

TO BE, OR NOT TO BE,

A

NATION:

That is the Question?

*Hear Me, O Ye Great Men of the People; and Hearken
with your Ears, Ye Rulers of the Congregation!*

*Give not thy Son, and Wife, thy Brother, and Friend,
Power over Thee, while Thou livest: and Give not
thy Goods to Another; lest it Repent Thee, and Thou
Intreat for the same again!*

*As long as Thou livest, and hast Breath in Thee, Give
not Thyself over to Any!*

Ecclesiasticus, Cap. 33.

Dublin :

PRINTED BY JOSEPH MEHAIN, 22,
CASTLE-STREET.

1799.

TO BE, OR NOT TO BE, &c.

WHEN the Question of an Union has become so much the reigning Topic of the Day, it may not be considered altogether impertinent, or uninteresting to my Countrymen, to offer a few Remarks on the Subject.

I have read the production of the Gentleman Usher of this Subject, thrown among Us, **AT THIS CRISIS**, as an Apple of Discord, with the Inscription of "Arguments FOR and AGAINST an Union between Great Britain and Ireland considered." He sets out on the first page, with saying, "The only fear is that it will not be properly debated."

It is strange that he should happen to split upon the very rock, on which his fear seems to have erected a Beacon, for the direction of others. It must be confessed that he has not agitated the question, "by passion or by force:" but, certain it is, that he has endeavoured to insinuate his Opinion, by Arguments the most plausible, fallacious, and inapplicable, that could well have been conceived.

Says he, "Two independent States, finding their separate existence mutually inconvenient, propose to form themselves into one state for their mutual benefit." (They find a state of Celibacy mutually inconvenient; they, therefore, resolve to take the advice of their Friends, and to propose a Treaty of Marriage, or, in other Words, an Union.— God grant they may turn out a happy Couple, and that the said Union may not terminate in a Divorce !) This is the first and fundamental ground of his opinion; the premises from which he argues: but, if it shall appear

appear that the premises are false, he must admit that the conclusion cannot be true.

Put it thus :

Two independent states, finding their separate existence mutually inconvenient, propose to form themselves into one State, for their mutual Benefit :

Great Britain and Ireland are two independent States, finding their separate existence mutually inconvenient ;

Therefore, Great Britain and Ireland propose to form themselves into one state, for their mutual benefit.

This must be the form of proof: and, whenever this PRO and CON Advocate shall be able to establish the Truth of the minor proposition, then, and not before, can we assent to the Conclusion. The burthen of proof lies upon him ; and, therefore, it is unnecessary to add more upon this point ; except that it

is

is equally incumbent on him, in this case, to prove that Ireland makes the Proposal suggested in the Conclusion.

“ When the **SABINES** found they could
 “ not maintain themselves any longer against
 “ the **ROMANS**, and saw that by uniting
 “ with them they had an opportunity of in-
 “ creasing their liberty, their happiness, and
 “ their power, they acted according to the
 “ principles of reason and right in relin-
 “ quishing their separate independency as a
 “ state; and, by their union, laid the foun-
 “ dation of **ROMAN** Greatness.”

That is to say, (as some Historian, or Ad-
 vocate for Union, in future Ages, may write)
 “ When the **IRISH** found they could not
 maintain themselves any longer against the
BRITONS, and saw that by uniting with them
 they had an opportunity of increasing their
 liberty, their happiness, and their power,
 they acted according to the principles of
 reason and right, in relinquishing their sepa-
 rate Independency as a state; and by their
 Union,

Union, laid the foundation of BRITISH Greatness."

And this is the reasoning, and this one of the instances, which, as this excellent considerer of Arguments says, forms a complete Answer to all Declamation upon the common topics of national dignity and national pride.

Have we been striving to maintain ourselves against the Britons, as, he says, the Sabines were against the Romans? Are we at War with Great Britain, or negotiating with her Ambaffador for Terms of Peace? Have the Yeomen, or, in other words, the People, of Ireland, hazarded their Health, their Lives, and their Properties, in maintaining themselves WITH the British against Invaders and Rebels? Does not every voice utter "The Yeomen are the Saviours of Ireland?" They have worked out that Salvation, but as YESTERDAY; and yet, TODAY, their proud and immortalized Services are to be buried in the dust, and they are
to

to be likened unto the Sabines who found they could not maintain themselves any longer against the Romans; and thence it is inferred they would act according to the principles of reason and right in relinquishing now their separate Independency as a state; and, by their Union, laying the foundation of British Greatness.

