration, stated, "that ten workmen in glass had been seduced into France, four of them in the latter end of last year; and that since those workmen had left us, the French had made a very considerable progress in this manufacture at Sève:" And, "another evidence, a currier and leather-cutter, stated, that several journeymen in that business had gone over to France, and that a great manufactory is carried on in Normandy." As to cottons, a member of this committee affirmed to the House of Commons, that from the rivalry of the French, his manufacture had suffered very considerably; and that "a respectable friend of his had been offered his own terms, if he would settle at Rouen, or in that neighbourhood." And the proficiency of the French in this branch,



was confirmed by another respectable gentleman, who being asked whether the French had not tried to establish the cotton manufacture in their country, replied, "That they not only had tried, but were increasing that manufacture very fast." The same too was asserted by another respectable member of this Chamber, who, in addition, produced to the House a specimen of French manufacture. In the article of fine woollens it is notorious, that the French have long since beaten us out of all the southern markets. They have also brought their coarse woollens to very high perfection, and are daily improving their wool, by amending their mode of managing their sheep. They have a large manufactory of hosiery at Moulins, under Mr. Jacqueson, who traces his descent from England. He works in all the Nottingham branches, and says, that he has made many important improvements, which, about two months since, he went to lay before the Minister and the King at Fontainebleau. And finally, in reference to the iron trade, your committee beg leave to repeat the information given by a member of this committee, who asserts, that there are several manufactories of iron established in Burgundy.

It is to our machines, presses, dyes, and tools, that we are indebted for present superiority. "In proportion as these are ex-

ported

ported and copied in foreign countries (said a respectable member in his evidence before the Lords) in that proportion our exports of manufactured goods to these countries must decrease, and (as he afterwards adds) the ultimate ruin of many of the British manufactures must follow." In their last report your committee stated certain doubts on this subject, which had been entered on their books, but did not yet appear to have been satisfied. They will now offer some remarks on the situation of the British manufacturers, supposing that the subsisting laws against the emigration of our artificers, and the exportation of our tools, shall not be formally repealed.

By the treaty a mode is opened, and now expressly to be legalised, in which all our manufacturing skill may be conveyed away. A French manufacturer on a small capital, supplied by Government, may come hither with his workmen, set up his trade, by large wages draw to him two or three of the best workmen of this country, mix them with his own, till the latter have acquired all the manual practices and secrets of the former; and if he cannot seduce our men to accompany him, he may at least return unmolested with his own.

The law against aliens, it is true, has not for a long time been enforced, because it would



would have been bad policy to prevent the influx of real capital, and real industry ; but it *might*, and your committee cannot doubt but it *would* have been occasionally exerted, if any such sinister practices had been attempted. By the present treaty, every check of every kind is totally removed.

After this detail of facts and reasonings, your committee have only to add, on this third resolution, that they do not find in the treaty, that which the Chamber unanimously resolved to be expedient ; there is no stipulation or provision which, in the opinion of your committee, can secure to our manufactures any permanent advantages.

*Resolutions, February 17th, 1787.*

Resolved unanimously, I. That the Chamber do with great satisfaction recollect, and most cordially recognize and confirm, the first principles upon which the General Chamber of Manufacturers of Great Britain was originally formed, viz. “ To watch over their interests at large as one AGGREGATE, and to be prepared to furnish Government, if required, with such IMPARTIAL and *true information*, as they may, from time to time, stand in need of, for the protection of the Commerce and Manufactures of the EMPIRE AT LARGE ; for the want of which, or by  
relying

relying upon the *information given by interested individuals*, the true interest of the whole has been often unavoidably mistaken." And are fully determined to be guided in their judgment upon the French Treaty, by the same just and liberal principles.

II. That it having been authentically stated by a member of this Chamber, that it had been urged in the House of Commons on Monday last, as an inevitable consequence of the present treaty, that the British market must be opened upon terms of a similar reciprocity to the Irish trader, and manufacturer; and that no satisfactory answer having been given by the Minister; that the Chamber, perceiving the weight and importance of this consideration, apprehend from his silence, that it is intended to renew the Irish Propositions when the present treaty shall be confirmed.

III. That the Chamber have received and examined the report of their committee, appointed to enquire how far the present treaty with France be constructed on such principles as had been previously approved by the Chamber, on the 10th of February, and do entirely admit the facts, and concur in the reasoning advanced in it, so far as it extends.

IV. That the Chamber are more than ever convinced, from a reflection on the important suggestions



suggestions thrown out in the sad report, of the indispensable necessity which exists for deep consideration, and all reasonable delay in this great subject, previous to a decision that may prove essentially injurious to all the commercial interests of this country.

V. That the Chamber are determined to persevere in respectful applications to Parliament, whenever they shall be necessary, without being awed or repressed by any sarcasms thrown upon their proceedings, or reflections on their conduct, come they from what quarter they may.

VI. That the thanks of the Chamber be given to Mr. Alderman Newnham, for his politeness and attention in presenting their petition to Parliament, and for the zeal and ability shewn by him in the support of it.

**JOSIAH WEDGWOOD, CHAIRMAN.**

*Proceedings of a General Meeting held March 27, 1787; Tho. Walker, Esq. in the Chair.*

The conclusion of the report of the Committee on the resolutions of the 10th of February, was examined and received. The following is a copy of it :—

THE enquiries of your committee under the fourth resolution, viz. [“ That the duties under

under which the manufactures forming such balance should be admitted, ought to be lower than the duties on the same articles from all other foreign countries; and so low as effectually to favour their consumption, even against the home manufactures of the same kind; otherwise the fair equality is perpetually liable to be destroyed,"] naturally resolve themselves into two points—whether by the tariff the British manufactures, from whence *alone* our gain is to arise, are secured in possession of the French market against all other foreign competitors; and whether they are so secured as always to ensure to us the same advantages against their own manufactures of similar articles?

On the former of these points your committee will content themselves with examining the duties on the very first article of the tariff, which can be imported into France from this country—the article of beer.

Your committee find that from any other foreign country but England, on entering the provinces of the Five Great Farms, beer only pays by the Paris ton of 216 English gallons—4 *liv.* 16s.

On this duty there are 10 five per cents.—2 *liv.* 8s.

Passing from the provinces of the *aids* to the provinces exempted from the *aids*, and



and the reverse, it pays a subvention duty of 4 *liv.* 1*s.*

Ten 5 per cents. on this—2 *liv.* 6*d.*

Gauge duty on the subvention duty—1 *liv.* 7*s.*

Ten 5 per cents. on this—1*3s.* 6*d.*

Total—15 *liv.* 6*s.*

In English money the Paris ton pays altogether 12*s.* 9*d.*

If the beer is designed for Lyons, or enters the kingdom of Languedoc or Provence; or if it passes in whatever manner into Dauphine, it pays also the local duty of the *Douane* of Lyons at the rate of 15 sols for every ance; (a measure containing about one ninth of a ton) this makes per ton—6 *liv.* 1*5s.*

Two 5 per cents. on this—1*3s.* 6*d.*

Total—7 *liv.* 8*s.* 6*d.*

*Douane* of Lyons per ton in English money, —6*s.* 2½*d.*

If the beer passes through Dauphine, it is also subject to the *Douane* of Valence of 12 sols the ance of three barrels, of which barrels there are eight to the ton, this makes by the ton—1 *liv.* 12*s.*

In English money—1*s.* 4*d.*

*English Beer* may be estimated at rather more than 1*s.* per gallon, if we average the value of strong beer, ale, and porter. A Paris ton therefore will be worth fairly about 216 shillings, or £10. 16*s.*

The

The value of the casks is stated by the brewers in their evidence before the Privy Council on the Irish Propositions, to be about  $33\frac{1}{3}d.$  per cent. say 33 per cent. on which the *ad valorem* duty must be paid, as well as on the liquor. The casks then will be an addition of about 70s. 9d.—£3. 10s. 9d.

Or, this added together will make £14. 6s. 9d.

And on this sum the duty to be paid at 30 per cent. will amount to 86s. and a fraction, or to £4. 6s.

While foreign beer imported into France from any other country may pay only 12s. 9d.

And at most can only pay £1. 3d. $\frac{1}{2}$ .

It is demonstrable, therefore, from these calculations, which are taken from undoubted authorities, that the duties on English beer entering France will exceed those on the beer of any other country by *three hundred per cent.* And even this heavy disproportion will be yet highly aggravated by the addition of the countervailing duties, which France has reserved the right of laying: but which your committee have not sufficient information to estimate with precision. It is unnecessary to remark, that there is no natural cause, why any foreign country should not be able to rival the breweries of England.

An attention to brevity will not permit your committee to examine all the articles in the same manner: they will, however,  
make



make some short observations on one or two more.

Linens from Great Britain admitted into France pay the same duties as Flemish or Dutch linens now pay in England; that is by the ell 15. 3*d.* 4-20*lbs.* and a fraction; or on the piece of 15 ells, 18*s.* 6*d.* They will also be subject to the duties on circulation, after they shall once have reached their place of destination, if they are then moved across the boundaries of the Five Great Farms.

Foreign linens in general on the piece of 15 French ells pay only 8 *liv.* Ten 5 per cents. on this—4 *liv.*

In English money, altogether, 10*s.*

And Swiss linens pay only half this, or 5*s.*

Besides the latter are exempted from all duties on circulation, this will effectually exclude British linens from France; and how far it will operate against the staple manufacture of Ireland, your committee trust the manufacturers of that kingdom will seriously consider.—

The finest kind of EARTHEN WARE pays in France by the hundred weight—20 *liv.*

Ten 5 per cents. on this is—10 *liv.*

In English money altogether, for every hundred weight sterling—£1. 5*s.*

The coarse kind of pottery pays an uniform duty, by the hundred weight, of—2 *liv.* 10*s.*

Ten 5 per cents. on this—1 *liv.* 5*s.*

Altogether in English money—3*s.* 1*d.*<sub>2</sub>.

Your

Your committee are sorry that they had not an opportunity of learning from the President what may be the amount of the 12 per cent. *ad valorem* duty by the tariff on 100lb. weight of the finer and coarser sorts of earthen ware and pottery. They have reason, however, to believe, from such knowledge as they could collect, that the difference of duties on the goods of foreign potters, when they enter France, must be some *hundreds* per cent. to the disadvantage of this nation in all ornamental articles.

