

14 vols, & 1 vol. Misc. works

5 vols, 157-

5076-24-10-0

Dhananjayrao Gadgil Library



GIPE-PUNE-003235

~~4137~~

~~39~~
~~Rte~~

3235



The Right Hon. Henry Grattan.

Published by Longman & Co. 21, Ave. Marie.

THE
SPEECHES
OF THE
RIGHT HONOURABLE
HENRY GRATTAN,
IN THE IRISH,
AND
IN THE IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

EDITED BY HIS SON.

IN FOUR VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

PRO PATRIA ET VIVERE ET MORI.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR

LONGMAN, HURST, REES, ORME, AND BROWN;
AND R. MILLIKEN, DUBLIN.

1822.

V342L46

A82201

3235

LONDON:
Printed by A. & E. Spottiswoode,
New-Street-Square.

DEDICATION.

TO THE

PEOPLE OF IRELAND.

I DEDICATE to you the following Speeches, for to you they peculiarly belong; they were delivered in defence of your rights and your liberties; and they contributed to make Ireland an independent nation.

They abound with precepts of philosophy, of morality, and of religion; and are founded in the spirit of genuine liberty. They furnish instruction to statesmen and to ministers, and contain advice for the people and the King.

If they should contribute to the public good, they will accomplish the object of a life passed in the service of his country.

And that the principles which they contain
may tend to make the Sovereign secure and
beloved, and *his subjects prosperous and free,*

Is the hereditary wish

of your Countryman,

HENRY GRATTAN.

Dublin,
November, 1821.

CONTENTS

OF

THE FIRST VOLUME.

	<i>Page</i>
INTRODUCTION	ix
Character by a member of the University of Dublin, 1789	xxxvii
— by Mr. Courtney, 1808	xxxix
Extract from the Memoirs of James Earl of Charlemont, by Francis Hardy	xl
— from the Historical Anecdotes of the Legislative Union between Great Britain and Ireland, by Sir Jonah Barrington.....	xli
Character by the Rev. Mr. Croly	xlv
Poetry	lxxvi

*Thus marked * are the principal Speeches.*

1778.		2. * Mr. Robert Stewart's Motion regarding the Expences of the Nation.....	1
		6. Mr. Grattan moves an Address to His Ma- jesty, setting forth the distressed State of the Irish Nation	13
1779.			
Oct.	12.	Mr. Grattan moves an Amendment to the Address to the King, requiring a Free Trade for Ireland	20
Nov.	10.	Mr. Grattan defends the Volunteer Associ- ations, and the Right of the Constituent to instruct his Representative.....	25
	24.	Mr. Grattan moves that it would be inexpe- dient to grant New Taxes.....	30
		List of Members who voted against the Motion	32
	25.	Mr. Trench's Motion to grant the Loan Duties for Six Months only	33
		List of Members who voted for and against a Six Months' Money Bill	36
1780.			
April	19.	* Mr. Grattan moves the Resolution, declaring the Right of the Irish Nation to be bound only by her own Parliament	38

		<i>Page</i>
1780.		
April 19.	List of Members who voted against Mr. Grattan's Motion	54
May 24.	The Speaker's (Pery) Speech on presenting the Money Bills	55
	29. Mr. Gervase Parker Bushe's Motion to introduce an Irish Mutiny Bill	57
Aug. 16.	Mr. O'Hara moves an Amendment to limit the Duration of the Irish Mutiny Bill	62
	List of Members who voted for and against a perpetual Mutiny Bill	79
Sept. 2.	Close of the Session. Speech of Lord Lieutenant (Buckinghamshire)	81
1781.		
Oct. 9.	Opening of Parliament. Speech from the Throne, of the Lord Lieutenant (Carlisle) ...	82
Nov. 13.	Mr. Grattan moves for leave to introduce Heads of a limited Mutiny Bill	85
	List of Members who voted for and against a perpetual Mutiny Bill	89
Dec. 7.	Mr. Grattan moves for a Committee to inquire into the State of the Public Expences	94
	22. The Speaker's (Pery) Speech, on presenting the Money Bills	97
	25. Mr. Gardiner moves for leave to introduce a Bill for the Relief of the Roman Catholics ...	98
1782.		
Feb. 15.	Roman Catholic Relief Bill	99
	18. The same	100
	20. The same	101
	22. * Mr. Grattan moves an Address to His Majesty, declaring the Rights of Ireland	104
	List of the new Administration	121
April 16.	Mr. Grattan moves an Amendment to the Address to His Majesty, declaring the Rights of Ireland	122
May 27.	* Mr. Grattan moves an Address to His Majesty, for his gracious Answer to their Declaration of the Rights of the Irish Nation	131
	Copy of the King's Answers to the Addresses from the Irish Parliament	136

1782.		
May	31.	Grant to Mr. Grattan..... 138
June	14.	Mr. Flood's Motion regarding the Simple Re- peal of 6 Geo. I. 140
July	19.	* Mr. Flood's Motion respecting the Declaratory Act of 6 Geo. I. 145
		Change of Ministry 167
	23.	Mr. Flood moves an Amendment to the Address to the Lord Lieutenant, with reference to the Declaratory Act of 6 Geo. I. 168
	27.	Speech of the Lord Lieutenant (Duke of Port- land) at the close of the Session 170
1783.		
Oct.	14.	Meeting of Parliament 172
		Death of Chief Baron Burgh 174
		Change of Ministry 175
	28.	* Dispute between Mr. Grattan and Mr. Flood 176
Nov.	3.	Mr. Flood moves an Address to His Majesty, stating the Expences of the Country, and praying for a Reduction in the Army 186
	10.	Sir H. Cavendish moves for a Retrenchment in the Expences of the Kingdom 188
	29.	Mr. Flood moves for leave to bring in a Bill for the more equal Representation of the People in Parliament 191
Dec.	22.	Speaker's Speech on presenting the Money Bills at the Bar of the House of Lords 195
1784.		
Feb.	18.	Address to the Lord Lieutenant (Northington) 196
		Change of Ministers 198
March	20.	Mr. Flood moves the committal of a Bill, for the more equal Representation of the People in Parliament 198
	31.	Mr. Grattan moves certain Resolutions respect- ing the Salaries of the Officers of Revenue.... 201
		His Reply 207
1785.		
Jan.	21.	* Meeting of Parliament. Address to the Lord Lieutenant (Duke of Rutland) 208
Feb.	11.	Mr. Orde introduces the Propositions regard- ing the Trade between Great Britain and Ireland 214

		<i>Page</i>
1785.		
Feb.	14. Militia	217
	28. Commercial Propositions	220
June	13. Mr. Orde proposes an Adjournment	222
Aug.	2. Mr. Orde proposes an Adjournment	224
	11. Mr. Flood moves his Resolution, regarding the Commercial Propositions	226
	12. * Mr. Orde moves the Commercial Propositions	229
	15. Copy of the Commercial Propositions	250
	Mr. Orde submits his bill on the subject of the Commercial Propositions	255
Sept.	5. Resignation of the Speaker (Mr. Pery)	261
	6. Address to the Lord Lieutenant	263
1786.		
Feb.	9. * Mr. Conolly's Motion relative to the Taxes granted, on the faith that the Irish Proposi- tions would be acceded to	269
March	13. * Mr. Forbes presents his bill to limit the Amount of Pensions	279
	21. Speaker's Speech	289
	22. Police Bill for the City of Dublin	290
	25. Police Bill	295
	The same	297

APPENDIX.

1782.		
June	11. Mr. Flood's Speech on Simple Repeal of 6 Geo. I.	301
	14. Mr. Flood's Motion on the subject of Simple Repeal	312
	Mr. Grattan's Remarks on Mr. Flood's Argu- ment on Simple Repeal	323
1783.		
Nov.	Mr. Flood's Defence in answer to Mr. Grattan	327

INTRODUCTION.

BY J. C. SCHMIDT

THESE volumes may serve as an Index to the History of Ireland. They explain the form of government prior to the period of 1782, and the oppressive laws imposed upon the Irish people, and show by what measures their situation was altered and improved; they set forth the condition of the Roman Catholic, and the progress made in repealing the laws by which he was aggrieved; they comprise the best period of the Irish nation, the rise and fall of her Independent Constitution.

The speeches have been collected from the most authentic sources to which the Editor could procure access. Some of them never appeared in Mr. Grattan's life-time, and many of them were revised or noted by him. The matter which it was thought necessary to connect with the several speeches, has been carefully selected; but where the subjects are so numerous and various, errors may have inadvertently occurred. The list of the divisions on some important questions have been inserted, with a view to render justice to the memory of honourable men, and to transmit to posterity the names of those who stood forward in defence of the Freedom and Constitution of their Country.

Mr. Grattan seldom wrote out more than the heads of his speech, and the principal arguments on which he meant to rely, and it was only at the instance of his friends that he could be induced to

give in writing the substance of what he had spoken. There remain several abstracts of important subjects, but in a state too imperfect to be of any service. Several of his speeches have, in consequence, been lost, and among these several of the early ones, which he always considered as the best. Nothing remains of those on the Irish embargo in 1776; on the employing 4000 Irish troops in America; on the repeal of Poyning's law; the Irish tenantry bill, the pension list, and the free trade in 1779. At that period, the debates in the Irish parliament were not reported with any degree of correctness, so that not only the speeches in question, but those also of the other leading characters of that day, are for ever lost to posterity. It is to be regretted, that Mr. Flood has left but little behind him, and that Mr. Burgh, Mr. Daly, and Mr. Yelverton, have left nothing. We can form no just idea of their ability, of their eloquence, of their constitutional principles, and their able arguments on behalf of the freedom of their native land; and though the fame of these great men is known by their acts, and though it lives, recorded in the annals of their country, yet justice is not rendered to their memory, since it remains deprived of the bold and splendid monuments which were reared by these strenuous asserters of liberty, and which would have perpetuated the eloquent evidence of their virtues, their talents, and their achievements.

The style of Mr. Grattan's speaking was strikingly remarkable, — bold, figurative, and empassioned; always adapted to the time and circumstance, and peculiarly well suited to the taste and temper of the audience that he had to address. His speech on the declaration of right, it is said, was delivered with a

singular degree of enthusiasm, and some individuals who were present declared that, towards the conclusion, they almost fancied it was the speaking of a man who was inspired. Much must be attributed to the spirit-stirring subject then under discussion; much also to the fervent character of Irish eloquence, and last, though not least, to the ardent genius and animated nature of an individual whose mind was fraught with a just sense of his country's wrongs, and who was impelled by the powerful motives of affection, of duty, and of patriotism.

Towards his latter days, *paulo deferbuerat oratio*. In the latter part of his career, his arguments were more closely arranged; there was less ornament, but more fact and reasoning, less to dazzle the sight, and more to convince the understanding; there was nothing open, nothing chinky, it was welded iron, it was beaten steel, it was a panoply on all sides round, *undique tectum, tutumque*.

Perhaps nothing was more remarkable than the difference in the auditory that he had to address in the Irish and the Imperial Parliament, and the complete success that attended his efforts in both countries. In the English House, his course was comparatively tranquil; but in Ireland it was different, *hoc opus, hic labor*, he had to awaken and inspire an oppressed nation, not yet grown to a knowledge of her rights, or a sense of her importance; to inculcate in the minds of the people, the value of a free Constitution; to mark the wrongs to which they had been doomed to submit; to instruct them what they had a right to demand; and to shake off the chains which had not only curbed their action, but cramped their understanding. Meanwhile they were to be cautioned and protected against the headlong courses almost inseparable from great popular bodies seeking

their long lost rights, and natural even after their recovery; least that, in shaking off the supremacy of Great Britain, the connection between the two countries should be endangered, and revolution should verge towards separation.

————— Here he had need
All circumspection.

Ireland had been so arbitrarily governed, and the people were so oppressed, that it was a matter of danger as well as boldness, even to state the grievances or the rights of the subject; Molyneux, Swift, and Lucas, were singular and illustrious examples of this melancholy truth; the champions of Irish liberty, and her martyrs; the writings of the first were burned, those of the second prosecuted, and the person of the third was banished. Primate Boulter, in his letters, says the works of Swift endangered the connection; the Irish government offered a reward for the discovery of the author; and proceeded against the printer in a manner the most arbitrary and unconstitutional. The British House of Commons resolved, that the celebrated work of Molyneux, "*The Case of Ireland*," was dangerous and seditious, and calculated to shake the *dependence* of Ireland upon Great Britain! The grand jury presented the writings of Lucas; the judge condemned them, the House of Commons denounced them, and the author was banished from his country, — that country whose liberties he had asserted. Never was such a thralldom known in any age or nation; the people had neither law nor liberty, nor education, nor manufacture, nor commerce; the House of Commons could originate nothing; the Privy Council could alter or suppress their bills; the Parliament was during the life of the

King; the judges were dependent on his pleasure; the customs and excise were granted to the crown for ever; the mutiny bill was perpetual; manufactures were discouraged, and trade prohibited. As to the Catholics, they were a proscribed race, and possessed neither rights of person, of property, or of religion. An idea of the mode of government can be formed from this circumstance, that it was not until the time of James the First that the murder of an Irishman was considered a crime; it was merely an offence punishable by fine. Such had been the state of Ireland. Every thing was terror, desolation, and rapine!

Time had removed some, and perhaps softened many, of these evils; habit had rendered others less intolerable, and the native character of the inhabitants had done much to mitigate the severity of a barbarous code. But it was not until the period of 1782 that the system was overturned, the last vestige of civil tyranny was effaced, and the dawn of religious liberty at length began to appear. The patriots of that day undertook this Herculean labour; and, determined to cleanse the island from centre to circumference, they commenced with caution, and proceeded with temper, with moderation, and with firmness. Mr. Flood and Mr. Yelverton selected the Law of Poynings; Mr. G. P. Bushe, the Perpetual Mutiny Bill; Mr. Gardiner and Sir Hercules Langrishe, the Penal Code; Mr. Grattan and Mr. Brownlow attacked the Supremacy of the British Parliament; Mr. Burgh and Mr. Daly assisted in all these various operations; and the meetings at Charlemont House superintended and directed the whole. They were at the same time supported by great auxiliaries; the American war; the depressed state of the fortunes,

of Great Britain ; and the weakness of Lord North's administration. They seized the opportunity with promptitude and judgment ; they proclaimed aloud the grievances and injuries of the nation, and the rights and liberties to which she was entitled by compact and by nature. The tone which they assumed was strong, because it was necessary ; for the only way to recover the lost liberties of the country was by an appeal to the people. To make that appeal was easy ; but to make it with success was a matter of difficulty ; and herein consists the great merit of the men of that day, and in particular of Lord Charlemont and Mr. Grattan. They excited a great body ; they roused them to a sense of their country's wrongs ; they appealed to their spirit ; they applied to their passions ; they invoked in aid every sentiment and feeling likely to operate on the mind of a sanguine and a sensitive people, — shame, pride, indignity, honor, and revenge. This body they not only called into action, but they directed its resolves, controlled its motions, and guided all its operations, with surprising wisdom and dexterity. Their moderation was the more singular, as their power and resources were great. Not a showy troop of horse, or a raw company of foot, but a *nation in arms* ; — the body of the people instructed, trained *, disciplined, and headed by the nobility and aristocracy of the kingdom. Never was there beheld so glorious a crusade in the cause of justice and of freedom. Never was there a political navigation in which lay so many shoals, and so few channels, in which such false lights were held out to the inex-

* See the return and list of the volunteers in the Appendix to the Miscellaneous Works of Mr. Grattan.

perienced mariners ; and yet, in which, amidst all the various and complicated dangers that surrounded them, the vessel of the state was piloted with such admirable steadiness and dexterity, not merely in safety, but with triumph.

The singular and memorable Revolution of 1782, designed by Lord Charlemont and Mr. Grattan, was effected by the volunteers ; their bold but judicious resolves on the state of the country ; their addresses to the popular members ; and the answers, or rather the advice given to them in answer ; their military meetings ; their provincial reviews ; their martial air ; their regulated deportment, and their temperate language, not merely excited a spirit of liberty, but diffused a union and harmony throughout all classes of men, and contributed to accomplish the object which their leaders had in view. The popular party in the House of Commons, thus encouraged from without, became emboldened, and acquired strength and spirit, feeling such a body at hand to aid and support them. Meanwhile the government beheld in silence, events which it had no longer the power to control. The ministerial party gradually became weaned from their habitual obedience to the mandates of the government. They abated somewhat of their opposition to the measures of the patriotic members ; and some of them even held negotiations with the chiefs of the opposition. Thus, by a rare and felicitous union, was that great question carried which Mr. Grattan had so often proposed ; thus was a great revolution effected without bloodshed ; and thus did Ireland at length become an independent nation.

To the strenuous exertions of a few patriots she owed her liberty ; she was also indebted for it to her own moderation ; the volunteers stated their griev-

ances simply, but firmly ; they felt they had arms in their hands, and knew they would be more formidable if they used the language of discretion. With a host of grievances they avoided clamour ; with many threats to deter, and artifices to deceive, they stood firm and unmoved ; and, with great and grave authority to mislead them, they remained unsuscepted and unterrified. After they had recovered the independence of their country, they proceeded no further, and in their moderation they discovered true greatness. They form an æra in the history of mankind ; they exhibit to posterity a splendid example ; and show what a nation can achieve, when governed by a spirit of union, and influenced by the principles of liberty.

To establish Mr. Grattan's fame for eloquence, a few select speeches might have sufficed ; but to preserve the record of his political life was a service of greater value. To transmit the entire of his public conduct to posterity, was a debt due not only to the individual, but to the nation ; on his part to show his early and incessant anxiety for her welfare ; his repeated efforts on her behalf ; his attachment to Irish independence and to British connection ; to the interest of the Protestant as well as the rights of the Catholic ; and, in the service of both, his long, his unwearied, and, to use his own words, *his desperate fidelity*. On the part of Ireland, too, it was incumbent to pourtray her wrongs ; her struggles for freedom ; her deliverance from political thralldom ; her progress in the cause of civil and religious liberty ; and likewise to record the noble efforts of those patriotic men, who, in 1800, were proof against temptation and menace ; and who under every disadvantage honourably stood forth to defend and preserve her independent constitution, and remove

from their character the lasting disgrace, of having basely sold the rights and liberties of their country. Mr. Grattan's argument on the question of simple repeal, and Mr. Flood's two speeches, together with his defence, have been inserted in the Appendix to the First Volume. It was the wish of Mr. Grattan that they should be published along with his "Remarks:" the point in dispute can at the present day occasion no interest; to many it will appear to have been originally of little moment. Whether the claim of England to make laws for Ireland was extinguished, by an act of repeal, or renunciation, or disclaimer; whether the proceedings were simple or complex, effected by a single act of parliament, or by a course of treaty (which latter was the case); can now be of little concern, and at the moment was not worth the cavil, inasmuch as the question was effectually settled; 1st, Ireland and her volunteers having denied and resisted the claim of England, and, 2nd, England, her parliament and her courts of judicature, having ceased to exercise the power. It was factious, therefore, to complain of the wording of a measure which *in effect* was accomplished, and was fully guaranteed by the consent of the constituted authorities of both islands. The question, however, gave rise to more serious consequences than the memorable dispute between Mr. Grattan and Mr. Flood. It tended to excite a spirit of discontent in Ireland; to create a distrust of England; and, at the very moment that the latter was yielding to measures most advantageous and beneficial to the former, it cast a doubt on her sincerity; it checked the full career of national gratitude, and sowed in the Irish bosom fresh seeds of jealousy, when every feeling should have been that of concord, and every senti-

ment should have been that of satisfaction. Further, it destroyed the friendship that subsisted between two individuals, whose co-operation could never have been so well employed as in the service of their country; and whose united efforts, as it subsequently appeared, were but scarce sufficient, (as they were indispensably requisite,) to secure the new-born freedom and commerce of their country.

The chief measures that Mr. Grattan supported, and many of which he proposed and carried, were as follows:—the Free Trade of 1779; the Tenantry Bill of 1780*; the Independent Constitution of 1782; the Repeal of the Law of Poynings, brought in by Mr. Yelverton; a limited Irish Mutiny Bill, introduced by Mr. Gervase Parker Bushe; the Roman Catholic Bills of 1778 and 1781, proposed by Mr. Luke Gardiner; that of 1792, by Sir Hercules Langrishe; that of 1793, brought in by Mr. Hobart; that in the Imperial Parliament, in 1813. Besides these, were various measures and resolutions, which he proposed in the Irish parliament in favor of the Roman Catholics; the proceedings of the opposition,

Leases of lives renewable for ever is a species of tenancy very common in Ireland. Unless the tenant, on the expiration of the lives, applied within a given time for new ones his interest was gone; and to preserve the tenant's right from forfeiture, was the object of this bill. The circumstances attending the measure strongly mark the sense of justice which actuated Mr. Grattan. An intimate friend of his requested him to delay the bill *for ten days*, in order that he might institute legal proceedings, and render void leases of very considerable value, but Mr. Grattan refused the request. His own case, however, was more remarkable. Much of his property consisted in tenancies of this sort; and a very valuable lease had been forfeited to him, and would have augmented his income more than a thousand a year, but he waived the forfeiture, sent to the tenant, granted the renewal, and, accepting the old rent, thus gave away for ever his right to a considerable property.

with regard to the Prince of Wales, at the period of the regency, in 1789; the Place Bill, the Pension Bill, and the Responsibility Bill, brought in by Mr. Forbes; various motions regarding tithes, regarding retrenchment; to control the public expenditure; to reduce the commissioners of Excise and Revenue; to regulate the Channel trade; to obtain for Ireland a trade with China and the East Indies; the bill for Reform in Parliament, brought in by Mr. W. B. Ponsonby, which he declared was excellent in its provisions, and indispensable for the liberties of Ireland.

The principal measures which he opposed were the celebrated Commercial Propositions, introduced by Mr. Orde, as altered by Mr. Pitt; the sale of honors in the House of Peers, to purchase seats for government in the House of Commons; the proceedings adopted on the recall of Lord Fitzwilliam; the Convention Bill, introduced by Lord Clare; the measures pursued in the administration of Lord Camden; the Gunpowder Bill; the Disarmament of the North; the Proclamation of General Lake, and the excesses of the Military: these all called forth his strenuous opposition.

In 1800 he came into Parliament purposely to oppose the Union.

In the Imperial Parliament he repeatedly introduced the Roman Catholic Question, and nearly succeeded in carrying his Bill through the House, the measure being defeated only by a majority of four. The other questions of moment on which he spoke, were the Orders in Council; the Walcheren Expedition; the motion of Lord Archibald Hamilton, regarding Lord Castlereagh; the question of Irish Tithes; the grant to Maynooth College; the Irish

Convention Act; the Irish Insurrection Act; the War with Buonaparte in 1815; and some local measures with regard to Ireland: these comprise almost the whole of his parliamentary career.

The speeches on the Declaration of Right and on the Roman Catholic Question, are those best preserved, and afford fine specimens of eloquence: they are conceived in the genuine spirit of freedom and toleration, and are replete with practical lessons of charity and religion.

When the Catholic Question was first introduced in the Irish House, Mr. Grattan, (and Mr. Denis Browne who supported it) could scarcely obtain a hearing, and such was the spirit of the times that, when the petition of the Roman Catholics was rejected, Sir Henry Harstonge brought it down to the bar and actually kicked it out of the house. The question, however, gradually made way: it was enforced by Mr. Grattan with peculiar earnestness, for his uniform opinion was, that *that* question must decide the fate of Ireland as a nation; and that no other method remained for the country to preserve her constitution, except by enrolling all classes in her ranks, and imparting to all her citizens equal rights and privileges. Concessions to the Roman Catholics had gone, *Pari Passu*, with the free trade and independence of the country; the relaxations, in 1778 and 1781, were mainly instrumental to carry the great events of 1779 and 1782; impressed with the idea of its extreme necessity, Mr. Grattan urged repeatedly the question of Emancipation; and never did he prophesy so truly as when he exclaimed, "*The day you reject the Catholic Question that day you vote the Union.*" He entertained in the Imperial Parliament a similar sense of its importance, and in one of his

latter speeches he, in like manner, says, "*The day you reject the Catholic Question you vote the separation of the two Countries.*" The paper which he dictated a few hours before his death, contains a further confirmation of this, his solemn conviction.

