

AN
U N I O N
TO BE
S U B J E C T I O N,
P R O V E D
FROM
MR. C.'S OWN WORDS
IN HIS
ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST.
IN TWO PARTS.

P A R T I.

THIS CONTAINS A STRONG REFUTATION OF ALL THE ABSTRACT OR METAPHYSICAL REASONING, AND IS CONCLUSIVE IN ITSELF. THE NEXT PART WILL DISCUSS FULLY ALL THE ARGUMENTS, METAPHYSICAL AND PRACTICAL.

BY AN IRISH LOGICIAN.

Ex ore tuo te jugulo.
Thy own words condemn thee.

CICERO
TRANSLATION.

—D U B L I N:—

PRINTED FOR J RICE, III, GRAFTON-STREET.

1799.

HOUSE OF COMMONS
IN PARLIAMENT ASSEMBLED
1790
M. GILGON WORDS
IN THE
ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST
IN THE
BY
BY AN IRISH LOGICIAN
LONDON
PRINTED BY
1790

TO

WILLIAM SAURIN, Esq.

SIR,

YOUR highly spirited Resolution, “ That
“ the measure of a Legislative Union of this
“ kingdom and Great Britain, is an innova-
“ tion, which it would be highly dangerous
“ and improper to propose at the present junct-
“ ture to this country ;” which was approved
of by a very great majority of the Bar, roused
me to a sense of the Independence of my
country, and urged me to take the pen in de-
fence of it. If any Irishman shall happen to
discover, from the following pages, the folly
of an Union with Great Britain, it is to you
he is indebted for the information; and may
all Ireland prove itself as grateful to you as I
am for the glorious example you have set your
countrymen, in defence of the Irish Constitu-
tion against avowed or concealed enemies.

I remain, SIR,

Your very humble servant,

Dublin, Jan. 6, 1799.

THE AUTHOR.

A 2

WILLIAM SAURIN, Esq.

YOUR highly spirited Resolution, "That
"the measure of a Legislative Union of this
"Kingdom and Great Britain, is an innova-
"tion, which it would be highly dangerous
"and improper to propose at the present jun-
"cture to the country," which was approved
of by a great majority of the Bar, would
me to a state of the independence of my
country, and urged me to take the pen in de-
fence of it. It may indeed be said that I have
distorted from the following pages the folly
of an Union with Great Britain, and may
be indebted for the information, and may
all Ireland prove itself as good to you as I
am for the glorious example you have set your
countrymen, in defence of the British Consti-
tution against a sword or concealed dagger.

I remain Sir,

Your very humble servant,

THE AUTHOR.

Dublin, Jan. 6, 1781.

A 2

ADVERTISEMENT.

HAVING seen the Pamphlet entitled, Arguments for and against, &c. I determined on answering it, as it seemed very ingenious and plausible, and might mislead; and if I had skimmed over the Pamphlet, my answer would have been the first; but, observing that the arguments placed in the van with great ingenuity, were not the least plausible, I entered into a full discussion of them. It was necessary, as many of them were *general*, and very *metaphysical*. This discussion swelled the answer to the ten first pages, into the size of an ordinary Pamphlet; thinking, therefore, that the discussion of the entire would take more time than I could afford, I declined publishing any answer, as a superficial one, on so momentous a subject, would not be satisfactory to my mind. However, I have now determined on publishing it in parts, and hope this *first part* will be acceptable,

B

table, as it contains a refutation of the material arguments, which serve as a foundation for all the rest; besides, this material part of the Pamphlet has not been so fully discussed by any other person. In the following parts, the author will not be ashamed to quote the strong arguments, and historical facts, introduced by the many gentlemen who have already written on the subject, in opposition to an Union.

AN
U N I O N

TO BE

SUBJECTION, &c.

REPORT, and something more, the unanimous consent of the inhabitants of Dublin, proclaim Mr. C. the author of the Pamphlet *For and Against an Union*—If I could presume to advise a gentleman of talents and respectability like him, I would recommend to Mr. C. to change his title-page, and prefix one more analogous to the body of the work. His title-page is *Arguments for and against an Union, considered*—whereas from the nature of the work it should be, *Arguments for an Union developed and maintained, and Arguments against an Union refuted, or at least attempted to be refuted.* If this latter title were boldly and manfully adopted, we should then see in the author's mind a strong bias towards an Union of the Irish and English Legislatures. By this honest and candid declaration of the author's intention to persuade the People of Ireland to an Union with England, his readers would have been more prejudiced in his favour, and more inclined to swallow his doctrine. From the title page, the

reader may expect to find the arguments for and against an Union calmly and deliberately discussed. Vain, however, are his expectations; The title is plausible, no doubt; advance but two or three steps, you then will see through this thin veiled plausibility, the strong interest the author takes in the debate. In the third page, his zeal breaks forth. On farther, you lose sight of the calm, dispassionate enquirer after truth, and in a short time you perceive the author to be the strong and able advocate of a proud, imperious client, striving, by all the arts of technical logic, to seduce our affections from our dear independence, and cast them upon the old projected Union—no doubt now a favourite object with the British Minister.

When mention of an Union was first made in this country, several cried out, O! its only the suggestion of a rebel, or at least of some disaffected persons, who, like fiends, delight in the mischief they make themselves. This was natural enough, I must confess; for who could conceive that any accredited person in administration would have propagated such a report, at a time when the fury of party had almost desolated the country; at a time when the party most inclined to oppose it, was triumphant; and at a time when both parties, seeing themselves tricked, might have united against a measure that ever was, and I trust will for ever be, obnoxious to Irishmen of every party and description in the country. At that time it was generally thought that the attempt of an Union might be the cause of a separation; and then a contrary mischief would follow, from what the English nation intended us.

On the report of an Union, an immaculate print, supposed to be hired by Administration, branded with treasonable views every other print that dared to agitate the public mind with so monstrous a thing as an Union. It stigmatized with the odious epithet of traitor,

traitor, any person proposing an alteration in the Constitution of Ireland—that Constitution of Irish King, Lords, and Commons, which our forefathers saved from the wreck, and retained, our Irish Volunteers improved, our Militia and Yeomen armed and fought for, and Orangemen leagued for, in defiance to the odium of all the Catholics, and the ill-will of a great many of their fellow Protestants. Indeed it is to be supposed the motives of the Orange league, in general, were political, and not religious, and it is most probable, notwithstanding all the misconceptions of them.

Mr. C. comes boldly forward, and tells us, “ that the subject of incorporating the Irish with the British Legislature, and forming a complete Union of Great Britain and Ireland, is undergoing a discussion by the leading characters of both kingdoms; and it is rumoured, that some measure may be proposed upon it to the two Parliaments.” I only cast my eye on this part of the pamphlet, when I was panic-struck, lest the independent and patriotic writer of the above *prating Journal*, would inveigh against Mr. C. himself, or any of the leading characters of this kingdom, especially, and stigmatize him or them, or both, with the name of traitors to the Constitution of Ireland. This Constitutional Journal would have supposed the *leaders* guilty for proposing it, and Mr. C. himself for seeming to credit the report of their proposing an Union would be liable to a prosecution for misprision of treason. At all events Mr. C. might be subject to prosecution before a military tribunal, for *spreading reports tending to alarm the public mind*; and the Journal might hand him over to the General in Belfast, who issued a Proclamation for the apprehension and punishment of *story tellers*. However, on learning the very important station the writer, or supposed writer, of the Pamphlet in question, holds in this country, my fears

have

have abated, hoping that the same hand which is supposed to have written the book I shall attempt to answer, will be able to stay the vehemence of this public spirited Journal so often alluded to, and prevent it from prejudicing the public mind against so able a production. When I recollect who the writer is, I cannot avoid thinking, that he has more than *circumstantial evidence* of an Union being on foot, though he sets out with modestly saying, "it appears from a variety of circumstances, that the subject," &c. I also cannot avoid thinking, that Mr. C. has more authority than mere rumour, for some measure on an Union being proposed to the two Parliaments—though he may say, in the stile of a British courtier, "and it is rumoured, that some measure " may be proposed upon it to the two Parliaments."