It reminds Us of the Fable:

“ An honest countryman observed a Snake, lying under a hedge, almost frozen to death. He was moved with compassion, and bringing it home, he laid it near the fire, and gave it some new milk. Thus fed and cherished, the creature presently began to revive; but, no sooner had he recovered strength enough to do mischief, than he sprung upon the Countryman's Wife, bit one of his children; and, in short, threw the whole family into confusion and terror. Ungrateful Wretch! said the man, thou hast sufficiently taught me how ill judged it is to confer benefits on the worthless and undeserving.”

Again;

Again: “ England was formerly divided
 “ into seven kingdoms, which were continu-
 “ ally engaged in predatory Wars with each
 “ other.”

That is to say (as the Historian, or Ad-
 vocate, may also write) “ Great Britain was
 formerly divided into two Kingdoms, called
 England and Ireland, which were continually
 engaged in predatory Wars with each other.”

In the name of common sense, were those
 arguments conceived and brought forth in a
 Dream; or how do they apply to the case
 before us? Are we engaged in predatory
 Wars with England? If a stranger was to
 hear such arguments, he must instantly con-
 clude that they treated of two Countries at
 open War, and who were in the act of confi-
 dering the best means of effecting Peace. Sup-
 pose that the English found they could not
 maintain the present War any longer against
 the French; (which God Forbid!) would the
 former act, according to the principles of
 reason and right, in relinquishing their sepa-
 rate

rate independency as a state; and by their Union, laying the foundation of French Greatness? Every Englishman must spurn at the Thought.

This Arguer has really employed his pen, in pointing out and proclaiming the comparative Inferiority of Ireland, and the WANT of advantages, which, he says, are to be attained by an Union.

In comparing the situations of Great Britain and Ireland, he says, “The former enjoys the best PRACTICAL Constitution and Government, which any Nation has ever experienced.” We have the same constitution in Theory; and I would ask, therefore, why we cannot have the same in Practice? Will nothing reform the practice, but an Union with Britain? No, truly. It is suddenly and sagaciously discovered that all the maladies of the state, and every species of disorder in it, (be the Causes, and Symptoms, what they may) are now to be cured only by the one newly invented Patent Medicine;

dicine: like the Quack Doctor Sangrado, in Gil Blas, who cured all his Patients by an Union—of Bleeding and Warm Water.

Is there any physical impossibility to prevent Ireland; in her own separate right, from enjoying the same practical Constitution and Government as England? Has it been decreed that she, and those states only to whom she may choose to impart it, shall enjoy that Blessing? Suppose any Antipodal Nation possessed the same Theoretical Constitution and Government as England, is it impossible that it should enjoy it practically, without “relinquishing it’s separate Independency as a state,” and sending it’s Members up through the Centre of the Earth, or circumnavigating them round the globe, in order to take their seats in the British House of Commons? I protest, I begin to fancy that this Thing called an Union was one of the Objects of Lord Macartney’s Embassy to China!

This Gentleman goes on to inculcate the peculiar policy of the measure from the Ex-
 ample

ample of FRANCE!!! “that desperate and unprincipled power” (to use his own words) which has been the scourge of all the countries within her grasp; cruelly dictating to and forcing them to abandon their own established Constitutions, and to unite with her. Here is a very worthy model to be held out for our imitation! France indeed “has not only united to herself and incorporated a great addition of Territory, but has rendered absolutely dependent on her will almost all the smaller states which surround her.” If example, whether good, bad, or indifferent, is to be followed, let us become ferocious savages at once. But, how has France brought about the union of the above-mentioned States? In WAR, and by right of CONQUEST. Is England at War with Us? Are we a Conquest of England? Then, how does the Example of France apply?