The Commercial Propositions in 1785, drew forth the active opposition of the aristocracy of Ireland, and roused all the spirited exertions of Mr. Grattan, and Mr. Flood. It was Mr. Grattan's opinion, that if adopted as at first proposed they would have served Ireland, but he advised that Mr. Orde should not stir the question, unless he was certain that it could be carried. The minister, however, pretended or imagined that he could succeed, and accordingly ten resolutions were proposed; but when to these were added ten more, prepared by Mr. Pitt, one of which required the assent of the Irish parliament to all commercial acts, to be adopted by Great Britain, the Irish people naturally imagined that this was an attempt by the British minister, to reassume for his country a legislative power over Ireland, and they loudly exclaimed against them. At the Irish propositions, England grew alarmed for her commerce; at the English propositions, Ireland trembled for her constitution. The English manufacturing towns were seized with a panic, and under that influence they loaded the table of the House of Commons with petitions, most numerous, and in their sentiments and apprehensions the most extravagant. The Bill introduced by Mr. Orde was accordingly condemned, and the measure was prudently abandoned.

The subject of tithes was one that occupied much of Mr. Grattan's attention. His labour and research on that question were immense. The papers, the statements, and calculations, from various parts of the

country, on that important subject, and his remarks upon them, would comprise a large volume; and the facts which they state, and many of which appear in Mr. Grattan's speeches, furnish strong and melancholy proofs of the great defect which still exists in this part of the domestic system in Ireland. The Barren Land Bill was the only part of his plan which succeeded. Prejudice and interest roused a powerful body to oppose a measure which would have protected the peasantry from great oppression, — have secured to the church an ample provision, and which many individuals of the establishment afterwards regretted had not proved successful.

The Regency was the first and severest trial of the Irish constitution. When the accounts of His Majesty's illness, in 1789, arrived from England, it was contended by the partisans of the government that the interference of Ireland was an usurped exercise of right, and one incompatible with the connection between the two countries. Such arguments, and such terrors, eagerly propagated by the old opponents of the independence of the country, were refuted by the event; and by the conduct of the leaders of the opposition, who showed that the regard with which they viewed the connection between the two countries was not less sacred, than that which they entertained for the constitution.

Mr. Grattan took a principal and a decided part on that occasion; and whatever of faction (if any there was) that mixed in the proceedings of that day, none can be traced to him. His determination (if his friends had come into power) was, like that in 1782, in 1795, and in 1806, *not to accept office*. He maintained that the Prince of Wales should be appointed Regent of Ireland, without restrictions;

and he defended the claim of Ireland to interfere in such appointment; pointing out how the rights of the people should be exercised on such an emergency, so as to uphold the prerogatives of the crown; and, during the virtual though temporary demise of the sovereign, to preserve them inviolate in whose hands soever Parliament might think proper to entrust them.

The question was, however, considered by Mr. Grattan as an unfortunate event for Ireland. It showed the only point where separation was perceptible. It furnished timid men with plausible, though groundless, apprehensions. It made an enemy of the minister, and it made no friend of the King.

In addition, it led to the hostility of the Lord Lieutenant, who refused to comply with the resolutions of the Lords and Commons, declaring that to transmit their address to the Prince of Wales would be incompatible with his oath of office. The consequence was a contest between him and both houses of parliament, and a vote of censure was passed on his conduct, which caused his departure from the kingdom. Then followed the introduction of corrupt practices in the government, of corrupt individuals into parliament, the sale of peerages, the promotion of Lord Clare to the seals, and the singular selection of a new Lord Lieutenant in the person of the Earl of Westmorland. Mr. Grattan, Mr. Ponsonby, and Mr. Curran complained and remonstrated against these measures loudly and repeatedly — but in vain.

The next important crisis, and (like the preceding) an unfortunate one, that occurred in Ireland, and in which Mr. Grattan took a leading part, was the eventful period of Lord Fitzwilliam's administration. The year 1795 was the season of national hope and

disappointment; one that produced consequences long after felt, and left impressions scarcely yet removed, from the minds of the people of Ireland. The spirit and intention of Lord Fitzwilliam's appointment was concession. So it unquestionably was considered by the leaders of the opposition. There was a clear and distinct understanding with the British minister that something should be done for Ireland. Mr. Grattan had gone over to London, and had several meetings and conferences with Mr. Pitt; *and such was his impression.* He accordingly acted on this idea, and with all that promptitude and boldness which formed, perhaps, the most prominent feature in his character. On the arrival of the Lord Lieutenant, he moved the address to His Majesty, in his instance, a novel and unprecedented occurrence; and he shortly after urged, without delay, those measures to which his party stood pledged, and which he conceived to be necessary for the welfare of the country. He was induced to press them thus rapidly, because after the Duke of Portland had condemned Mr. Pitt's government in Ireland, the acquiescence of Lord Fitzwilliam in the old system would have been productive of greater evils than those even which afterward occurred; inasmuch as it would have shown the people that there was no party of the upper orders in either country on whom they could have the least dependence, and in that case his continuance would have been more productive of insurrection than his recall. Besides, Mr. Grattan well knew the character of the British minister, and was justly apprehensive that his new-born affection for Ireland might cool, and the obligation for the largest supply ever granted by her parliament would be forgotten: the event proved it. The object of the minister had

been gained;—from Ireland he had gotten money for his war; in England he had strengthened his party by detaching the opposition; all friendly disposition towards Ireland, (if ever entertained with sincerity,) was quickly effaced; the plan of conciliation and liberal policy was reversed in an instant; Lord Fitzwilliam was abruptly recalled; Mr. Grattan and his friends were obliged to retire; and the old court returned to power, with hungry feelings on account of their removal, and a keen sense of political resentment.

This proceeding Mr. Grattan never ceased to consider as fatal in the extreme, and one most detrimental to the British interests in Ireland; it not only darkened every ray of hope, but destroyed every vestige of confidence in the British government; and, to use his expression of that day, often repeated since, "*it lost to Great Britain the heart of the Irish nation.*"

If the measures which Mr. Grattan proposed had been acceded to, or an act similar to that of 1817 (opening the army and navy to Roman Catholic officers) had then been passed, or if, without those measures, a system of conciliation, (as of late years begun at last to be adopted,) had then been pursued, and a temperate language had been used towards the Catholics and the people, in his opinion, much of the calamity which followed would have been avoided. But the Irish ministry knew no bounds, they kept no terms with the people, and they had no statesman or discreet individual who possessed either ability to advise, or authority to restrain them. Mr. Burgh was dead; Mr. Daly was dead; the government would not hearken to Mr. Grattan or Mr. Ponsonby; and the people would not listen to the government:

Hoc fonte derivata clades
In patriam populum que fluxit.

The question of war with France in 1794, came under discussion in the Irish parliament, and received Mr. Grattan's support; though he originally agreed with Mr. Fox, in the policy of leaving France to her own distractions, and if he had been in the British parliament would probably have opposed the war in its origin, conceiving that the occupation of Brabant, the opening the Scheldt, and the French decree of the 19th of November, were subjects which rather required explanation than called for war. Yet when the war had commenced and England was involved, he justly conceived that Ireland was bound to afford the utmost aid, and furnish immediate support to Great Britain, for he ever had in mind the principle laid down in 1782, which was introduced into the Address, where he says emphatically "*we remember, and do repeat, our determination to stand or fall with the British nation.*" His opinion on that question, which had caused party to run so high in England, and which had led to the untoward separation between Mr. Fox and Mr. Burke, created no small degree of interest in England, and Mr. Burke often felicitated himself on the part which Mr. Grattan took on that important question: the cases, however, were widely different.

The speeches from 1790 to 1796, which relate to the administration of Ireland, present, it is to be feared, too faithful a picture of the proceedings in those years, and discover the real tendency of the measures adopted by the minister. The sale of peerages, the purchase of seats in the lower house, which the opposition, and in particular Mr. Grattan, Mr. Ponsonby, and Mr. Curran pledged themselves to prove; the creating new places, and the strong measures shortly after introduced, tend to confirm the idea that a plan was then in contemplation to subvert the

independent constitution of Ireland, and recover what had been obtained for the country in 1782, and if any further proof was requisite, it has been given in the declarations of Lord Clare in 1800, that, for eight years preceding, he had been endeavouring to effect the Union.

In 1797, the leaders of the opposition seceded. They proposed the measures which they conceived requisite for the country, and best calculated to secure her internal quiet; Roman Catholic Emancipation, and Parliamentary Reform. Their opinion was that, if either of these measures had been conceded, a great force would have been detached from the disaffected party, and the peace of the kingdom preserved. How far they were right has been proved by subsequent events; the necessity of these measures having been fully admitted by what has taken place in both countries, the Union in one, and a conciliatory disposition now evinced towards the Catholics in the other. With respect to the propriety of bringing forward these subjects at that precise juncture, there may exist some reasonable doubts. Mr. Grattan himself inclined to think the period too late, the times too much agitated, and the crisis too imminent; but it is difficult, when acting with a party, to refrain from urging public measures to which that party stand pledged, and which all men on that side agreed were essential for the safety of the community.

At the general election in 1797, Mr. Grattan addressed a letter to his former constituents, in which he made a statement of the situation of the country, the conduct of her ministers, and declined to stand again for his native city. His health, by close attention, had become impaired; disappointment natural on the rejection of measures, to the success of

which he attached such vital importance, grief and indignation at beholding the desperate courses pursued by both parties, preyed upon an ardent mind, exquisitely sensible, and unceasingly anxious about the fortunes and the prosperity of his country; all these united, contributed to bear down his constitution; a low nervous fever attacked him, which, for a long period of time, neither change of place or climate, or society could remove. At length the question of Union called him forth, and in 1800 he was elected for the town of Wicklow. News of the return came to him at night; his immediate attendance was required; his friends sent for him; he was at that moment overcome with pain of body and mind, and exclaimed; "*What! will they not allow me to die in peace.*" However he was resolved to go; for public duty and private considerations both impelled him;

— *Æstuat ingens*

Imo in corde pudor, mistoque insania luctu

Et furis agitatus amor et conscia VIRTUS.

He bade farewell to his family and his friends; for, though he did not fear, yet he had reason to apprehend danger from the fury of the times, the violence of faction, and the vengeance of a resentful and desperate party. He came into the House, supported by Mr. (afterwards Judge) Moore, and Mr. W. B. (afterwards Lord) Ponsonby. Several who beheld the scene, have described it as interesting to a degree. The weak state of the individual, the report that an attack upon him was meditated, the vast importance of the subject in debate, and the awful crisis on which hung the fate of the parliament of Ireland, and that of the independent constitution, of which he was the parent and founder; all these circumstances, which might have depressed an ordinary

mind, and one enfeebled by illness, served only to rouse and inspirit him. He spoke sitting, but with all his wonted fire and animation, and there delivered those speeches, which, while they record his exertions in defence of the Irish parliament, remove from *his* grave the foul disgrace of standing apart while a deadly blow was aimed at the independence of his country.

The dispute between him and Mr. Corry having led to consequences that were settled out of the House, Mr. Grattan thought it more honourable not to publish his reply, in answer to the attack made upon him; but the most accurate account of his speech that could be procured, has been given in this collection. The opinions, which, from the outset, he entertained on the subject of Union, never underwent any alteration. He ever continued to think the connexion between the two countries was as secure, the liberties of *both* infinitely more so, and their respective interests likely to be better attended to, by preserving in each a separate and a resident legislature. Independent of constitutional considerations, he foresaw that the emigration of a great portion of the nobility and gentry, and the annual drain occasioned by the absentees, must, of necessity, injure and impoverish the country. His emphatical expression, "*the ocean protests against separation, and the sea against union,*" is recorded in the last speech he ever made; in which he says that his old opinions on that subject remained unchanged.

During the short adjournment of the Irish parliament, when the articles of Union were transmitted to England, he wrote the celebrated answer to Lord Clare's speech, in which he details his opinion upon the system of Irish government, and draws the characters of his early friends, with a talent and in a

style which will preserve their memory to the latest posterity.

After the extinction of the Irish parliament, he withdrew from public life; but when the Catholic Petition was brought forward, at the request of his early, his unchanging, and his much esteemed friend, Mr. Fox, he was again induced to come forward, and through the kind offices of Lord Fitzwilliam, was returned to parliament. This event occasioned no inconsiderable degree of solicitude among his countrymen, who all felt a national anxiety for his success in the House of Commons in England. The case of his contemporary (Mr. Flood) was in some degree similar; and the remarkable words of Mr. Grattan respecting him were still fresh in recollection. "*He was a tree of the forest, too old and too great to be transplanted at fifty,*" was the figure conceived applicable in the one instance, and it now remained to be seen whether it would equally apply in the other.

Perhaps there is not in any country so fair a tribunal, or so competent a judge of talent and of merit, as a British House of Commons. It comprises the different ranks and professions, and represents all the various classes of the community. Possessed of an understanding strengthened and improved by constant habits of business, and a mind fraught with the richest stores of eloquence and of literature, brought to their highest perfection in an age not merely refined but luxurious; — they listen with patience, and they decide with impartiality. Before such an assembly he was to speak. But it was that body whose claims over his country he had denied and rejected, and it was on that very question which they were least inclined to concede. It happened that Dr. Duigenan was at that time in parliament; and, by a speech as singular as any ever deli-

vered in the Irish House of Commons against his countrymen, and as serviceable to the Catholics, afforded an admirable opportunity for Mr. Grattan to reply. His manner was perfectly novel; his style of speaking was unusual; his commencement, too, was peculiar, and not very attractive. For some minutes the house hesitated; but after he had got under weigh, the question was no longer doubtful, and the cheers from all sides proclaimed his complete success.

The most remarkable question that occurred while he sat in the Imperial Parliament, was the French war in 1815; and, on that occasion, he differed from the party with whom he generally acted. In conformity to the principles of the Revolution of 1688, which he ever admired, he entertained a constitutional horror of military governments; he justly thought that standing armies were, from their nature, a foe to liberty, fatal to the morals, the manners, and the simple structure of civilized society; in all countries oppressive, and in most countries destructive. In the government of Buonaparte he beheld nothing advantageous to France, nothing secure for Great Britain, nothing calculated to advance the interests, or promote the happiness, of any single state on the continent of Europe. The events of 1814 had put the French in possession of a charter of rights, which Buonaparte had never given or even offered them; and for the preservation of which, (had he succeeded,) the promise of a soldier, must in all cases be but doubtful security. The conduct too of the French and of their Marshals, the rapidity with which they violated their oaths, and set at nought the obligations that bound them to their sovereign; and the treaties that connected them with other powers, left no room to hope that they

was elected along with Lord Henry Fitzgerald, for the city of Dublin. In 1797 he declined to offer himself again as candidate. In 1800 he was returned for the borough of Wicklow, to oppose the Union. In 1805 he came into the Imperial Parliament for the borough of Malton, in Yorkshire. At the general election in 1806, he was once more induced to stand for his native city, and was then re-elected. For that place he sat in the several parliaments summoned in the years 1807, 1813, 1818, and 1820. He went over to take his seat in the new parliament, on the accession of His present Majesty; and although afflicted with heavy illness, he insisted on performing the journey, contrary to the advice of his physicians, and the entreaties of his friends. His intention was to have brought forward the Roman Catholic subject, conceiving the adjustment of that question to be one of vital importance to the welfare of the empire; but the complaint with which he had been afflicted, much increased by the long and painful journey*, rendered this effort ineffectual, and after much suffering, in a few days subsequent to his arrival in London, he expired on the 4th of June 1820, having spent in the public service nearly 45 years.

His private life was not less interesting than his public conduct; a taste for literature — classics — a passion for the country and its rural occupations, engaged the moments when he could abstract himself

* He was so ill that he could not bear a land journey. He went by water from Liverpool to London, in a canal barge, emptied of its lumber, covered with sail cloth, and hung round with garden mats. He sat up in a chair for six days without moving, and continued travelling one entire night, such was his anxiety to perform his last duty to his country!

from public affairs. He loved simplicity, and in his society there was something which not only charmed but fascinated; for he could disengage his mind from the trammels of business, and the hard habits of a politician, with admirable facility. When he discoursed on a subject, he so illumined it that he rendered it clear and visible to the simplest understanding, without making his superiority felt, or even wishing it to be perceived; and, in his conversations, there was something that pleased and instructed, whether the subject was philosophy, politics, or poetry. Age was improved by his dialogues, and Youth was captivated by his condescending manner and his affable disposition; for in his most playful, as in his gravest mood, he possessed the peculiar talent of conveying instruction. It appeared as if in him nature grew more embellished; so that art lost half its effect, and vice grew ashamed of her deformity. His conversations were full of moral, and no individual, however lost to a sense of duty, could have enjoyed his society long, without feeling an inclination to be reformed by his precepts, or his example. He had an innate horror of every thing base or corrupt, and a love of principle, private as well as public; which, united with a contempt for money, went hand-in-hand with a generous feeling for the wants of others.* His life

* *The following extract from his Will shows the benevolent disposition that actuated him, to the latest period of his life.*

“Whereas I have a Reversion in fee in my Queen’s County Estates, and if all my children die without issue living, at the time of their death, I leave the said estate back to the public; that is to say, to the following great officers, for the time being: the Provost of Dublin College; the Lord Chancellor of Ireland; the Lord Chief Justice of the King’s Bench; the Lord Mayor of Dublin; the Bishop of Dublin, and Judge Day; in trust, to form a foundation

was *one continued, gentle, moral lesson*. It was impossible in his society not to become enamoured with virtue. Of him, as of that kindred spirit by whose side he lies, it may be truly said : —

A patriot's even course he steered,
Mid faction's wildest storms, unmoved;
By all who marked his mind, revered,
By all who knew his heart, beloved.

Thus did this *Man* live and thus he died, and never was there an individual whose life was more the sport and prey of political rage and tempest; idolized by the people at one moment* ; cashiered by them in the next † ; denounced as an enemy to his country ‡ ; then deified as the strenuous champion of the constitution § ; traduced as the deserter of the civil liberties of his countrymen ¶ ; dismissed as the betrayer of their religious freedom ¶¶ ; elected by the general voice of the people ** ; and almost stoned to death in the midst of his native city.

Let not this picture affright or deter others from daring to defend the cause of liberty, rather let it be a useful lesson, and teach us perseverance and firmness, in upholding the freedom and the rights of our country ; protecting her against her own inconstancy, and guarding ourselves against the fallibility of human nature.

for the annual support of unprovided gentlewomen, daughters of poor and meritorious citizens of Dublin, according to such rules and regulations as they shall plan and devise."

* Free trade and independence.

† Simple Repeal.

‡ The year 1798.

§ The Union.

¶ The Insurrection Act.

¶¶ The Veto.

** 1818.

* *Attributed to a Member of the University of Dublin. — 1789.*

“THE emancipators of nations, and the deliverers of their native land from political thralldom, are justly entitled to the warmest retributions of gratitude, both on account of the importance of the benefit, and the difficulty of its achievement. To rouse the languid, to inflame the cold, and to inspire the spiritless, is not the work of common talents or inferior souls; but of transcendant abilities, emulous of distinction, and of superior genius invigorated by patriotism. To perceive the happy moment for rendering their exertions effectual, and seize on the fortunate opportunity which the revolution of time and of accidents has produced, for giving decisive efficacy to their efforts, are instances of sagacity and foresight, of opportune resolution and vigorous determination — which may be extolled, but cannot be exaggerated. So many concurrent circumstances are requisite to shake off the yoke of long-confirmed usurpation, to infuse a contempt of threatened menaces without infringing affection, and to elevate a people from the meanness of servility to the dignity of independence, that, to combine these circumstances, to direct their operation, and to moderate their energy, are marks of such merit as deservedly claims the amplest and richest civic meed that can recompense the worthy citizen.

“Mr. Grattan is one of the most conspicuous ornaments of the Irish senate. To his manly and persevering exertions do we owe an independent legislature, and the gratitude of the nation for the boon, though testified with a munificence becoming its spirit, by no means exceeded the measure of his deserts.

“As a public speaker, Mr. Grattan’s voice is thin, sharp, and far from powerful; not devoid of a variety of tones, but these neither rich nor mellow; and though not harsh, its want of an harmonious modulation is often striking. Unequal to impassioned energy it is shrill when it should be commanding, and in its lower notes is sometimes scarcely

* The characters and remarks which follow, have been inserted here with a view to oblige those anxious friends and admirers of Mr. Grattan from whom the editor has received them.

audible, from its hollowness of sound. His management of it is but ill adapted to remedy its natural defects or to supply its deficiencies, as he allows it to spaiate at large, unrestrained by any curb from rule; now raising it to an elevation it cannot bear, and then sinking it to a depth where its distant murmurs can be barely guessed at. His language is lofty, magnificent, copious, and peculiarly his own. Not tricked out with the gaudy dress of poetic phrases, nor fatiguing the attention with pompous terms, high sounding and unmeaning; but combining strength with beauty, conciseness with ornament, and sublimity with elegance. Adapted to the exigence of the occasion, it is now a wide spreading conflagration, and anon a concentrated fire: now abundant and splendid, then brief and pointed; equally fitted to instruct, delight, or agitate; to soothe the soul, or to awaken and arouse all its exalted and elevated energies.

His delivery admirably accords with the style of his oratory; never languid, or insipid, or cold, but always possessing a pleasing warmth, expressive of feeling and imparting spirit, whilst his pronunciation, generally correct, though frequently rapid, is never crowded or redundant, but distinct and articulate, leaving ample space for strength and propriety of emphasis. In his manner, life, animation, and ardour predominate, and that to such a degree that they fascinate the prejudiced, and invigorate the torpid. From their impulse prostitution forgets for a moment the voice of the minister, and the influence of place, pension, and peerage have but an enfeebled hold.

With comprehensive intelligence embracing a great object, not catching at its parts by detail, he takes in the whole at one glance, and sees instantly the pivot whereon it turns with almost intuitive acuteness. In argument he is strong, pointed, close, and conclusive, never deviating from his subject, never straying in search of extraneous matter, but explaining with success what he understands with facility. He conducts not the mind to the conclusion he aims at by a long chain of abstruse disquisitions, but guides it with seeming ease through the pleasing path of natural illustration. Every man thinks he could reason like him, but when attempted it is found to be the bow of Ulysses. In the refutation of his opponents, he puts forth all his might, and accumulates his force to over-

whelm and oppress them; but his superior genius is most apparent when he enforces what cannot be denied; when he defends the rights of a nation; when he portrays the hopes, the fears, the expectations of a magnanimous people; when he threatens the vicious and appals the proud; when he pronounces the panegyric of departed excellence; then he is magnificent, sublime, and pathetic.

“ His fund of knowledge is great, and his diligence of acquisition still greater; hence the matter of his speeches is ever of the first impression. Early in life distinguished as one of the best scholars in the university of Dublin, no time since has been lost to increase his first acquirements, and to add to classic and scientific lore, a competent skill in the law, a profound acquaintance with the constitution, and a mastery of polite literature. Thus, to every subject of discussion he comes perfectly prepared, familiar with what it requires, and instantly bringing it forth as the contingency demands; instructing the youthful, and delighting the aged with the mature fruits of a capacious mind, rich in its native produce, and richer from careful cultivation.”

For the brilliant eulogy on Mr. Grattan, by Mr. * Burrowes, see vol. iv. p. 22.