We have tolerable authority that some measure on an *Union* will be proposed to the two Parliaments; and if so, I have no great doubts concerning the event. That the Union will be determined on, if proposed, is most probable. Perhaps at this very moment it is determined upon; and we are invited to a public discussion of the subject, the day after the feast. In this case, every pamphlet makes its appearance in the shape of a Doctor after death.

But we have been invited to discuss the subject freely, to debate it properly; let us do so; though the invitation might have been made in the hopes it would not have been accepted of, yet we are not to suppose this specious hospitality to predominate elsewhere, we are so little acquainted with it in Ireland. We are told, "that the question of an Union " is of great importance," and "that it applies so " warmly to all the feelings, prejudices, and passions " of the human mind, that it cannot fail to be uni- " versally debated." The fear is it will not be properly debated; this fear is not well founded, for when any subject is *universally debated*, it is a strong presumption

sumption it will be *properly debated*. If the gentleman has not a peculiar meaning of his own for the word *properly*; if by the word *properly*, is understood *rationaly*, then the more a subject is universally, the more properly will it be debated: in this case all his fears may subside; but if by the word *properly*, which is very emphatic here, is meant with a proper due deference for the rights, privileges, and advantages of Englishmen, with a neglect of, and contempt for every thing that is dear to Irishmen, then indeed the gentleman will have some cause to fear the subject will not be *properly debated*. We are cautioned against our feelings, our prejudices and passions, and we are not told a word of our interests and advantages, and the interests and advantages of our posterity, that will be eternally affected by a measure of this great importance.

I will agree with the gentleman, that this subject “ought to be discussed with temper, and that it deserves such a discussion.” The importance of the subject which must be admitted on all sides, involves in it the necessity of a temperate discussion without any other proof being required. The Author of Arguments for and against an Union professes the object of his considerations to be two-fold; first, “to state the general arguments which respect the subject:” and secondly, “to prove that it ought to be discussed with temper.” Though this second part of the Author’s object might be granted without any proof, for who will be weak enough to alledge that every subject ought not to be discussed *with temper*; let me ask him who is most likely to introduce violence into the debate? Is it poor humiliated Ireland, disgraced by the recent Rebellion, and distracted by political and religious jealousies; or is it another country, proud, ambitious, and triumphant; exulting in her late naval victories? Is it the sheep that will offer violence to the lions? Or is it not more likely
that

that the tame fleecy animal has to dread the violence of the roaring lion? Is there not a great English force in this country? Is it not very likely this force will be continued? Mr. Pitt has lately confirmed, by a renewal of it; the clause for continuing the English militia in Ireland, and allowing more to volunteer in this service. Perhaps before this pamphlet is put to press we shall have more English soldiers on our shores to protect us, and assist us in *discussing the subject of an Union with temper*. It is very prudent to deprecate violence and passion on this momentous question, (page 1) as it may terminate in discontent or convulsion, (page 2.) It is to be hoped this wise doctrine will be followed up, and that the prudent Author will recommend it to higher powers. I shall now recur to the first object of the considerations which follow; namely, "to state the general arguments which respect the subject," (see page 2.) These general arguments alluded to, are divided into two kinds—*Arguments for an Union*, and *Arguments against it*.

My answer will likewise contain *two parts*; and in order to follow the learned gentleman in the same course he has taken, I will endeavour, in the *first part*, to refute the arguments for an Union, and in the *second* I hope to maintain and establish the arguments against an Union, and to subjoin a few that have occurred to myself on the subject. I am perfectly aware of the difficulty of the task I undertake, as I am not accustomed to submit my thoughts to public animadversion; yet if I did not write now, as my mind dictates, on this great and truly awful subject, I should fear greatly the censure of my own conscience in private. Without any further preamble then, let us come to the point, and meet Mr. C. on his own ground. "Let us, as he says, view the question in the abstract." Viewing the *question in the abstract*, can have no weight, except we always keep in view
the

the question in debate. See then how an abstract view of it can apply to the present question.

“ Two independent states, finding their separate existence mutually inconvenient, propose to form themselves into one state, for their mutual benefit.”

Page 2.

I grant you all this; but how does any part of it apply to the present question? How are we certain, that an Union of Great Britain and Ireland, will be for their mutual benefit? Is not this begging the question? I appeal to any logician, if this is not *petitio principii*—a mode of argument you, as a good logician, do not approve of in page 28, where you say,

“ To solve this objection, it is only necessary to state it as a *petitio principii*. What ground is there to assume that the Catholics will oppose an Union, though founded on Protestant principles?” Give me leave to retort (and *retortion* is a good mode of argument, you will allow). What ground is there to assume that Great Britain and Ireland will be both benefited by an Union? “ *Two independent states*” are spoken of; but are the two states in question *equally independent*? If not, I am afraid the adoption of an Union would not be from *choice*, at least that *choice* which proceeds from *conviction*, and creates *satisfaction*. It is supposed these *two independent states* find “ their separate existence mutually inconvenient.” Have Great Britain and Ireland both complained of this *inconvenience*? If they have both freely and unanimously consented to apply the remedy of an Union to the complaint, I am satisfied, tho’ I may suspect the wisdom of a weaker state uniting with the stronger, in expectation of equal privileges and equal rights; and indeed I am induced to think it is a desperate remedy prescribed by a state physician, without having had a proper consultation on the disease. Examine further this fancied *mutual in-*

convenience of separate existence, as applicable to Great Britain and Ireland. What INCONVENIENCE may we suppose Ireland to complain of? A temporary one, which does not now exist. The late rebellion is the chief inconvenience Ireland, in my mind, has to complain of. It has been the melancholy cause of mischief and woe to Ireland. But have we not a Legislature of our own, enlightened, and, we are told, independent? Can it not provide for the happiness of its people? Can it not repair the injuries done to its country by rebels, who are now subdued? If it cannot effect this with all the wisdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and all the loyalty of the latter, how will a foreign Legislature, sitting in Great Britain, and perhaps not assisted by all the loyalty of Ireland, restore this country to its former quiet, and repair the losses it has sustained from the late rebellion, or insurrection, as it may be called? The People of Ireland have put down a formidable insurrection, at the risk of their lives and fortunes. What is the recompence? The annihilation of the *independence of Ireland*. See page 3, where we are told, “that national dignity and national pride, are with us Irish, only common topics of declamation,” though a little before we were called an *independent state*. When this language is used by a gentleman, who is supposed to have come from the other side of the water, how may we expect to be treated when we have *bona fide* surrendered what *independence* we have? See what a cause this gentleman must have to maintain, whose inconsistency of argument can be so speedily detected, though few from Cambridge or Oxford seemingly can vie with him in logical skill. “Were any person to exclaim, says the able writer (page 3) that the independence of Ireland shall be annihilated? I would answer him by another question—if the liberty, the conveniences, the happiness, the security of the People
“ of