On the second point, whether we are secured in the French market against the French manufactures; your committee will only observe, that the reciprocal duties are so high as to be virtual prohibitions, whenever there shall be any thing like an equality of skill. Our manufactures are liable also to be unequally burthened by various internal regulations, which your committee will more fully consider under the sixth resolution.

The position of the fifth resolution, "That our own home market ought to be secured by unequally high duties on those manufactures which form the balance on our side," is a principle palpably disregarded throughout the treaty;—since, as your committee have before remarked, and as the most inattentive reader will perceive, all the duties of the tariff, except those on the



products of France, are nicely reciprocal. These duties, however, will not act as virtual prohibitions in our favour, in the same decisive manner as they will protect the French manufacture, supposing the skill of the two nations to be hereafter equal; because the other advantages which our rivals would enjoy in the cheapness of labour, and comparative immunity from taxes, and other circumstances before mentioned, would, in most cases, more than counterpoise the import duties of the tariff; in the leather trade especially, the excise duty on the dressed material has been computed to be equal to the *ad valorem* duty of 15 per cent. And this excise is not to be countervailed. Your committee, therefore, have no doubt, that from the gradual proficiency of France in manufacturing skill, "It may, in a little time, happen that the advantages which were at first balanced against each other, may all shift to one side."

Under the sixth and last resolution, your committee have endeavoured to learn as accurately as they could, what internal regulations still remain in France; partially favourable to their own, and oppressive to foreign manufactures: for in our own country no such regulations do, or from the nature of our constitution can exist. And here your committee proceeded with the more caution; because they have been in-  
formed

formed by one of their Members, that a person of very high authority publicly asserted, on a recent occasion, that no such regulations exist in France, more than in our own island. The minister is reported to have said, that the duties on circulation were in the nature of a toll, and were equally levied on all similar goods of whatever origin, and the same information was delivered to the committee by a member of the Chamber from the Lords of Trade. Your committee, therefore, think it their duty to represent on what authority they presume to state the contrary; and that is, a French Book of Rates, called *Recueil Alphabetique des Droits de Traités*, published at Avignon in 1786, and, as it is generally understood in Paris, under sanction of the Farmer's-General themselves: A work from which your committee have derived considerable assistance, as to the French duties, which they have already had occasion to notice in this report.

The first partial regulation of this kind, respects the duties on goods returned to France from foreign countries to which they may have been exported, or from the effectively foreign provinces of Alsace, Lorraine, and the three bishopricks as well as the free ports of Dunkirk, St. Jean de Luz, Bayonne, L'Orient and Marseilles. That is to say, on



on all their own goods, which have a mark distinguishing them to be of the national fabricks, they exact only a moderated duty of *one per cent. ad valorem*, while all other goods pay the full duties of the respective tariffs, by which the different custom-houses of France are regulated.

With respect to internal circulation, the privileges of the several manufactures, and even of the several manufactures of the same articles considerably differ. Your committee cannot undertake to point them all out, because they lie dispersed over three thick volumes of the French publication above mentioned; but they will state such, as they think amply sufficient to excite the alarm and jealousy of the manufacturers of Great Britain.

All cotton, plain, or woven with dyed yarn, if of the national fabrick, circulate duty free throughout the realm. All cottons of foreign fabrick were entirely prohibited by the edict of July the 10th, 1785; that prohibition is now taken off as far as relates to England, and we are consequently to be on the footing of other nations before that edict. Our cottons, therefore, must be subject to the duties on circulation, established before the 10th of July, 1785.

Woollens at the *Douane* of *Valence*, if of the

the national fabrick, pay, by the 100lb. weight only—*2 liv. 6s. 8d.*

Where the same articles of foreign manufacture pay—*6 liv. 4s. 3d.*

Difference in favour of their own—*3 liv. 17s. 7d.*

Or more than 150 per cent.

The same distinction too is made at the *Douane of Lyons* in favour of their national woollens; and the manufactures of Sedan have the privilege of passing to and from *Lyons* duty free, or to any place in the realm.

All linens of France (and even of Switzerland) circulate freely all over France. After having arrived at their first destination, all linens of Great Britain and Ireland cannot circulate without paying the full duties.

In like manner, *gauzes* of their own national manufactories have, by a decision of council, been declared to be free of all duties on circulation; while our fabrics of this kind must pay the full entries.

With respect to the *iron trade*.—The forges of Mr. *Chaussade*, which now belong to the King, have peculiar privileges. All anchors, and grappling irons from those forges circulate freely after paying the small duty of 1d. per 100lb. weight, and *nails* and *hardware* of all kinds pay only the moderate duty of 4d. the 100lb. with 10 five per cents thereon. Kitchen



utenfils too of hammered *iron* from the forges and furnaces of Morlaix, Pont-sur-faulx, Herrouville, Pennemaire, and Coufance, in the district of Bar, enjoy the privilege of paying only three fourths of the stamps duty on iron, wherever that is due. On the other hand, our hardwares must pay the full duties every time they pass the Bureaux after their first entry.

Your committee must also remark, that many manufactories have their bar and pig iron, and their steel, either duty free or at very moderate duties.

It must also be observed, that many manufactures, which have no advantages in respect of *internal circulation* are *exported*, duty free to foreign countries, and to the effectively foreign provinces and free ports of France, while our goods of the same sort, sent from any interior part of France, would pay heavy duties.

Your committee find on your books, that being asked by some members of this Chamber, whether our trade with France was to be limited to certain ports, the Lords of the committee of council replied, "That some limitation would probably take place; but it would be rendered as convenient as possible." A convention has since been concluded; but no mention whatever is made of this subject.—Your committee, therefore, must

must acquaint the Chamber, that by the subsisting laws of France, (and all laws respecting trade and navigation are to remain in full force, where they are not *expressly* abrogated by virtue of the present treaty,) two kinds of foreign manufactures, namely, woollens and cottons, are to be imported only by Calais and St. Valery, whence they are to be sent to Paris, where they must be inspected before they can be forwarded to the place whither they may be addressed.—This limitation the committee apprehend, the French have a right to enforce, as it is neither done away by the treaty or the convention, and how burthensome such a regulation must be, your committee need not explain.

These instances, which might be considerably multiplied, if the very extensive nature of the subject would permit your committee to enter into it at large, are sufficient to warrant the assertion that internal regulations *do exist* in France, partially favourable to their own, and oppressive to foreign manufactures; and consequently that no fair equality can exist. Your committee too must add, that it is not only the present existence of the duties, but the possible augmentation of them in future, or the extension of immunity to their own fabricks, that appears truly formidable to the success of our competition under the present treaty.



Since the time that the present report was begun, a solemn convention of persons, illustrious by birth, or high in office, called the *Notables* of France, has been called together at Paris. The object of this great national assembly, is a reform of ancient abuses in the revenue system of the country. Your committee must observe, that we are not very accurately informed what has yet been done, or what is to be done by them. This only we know from official authority, that the *Taille* upon industry has been already repealed; the general *Taille* has been reduced *one-tenth*; and the “suppression of several duties prejudicial to industry, or too liable to cause vexations,” is yet further promised. Nor can your committee think it out of place to insert here the recital, which Mr. Calonne makes, of the other measures lately taken by the Most Christian King for the protection and extension of trade.

“He has suppressed (says Mr. Calonne,) several duties detrimental to commerce, and the sacrifice which he has thought proper to make of their produce, by favouring the exportation of our commodities, is become a new source of wealth.

“His Majesty has created, supported and animated various branches of industry, which at present supply the kingdom with a great number

*number of articles, that were FORMERLY IMPORTED FROM ABROAD.*

“Several establishments of great consequence have been added, and received signal marks of a vigilant protection. Such, amongst others, are the *iron works* at Mount Cenis, the most considerable of their kind that exist; and that of the whale fishery, which originated under the most favourable auspices, at the same time, that all the other fisheries of the kingdom are encouraged, *and whilst they prosper, are preparing for the MARINE, A NURSERY OF SEAMEN.*”

There are, however, some points of reform, to be submitted to the *Notables*, which may be thought to affect certain of the preceding arguments of your committee; namely, “the projected arrangements in France, for the freedom of internal circulation; the removal of the Custom-houses to the frontiers; and the establishment of an uniform tariff, combined with the interests of commerce.”

But to this your committee have to answer, that no reasoning relative to these points, can proceed on any sure ground, till we know the precise extent of the reform; and we have no right to expect from such a rival, any alterations more favourable than the system which at present exists. The uncertainty of the new regulations which are to be proposed



posed seems to your committee to be an irresistible motive, why the manufacturers of Great Britain should yet further think, before they decide, and the legislature pause, before they carry into effect the pending treaty. As to the duties on circulation in particular; your committee cannot but remark, that the same measures, which shall remove the inequalities stated above, must also generally let the manufacturers of the most industrious provinces of France, where labour and living also are lowest, into the great markets of that kingdom, exonerated from the burthens under which they have hitherto struggled in their competition with foreigners.

Your committee cannot dismiss this enquiry without adding, that whatever inequality of duties may at present exist to the disadvantage of the English manufacturer in his competition with the French, and with other foreign manufacturers in the markets of France; this inequality will yet be materially augmented *in the short space of four years*. All the French duties in this report, (excepting the duties on English goods under the tariff,) are computed with *ten* five per cents. on the original sum; but *two* of these five per cents, or *one fifteenth* of the whole duties, as they are here calculated, will expire with the year 1790. On the other side, the duties of the tariff are "fixed invariably" for the duration of the treaty. These

These facts and reasonings contain all that your committee have to offer under the heads referred to them by the Chamber. They cannot, however, forbear to repeat, that many very important considerations arise from the wide entrance, which will be opened by the treaty, to many old, and some new branches of clandestine importation; especially of silk, hosiery, ribbons, and other manufactures of the same material.