Said to have been written by Mr. Courtney.

“ Mr. Grattan’s rhetorical powers are singularly striking; he arranges his arguments and condenses his expressions with inimitable skill and propriety.

“ On the state of Ireland, and the sentiments of the mass of the people, he displays the experience and enlightened mind of a great statesman. He excites irresistible emotion, and commands the stillest attention, by the energy and precision of his style, and originality of his expression.

* This individual was one of the most intimate friends of Mr. Grattan. At the Union he took a decided part for the liberties of his country, and was equally an ornament to the senate and the bar; his speeches on the trials of the Catholics under the Convention act in 1811, reflect honour on the profession. He has been lately appointed a Judge of the Insolvent court; but his proper station is the bench.

“In personal controversy, he devotes his opponents to scorn and contempt by the most poignant sarcasms: he seems to disdain the common weapons of ridicule, as too slight and inefficient, and incompatible with the serious and important object and design of true and genuine eloquence: his constant aim is to stimulate and convince the house. In the fervour of debate, he seems to hazard much by his bold figurative language, and sometimes deviates into broken and mixed metaphors; yet he never falls, but rises with renovated strength into dignity and splendour.”

“ London, 1808.”

From the Memoirs of James, Earl of Charlemont. By Francis Hardy.

It was the will of providence that Lord Charlemont should sustain a most severe domestic calamity. His brother, Francis Caulfield, an amiable man, representative of the borough of Charlemont was, on his return from England to attend his duty in parliament, lost between Parkgate and Dublin. But so little do we know to-day what the morrow may produce, that this shipwreck, which for some time covered Lord Charlemont's house with mourning, was, at no distant period, the source of much gratification to his feelings as a statesman. By the vacancy which Mr. Caulfield's death

* This individual, so justly deserving of praise for his valuable memoir of that patriotic and accomplished nobleman, (the Earl of Charlemont,) was the attached friend of Mr. Grattan. He contributed to the charms of the domestic circle at Tinnehinch, by his literary acquirements, his refined taste, his agreeable anecdote, and his polished conversations. His private qualities, however, were the least of his recommendations. His public conduct was exemplary. He sat in the House of Commons in the last three parliaments of Ireland, and uniformly supported her rights and interests. At the period of the Union, great inducements were held out to him to procure his support to that measure. By one single vote, he could have raised himself from domestic difficulties and embarrassments to a state of comparative affluence. Some of his acquaintance, more worldly than patriotic, seeing the success of the measure inevitable, advised him to accept the terms; but his integrity could not be warped; his virtue was inflexible; he rejected the advice of his friends, and the offers of the minister, and nobly stood by the falling fortunes of his country.

occasioned in parliament, the electors of Charlemont were enabled, under the auspices of his lordship, to return a man to the House of Commons who was destined to act a more conspicuous part than any one who had ever been deputed to serve there. This was Henry Grattan, a name which will last, as long as Ireland has a name among nations. Lord Charlemont always spoke of this election as most flattering to himself, and as an event, amongst innumerable of the kind by which the dispensations of heaven are peculiarly marked, extracting satisfaction and self approbation from the bosom of misfortune, and the triumphs of a nation from the overwhelming of the deep.

From the Historic Anecdotes of the Legislative Union between Great Britain and Ireland. By Sir Jonah Barrington.

EVERY chief turned his eyes, by almost unanimous assent, to the eloquence and energy of the ardent Grattan,* The favourite of the parliament; the terror of the minister; the intimate friend of the ablest men; and the indefatigable advocate of his country; he seemed most peculiarly calculated to bring forward some great or decisive measure, which should at once terminate the dangerous paroxysm to which the minds of the whole nation were now worked up, and by its decision inform them, whether they were to receive their rights from the justice, or to enforce them by the humiliation of Great Britain.

The period, however, had not quite arrived for this step. Extensive as the abilities of Mr. Grattan were, they had many competitors. Jealousies intrude themselves even into the highest minds; the spirit of rivalry is inseparable from great talents; Mr. Grattan's importance was merely individual; and he was then only advancing to that pre-eminence which he soon after acquired over all competitors. Though it was approaching fast, it was evident that it had not indisputably arrived. It was essential that all those parties in the house should be a little more approximated, before a measure was announced on which unanimity was of vital importance.

* * * * * Exclusive of

The period of 1782.

the distinguished personages already mentioned, many other eminent men were daily emerging from the general body of the commons, whose talents and eloquence, catching the flame which surrounded them, soon added to the brilliant light which illuminated the whole nation; but the public eye still kept steadfastly fixed on Mr. Grattan, as the person best qualified to take the lead in asserting the rights and independence of his country. The style and fire of his eloquence; the integrity of his character; the indefatigable perseverance of his patriotism; and an intrepid fortitude of spirit, which had always great weight with the Irish, procured him a consideration far above his cotemporaries, in none of whom were these grand qualities so generally united; whilst a kind heart, and the mild, unassuming, playful manners of a gentleman, secured to him that sort of private esteem which banishes the feelings of rivalry, even from the most zealous partizans. Thus, as if by general assent, at the time of the Duke of Portland's assuming the government, was Mr. Grattan considered by all ranks as the chosen champion for the independence of Ireland; distinguished by the most elevated characters; admired by the parliament; and idolized by the people. * * *

Mr. Grattan had long declared the absolute necessity of gratifying the people by a legislative declaration of Irish rights and constitutional independence; marking out, by an indelible record, that sacred Rubicon, past which the British government should never again advance, and beyond which the Irish nation should never wander. On that point the fate of Ireland vibrated as on a pivot; it must rise or it must fall; it could no longer remain stationary, and the great landed proprietors strongly felt that they must necessarily participate in its vicissitudes. The court had totally lost its influence; the people had entirely acquired theirs; the old system of Irish government was annihilated; and the British cabinet had neither the wisdom nor the disposition to take the lead in more popular arrangements. The parliament and the people were gradually drawing together against the government; an instinctive sense of the common difficulty called all men towards some common centre; and as that centre, all parties, all sects, and all factions, looked to the

abilities and the honesty of Mr. Grattan; they knew that he had no object but his country, and no party but its supporters; they knew that his energetic mind could neither be restrained by resistance, or neutralized by subterfuge. He possessed all those intellectual qualities, best calculated to lead the Irish people to the standard of freedom, without suffering them to advance to the anarchies of revolution.

His principles, democratic by nature, were monarchical by education. He hated tyranny in the same proportion as he loved constitution. In him ambition for power was merged in ambition for popularity; and he acted under the peculiar advantage, that, if at any time the ardency of his zeal should happen to lead him beyond the boundaries of sound discretion, his wise, weighty, and moderate advisers would always give a steadiness, a safety, and a character, to his views and proceedings. * * * The structure of the Irish House of Commons, at the period of these debates, was particularly adapted to convey to the people an impression of dignity and of splendour in their legislative assembly. The interior of the Commons' house was a rotunda of great architectural magnificence. An immense gallery, supported by Tuscan pillars, surrounded the inner base of a grand and lofty dome. In that gallery, on every important debate, nearly seven hundred auditors heard the sentiments, and learned the characters of their Irish representatives; and the admission of the students of the university gave to the rising generation a love of eloquence and of liberty; taught them the principles of a just and proud ambition, the details of public business, and the rudiments of constitutional legislation. This entire gallery had been crowded at an early hour by personages of the first respectability of both sexes. It would be difficult to describe the interesting appearance of the whole assemblage at this awful moment. After the speech of Mr. Hutchinson, which, in fact, decided nothing, a low confidential whisper ran through the house, and every member seemed to court the sentiments of his neighbour, without venturing to express his own; the anxious spectators, inquisitively leaning forward, awaited with palpitating expectation the development of some measure likely to decide the fate of their country, themselves, and their posterity. No middle course could

possibly be adopted. Immediate conciliation and tranquillity, or ultimate revolt and revolution, was the dilemma which floated on every thinking mind. A solemn pause ensued. At length Mr. Grattan, slowly rising from his seat, commenced the most luminous, brilliant, and effective oration ever delivered in the Irish parliament.

There is something in the tone, the action, and the emphasis of public speakers, which, extrinsic of their arguments, makes great impression. The entire singularity of Mr. Grattan's address, the eccentricity of his drawling yet fiery diction, which would have been disadvantageous to another orator, in him only excited a more anxious attention to his language, and acted as an attractive companion to his logic and his eloquence. This speech, ranking in the very first class of effective eloquence, rising in its progress, applied equally to the sense, the pride, and the spirit of the nation. Every succeeding sentence increased the interest which his exordium had excited. Trampling upon the arrogant claims and unconstitutional usurpations of the British government, he reasoned on the enlightened principle of a federative compact; and urged irresistibly the necessity, the justice, and the policy of immediately and unequivocally declaring the constitutional independence of the Irish nation, and the supremacy of the Irish parliament, as the only effectual means of preserving the connection between the two nations. * * *

The speaker put the question on Mr. Grattan's amendment; a unanimous "Aye" burst from every quarter of the house. He repeated the question; the applauses were redoubled; a moment of tumultuous exultation followed; and, after centuries of oppression, Ireland at length declared herself an *independent nation*.

This important event quickly reached the impatient crowds of every rank of society, who, without doors, awaited the decision of their parliament. A cry of joy and exultation spread with electric rapidity through the entire city; its echo penetrated to the very interior of the house; every thing gave way to an effusion of happiness and congratulation that had never before been exhibited in that misgoverned country. * * * Ireland from that moment assumed a new aspect. She rose majestically from her ruins, and surveyed the author of her

CHARACTERS.

resurrection with admiration and with gratitude. A barrister, without professional celebrity, without family connections, possessed of no considerable fortune, nor of any personal influence, save that which talent and virtue involuntarily acquire; leagued with no faction, supported individually by no political party, became the instrument of providence to liberate his country; and, in a single day, achieved what the most able statesmen, the most elevated personages, the most powerful and best connected parties, never could effect.

Aided by the circumstances of the moment, he seized the opportunity with promptitude, vigour, and perseverance. But whilst he raised his country to prosperity, and himself to unexpected fortune and never-fading honour, he acquired vindictive enemies by the brilliancy of his success, and afterwards fell a temporary sacrifice to the perseverance of their malice, and the dissimulations of their jealousy.

Attributed to the Rev. Mr. Croly.

It is now about forty years since Ireland began to have a history. The past was fable or affliction; a desert traversed by furious faction, or covered with the sad memorials of what, under better times, might have made the living strength of the land, a field of battle or a grave. From Mr. Grattan's first emergence, a milder light rested upon the public mind, and Ireland began to take upon her the robes and aspect of a settled polity. It was his own language of her constitution, "that he had stood by its cradle, and followed its hearse." This was the phrase of a moment of strong and melancholy feeling. But he had at least seen its birth, and he had done more, he had poured of his spirit upon it, and anointed the infant for aspirations and triumphs, glorious beyond the youth of any other freedom. In England we are a grave people, and steadily loving our public rights; our value for them is chastened by long possession. We are not led for the first time into the knowledge of our inheritance. We take posses-

sion of our estate after having been trained in the sight of heir-looms and escutcheons of the magnificence of freedom, and hallowed ancestral memorials of heroic achievements in the public cause. But in Ireland all was new. It was poverty starting into sudden wealth. It was a desolated mind suddenly filled with prosperous and splendid imaginations. It was the breath of life breathed into the nostrils of a human image, and awaking him to cast his eyes round a new creation. This language is not exaggerated. The enthusiasm, the rejoicing, the gratitude of Ireland, on her first possession of public rights, were beyond all language. The proceedings of the first few years, after 1782, were like a continued triumph. The man who had led the battle, led the march to the capitol; but, unlike the triumph of the Roman, his glory was that his car was followed by no slave. In after years, this man was repelled by the same heated and impetuous spirit which then rushed, rejoicing, before, and around, and behind his progress. The popular feeling grew disturbed. It was a time of European perplexity. The first advances of the great convulsion, which was yet to lift temples and thrones upon it, like weeds upon a wave, were felt in the quiverings of the earth, and the overshadowing of the air; and, far as Ireland was from the central shock, she was reached by the general heave. But her first exultation was beyond all experience. It was the first beam of the sun upon Memnon's statue; and if, as the day advanced, the voice died, and the form was tinged with a darker hue, the early miracle was yet the great testimony and tribute, neither to be forgotten nor retracted.

It is the praise of Mr. Grattan, and no man needs desire a nobler epitaph, that, with powers supremely fitted to influence the multitude, he restrained himself from popular excitement. The Irish have habitual propensities to public speaking; and Mr. Grattan's celebrity had still more strongly turned the powers of her ambitious minds to oratory. But he withdrew from the temptations of the hustings and the highway, to devote his mind under the only roof where public freedom can be worshipped without reproach and without fear. His place was in the House of Commons. There he laboured, and there he lived. It was full of his trophies. He was its true

architect. It might have been said of him, "*Si monumentum ejus quæras, circumspice.*" And for this he had his reward. The long succession of demagogues, who each misled the public mind, and who, for the time, were borne above him, perished like the foam when the storm is done. Mr. Grattan's name always rose with the falling of the surge, and in the returned calmness and sunshine of the great popular expanse, his firm renown stood up like a rock from the bosom of the ocean.

The chief instrument of those successes was his eloquence. It had the first mark of genius, originality. With Burke, Curran, and Sheridan for his contemporaries, his senatorial oratory had a form and countenance altogether its own. All definitions of the powers of those gifted men have grown common-place; but with a portion of what made the splendour of each, he had a direction distinct and peculiar. He was not a satellite of the most illustrious among them, but a new star, sweeping round its own orbit, and enlightening its own region, undisturbed, and unexhausted. But his style had the merit of being admirably fit for immediate impression. It kept clear from the solemn didactic with which Burke sometimes barred up the torrents of his oratory. It was not seduced into the fantastic wit with which Curran often made his audience laugh where he should have made them feel. The broad humour that impaired and drew down towards earth the loftiest imaginations of Sheridan, was never attempted by him. But for those he brought keen, solid, vivid thought; in language condensed, and close to its substance, shaped like the sheath to a sword. His powerful imagination never wasted itself on idle flights, never spread out its ætherial flames and colours to wanton before the eye. It was always strongly employed, always striking home upon its object with concentrated power. Its fault was mannerism:—this has been observed to be the natural fault of all original minds. The torrent and vigour of feeling which has forced away a new channel for its stream, can scarcely be soothed and subjected into other courses. The strength which it inherits from its first mighty bound never deserts it altogether; and, even in its gentlest flow, a trivial check chafes and rouses it into the torrent again. Mr. Grattan's habit of antithesis was the single

fault of his style. It grew on him with the close of life. In his early speeches it was rare. Of those famous speeches, nothing now remains but a few imperfect reports, and the fragments that are yet treasured in the memories of their ancient hearers, like oracles. But the true evidence of their power is in what they had done. They found Ireland a place of desolation and savagery. They collected its scattered powers, and taught them wisdom and language; and, with more than the old miracle of Greece, built up the walls of their polity. Before Mr. Grattan, Ireland had scarcely a merchant, or a manufacturer, or a statesman, or a man of name in literature. He created them all, or rather he smote away the encumbrances of the soil, and left its native fertility to flourish and ascend in the light and air of constitution.

His conduct on the public questions which agitated Ireland, in common with the civilized world, was conformable to his wise and pure intelligence. He met the habitual fate of moderation, and was the object of offence to vulgar partisanship on both sides. But his fortitude was as little to be broken down, as his honour; and, when the lunacy of the hour was past, all venerated his cloudless and superior course with the same homage. In his conduct of the Catholic question, he gave a model for the pursuit of all great claims for the time to come. His heart was in his cause; but his zeal was without bigotry, rashness, or irritation. He saw intruders rush before him, and bear away his followers to unfruitful enterprises; but, in this attempt to recover the ancient privileges, the Palestine of the Catholic, he neither quickened nor retarded his march for the enthusiasts, who hastened to cover the desert with their bodies. His advance was deliberate, but it was secure. The leader reflected lustre on the host; and, before he died, he left them in sight of the city to which they had looked in hopelessness for a hundred years.

But Mr. Grattan is defrauded of his highest praise, if his integrity is forgotten. His powers might have commanded all that ambition covets. He was impregnable to place and title. He refused all honours and emoluments, even when they were offered by hands which he honoured. He declared himself to be the purchased servant of the country, and to

be incapable of adopting another master. No disclosure that death, the great unsealer of cabinets, has made, has been able to throw a shadow on the exalted patriotism of Mr Grattan. No evil secrets are buried in his grave. He lived till he saw doubt and detraction perish before him, and was assured of his immortality. But his grave does not bound the services of such a life. While there is memory in man, his name will be an incentive to the generous ambition of his country. But he is now gathered to the great repository of the human race, and belongs to the infinite assemblage of all tongues, and ages, and nations that have been. The virtues of the dead patriot become the property of mankind. The small seed is buried in the earth, but from it springs the mighty tree gathering the dews of heaven in its branches, and covering the multitude with its shade.

London, 1820.

Said to have been written by Mr. Taylor.

THE destination of Mr. Grattan was the bar, but nature had given him talents better adapted to the senate; his education improved them, and his good fortune rendered them available to his country. Early honoured with the friendship of the patriotic and accomplished earl of Charlemont, he entered as auspiciously as a young man could enter, the difficult road to political distinction. In the best circumstances in which a nation can be placed, they are no ordinary abilities which obtain an historical reputation that time cannot destroy among the wreck of empires and opinions; and such were the abilities of Mr. Grattan. He would have graced the senate of the most prosperous and enlightened nation, and been in the proudest days of Athens, or of Rome, one of her conspicuous men. One of those whose life would have been a national benefit, and death a public regret. But the situation in which Ireland was placed, when Mr. Grattan appeared on the stage of her stormy politics, was so peculiar that nothing in human relations could be imagined better calculated to try the resources and wisdom of a public man.

Power and violence on the one side — slavery and disorder on the other; a disorganized people, a contemptuous court; neither had temper, neither had consideration. Just demands were exaggerated by the one, and more than fiercely repelled by the other. There was no apparent room for either persuasion or compromise between a vaunting intolerance and prejudice without moderation. For nearly six centuries the history of this unhappy people was but the vicissitudes of a sullen submission, desultory outrage, defiance, terror, and proscription. The mind was familiarised to the form of a social community connected with the insecurity and excesses of savage life, and when there was not famine, plague, or rebellion to devastate, a civil hatred, perverse and malignant, enflamed both parties, and poisoned all the sources of social happiness, without affording, like the shock of battle, the prospect of a termination of hostilities.

Such was the scene on which Mr. Grattan was called to enter. To a man who only sought that unprincipled notoriety which gratifies a vulgar ambition, such circumstances would have afforded facilities towards the attainment of a turbulent fame. The combustible materials were there in profusion to offer to the torch of the incendiary the chance of mighty conflagration; but Mr. Grattan was neither the coarsely minded demagogue, nor the great bad man, who could make the ruins of his country the path to a vicious eminence. All his views embraced her interests, and terminated in her improvement; and if he wished to raise himself, it was upon her exaltation. Thus he encircled in the zone of his ambition the cause of four millions of human beings, and would have bound them in a prosperous and moral confederacy, honourable to themselves, and useful to the British Empire. He wished them to be free, because rational freedom is the only soil of the virtues; the graces of refinement may give a florid complexion to a despotic state; but the glow and current of health only invigorates that nation which breathes the atmosphere of a free constitution. Such was the country whose tongue the orator of Ireland had first studied, whose history he had first read.—Such was England; and the practice of his public life was a comment upon his admiration of her well-constructed glory. His anxious life was devoted

to the great task of assimilating the country of his birth to that of his affectionate regard. It was not a nominal union that he laboured to effect, but one of the heart and of the sentiment; reciprocal, moral, improving; an interchange of good offices; a blending of interests; a coalescence of strength. To accomplish his object he brought into the field of public action, original powers, great industry, great political discernment, a dauntless spirit, and a mind tenacious of its purpose. To give these qualities effect, he cultivated public speaking with an almost incredible ardour;—the genius of eloquence had never a more indefatigable disciple; the abstract sciences never gave a more intense exercise to the faculties of Archimedes or of Newton, than that which Mr. Grattan displayed in attaining the art of addressing a public assembly. His own mind was of a reasoning and philosophical cast; but he knew that his audience was a susceptible one; and he rightly judged that the voice of truth would be most prevailing, when it consulted the temperament of its audience. He succeeded in combining a manly and animated style of reason, with a great display of imaginative power; and, accordingly, the efforts of the orator produced the sensation favourable to the virtuous designs of the statesman.

It is probable the power which he realized over the public mind surpassed his own early hopes. The popular impression which his matured style of speaking created, can hardly be conceived by those who only witnessed the exertions of his old age. That union of the severest logic with the most liberal and popular qualities, that make men fascinate multitudes, which he displayed, could only have been the result of judicious cultivation upon the happiest temperament of genius. He was not an orator of that class who decry industry, who scorn the labours of knowledge, and would be supposed to speak from immediate revelation. No, he devoted his days and nights to the education of his talents, ambitious of no superficial renown, unsatisfied but by solid glory. But laborious as he was, his logic had none of the pedantry of the schoolman; and his imagination was free from the ostentation of the rhetorician. The one was vigorous reason liberally wielded; the other an intellectual fire that seemed

only the glowing of thought that kindled in its progress. In looking at a subject he was not content with a confined view or a hasty glance; he chose elevated ground, and gave it a deliberate inspection. He took in all its bearings with a comprehensive precision; and therefore his treatment of a great subject was equally remarkable for breadth of design and lucid arrangement of parts. While his soul seemed to burn with the most intense feeling of his subject, his method, severe but not formal, embraced every topic in order, and gave to each its due attention. He did not dwell upon points beyond their value, or after he had said all that was necessary for their enforcement; nor did he return upon his steps and embarrass his hearers and himself by repetition, nor alarm them by discrepancies; all was connected, clear, progressive; without feebleness, without distracted energy. His elocution was not a mountain stream that foams and frets in a rocky channel, where sometimes it shows only scanty rills, and again bursts away in a torrent. That could better illustrate the eloquence of Curran, erratic and unequal; but Mr. Grattan's had more of the copious and majestic river, deep, grandly reflecting clear images, always placid, and always irresistible. In his most tranquil moments attention was chained to his words;—but when he poured himself forth in the full ardor of his intellect, the advocate of a principle was forgot in the admiration of a superior intelligence. He could sketch character with a rapid and powerful hand; and it seemed to arise naturally out of his subject, to illustrate and enforce argument by authority. This gave a living animation to his harangues, and made them more valuable when the conflicts of the day should have been forgotten; because man and his nature, his public virtues, and the vices of his ambition, ever continue to attract rational curiosity, although the scene on which they were originally exerted has ceased to exist.

The language of Mr. Grattan was forcible and peculiar. He was fond of point and antithesis: but this was the natural result of a talent that delighted in bold yet nice distinctions. It is said that he copied the style of Tacitus; but it is more probable that a similarity of genius led to the coincidence.—There is in Mr. Grattan that same power of tracing in a few words the outline of a character, and the condensed thought

which give fulness and force to the balanced periods of the great historian. He was altogether a spirit worthy of being commemorated by the writer whom he is said to have imitated. Had he lived in the reign of Tiberius, the Roman senate would have contained one virtuous and fearless senator, one who was not born to be a courtier even in the palace of Trajan.