Says he, “The Irish Parliament is supposed to be in a great degree subject to British Influence.” And, is it in order to make it in a greater degree subject to British

tish Influence that an Union is to be desired? At present, we have a substantive House of Commons, consisting of 300 Members, constitutionally unconnected with the English parliament. The plan of Union is thought to be, "that a reasonable representation may be selected." The number in the British house is 558. UBI MAJOR PARS EST, IBI EST TOTUM, is a settled maxim. If the major part of the united parliament be English, then is the Whole English. What says our Law?—"Whenever a greater estate and a less coincide and meet, in one and the same person, the less is immediately annihilated; or, in the law phrase, is said to be MERGED, that is sunk, or drowned, in the greater." The less estate of Irish representatives would be therefore immediately annihilated, or merged; that is sunk, or drowned, in the greater. If an Union of two Legislatures is to be founded on the principles of Equity, let the number of members from each be equal. But, it is plain that, while the number is at all greater on the side of England, the laws made by such a parliament may

may be enacted by Englishmen, and not by Irishmen: or, on the other hand, supposing the greater part to consist of Members delegated from this Kingdom, then, on the same principle, the laws might be enacted by an Irish, and not by an English, Legislature. If, then, the Irish Parliament is now supposed to be in a great degree subject to British influence, as this arguer says; how much greater and more effectual, must that influence be, when there would exist 558 voices against 300. (even supposing no reduction of the present Irish Representation.) The Parliament of Ireland would be completely in a Parenthesis! It might be left in, or out, without altering the Sense of the British Legislature. All the Business of Ireland might be most happily dispatched, without the vote or busy intermeddling of any one of it's own Members. When the Speaker of the British House of Commons takes his seat; will he ask, are the Irish Members come yet? No. If there be a sufficient Number to constitute a House, it will not be inquired whether any of them are from Ireland, or not: and the house will proceed

proceed to Business, even though all the Irish Members should be at Grand Cairo, or Ballynamuck. Here would be a full and complete representation of the People of Ireland in Parliament! Although Paddy in the Gallery may blunder and say, "By my own Shoul, this is a famish Representation! These Englishmen are fine Irish Members!"—And yet, one of the objects proposed by an Union is, to do away British Influence.

"The Absentee Proprietors of land might
 "in some degree increase; and London, as
 "at present, would be the general resort
 "for business, for advancement, for pleasure."
 Mark the Levity with which he talks of Absentees! One of the greatest grievances, which this country suffers, would not cease, or be in any degree alleviated; but "might
 "in some degree INCREASE!" Hear him!
 Hear him! Hear him!

"British faction would cease to operate
 "HERE;" that is to say, the local operation
 of

of it would be changed: the Scene would shift from Dublin to Westminster.

The quotations from Messrs. Adams and Washington are perfectly inapplicable. It is a well known adage that one Kingdom divided against itself, cannot stand; but, how does that apply to the case of two separate and independent kingdoms, having two separate and independent parliaments? Such parliaments cannot be divided; because they are not one. The Irish parliament may be divided against itself; and so may the English; but one cannot be divided against the other, because they are not one. They cannot have any diversity of opinion on the same subject; because they never can debate on the same subject; Ireland being to legislate for itself, and England for itself. But, form an Union; and, then indeed, the united parliament may be divided against itself; and, in that case, the majority, which would be ENGLISH, must bind. Admitting Irishmen to seats in the English house, as this Arguer says, would be like inviting a man to dinner; and,

and, on his acceptance of the invitation, shutting the door in his face.

The Honorable Gentleman has gone into a detail relative to the rivalry between Protestants and Catholics, in order to shew the utility of an Union: to which I shall say no more, than that I feel concern that the differences of religion should have made any part of his discussion. In my opinion, it is a topic which ought to rest in silence.— But, I am at a Loss to comprehend what he means by saying, “Ireland would be in a natural situation; for, all the Protestants of the Empire being united, She would have the proportion of fourteen to three, in favor of her establishment; whereas, at present, there is a proportion of three to one against it.” And “The Catholics would lose the advantage of the argument of numbers, which they at present enjoy.” I certainly am at a loss to comprehend how Ireland, after an Union, still separated on the Map of Europe from Great Britain, could have the proportion of fourteen to three, or
any

any proportion whatsoever, in favor of her establishment; or how the Catholics could lose the advantage of the argument of numbers, which they at present enjoy. Will an Union have the magic and miraculous power of converting three Millions of English Protestants into Catholics, and the same number of Irish Catholics into Protestants? How then is the proportion of fourteen to three to be effected? Let me Consider——I have it——This Gentleman has forgotten to tell us that one of the Articles of Union is to be that, immediately upon the Act of Parliament receiving the Royal Assent, three Millions of English Protestants are to embark for this Kingdom, to be exchanged for the same number of Irish Catholics; and thus they would lose the advantage of the argument of Numbers. But, hold—this service would employ all the vessels in the British Navy; and, engaged as We are at present in a War with France, she might seize the opportunity to invade both Kingdoms. For which reason, this Advocate for an Union must see that the measure ought to be

adjourned

adjourned until the end of the War, at least.