Your committee also beg leave to call the serious attention of the Chamber, to an interpretation of the treaty, which (as your committee are credibly told) was given to the House of Commons by the minister himself, namely, that the reciprocal duties of the tariff are to be the terms of commercial intercourse as well between France and Ireland, as between France and Great Britain. On the question of the Irish Propositions, it was the unanimous and settled opinion of the Manufacturers of Great Britain, that 10½ per cent. *ad valorem* (together with countervailing duties) would not be sufficient to protect our home markets against the manufacturers of Ireland; how then are we to stand the competition against them in the markets of France, where the similar commodities of the two sister kingdoms are to be equally burthened with the same duties on importation? nor must it be forgotten that Ireland,



treating France at this moment like other nations, will give little or nothing in return; the equivalent to France can only be found in the opening of the British market to the productions and industry of her ancient rival; while Ireland bids fair to enjoy much the greater part, if not all, of the emoluments to be gained in the French market; nor is this the only danger which appears to threaten us from this new explanation of the tariff—an explanation, which (we cannot but notice) was refused by the Privy Council to several members of this committee. It was sworn by the manufacturers before the House of Lords in 1785; that in many cases 15, 20, 30, nay 50 per cent. with countervailing duties, would not keep out the manufactures of Ireland; but under cover of the present treaty, Irish goods may be easily smuggled into this country, as French commodities, at the duties of the tariff, with only the additional expence of touching, and procuring the necessary papers, at Dunkirk, or some other French port; and if this traffic be carried on in French vessels there can be little difficulty, and as little cost, in the practice of this fraud; which at the same time could not suffer any very essential check from any regulations which the legislature may make in our system of revenue.

On these points your committee should not  
be

be unwilling to enter into some detail ; but they think themselves not warranted by their instructions so to digress. Should they be directed by a general meeting, they would cheerfully resume their enquiries. In the mean time they must take the liberty of repeating their recommendation of these subjects to the anxious discussion of the Chamber, as they are indispensable to the proper understanding of the present question, and yet more particularly indispensable to the just preservation of that which it is hoped the Chamber will ever be jealously solicitous to guard, their own consistency and honour.

THOMAS WALKER, Chairman,

*Resolutions, March 27, 1787.*

RESOLVED unanimously, That the various reports of the committee upon the subject of the French treaty, from the 9th of February inclusive, be sent to the members of the Chamber.

That every degree of additional information which can be obtained, shall also be sent to the members, in order to enable them to form their judgments, calmly and deliberately, on the great question of the French treaty, previous to any decision of this Chamber.

THOMAS WALKER, Chairman.

*The*



*The YORKSHIRE QUESTION, or PETITION, or ADDRESS: (Being a short and fair state of the Case, upon the Principles, the Views, the Means, and the Objects of both Parties as confessed by themselves.) Most earnestly and seriously addressed to the CONSIDERATION of the PEOPLE of ENGLAND, assembled in their several County, City, and other Meetings.*

**I**N all public discussion, upon public affairs, it has been usual to guess at the views and objects of those who propose any measure, and of those who oppose it; and to state their intentions, as arguments for or against the measure itself. It very seldom indeed happens, that either party acknowledge their intentions to be what their adversary imputes to them. Hence much difficulty of judging between the competitors for public trust and confidence arises to the people, who are first diverted from an examination of the measure advised, to the probable intentions of the adviser or opposer, and then, a greater difficulty attends the fixing with certainty, what that intention is; neither party, as has been remarked, confessing the motive to be that, which is suggested by his opponent.

Much benefit is expected, and it is hoped that much indeed will be derived, from

the petition of the county of York—from the effect of the resolutions there entered into—and from the watchful, prudent, and well-directed labours of the very respectable committee of that great county. This for the future.—[*A copy of the Petition, and the names of the Committee, are annexed.*]

But a very great and diffusive good has already flowed from it. In that meeting, the contending parties have fairly owned their principles; avowed their intentions, and precisely marked their objects. All conjecture as to motives; all inference from the ostensible end to the occult design; every argument from presumeable or probable intention being thus done away—the parties come fairly with their measures, and their means before the people, now to be assembled in the several towns, cities and counties of this kingdom; and thus, that people are enabled to judge with certainty, and to chuse for themselves, without the least dread of being deceived in the nature of the object, or the quality of the means, by which that object is to be obtained.

At the Yorkshire meeting two opinions were given—very different indeed; and two measures proposed—absolutely contradictory to each other. Each, however, had its advocates and supporters. All other than a numerical comparison of these shall be  
here



here abstained from. That indeed was remarkable; for one party was so small as not to give their measures and doctrines the support or countenance of their own vote. The propositions of the other were carried without a dissenting voice. The first of these *call themselves* the KING'S FRIENDS. The other party was composed of the GENTLEMEN and FREE-HOLDERS of the county; and each, by their spokesmen, clearly and distinctly avowed their object, and recommended the means by which they proposed to attain it. Let these be stated; and let the COUNTRY GENTLEMEN, for this time, have the precedence.

The COUNTRY GENTLEMEN, then, by the mouths of Mr. Wyvill, Mr. Pritchard, Mr. Hill, Sir George Savile, Mr. Stanhope, Mr. Turner, and several others, represented the corrupt dependence of Parliament as the grand cause of all our misfortunes; from which dependence and corruption, they insisted, flowed the most improvident and lavish grants of the money of the subject, squeezed from them by the most oppressive taxes; and charged the misapplication, and profuse squandering of that money, as owing to the neglect, or refusal of Parliament to examine, or, in any wise, controul the expenditure. They represented the undue, already prodigious, and still encreasing influence

ence of the Crown, as the grand corrupter of Parliament: they stated the variety and magnitude of places and emoluments in its gift and disposal, as the means employed for that corruption; and they charged, that the public money was lavishly applied to continue and forward the very corruption from which it flowed. These were the *evils* and their *causes* as represented and alledged by the COUNTRY GENTLEMEN.

To remedy these was their object. The means proposed by them to attain that object were, to bring the influence of the Crown within some reasonable bounds; and, by removing some of the most apparent and obvious causes of the corruption of Parliament, to restore that body to such a state of purity and health, as might enable it to discharge its function; and dispose it to grant the money of the subject with some degree of caution; and to controul the expenditure with, at least, some degree of care.

Thus far the COUNTRY GENTLEMEN; and to them succeeded the—KING'S FRIENDS.

The KING'S FRIENDS, then, by the mouth of Mr. Smelt,—but here it may not be amiss to make those who are not yet informed, acquainted with Mr. Smelt; his *situation* and *connections*.

Mr.



Mr. Smelt is a gentleman of the county of York of decent fortune, and of a family sufficiently reputable. In himself, in his private life, not only unexceptionable, but respectable. About eight years since, this gentleman was appointed Sub-Governor to the Prince of Wales, in which office he continued some years; during which time his Majesty paid him most particular regard and attention. So highly was he in the royal favour, that, when the King discharged Dr. Markham (now Archbishop of York) and the late Lord Holderness, together with an Oxford scholar, whose name does not occur, from the government and education of the Prince, he earnestly pressed Mr. Smelt to remain. From what motive is not well known, but he declined the offer, and even refused, though much pressed, to retain the salary. His Majesty's favour and approbation, so far from ceasing, has every day increased. He has again been called to the King's presence, and there is not a man in the kingdom, who enjoys so much of the *apparent* confidence of the King at this day; and certainly there is not a man of any rank or condition in the country, who was ever honoured with so much of the private society, and familiar intercourse with his Majesty, as Mr. Smelt is at this very time. This account of Mr. Smelt is intended to impress on the people

people the *great authority* with which he spoke; the *certain knowledge* which he had, from long intercourse of his Majesty's *gracious dispositions*, and *princely desires*; and the *habitudes of thinking, reasoning and wishing*, in which he must have been *quite familiar* at the Queen's House, in which his Majesty resides, and where the King's friends must of course resort and consult.

From the *bosom of these*,—from the very *interior* of the King *himself*, Mr. Smelt issues to the Yorkshire meeting, and becomes the mouth of *that party*.

Mr. Smelt then affirmed, that all our misfortunes arose from the King's *not* having more *power and influence* than he has. As a remedy, therefore, he recommended that the *power and influence* of the King should be encreased. The first, he plainly asserted; the second, he directly recommended. The immediate benefits, which he expected from that increase of power and influence, he did not state in words equally precise. But it was impossible to *mistake* him. To remove even every possible insinuation of unfair construction, the people of England are desired to attend to his words, which shall be fairly quoted. The people will interpret for themselves. These are his words;—

“The *power* of the crown is by *no means*  
“*exorbitant*;



“ *exorbitant*; on the *contrary*, it wants greatly  
 “ to be *increased*; the King’s *influence* is too  
 “ *little*; his hands want to be *strengthened*, for  
 “ he is *not able* to curb the licentiousness with  
 “ which he is every day *talked of* in every  
 “ *company*, and every *street*, nor even to re-  
 “ strain the insertion of a *newspaper para-*  
 “ *graph*.” In a preceding part of his speech  
 he said—“ The ground of the petition seemed  
 “ to be, to *curb* the *influence* of the crown,  
 “ and to prevent the Sovereign from *disposing*  
 “ of the revenues granted to him by Parlia-  
 “ ment.”—It is *hardly* necessary to add, that  
 he ended by a most earnest entreaty to the  
 meeting to reject the petition. For the fur-  
 ther satisfaction of the reader, Mr. Smelt’s  
 speech is annexed to this address.

After these expressions, thus fairly trans-  
 cribed from his speech, it cannot be unfair to  
 observe that—to lament an inability to do  
 any particular thing, is to assert that such  
 particular thing should be done, were the  
 power equal to its performance; and that in  
 no form of government whatsoever can any  
 action be restrained, but by the terror of the  
 punishment annexed to its commission. These  
 remarks cannot be so much as cavilled at; to  
 deny their truth, is impossible.

Under the authority, then, of these remarks  
 (without enquiring what company Mr.  
 Smelt keeps, in which the King is *constantly*  
 and

and *licentiously reviled*) the immediate *benefits* which Mr. Smelt proposed from the desired increase of the King's power and influence, are——

First, That his Majesty would regulate all “*private, friendly and convivial* society at his “pleasure; and either repress the freedom of “conversation intirely, or punish it, when it “transgressed such limits as he may be pleased “to assign it.” This is the unavoidable inference from Mr. Smelt's complaint, that the King is abused in every company, and every street, for want, as he asserts, of *sufficient* power and influence. It was ridiculous to complain of want of power, if it was not intended to use the power when got, to remedy the evil; and there is no possible remedy for this evil, “*talking* licentiously of “the King in every company,” but by using the desired power for the regulation of *private companies*; and suppressing the freedom, or punishing the inadvertencies of *private, family, friendly, and convivial* conversation. Another advantage would arise, indispensably necessary to the exercise of this power, and inseparable from it, which it is odd that Mr. Smelt should pass over in silence—the employment of SPIES! The necessity of an whole host of these honourable officers is self-evident. How otherwise is it possible to bring the private discourse of families and friends into



judgment before the magistrate, and to punish those who have transgressed? Without the aid of some such, even now, how could Mr. Smelt know that the King was evilly spoken of, in other companies than those which he himself keeps; it must be through the ministry of spies that Mr. Smelt has been able to assure us that the King is reviled in every company.