In the presence of his country he saw no other hope, no other fear; that one great object absorbed all inferior consideration. He gave it the service of his intellect, and the devotion of what he himself so justly termed a "desperate fidelity." In that cause he laboured, sorrowed, and rejoiced; but he looked at her interests in connection only with those of justice, civilization, and universal humanity. Hostile to all the principles that pamper and exclude, his policy was the simple recognition of Christian sentiment; as it ought to animate the conduct of states and the relations of society, it was calculated to draw into the closest compact of strength, the elements that go to form nations, and to remove the most painful and least profitable task of history, the narration of their civil discords. Such was the cause to which the long and splendid career of his life was given, and to which he dedicated his expiring breath. Though sometimes assailed by a cruel ingratitude, it abated nothing of his zeal, because it was founded on principle, and not dependant upon the errors or passions of mankind. His mind always looked serenely upon its own course; intrepid and daring, as it was gentle and courteous; though fierce and dangerous, when wantonly provoked in the performance of his public duty. It was his cause, and not himself, that inspired the indignant vindication; for he never so worshipped ambition as to sacrifice upon her altar the graceful charities of life, or the mild glory of domestic virtue.

THE ardent and impassioned character of Mr. Grattan's eloquence, when, glowing with youth and hope and patriotism, he first bent the mighty energies of his great mind to rouse the dormant spirit of his country, could not be suffi-

ciently appreciated by those who witnessed only the occasional exercise of his talents in the British House of Commons. In Ireland, his object was to infuse a spirit of proud independence into his auditors, to inflame their minds with a sense of the injuries their country had sustained, and to contrast their degraded condition with the lofty state to which it was their duty to aspire. He had the countless wrongs of ages to enumerate; he had to wade through annals of oppression and crime; and feeling with warm sensibility for the sufferings of his country, he poured forth the torrent of his indignation with an overpowering force. But in England, there was neither scope nor necessity for this vivid eloquence. The temperament of the people, and the circumstances of the country alike forbade it; and it was no inconsiderable proof of Mr. Grattan's strength of mind, and correctness of discretion, that, accustomed as he had ever been to address the imagination of men characteristically susceptible, practised, if the expression may be allowed, to carry the feelings of his auditory by storm, he could, when circumstances rendered it necessary, so far temper his fire and alter the habits of his mind, as to sacrifice his peculiar means of triumph, and confine himself solely and exclusively to the display of good sense and sound judgment. The condition of the two countries respectively was also essentially different. Ireland was, during the continuance of Mr. Grattan's rapid career, a scene of fierce and unrelenting political contest, embittered with every angry feeling that could be excited by a sense of insult and injury on the one hand, and of disappointed power on the other, and animated throughout with alternate triumphs and defeats. In England every thing was comparatively tranquil, the principles of civil and political liberty were fully recognised, and the constitution was permitted to act for the welfare of the community, uncontrolled by open enmity or ill-concealed treachery. In England there was no systematic oppression to inflame the indignation, nor were the energies of the people controlled by the jealous interference of a more powerful neighbour. Ireland was in a state similar to that of a province recently subdued by a vindictive and injudicious conqueror; her trade prohibited, her domestic industry discouraged, her people oppressed, and her interests betrayed.

From this degraded condition, it was the glory of Mr. Grattan to elevate his country. By the electric fire of his eloquence he shook off the bondage of ages; he taught the people a knowledge of their rights, and from the state of a despised and degraded province, he raised Ireland to the rank and port of an independent kingdom.

London, 1820.

It was the intention of Mr. Grattan to have made an effort to take his seat in the House of Commons, and closed his eminent career of public services, by laying on the table of the House of Commons, a series of resolutions declaratory of those principles of civil and religious liberty, which he thought became the high moral station of Great Britain, and the enlightened character of the age in which we live. It pleased Providence in its all-wise dispensation of human destiny, to have withheld from Mr. Grattan the opportunity of performing this last act of public duty, on which he had set his mind, and to make which, he undertook his last journey, and encountered that fatigue, which, in his debilitated state of health, accelerated his demise. Though it was not reserved for Mr. Grattan to have closed his public life as he earnestly desired, yet it is a consolation to feel that he was not snatched from his country, as other statesmen have of late years unhappily been, in the prime of life and in the midst of their immatured energies, for the promotion of the public interests. It has been reserved for few men to have performed such essential services for their country; to have watched with such solicitude over its dearest interests, and achieved, under the most discouraging circumstances, so many solid advantages for their countrymen. If he did not live to consummate the complete success of the great cause to which his life of late years had been devoted, he at least succeeded in placing it upon a basis of public opinion, from which it cannot be shaken, and left for his successors the single task of recording the final settlement of a question, which his talents and eloquence had advanced to the verge of final adjustment.*

* Roman Catholic Emancipation.

As a public character, the efforts of Mr. Grattan will be best understood by a reference to the history of his own country, during the last half century of its eventful annals. No man that ever preceded him filled a greater space in the public mind, nor were ever greater questions more dependant on the patriotism and energies of a single individual. As an orator, Mr. Grattan stood in the first class. He was above grappling with the minor details of political questions. His view was that of a philosopher, and no statesman of modern times exceeded him in his manner of pressing his arguments, or in the eloquence which he shed upon every subject that came before him. There was an indignant sarcasm and severity in his language, when treating of the wrongs of his country, which appalled his opponents, and made him terrible in the eyes of those minions of power, who adhered with selfish eagerness to a system of government, happily since abandoned in administering the affairs of Ireland. Though Mr. Grattan commanded a power of language almost beyond any other man of his time, yet his delivery, warm and impassioned as it was, was unmarked by the imposing graces of action. The force and originality of his diction, the concise and yet comprehensive form of his arguments, and copious splendour of his illustrations, threw a commanding interest over his speeches, in which some peculiarities of manner and phraseology were entirely overlooked and forgotten. The death of this distinguished patriot will be long mourned by his country. He was the last survivor of that great galaxy of talent which shed such a lustre upon the annals of this country since the time of Lord Chatham.

London, 1820.

WE know of no sovereign for whose memory Ireland should so sincerely mourn as for the memory of that great man, who might be truly styled an unlimited sovereign in this realm of genius; *one* who, in eloquence, had many competitors, but no equal; who was as original in mind as he was in the power of giving expression to it; who seemed to be born for the epoch in which he lived, and to be delegated by Providence the instrument of that liberty he assisted

in achieving. Without the volunteers of 1782, it may be truly said that Mr. Grattan could not accomplish the vast and comprehensive speculations of his powerful mind; but it may be *as truly* said, that without Henry Grattan, the Volunteers would have wanted the trumpet which sounded their fame and glory through the world. It was his classic eloquence that recorded their achievements, and made them at once the terror as well as the admiration of their enemies.

When we look back to the pages of our history, and see them illuminated with the splendid proceedings of those early struggles for the liberty of Ireland, and contemplate the part which Mr. Grattan performed on this great theatre of human action, we are lost in the impotency of language, to give expression to the sorrow we feel, when we are obliged to turn to the tomb that has closed for ever on our illustrious countryman. But it is our duty to go to *that* tomb, and learn from the dead, the wisdom and the truth which we cannot obtain from the living; it is our duty to consult even the ashes of Grattan, and to catch from the devouring grave a particle even of that mind which once electrified the bosom of millions. To whom can Ireland say she is so much indebted as to this great man? We challenge the readers of her history to point out the Irishman to whose genius, and to whose virtues, to whose unconquerable spirit and *desperate fidelity*, the people of Ireland are so much indebted as to Mr. Grattan. Where is the man who devoted forty years of a spotless life, and of unabated labours, to the elevation and aggrandizement of his native land, and who never sought reward, but from the spontaneous gratitude of an admiring people? — Where is the man who can say, “I rose and I fell with my country! I carried her on my shoulders into the temple of Freedom, and I stood at the door of that temple, to devote my life, if necessary, to its preservation.” What man in Irish history, can say this but *Grattan*?

Yet, even he, though so gifted with genius, and so full of virtues, could not be exempt from the weaknesses of his nature. The pride of opinion, the vanity of not giving way to humble men, sometimes seduced Mr. Grattan into the committal of errors, which were obvious to every one but to him, and would have been avoided by those who, compared with

him, were as the Lilliputian to the Giant. When living, it was the duty of the humblest intellects to remonstrate even with Mr. Grattan; to speak of his deviation with candour, but with decorum; to guard the nation against an example so fascinating, and a name so powerful. But the grave has swallowed all our differences, and history seems to stand before us at this moment holding up to our view the brilliant scenes in which Mr. Grattan is shedding on an enslaved and benighted land the light of his glowing mind, animating and invigorating the sleepy and inert mass which surrounded him, and giving to his wondering countrymen a strength and a spirit of which they were hitherto unconscious. From the free trade of 1779, to the establishment of the Union, the life of Mr. Grattan was an uninterrupted and fearless struggle for the independence and rights of all denominations of his countrymen. During that interval, it is true, a few clouds passed across him in his brilliant career, but they only obscured and hid him for the moment from the nation's eye. He rose again with redoubled effulgence, and followed the fortunes of his country to the last moment of his existence. In 1788, he was denounced by the bishops of the established church, because he assailed their monopoly and arraigned their avarice. He was the enemy of church and state, because he interfered between the poor and the tithe-proctor; and, in 1793, the corporation of Dublin threatened to depose him from the throne on which his fellow-citizens had placed him, (the *representation* of the metropolis,) because he pleaded, with more than human eloquence, the rights of his Catholic countrymen to equal and impartial privileges. In 1795, 1796, and 1797, he was put up and put down by the sycophants of power, as that power thought proper to issue their orders. His early idolaters forgot the object of their idolatry in the contemplation of their interested speculations; and the heads of the university were the first to set the example of political monopoly. Mr. Grattan's picture was no longer to be seen in the college-hall. Lord Clare was the chosen favourite, and this, too, at the moment when that very Lord was sapping the foundations of Irish freedom; but Mr. Grattan went on in his glorious course, undisturbed

by the anathemas of churchmen and schoolmen. He knew the day would return, when corruption would lament her credulity, and when his name would once more reascend to its proper station in the mind of his country.

Dublin, 1820.

Edinburgh Review, November 1820.

IRELAND.

THANK God that all is not profligacy and corruption in the history of that devoted people; and that the name of Irishman does not always carry with it the idea of the oppressor or the oppressed; the plunderer or the plundered, the tyrant or the slave: great men hallow a whole people, and lift up all that live in their time. What Irishman does not feel proud that he has lived in the days of Grattan? who has not turned to him for comfort, from the false friends and open enemies of Ireland? Who did not remember him in the days of its burnings and wastings and murders? No government ever dismayed him: the world could not bribe him: he thought only of Ireland; lived for no other object; dedicated to her his beautiful fancy, his elegant wit, his manly courage, and all the splendour of his astonishing eloquence. He was so born and so gifted, that poetry, forensic skill, elegant literature, all the highest attainments of human genius, were within his reach. But he thought the noblest occupation of a man, was to make other men happy and free; and in that straight line he went on for fifty years, without one side look, without one yielding thought, without one motive in his heart which he might not have laid open to the view of God and man. He is gone: but there is not a single day of his honest life, of which every good Irishman would not be more proud than of the whole political existence of his countrymen, the annual deserters and betrayers of their native land.

To James and Henry Grattan, Esqrs.

London, June 7. 1820.

GENTLEMEN, — Filled with veneration for the character of your father, we venture to express a wish common to us with many of those who most admired and loved him, that what remains of him should be allowed to continue among us.

It has pleased Divine providence to deprive the empire of his services, while he was here in the neighbourhood of that sacred edifice where great men, from all parts of the British dominions, have been for ages interred. We are desirous of an opportunity of joining in due honour to tried virtue and genius. Mr. Grattan belongs to us also, and great would be our consolation were we permitted to follow him to the grave, and to place him where he would not have been unwilling to lie; by the side of his illustrious fellow-labourer in the cause of freedom.

Duncaanon	R. C. Ferguson	Kinnaird
Wentworth (Fitzwilliam)	T. C. Lambton	Thanet
Augustus Frederick (Duke of Sussex)	Creve	Vassal Holland
W. V. Fitzgerald	King	H. Brougham
T. Ponsonby	Milton	Jersey
Althorpe	Thomas Coke	A. Hamilton
W. H. Littleton	Arundell	Erskine
W. H. Prinn	Roslyn	Samuel Rogers
George Tierney	J. Mackintosh	Blessington
Clifford	Albemarle	Henry G. Bennett
Hamilton Bandon	Carnarvon	R. Sharpe
Besborough	Darnley	Morpeth
W. T. Ponsonby	Darlington	H. Russell
Ossulston	Bute	Nugent
John Lens	Derby	William Lamb
John Bennett	Spencer	Thos. H. Burke
C. W. Wynne	Edward Petre	I. M'Donald
St. Vincent	Tavistock	H. Norwich
Cowper	J. Russell	Norfolk
	Devonshire	Bedford
	J. Fazakerly	Surrey.

To His Royal Highness the Duke of Sussex, and the Noblemen and Gentlemen, &c.

In answer to the kind and flattering communication received by Mr. James and Mr. Henry Grattan, they beg to assure his Royal Highness, and the Noblemen and Gentlemen who have made it, that they are most sensible of the expressions of esteem and veneration which it contains towards their father.

In the calamity with which they have been afflicted, it is a consolation to them to find, that he is honoured and mourned by those whom he esteemed and respected.

If private feelings alone were consulted, their wish would be that his remains should lie in that ground purchased by the people of Ireland, as the reward of his exertions in defence of her liberties; but as so many individuals of Great Britain, and his own countrymen and friends, agree that he should be placed in Westminster Abbey, they gratefully accede to the honourable request of depositing his remains in that sacred edifice, and by the side of that illustrious individual whom, in life, he so dearly valued, and near whom, in death, it would have been his pride to lie.

Baker-street, June 15th, 1820.

THE remains of Mr. Grattan were, on Thursday night, conveyed in a hearse and four to Richmond House, Privy Gardens, where, according to the published order, the friends of the deceased were to assemble at ten o'clock in the morning, to be marshalled for the funeral procession. The body lay in state in one of the parlours on the ground-floor. The room was hung in black, and lighted with silver lamps.

At the appointed hour a considerable number of personages of the first rank attended, and were accommodated on the ground-floor, in the grand range of drawing-rooms, and a considerable number of gentlemen took their station in the garden in front of the house, where the ceremonial of marshalling was to take place. At a quarter before twelve o'clock, the neces-

sary arrangements being completed, the procession (which was pedestrian) moved out of the coach-entrance which opens into Whitehall, and advanced against the centre of Parliament-street, which was newly gravelled for this melancholy occasion. A considerable multitude of persons who had, as early as nine o'clock, assembled, filled the pathways and the greater part of the centre of the street; but the constables, who were arranged under the direction of Mr. Lee, the high constable, kept a sufficient space open for the funeral to advance.

Every individual, from the highest to the lowest, seemed to feel as if he had been deprived of a friend, a father; and the general interest was not a little deepened and increased by the simple and unostentatious manner in which dukes, peers, and nobles assisted in this last sad ceremony. It was the offering of title at the shrine of talent, virtue, and integrity; and in the hour of his country's affliction, such a testimonial must prove no common consolation. In the procession were recognized many of his political opponents, who knew too well how to value the purity of his intentions, and the profound resources of his intellect, not to mourn his loss.

Mr. Lee and a body of constables clearing the way.

Two mutes.

Mourners, two and two.

Two pages. Two hundred gentlemen, two and two. Two pages

The Irish students-at-law with hat-bands and gloves.

The clergy and medical gentlemen with scarfs.

Two mutes.

Bearer, with plume of feathers and escutcheon of the deceased.

THE COFFIN,

covered with a rich pall, and supported by the

Duke of Wellington,

Duke of Norfolk,

Earl of Harrowby,

Earl of Donoughmore,

Lord Holland,

Lord W. Fitzgerald,

Marquis of Downshire,

Lord Castlereagh (by proxy).

Chief mourner,

his train borne by Mr. H. Burke, supported by the Marquis of Wellesley and Lord Erskine,

James Grattan, Esq. (eldest son of the deceased).

Second mourner,

his train borne by Mr. James Corry, and supported by Sir B. Bloomfield and Mr. H. Caulfield,

Henry Grattan, Esq. (second son of the deceased).

Duke of Devonshire. { His Royal Highness } Lord Lansdowne.
 { the Duke of Sussex. }

Members of the House of Peers, four abreast, according to title and rank.
 Members of the House of Commons, four abreast, according to rank.
 Gentlemen who attended as friends of the Deceased, two and two.
 Undertaker's men as fitting, &c.
 Three pages closed the procession.

The Roman Catholic nobleman and gentlemen attended in pursuance of the resolution adopted by that body: —

British Catholic Board, Monday, June 12. 1820.

His Grace the Duke of Norfolk in the chair.

Moved by Lord Arundell — seconded by the Hon. Edward Petre.

Resolved unanimously. — 1st, That the British Catholic Board feel an anxious wish to manifest, in the most expressive manner, their deep affliction at the heavy calamity which has befallen the empire, and particularly the Catholic body, by the death of the Right Hon. Henry Grattan, and that the members of the Board do attend his funeral in Westminster Abbey, as a testimony of their gratitude for his eminent services, of their respect for his memory, and of their heartfelt grief at a loss so generally and so deservedly deplored.

2dly, That the governors and committees of the Catholic schools within this metropolis be requested to allow the children of their respective charities also to attend the funeral.

NORFOLK, Chairman.

EDWARD JERNINGHAM, Secretary.

The children were accordingly ranged in front of the grand entrance into the abbey. The Irish children were habited in green; and the whole presented a most interesting and affecting spectacle.

The procession occupied nearly an hour in moving from Richmond House to Westminster Abbey, where it was received at the great western door by the Rev. Dr. Ireland, the dean of Westminster, and attended by the whole choir of the abbey, who chaunted one of Handel's grand anthems as it advanced along the aisle to the vault prepared to receive the coffin. The distinguished characters who composed the procession formed at each side of the vault, which was hung with black, as the coffin was borne to the opening of the vault.

The dean, after ten minutes past one o'clock, read the service for the dead, and immediately after the doors of the tomb were closed upon the remains of Mr. Grattan, amid the strong and unaffected grief of the most illustrious characters of the empire. The tomb lies nearly between the spot of earth which encloses all that was mortal of Pitt and Fox. It adjoins the grave of the great Lord Chatham, and is surrounded by the tombs of Lord Mansfield and other eminent public characters. — The foot of Mr. Grattan's coffin nearly touches that of Mr. Fox. It is exactly the spot, out of his own country, which it would be supposed Mr. Grattan would have selected for his tomb. He rests among the most illustrious statesmen who have adorned the modern annals of the country.

House of Commons, Wednesday, June 14. 1820.

NEW WRIT FOR DUBLIN.

SIR J. MACKINTOSH, in rising to move for a new writ for the return of a member to serve in Parliament for the City of Dublin, in the room of the Right Hon. Henry Grattan, begged leave, in the absence of his Right Hon. Friend, (Sir J. Newport) to say a few words upon this melancholy occasion. He could assure the House, with the utmost humility, that he had not undertaken this task without the deepest sense of his own inability to do justice to that immortal name; and he could assure the House, with equal truth, that he had not undertaken it from any general partiality to proceedings of this nature. Far from approving of such a course being pursued in cases of an ordinary description, he was ready to admit that, if the practice were extended beyond the very narrow limits within which it had been of late years confined; if friendship should make such addresses degenerate into matters of course, he should most sincerely deplore the departure from our recent custom, and heartily wish to return to the modest silence of our forefathers. Indeed, studied panegyrics on the dead, were not consistent with the general

character and simple habits of Englishmen; it was a practice rather suited to an enslaved people than to a land of freemen, for those who were debarred from the manly exercises open to the natives of this country, and restrained to few subjects, might be expected, in the absence of other themes on which they might dilate, to exhaust themselves in laboured orations and in unmerited praise. In modern times, the House had wisely limited this usage, and had confined such tributes to cases in which the recent death, where warm respect, admiration, and affection, made it impossible for any difference of opinion to prevail. The bounds which has thus been observed, ought not to be exceeded. The House had acted wisely, reserving such distinctions for occasions of an extraordinary nature. Were this not done, the practice would soon resolve itself into a hollow and hypocritical parade, conferring no honour on the subject of it, reflecting no credit on the House, and degrading to the feelings of the nation. If he should be ashamed of being found wanting in respect to the memory of those he had most loved and honoured on earth, he should not be less so of suffering feelings of personal regard to influence him on an occasion like the present, so as to induce him to bring forward the merits of an individual as entitled to public admiration, where it was at all doubtful whether posterity would confirm the decision that might become so in the first instance. The honours they might render to those who were no more, ought to be strictly confined to such cases as he had supposed. They owed this as well to the memory of those who had not received such honours as to those who had received them; to their own characters as well as to those of their friends; for many who had not been so distinguished, were entitled to the highest honours that friendship could bestow, though not to that peculiar mark of public consideration in that House which ought to be the appropriate reward of exalted public virtue and transcendent talent. He could not but insist that the restraint imposed on their feelings ought to be continued, for that eulogium and those plaudits would become utterly worthless, if for a moment it could be doubted that they were sincere. When he stated that exalted virtue, great public services, and transcendent talent were the conditions on which

such honours should be granted, and uttered the name of Mr. Grattan, he was confident that every one who heard him would be ready to reply with eagerness, that he had satisfied them all. The first peculiarity which he would mention in the character of this distinguished individual, was a circumstance memorable in itself, and, as far as he knew, unparalleled in history. Mr. Grattan was the first person (as he was informed), and certainly he was the only individual in our age, to whom parliament had voted a recompence for services rendered to the country, by one who was no more than a private gentleman, and who enjoyed neither civil nor military honours. It was now nearly forty years since the House of Commons had voted an estate to him and his family, not as a remuneration, for it was impossible that his transcendent merits could be remunerated, but as a testimony of national gratitude for his unequalled services. That vote was an indelible record of the gratitude of his country. He found his country labouring under the evils of a foreign policy; he restored it to its independence; he found his country a province of England; he gave it a name among the nations; he restored it to its just rights and privileges. He was one of the few whose happiness and whose glory it had been to have liberated his country from the domination of a foreign power, not by arms and blood, but by wisdom and eloquence. And he had the peculiar felicity of enjoying as much esteem and admiration in the country whose pretensions he had resisted, as in the country whose independence he has restored. To try his merits by another criterion, it was to be expected that in his arduous career of public service, much diversity of opinion was to be encountered, and many honourable enmities to be incurred. It was, however, the peculiar happiness of the great man whose loss they deplored, that he had survived all those enmities; he had lived till the mellowing hand of time and the mild virtues of age, had extinguished every feeling of jealousy, and men of all parties and opinions united in paying to his memory a homage, deep, sincere, and unexampled. The House must feel, that, in paying this mark of distinction to his memory, posterity would review their decision, and that the name of Grattan would occupy a large space in history. The narra-

tive of his life would, in reality, form the history of his country. Fertile as the British empire had been in great men during the last half century, Ireland had undoubtedly contributed her full share; but no name, not even the illustrious names of Burke, Sheridan, and Wellington, were more certainly historical, or more sure to be remembered by posterity, than that of Grattan. Without entering into those controverted topics, the defence of which had obtained for him the gratitude of his country in the year 1782, he would observe only, that whatever difference of opinion might exist, as to the Union between the two nations, nothing was more certain than this — that no union could be lasting, till the two nations met upon equal terms, and the representatives of Ireland had their just and full share in the administration of the whole empire. To mention a circumstance of inferior moment, it was a striking peculiarity in his parliamentary history, and unexampled, perhaps, in the history of orators, that he might be said to have arrived at the first class of eloquence in two parliaments, differing in their taste, opinion, and habits, as much as any two assemblies of different nations could differ from each other. His pre-eminence was confessed in his own country, where wit and eloquence sprung up more spontaneously than in any other — it was confessed in this country, where he came at an advanced age, and at a period when the House of Commons were made justly severe in their judgment by the daily display of talents, such as had rarely been seen in any age or country; he had therefore to encounter great names on the one hand, and unwarrantable expectations on the other. The inconvenience arising from the practice of addressing the House upon these occasions, rendered it necessary to allege peculiarities, and he could show that in this case at least the precedent could not become dangerous. This great man did not indeed die in this House; but he died in his progress to discharge his public duties; he died in the public service. As to the measure which he intended to propose to Parliament, he might venture, perhaps, without offending the feelings of any man, to describe what that great man thought upon the subject. He had risked his life to come to this House, because he thought it would be the means of healing the bleeding wounds of his

country, of establishing harmony and union in a kingdom, whose independence he had himself achieved; of transmitting to posterity with the records of her political, the history of her religious liberation; of vindicating the honour of the Protestant religion, and wiping from it the last stain that dimmed its purity, and of supporting the cause of religious liberty, whose spirit went forth emancipated at the Reformation, and which was adopted into the laws and constitution of the country. In this great cause he had sacrificed his life. His virtues were without alloy, and the purity of his life was equal to the brightness of his glory, for he was as eminent in his observance of all the duties of private life, as he was heroic in the discharge of his public ones. He was one of those rare examples whose private virtues were as conspicuous as his public character, and shone forth as an example to all human nature. It was not his fortune to become acquainted with him till an advanced period of his life; and though, in all the intercourse which he had had with men of genius, he had constantly found simplicity of character to accompany great endowments of mind; he might truly say that he had never met with an instance in which such native grandeur of mind was blended with so much infantine playfulness and simplicity; in which the softest qualities were so happily combined with the loftiest and the grandest of human nature. He might truly apply to him the words of an ancient writer:—

Vita innocentissimus, ingenio florentissimus, proposito sanctissimus.