“ of Ireland, will be improved by an incorporation
 “ of the Irish with the British Legislature, shall we
 “ not for such advantages endeavour to procure *that*
 “ *independence?*” I see the ingenuity of this ques-
 tion, and answer it in the negative. We should not
 endeavour to procure that incorporation, *ex concessi-*
tis, from your acquiescence to the former question.
 Shall the independence of Ireland be annihilated?
 You allow that the *independence* of Ireland would be
annihilated by the *incorporation of the Irish with the*
British Legislature? How is it possible that the liber-
 ty, the conveniences, &c. of the People of Ireland,
 can be improved by such an incorporation as would
 annihilate their independence. I thank you, Sir, for
 saving me the trouble; you refute yourself. You
 suppose (page 2) Great Britain and Ireland “two in-
 “ dependent states.” Ireland is not dependent on,
 nor independent of, Great Britain, but is appendent
 to, that is, annexed to Great Britain. Immediately
 after, you suppose them to find *their separate existence*
mutually inconvenient. They have no *separate exist-*
ence—as one is *inseparably annexed* to the other. You
 say also, that they *propose to form themselves into one*
state for their mutual benefit. I doubt much that they
 do. The British Minister may propose it, and re-
 commend it to us; but the British and Irish nations
 are not fully convinced that this *incorporation* will be
 for their *mutual benefit*. In the hypothesis of their
 having a *separate existence*, I have shewn that the in-
 convenience which has arisen to Ireland, has been re-
 cent, partial and temporary, and that we possess
 power enough to remedy the evil. In order to get
 rid of this *inconvenience*, are we to adopt a much
 greater one? In order to secure ourselves against the
 inconvenience of the rebellion that does not exist,
 and which, if it ever occurs again, which God avert!
 may happen as well in the time of *union*, as in the
 time of *separation*, are we to *surrender our Legislature,*
 and

and *annihilate our independence*? Is not this an *inconvenience*? Yes; it is a calamitous inconvenience. Every misery has been entailed on the countries who have surrendered their independence. What nation can boast of such generosity, as to have returned back that freedom and independence it had borrowed for a while from another nation, to whom it had been inconvenient? We have seen what kind of an inconvenience Ireland feels from a supposed *separate existence*. What *inconvenience* does Great Britain seem to feel from the same? The British nation has not complained, as I can learn. They have had no meetings on the subject; nor has it been discussed publicly. It must be the British Minister that complains. It is inconvenient to him to attend to two Legislatures; he has too much business on hands: to manage and maintain the strange alliance of the Ottoman Porte with the Court of Russia; to unite old and inveterate enemies, the Greeks and Turks; to subsidize one or both; to rouse up Naples; win over the vacillating King of Prussia, and kick up the balance, by throwing a new and weighty subsidy into the scale. These, and many other affairs, with the very weighty business of the British nation, are sufficient to employ the mighty descendant of the more mighty and illustrious Chatham. The management of Irish affairs will be handed over to the Executive, who will have a strong military force in the country. We well know there is not much trouble in managing affairs in the military department; every thing goes on there like clock-work. The revenue also can be managed without much trouble. But in Legislatures, there are to be found sometimes troublesome, dissatisfied persons, who give opposition to some of the Minister's plans. Therefore too many must be very troublesome—besides they are at times disagreeable things; but we Commoners will have 100 members in the British Legislature. Yes, I can see

see a convenience to the Minister in this too: they will help to disjoint the meat for the Minister that he may carve it with more dexterity, and very probably they may advise the Minister to send over the bones to us to pick, and by the time they reach us, they will be both bare and marrowless.

“ Such is the question of Union, than which no question can be devised more fit for sober and philosophical argument.” Page 2.

True; and I hope no other kind of *argument* will be introduced; if not, I fear not for the rejection of this bold measure; but sometimes we see introduced *powdered arguments* not dressed up in the philosopher's study, and also a kind of *sharp pointed arguments*, which are of some weight in pushing forward a *question* between nation and nation.

Again—“ Every independent society or state has a right, consistent with its existing duties and obligations, to propose the means which appear most probable for the attainment of the happiness of its people.”

Does this argument prove that by the adoption of an *Union*, the people can best attain their happiness? I hope I have already proved that it would be, at best, a very doubtful remedy; and that before I close this subject, I will prove fully that it is at least the most improbable means for either attaining or securing the *happiness of the people*. If a state or society is independent, has it not within itself the means of attaining its own happiness? Why not have as good means as another independent state? If one independent state has not these means within itself, where is the certainty that another independent state will have the means of attaining the happiness of both states together? If there is a difficulty in the one case, is it not double in the second? Perhaps one of the states may possess *præter natural* means; it may be a favourite state with heaven. There was a favourite state of this kind
once,

once, but we know of none now. The Jews we are told were once the chosen people of God. But at this day I will not be so unreasonable as to ask any gentleman to shew me the chosen people of God; it would be as difficult to find such a people as the *philosopher's stone* of the antients. Even the Jews themselves were not too fond of sharing their means of happiness with other nations, though as being inspired by God, and having a direct communication with the Deity, we must suppose them to have possessed more generosity and more disinterestedness than is the portion of some nations at this day.

Again—"Every independent society or state has a right, consistent with its existing duties and obligations to propose, &c. in other words an *Union*."

Ireland as an *independent society* has *duties and obligations*, consistent with which it can not, it has no *right to propose means* that will most probably, if not most certainly, subvert that very independence it is its greatest *duty* to maintain. Its most material duties and obligations flow from its independence.

Let Ireland surrender her independence, her duties and obligations will follow the same fate. Will any duty or obligation remain with poor Ireland? Yes; one single, solitary duty will remain, or rather she will be under the necessity of tamely submitting to the will of a British Minister, and his satellites. The Prætorian band then may dictate duties and obligations to Ireland. This seems to appear so evident to the learned advocate for an *Union*, that fearing lest we may be startled at the idea of an *Union*; he takes great pains, he strains every logical art within his compass, to shew us it is not so frightful an object. You are accustomed to look on this thing of an *Union* as a *monstrum, ingens, horrendum, nefas*, says he; but I will endeavour to shew you that instead of looking on it with such horror, it is a fit subject for discussion. That it is a fit subject for discussion for the British Minister

Minister I have no doubt ; but that it is a fit subject for the People of Ireland to discuss, more particularly at this period, is not so certain. The Prime himself may have discussed it already, and drawn very satisfactory conclusions ; these very tattered fragments of reasoning I am now answering, are, perhaps, the effusions of his own brain, which he has sent over here to be fine-drawn. Do not be surprized at my having dwelt so much on the two first pages of this Pamphlet. The second page contains two *propositions*, as famous for their plausibility and ingenuity as the propositions of Secretary Orde were infamous in every respect ; I thought therefore too much care could not be taken to guard my country against the fallacy of these arguments. Besides, these general arguments being laid down as *premises*, on which the most part of the reasoning that follows, is founded ; I do hope, that by exposing the weakness of them, and banishing the mist from before their eyes, Irishmen will be better enabled to see the fallhood of the conclusions drawn from them. Gazing on this mighty and shewy fabric of an Union, and being cautioned against the manifold flaws in the foundation, and the weakness of it, it is to be hoped my countrymen will avoid this monstrous building, which by tumbling on them might crush them to atoms.