Second benefit. "That his Majesty would prohibit all discussion of public affairs, and political controversy *in print*, even to the insertion of a *single paragraph in a newspaper*, or punish severely those who shall transgress."——The same reasoning which arose from the first benefit is applicable to this second; as, without a *licenser* of the *press*, that is, without making it criminal by the King's authority, to publish any thing in print, to convey the smallest information; or lay any fact, or submit any reasoning to the people through the press, without the King's licence first had and obtained; and inflicting heavy punishments on those who presumed to do otherwise;—without this, it is impossible to devise any method by which the King shall be enabled to suppress, or prevent the insertion of such paragraphs as he may dislike, in a news-paper.

Third benefit. "That, by such increase of power, the King would be enabled to  
" dispose

“ dispose of the revenues, granted to him by  
“ Parliament, according to his *will and pleasure*,  
“ without controul, and without account.”  
This is the obvious and unavoidable sense of  
the speech! Mr. Smelt bitterly lamented  
that the petition tended to defeat this power.  
Let the following expressions taken from his  
speech be considered, and not even a shadow  
of doubt can remain: “ The petition tends,  
said he, “ to prevent the Sovereign from  
“ *disposing* of the revenues granted him by  
“ Parliament.” The petition neither asks  
nor implies any such thing. The King now  
has, and has always had, the disposal of  
the revenue; the business and duty of the  
Parliament was to take care that the Ministers  
of the King did not divert it from the objects  
to which they had destined it, and to punish  
them for such malversation when it hap-  
pened. This the petition begs the House of  
Commons to consider again as their duty and  
business, and to *perform* that duty. It asks  
this, and on that head, it asks no more.  
Again, “ the petition tended to make the  
“ King no longer a *judge of his own benevo-*  
“ *lence* (with whose money pray?) but to  
“ constitute parliament his guardians.” Surely  
Mr. Smelt must have thought the people  
of this country strangely altered, if not de-  
generated, when he hopes to alarm them into  
an opposition to any measure by telling them,



that "it tended to make the Parliament the King's Guardians." But, one more of Mr. Smelt's wishes laid before them, the people will think for themselves. Lest the *benevolence* of the King should be *stinted*, when the guardianship of the Parliament was ended;—lest his Majesty might not have *his* revenues large enough when entirely at *his own disposal*, Mr. Smelt expressed a strong desire "that *all* WAR TAXES and ESTABLISHMENTS should be kept to their *full extent* in times of peace." This indeed was not quite so well received in Yorkshire. The rest of the kingdom may perhaps *like it better*, especially when they consider with WHOM Mr. Smelt is in the most *confidential intimacy*.

Here, then, O people of England, you have both parties before you, in their own words, with their avowed intentions, with their acknowledged projects; the ends they desire, and the means by which they propose to attain those ends, openly professed. After this, no freeholder, not one of the people, can be at a moment's loss to decide on the part he shall take in the several county and other meetings, now or shortly to be called for the purpose of presenting such a petition as has been voted in Yorkshire. A short recapitulation will remove all doubts.

Whoever thinks that the *power and influence*

ence of the crown is *too little*, and ought to be ENCREASED;—

Whoever wishes that the King, so encreased in power, should regulate all *private companies*, and *punish* such *conversation* as he does not like;—

Whoever wishes and desires that the *liberty* of the PRESS should be restrained; a *licenser* established; all *information* to the people, in print, concerning *national* affairs, *suppressed*; and the inserting even a *single* paragraph in a news-paper, without the *King's leave*, severely punished;—

Whoever thinks that the Parliament ought to *grant* whatever money the King *asks*, and wishes that the *King* should dispose of his *people's* money so *granted*, according to his *will* and *pleasure*, without controul and without account;—

All those, who thus *think* and *wish*, are desired to attend at their respective county, city or other meetings, and there, with the KING'S FRIENDS and Mr. Smelt, support an address to his Majesty for the attainment of such *desirable objects*;—But

Whoever thinks that the *influence* of the CROWN is already *too great*, and employed to *corrupt* the parliament;—

Whoever thinks that corrupting the parliament with the *money of the people*, already *granted*, a means to make that parliament *grant more*;—

Who-



Whoever wishes to see a stop put to *unmerited* pensions; an abolition of *useless* places, and a temperate *reform* of all;—

Whoever wishes that parliament, made less corrupt, should grant the *people's money* with *caution* and *reluctance*, and see it *accounted* for with *rigorous punctuality*;—

All men, who *thus* think and wish, will attend at the county or other meetings; and, with the COUNTRY GENTLEMEN, support a PETITION of the *same kind* as that resolved on in the COUNTY of YORK.

---

*The Speech of Mr. SMELT, lately Sub-Governour to the Prince of Wales, at the Yorkshire Meeting; carefully taken down at the time.*

MR. SMELT requested the indulgence of the meeting, and their candid interpretation of arguments, which his want of skill and experience might fail to arrange with judgment, or place in their proper point of view. He said, that as the advertisement to call the county together was signed by many respectable names, he came to York with a confident hope, that their intention was to propose some measures for the promotion of the common cause, and to unite the

the minds of men in the hour of distress ; but that he lamented to find, that, instead of contributing to the support of government, the intention avowed was to divide its strength ; for that the ground of the petition seemed to be to curb the influence of the Crown, and to prevent the sovereign from disposing of the revenues granted to him by Parliament ; a measure by which he apprehended the latest posterity might be sensibly affected.

He then desired to shew his own consistency, by a detail of the circumstances of his life, and related, that he had early engaged in, and after nineteen years' faithful service, retired from a profession, without accepting any reward, or pension, as an illness, not contracted in service, but which had grown up with him from his infancy, had occasioned his desire to resign.

He took occasion here to reflect on the neglected state of the navy, and weak condition of the works at Plymouth, when he was called on in his official character, to inspect them in the course of the last war. During his retirement, of which this city was the scene, he affirmed that he had dedicated his time to the study of our constitution, and other national objects ; that while in this situation he received a call to a most important duty, for the faithful  
though



inadequate discharge of which, while in employment, he was well pleased to receive his wages; but that on the conclusion of his attendance upon the Princes, which he resigned from a sense of his own ability, he had declined the offer of an annuity for the remainder of his life; that he therefore once more retired to his own natural and humble situation, whence he was again drawn by the commands of his most gracious master; that whether the stipend he had from that time enjoyed was to be construed into a pension he could not tell, and was now even indifferent, for that from this moment he resigned it; "and now," said he, "I am an independent man."

He then reprobated the petition to the House of Commons, as it tended to make the King no longer the judge of his own benevolence, but to constitute Parliament his guardians; and declared it even illegal for one branch of the constitution to interfere with the operations of another. He affirmed that the power of the Crown was by no means exorbitant; that, on the contrary, it required to be greatly increased: that the King's influence was too little, and that his hands wanted to be strengthened; for that he is not able to curb the licentiousness with which he is every day talked of in every company and in every street, nor even to  
restrain

restrain the insertion of a news-paper paragraph, while the present measure tended to anarchy and confusion, and to snatch away that sacred veil which the constitution had wisely drawn round the Crown, and which only the greatest occasion should remove from before the splendour of Majesty. That such was the delicacy of the legislature, at the time of the Revolution, that the word *Abdication* was a work of three days' deliberation, their object being to maintain the immortality of the Royal Person, a person upon which the law had bestowed not only an exemption from death, but from error; that in this maxim, "the King can do no wrong," the only safeguard of the people is contained, and that from his protection alone their liberty is to be derived; he therefore recommended it to those who were in pursuit of liberty, that they should implore the protection of the King, as by protection and security liberty was to be understood.

He now entered on the comparative merits of the present administration, and those who conducted the affairs of the nation on Whig principles, and hence again deduced the property of giving greater power to the crown. He averred that, in the days of Whiggism, the minister, distinct from the crown, formed a fourth branch of legislature, which had absorbed within itself the power  
and



and office of the crown, and that leaving *de jure* royalty to be possessed by the Royal Person, the party of the minister assumed and exercised the office of King *de facto*. The narrow principles of self, actuated the measures and pursuits of Whigs: hence the complaints of our brethren in Ireland have been fomented, and hence the rebellion in America grew to so stupendous a height, that it was irresistible almost at the first. Lord Chatham, he granted, was formed to glare a meteor in a storm, but by no means to conduct finances in the time of peace; and declared that the present increase of debt arises from that want of foresight, which, in peace, never looks forward towards the exigencies of war; adding, that one of the greatest misfortunes of this country is, that no minister is found sufficiently firm to keep up the taxes on the return of peace to the greatest height of a war establishment: [*Here the whole meeting expressed the utmost disapprobation.*] for if that were done, provision might be made against the day of danger, and we should not, in the hour of pressing necessity, be obliged to purchase every requisite article at the most exorbitant prices: and here recurring to the crimination of Whiggism, he affirmed, that, if the last war had broke out two years after, we should not have had a fleet fit for service.