“ The Peerage would probably, in any
 “ plan of Union, be represented like the
 “ Scotch Peers, by a delegation to the Bri-
 “ tish parliament. This arrangement would
 “ not affect those Nobles, who are Peers of
 “ Great Britain; and it would be favorable
 “ to those who reside in Great Britain.”

See how much alive and attentive the Honorable Gentleman is to the interest of those Nobles, who are Peers of Great Britain, and of those who reside in Great Britain. I'll venture to stake twenty of my Pamphlets to one of his, that the measure would be favorable to every Man, Woman, and Child, who resides in Great Britain. But I am very weak indeed; if I am not right in thinking that, in as far as it would be advantageous in this respect to Great Britain, so far, of course, it must be disadvantageous to Ireland. Is this gentleman an Englishman, writing for England, in order to curry Favor with her? If he is, I incline to make some allowances for

his selfish patriotism; at the same time expecting that I am to be excused for being equally interested for the Advantage and Honor of my native Country. DAMUS VENIAM, PETIMUSQUE VICISSIM.

“ There are forty one of the former class,
 “ and about eighty of the latter. The remaining fourscore peers, who attend parliament occasionally, would be the only
 “ peers materially interested; but almost all
 “ of those have considerable property in
 “ land.” This Gentleman seems to treat the Irish Nobility, as a Grazier does his Stock. Says he to his Herdsman; “ There are forty one of the Bullocks, and about eighty of the Sheep, fit for Market; they are to be driven to Smithfield. The remaining fourscore must be kept grazing upon their usual pasture, until we shall decide how to dispose of them.”——Would this Gentleman wish to see fourscore of the English Peers turned to grass in
 this

this manner? If not, will he allow an Irishman to entertain some degree of respect for the Irish Peerage; which now forms one of the supreme branches of the Legislature; and the greater part of which he, in the most flippant, and (as I conceive) disrespectful manner, consigns to Rustication.

As to the Bar, he says, "As the profession will not support by any means the numbers which pursue it, Lawyers in Ireland extend their circle to politics." And again; "Were a legislative Union to take place, Irish lawyers would be deprived of the parliamentary market for their abilities and ambition." What then must they do? Are they to confine themselves to professional prospects? No. He declares that the profession will not support by any means the numbers which pursue it; and at the same time, and in the same breath, adds that an Union would deprive them of the only other market for their abilities and ambition. Here is another instance of his disrespect towards the most respectable

table body, rendered doubly so by their arduous and distinguished services during the late perils in Ireland. Possibly he forgets, or might wish to forget, that they form part, a principal, the leading, part of that glorious Phalanx, who stood forward, in the hour of peril, against the uplifted hand of Rebellion; and whom the public voice proclaims, and acknowledges with gratitude, as the Saviours of this country. When the most formidable conspiracy was ripened, to destroy the Union of Affection between the two countries, they were the first and the last to oppose it: and it is no *mal a propos* circumstance, that such of them as were Members of Parliament were amongst the foremost in the Ranks.—So much for their late Services—And now, let me remind this Gentleman that our Law-books and Historians have branded that Legislature, in which there were no Lawyers, with the Epithet of “The LACK-LEARNING Parliament;” and that Sir Edward Cooke observes that there never was a good law made thereat. And, let me ask the Gentleman, who are or ought to be supposed
more

more competent to make Laws than those, who have made the Laws their Study? Does the Knowledge, acquired from the study of the Laws, incapacitate from the making of them? TULLY was of a different opinion; it is necessary, says he, for a Senator to be thoroughly acquainted with the Constitution; and this, he declares, is a knowledge of the most extensive nature; a matter of Science, of Diligence, of Reflexion: without which, no Senator can possibly be fit for his office.

The honorable and pious mention, which this Gentleman makes of the CLERGY, ought not to pass quite unnoticed. To demonstrate to them, says he, the advantages of an Union, would be lost labour indeed. Is it because this venerable body of men are Guilty of more Learning and Information than Laymen, and consequently more likely to detect and expose his fallacious doctrines, that the Benefit of Clergy is not allowable in this case? If he has any sense of feeling for the public reception which his

er-

performance has met, he must be convinced by this time, that it is lost Labour indeed from beginning to end.