We have not done yet with the Propositions ; another will be found at the bottom of the second page ; but will not detain us long. “ If it appears
 “ probable that such happiness can best be attained
 “ by remaining in its present state, separate and in-
 “ dependent of any other country ; separation and
 “ independence ought to be maintained at all ha-
 “ zards.” Grant all this, though I have shewn
 already that Ireland is not a state separate from, and
 independent of Great Britain. The second part of
 this same disjunctive proposition is this—“ If it ap-
 “ pears probable, that such happiness can best be
 “ attained

“ attained by a federal or incorporate Union with
 “ another country, such an Union ought to be the
 “ national object.” You may fancy the federal
 Union of any two countries in the moon you please.
 But I have shewn that an Union between Great
 Britain and Ireland would not in all probability be a
 means of attaining the happiness of Ireland; nor is it
 probable that it will contribute to the happiness of
 England, as I hope to shew hereafter; and you your-
 self have at least acquiesced, as I have also shewn, in
 the idea, that such an *incorporation* would be the
annihilation of our *independence*. Here end the three
 famous propositions which are to be seen in the second
 and part of the third page; these may be fairly called
 general arguments; indeed they are too general, and
 have nothing particular in them that can relate to
 the particular question before us, although the writer
 has given great proofs of generalship in the manage-
 ment of them, which obliged me to reconnoitre the
 force of his arguments more fully, and shew that their
 strength consisted in manœuvering, so that the public
 must now see it was the dexterity of this logical ge-
 neral, that concealed the weakness of his arguments;
 and I trust now he finds himself out-manœuvred by
 a logician not so ingenious as himself, but probably
 more disinterested. I am now come to a few particu-
 lar arguments drawn from the conduct of particu-
 lar countries. “ When the Seven United Provinces,
 “ being cruelly oppressed by the Spanish Govern-
 “ ment, separated from that Government, in order
 “ to escape from tyranny, and to secure liberty and
 “ happiness, they acted according to right, in de-
 “ claring and establishing their independence.” Most
 undoubtedly; and therefore I will recommend to
 those who are supposed to enjoy independence, to
 maintain it, as the high road to liberty and happiness.
 The gentleman argues for me, who has introduced
 the conduct of the Seven United Provinces. I ap-
 plaud

plaud his candour, but cannot admire his judgment in introducing this argument. It proves too much; at least more than I require; I am assured by it, that if Ireland is, at any time, oppressed by the English Government, it may separate from it, in order to escape from tyranny. I suppose and allow, with Mr. C. that Ireland would be as willing to shake off the yoke of tyranny as the United Provinces were; if ever she should be oppressed. But as Ireland does not complain of oppression, I do not see the wisdom of proving by precedent that she has a *right* to shake off oppression and tyranny. Since I am informed of this *right*, I will ask what right did the Seven United Provinces exercise? The right of *declaring* and *establishing their independence*. For what purpose did they exercise it? To secure their *liberty* and happiness. Ireland, then will I say, maintain you your independence, because it secures your liberty and happiness; at least, that portion of liberty and happiness which you derive from your connexion with Great Britain; because if you once surrender this independence, this security of your liberty and happiness, it may cost you as much blood to recover it, as it did the *United Provinces* to *declare* and *establish* it, though you should be *cruelly oppressed by your Government*, which is not impossible, and it is utterly impossible to recover independence without the shedding of blood, and a great deal of it—Yes, blood, would flow in streams, nay rivers; oceans of blood might flow from the gashly wounds of your devoted countrymen fighting to regain their *independence*:—Avert such an evil, good God! and preserve unborn generations from such havoc and destruction! In case this nation freely and unanimously surrenders its independence, I recommend perfect submission to the greater nation without murmuring, to avoid the calamitous consequences of revolt and rebellion, I would have our children, to the third and fourth generation regularly instructed in the arts

of submission and obedience, but I am afraid all would be in vain. A nation who has once tasted the sweets of liberty and independence, does not easily banish the flavour of them from her thoughts, In truth England might reap less benefit from the surrender of Irish independence, than it does now from the connexion of Ireland. Ireland, even in the case of a free surrender of its liberty, would soon repent, would become uneasy, restless and troublesome to England in endeavouring to recover her independence. Great Britain would be obliged then to annihilate the People with their independence, or to abandon it entirely, as they have abandoned Corfica, and St. Domingo; and leave the half-starved nation of Ireland to heal the wounds it must have received in the bloody contest for liberty and independence, after having been itself at a prodigious loss both in men and money.

The United Provinces certainly exercised a right, when separating from the Spanish Government, and as certainly this matter of right was likewise a matter of choice; that is, this separation from their Government was, to use Mr C.'s own honest expressions, (see page 2) "the result of conviction, and produced "satisfaction." Was this the case with the Sabines uniting with the Romans? The following words of the Author himself convince me that this Union of the Sabines was not the effect of choice; ("was not "determined on its merits," page 2, line 2d.)

Here they are, "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 increasing their liberty,
 "their happiness, and their power; they acted ac-
 "cording to the principles of reason and right, in
 "relinquishing their separate independency as a state,
 "and by their Union laid the foundation of Roman
 "greatness."

When did the Sabines unite with the Romans?
 When she could not avoid it. This was a matter of
 necessity.

necessity. Are we bound by this precedent? No, says the Author himself, (page 2, line 2d and 5th) necessity precludes and despises discussion and a determination on the *merits* of the cause; the Romans forced the Sabines to an Union, therefore the adoption of it could not be the result of *conviction*, nor could such an Union *produce satisfaction*, neither would an Union between Great Britain and Ireland, on this principle *produce satisfaction*. But says he, (page 3, line 5.) “ They acted according to the principles of reason
 “ and right, in relinquishing their separate indepen-
 “ dence as a state,” I answer in the negative. No state is justifiable in *relinquishing* its separate independence if not forced by the imperious command of necessity as the Sabines were. Notwithstanding they
 “ saw, that by uniting with them, they had an op-
 “ portunity of increasing their liberty, their happiness and their power.” I cannot find she could then *see an opportunity of increasing*, &c. But Mr. C. may have in his possession glasses of a more magnifying nature than those used by the Sabines, which enable him to see more than they could. Optic glasses have been improved greatly since the time of the Sabines. But the historical glass, the only one we can apply to this object does not lay before us a view of the *increased liberty, happiness, and power* of the Sabines after their Union with the Romans. How could they increase their *liberty and happiness* when they surrendered their *power*? And how could they increase their *power*, when they surrendered their *independency*? They enjoyed the *liberty* of sending their children and relatives to swell the Roman armies, and fight Roman battles. They had the happiness of being governed by Roman officers; and they had the power once or twice in a century, to complain of a plundering Proconsul, or a pillaging Questor. This was great *power, true happiness, and splendid liberty!* Rejoice, O ye Sabines, in the increase of your liberty, happiness, and power; but alas! you no longer exist as a
 D 2 nation;

nation; nor did you long survive the surrender of your independence. Your People melted away in the Roman armies; their bones were left bleaching on the fields Roman greatness and Roman ambition did invade; or they drudged a base existence in the service of the Roman Knights. Who took possession of the Sabine country—who fattened on the land? The Roman colonists, the adventurers who followed their friends, the Pro-consuls, the Pro-prætors, the Questors, &c. &c. If any of these tribes asked for an office, an employment, he was a Roman, he could not be refused. They did not even hesitate to ask for a good farm. We may well apply here the language of Horace, talking of a gentleman casting an eye on his neighbour's farm. *O si angulus illemibi.**

Mr. Knight, says a Roman follower, that Farm belonging to that Sabine fellow, would answer men, and I'll ask no other payment from you. Perhaps they had no leases at that time; if they had such things, they were no interruption to the benevolence of one Roman to another. Truly, says the Roman Knight, and the plundering Appius was a Roman, we must give you Romans the preference; these Sabines are a sturdy race of mortals, and we must endeavour to weed them out of the country. It would be too hard a task for me to shew that the Roman Knight himself came by the Sabine estate honestly, and that he did not paddle in the corrupt conduct of the Roman Governor. Any part of this charge cannot apply to Great Britain, who displayed her magnanimity and love of justice in endeavouring, at a vast expence, to bring to condign punishment the great and wealthy Hastings, late Pro-consul or Governor in India, who stood accused of enormities of various kinds, said to have been committed in that colony.