He

He then directly undertook to exculpate Government from the charge of having occasioned the calamities complained of, and transferred the blame to the people, whom he called the slaves of selfishness, which descended even to the election of coroners: to them alone he ascribed the disorders of the country. He denied the existence of one patriot. After admitting the possible truth of Lord Orford's assertion, that all men had their prices, he affirmed that if there be a patriot in this country, he is now upon the throne: "The King is not only the greatest and the best, but he was sorry to say, he believed him to be the only patriot in this country." He called to recollection a former meeting of the county of York, and lamented that the assembly present could blow both hot and cold in that room; for that nine years ago they considered the King as worthy of their respect; they then called on him to dissolve the Parliament, for excluding a man, whose private character none would be so bold as to vindicate; whereas, on the present occasion, Parliament is to be called on to restrain the King; he therefore besought the meeting, by every obligation that could influence the lover of his country, from every principle of public and private interest, from the loyalty and affection due to the most gracious prince,  
engaged



engaged in a war the most just that ever was entered into, to reject the petition, and to seek for the redress of our calamities from means in our own power to carry into effect. Let reformation begin with the body of the people. The principles of electors were corrupt: let them return to virtue, and let them choose for representatives discreet and dispassionate men; such men as are recommended to their choice by the writ of election. The only ground on which the petition could pretend to propriety, he said, was an opinion that the King is the servant of the people; and, now returning to the royal attributes, added, that it is a narrow, a little, and a mean idea: he is not the servant of the people, he is their soul; he is the soul of the constitution: from him and him alone, the constitution derives its energy; from him alone the operations of the state derive their efficacy: he is the life, the soul, the very existence of the constitution. And here, recommending once more the rejection of the petition, he professed his readiness to join in an address to the throne, expressive of loyalty, confidence, contribution of strength, and co-operation, &c. &c.

York,

*York, December 30, 1779.*

AT a very numerous and respectable meeting, of the first persons of consideration and property in this county, held here this day, the following petition and resolutions were unanimously agreed to:

*To the Honourable the Commons of Great Britain in Parliament assembled:*

*The Petition of the Gentlemen, Clergy, and Freeholders of the County of York,*

*Sheweth,*

THAT this nation hath been engaged for several years in a most expensive and unfortunate war; that many of our valuable colonies, having actually declared themselves independent, have formed a strict confederacy with France and Spain, the dangerous and inveterate enemies of Great Britain; that the consequence of those combined misfortunes had been a large addition to the national debt, a heavy accumulation of taxes, a rapid decline of the trade, manufactures, and land-rents of the kingdom.

Alarmed at the diminished resources and growing burthens of this country, and convinced that rigid frugality is now indispensably necessary in every department of the State, your petitioners observe with grief, that notwithstanding the calamities and im-

verified



verified condition of the nation, much public money has been improvidently squandered, and that many individuals enjoy sinecure places, efficient places with exorbitant emoluments, and pensions unmerited by public service, to a large and still encreasing amount; whence the Crown has acquired a great unconstitutional influence, which, if not checked, may soon prove fatal to the liberties of this country.

Your petitioners conceiving that the true end of every legitimate government is not the emolument of ANY INDIVIDUAL, but the welfare of the community; and considering that by the constitution of this realm, the national purse is intrusted in a peculiar manner to the custody of this Honourable House; beg leave further to represent that until effectual measures be taken to redress the oppressive grievances herein stated, the grant of an additional sum of public money, beyond the produce of the present taxes, will be injurious to the rights and property of the people, and derogatory from the honour and dignity of Parliament.

Your petitioners therefore, appealing to the justice of this Honourable House, do most earnestly request, that before any new burthens are laid upon this country, effectual measures may be taken by this House to enquire into and correct the gross abuses in the expenditure,

expenditure of public money; to reduce all exorbitant emoluments; to rescind and abolish all sinecure places and unmerited pensions; and to appropriate the produce to the necessities of the State in such manner as to the wisdom of Parliament shall seem meet.

And your petitioners shall ever pray, &c.

After which the following resolutions were proposed, and also unanimously agreed to, viz.

1st. Resolved, that the petition now read to this meeting, addressed to the House of Commons, and requesting that before any new burthens be laid upon the country, effectual measures may be taken by that House to enquire into and correct the gross abuses in the expenditure of public money: to reduce all exorbitant emoluments; to rescind and abolish all sinecure places and unmerited pensions; and to appropriate the produce to the necessities of the State, is approved by the meeting.

2d. Resolved, that a committee of sixty-one gentlemen be appointed to carry on the necessary correspondence for effectually promoting the object of the petition, and to prepare a plan of an association on legal and constitutional grounds, to support the laudable reform, and such other measures as may conduce to restore the freedom of Parliament.

The



The following gentlemen composed the Committee:

Sir. G. Armitage, Mr. Chaloner, Sir R. Hildyard, Mr. Morrit, Rev. Mr. Zouch, Sir. J. Norcliffe, Mr. Strickland of Boynton, Dean of Ripon, Mr. J. S. Smith, Mr. P. Milnes, Mr. Croft, Mr. Bell, Rev. Mr. Wyvil, Mr. Hill, Gen. Hale, Mr. Smith of Heath, Rev. Mr. Mafon, Mr. Tooker, Mr. H. Duncombe, Mr. H. Thompson, Mr. Croft, jun. Mr. Duncombe, Mr. Dalton, Mr. Strickland of Beverley, Sir William Milner, Mr. Hawksworth, Mr. Withers, Rev. Mr. Robinson, Mr. Foljambe, Major Ferrand, Mr. Farrer, Mr. James Milnes, Mr. Law, Mr. Edmunds, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Jackson, Rev. F. Dodsworth, Mr. Cradock, Mr. Carver, Rev. Mr. Michell, Sir Watts Horton, Mr. C. St. Quintin, Dr. Dring, Rev. J. Robinson, Mr. P. Wentworth, Mr. S. A. Ward, Rev. Mr. Cayley, Dean of York, Rev. Mr. Bourn, Rev. Mr. Comber, Mr. Marriott, Mr. G. Elsley, Mr. Pool, Alderman Carr, Mr. Barlow, Mr. Thornton, Rev. Mr. Dealtry, jun. Mr. F. Smyth, Rev. Mr. Eyre, Mr. Baynes, jun. Mr. Garforth, and Mr. Hildyard.

The above meeting was the most numerous and respectable ever known upon any occasion, since the Revolution.

Case of LORD HOLLAND.

---

*Copy of a Letter from Lord Holland to the  
Lord Mayor (Samuel Turner) of London,  
with his Lordship's Answer thereto.*

*To the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor.*

MY LORD,

**I**N a petition presented by your Lordship it is mentioned as a grievance—*Instead of punishing, conferring honours on a Pay-master, the public defaulter of unaccounted millions.* I am told that I am the pay-master here censured: May I beg to know of your Lordship if it is so? If it is, I am sure Mr. Beckford must have been against it, because he knows, and could have shewn your Lordship in writing, the utter falsehood of what is there insinuated.

I have not the honour to know your Lordship, so I cannot tell what you may have heard to induce you to carry to our Sovereign a complaint of so atrocious a nature.

Your Lordship by your speech made to the King at delivering the petition, has adopted the contents of it; and I don't know of whom to enquire but of your Lordship concerning this injury done to an innocent man, who am by this means (if I am the person



person meant) hung out as an object of public hatred and resentment.

You have too much honour and justice not to tell me whether I am the person meant, and if I am, the grounds upon which I am thus charged, that I may vindicate myself, which truth will enable me to do to the conviction of the bitterest enemy ; and therefore I may boldly say, to your Lordship's entire satisfaction, whom I certainly have never offended,

I am, with the greatest respect,

My Lord,

Your Lordship's most obedient,

And most humble servant,

*Holland-House, Kensington,*

HOLLAND.

*July 9, 1769.*

*The Lord Mayor's Answer.*

THE Lord Mayor presents his compliments to Lord Holland, and in answer to the honour of his Lordship's letter delivered to him by Mr. Selwyn, he begs leave to say that he had no concern in drawing up the petition from the Livery of London to his Majesty ; that he looks on himself only as the carrier, together with other gentlemen charged by the Livery with the delivery of it ; that he does not, nor ever did, hold himself accountable for the contents of it, and is a stranger to the nature of the supposed charge against his Lordship.

*Mansion-House, July 10, 1769.*

*From*

*From the GAZETTEER, July 17, 1769.*

---

*We have authority to give the public the following authentic copy of a letter, received yesterday by a Liveryman of London:—*

“DEAR SIR,      Fontbill, July 15, 1769.

“I AM as much surprized as you seem to be, at seeing my name, and papers in my possession, appealed to by a Noble Lord. You and my friends in the city think it incumbent on me to vindicate (as they are pleased to express themselves) my honour and character, which is called in question.— The only proper satisfaction in my power to give you, and my other friends, is, to relate plain matters of fact, to the best of my recollection.

“In the last sessions of Parliament, on a question of revenue, (as far as my memory serves,) I did declare to the House, that the public revenue had been squandered away, and that the money of the nation had not been regularly audited and accounted for; that in the department of the Pay-Office, I had been informed, there were upwards of forty millions not properly accounted for. That the Officers of the King's Exchequer were bound in duty to see justice done to the public. That process had issued out of the Court of Exchequer, and that all proceedings for a certain



certain time, had been suspended by the King's sign manual. I then did declare that it was an high offence for any minister to advise the King to stop the course of public justice, without assigning a very good reason for such his advice.—I desired the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the Lords of the Treasury, who sat opposite to me, to set me right if my information was not well founded; but not a single word was uttered in answer, by any of the gentlemen in administration.

“After some days had elapsed, I met my friend Mr. Woodhouse in Westminster-hall; he told me, I had been misinformed as to what I had mentioned in the House of Commons; and that, if I would give him leave, he would send me a paper from a Noble Lord, which would convince me of my mistake.—The paper alluded to is in London, I, therefore, cannot speak of the contents with accuracy and precision; but this I recollect, that the perusal of the papers did *not* convince me, that all I had heard was false. It was a private paper, and I do not recollect having shewn it to more than a single person. I have no doubt Mr. Woodhouse has a copy of the paper by him, and hope he will submit the contents to the judgment of the public, in vindication of an INNOCENT man.

“I am, dear Sir, your ever faithful

“And affectionate humble servant,

“WILL. BECKFORD.”

*From*

*From the same, July 19, 1769.*

**MUCH** having been said upon the subject of a Paymaster's accounts, it is fit that matter should be understood; and the public may be assured that the following detail is true.

When there is an account to be taken of any debt or debts due to the Crown, a writ of *Distringas ad Computandum* issues, *ex officio*, out of the Court of Exchequer. In obedience to this process, the Sheriff, where there is a liquidated balance, returns a shilling in the pound; but, where there is no liquidated balance, the Sheriff returns what are called *Issues*, generally, and these issues are more or less, according to the quantum of the debt or demand. To come now to the case of a late Paymaster. A *Distringas ad Computandum* was issued against him, directed to the Sheriffs of London. There being no account settled, or balance liquidated, the Sheriffs could only return *Issues*, and they returned against the same Paymaster, issues to the amount of 1000*l*. These issues were, in the regular course, carried, by the proper officer, from the Exchequer into the *Pipe*-office.