It was the dying prayer of this great man, that Great Britain and Ireland might be for ever united in the bonds of amity, and that the last stains of religious intolerance might be effaced from our system. Such has been the great object of his political life, and by his unceasing endeavours in this cause, he had not merely rendered himself the pride and ornament of his own country, but he was entitled to the reverential gratitude and pious affection of every Englishman. He trusted that he would not be too fanciful if he indulged a hope that the honours paid to Mr. Grattan's memory in this country, might have some tendency to promote the great objects of his life, by showing to Ireland how much we valued

services rendered to her, even at the expence of our own prejudices and pride; the man who has thus served her, must ever be the object of the reverential gratitude and pious recollection of every Irishman. When the illustrious dead are gathered into one common tomb, all national distinctions fade away, and they seem to be connected with us by a closer union, than laws or governments can produce; it is natural to dwell on their merits and their probable reward. I feel, therefore, that I cannot better close what I have to say, than by applying to Mr. Grattan the lines written on one who had successfully laboured to refine our taste and our manners, but had nothing in common with him other than a splendid imagination and a spotless life. Of Mr. Grattan, when carried to that spot where sleep the ashes of kindred greatness, it may truly be said,

Ne'er to those chambers where the mighty rest,
 Since their foundation, came a nobler guest,
 Nor e'er was to the bowers of bliss convey'd
 A purer spirit or more holy shade."

Lord Castlereagh agreeing with the remarks made by the Hon. and Learned Gentleman, as to the occasions on which a public tribute of applause should be rendered to those who were no more, perfectly entered into the feelings which had been expressed with respect to Mr. Grattan, and thought no individual could hesitate in awarding to his name the honours claimed for it. He could remember when he, (Lord C.) first came into public life in 1790, that Mr. Grattan was then in the splendour of his talents, and certainly no talents had ever asserted greater supremacy over a popular assembly than his had done. (Hear, hear!) — He was of opinion, that, in the great transaction which had been alluded to, England profited not less from the talents of Mr. Grattan than Ireland had done. By the victory which he had previously gained, Mr. Grattan had laid the foundation for that measure which had united the two islands of Great Britain and Ireland into one empire, and dissipated those mists which had before prevented both countries from seeing their true interests. The commercial bigotry which had once existed, was overthrown in consequence of his exertions, and the ad-

vantages resulting from this, were now felt in the wealth which each country poured into the other, and which it was now the business of parliament to fructify and encrease. He concurred entirely in the observation which had been made by the Honourable and Learned Gentleman, upon the eloquence of Mr. Grattan. It was no easy matter to transplant a tree after a certain period; but in Mr. Grattan's case, the tree had been successfully transplanted, and the House had felt its shade. Whatever difference of opinion might exist as to the great question which it was his intention to bring before Parliament, there could be none as to the transcendent merits of the great statesman who had made the last feeble effort of his expiring frame, to promote the welfare of his country. (Hear, hear, hear.)—He wished it were in his power to express in terms more adequate, the general political veneration he felt for the great character who was the subject of their present discourse. He was sure that there would be found as many, whose sentiments agreed with those so eloquently expressed by the Hon. and Learned Gentleman, on his (Lord Castlereagh's) side of the House, as there were on the other.—(Hear.) He was sure the virtues of that great character would long live in the memory of the British nation. (Cheers.)

Mr. C. Grant entreated the pardon of the House for occupying their attention for a few minutes on a subject which to him was so deeply interesting. He was glad that this occasion had not been allowed to pass, without paying that just tribute of panegyric to the memory of the late Mr. Grattan, because he thought it was due to the feelings of the House of Commons, to the feelings of Ireland, and he would add, of England; for we had also shared the advantage and glory of his talents. He would not enter into a detail of the public life and character of Mr. Grattan—it was satisfactory and consoling, that upon such an occasion all party differences should be laid aside. In truth, that great man was now far removed from all party differences; he had already taken his place among kindred spirits, to whom his distinguished virtues on earth had long been approximating him. That great man was as delightful in private life as he was in public. One great beauty in his character was, that love of retirement

which the ardour of his patriotism led him to forsake. To his last days he felt and admired all the silent charms of nature, with all the freshness and ardour of a first affection. He had had opportunities of seeing him in the midst of his family and friends, and of observing with what urbanity he gave himself up to the pleasures of domestic life. These recollections made him feel far more deeply the irreparable loss which himself, in common with the whole nation, now sustained; but they suggested another more useful feeling — the intimate connection there was between great public and great private virtues. In truth, Mr. Grattan's political virtues struck so deep, because they were deeply rooted in the domestic virtues. — (Hear, hear!)

Mr. Wilberforce observed, that the great public services which had been rendered, both to Ireland and to Great Britain by the eminent and lamented individual in question, had been well described by his Honourable and Learned Friend. Having witnessed all the exertions of Mr. Grattan's political life, after his introduction into this country, he begged to be allowed to say a single word on the subject. He had never known a man whose patriotism and love for the constitution of his country seemed so completely to extinguish all private interests, and to induce him to look invariably and exclusively to the public good — (Hear, hear, hear.) His mind was of a character which enabled him completely to triumph over party feeling on all questions of great public importance. (Hear, hear.) He could not abstain from remarking, that to this particular praise, Mr. Grattan was entitled in more than an ordinary degree; well he remembered, that when Mr. Grattan was apprehensive that the love of liberty, which no one had more zealously infused into his countrymen than himself, carried to excess, might betray them into illegitimate conduct, he freely subjected himself to unpopularity, with a view to avert the evil, and to recal those who were giving way to it to a just sense of the beneficial and excellent qualities of the constitution under which they lived — (Hear, hear.) Mr. Grattan showed true wisdom in thus manifesting that the love of liberty was never so substantially gratified, as when it was gratified with a due observance of that proper rule and

subordination without which the principles of society must immediately dissolve; → (Hear, hear.)

Mr. V. Fitzgerald trusted he might be permitted to occupy the House for a few moments, with the expression of those sentiments which were common to all who had ever known the revered individual whose loss the country had now to deplore. He was fully sensible, that whatever might be said on the subject, might do honour to themselves and to the country; but could add no honor to the memory of such a man as Mr. Grattan. The Honourable and Learned Gentleman who had introduced the topic to the House, had expatiated on the character of his illustrious friend with an eloquence and a feeling to which every breast responded. It had been truly said by the Honourable and Learned Gentleman that, if they wished to read the history of Mr. Grattan, they must read the history of his country. With every memorable occurrence in Irish history during the last forty years, Mr. Grattan's name was connected; and he had stamped it with his character. It was superfluous to dilate on this subject. To Mr. Grattan's exertions, Ireland principally owed her independence. In his own words, the revolution then achieved was "alone in the history of empires, the revolution accomplished without shedding a drop of human blood." (Hear, hear, hear!) He would abstain from dwelling on any topic calculated to excite a difference of opinion; but it was impossible to contemplate the occasion and circumstances of Mr. Grattan's death, without some reference to that particular question, which, to the last moment of that great man's existence, occupied his whole heart and soul. Without entering into any discussion, whether Mr. Grattan's opinions on that question were right or not (the House knew his, Mr. V. Fitzgerald's sentiments upon it), he could not refrain from observing that there was, in the very manner and time of Mr. Grattan's death, a consecration of his opinions on that most important subject which was well calculated to augment their force and impression. He recollected that on the first occasion on which he had the honour and the happiness to hear Mr. Grattan in parliament, in adverting to the talents and services of his eminent but deceased contemporaries, Burgh, Yelverton, and Flood, he

observed, that although they had not lived to witness the restoration of the independence of Ireland, their genius might be said to survive, even in the measures which they had themselves failed to accomplish. Mr. Grattan was more felicitous. His fame rested, not on measures which had failed, but on measures which had succeeded: but he (Mr. V. Fitzgerald) trusted that, with respect to the other great principles so often and so admirably maintained by him in that House, his genius (to use his own expression) might survive and operate, though his mortal part had ceased to exist. (Hear, hear, hear.)

Mr. Beecher declared his conviction, that the House would make allowance for the feelings which must animate every Irish bosom on contemplating the qualities of the most distinguished and useful patriot that his country had ever produced. (Hear.) Without stopping for a moment to consider his own incapacity to address the House on such a subject, he should be ashamed to sit silently in any assembly where he had a right to deliver his sentiments, when the name of Mr. Grattan was mentioned; and he was sure that his sentiments were in unison with those of all who heard him, when he expressed his deep lamentation for the loss, and his profound veneration and gratitude for the services of the illustrious individual in question. He by no means intended to enter into any detailed panegyric on that great man. He was incapable of the task; and if he were capable of it, it would be altogether superfluous. His principal reason for rising was to mention to the House that a document — the dying exhortation of Mr. Grattan to his Catholic countrymen had been communicated to him (Mr. Beecher), which, with the permission of the House, he would now read. (The Hon. Member here read the document in question.) *

* The following is the paper alluded to. Finding himself unable to go down to the House, Mr. Grattan dictated it a short time before his death.

I have entreated of Providence to give me an opportunity to submit a few propositions, regarding your situation; they go to the Roman Catholic interest and to your own.

First, — I most strongly recommend that the two countries may

Nothing could, in his opinion, be more favourable to Mr. Grattan than this proof, in his dying moments, of his anxious solicitude that his Catholic countrymen might not fall into error. He (M. Beecher) trusted that they would not do so. He trusted they would not fail in the attainment of the important object which they had in view. If they should fail, he was persuaded it could only be by a departure from the

never separate, and that Ireland should never seek for any connexion except with Great Britain.

My next advice is, that the people of these countries should not look to a Democratical Government; *they are not fit for it*; and the Democracy proposed, means *nothing but a military government*.

Universal Suffrage and Annual Parliaments, profess to give the people the power which *they do not*. Their first operation is to repeal all the laws which prevent the army from voting, and of course *leaves the election to the army*. The next operation is to remove all the laws that prevent persons who are connected with the revenue from voting, and *leaves the election to the influence of the Crown*; the result of both would be a riot, and not an election. I have just breath enough to enter my protest against both.

With respect to the Roman Catholics, they have a right to worship their God as they please, the Roman Catholics have a right to believe in transubstantiation; they owe allegiance to their God and to their king; but *they do not owe allegiance to the Pope*; there exists no right, there exists no power to control them.

Under these circumstances, I beg to propose the following resolutions.

Resolved,— That a committee be appointed, with a view to repeal the Civil and Political disabilities, which affect His Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects on account of their religion.

Resolved,— That such repeal be made with due regard to the *Inviolability* of the Protestant Religion and Establishments.

Resolved,— That these Resolutions do stand the sense of the Commons of the Imperial Parliament, on the subject of Civil and Religious Liberty, and as such be laid before His Majesty.

These resolutions contain my sentiments; *this is my testamentary disposition, and I die with a love of liberty in my heart, and this declaration in favour of my country in my hand*.

dying injunctions of their unwearied champion and best friend; and who had taken so solemn an opportunity of giving wholesome advice to them, as he had frequently done to those who were to legislate for them. He had gratified his own feelings in having said these few words; he hoped he had done no injury to the memory of the great man of whom he had been speaking; and he trusted he had not committed an unreasonable trespass on the patience of the House. — (Hear, hear.)

The motion was agreed to.

GRATTAN'S GRAVE.

BOWED down by patriarch length of days
 And toil of public services,
 Dim waned at last Life's wasted flame,
 And Nature's final crisis came —
 Yet then, even then, when withering pain
 Press'd hard upon the breath and brain,
 The spirits' quenchless element
 Blazed forth all freshly and unspent —
 For liberty one rally yet,
 One struggle ere her sun be set! —
 The Patriot willed — the mortal tried —
 And in the glorious effort died!
 He died, as might become the past,
 Sublime and radiant to the last;
 His latest accents breathing zeal
 For freedom, and his country's weal.
 For them he lived — for them would pray,
 As life's low pulses ebb'd away;
 But, in the midst, the prayer was riven,
 On earth half uttered — half in heaven —
 And sure, if dying Patriot's love
 E'er reached the eternal throne above,
 That martyr's pure, impassioned prayer,
 Found audit and acceptance there.
 Ranged by his bier in stranger land,
 There mourn'd a good and glorious band,
 Of majesty, and might, and mind,
 The living lights of human kind;
 And near his proud allotted bed,
 Reposed the kindred patriot dead —
 Yet 'midst that scene, where every name
 Was shrined in History — dear to Fame —
 Seemed the new inmate, entering there
 Like some celestial messenger,
 To reign alone — his memory
 To dim all else — and every eye
 Forgot the royal, good, and brave,
 Rooting its glance in Grattan's grave.

And Eloquence, her son was weeping,
 Among the mute now stilly sleeping;
 And Erin's orphaned children sent,
 Across the seas, their hearts' lament;
 And generous England's chosen flower
 Of chivalry, and worth, and power,
 Mingled their manly sympathy
 Above a name that cannot die.
 The Patriot's memory will be blest
 Wherever be his place of rest,
 Yet his, perchance, had meeter been
 In his own native valleys green,
 Where pilgrim hands, with pious care,
 Shamrocks, the first of spring, might bear,
 And offer, all to them that's given —
 Their fond, believing prayer, to Heaven.
 But no — 'tis *here* his grave should be,
 Majestic land-mark to the free,
 Breathing a soul, a power, a spell
 O'er men — a moral miracle —
Here, * near yon walls so often shook,
 By the stern might of his rebuke;
 While bigotry, with blanching brow,
 Heard him, and blush'd, but would not bow.
Here, where his ashes may fulfil
 His country's cherished mission still,
 And when, by his example fired,
 Some Patriot, like himself, inspired,
 Again the arduous theme shall try,
 For which 'twas his to live and die;
Here let him point his last appeal,
 Where Statesmen and where Kings should kneel;
 His bones will warn them to be just,
 Still pleading even from the dust !

* Westminster Abbey.

By Thomas Moore.

SHALL the harp then be silent, when he who first gave
To our country a name, is withdrawn from all eyes?
Shall a minstrel of Erin stand mute by the grave,
Where the first — where the last of her patriots lies?

No — faint though the death-song may fall from his lips,
Though his harp, like his soul, may with shadows be cross'd,
Yet, yet shall it sound, 'mid a nation's eclipse,
And proclaim to the world what a star hath been lost!

What a union of all the affections and powers
By which life is exalted, embellished, refined,
Was embraced in that spirit — whose centre was ours,
While its mighty circumference circled mankind.

Oh! who that loves Erin — or who that can see
Through the waste of her annals, that epoch sublime —
Like a pyramid rais'd in the desert, where he
And his glory stand out to the eyes of all time! —

That one lucid interval, snatch'd from the gloom
And the madness of ages, when, fill'd with his soul,
A nation o'erleap'd the dark bounds of her doom,
And, for one sacred instant, touch'd Liberty's goal!

Who, that ever hath heard him — hath drank at the source
Of that wonderful eloquence, all Erin's own,
In whose high-thoughted daring, the fire and the force,
And the yet untam'd spring of her spirit was shown —

An eloquence, rich — wheresoever its wave
Wandered free and triumphant — with thoughts that shone
through,
As clear as the brook's "stone of lustre," and gave,
With the flash of the gem, its solidity too.

Who, that ever approach'd him, when free from the crowd,
 In a home full of love he delighted to tread
 'Mong the trees which a nation had given, and which bow'd,
 As if each brought a new civic crown for his head —

That home where — like him who, as fable hath told,
 Put the rays from his brow, that his child might come near,
 Every glory forgot, the most wise of the old
 Became all that the simplest and youngest hold dear.

Is there one who hath thus, through his orbit of life,
 But at distance observed him — through glory, through blame,
 In the calm of retreat, in the grandeur of strife,
 Whether shining or clouded, still high and the same —

Such a union of all that enriches life's hour,
 Of the sweetness we love, and the greatness we praise,
 As that type of simplicity blended with power,
 A child with a thunderbolt only pourtrays.

Oh no — not a heart, that e'er knew him, but mourns,
 Deep, deep o'er the grave where such glory is shrin'd —
 O'er a monument Fame will preserve 'mong the urns
 Of the wisest, the bravest, the best of mankind !

ON A LIBEL, SAID TO BE COPIED FROM AN IRISH NEWS-
 PAPER*, ON THE MEMORY OF MR. GRATTAN.

CAN it be that from Ireland the calumny came ?
 Was it there that a heart and a hand could be found
 To rake up the ashes and rifle the fame
 Of the mightiest man that e'er hallowed her ground ?

Does she boast her exemption from venom no more ?
 Most wretched, but long the most pure spot of earth !
 Have the tears of her sons washed the charm from her shore,
 And *corruption* hatched vile things like this into birth ?

* The Hibernian Journal, now extinct, conducted on Orange principles under the administration of the Duke of Richmond, Lord Talbot, and Mr. Saurin (Attorney General.)

No, no — let us hope that some less favoured clime
 Engendered the crawler; which crept from the gloom
 To shake off its covering of slander and slime
 In the brightness that shines round the Patriot's tomb.

Or is it that fame — like the mouldering clay
 In the charnel — is doomed for a while to remain,
 Of self-begot reptiles the sport, till the day
 When the loud trump of Heaven shall arouse it again?

It would seem so — for all whom the world has adored,
 Let their glory be built on what structure it might,
 On virtue or valour — by pen or by sword —
 Have had spots on their disk, be it ever so bright.

Let us look through the vistas of History's page,
 And we see not one name of the good or the great,
 Ungnawed by the loathsomest worms of the age.
 And can Grattan find freedom from Cicero's fate?

But no fear for his fame from such reptiles as those,
 When Wellington, Castlereagh, Canning were proud
 To wash out the shame that they once were his foes,
 In tears which bedewed every fold of his shroud.

Little fear for his fame, when a hand weak as mine,
 That was palsied by grief when the Patriot died,
 And *dared* not his greatness disgraced by one line,
 Has nerve to crush *this* thing by which he's decried.

Still let not the unavowed wretch slink from way
 In some bye-place of scorn — for when ruffians infest
 Each illustrious traveller on honour's broad way,
 We must gibbet some victims to frighten the rest

Let him skulk not unknown, but immortal uprise,
 Like the Grecian incendiary, blasted by Fame;
 And when temples to Grattan are piercing the skies,
 On their basements be sculptured the Libeller's name!

MONODY
ON
THE DEATH OF MR. GRATTAN.

Attributed to Mrs. Richard Trench.

THE phoenix of our isle ascends on high :
He did not idly wait
Th' impending stroke of Fate
The noble bird prepar'd his nest to die.
The scintillating flame
Arose to heav'n, from whence it came,
And leaves a trail of light along the sky.

Grattan ! thy triumph over death,
Thy fervid days' majestic close,
Thy kindling hope, and bright repose,
Bequeath'd us, with thy parting breath,
A boon as great as ought thy mind
E'er strove to win for human kind.
We catch a glimpse of unknown pow'rs,
More of the coming world than ours,
Seeing, that high and holy views
Such glories o'er thy couch diffuse,
That life can nought more precious give,
Than thus, like thee, to cease to live.

Thy patriot heart desir'd t' exhale
Its latest sigh within the pale
Where Chatham, deeply honour'd, fell,
Dying, like him, in duty's path.
Heav'n check'd this wish — not in its wrath,
But lest thy rising soul should trace,
In those it loved on earth so well,
Such pangs as time can ne'er efface,
Had other eyes or hearts than theirs
Bestowed the last and dearest cares.
For, blest and blessing in each tie
The charities of life supply,

'Twas thine domestic joys to prove,
 Through a long line of circling years,
 Whose mingling radiance but appears
 One summer's day of wedded love.

Oh! was it not a piercing task,
 When a pale daughter knelt to ask
 A dying father's last reply!
 As Royal Sussex pray'd, that all
 Of noble Grattan, that *could* die,
 Might wait the last triumphant call,
 Where poets, heroes, sages lie.

Deep love explor'd thy fading eyes,
 So near their total, last eclipse,
 And saw a transient spark arise —
 Saw a sweet smile pass o'er thy lips,
 And in the pressure of thine hand,
 As cold before as mountain snow,
 Now warm with momentary glow,
 Felt how the vestal flame was fann'd,
 • That, deep within thine ardent soul,
 Blaz'd under virtue's strong control,
 Immortal as from Heav'n it came,
 The pure, ethereal love of fame.

When, on Ierne's emerald shore,
 Thou saw'st her grateful myriads pour;
 Her cliffs all kindling into life,
 As swift receded from thy view
 That beauteous theatre of strife,
 The land that found thee always true —
 The workings of thy mighty mind
 Must in their circle have combin'd,
 Of thought, of feeling, passion, more
 Than ev'n thy eloquence could reach —
 Too deep for tears, too strong for speech.

The multitude, with fond respect,
 Awhile each mark of feeling check'd:

The light wave, rippling on the shore,
Was plainly heard — the parting oar.

But when this hallow'd silence broke,
When ev'ry voice was heard to swell,
In one magnificent farewell,

As if thy country's genius spoke,
Far as th' inspiring sounds extend,
The ocean, Freedom's awful friend,
Thrill'd through his inmost depths, and marmur'd
hoarse applause.

While on thine heart an impulse fell,
That, sweetly soothing, seem'd to tell
Of triumph to thine holy cause.

What was thy sum of public life?
One long and exemplary strife,
To banish all that darkens earth,
And serve the land that gave thee birth.
Thy youngest hope — thy latest care —
Thy daily wish — thy dying prayer —
Was freedom of the noblest kind,
The freedom of th' immortal mind.

Thy energy nor rose nor fell,
As pride might wake, or passion swell;
Such in thy bosom could not dwell:
'Twas a bright river, swiftly flowing,
Abounding more as onward going:
Now with fertilizing course
Diffusing plenty; now with force
Upheaving dark and ruin'd tow'rs,
Grey relics of barbaric hours.
Thine eloquence illumined high
Whatever caught thy mental eye;
Adorn'd the lovely form of Truth,
To claim th' enamour'd vow of youth,
Dispell'd the mists in Error's dark domain,
The conscience pierc'd with salutary pain,
Call'd forth new feelings, waken'd dormant powers,
And bade the desert bloom with vernal flowers;

Pale Bigotry her war-whoop sang in vain,
And charm'd Attention hugg'd her golden chain

Yet, though thy name illumine th' historic page,
As patriot, statesman, orator, and sage,
Though nation's blest and rival senates hung
On the commanding accents of thy tongue —
There was a daily beauty in thy life,
In Nature's lap, remote from toil and strife,
Soothing deep sorrow with this dearer boast,
Who nearest saw, admir'd and lov'd thee most.