* The English were jealous also of strangers from France. "Every office and command was bestowed on these unprincipled strangers, whose avarice and rapacity were exceeded only by their pride and insolence."

colony. I have heard a gentleman say during the trial, *parturiunt montes nascetur ridiculus mus*—the mountain is in labour, and will bring forth a mouse; but I was happy to find, for the honour of humanity and of the British name, that Warren Hastings was declared innocent by his country. I had nearly forgotten the Sabine argument I was answering—let us return to it, and take a view of the last line; it is a complete answer to the rest: “And by their Union, laid the foundation of *Roman* greatness.” Is there a word here of *Sabine* greatness? No; it is *Roman* greatness that was raised on the foundation—of what? Sabine servitude, and dependency; because the Sabines *relinquished their independency as a state*. Their independency obstructed the building of Roman greatness—it was a kind of rubbish that should be cleared away before the foundation of Roman greatness could have been laid. Should not this be a warning for us? Are we to lay the foundation of British greatness, on the ruins of Ireland? No; the Seven United Provinces preferred to oppression and tyranny the destruction that seemed to await them, by opposing a very powerful kingdom, and by persevering valour and love of liberty, astonished the world by their glorious success in declaring and establishing their independence; and they acted according to *right*. The Sabines united with the Romans, because they could not maintain themselves any longer. They made a virtue of necessity, and surrendered what they could not maintain—their independence. Much blame cannot attach to them—they could not well do otherwise; but surely much blame must attach to that nation which voluntarily surrenders its independence. We are not in the same predicament the Sabines were in. The English are not harrassing and tormenting us; we are not at war with Great Britain. Rome was an open-mouthed monster, ready to devour the neighbouring states, if they did not submit to her will. England, generous England, did not seek to subdue

us. She has been content with annexing our kingdom to hers. She is, we are told, our sister; therefore we are in perfect amity with her. We do not dread her violence; she is too just to use any. Since she has agreed to leave us our independence, let us keep it; let us not part with it but by compulsion. If we should be so mad as to surrender our independence freely and voluntarily, and with our eyes open commit suicide, Great Britain herself might one day lawfully sit on us as our jury, and without leaving the box, bring in a verdict of lunacy, and posterity would approve of the sentence. Notwithstanding all I have said, Mr. C. says, "This reasoning, and these instances, form a complete answer to all the declamation on the common topics of national dignity, and national pride." Altho' I have before answered this paragraph, give me leave to ask where is his *reasoning*? and where are his *instances* now? Do they both form a complete answer to my declamation, as he may call it, or rather to my argumentation on *national dignity* and *national pride*? If by dignity and pride he will understand, as they are vague terms, *liberty* and *independence*, his terms *national dignity* and *national pride*, are as vague as I trust I have made the preceding *reasoning* and *instances* appear to those who have followed me in my reasoning, and in the instances I have adduced. It seems that *national dignity* and *national pride* are introduced as an imputation of folly on Ireland for attempting to ape after such high terms. I think I see them attended with a sneer. If they have any meaning, why should not an independent nation, as you say Ireland is, use them, without being cried down as *common topics of declamation*. If they have no meaning, Great Britain, who makes frequent use of them, may keep them to herself. Perhaps the gentleman means this, by his sneering language: Ireland, you are independent, it is true; but your *national dignity* and *national pride* are
common

common topics of declamation. Give up your independence to Great Britain, and she will sweep away from before you these common topics of declamation, and all other stuff of the kind. Turn the other side of the picture, the author's meaning will wear the same face. Ireland, though you are independent, you cannot boast of true national dignity, or true national pride; surrender but your independence to us, and then you shall enjoy national dignity and national pride. This is reasoning, and these are promises I am not disposed to attend much to, between nation and nation. The Fox has been always cautious of trusting too much to the generosity of the Lion. By what further *reasoning* are we encouraged to incorporate with Great Britain? By the example of the unfortunate countries that have been subdued by France, and obliged to incorporate with her, in order to lay the *foundation of French or Directorial greatness*, as the Sabines, by their incorporation with Rome, laid the foundation of Roman greatness. "Supposing, says the paragraphist, page 8, there were no other reasons which render the Union of the sister kingdoms desirable, the state of Europe, and especially of France, seems to dictate its peculiar policy at the present day." We cannot be surprized at any thing at the present day, when we behold the virtuous Minister of Great Britain metamorphosed into an advocate for French plundering systems, and French plans of *incorporation*. *The state of France rendering absolutely dependent on her will almost all the smaller states which surround her, is an example of peculiar policy for us to adopt!* You who with your Syren voice have charmed your country into a war with unprincipled France; you who have not spared men or money, and even subsidized your allies with the money of an heavily taxed Empire, to stop them in their infamous career of incorporating and subduing nations; you, who have so often in

nervous

nervous and pathetic terms, reprobated this vile conduct—you seem inclined to follow the same system, and incorporate Ireland with Great Britain, and subject her to the *will* of Great Britain, and perhaps to your own! Take care; classical gentlemen may apply to you this Latin phrase, when you are accusing the French Directory—*Clodius accusat mæchos, Catilina Cæbegum*; because “ Geneva, Savoy, all “ the Austrian provinces in Flanders, and all the “ German states on this side of the Rhine,” have submitted to the will of France, is Ireland to submit to the will of Great Britain? The same necessity does not exist; these smaller states yielded to the power of French arms. England has not turned her arms against Ireland. She will not run the risk of a contest, because she receives all the reasonable assistance she can expect from her sister Ireland; and she might not be as successful in the incorporating system, as France has been. If we examine history, we shall scarcely see, at one time, two, what are called great nations, but what I take the liberty to call robbing, plundering nations, both remarkably successful in the infamous system of aggrandizement and incorporation at the expence of the neighbouring states. The Almighty, in his wrath, thinks one such scourge sufficient at one time; and when his anger is appeased, he will pull this mighty nation herself, and in her turn she will be punished for her wickedness, and scourged by some other great nation. *Sic transit gloria mundi*. Thus the glory and greatness of nations aggrandizing themselves, by enslaving, robbing, and plundering the smaller states which surround them, may be compared to smoke rising in a mighty voluminous body, and vanishing in the air. It is to be lamented, and yet history records it, that nations seldom think themselves bound by the sacred obligations of morality, in their engagements with one another; and to find them act towards one another,

another, in direct opposition to morality, is very common; yet such conduct amongst individuals, subjects them to the censure of their neighbours, and at times to punishment, when the law of the land is violated. Keep in view this difference of conduct between states and individuals—it will serve as a telescope, by which you cannot fail to see the incongruity of two similes, introduced by my adversary to recommend an Union, which is said in the first to resemble a partnership in trade (see page 5); in the second comparison, Ireland is portrayed as an uneducated son, &c. sent by his father into well-educated company (pages 7 and 8). I shall follow, step by step, as usual, and begin with the first comparison. “An Union may be compared to a partnership in trade.” How is it possible the art of man could devise such a comparison? Indeed, comparisons are apt to mislead the unwary; therefore let us examine it. When one man enters into partnership with another, they both enter into a covenant on certain terms, and there is a controuling power over both; the law will bind both to the performance of the contract. If one is aggrieved, he appeals to the law of the land, and he gets redress. Is it so with the partnership of an Union? No; there may be an agreement between the two nations. They may consent to an Union; but who will guarantee the performance of the contract? where is the controuling power? There is none. The stronger nation may cheat and defraud its partner, the weaker power. Where will the latter power apply for redress? I can find no other judge to decide the matter, but the conscience of the superior power, who, having had the conscience to cheat, and defraud, and violate the contract in the first instance, will have the conscience to judge in her own favour, and continue the fraud. This is a pretty partnership! Ireland enters into partnership with Great Britain. Ireland is the weaker power—particularly