A warrant afterwards came from the Treasury to stop these issues. The issues were taken back from the *Pipe*-office.

To



*To the Printer of the GAZETTE*

*Kingsgate, July 20, 1769.*

**L**ORD HOLLAND seeing in your paper a letter from Mr. Beckford to a Liveryman, of July 15, 1769, and Mr. Woodhouse being at Spa in Germany, sends you an authentic copy of the paper, which he sent by Mr. Woodhouse to Mr. Beckford: he hopes the perusal of it will convince the reader that all is false that can be imputed any crime to Lord Holland.

The reader will see, that some of Lord Holland's accounts were then before the auditor; and there are two years' accounts since lodged there.

He will see that Lord Holland's accounts (voluminous and difficult beyond example) have not been kept back from inclination, but necessity; and not longer than those of his predecessors.

He will see (and is desired to observe particularly) that savings, so far from remaining all in Lord Holland's hands, had been given in, and voted in aid of the public service, to the amount of 910,541l. and 43,533l. 19s. 7d. (upon some regimental and other accounts, being adjusted this last winter) have been since paid and voted.

He

He will read in it, that Lord Holland desired to be shewn how he could proceed faster than he did. If nobody has shewn, or can shew how that might have been, or may be done, does he deserve either punishment or censure? And had he not a right to think himself sure that Mr. Beckford must have been against the article in the petition relating to him, because *Mr. Beckford knew, and could have shewn the Lord Mayor in writing, the utter falsehood of what is there insinuated.*

Lord Holland prints the memorial examined by the Treasury, and the sign manual it obtained; stopping process (not accounts) for six months, which neither did, nor could suspend or delay the Paymaster's accounts an hour.

HOLLAND.

---

*Observations on the Accounts of the Paymaster General.*

*Why were Lord Holland's Accounts as Paymaster General, for the years 1757, 1758, and 1759, not delivered to the Auditors, before the year 1768?*

Answer.

The Paymaster General's officers being best acquainted with army accounts, are employed in making up the account of the preceding



preceding Paymaster. The accounts of the Earls of Chatham, Darlington, and Kinnoul, and Mr. Potter, were made up by them, and regularly, and in due course delivered to the auditors.

Great as the army and its expences were, during the last war, beyond all former example, dispersed in all quarters of the world; and difficult, as it evidently must have been, to keep the accounts in any tolerable order; it will be found upon examination, that the accounts of Lord Holland, as Paymaster General, are not further back than those of his predecessors, and that his Lordship's accounts are not kept back, as has been suggested, from inclination, but necessity.

The late Mr. Winnington's accounts, for two years and a half, from December 1743, to the 14th of June 1746, were declared the 15th of May 1760. The Earl of Chatham's accounts, for nine years and a half, from the 25th of June 1746 to the 24th of December 1755, are not yet declared. The Earls of Darlington and Kinnoul, for the year 1756, and Earl of Kinnoul's and Mr. Potter's, for six months, to the 24th of June 1757, are now before the auditors. The accounts of Lord Holland, for the years 1757, 1758, and 1759; likewise the accounts of his deputies, attending the army in Germany,

many, from the commencement to the end of the late war, are also before the auditors for their examination; and his Lordship's account for the year 1760, is almost ready to be delivered to them.

From the nature and extension of army accounts, it is most evident, to those that are best acquainted with them, that it is tedious and difficult to bring even regimental accounts to a final adjustment; other parts of the accounts are more so. Lord Holland in the course of the years 1759, 1760, 1761, 1762, 1763, and 1764, has paid to regiments and independant companies, 320,391l. 9s. 11d.; whose accounts are at this time, unadjusted, for want of proper authorities; and till those authorities are obtained, the auditor will not allow one shilling of said sum, in his Lordship's accounts: to obtain those authorities, his Lordship has often repeated his solicitations.

*What is the Balance of Cash in Lord Holland's hands?*

Answer.

The meaning of this question can be no other than, What are the savings in Lord Holland's hands? Or, in other words, How much has the expence, in any case, fallen short of the sum voted?

As



As to the savings:—So far as the pay-office has been able to state the army accounts, they have been given into parliament.

From services that have fallen short of the sums voted; and for monies paid in by the army accountants, Lord Holland directed accounts to be made up and laid before the House of Commons; and accordingly (out of these savings in Lord Holland's hands) parliament from time to time availed itself of the following sums, viz.

	<i>l.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
Voted in aid of extraordinaries, to Dec. 24, 1763,	239,966	1	4
Voted in the year 1764, in aid of German claims	170,906	2	8
Voted in the year 1765, in aid of ditto service, -	251,740	2	7
Voted in the year 1766, in aid of extra services, -	60,638	2	10
Voted in the year 1767, in aid of extraordinaries, and other services - -	171,571	13	3
Voted in the year 1768, in aid of supply - -	15,712	15	7
	<hr/>		
	£.910,534	18	3

His Lordship could by no other means ascertain and give into parliament the savings on the votes for the army, but by the final adjustment

adjustment of army accounts; what further savings may be, is very uncertain, as they cannot be known before the services are absolutely determined and closed.

His Lordship is very sorry to say it, That in the years 1759, 1760, 1761, 1762, 1763, and 1764, there are not less than fifty-six regiments and companies, now standing open and unadjusted, for want of authorities; and in his ledgers there are accounts to a much greater extent, as the pay of staff-officers, &c. &c.

It may be seen here, that though Mr. Winnington died in April 1746, and his executor, Mr. Ingram, used all possible industry to close his accounts, they could not be closed till 1760; fourteen years. The Earl of Chatham went out in December 1755; yet his accounts were not closed till 1768; thirteen years. The Earl of Kinnoul's are not closed yet, and he has been out of office eleven years. Lord Holland has been out three years and a half; Where is the wonder his are not closed?

If those who complain, will shew Lord Holland how he can proceed faster than he does, he will be very much obliged to them. Let it be observed, that he has before the auditors, already, accounts for more years than Mr. Winnington or Lord Kinnoul had to account for.

MEMORIAL



MEMORIAL *for Lord Holland to have longer time to make up his accounts, as late Paymaster General.*

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR LORDSHIPS,

**I** BEG leave to inform your Lordships that a process is in the hands of the Sheriffs of Middlesex, against me, to account to his Majesty for the monies intrusted to me, as Paymaster General of his Majesty's forces.

I most humbly apprehend, that the regular ordinary course of accounting in the Exchequer, was calculated (when established) for transactions at home, which are easily and readily to be collected, and made up at short periods of time.

The accounts of the army, when employed abroad particularly, must unavoidably be much in arrear, from the nature of the service. The army payments are necessarily in arrear; and articles, from accidents inevitable, are obliged often to remain open a very long time before they can finally be closed.

The accounts of the last war are voluminous and difficult beyond example. The great variety of operations, and the very great distance of the troops, made, and must make, the correspondence, and adjusting those accounts, with the paymasters and accountants attending them, very slow and tedious: These  
therefore,

therefore, will require longer time to make up, both from their bulk and difficulty.

During the course of a war, the troops constantly changing and moving, and the service in the utmost hurry, it cannot *then* be done with the order and regularity absolutely necessary.

Since the war the utmost diligence has been used in them. The great intricate article of foreign expence, (*viz.* the German,) has been got together for the whole time, (which, after the former war, was several years about); and one year and an half's *General Account* is now made out, and ready to be laid before the auditors; the rest will regularly be laid before them, as fast as it is well possible to make them up. Though I have been two years out of employment, the payments for my time are not yet compleated.

I therefore pray your Lordships will be pleased to obtain his Majesty's warrant, granting me longer time for making up my accounts as Paymaster General of his Majesty's forces;

Which is, &c.

Pay-Office, Horse-Guards,

HOLLAND.

June, 25<sup>th</sup>, 1767.

King's



*King's Warrant. Stay of Process against  
Lord Holland for six months.*

(COPY.)

GEORGE R.

**W**HEREAS Our Right Trusty and Well-beloved Henry, Lord Holland, hath, by the annexed Memorial represented, that from several unavoidable causes and difficulties he hath been prevented making up his accompts, as late Paymaster General of Our forces: And we having taken the said matter into our Royal consideration, are graciously pleased to grant unto him a farther time for making up of his said accompts. Our will and pleasure therefore is, and We do hereby direct, authorize, and require you to cause all process against the said Henry, Lord Holland, for his accompts, as late Paymaster General of Our forces, to be stayed, for and during the term of six months, computed from the day of the date hereof. And for so doing this shall be your warrant, Given at Our Court at St. James's, the eighth day of July, 1767, in the seventh year of Our reign.

By his Majesty's Command,  
GRAFTON,  
C. TOWNSHEND,  
THO. TOWNSHEND.

*To Our Right Trusty and Well-  
beloved Samuel, Lord Marsham,  
Our Remembrancer in Our  
Court of Exchequer.*

Mr.

Mr. BURKE's *Speeches at Bristol.*

---

*Bristol, October 18, 1774.*

*The following is Mr. Burke's Speech to the  
Electors of Bristol, from the Hustings.*

'GENTLEMEN,

I am come hither to solicit in person, that favour which my friends have hitherto endeavoured to procure for me, by the most obliging, and to me the most honourable exertions.

'I have so high an opinion of the great trust which you have to confer on this occasion, and by long experience, so just a diffidence in my abilities, to fill it in a manner adequate even to my own ideas, that I should never have ventured of myself to intrude into that awful situation. But since I am called upon by the desire of several respectable fellow subjects, as I have done at other times, I give up my fears to their wishes. Whatever my other deficiencies may be, I do not know what it is to be wanting to my Friends.