APPENDIX.

N^o. I.

MR. FLOOD'S SPEECH ON SIMPLE REPEAL.

June 11. 1782.

MR. FLOOD asked the secretary what the nature and extent of the repeal of the declaratory law of England, with regard to Ireland, was to be; that is to say, whether it was to be barely repealed, or whether the legal principle or right was also to be renounced?

The secretary said, he believed it was to be a mere repeal; but as the bill had not passed, no judgment or proceeding could well be had upon it, because it might be altered.

A resolution was then read, that passed in the English House of Commons the same day on which the resolution passed, asserting that the declaratory law ought to be repealed: the resolution was as follows: "That the interests of the two kingdoms are inseparable, and that their connection ought to be founded on a solid and permanent basis."

Mr. Flood said, that these resolutions were worded exactly alike, and both had a future aspect, so as to denote that something was necessary to be done in both cases; that is to say, that the repeal of the declaratory law was to be attended with some measures to be taken here, for adding to the constitutional connection between the two kingdoms, whereas, he thought the connection was at present complete: he added, that, throughout the whole debate, ideas of final adjustment and negotiation were talked of. He would therefore propose a resolution, as to the connection of the kingdoms, (as far as the laws of Ireland are concerned,) viz. "That a solid basis of permanent connection does at present subsist between Great Britain and Ireland, inasmuch as they must by law always have one common sovereign; and that the approbation of that sovereign, under the great seal of England, must be had to any bill before it can become law in Ireland." He said, however, that if the secretary would say for certainty, that no such idea was held, he would withdraw the resolution. The secretary said he had not at that time any such intention, but could not ascertain any thing on the subject.

Mr. Flood's argument was as follows:

Nothing ever was more judicious than the conduct of Great Britain on this occasion. She was so embarrassed abroad, and you were so strong at home, that she could not deny the repeal of the declaratory law; yet it must ever be her wish to retain the principle of it; because it is the principle of power, which no nation has ever relinquished while it could maintain it. What then has she done? By seeming to yield unconditionally to you, she seized on the generous credulity of your nature, and took full advantage of a change in her own administration. Her first step was bold, in order to strike your imaginations with something, that seemed to be decisive. She resolved that the declaratory law ought to be repealed: she did not say, however, that it ought to be repealed, as having been a false and erroneous declaration of law; far from it. Not a man in the British Parliament held such an idea; the very mover and seconder of the resolution said the contrary. I mention them both with honour; I mention the ministry, the parliament, and the people of Great Britain, with all honour. I lament, but cannot blame their sentiment on this subject. They declared the constitutional right of the British Parliament to make laws for every part of the empire; one of them said, externally; and the other, both externally and internally. One said, the repeal must be accompanied by a final adjustment; and the other, that the law could only be repealed on a principle of compact.

Now this is so far from a renunciation, that it is the very contrary, and a repeal without a renunciation leaves you in effect only where you were. It is a first principle of law, that a declaratory act only declares the law to be what it was before; that is to say, that it only declares, and that it does not alter the law. What follows? That as making a declaratory act does not alter law, so neither can the mere unmaking, alter law; or, in other words, it follows, that if a declaratory act is not pronounced to have been an erroneous declaration of law, the bare repeal of it can do no other than leave the law in that state in which the declaratory act did declare it to have been before such declaratory act passed. An enacting statute alters the law when it is made, and consequently when it is repealed it alters the law; that is to say, its enactment makes law, and therefore its repeal unmakes law. Inconsiderate people confound this idea of an enacting with that of a declaratory act, and are imposed on to believe that the repeal of a declaratory act unmakes and alters the law, in like manner as the repeal of an enacting statute does; but this is utterly false. The repeal of a declaratory law, (unless it con-

tains a renunciation of the principle,) is only a repeal of the declaration, and not of the legal principle. The principle remains behind in full force, unless it be renounced. This is universally true, and it is strengthened in this case by this circumstance. Many acts have been made by the British Parliament binding Ireland; some of them before the declaratory law of George the First. Now, whilst one of these remains, there is an exercise and a proof of the right, stronger by much than the declaratory law. A simple repeal, therefore, of the declaratory law, is no vindication of your legislature. But it is argued, that because in your first address you declare that the British Parliament has no such right, therefore the repeal joined to this, will be equal to a renunciation by England.

But what man in his senses can believe that our renunciation of the British claim can be equal to her own renunciation of it? or that, in any controversy, an assertion of a party in his own favour, is equal to the admission of his antagonist? If Britain renounces it, no other power on earth can pretend to maintain it. But if all the rest of the world were to deny her pretension, yet as long as she maintains it, our rights are not vindicated, and our constitution is in danger. Will any man say, that if I ask a thing on a particular principle, that therefore if I obtain it at all, it must follow that I obtain it on my own principle? There is no such inference in law, in logic, or in reason; it would only appear that the two parliaments had agreed in one point, — that of the bare repeal; but it never would appear, without an express renunciation, that they agreed in the renunciation also; and we know the fact to be, that they do not agree with us in that principle. But to put this argument to a decisive proof, let us suppose that, after such a simple repeal, at a future day the British Parliament should revive the principle, and make a law for us. Suppose that Ireland should remonstrate on this — suppose she should read that paragraph of her address, and quote the British repeal of the declaratory law, and should argue from both that England had for ever renounced her claim, do you think that England would listen to such an interference, or that any reasoner in Europe would allow the force of the argument? Would she allow you to piece your address to her act of parliament? If you questioned her declaratory act, would she not question your declaratory address? Would she not appeal to the language held by her own members? Would she not appeal to words upon your journals? Would she not appeal to the silence of her law of repeal, and to your acquiescence under that silence? Would

she not say, that that was virtually a national relinquishment of any idea of renunciation, so that the principle remained not only unrenounced, but the equity of it impliedly admitted by Ireland, at a moment when she was the ablest to contest it?

But I shall be asked (though the repeal of the declaratory law should be simple and imperfect), whether I think that England will ever revive the claim? I answer, I cannot be certain that she will, neither can I be certain that she will not; and I ask in return, whether any man will be surety that she will not; and if any man is weak enough to say that he will be so, I will tell him that this nation will not be weak enough to accept of his surety (no mortal is adequate to such a business). I add, that England either has or has not a possible notion of such a revival; if she has not, she will not quarrel about renouncing it; and if she has, the renunciation is absolutely necessary. I add that if she does not renounce the claim, she certainly may revive it; but that if she does renounce it, she certainly cannot revive it. Yes, you will say, for she might even repeal an act of renunciation; and to argue every thing fairly, I will admit that in the utmost range of possibility such an outrage is not unimaginable; but what do I infer? not that I should be the more negligent, but that I ought to be the more careful; that it is my duty to make it impossible if I can; and if I cannot do so, that it is my duty to make it next to impossible. It is absurd to say, because I cannot make a thing physically impracticable, that therefore I should leave it morally easy; but it is good sense to say, that I will make a thing as difficult as I can, though I cannot make it as difficult as I would, and that if I cannot make a thing impossible, I will make it next to impossible.

Indeed, on what principle did we enter into this business? It was not surely on the silly notion of getting the force or the good-will of England to act on our side, and against herself in this question: that was impossible. What then was our pursuit? To obtain the utmost security that law could give; certain, that if at such a time of extremity, we did not obtain it, we never should be able to obtain it: we had but an alternative; either to rely on the liberality of England, and then to suffer her declaratory law to remain, as a thing impotent and never to be exercised; or, in a matter of such stupendous consequence, we were to say, that we would not trust the generosity even of Great Britain, but that we would have solid and legal security. The latter is certainly the strongest, and the most rational dependence; but though the former be weaker, it is better than neither. Now, in desiring

even the repeal of the declaratory law, you forfeit the liberality of England, because you do not confide in it; and if you do not carry the matter on until you obtain legal security, you in effect relinquish both. That is to say, you do the very worst thing the case is capable of, so that it would be difficult to say whether your attempt was the most glorious, or the conduct of it the most inadequate and disgraceful. But the pride of England will be hurt. I should be sorry for it; either however her pride is contrasted to our security, or it is not; if it is not, our effectuating our security will not hurt our pride, and if it is contrasted to us, we must choose one of two things, either to hurt her pride, in order to obtain our security, or to relinquish our security, in order not to hurt her pride; but if there be a pride on one side, there is a pride also on the other; if there be a pride of England, there is a pride of Ireland too. Now, I ask which ought to give way? for one must; and I answer impartially, that which has the worst foundation. Now, which is that? The pride of England in this case, is the pride of wrong, and the pride of usurpation. The pride of Ireland, is the pride of right, the pride of justice, the pride of constitution. I will not ask you, after that, which ought to give way; but it is wrong to put this question principally upon pride. England, it is true, has a pride in the matter, but she has what she values more, a principle of power. Ireland too, has a pride in the matter, but she has what she ought to value much more, a principle of permanent security. Now, that nation will be the wisest in this transaction that sacrifices her least object to preserve her greatest, and England will do this precisely, if she can prevail on you to accept of a simple repeal without a renunciation; for in that case she will sacrifice a little pride to preserve all her power, whereas, you will, for a petty sacrifice to your pride, forfeit all your security. But a confidence in the present administration ought to stop us. I deny it, not that I mean to deny or diminish any one of their virtues; I will allow them to have as much ability, power, popularity, and patriotism, as any of their predecessors: to fortify my argument, I will suppose them to have more of every excellence than all their predecessors together; and what do I say then? I ask, are the wisest, honestest, and greatest men of Ireland, the men that would soonest relinquish what they thought to be the rights and dignities of Ireland? Certainly not. Are then the wisest, honestest, and greatest men of England, the likeliest to relinquish what they think the rights and dignities of England? Certainly not: either then the ministry are such men as I have now been describing, or they are not; if they

are not such men; they do not deserve our peculiar confidence in any thing; and if they are such men, they cannot deserve our peculiar confidence in this point, unless their principle and conviction be on our side. Now, we know it to be decidedly against us. Why does any country wish for a strong administration, I ask; because it makes the country strong. Now, was it from the strength of England that we have gained our advantages, or from her weakness? From her weakness undoubtedly. How then do we argue? The great strength of administration gives great strength to England; but the great strength of England in this case, is the weakness of Ireland: and yet the strength of administration is her security;— these things are impossible.

This brings me to what fell from Mr. Fox: he said, the measure of the repeal could not stand alone, but must be accompanied by a final adjustment, and by a solid basis of permanent connection between these kingdoms; he said, that some plan of this sort would come from the servants of the Crown in Ireland to the Irish Parliament; that when the result of Parliament was known, a treaty might be begun if necessary; if a treaty should proceed, then it would be to be ratified by the two parliaments, and finally, to be completed by irrevocable acts of the respective legislatures. Now, I say, if we are to negotiate at present, we are to depart from our original principles; it is not five weeks ago that we all declared that we had made this as a peremptory demand, and that we had nothing in it to negotiate; were we now to begin to negotiate, we should negotiate after great advantages had been obtained against us; for instance, we were desired to specify our wrongs that they might be redressed; we did so; and as we specified for redress, we made our specification as narrow as possible, in order to facilitate redress; but had we specified with a view to negotiation, we must have made our specification as broad as possible, in order to have the greater advantage in negotiation.

Our second address is another advantage gained against us; that is represented even here, and still more will it be held in England, to be a repeated restriction on the requisitions of this country. What follows? That if we were to negotiate now, we must negotiate all on one side, bound up not to make demands, and open only to make concessions. Now, a negotiation in which one may give every thing, and gain nothing, may be called a negotiation by some men, but by most men it will be called folly; in this too, we are to propose, though the proportion is to be against ourselves, and we are to propose this through the servants of the Crown, which is, still

more against us. Now, the servants of the Crown will not propose terms for England, till our Parliament is properly prepared for the subject, and we know what that means. If the servants of the Crown and the Parliament cannot be got to go far enough for England, then a treaty is to be begun, in which England will have advantage as to matter, and command as to time.

In the stage of ratification she will have more, and in that of completion and consummation still greater advantages in all of these stages; all the cabinet and parliamentary councils of England will be unanimous on one side, viz. that of England. But the cabinet and parliamentary councils of Ireland will not be unanimous in favour of Ireland, but will in general have a decided majority in favour of England. What equity can there be in such a result? Here are five stages marked out by Mr. Fox, in each of which there may be a final difference of sentiment, and in each of which there may be a necessity for some, and an opportunity for great delay, without any management; this must be dilatory, and with a little dexterity it can easily be spun out to a peace. Now, I ask you, what it is that has given you every thing; is it not time? And, as time has given you every thing, reflect that time may also take every thing away from you; but time is not necessary, negotiation alone is sufficient to undo you; you were not born to be negotiators; the negotiation is a dark, austere, inexorable character; you are soft, open, and persuadable; you have not the detailed knowledge, the systematical procrastination, the suspicious reserve, or the frigid perseverance of a negotiator. When have you negotiated that you have not lost? You negotiated at the restoration, you negotiated at the revolution, you negotiated at the augmentation of your army, you negotiated your free trade, you negotiated the mutiny bill! When have you demanded, that you have not succeeded; and when have you negotiated, that you have not been deceived?

There never was a time which required more consideration than the present. The national exertion began in the last year of Lord Buckingham's administration; it is now drawing to a period, and whether that shall be glorious or otherwise depends on your wisdom: a short view of what we have done will be a guide to what we should do. We had groaned for a century under an increasing usurpation; the American war broke out, and, whilst we were called upon to shed our blood for Great Britain, we were insulted with the application of that principle to Ireland which had revolted America; our feelings were exasperated by the application, and our trade

was ruined by the war; we saw ourselves beggars in fact, and slaves in assertion. The merchants flew to a non-importation agreement, &c. — the people flew to arms! Amidst this perturbation Parliament assembled, and we amended our address by the demand of free trade, as we have lately amended our address by the demand of a free constitution, that is, of an exclusive legislature, on which all freedom of trade must depend. And therefore it was, that I did originally differ with some gentlemen, for I asserted that they had not obtained that freedom of trade of which they had boasted, because they had not obtained that freedom of parliamentary constitution, without which a freedom of trade could not possibly exist. We received from England a dilatory answer. We shortened our money-grants to the Crown, we shortened them to the subject; and the Irish public creditors, to their immortal honour, embarked so fully with the rights of the nation, as cheerfully to accept of a six-months' security. This rapid succession of sober and consistent efforts struck like lightning on the ministry and Parliament of England; all obstacles gave way, our demand was to be granted in all its plenitude, all the British statutes restrictive of our foreign commerce were to be repealed, and on that constitutional principle on which alone it would be welcome, — a principle, which, in that early period of this question, I took the first opportunity to lay down in clear, unambiguous, and categorical terms. What was that principle? that, having a parliament of our own, our foreign trade was necessarily free, and subject to no restriction as to our ports, but such as our Parliament might impose. This principle, we were told, was admitted by England, as to our foreign trade, and pleaded by her in return, as to her own ports and those of her colonies. We admitted the principle which we claimed, and she said she would open to us her colony ports on equal regulation of trade. The tidings of this emancipation, as it was idly called, landed in Ireland. The post-office was illuminated by an emissary of the Castle; the college took fire in the next instance by a happy contagion, and the city caught the flame in a regular and sympathetic succession. All sober consideration was lost in an ignorant clamour, and the steady pulse of the public yielded to a fever of exultation. What was the consequence? England saw that we were surprised at our success, saw that we had asked more than we expected, concluded we would accept of infinitely less, and determined that should be as little as she could. First, then, she determined, not to repeal all her laws restrictive of our foreign commerce, yet, whilst an atom of such restriction remains, the total impeachment of your constitution.

remains; when therefore an artful resolution was proposed for this House, on that occasion, expressive of satisfaction in that enlargement of our foreign trade, I exclaimed against the word. If you thank the British Parliament, I said, for the enlargement of your foreign trade, you admit she can restrain it; if you admit she can restrain it, you admit her legislative authority; that is, you gain little in commerce, and you lose every thing in constitution. I object to the word foreign, therefore; it belies Ireland, and it deceives Great Britain. The independent gentlemen of the day, however, did not feel, did not take up the principles; yet, though they did not take it up that day, they have felt it since; and though the word was universally admitted then, there is not a man in the nation that would not reject it now.

Such was the first stage of this business. Let us see how much more worse we made it in the progress of negotiation. The language of England was the language of common sense. Ireland must have equal regulations of trade, she said, but equal taxes on home-consumption she did not say; equal regulations of trade may subsist between a poor country and a rich one, but equal taxes on consumption cannot. Now, what has your negotiation made of it? You have made your arrangement a tax-law in part, which ought to have been a trade-law in the whole; that is to say, instead of a regulation in trade, you made it a regulation against trade, and a severe and a caustic regulation too. What regulation, indeed, can be much more adversary to trade, than a heavy tax on a raw material imported for the purpose of trade, and for the end of manufacture? So pernicious are such taxes, that the ministers in England, whose profusion has brought them on that country, have endeavoured to extenuate their malignity by two regulations: to console the manufacturer, they tell him that they will open to him the foreign market, by giving him a drawback on his manufactures exported, equal to the tax on the imported material; and they tell him besides, that they will shut up for him the home-market, and give him a monopoly of it. How? by laying a prohibitory duty on the manufacture imported from abroad. And what have they done as to manufactured sugars? They have laid a prohibitory duty upon them when imported into England from any other part of the world, Ireland even not excepted. What have we done? We have laid the same prohibitory duty on manufactured sugars imported into Ireland from any other part of the world; but we have excepted England, whereas she did not except Ireland. Now, there was much more reason for our excepting England, than there was for her excepting Ireland; and why?

Because Ireland could never, by any possibility, be a rival in sugars to England in the English market, but England is actually a very formidable rival to Ireland in the Irish market. What is the fact? The Irish manufacturer of sugars has but one rival in the world, and that is the English manufacturer of them. And what have we done? We have given him the full security against all those that are not his rivals; and we have not given it to him against the only manufacturers that are his rivals; we have given him perfect protection where he is in no danger, and we have not given it to him where he is in all danger: we have done worse by him; we have not only given him as much security against his only rivals, as against those who are not at all his rivals; but we have not left him as much security against his only rivals, as he always had before; that is to say, the duty on the imported manufacture now bears a less proportion than ever it did before to the duty on the imported raw materials. By consequence his peril is greater, as his protection is less; and his security being diminished, his danger is enhanced: but that is not all; you have not done for him what England originally pointed out to you in his favour: she proposed equality as the principle of your regulation of trade; we adopted it religiously in that part to which it was not applicable, and where it was precious, I mean in the tax part; and we only deserted it in the trade part, where alone it was applicable, and where alone it was beneficial.

Such was the spirit in which we negotiated our free trade; let us take care how we negotiate our free constitution; but the error of that arrangement does not stop here. Its first principle was erroneous; it set out with this maxim, that you were to pay for this as if it were an enlargement, and that you were to pay for it in tax, as if you had not paid it otherwise before. But what is the truth? The sugars of Spain, Portugal, and France, would supply your manufactures as well as the British West Indian islands, and generally better; if, whilst you retained those markets, England had opened her colony ports too, this would have been a new market, which is always an advantage to the buyer. But what is the case now? You are suffered to go to the colony market of England, which is the English market in effect, and which is, therefore, her advantage; but you give up this for all other, and some better markets, which is your disadvantage. Instead of its being an enlargement, therefore, this is more properly a restriction; and instead of England's granting you a boon in this matter, it is you that give her a monopoly. Now, a monopoly is so much against the giver, and so much in favour of the obtainer of it, that no nation in its

senses ever gives it to another: and if a part of an empire gives it to the head, it cannot be on a principle of trade, because a principle of trade is a principle of gain, whereas this is a principle of loss. On what principle alone can it be given? on a principle of empire? That is to say, in other words, it is a tax or a tribute, and that of the heaviest nature; but, if you were to pay for it in taxes, besides paying for it by monopoly, it would be absurd to pay for it more than it was worth.

Now, take the whole West Indian commerce, take the utmost proportion of that commerce that could ever fall to your lot, take the utmost proportion of clear profit that can be supposed to accrue from that quantity of trade, and then take the utmost proportion of what clear profit that can be afforded to revenue, and I say it would never amount to that sum which you have agreed to pay on the instant for the contingency of this direct trade, with this additional absurdity, that if you should not be able to establish it, these additional duties will be equally payable upon your old circuitous trade, which before was free from them. Will you trust negotiation again? This arrangement cannot be justified on any commercial principles. Was any constitutional advantage obtained by it? Far from it; the very principle of the arrangement is hostile to the constitution; it gives to the British Parliament a virtual power of taxing you; for wide is the principle of it; that when England taxes a colony produce, you must tax it equally, or give up the trade. Thus this arrangement leaves both your trade and your money at the mercy of the ministry and Parliament of England.

Combine this with another law of the same period, the mutiny bill, therefore, and see what the result of both is. You complained that the British Parliament should make even a twelvemonth's law for your army; and what did you do to remedy it? You made an act that she should do it for ever. The two greatest powers in the management of human concerns are the power of the purse, and the power of the sword. You did by these two laws for so much delegate away both of these great powers from yourselves to the British Parliament; that is to say, in the very moment that you talked of recovering your own authority and denying that of the British legislature, you did every thing you could to strengthen the power of that parliament which you meant to overthrow, and to weaken the power of that parliament which you meant to establish.

I do not speak these things in order to say what is disagreeable to any man living, much less to say any thing dis-

agreeable to that body, in defence of whose privileges I have lived these two-and-twenty years, and in the defence of whose privileges I will die. I speak them from a deep conviction of their necessity. You see how you have been negotiated out of every thing, and how dangerous it is to negotiate again. You see how dangerous it is to exult too soon, or to imagine that any thing of this kind is done, while any thing remains undone. You see what a miserable end was made of Lord Buckingham's last session of parliament, though it began with so much splendor; and as a part of this session has trod the steps of its glory, I would warn the conclusion of it against the steps of its decline. To put a stop, therefore, to the danger of negotiation, and to accelerate the safety of an immediate repeal, and of a final renunciation, I move the resolution I have before stated to you.

On this resolution Mr. Daly moved the order of the day, which was carried without a division. Mr. Flood's motion was consequently lost.

N^o II.

MR. FLOOD'S SPEECH ON SIMPLE REPEAL.

June 14. 1782.

I DO not mean to oppose the most liberal interpretation that can be given to the British act of parliament in question.* The right honourable gentleman defends it by saying, that if Ireland had been by name excepted; even that exception of Ireland might have been considered as implying, that if she had not been excepted, she would have been bound; and certainly it would have been exceptionable for that very reason; and for the same reason, the law as now worded is exceptionable: it includes all His Majesty's dominions in Europe, and as Ireland is one of them, it does impliedly include Ireland; both of these methods, therefore, are equally exceptionable. But there was a method of avoiding both of these objections; and if I, a weak and incapable man, can at first sight point out an easy method of doing so, how much more easy would it have been for His Majesty's ministers to have done so. It might have been worded so as to have included

* An act regulating the trade to Nevis, St. Christopher, and Montserrat.

all His Majesty's dominions in Europe, that were subject to the legislative authority of the British Parliament: it would then have been an implied assertion of our constitution, instead of being now an implied infringement of it. Had the British Parliament renounced the right, she could have no objection to some such form of words: but she well knew that a repeal of the declaratory law is no renunciation of the right; in this, and in every instance, she shows an utter reluctance to such a renunciation: now every symptom of such reluctance on her part, is equal to a thousand demonstrations that such a renunciation is necessary for us. I do not understand the doctrine of clerical mistakes; how far is it to lead us? where is its boundary? is it only to hold for the present time, and during the present ministry? or is it to extend to all times and to all ministries? If it is to do the latter, the doctrine is too dangerous to be admitted; and if the former only, it is too partial. No minister of England, no attorney-general of Ireland, could desire a more convenient principle, than that the doctrine of clerical error was to excuse an act of the British Parliament binding Ireland; but such a doctrine would soon leave our constitution where it was, and would efface the glories we have been acquiring.