cularly weak is Ireland, poor Ireland, when she surrenders her Legislature to Great Britain. Our Legislature is the only security we now have for the performance of a contract, already entered into with Great Britain; who wishes now to enter into another contract, and says, I have made a contract with you already, for the performance of which your Legislature has been held by you as a pledge: Give up this pledge to me, and I will enter into another contract with you, for which you shall have no pledge. Must not I, as an Irishman, suspect this language? It is vain for the British Minister to tell me we want no pledge, and equally vain is it for any one to tell me that we have a pledge in British faith. I would recommend to my countrymen, not to be the means, by their folly, of tempting Great Britain, or any other nation on the earth, to violate their faith in a matter of such importance. The present Minister and Government of Great Britain may be sincere; but who will answer for the virtue, morality and good faith of a succeeding Ministry and Government? This partnership account being settled, let us take a view of the comparison of the uneducated son. Pages 7 and 8—"If any person has a son uneducated, unimproved, and injured by bad habits, and bad company, in order to remedy these imperfections, would it not be his endeavour to establish him in the best societies, and introduce him into the most virtuous, the most polished, and the most learned company? And if he could once reconcile him to such companies, and teach him to relish their conversation, would he not be certain of his son's improvement, and of his finally turning out to his credit and satisfaction?" This is a more plausible comparison than the former; but there is no parity between an uneducated son, sent into good company for improvement, and the inalienable treasure of Irish independence, handed over to Great Britain to be lost and

and abandoned for ever. Suppose Ireland to be the father, and Independence his son (putting the breeches imported from England on her for a while, as it will give her a masculine appearance) Mr. C. would advise the father to send the son, Independence, who is uneducated, and has got bad habits in Ireland, to be apprenticed to the wealthy firm of Great Britain, where he will learn, become polite, and grow rich. In this case the father would answer—he is an only son, and I will not let him go so far out of my sight, where, among the good qualities you mention, Mr. C. he might also learn this other quality, which you Englishmen possess in an eminent degree, that of despising me, poor Ireland, his father, and forgetting to return to me again. He might be taught also to leave me comfortless, and in a measure fatherless, without enjoying the satisfaction of having him even at my last hour, to close my eye-lids, wearied with the longing desire of seeing my dear child, Independence. The father, who sends his uneducated son into good company, has every reason to expect improvement of his son; but Ireland has no reason to expect her Independence will improve, by paying her respects to the British Minister, or the British Flag. The learned, good company, the virtuous men have no interest in impeding the improvement of the vicious son, moreover there is a certainty that they will take pride and pleasure in his improvement. Who in his senses will say the independence of Ireland will improve, by being transferred to Great Britain? Where is the certainty of it? Few nations have ever been so magnanimous as to improve the independence of another country subjected to their will, as Ireland unavoidably must be when she surrenders her Legislature. “Your Legislature, says Great Britain to Ireland, is an uneducated son, unimproved, and injured by bad habits, and bad company. To remedy these imperfections, send

over your child into the *most virtuous, most polished, and most learned company* of our Legislature. *We will reconcile him to our company, and we will teach him to relish our conversation.* Then you will be certain of your son's improvement, and *finally* he will *turn out to your credit and satisfaction.*" What may Ireland maintain in answer to this? If my child, the Legislature, has been *injured by bad habits* and bad company, whose bad company has he kept, and from whom has he imbibed these bad habits? Who has corrupted this Legislature, if it is corrupted? The British Minister most certainly. If then he has taught my son to keep bad company at home; if he has injured him by bad habits immediately before my eyes; is it not probable that he will teach him to keep worse company, and that he will be injured with worse habits, when removed from my sight, and under the influence and controul of so debauched and profligate a tutor as you seem to acknowledge the British Minister to be, will he inculcate better morals into my son abroad, than he has done at home? Are the morals and manners of the British Legislature influenced by this good moral tutor? If so, I will not trust to a British Minister, who, in one hand, holds out a bait to corrupt the morals of my son, and has actually tainted him with bad principles, though he should feast my eyes with pye-crusts and promises; in the other hand, inviting me to consign over my son into his care, in order to be improved. My son's mind, will Ireland say, has been already poisoned by your instructions; I should doubt much the efficacy of any remedy you would prescribe for his *imperfections*. No, I will not apply to that wretched physician to cure my son with a cup of the Balm of Gilead, who has already helped him to a cup of poison.—Having proved there is no parity between the uneducated son, and the unimproved Legislature of Ireland, I will now shew that supposing a resemblance to exist between

between the two, the comparison of the uneducated son, introduced in page 7 of Mr. C.'s Pamphlet, is not in itself founded. It is not true that a person inured to bad habits, and bad company, uneducated, and unimproved, will always become improved, virtuous and learned, by frequenting the most virtuous, the most learned, and most polite companies. He must possess an extraordinary genius, and abound in the milk of human kindness (two qualities not commonly found in one person), if he does. Something else must be done for the unfortunate boy; unfortunate will he be in all human probability, if he is thus left to chance. This society is not interested sufficiently in the improvement of the boy. Every virtuous society is not bound to improve every boy that comes into company. This company is passively virtuous. It requires an actively virtuous person to counteract the poisonous effects of bad habits and bad customs; to substitute learning for ignorance, and politeness for barbarity. Besides the advantage of good company, a wise, virtuous, zealous, and learned tutor must be looked for, who will have a strong interest in the improvement of the boy. Besides the pleasure of doing good, such a person will be influenced by the motives of reward and punishment, to great exertions in behalf of the boy. If he succeeds, the father, the family, and the boy himself, will care for him, and be bountiful to him. If he does not succeed, he may meet with displeasure from the family, and may expect reproach and shame. Something more than good company is therefore wanting to this boy. But what will become of him, if he is handed over to a proud, immoral preceptor? He will become callous, seasoned in iniquity, and deaf to the voice of mankind and their reproaches. Here I discover a similitude with regard to Ireland. What will become of her independence, uneducated, unimproved, &c. &c. as it is supposed to be, if it is handed over
to

to a proud, corrupt statesman, as he is supposed to be, when he is allowed to have introduced our Legislature, the uneducated son, into bad company, &c. ? Shall I tell you ? The Legislature of Ireland, or rather the fragment that will remain, will be removed from the voice of her constituents ; or if she should once in seven years be assailed by their reproaches, she will be deaf to them ; she will wallow in the mire of English corruption ; she will learn to relish the conversations of English prejudice ; she will not only be incorporated, but she will be identified with Great Britain ; and she will learn to forget and despise Ireland. I know some gentlemen who have been educated in Great Britain, and who have returned to this country poisoned with all the prejudices of that country against Ireland, and who, in the teeth of the inhabitants of the country, their own relatives perhaps, will cry down every thing that is Irish. He does not relish Irishmen, or Irish manners ; he regrets Oxford, Cambridge, and Eton. It will take years to reconcile him to Irish beef, Irish mutton, and particularly Irish potatoes. And who is he ? Will one ask ? He is an Irishman, who has spent a few years in Great Britain. This is British education ; no doubt it is to be admired by the people of Ireland. What interest will he take in the liberties and privileges of Ireland, who, thus initiated, will put himself, or be put by the people, under the tutorship of the British Minister ? He will be confirmed in his prejudices against his native country, by the rewards that will be held out to him, to exercise his talents in the Ministerial way. It is very probable that all who may expect to become Hibernico-Anglico Legislators, or Irish Legislators in England, will not be born and bred in Ireland. They must not walk into the British Legislature with an Irish brogue ; they may be cradled in Ireland ; they must be hurled into a British nursery ; they may be nursed in Ireland ;

land; they must be taught the horn-book in England. Indeed some may owe their title to become Irish Legislators, to the bare, naked circumstance of birth. I will take the liberty of introducing here the smiling language of a pleasant, eminent Barrister, Mr. O'Grady, who appears to be a candid, honest man, when talking at the meeting of the Bar, on the subject of the Union, one gentleman avowed himself an Englishman; another said he was an Irishman, but if his *English predecessors* had not come over to this country in the company of an English army, he might have been an Englishman. It is not impossible but a wily Minister may hereafter prevail on officers' wives to accompany their husbands to Ireland when in a thriving state, that they may favour the Irish with patterns of Irish Legislators.