'I am not fond of attempting to raise public expectation by great promises. At this time there is much cause to consider, and very little to presume. We seem to be approaching to a great crisis in our affairs, which



which calls for the whole wisdom of the wisest among us, without being able to assure ourselves, that any wisdom can preserve us from many and great inconveniencies. You know I speak of our unhappy contest with America. I confess it is a matter on which I look down as from a precipice. It is difficult in itself, and it is rendered more intricate by a great variety of plans of conduct. I do not mean to enter into them. I will not suspect a want of good intention in framing them. But however pure the intentions of their authors may have been, we all know that the event has been unfortunate. The means of recovering our affairs are not obvious. So many great questions of commerce, of finance, of constitution, and of policy, are involved in this American deliberation, that I dare engage for nothing, but that I shall give it, without any predilection to former opinions, or any sinister bias whatsoever, the honest and impartial consideration of which I am capable. The public has a full right to it; and this great city, a main pillar in the commercial interest of Great Britain, must totter on its base by the slightest mistake, with regard to our American measures. Thus much however, I think it not amiss to lay before you: That I am not, I hope, apt to take up or lay down my opinions lightly. I have held, and ever shall

I shall maintain to the best of my power, unimpaired and undiminished, the just, wise and necessary constitutional superiority of Great Britain. This is necessary for America, as well as for us. I never mean to depart from it. Whatever may be lost by it, I avow it. The forfeiture even of your favour, if by such a declaration I could forfeit it, though the first object of my ambition, never will make me disguise my sentiments on this subject.

‘ But I have ever had a clear opinion, and have ever held a constant correspondent conduct, that this superiority is consistent with all the liberties a sober and spirited American ought to desire. I never mean to put any colonist, or any human creature, in a situation, not becoming a free-man. To reconcile British superiority with American liberty shall be my great object, as far as my little faculties extend. I am far from thinking that both, even yet, may not be preserved.

‘ When I first devoted myself to the public service, I considered how I should render myself fit for it; and this I did by endeavouring to discover what it was, that gave this country the rank it holds in the world; I found that our prosperity and dignity arose principally, if not solely, from two sources; our constitution and commerce. Both these I have spared no study to understand, and to endeavour to support.



The distinguishing part of our constitution is its liberty. To preserve that liberty inviolate seems the particular duty and proper trust of a member of the House of Commons. But the liberty, the only liberty I mean, is a liberty connected with order: that not only exists along with order and virtue, but which cannot exist at all without them. It inheres in good steady government, as in its substance and vital principle.

The other source of our power is commerce, of which you are so large a part, and which cannot exist, no more than your liberty, without a connection with many virtues. It has ever been a very particular and a very favourite object of my study in its Principles, and in its details. I think many here are acquainted with the truth of what I say. This I know, that I have ever had my house open, and my poor services ready for traders and manufacturers of every denomination. My favourite ambition is to have those services acknowledged. I now appear before you to make trial, whether my earnest endeavours have been so wholly oppressed by the weakness of my abilities, as to be rendered insignificant in the eyes of a great trading city; or whether you chuse to give a weight to humble abilities, for the sake of the honest exertions with which they are accompanied. This is my trial to-day. My industry is not on trial; of my industry I am sure, as far as my constitution of mind and body admitted.

When I was invited by many respectable merchants, freeholders, and freemen of this city, to offer them my services, I had just received the honour of an election at another place, at a very great distance from this. I immediately opened the matter to those of my worthy constituents, who were with me, and they unanimously advised me not to decline it; that they had elected me with a view to the public service; and that as great questions relative to our commerce and colonies were imminent, that in such matters I might derive authority and support from the representation of this great commercial city; they desired me therefore to set off without delay, very well persuaded that I never could forget my obligations to them, or to my friends for the choice they had made of me. From that time to this instant I have not slept, and if I should have the honour of being freely chosen by you, I hope I shall be as far from slumbering or sleeping when your service requires me to be awake, as I have been in coming to offer myself a candidate for your favour.

*To the Gentlemen, Clergy, Freeholders and  
Freemen of the City of Bristol.*

GENTLEMEN,

I HUMBLY request your acceptance of my most hearty thanks for the high honour I have



I have this day received, in being elected one of your Representatives in Parliament.

Whatever advantage my public character may derive from the weight of so respectable a representation, you may be assured, shall be employed in promoting to the best of my judgment, the true interests of those from whom it is derived. I hope, that, by your frequent advice and seasonable assistance, I may be enabled to execute the great trust you have reposed in me, in a manner in some degree equal to its importance and your wishes.

To my particular friends I owe the sincerest affection; to this city the most inviolable duty; to the Sheriffs, who presided, my full testimony, that they have conducted themselves, through the whole of this long election, with the most liberal impartiality; with all the dignity of magistrates; with all the politeness of gentlemen.

It is natural, that an object, so important as the honour of representing this great city, should not be abandoned without reluctance. The Gentleman, who has been unsuccessful in his pursuit, threatens a petition. I submit, with great cheerfulness, my pretensions, and, what are more important, your rights, to the committee of election; the clearest cause to the justest tribunal. That tribunal, I am confident, will never authorise an attempt to render, contrary to the clear and express

express law of the land, the original, inherent, corporate rights of those entitled to freedom in this great city, dependent, for their valid exercise, on the occasional pleasure of a Minister, by dating their effect from the issuing of the writ. The time for issuing the writ is entirely in the power of the Minister; and he may communicate his intentions to those, and those only, whom he is inclined to favour; and upon this new doctrine enable them, and disable all others, from taking advantage of the right of freedom.

No care of mine shall be wanting to support the rights even of those freemen whom the gentleman who threatens a petition, was the first to produce and encourage, and when they can no longer serve his purpose, now endeavours to disfranchise by a retrospect.

I have the honour to be, with the highest veneration, esteem, and gratitude, Gentlemen, your most obedient, and ever obliged humble servant,

*Bristol, Nov. 3, 1774. EDMUND BURKE.*

*To the Gentlemen, Clergy, Freeholders, and Freemen of the City of Bristol.*

GENTLEMEN,

MY general conduct in Parliament, and my humble endeavours to serve the city, and the citizens of Bristol in their particular affairs, having been honoured by the unanimous



mous approbation of a very large and very respectable meeting at the Guildhall this day; in conformity with the desire of that meeting, and under the sanction of their weighty authority, I beg leave to renew to you my humble solicitation for your votes at this election, and the favour of your early appearance at the poll on Friday next; and if I have the honour of being again chosen to represent you, I trust that I shall not shew myself less deserving of your favour than formerly, or less sincerely grateful for it.

I have the honour to be, with the most perfect respect and esteem, Gentlemen, your most obedient and most obliged servant,

Bristol, Sept. 6, 1780. EDMUND BURKE.

*Mr. BURKE made the following speech on the hustings at Bristol when he declined the poll;*

“GENTLEMEN,

“I DECLINE the election. It has ever been my rule through life, to observe a proportion between my efforts and my objects. I have never been remarkable for a bold, active, and sanguine pursuit of advantages that are personal to myself.

“I have not canvassed the whole of this city in form. But I have taken such a view of it, as satisfies my own mind, that your choice will not ultimately fall upon me.

Your

Your city, gentlemen, is in a state of miserable distraction: and I am resolved to withdraw whatever share my pretensions may have had in its unhappy divisions. I have not been in haste; I have tried all prudent means; I have waited for the effect of all contingencies. If I were fond of a contest, by the partiality of my numerous friends (whom ye know to be among the most weighty and respectable people of the city) I have the means of a sharp one in my hands. But I thought it far better, with my strength unspent, and my reputation unimpaired, to do, early and from foresight, that which I might be obliged to do from necessity at last.

“ I am not in the least surprized, nor in the least angry at this view of things. I have read the book of life for a long time, and I have read other books a little. Nothing has happened to me but what has happened to men much better than me, and in times and in nations full as good as the age and country that we live in. To say that I am no way concerned, would be neither decent nor true. The representation of Bristol was an object on many accounts dear to me; and I certainly should very far prefer it to any other in the kingdom. My habits are made to it; and it is in general more unpleasant to be rejected, after long trial, than not to be chosen at all.

“ But, gentlemen, I will see nothing except  
your



your former kindness, and I will give way to no other sentiments than those of gratitude. From the bottom of my heart I thank you for what you have done for me. You have given me a long term, which is now expired. I have performed the conditions, and enjoyed all the profits to the full ; and I now surrender your estate into your hands, without being, in a single tile, or a single stone, impaired or wasted by my use. I have served the public for fifteen years. I have served you in particular for six. What is passed is well stored. It is safe and out of the power of fortune. What is to come is in wiser hands than ours ; and he, in whose hands it is, best knows whether it is best for you and me, that I should be in Parliament, or even in the world.

“ Gentlemen, the melancholy event of yesterday reads to us an awful lesson against being too much troubled about any of the objects of ordinary ambition. The worthy gentleman, (Mr. Combe,) who has been snatched from us at the moment of the election, and in the middle of the contest, whilst his desires were as warm, and his hopes as eager as ours, has feelingly told us, what shadows we are, and what shadows we pursue.

“ It has been usual for a candidate who declines, to take his leave by a letter to the Sheriffs ; but I received your trust in the face of day, and in the face of day I accept your dismissal.

dismissal. I am not—I am not at all ashamed to look upon you: nor can my presence discompose the order of business here. I humbly and respectfully take my leave of the Sheriffs, the candidates, and the electors, wishing heartily that the choice may be for the best, at a time which calls, if ever time did call, for service that is not nominal. It is no plaything you are about. I tremble when I consider the trust I have presumed to ask. I confided perhaps too much in my intentions. They were really fair and upright; and I am bold to say, that I ask no ill thing for you, when, on parting from this place, I pray, that whoever you choose to succeed me, may resemble me exactly in all things, except in my abilities to serve, and my fortune to please you."

*To the Gentlemen, Clergy, Freeholders, and  
Freemen of the City of Bristol.*

GENTLEMEN, *Bristol, Sept. 9, 1780.*

A VERY large and most respectable meeting of the principal citizens of Bristol did, by an unanimous vote, authorise me to offer myself once more to your service. My deference to that authority was my sole motive for giving you one moment's trouble. On my canvass, so far as it has proceeded, I found that my pretensions were well received, and even with a degree of warmth in many of the electors.

VOL. III.

E F

But



But on a calm and very deliberate view of the state of the city, I am convinced that no other consequence can be reasonably expected from my continuing a candidate, than a long, vexatious, and expensive contest. Conscious, that no difference between my service and that of any other man, can be worth the inconveniencies of such a struggle, I decline the election.