This brings me to speak of the repeal of the declaratory act of George I. as it is now proceeding. In the first place, it is an undeniable principle of law, that the mere repeal of a declaratory act does not renounce the principle of it; and it is clear to common sense, that nothing but a final renouncing of the principle of this law is adequate to our security. With regard to this law of George I., the maxim I have mentioned obtains with peculiar force. What is the title of the law? It is an act for the better securing the dependency of Ireland: on the face of it, therefore, it imports expressly, that that dependency did before exist, and that by consequence it must continue after; unless renounced, it had, indeed, too strong an antecedent existence, to be destroyed by any weak implications. The first authority of law known to the English constitution, is that of the great Lord Coke; his authority is expressly against us, and in favour of the English Parliament. Will any lawyer say, that the clear and decided opinion of Lord Coke, in a matter of law, is a thing to be contemned? Add to this a number of statutes made by the English Parliament, and acquiesced in by the Irish nation, antecedent to the declaratory law of George I.; and will any man be so rash, so foolish, or so corrupt, as to say that such a pretension is to be overlooked? or, that it can rationally be stated to be so void of principle and colour, as that a bare repeal of a sub-

sequent and merely declaratory act, can annihilate it? Let no man conceive such a thing.

The honourable gentleman * says, that the giving up the final judicature is a decisive proof of sincerity in the British Parliament, because it cannot be supposed, that our final judicature would carry British laws into execution; but how far does this reasoning go? It shows, indeed, that they think the spirit of this country is so unanimous on this subject at present, as that nobody will appeal to their judicature; or that if any person should appeal, that the decree would be resisted and baffled in the execution of it; they, therefore, very wisely determine to give up what it is impossible to retain; but though this may extend (as long as the present spirit continues) to *internal* final judicature, and to *internal* legislation, yet it does not at all extend to external legislation, or to the final judicature proper to that species of legislation. Now, what is external legislation? It is that species of legislation which Mr. Fox expressly specifies and assents, and which not one British member controverted; that is, in other words, it is the whole of commercial and marine legislation. Now, what is the final judicature in that? It is the British fleet. Witness what happened in this kingdom the other day: the spirit of the country was such, that the commissioners dared not refuse a clearance to a vessel, though freighted with goods prohibited by British acts of parliament; but though the vessel had her clearance, she could not sail; and why? because the Stag frigate was in the bay ready to seize and to confiscate.

The hon. gentleman knows the story to be true, and has quoted the fact himself within these walls. Now, this maritime, or external legislation, and this final judicature of the Stag frigate, is a thing which nothing can reach but a formal renunciation of the right on the part of Great Britain. Is this a situation in which an able general would leave an army; or in which a wise patriot would leave his country? certainly not. The hon. member says, that the royal word is as firm as a parliamentary renunciation. Does not the hon. gentleman know, that the words of the king are the words of the minister, in all constitutional and parliamentary consideration? How often, in his short experience, has he known that security fail? Did it give us a judge's bill in Lord Townshend's time? Did it keep 12,000 men in the kingdom ever since? Has it secured economy to us, so often promised, and not yet arrived? I will not multiply instances. Now,

* Mr. Grattan.

these are cases where the most express words were used in the speech from the throne, which is the speech of the minister, and not of the king. In this case, is there any express mention of renunciation? No such thing. Now, if express words have failed, why may not words fail that are not express? Again I ask, will any man pretend to affirm, that the declaration of the king can be equal in force to an act of legislature? No man in his senses can believe it to be so. In the American question, what was the doctrine? That if the king wished it ever so much, yet it was not in his power to give up the power of the British Parliament. Did the king ever attempt to make the smallest relaxation without an act of legislature to authorize it? I ask the hon. member, whether the king, by a declaration to the British Parliament, could give up any of the rights or pretensions of the Irish legislature? I am sure, he will answer no. Then, by what rule, I ask, can any declaration of the king to us give up or cancel any pretension of the British Parliament? What authority on earth can be so perfectly adequate to it, as that of the Parliament of Great Britain itself? But the hon. member would not accept a great charter, he says, from the British Parliament; so jealous he is of its authority; nor would I, provided it contained an assertion of its legislature over us, because that would be nominally a great charter, but really a defeazance and a concealment of our constitution. Now this is impliedly the case in an act merely and simply of repeal; but if it contained a renunciation of all such authority, I would accept of it, because then it would indeed be a great charter; for what was the great charter of our early kings to their subjects? Was it not in fact a renunciation of the usurpations of those kings, and nothing more? It was not a donation, but a mere recognition of the rights of the subject; which recognition became necessary only in consequence of the regal usurpations. Now, I ask, did those kings or any other part of mankind ever think that in renouncing those usurpations they re-established them? No man was ever so frantic as to suppose it; how then could a parallel renunciation by the British Parliament have any tendency to legalize its usurpation? I will venture to say, that a renunciation of all right is the last method that the British Parliament will think of taking by way of establishing her authority over Ireland; and why? because it is the most effectual method on earth of defeating it. The sound of an English act of Parliament ought not to frighten us out of the sense of it, if the sound of it could be destructive to us; an act of repeal would be as noxious as an act of renunciation, and if the sense of it can be salutary, it

is by its being an act of renunciation; any other act may be an exercise of legislation over us; but an act of renunciation cannot be so.

The hon. member said that I had thought on a particular subject till it had become my weakness: may not the remark become applicable to himself? for surely, if his zeal on this subject had not outgone even his judgment, great as that is, he would not use arguments on this occasion which, on any other, he would reprobate from the lips of any servant of the Crown; he would not call a British act of parliament, including Ireland, a clerical error; he would not say, that a speech from the throne is equal to an act of parliament; that a British act of repeal is a safe exertion of her power towards us, but that an act of renunciation would not be so; he would not say, that a renunciation would be a better security, and yet that a repeal is sufficient, in a case where no security can be too great, and in which scarce any is adequate; he would not say, that good faith is equal to legal security, or that legal security, with the addition of good faith, is not better than the latter is alone.

It is not pleasant to me to differ with the honourable member; but in this case it is unavoidable: it is one of those cases in which I feel myself impelled by so strong a duty, that nothing personal either to myself or to others can controul me; and I feel it the more my duty to speak out on this occasion, because I have never ceased to repent my having not done so in Lord Buckingham's administration, with respect to the word *foreign*, which was then inserted in our resolutions, — I will not say with evil design, but certainly with evil example.

I differed with the honourable member, and others whom I much respect, with regard to that expression. I disapproved of it in the strongest terms in private conference; they did not perhaps approve, but they did not disapprove of it, and therefore it passed without notice. Since, however, it has been felt, and the objection which the honourable member has this day made to the British act which he has quoted, is, that it seems to assume a power over our *foreign* trade. Now, this is the very principle on which I objected then to the word *foreign*, though I was not at that time supported in it; with this omen, therefore, (that I may sometimes differ from the honourable member, and not be always in an error,) I go on.

The honourable member says, that we have the faith of nations to depend on. Now, as to the faith of nations, I have this to say, that like every thing else, where it is the best

thing that can be had, it is good for that reason; but where it is not the best thing that can be had, it is for the same reason not good: what follows? That it is good between unconnected nations, because there is nothing stronger between them, (except force); but it is not good between countries connected by civil government, because there is something stronger there, and that is, legal security: but what does the faith of nations between unconnected kingdoms amount to, I ask? to what, but to perpetuate warfare, and an everlasting appeal to heaven, as it is called, by a peculiar and a very barbarous prophanation? In short, what is a state of dependence on good faith, other than a state of nature, which though not a state of war, is yet so liable to it, that it is to avoid its disorder that we have yielded to the incumbrances of government? Each of these conditions has some disadvantages; but it would be utterly absurd to retain the disadvantage of both.

If we will submit to the insecurity of mere good faith, let us be freed from the burden of government; but if we are to have the burden of government, let us take care to have also its security. Look at England; has she trusted to the good faith of Ireland, that Ireland will never desire any other sovereign than the monarch that sits upon the British throne? No; she has got a perpetual Irish law to put it out of doubt.

Has England trusted to the good faith of Ireland, that our Parliament should never pass a law disagreeable or disadvantageous to English government? No, she has got a perpetual Irish law to make it impossible. Does any man think she acted unwisely or illiberally in doing so? No man can think so. How then can it be unwise or illiberal in us to desire a legal security in this point, upon which all other legal security depends? The good faith of Ireland is equal to that of any country in the world; and if her good faith was not a sufficient security to England, with the British superiority of power to support it, how can good faith be a sufficient security to us in our inferiority?

When the stamp act was repealed, and the declaratory act passed as to America, America was told that it was a sacrifice to British pride, and that it never would be exercised. But how long was it before it was exercised? Is there a man in England that would ask America now to be content with the bare repeal of that declaratory law? Then why should he ask it of Ireland? Ireland had a parliamentary constitution, the same as that of England, with an hereditary and ennobled branch of legislature, invested with final judicature, above three hundred years before any colony in America had a

name. Those colonies have had popular assemblies, it is true, but not parliaments consisting of King, Lords, and Commons, with all the powers belonging to them. The final judicature of America was never to any of the orders of her provincial assemblies, nor to the House of Lords of Great Britain, but to the British Privy Council; yet with these, and a thousand other marks of a distinct kingdom in Ireland, and of a colony constitution in the American provinces, without analogy of fact, and without inference of argument, Ireland is at this day, as to the legislative claim of the British Parliament, sunk to a level with the colonies of America; but though she is argumentatively depressed to that level, where the parallel is injurious to her, she is not lifted up to that level where the parallel would be advantageous.

For instance, England says, that constitutionally she has a right to make laws for Ireland, as well as for the American provinces; but when the declaratory law is to be given up as to both, a simple repeal is enough for Ireland, whilst an express and a final renunciation is offered to America. This difference can have no foundation in equity or in reason; it can therefore only be grounded on a difference of situation, that is to say, that England is obliged to relinquish more to America than she is compelled to surrender to Ireland, and that neither England nor any other nation ever relinquished any authority they could retain. Now I do not blame England for this, because it is the nature of men; but I blame Ireland if she does not see it, and if she does not know, therefore, that nothing is relinquished that is not renounced. I have as great an opinion of the good faith of England as any man, and therefore I wish to have it solemnly pledged. Now, a bare repeal, I say, does not pledge her good faith never to exercise the power, because it is not a renunciation of it, it is therefore that I desire a renunciation; and why? because a renunciation will, in the first place, give all the legal security that the cause is capable of; and because, in the next place, it will pledge the good faith of Great Britain expressly, and when it is expressly pledged, I shall be ready to confide in it. A positive promise is, in every case in the world, more to be depended on than a constructive one, and the greater the honour of the nation that makes it, the more it is to be confided in, and the more it is to be sought; but a simple repeal is not even a constructive promise. Why is it, that in all treaties between unconnected nations, the utmost care is taken to use the most explicit terms? it is not because the most explicit terms may not be violated, but it is because the violation of them is highly dishonourable and highly danger-

ous to the state that is guilty of it. If, after the conduct that Ireland has ever held to Great Britain, England should formally renounce her legislative pretension now, and afterwards should attempt to resume it, her own act of parliament would be her condemnation all over Europe, every cabinet on the continent would exclaim against her baseness, and would think themselves authorised to assist the oppressed subjects, whom her own act would prove not to be rebels.

Every man on every side, and of every description, equally confesses that a renunciation is necessary. The honourable gentleman himself, and every other man who is content with a simple repeal, profess that they are so, only because they consider a repeal as being a renunciation: now this is unanswerable; a renunciation is certainly a renunciation, nobody can deny that; but a simple repeal may not be so; one therefore is certain, and the other at best is uncertain. Which shall I prefer in a case of this consequence? But this is not all; a repeal of a declaratory law, not only may not be a renunciation of its principle, but I maintain that it certainly is not so; in this I am so clear, that I stake my character with you for common sense upon the subject; in this I am so clear, that my motion shall be an appeal to the nine judges of Ireland, and, if you please, to the twelve judges of England also upon the point. I have appealed to all the great lawyers in the house, and every one of them has confessed, that a repeal of a declaratory law is not a renunciation of the legal principle. Two only have attempted this evasion; they say, that in this case there was no colour nor principle of law at the bottom of the act, and that therefore when the act is removed, nothing can remain: now, this is very well on one side of the water, but it is totally false on the other; here we say there was no colour nor principle of law at the bottom of that act, but in England they assert the very contrary. In England, therefore, they will have a right to say, that after the repeal, the principle will remain. What we may say here, will not avail to our security, unless England can be got to concur with us. If England, indeed, will renounce the principle as we do, the repeal may be sufficient, that is to say, a repeal with a renunciation by England will be sufficient; but a repeal without such a renunciation will not be sufficient; it is but three days ago that the honourable gentleman thought a repeal inadequate, and therefore declared an intention to bring in a declaratory Irish law, in order to have the great seals of both kingdoms affixed to the recognition of our constitution. What has happened since to render such an intention less necessary? nothing has been mentioned to diminish

the necessity, but some men are fond to argue, that our address has bound us to a simple repeal. Now, first, I say, that if such an error had been committed in the address, it would be hard that the constitution of a great nation should be irrevocably tied to the diction of any individual; but I utterly deny the fact: I desire the words of the address to be pointed out that mention a simple repeal of that act as adequate to our views; and as no such words can be pointed out, I will mention words in it that prove the contrary. The grievance as to this point, stated by the address as necessary to be redressed, is not that act alone, but that act and the claims of it; now, the repeal may take away the act, but nothing except a renunciation can take away the claims. The claim is the claim of right, or the legal principle either real or assumed. The simple repeal takes away the declaration only, but leaves behind the claim or legal pretension. I say, therefore, that the address is full to the purpose, and that we must misconstrue that address before we can forfeit our constitution; clear, however, as these things are, I will not affirm that a majority will instantly accede to them; but this I know, that majorities can sometimes err, and that majorities can sometimes change their opinion.

What was the first feature of this session of parliament? a triumphant majority in support of Lord Carlisle against any redress of our injuries in Portugal. What followed? the honourable member proposed an alteration of the perpetual mutiny bill; a rank majority opposed him. I attempted it in another form; a rank majority opposed any reformation of it: it was faction in one, it was disappointed ambition in another; in both, it was any thing but truth and the constitution. What was the cry of the parasites of the Castle? The sugar bill and the mutiny law were such acquisitions to this country, they said, that Ireland had nothing to redress, and that nothing but industry in her people, and gratitude in her Parliament, could now become her. Was not this gabble held, and was it not even popular for a time? I brought forward, notwithstanding a vindication of your privileges against the manifold perversions of the law of Poyning; and what did I ask of you? not implicitly to adopt the sentiments and words of any individual, but to appoint a committee of yourselves to examine the authorities I had produced in your behalf, that, if I had erred in fact, or in inference, you might not be misled; and that if I had, you might benefit by the proofs, and perpetuate the decaying evidences of your constitution; yet even such a committee was denied, not to one but to the Parliament and to the nation. The honourable member then brought forward, in the form of an address, an assertion of your exclusive

legislature; a huge majority opposed the reception of it. I brought it on again by a resolution then simple, that you yourselves were the only representatives of the people: a huge majority refused to affirm it; these reiterated defeats struck like thunder upon the hearts of the people, and in these decided and stupendous majorities, they thought they saw the death of the constitution. A voice from America shouted to liberty! the echo of it caught your people as it passed along the Atlantic, and they renewed the voice till it reverberated here. What followed? All the propositions that had been separately reprobated, were now collectively adopted; the representatives of the people articulated, at length, the sense of their constituents. The case of Ireland, originally stated by the great Molyneux, and burned at the Revolution by the Parliament of England, is not now afraid of the fire, it has risen from that phoenix urn, and with the flames of its cradle it illuminates our isle! What is the result? It is now in your power, and I trust, it will be in your wisdom to do final justice to the rights and interests of your country; for me, I hope, I have not been peculiarly wanting to them.

At an early period of my life, on a question of embargo, in consequence of a proclamation founded on a British act of parliament, I brought the criminal gazette within these walls, and at your bar, I arraigned the delinquent. The House was alarmed, and I withdrew any question, on the proclamation's being withdrawn. If you ask, why I did not pursue it to a formal declaration of right? I answer, — for I wish to be answerable to you for every part of my life, — I answer, that the time was not ripe for it. The first spring of the constitution is the elective power of the people, till that was reinforced by limiting the duration of parliaments, little could be done.

The people wanted constitutional privilege; till the fabric of usurpation, founded on the law of Poyning, had been shaken to its foundation, little could be done; the Parliament wanted conscious dignity, till the people were armed; every thing could not be done; the nation wanted military power: These were necessary antecedents. The public mind wanted much cultivation; the seed, too, was necessary to be sown; and if I have not been wanting to the preparation of the soil, may I not be permitted to watch over the harvest? To that harvest too, as well as to every other, a prosperous season was necessary, and that season presented itself in the American war. When, therefore, the honourable member, in the sunshine of that season, and of his own abilities, brought forward a declaration of rights in Lord Buckingham's government, after that administration had amended his proposition for the

purpose of defeating it, I stepped forward in office, as I was, and at the hazard of that office, and rescued the principle from the disgrace of a postponement, or from the ruin of rejection. In this session, too, I hope that my humble efforts have not been peculiarly wanting. In ability I will yield to many, — in zeal to none; and, if I have not served the public cause more than many men, this, at least, I may say, I have sacrificed as much to it. Do you repent of that sacrifice? if I am asked, I answer, no. Who could repent of a sacrifice to truth and honour? to a country that he loves, and to a country that is grateful. Do you repent of it? no. But I should not rejoice in it, if it were only to be attended with a private deprivation, and not to be accompanied by all its gains to my country. I have a peculiar right, therefore, to be solicitous and ardent about the issue of it, and no man shall stop me in my progress.

Were the voice with which I utter this, the last effort of an expiring nature; — were the accent which conveys it to you the breath that was to waft me to that grave to which we all tend, and to which my footsteps rapidly accelerate, I would go on; — I would make my exit by a loud demand of your rights, and I call upon the God of Truth and Liberty, who has often favoured you, and who has of late looked down upon you with such a peculiar grace and glory of protection, to continue to you his inspirings; to crown you with the spirit of his completion, and to assist you against the errors of those that are honest, as well as against the machinations of all that are not so.

Mr. Flood's motion was, that the opinion of all the Judges be desired on the following question: "Does the repeal of a declaratory act amount, in legal construction, to a repeal or renunciation of the legal principle on which the declaratory act grounded itself?"

The order of the day was called for, and carried without a division, and Mr. Flood's motion was consequently lost.

N^o III.

MR. GRATTAN'S REMARKS

ON MR. FLOOD'S ARGUMENT ON SIMPLE REPEAL.

MR. FLOOD observed, that a declaratory act does not make a law, and that the repeal of it does not unmake a law; — it makes a statute, and a statute is a law; the repeal of it unmakes a statute, and the unmaking of a statute is the unmaking of a law. It makes a law by declaring it: there are three legislating terms, *enact, declare, and repeal*; declare, differs from enactment, by having a retrospective aspect, but it is equally a legislating term. Mr. Flood observes, that a declaratory act is a declaration of law, not a law: then there would be no such thing as a declaratory law, and the 6th of George the First is not an act of parliament; but a declaratory law is not, properly speaking, a declaration of law; it is a law made by the legislature; it is defined a new law affirming an old one, and the repeal is the disaffirmance of the existence of that law; it gives to a doubtful common law title, the authority of statute: declaration is legislation, not adjudication; it is not the opinion of the legislature on a doubtful point of law; it is the act of the legislature settling that doubt by a law. Parliament speaks laws, not opinions; and when Parliament declares, it wills: to say that a declaratory act leaves the law as it finds it, is not law; it leaves the law as it declares it: the judges must take the law from the Parliament, they must not look back to the common law. Declaration by Parliament is law; negation is law: the common law is lost in the statute and identified, and the repeal of the statute is the repeal of any common law on the subject; and of such high authority is the statute, that, though it departed from the common law it professed to declare; you must abide by the statute.

Blackstone, on the subject of the law in question, viz. on the declaratory act of George the First, says, "it settled the question," "and is the ruling law in the case:" this is the act which Mr. Flood denies to be any law at all. Mr. Flood observes, that the repeal of this act does not repeal the law, but the declaration; what is the declaration? it is not adjudication; it is not the vote of the two Houses of Parliament;

it is a law-making word, by force of which the 6th of George the First is an act of parliament; the declaration is what, in enacting laws, enactment is; the legislative term that makes the statute. What is the repeal? it is the repeal of the legislative word that makes the statute, that is, the repeal of the statute, otherwise the 6th of George the First would be in existence; but the repeal speaks for itself, "Be it enacted that the 6th of George the First:" it does not say the declaration, but the act, "and all the things therein contained, be repealed." Enactments are not laws, they make them; properly speaking, declarations are not laws, they make them: the law repealed in this case, is the 6th of George the First, "Be it enacted that the 6th of George the First be repealed." What is that law? the title of England to bind Ireland declared by Parliament. What is the repeal of that law? the abrogation of that title? it is the legal mode of doing away that title; "Be it enacted that Ireland is subordinate, and that England hath and ought to have a right to make law for Ireland." "Be it enacted, that said law in all its parts be repealed;" the former sets up the title, the latter sets it aside.

Observe, repeal is not to abrogate a declaration; it is not to withdraw the authority of Parliament from the common law alleged; it is to exercise the authority of Parliament, and to abrogate the statute; and let it not be said that the common law title remains after the statute title has been abolished, for you cannot set up at common law the same title which a statute of repeal has abrogated; the statute rules the common law; nor let it be said that the common law title stands after the repeal of the 6th of George the First, as it did before the repeal of that statute; before it was a title doubted; it is now a title disclaimed. You will observe, that the question has been put in issue; the common law title is set forth in the statute; and common law and statute law title is one proposition; it is the same title, and when you abrogate one, you abrogate both: the common law title is set up by one act of parliament, and set aside by the other.

Mr. Flood observes, that the declaration is repealed; then, it is a law, for repeal does not apply to a mere opinion of Parliament, but to law. What is this declaration that he allows to be repealed? it is, "that the kingdom of England had, hath, and ought to have a power to bind Ireland:" this is the principle, and this the alleged common law right and title of England; it is not an assertion of title by Parliament, it is a law and a title made by Parliament; for to declare, is to enact, or make a law; and to repeal, is to abrogate the law and title so declared and made; not to abrogate what Parliament says, but what Par-

liament does, — its acts: then the case of the repeal amounts to this, “ Be it enacted, that the common law right and title declared by the 6th of George the First be repealed;” the declaratory act is the common law declared, the repeal of the declaratory act is the common law repealed. When a motion is thus, “ Be it declared, that the Parliament of England hath a right to bind Ireland,” the question is on the declaring; but when you have declared, and the motion is put, that you agree in the declaration, the question is then on the merits, — title or no title.

Mr. Flood observed, that the Parliament of England might revive her claim; it was answered, no, not consistently, because she had disaffirmed the existence of any title, and because she had done so under an adjustment; there was an adjustment between the two countries, and the Parliament was put in covenant: this was the case of the Methuen treaty. He said the repeal was simple; no, it is conventional; the convention is not recited in the act, because that was not the proper place for it; it is a treaty of which the repeal is a part; it is to be found, however, in the rolls of parliament.