The argument of the Heptarchy is somewhat plausible; let us analyse it, and see what it is composed of.

“ England was formerly divided into seven kingdoms, which were continually engaged in predatory wars with each other, and the island was a general scene of confusion and barbarism.” The seven kingdoms were constantly at war. Is Ireland at war with Great Britain? No; therefore no occasion for such an Union. Are the two islands *general scenes of confusion*? No; they are both at peace with each other—therefore no such Union is necessary. Who united the seven kingdoms? A wise and sagacious Prince. Were they invited to a discussion on the subject, as we are nobly and generously invited now? Did they determine on its merits, as we hope we shall be allowed to do now? No; he united them himself; he saved them the trouble of discussion, perhaps because he knew that barbarians were not capable of discussing any thing. Might not the wisdom and sagacity of this Prince have been tinged with ambition? He saw them continually engaged in plundering each other; the whole island was in
confusion,

confusion, and in a state of barbarism. He was wise, sagacious, and a little ambitious; he took advantage of their miserable situation, and united them. I cannot avoid comparing this wise, sagacious Prince, to the gentleman, who seeing two countrymen, in a state of barbarism, I should suppose, quarrel about an oyster, told them he would decide the matter, and unite them both in the bonds of friendship and peace. He actually did so. He opened the oyster, eat the fish, and divided the shells between them. The barbarians went home, no doubt perfectly reconciled and happy. The judge, in this case, they say, was a lawyer, and truly he was both wise and sagacious. I am asked now, "Did the People of the Heptarchy lose their independence by this Union?" I answer the advocate for an Union, they did. They could not maintain their separate independence against one another; they were barbarians; they surrendered it to a wise, and sagacious Prince. This wise, sagacious Prince, may not have profited of the folly of these barbarians, as other Princes would have done. Perhaps the Turkish Emperor, or the amiable Catherine of Russia, if in his place, would have endeavoured to become absolute Monarchs, and reduce them to perfect slavery. From the despotic conduct of succeeding Princes, the People lost their independence, and the awful page of history traces, in bloody characters, the bloody conflicts that have existed between Prince and People. There were times in history, when it was considered by surrounding nations a disgrace to be an Englishman, as it is said that the English think it a disgrace to be an Irishman, since the late rebellion. The English were successful against their tyrannical Princes; they recovered their independence at the expiration of many years. Their long servitude proceeded from the unnatural Union of kingdoms so inimical to each other. Their animosities, their pre-
judices,

dices, the difference of their customs, habits, manners, and *local regulations*, were played against themselves, as so many engines to divide and enslave them. If it took ages to reconcile the different kingdoms of the Heptarchy to one another, though small, and connected together within one island not very large, how many ages will it require to reconcile perfectly to one another, two islands totally unconnected, and divided by that great liquid barrier which Heaven has placed between them; the inhabitants of whom differ widely in their manners, habits, and *local regulations*? I am asked again, "Was a Mercian degraded by becoming an Englishman?" I will ask, in my turn, would an American be degraded by becoming an Englishman? There is evidently more analogy between America and Ireland, in the present question, than between Mercia and Ireland. America is an independent state; so is Ireland (at least in the arguments of my adversary). Mercia was not independent—she could not keep so, or she surrendered thro' ignorance. Being in a state of barbarism, Mercia and the other states, were always at war. Though barbarous they knew they could be happier; they enjoyed a precarious, doubtful independence (if the hostile, barbarous state they were in, can deserve this name). But this barbarous independence did not give them peace; and being disposed towards peace, and tired of war, they surrendered this separate existence, for it could not be independence for an united existence is Ireland, an island in itself, not engaged in *predatory wars* with England, both islands not being a *general scene of confusion and barbarism*; for which strong expressions, I am thankful to my antagonist, to follow the example of Mercia, and the other barbarous and uncivilized states. Moreover, Great Britain and Ireland are *not separate hostile societies, destructive of themselves and others*, as Mercia and the other states were; and how are you told the seven kingdoms were

F

united?

united? In the two last lines of this Heptarchic argument, it is said, that they were associated and united under *one regimen, one code of government, and one sovereignty*. This kind of Union we enjoy already. We are united *under one regimen, one government, and one sovereignty*; but another kind of Union is demanded; that is, an *incorporation*. We have united with Great Britain, because we thought it our advantage. We do not wish to *incorporate*; we think it will be a great disadvantage not only to us, but to Great Britain herself. We have done enough; more would be the annihilation of what independence we have reserved for ourselves, by the articles of the former Union. The loss of our independence will only contribute to increase her false pride and vain glory, without any solid advantage to, Great Britain. The Premier will have the advantage of launching out into more expenditure and extravagance, because his folly will be less glaring, when the burthen is divided between two nations instead of one. The many other advantages he may expect to reap from this Union, to the injury of both countries, will be pointed out hereafter.

“ We might extend this reasoning, were it not too obvious both to Wales and Scotland.” I will agree with this learned gentleman; and I will take the liberty of telling this gentleman to consult his conscience, and inform the world what glorious consequences of an Union he has observed in these two countries, poor Wales and poor Scotland—*fas est et ab hoste doceri*.

“ How, continues he, is a Welchman degraded, “ by being represented in the British Parliament?” A proud and mighty Lord, may not think a gentleman *degraded*, by being in his service, and subject to his will. The British Parliament may think any nation honoured, by a seat in their august assembly, even at the expence of their independence. So did the

the Roman Senate, that mighty and august assembly, though their pride, and vanity, and ambition, are now under foot, and buried with Roman greatness. This term *degraded*, is a very *abstract* term. I am not surpris'd at it. We were told in the beginning, that a view of the question would be taken in the *abstract*; but as questions in the abstract, are questions in the Moon, if not applied to the debate, let us make the application, and meet the question fairly. Was there ever a time when a Welchman thought he would be degraded, by being represented in a British Parliament? Did a Welchman ever fight against a Briton, to avoid this honour? For what purpose did Lewellyn, the Welch General, oppose the vigorous and warlike King Edward; a General very experienced, and somewhat ambitious? Here, after extorting submission from the Welch Prince, the King retired; but an idle prophecy, in which it was foretold by Merlin, that Lewellyn was to be the restorer of Brutus's empire in Britain, was an inducement sufficiently strong to persuade this Prince to revolt once more, and hazard a decisive battle against the English.—Golds. 72. Hist. Eng.