I return you my best thanks for having at any time, or for any period, condescended to think of me for your representative. I have done my duty towards you, and towards the nation, as became me. You dispose of the future trust (as you have a right to do) according to your discretion. We have no cause of complaint on either side. By being returned into the mass of private citizens, my burthens are lessened, my satisfactions are not destroyed. There are duties to be performed, and there are comforts to be enjoyed in obscurity, for which I am not without a disposition and relish. I am sure there is nothing in the retrospect of my public conduct, which is likely to disturb the tranquillity of that situation, to which you restore me.

I have the honour to be, with the utmost possible respect, gentlemen, your much obliged, and most obedient humble servant,

EDMUND BURKE.

FINIS.

## NEW PUBLICATIONS.

PRINTED FOR

T. N. LONGMAN, No. 39, Paternoster-Row.

1. **FAMILY SECRETS**, Literary and Domestic. By Mr. PRATT. In five large Volumes, 12mo. Price 11. 5s. Boards.

"Mr. Pratt has introduced to a numerous set of readers a Novel that has the merit of being at once tender, pathetic, and full of love; and, which may be a more uncommon circumstance, of love mixed with the greatest discretion." *Monthly Review, May, 1797.*

"In the volumes before us, there are several beautiful and affecting strokes of nature." *Analytical Review, April, 1797.*

"This production is in the manner of the *Old School*; that is, the author has made it his chief object to display *Nature as she is*, and to exhibit such characters as cannot but be found among those classes whom he has delineated. Accordingly, the great merit of the book consists in the several scenes producing their appropriate effects, and the whole tending to impress on the mind new motives to love, and to promote humanity, virtue and religion."

*Gentleman's Magazine for May.*

2. **GLEANINGS THROUGH WALES, HOLLAND, and WESTPHALIA**; with Views of Peace and War at Home and Abroad. To which is added, **HUMANITY**; or, The Rights of Nature: A Poem. Revised and corrected. By Mr. PRATT. In three Volumes, 8vo. Price One Guinea in Boards. Third Edition.

"We have found so many lively and pleasant exhibitions of manners, so many amusing and interesting anecdotes, and so many observations and reflections, gay and grave, sportive and sentimental, (all expressed in a gay and familiar style,) better suited to the purpose than sentences laboured with artificial exactness, that we cannot but recommend it to our readers as a highly amusing and interesting performance." *Analytical Review, Jan. 1796.*

3. **CLARA DUPLESSIS, and CLAIRANT: The History of a FAMILY of FRENCH EMIGRANTS**. Translated from the German. In 3 vols. 12mo. Price 10s. 6d. in Boards.

"This pathetic novel, or relation of facts, has been deservedly successful in its native country, and at Paris."

"The characters are drawn with a truth of nature which is truly admirable."



NEW PUBLICATIONS PRINTED FOR T. N. LONGMAN.

"We should with pleasure translate some affecting fragments, but a work of this stamp is not formed to be long a stranger to our literature."

*App. to Monthly Review, Vol. 22.*

4. AN OLD FRIEND WITH A NEW FACE; a Novel. By Mrs. PARSONS. In three Volumes. Price 10s. 6d. Boards.

5. A GOSSIP'S STORY and LEGENDARY TALE. By Mrs. WEST, Author of Advantages of Education, &c. In two Volumes, 12mo. Second Edition. Price 7s. in Boards.

"We can recommend this story as uniting to a great degree of interest the rarer qualities of good sense, and an accurate knowledge of mankind. The grammatical errors and vulgarisms which disgrace many even of our most celebrated novels, have here no place; and several of the shorter poetical pieces interspersed through the work, have very considerable merit. Amusement is combined with utility, and fiction is enlisted in the cause of virtue and practical philosophy."

*Monthly Review, January, 1797.*

6. LOVE'S PILGRIMAGE, a Story founded on Facts; compiled from the Journal of a deceased Friend. In three Volumes, 12mo. Price 9s. in Boards.

"A most interesting and well-told Story. The language polished and easy; the morality pure and clear. We could expatiate on its merits; and we could select many striking parts; but we trust a strong commendation will be as useful as a prolix one."

*British Critic, August, 1796.*

7. CAROLINE DE MONTMORENCI, a Tale. In one Volume, 12mo. Price 3s. sewed.

"A pathetic Tale, told in elegant language.—As a whole it is far superior to most publications of the kind."

*British Critic, May, 1795.*

8. A JOURNEY OVER LAND to INDIA, partly by a Route never gone before by any European. By DONALD CAMPBELL, of Barbreck, Esq. who formerly commanded a Regiment of Cavalry in the Service of his Highness the Nabob of the Carnatic. In a Series of Letters to his Son; comprehending his Shipwreck and Imprisonment by Hyder Ali, and his subsequent Negotiations and Transactions in the East. Handsomely printed on fine Wove Paper, 4to. Price One Guinea in Boards.

"A work like this has, in one respect, an advantage over those books of Voyages and Travels which are written on the spur of the occasion; for it abounds with matured reflections, and contains the travels of the writer's mind, together with his bodily peregrinations. We cannot take leave without expressing our admiration of the spirit and perseverance displayed by Mr. Campbell, in surmounting the difficulties and dreadful hardships, which he has described with so much feeling and ability."

*Monthly Review, Oct. 1795.*

9. A RESIDENCE IN FRANCE, during the Years 1792, 3, 4, and 5; described in a Series of Letters from an English Lady; with general and incidental Remarks on the French Character

NEW PUBLICATIONS PRINTED FOR T. N. LONGMAN

Character and Manners. Two Volumes, 8vo. The third Edition.  
Price 14s. in Boards.

"It is only justice to say, that the style is as polished as the matter is interesting and important; nor have we any doubt that the book will remain a permanent monument of the taste and talents of the writer."

*British Critic, Sept. 1797.*

10. A LETTER to the Honourable THOMAS ERSKINE, containing some STRICTURES on his "VIEW of the CAUSES and CONSEQUENCES of the present WAR with FRANCE." By JOHN GIFFORD, Esq. The Tenth Edition. Price 3s.

"Seeing also, as every reader must here see, facts, applied to declamation, and proofs to bare assertion, we cannot conceive ourselves biased by any kind of prejudice, when we pronounce that this publication contains a complete and solid answer to Mr. Erskine."

*British Critic, April, 1797.*

11. A SECOND LETTER to the Honourable THOMAS ERSKINE. By JOHN GIFFORD, Esq. Price 2s.

12. A DEFENCE of the FRENCH EMIGRANTS. Addressed to the People of France. By THOMAS GERALD DE LALLY-TOLENDAL. Translated from the French by JOHN GIFFORD, Esq. In one Volume, 8vo. Price 7s. in Boards.

"We do not here propose to announce, or recommend to public notice, a work which was known all over Europe as soon as it was published, and of which the numerous editions are disposed of with a rapidity equal to that with which they succeed each other; but we would willingly pay that tribute of homage and good wishes which is due from every man who commiserates the unfortunate, or is sensible of the claims of justice, and the interests of social order."

"If ever a man could be fitted, by a train of circumstances, to undertake the defence of a cause so great, and at the same time so distressing and so difficult, it is undoubtedly the noble advocate who has taken it up."

"Undoubtedly there is not among all the French Emigrants a man more proper to undertake their defence, than he whom fortune had placed in such a situation; than he on whom Providence had imposed such duties; endowing him with such sentiments and faculties, and had forced and instigated from his infancy to pursue, to unmask, to combat, to disarm, and beat down fraud, injustice, and violence."

"We confess that under each of these points of view, the champion of the Emigrants has fulfilled, perhaps surpassed, what we had promised ourselves from his undertaking. We shall not praise the eloquence, the force of reasoning, the touching sensibility which characterize every page of the Defence of the Emigrants. We shall only repeat what has been said a thousand times in France and out of France, 'I was what every body expected from him.'"

*British Critic, June, 1797.*

13. SECRET



13. **SECRET HISTORY** of the **FRENCH REVOLUTION**, from the **CONVOCACTIONS** of the **NOTABLES** in 1787, to the **FIRST** of **NOVEMBER**, 1796; containing a vast Number of Particulars but little known; together with Extracts of the most remarkable Publications on the Revolution, which have appeared in France, Germany, and England. Translated from the French of **FRANCIS PAGES**. In two Volumes, 8vo. Price 14s. in Boards.

14. An **HISTORY**, or **ANECDOTES** of the **REVOLUTION** in **RUSSIA**, in the Year 1762. Translated from the French of **M. DE RULHIÈRE**. With an elegant Head of the late **EMPERESS**. Second Edition. Price 4s. sewed.

This work was written by the author shortly after the transactions which he relates, of which he was an eye witness. Great efforts were made by **CATHARINE** at the Court of **FRANCE**, to suppress the publication. Bribes and menaces were made use of, but she could succeed no further than to obtain a promise that it should not appear in her life time.—The **EMPERESS** being now dead, it is just published in France, by the Heir of **M. DE RULHIÈRE**.

“The grounds of **M. DE RULHIÈRE**’s information seem indisputable, and his readers appear to have every reason to be satisfied with his discernment, in unfolding the motives and circumstances that concurred in bringing about this striking event. He is no servile copier, but has drawn his characters, and described his scenes, with the hand of a master.—Such is the account now, for the first time delivered to the public, of the circumstances attending the melancholy end of **PETER III.** the absolute monarch of a vast empire; and who, with all his infirmities, performed, during his short reign of only six months, so many acts of humanity and mercy, and shewed such dispositions to promote the happiness of mankind, that his defects in point of prudence demand from the sympathizing heart a tear upon his ashes.

“We shall only add, that we have seldom met with more interesting original anecdotes, than those that are contained in the little work which we have now reviewed.”

*App. to Monthly Review, Vol. 22.*

15. A **LETTER** to a **MINISTER** of **STATE** on the **CONNECTION** between the **POLITICAL SYSTEM** of the **FRENCH REPUBLICK**, and the **PRINCIPLES** of the **FRENCH REVOLUTION**: Containing an Exposition of the Resolution and Projects of the French Government, on the important Subject of **PEACE**. By **MALLAT DU PAN**. Translated from the French. Price 1s.

“There is no political writer in Europe to whose productions we are more inclined to pay attention, than those of **M. MALLAT DU PAN**.”

“Of a pamphlet so very important, we could not content ourselves with giving only a short account; we have therefore laid before the reader such specimens as will evince its general nature, and will, doubtless, induce many to consider more at large a memorial containing so many proofs of political sagacity and wisdom.”

*British Critic, July, 1797.*