Why is an Union to be made the Condition of all the Advantages held out to Us, and published by this Gentleman in his Column of "WANTS? Why may not these be attained by us, as well WITHOUT, as WITH, an Union? Is the Effect to be produced by no other Cause? If it would be beneficial to the Nation, why has it not been sought by the Nation? It cometh in a very questionable Shape. Perhaps it may too much resemble a BENEFIT, imposed by the Manager of a Theatre, upon one of his unfortunate Actors; which, after paying the Expences of the House, turns out to his RUIN.

"The vice of our former connexion
 "with England was that Great Britain
 "made laws to bind Ireland, without
 "binding herself at the same time by
 "the same Laws." It occurs to me that
 an Union would produce a more flagrant
 Vice. If Great Britain, after an Union,
 could

could or would impose Taxes on herself, and make laws to enforce them, without binding Ireland in some measure at the same time by the same laws, an Union would not seem so injurious in this point of view. But, there's the Rub. After an Union, Great Britain would not and could not make Laws to bind herself, without binding Ireland in some measure at the same time by the same laws. This indeed would be the vice of our connexion. At this Day, it is the exclusive privilege of the Irish Commons to tax themselves; and, so jealous are they of this valuable privilege, that herein they will not suffer the other house to exert any power, but that of rejecting: they will not permit the least alteration or amendment to be made by the Lords, to the mode of taxing the people by a Money Bill. If, then, such a Jealousy Constitutionally subsists between the Commons and Lords, branches of one and the same Legislature, how much greater must the Jealousy of the People of Ireland be towards not only the Lords but the Commons of a foreign Legislature?

Union

Union is become so much the Rage, that I should not be at all surpris'd, if We were shortly to be entertained with a Dish of "Arguments for and against an Union, between the Bank of England and the Bank of Ireland, considered:" and I presume that the Cook, as in the case before Us, would first invite Us to taste a little Morsel of it, by viewing the question in the Abstract, thus:

"Two independent National Banks, finding their separate existence mutually inconvenient, propose to form themselves into one Bank, for their MUTUAL benefit."

And, after seasoning our Appetites, he would proceed, without further Ceremony, to CRAM it down our Throats, as in the Case before Us:

"Were any person to exclaim, who shall dare to propose that the Independence of the Bank of Ireland shall be annihilated? I would answer him by another question.—If

the

the Conveniencies, the Security, of the people of Ireland will be improved by an incorporation of the Irish with the English Bank, shall we not for such advantages endeavour to procure that Incorporation?—The question of forming an Union between two National Banks, must never be confused with the subjection of one Bank to another.—If the measure of forming an Union between two National Banks, whose separate existence is inconvenient, is abstractedly agreeable to reason and philosophy; and if, in many instances, it has been attended with advantage to the contracting parties, it is plainly a subject for temperate discussion.—What can any sanguine Irish Trader wish for his Bank, but that it's Governor and Company should attain the same Habits, Manners, and Improvements, which make the Bank of England the envy of Europe? and, by what means can he hope to attain that end so effectually, as by uniting with her Bank, and binding up all her interests and concerns in the same bottom? Supposing there were no other reasons which rendered the Union of the

Sister-Banks desirable, the State of Europe, and especially of FRANCE, seems to dictate it's peculiar policy at the present day. France has not only united to herself, and incorporated a great addition of SPECIE, but has rendered absolutely dependent on her will, almost all the smaller Banks which surround her. The Bank of Geneva is incorporated, the Bank of Savoy is incorporated, all the Austrian Banks in Flanders, all the German Banks on this side of the Rhine, are incorporated. Spain's Bank is subject to her influence; the Banks of Holland, Switzerland, Sardinia, and of the new Republic of Italy, are occupied by her Governors; to every country she extends her principles and her intrigues; and on the National Bank of this kingdom her designs have been nearly successful—but, as we wish to check the ambition of that desperate and unprincipled power; and, if that end can only be effected by maintaining and augmenting the power of the English Bank, we should be favorable to the principle of Union; which must increase and consolidate it's resources—The Governor must reside

reside in one of the Banks; THERE would of course be the metropolis of Trade and Commerce; THERE would be the real seat of Business; THENCE would flow all the MONEY; and thither would resort those, who wished for Notes and Post-Bills." &c. &c.