By simple repeal, they mean repeal without preamble; and by preamble, they mean acknowledgment of British usurpation by England: and first, that was impossible to obtain, and secondly, that was unnecessary, for disaffirmance of title does not become more complete or legal by assigning the reasons for making it.

But Mr. Flood said, that he required a legal security in the laws of England against her parliament: a species of blunder this, to look for legal security against the legislature in the municipal laws of the land which that legislature makes or unmakes at its pleasure. The legislature can as legally repeal an act of renunciation as make it; but there is a legal security against the Parliament, which you cannot find in the law of the land, but which is legal security notwithstanding; that is, the faith of conventions, which you have in the case before you: you have two securities, first, that England has legally disclaimed her title; secondly, that she has done so under an adjustment with Ireland, which puts her parliament in covenant, and gives you the legal security of the law of nations against the revival of her claim.

Mr. Flood observes, that we should have required of the British Parliament to acknowledge her usurpation: we certainly should not, and that for the following reasons; first, that acknowledgment of her usurpation would not have been what he required, a legal bar to her resumption; secondly,

that a disclaimer of her title, under a national covenant, rendered such an acknowledgment unnecessary; thirdly, because it was impossible to obtain it; and, fourthly, because it would have been criminal to ask it; criminal to suffer the conventional disclaimer of her title to wait until she was ready to acknowledge herself a usurper. It was said, that the authority of the lawyers were against us; what authority? the lawyer's corps! And we have in our favour, the Chief Justice of the King's Bench, the Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, the Chief Baron of the Exchequer, Mr. Hussey Burgh, and Lord Yelverton; they were sent for by the Castle to give their opinions on this subject, and they gave their opinions at length; and agreed that the repeal of the 6th of George the First did away the title of England. I was at the meeting with several others; I beg to add, that Mr. Hussey Burgh was the Chief Baron who attended; I beg to mention in addition, Mr. Burke, who writes as follows: speaking of a declaratory act, he says, "that if a declaratory act were repealed, it would be a denial of legislative power, as extensive as the affirmation in the act declared."

But there is another argument which time has produced, and which furnishes me with ample justification; it is the measure which these gentlemen produced, and with which they were satisfied; namely, an English act of parliament, not declaring its usurpation — not renouncing its right, but exercising, in the most plenary manner, that usurped legislative power, and settling the Irish constitution by the authority of the British parliament.

I beg to conclude by saying, that the repeal of a declaratory law is the repeal of an act of parliament; secondly, that the declaratory law in question is the title of England to bind Ireland, declared by Parliament; thirdly, that the repeal of that law is the disaffirmance of that title; fourthly, that a title disaffirmed by statute, cannot be set up at common law.

N^o. IV.

MR. FLOOD'S DEFENCE.

MR. FLOOD ENTERS INTO A STATEMENT OF HIS CONDUCT, IN
REPLY TO MR. GRATTAN'S ANSWER TO HIS SPEECH ON THE
28TH OF OCTOBER, 1783.

November 1. 1783.

SIR, I wish to take the earliest opportunity of speaking a few words to you, and addressing a few to the House, upon the situation in which I left this House last Tuesday. You heard, Sir, and the public heard me, the subject, as I think, of an unwarranted attack. I rose to defend myself, I am sure, with temper. I am not lightly moved; and, I think, I should be lightly moved, indeed, if I could have been moved by that. I was, however, interrupted, though I did not bring any fictitious subject before you, or set out without the least appearance of any argument; in consequence of this interruption, Sir, I left the House; but soon after, I understand, that the House thought proper to say, they would give me liberty to proceed, and I wish to take the earliest opportunity of returning them my thanks for that permission; at the same time, Sir, that I return my thanks for that permission, I hope they will suffer me to render it not an empty indulgence; but, upon the present occasion, to take up the subject where I left it the last night.

(Mr. Toler rose to order; but Mr. Flood proceeded):

I hope gentlemen will not interrupt me: when they find me going out of order, when they hear me drawing fictitious characters, let them stop me; when I say any thing unparliamentary, — when I endeavour to recall the asperity of that day, which, whilst I despise, I must disapprove, I rise in defence of what I think an injured character. As I have endeavoured to defend the rights of this country for twenty-four years, I hope they will permit me to defend my reputation.

My life, Sir, has been divided into three parts, and it has been dispatched by three epithets: one part, Sir, that which preceded Lord Harcourt's administration; another, which

passed between Lord Harcourt's and Lord Carlisle's; and the third, which is subsequent. The first has a summary justice, or injustice done to it, by being said to be intemperate; the second is treated in like manner, by being said to be venal; and the conduct of the third is said to be that of an incendiary.

(Mr. O'Hara, to order. "It is against order to speak of what passed on a former day, not that any thing the honourable gentleman has said now is improper, but that the order of the House forbids a reference to the debates of a former day.")

Mr. Flood. I take this matter up upon the ground of an interrupted debate; it is in that light it comes within order. I have a right to begin where I was interrupted; but, Sir, there are some cases of so particular a nature, that a strict adherence to a general order would be the height of injustice. The attack made upon my person went back, not only to the arguments of two or three days before, but to the conduct of twenty years antecedent; therefore, Sir, I hope, that if animadversions of twenty years are allowed to one, I may have an opportunity of referring to arguments used three days ago. With respect to that period of my life which is dispatched by the word intemperate, I beg gentlemen would consider the hard situation of public characters, if that is to be their treatment; that period takes in a number of years, not less than sixteen, in which there were five administrations, and in which the public were pleased to give me their sentence of approbation. Sir, it includes, for I wish to speak to facts, not to take it up upon epithets,—it includes the Duke of Bedford's, Lord Halifax's, the Duke of Northumberland's, Lord Hertford's, and Lord Townshend's.

Now, Sir, as to the fact of intemperance, I will state to you how that stands, and let the gentleman see how a plain tale shall put him down. Of those five administrations, there were three to which I was so far from giving an intemperate opposition, that I could not be said, in any sense of the word, to oppose them at all; I mean, the three first. I certainly voted against the secretary of the day, but oftener voted with him. In Lord Hertford's administration, I had attained to a certain view and decided opinion of what was fit, in my mind, to be done for this country. I had fixed upon three great objects of public utility. I endeavoured to attain them, with that spirit and energy with which it is my character and nature to speak and to act; as I must take the disadvantages of my nature, I will take the advantages of it too. These three great objects were resisted by that administra-

tion: what was the consequence? A conflict arose between that administration and me; but that conflict ought not to be called opposition on my part; no, it ought rather to be called opposition on their's; I was the propounder, and they resisted my propositions. This may be called a conflict, not an opposition to that administration. What were those three objects? One was, to prove that the constitution of Parliament in this kingdom did still exist; that it had not been taken away by the law of Poynings, but that it was an infamous perversion of that statute, by which the constitution had suffered. The other was, the establishment of a constitutional military force in superaddition to that of a standing army.

The only idea that ever occurred to England, or any free country of Europe, I adopted, namely, that of a constitutional militia. At that time the idea of a volunteer force had not arisen, therefore, I adopted the idea which at that time appeared to be the best. The third great object I took up as necessary for this country, was a law for limiting the duration of parliaments. These were three great, salutary and noble objects, worthy of the enlarged mind of an enlarged country. I pursued them with ardour, I do not deny it; but I did not pursue them with intemperance; I am sure I did not appear to the public to do so; they gave my exertions many flattering testimonies of their approbation. There is another proof that I was not intemperate; I was successful; intemperance and miscarriage are apt to go together, but temperance and success are associated by nature. This is my plain history with regard to that period. The clumsiness or virulence of invective may require to be sheathed in a brilliancy of diction, but plain truth and plain sense are best delivered in plain terms.

I now come to that period in which Lord Harcourt governed, and which is stigmatized by the word venal. I say, Lord Harcourt's, for, in my consideration of his administration, I will include that of Lord Townshend. If every man who accepts an office is venal, and an apostate, I certainly cannot acquit myself of the charge, nor is it necessary: I should have so many associates in the crime, if ever there was a crime in what multitudes would defend. I am sensible, multitudes and majorities would not be wanting to defend that. But, I say, either it is a crime or it is not; if it be a crime universally, let it be universally ascribed. But, Sir, I say, it is not fair that one set of men should be treated by that honourable member as great friends and lovers of their country, notwithstanding they are in office; and another man, because he was in office, should be treated as an enemy and an apostate? But what is the truth. Every thing of this sort depends upon

the principles on which office is taken, and on which it is retained: with regard to me, let no man imagine I am preaching up a doctrine for my own convenience; there is not a man less concerned in the propagation of it. I have no treaty with the right honourable gentleman on the floor, nor shall I have any.

Now, Sir, I shall beg leave shortly to state the manner in which I accepted that office, which I give you my word, I never will resume. It was offered to me in the most honourable manner, with an assurance not only of being a placeman for my own profit, but a minister for the benefit of my country. My answer was, that I thought, in a constitution such as ours, an intercourse between the prince and the subject ought to be honourable, the being a minister ought to redound to a man's credit; but I lamented that it often happened otherwise: men in office often gave up those principles which they maintained before. I told them, therefore, that my objections were not to the going into office, but to following the examples which I had sometimes seen before me. I mentioned the public principles I held. I said, if consistently with those principles, from an atom of which I would not depart, I could be of service to His Majesty's government, I was ready to be so. I speak in the presence of men who know what I say. After the office had come over, and landed in this kingdom, I sent in writing to the chief governor, that I would not accept the office, unless upon that principle.

Thus, Sir, I took office; the administration before, I opposed only in part of it; in the first session of Lord Townshend, I did not oppose; I never opposed Lord Townshend till after his prorogation and protest: this appeared to me an infamous violation of the privileges of Parliament. With regard to money-bills, and after that protest by which he endeavoured to make the journals of the House of Lords, instead of being the record of their privileges, the monument of their disgrace, I opposed him: now, what did I oppose in that administration? The violation of the privilege of this House, with regard to money-bills, and the wanton augmentation of offices, by the division of the board of commissioners into two parts. In Lord Harcourt's administration, what did I do? I had the two boards of commissioners reduced again into one. I do not say my single voice effected this, but, as far as it had any efficacy, it insisted on having the twelve commissioners again reduced to seven, and the two boards to one, — a saving, including the whole arrangement, of twenty thousand pounds a-year to the nation; it went further, it insisted to have every altered

money-bill thrown out, and Privy Council money-bills not defended by the Crown. Thus, instead of giving sanction to the measures I had opposed, my conduct was, in fact, to register my principles in the records of the court, to make the Privy Council a witness to the privileges of Parliament, and to give final energy to the tenets with which I commenced my life.

Economy did not stop with the reduction of the commissioners boards. The right hon. gentleman who has censured me, in order to depreciate that economy, said, that "we had swept with the feather of economy the pens and paper off your table;" a pointed and a brilliant expression is far from a just argument. This country has no reason to be ashamed of that species of economy, when the great nation of Great Britain has been obliged to descend to an economy as minute. Neither, Sir, was this all: it is not my fault if infinitely more was not done for this country upon that occasion; they were offered a saving: they did not chuse to take it; they were offered the absentee-tax, and they refused it. I am not to blame for that: it was part of the saving proposed. If administration were wrong on that occasion, they were wrong with the prejudices of half a century; they were wrong with every great writer that had ever written upon the subject of Ireland; they were wrong with some of the plainest principles, as it seems, of human nature, in their favour. I will suppose the determination not to accept it, to have been right, still it was meritorious in administration to offer it; and to shew that I was not under any undue influence of office, I appeal to the memory of many men present, whether, when the disposition of the House was made to alter upon that subject; and when administration yielded, not unwillingly, to the violence of Parliament, I appeal to the conscious and public knowledge of many, whether I did veer and turn about with the secretary, or whether I did not make a manly stand in favour of that principle, after having pledged myself to the public? I would rather break with a million of administrations than retract?

I not only adhered to it, but by a singular instance of exertion, I forced it a second time under the consideration of this House. That this benefit was lost to this country, if it be a benefit, it was not my fault. One thing I must go back to; I had repeatedly pressed the bill for limiting the duration of parliaments. In Lord Townshend's time, I brought it in finally, and crowned it with success: thus, I restored to the universal community of Ireland, a right of which they had been robbed for near a century, namely, their first and fun-

damental franchise as electors, without which this House is but a shadow. And thus, after having restored that root of all their other rights in Lord Townshend's administration, after having restored economy, and reduced twelve commissioners to seven in Lord Harcourt's, I went on to the other great measure which I have mentioned, the militia law; and when a right honourable gentleman (Mr. Ogle) moved that question, I engaged all the interest I could with Government in behalf of it; I rose up to second his motion, and declared I would support him and his militia bill to the last; accordingly, I gave him the assistance of my poor labours, and it was carried. Thus, therefore, Sir, I say, that in that administration in which I accepted office, instead of relinquishing my principles, I preserved them; instead of getting a minority to vote for them, I brought the majority to give an efficient sanction to their truth, by entering into office upon that occasion, and acting as I did; I acted the part of an honest minister between the prince and the people; in doing so, I think I was more a patriot than if, out of office, I had made empty declamations on empty subjects, without any advantage to the public.

Most of those who hear me, can recollect the state of this kingdom at the close of Lord Townshend's administration: I appeal to them all, and I ask what was then my repute in the nation; I will not say it was the first, or the second, or the third; but did it not stand in an honourable rank, and among the foremost rather than among the last? In Lord Harcourt's government, the vice-treasurership was offered to me, accompanied with every declaration that could render it acceptable to an honourable mind. When that office was offered to me, was my situation that of a reprobated man? Did the administration of England send over an office usually reserved for the Parliament of England, and offer it of their own accord, to a reprobated man? I take the facts of both countries to disprove this calumny. Is it since, I have become a mark of obloquy? I flatter myself not. Lord Buckinghamshire's administration succeeded. With regard to Lord Harcourt's administration, the objection is, I did too much; the charge with regard to the other is, I did too little for it: those two accusations run a little in contrary direction, and like a double poison, each may cure the operation of the other: but the fact is this, I acted not upon visions and imaginations, but on sound common sense, the best gift of God to man; which then told one, and still whispers, that some administrations deserve a more active support than others; that some administrations deserve a more active opposition than others, and that some deserve little of either. I adapted my conduct

to those three conditions. I did not run headlong against Government at one time, and with Government at another; but adapted my conduct, as I ought to do, to what I saw, and what I felt. Did I support Lord Harcourt? why? Because he gave me an influence in his councils.

It is nonsense to say, a man is not to support his own councils: but the next administration took another direction, and they did not give me any influence on their councils. What was the consequence? I did not give them support. Was there any thing more fair? I felt myself a man of too much situation to be a mere place-man. If not a minister to serve my country, I would not be the tool of salary. What was the consequence? I voted with them in matters of importance, when they were clearly right; I voted against them in matters of importance, when they were clearly wrong; and in matters of small moment, I did not vote at all: and why? I scorned, by voting for them in such matters, to seem to pay court: to vote against them in such matters would have been absurd. What remained? Not to vote at all. If you call that absconding, going behind the chair, or escaping into the corridore, call it what you please, I say it was right. This is my plain way of dealing; it is common sense. I told Lord Buckinghamshire, I would not attend the cabinet councils of the sage Mr. Heron. Was that duplicity? I think not. I did more; I sent my resignation to England, to the same friend through whom the first communication was made to me on the subject of office; but, from ideas of friendship to me, he took time to consider, and, at length, declined to deliver my resignation.

I have said something to the middle period. I shall come to the third, viz. Lord Carlisle's administration, in which my conduct has been slandered as the conduct of an incendiary; when that idea took place in some minds, I cannot tell, but this I am sure of, that the right honourable gentleman who censured me, was called an incendiary at that time, and so perhaps might I; but I am sure the right honourable gentleman at that time did not think me an incendiary any more than himself; there was not a single instance in which he did not co-operate. If I am an incendiary, I shall gladly accept, therefore, of the society of that right honourable gentleman, under the same appellation: but he laughed at the folly of the accusation at that time, and so do I now. If I was an incendiary, it was for moving what the Parliaments of both kingdoms have since given their sanction to: if that is to be an incendiary, God grant I may continue so.

In this administration it was, that I was dismissed from office; now, Sir, I do not know that, in general, my dis-

mission from office was thought any disgrace to me: I do not think this House or the nation thought me dishonoured by that dismission. The first day I declared those sentiments for which I was dismissed — *I remember it well* — I thought it for my *honour*; some very honourable and worthy gentlemen, some since dead, and some still alive, one of them whom I shall ever love, and shall ever lament; one of them, dead since to every thing but his own honour, and the grateful memory of his country; one of them, who thought me so little of the character of an incendiary, that he crossed the House, together with others, to congratulate me on the honour of my conduct, and to embrace me in open parliament. At that moment, I think, I stood clear of the imputation of being an incendiary. The character of an incendiary, therefore, seems to have been superinduced upon me of a sudden; it has sprouted out and germinated from that root of much evil, the simple repeal; since that moment only, it seems, that I have been going down in the opinion of the public; since that moment they have found out my character and conduct deserve all reprobation, and deserve the brand of being an incendiary; and yet I can hardly prevail upon myself to think that this is the case; because, since that moment, I have received more honourable testimonies from every corner of the kingdom, than that right honourable member has received in the same period.

I shall return once more to the sentiments of that beloved character I have just described*: he was a man, over whose life, or over whose grave, envy never hovers: he was a man, wishing ardently to serve his country himself, but not wishing to monopolize the service, wishing to partake and to communicate the glory of what passed: he gave me, in his motion for a free trade, a full participation of the honour. Upon another occasion, he said, — *I remember the words*; they are traced with the *pencil of gratitude on my heart*: he said, “that I was a man whom the most lucrative office in the land had never warped in point of integrity.” The words were marked; I am sure I repeat them fairly: they are words I should be proud to have inscribed upon my tomb. Consider the man from whom they came; consider the magnitude of the subject on which they were spoken; consider the situation of the persons concerned, and it adds to, and multiplies the honour.

My noble friend, I beg pardon, he did not live to be ennobled by patent; but he was born ennobled by nature; his situation at that moment was this: he had found himself obliged to surrender office, and enter into active opposition to

* The Right Honourable Walter Hussey Burgh.

to those three conditions. I did not run headlong against Government at one time, and with Government at another; but adapted my conduct, as I ought to do, to what I saw, and what I felt. Did I support Lord Harcourt? why? Because he gave me an influence in his councils.

It is nonsense to say, a man is not to support his own councils: but the next administration took another direction, and they did not give me any influence on their councils. What was the consequence? I did not give them support. Was there any thing more fair? I felt myself a man of too much situation to be a mere place-man. If not a minister to serve my country, I would not be the tool of salary. What was the consequence? I voted with them in matters of importance, when they were clearly right; I voted against them in matters of importance, when they were clearly wrong; and in matters of small moment, I did not vote at all: and why? I scorned, by voting for them in such matters, to seem to pay court: to vote against them in such matters would have been absurd. What remained? Not to vote at all. If you call that absconding, going behind the chair, or escaping into the corridor, call it what you please, I say it was right. This is my plain way of dealing; it is common sense. I told Lord Buckinghamshire, I would not attend the cabinet councils of the sage Mr. Heron. Was that duplicity? I think not. I did more; I sent my resignation to England, to the same friend through whom the first communication was made to me on the subject of office; but, from ideas of friendship to me, he took time to consider, and, at length, declined to deliver my resignation.

I have said something to the middle period. I shall come to the third, viz. Lord Carlisle's administration, in which my conduct has been slandered as the conduct of an incendiary; when that idea took place in some minds, I cannot tell, but this I am sure of, that the right honourable gentleman who censured me, was called an incendiary at that time, and so perhaps might I; but I am sure the right honourable gentleman at that time did not think me an incendiary any more than himself; there was not a single instance in which he did not co-operate. If I am an incendiary, I shall gladly accept, therefore, of the society of that right honourable gentleman, under the same appellation: but he laughed at the folly of the accusation at that time, and so do I now. If I was an incendiary, it was for moving what the Parliaments of both kingdoms have since given their sanction to: if that is to be an incendiary, God grant I may continue so.

In this administration it was, that I was dismissed from office; now, Sir, I do not know that, in general, my dis-

power, let me come to a highly respectable body, the corps of lawyers in this country, who, after six months' meditation by a committee chosen by ballot, gave their sanction to that opinion, which is the opinion of an incendiary, if I deserve that name. If Lord Mansfield be an incendiary, if the Parliament of England be an incendiary, if the corps of lawyers are incendiaries, if the Ulster delegates are incendiaries, if the Connaught delegates are incendiaries, and all the societies who have joined that opinion throughout the kingdom, if all of these be incendiaries, in the name of God let me be added to the number, and let me be an incendiary too: but though I may be *such* an incendiary, I will never be that which would deserve the name; I will never, by any hollow composition, lay the seeds of future dissention: I will go clearly and fully to the work: I will be satisfied, when satisfaction is given; my nature is as prone to satisfaction, and as distant from chagrin as that of any man. I appeal to those who know me from my childhood, first, at a public school, then at the university of this kingdom, then at the university of Oxford, and afterwards, during twenty-four years, taking no very private part within the walls of this House — I have spoken to facts. I do not mean to arraign; any man may be mistaken, and I wish to suppose any man to be really mistaken rather than to be so intently. I would rather reconcile all men to the public, than make unnecessary divisions. But though I would do every thing a man can do to prevent dissention, I cannot be expected to sacrifice my character to unlimited obloquy.

Sir, one circumstance I must mention, as it is somewhat extraordinary. It has been said by some authority on that side of the question, that I am the outcast of Government and of my prince: certainly, Sir, my dismissal from office was attended with the extraordinary circumstance of my dismissal from council; therefore, I suppose it is, that the right honourable member has called me the outcast of Government and of my prince. It certainly, Sir, was an extraordinary transaction; but it was done in the case of Mr. Pulteney, it was done in the case of the Duke of Devonshire; therefore, I suppose it will not be a decisive proof of any reprobated or factious character in the person to whom it happened. It is the first time it has been mentioned to my disadvantage. It was in the House of Lords of England, mentioned to the disadvantage of the minister who was supposed to have done it by a most respectable character; it was thought not to my dishonour here; it was thought not to my dishonour in the House of Lords of Ireland, where I have lately received from a very eminent

peer, the sanction of sentiments very different from these. In a word, it is but the sentence of one tongue, and upon that tongue I leave it. I do not, however, pretend to dispute a ministerial fact, which a gentleman in confidence alleges. He has been in the confidence of the Duke of Portland; he is as much a minister as any man who is not in office.

Thus much, therefore, I must give to this ministerial assertion, that I shall find it impossible for me, under such an interdiction, to pay my respects at His Majesty's Castle of Dublin, which otherwise I should be prompt to discharge; and I mention it thus publicly, that my absence may not be interpreted into any want of the most perfect duty and loyalty to my prince, or of the greatest respect to the nobleman who presides there. I am not a man formed to court proscription; I will not seek disgrace; let it remain in its den; I will not revoke it.

Sir, I have trespassed too long, and I am oppressed with the weight and multitude of thanks which I owe you and the House; I have troubled you too long upon a private subject, but, with your permission, I will endeavour to make amends on the next day, by bringing before you a subject of more importance, — the economy of the nation. I beg pardon for what I have said; I have promised too much; I am in your judgment whether I shall do it. You have heard what has passed upon my subject; I appeal to you, if I am that character that has been drawn; if I am that character in any degree, do not deprecate your justice; but I call for it, and exhort you, for yourselves and your country, to get rid of a member who would be unworthy to sit among you.

END OF THE FIRST VOLUME.

LONDON:
Printed by A. & R. Spottis
• New-Street-Square.