Did not a Welchman then think it a greater advantage to his country, to be represented in a Welch Parliament? The next question is not an abstract one; but it is a staggering one—it frightens me: “How is a Scot enslaved, by becoming a Briton?” Perhaps if I should tell a Scot how he is enslaved, by becoming a Briton, an English judge, in Scotland, might, with the testimony of one witness, find me guilty of high treason. This question resembles a strong battery; it would be imprudent to face it; let us endeavour to undermine it. Would a Scot think himself more free, by not being a Briton? What choice would he make, if he was allowed a cool, temperate discussion, without any interference of the military? Would the Scotch prefer a Scotch to a

British Parliament? Now I will reverse the medal, and propose a question to be admired by Englishmen: How would a Briton be enslaved, by becoming a Scot? As the Scotch are treated now by the English, so the Scotch would treat the English in their turn, if they had the power. Power, between nations, as between individuals, leads to an abuse of it. “The question (page 5) of forming an Union between two countries, must never be confused with the subjection of one country to another.” This is plausible reasoning in the abstract; but even in the abstract it is not invincible. I assert the very direct contrary, and will prove that *an Union between two countries*, is the *subjection* of one country to another; it is in reality the subjection of the weaker to the stronger power. To what kind of Union is Ireland invited by Great Britain? To the same Union evidently the Sabines were invited by the Romans. What followed this Union? The subjection of the Sabine to the Roman state; for in page 3 of *Arguments for and against*, are to be found these remarkable words: “And by their Union laid the foundation of Roman greatness.” Let us attend to the following words of this remarkable page 5, and it will appear more evident that the Union of Ireland with Great Britain, would be the subjection of Ireland to Great Britain. “The latter (that is, the subjection of one country to another) is supposed to be the result of force; the former (that is, an Union between two countries) of consent.” With the help of these very words, I argue thus: The Union of the Sabines with the Romans, was the *subjection* of the former to the latter; therefore *Union* and *subjection* are synonymous terms. But we are advised to the same *Union* as the Sabines formed, which turned out a *subjection*; therefore we are advised to a *subjection* to Great Britain—and *vice versa*, the Union of the Sabines with the Romans, was the result of force,

force, as proved before—page ; therefore the Sabines became *subject* to the Romans. And Ireland, acting on this principle (which is the principle recommended by the Sabine argument) of an Union, must be forced to an Union; because an *Union* is a *subjection*, and *subjection* is the result of force. But, says the metaphysical advocate, the Union of the Sabines with the Romans, was the *result* of *consent*; therefore it could not be a subjection, &c. Mark with what ingenuity the word *consent* is introduced here. The Sabines gave *consent* to the *Union*. What *consent* did they give? Such a *consent* as a gentleman gives, when surrendering his purse to a robber on the highway; but this *consent* is in itself the *result* of force, and still includes subjection. Having seen that an *Union* is *subjection*, we will now from himself learn the dreadful consequences of *subjection*. “The latter (subjection) is calculated to extinguish the power and independence of one of the parties.” If Ireland is *United* with Great Britain, Ireland is, in all human probability, and to a moral certainty, the party whose power and independence will be extinguished, except some supernatural power interferes, of which we have not many instances in the present day. These are the blessed effects of *subjection*, or, in other words, of an *Union*. “No, says Mr. C. the former (an Union) by the communication of privilege, and union of strength, is supposed to increase the power and independence of both.” If it was any way probable that Ireland could obtain a *communication* of *privilege*, with an *increase* of *power* and *independence*, by an *Union*, I would be a strenuous advocate for such a measure; but these advantages are held out to us as flowing from an Union, to blindfold us, and prevent us from seeing the great advantages that must flow from it to Ireland. Thus I have read of a small, but cunning animal, who, in a contest with one of much greater strength,

strength, would have been devoured by the giant animal, if he had not received very timely assistance from his ingenuity. Having wet his tail, he rolled it in the dust, and with great agility dashed it into the eyes of his adversary, who, being deprived of such useful allies, gave up the contest. Let Ireland not be blind-folded by any ingenuity or sophistry; let her guard against any dust that may be thrown in her eyes—and if she is forced to an Union, let her *not submit, but from necessity*. What is very remarkable, the writer says, in the last line of this metaphysical, ingenious paragraph, “the other (i. e. the “Union may be the object of *choice*.” He does not pretend to say, that it is always the object of *choice*. If it is not then always the object of *choice*, it is sometimes the object of *force*; which concludes for me, and shews that an *Union* may be the object of force, and therefore become *subjection*, which is the result of force. If an *Union* with *Great Britain* should become the *choice* of Ireland, I shall then submit to the will of the nation, hoping that the choice may be universal, unanimous, and uncontrouled; my philosophy will bow obedience to such consent; and if an *Union* should be the *result* of force, I will *submit*, from *necessity*, to the strength and power of *Great Britain*; though if such a disaster should befall Ireland, she will, I must confess, *lay the foundation of British greatness*—and alas! this greatness, meeting with the fate of *Roman greatness*, may one day moulder into dust, with a more rapid pace than it increased, and be annihilated, as probably France herself will one day be, for having robbed and plundered the *neighbouring states*, and *subjected them to her will*. Yes, the rapidity of the fall may be some atonement to Heaven for the enormity of the crime. Yet, strange as it may appear, we are invited to follow the example of *Belgium* and of *Savoy*, and unite with *Great Britain*, as they did with *France*. This

is

is a discovery! this is the *Union* we are to have! Here we must compliment the writer on his candour. Is not this kind of *Union* a *subjection* of *one power to the other*? Can it be said that Belgium, Savoy, &c. is not under the subjection of France? The French Directory has, by the union, gained the power of making laws for these countries thus united; so the English Minister wishes to have the power to make laws to bind Ireland. The Directory have gained the privilege of foreign requisitions, and raising immense contributions in Italy, Switzerland, &c.; so will the British Minister, by an Union with Ireland, obtain *carte blanche* for levying contributions, and ordering requisitions of Irishmen. Shall we, with our eyes open, *incorporate* thus with Great Britain? Was the Union an *object of choice* with the Swiss? Was it an object of choice with the Savoyards? No; they *consented by force*. Neither will it be an object of choice with Ireland, having so much experience and knowledge of other *Unions*, to Unite with Great Britain; because such an *Union* is not a *communication of privilege*, and an *Union of strength*; nor will it *increase the power and independence of both*. There is a similitude between France and Great Britain, as to time: France thought of incorporating and uniting other countries, after having obtained some triumphant victories. Great Britain, after the blazing victory of the Nile, thinks of uniting Ireland with herself. There is a very essential difference likewise between the two. France has made the experiment; Great Britain has it yet to make. France has succeeded; Great Britain may fail in the attempt to unite Ireland to herself. Great Britain is great and powerful by sea; France is the great nation by land. A great maritime power has not the means of subduing the *neighbouring states*, that a great Continental military power, like France, had. Great Britain is much greater, and more powerful, than Ireland; but there

is

is not such a prodigious superiority in Great Britain, that a love of Freedom, and a spirit of Independence, may not overcome, and rouse our countrymen to victory. An *Union* of the People of Ireland can, and may prevent an *Union* with Great Britain, and the *subjection* of Ireland to her ambition. We already enjoy an *Union* with Great Britain. This is the *Union* we ought to have; this *Union* is useful to both countries; this *Union* may be the object of choice—it is the closest *Union* that *two independent countries* can form with any possible degree of safety to their mutual *independence*. The *Union* that now exists may, and must, be called the *maximum* of *Union*—the *ne plus ultra* of the antients. It is critically dangerous to go beyond it one step. If you are invited to a closer kind of *Union*, that is, another kind of *Union*, beware, *latet anguis in herbâ*—there is a snake in the grass. In the witty language of a reverend writer to the Bishop of Cloyne—you may go *farther*, and speed *worse*.

(To be continued.)