Can any thing be more striking than the Parallel between this case of an Union of National Banks, and that of our Parliaments; both in it's Plan and Consequences? Is there any one so besotted, and out of his Senses, as not to perceive it?

Upon the Whole; the Honorable Gentleman has sent abroad his Production among Us, in order to feel our Pulse: and it beats high against him. His first and fundamental Position is unfounded.—The Cases, cited by him, do not apply—At one Time, he seems to address Us, as in the Tone of a Conqueror, speaking to a subjugated Province; and as if telling Us, that he will make a moderate and prudent use of his Victory. He condescends to look upon Us all, as his natural

Sub-

Subjects; invites Us to live with him in London, and to enter into the number of his Citizens.—Ingratitude is another prominent Feature, in this Gentleman's Portrait: every one of my Readers may perceive his Likeness, in the Ungrateful Snake, fed and cherished by the Honest Countryman!—Absurdity comes next: if We are to give Credence to him, Theory and Practice cannot flourish, except in the Climate of Great Britain: there appears to be some noxious Quality, in the political Atmosphere of Ireland, which excludes Us from the practical Blessings of our Constitution; the very same, in Theory, as the British — The Example of modern France is next held out to Us. France dethroned, and murdered, her King; are We to imitate Her? For my part, I do not hesitate to pronounce any Man, as little removed from a Traitor, who dares to hold out, to a Loyal and Affectionate People, the Example of a Regicide Nation;

“ Who hastes to murder, with a Savage Joy!

“ Invades around, and Breathes, but to destroy.—

Next;

Next; he demonstrates, with great Success, that, by an Union, the Irish Representation will be in a greater degree subject to British Influence—that Absentees! will increase—that British Faction will be taken to the other Side of the Water, out of our View, and out of our Control—that the Catholics will retain the advantage of the Argument of Numbers—that those Nobles, who happen not to be Peers of Great Britain, and those who do not reside there, will be turned to Grass—that the Loyal Irish Lawyers will be deprived of the Parliamentary Market for their Abilities and Ambition; and, therefore, may Feed upon an “Abridgment of Bacon,” or starve—that the Clergy are beneath his Notice—And, in Fine, that We are to surrender our Legislature, the Disposal of our Lives, our Liberties, and our Properties, into the Hands of a British Parliament, for ever—From such ADVANTAGES as these, Good Lord Deliver Us!

Before I have done, it may not be amiss to state, that the statute 23 Geo.

3. cap. 28, enacts that the right claimed by the people of Ireland to be bound only by laws enacted by his Majesty and the parliament of this kingdom in all cases whatever should be and it is thereby declared to be established and ascertained FOR EVER, and should at no time thereafter be questioned or questionable. Have these words any force or meaning? Was it not the intention of the legislature by this law to shut the door for ever against all further discussion of the subject? And is not this Gentleman guilty of something little short of a misdemeanor in endeavouring to persuade the people of Ireland, or their Representatives, to renounce a right, which, the law of this realm emphatically says, shall at no time be questioned or questionable?

One Word more ---The Title of this Gentleman's pamphlet is really curious--- he professes to consider Arguments for and against a question---arguments hammered out in his own forge, and on his own Anvil. He has found the Ore, roasted it, smelted it, made Pigs of it: and, with his PRO Hammer in one Hand, and his CON Hammer

Hammer in the other, he beats out these unfortunate Pigs into fantastical and monstrous Shapes, which he immediately sets on to fight a pitched battle: whilst he puts on his Considering Cap; and, like Jupiter IN THE CLOUDS, holds the Scales of Victory in his Hand; but slyly fillips the Beam, and decides for his favorite Combatants—Thus he UNITES in his own person the threefold Character of the Arguer for, the Arguer against, and the Considerer of his own Arguments for and against!

To conclude, in his own Words, “ We have been sufficiently distracted and harassed. We have drank enough from the bitter Cup of Dissension.” it is, therefore, to be hoped, by every well wisher of this Country, that the Question may drop into the Grave—As many, as are of that Opinion, say “ AYE:” as many, as are of the contrary Opinion, say “ No.”—

The AYES have it.

Houses of the Oireachtas