



SPECIAL  
COLLECTIONS  
DOUGLAS  
LIBRARY



QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY  
AT KINGSTON  
Presented by

KINGSTON ONTARIO CANADA





AN

A D D R E S S

TO THE

P R E S I D E N T

OF THE

*PROTESTANT ASSOCIATION;*

INCLUDING REMARKS ON

STRICTURES LATELY PUBLISHED

ON THE

STATE AND BEHAVIOUR

OF

ENGLISH CATHOLICS.

---

L O N D O N :

PRINTED FOR R. FAULDER, NEW-BOND-STREET.

M,DCC,LXXXII.

1 (11) 2367 (11) 1

---

A N

A D D R E S S , &c.

---

My Lord,

**W**HEN causes, the most powerful and stimulant, have produced no effect, little surely can be expected from those of inferior energy. The texture of your mind has withstood impressions, at which even Mahomet or the Bohemian Zisca would have recoiled; the sollicitation of friends, the ridicule of opponents, the view of the capital nearly in flames, the execration of citizens, the blood of your followers, and in your own person the terrors of an approaching ignominious  
B death.

death. I omit the pleadings of humanity and of religion ; for their voice, I know, is weak, when *enthusiasm*, with his hand of iron, has barred up every inlet to sensibility. I wish, my Lord, I could break down that tyrant of your nature ; because I do not think, your component elements were originally formed for the work of fanaticism or false zeal. Man indeed, is not the creator of his own dispositions, but the regulation of them is always in his own hands ; unless perhaps it should be true, what an ingenious writer has lately asserted, that we are sent into this world as into a prison, with such inclinations and passions, as we had acquired in some previous state, here to be punished and to be reformed. Though it may solve, not unsatisfactorily, some of the great problems of nature, this however is not the pure metempsychosian doctrine : in this I discover more marks of genuine truth ; and it tells me why a Papist from old impressions,



pressions, may now be to your lordship an object even of involuntary aversion.

There was a time, my Lord, when Scotland was barbarous, inhospitable, and rude. The beneficent hand, which first smoothed its rugged countenance, and humanized its manners, was, I recollect, directed by the influencing principles of the Romish religion; for by the missionaries from that church, you know, were sown the first seeds of cultivation, which have since sprung up so luxuriantly in all parts of Europe. In conducting this early process of necessary reformation, severe discipline was sometimes essentially requisite. There are noxious and untractable characters, on which measures of moderation have no influence. So the wolves which once infested this island, could only be restrained by a total extinction of the species. The mind long retains the recollection of injuries, real or imaginary. Let us then suppose that the souls of our stubborn ancestors,

cestors, *who* or *whatever* they were, are now again risen in modern forms, and it will account for the existence of some very singular characters, which at this day we view with amazement. I leave the application and further illustration of this doctrine to your own ingenuity. It certainly affords ample matter for speculation, and may, if properly pursued, be productive of much good. The *ruffians* (they are so called by the first writer of this country) who two centuries ago *reformed* Scotland, were, I doubt not, originally of that tribe of ferocious animals, which I just mentioned. The breed is not yet extinct.

Et veteris servant vestigia formæ.

You were tried, my Lord, by the laws of your country, and were acquitted. I shall not therefore say you had been guilty of the *crime* with which you were charged. *Treason* is of a peculiar complexion; it, I believe, you had not committed:

mitted : but in any other country, and in this, at any other time, the avenging hand of justice would have reached you. The violated rights of a much injured and insulted public, had a claim which must have been satisfied. You deluded the multitude, and led them into those circumstances from which such tremendous evils ensued.

My Lord, I did expect we should have heard no more of you. I thought you would have retired, in bitterness of heart, to some gloomy cave, congenial with the feelings of a tortured mind ; and that you would never have dared to meet the eye of that public, you had so deeply injured. Yet I have seen you, with all the serene composure of innocence, often tread those very spots, which were hardly cool from the flames you had lighted round them. The calcined materials seemed to curse you.

Your

Your re-appearance, a few months ago, in the great character of *defender of the protestant faith*, was rather curious. I have read that volume you wished to present to the king. If it does really contain the genuine sentiments of the Scottish nation, I vote that the wall of Adrian be instantly rebuilt : a people professing such opinions should be secluded from all intercourse with the rest of mankind. Profess and practise your own religion in all its fullen glooms ; but why molest those, whose ideas of virtue and of Christian duties are more consonant with the general feelings of human nature ? See with *whatever sight* you please, but why compel Englishmen to fall down and adore those phantastic demons, who have no relish but for Scottish worship ?

Your political *Essays*, which begin to crowd the daily prints, are inoffensive, and sometimes not unentertaining. They much resemble those speeches, at which,  
some

some few years ago, the walls of St. Stephen's chapel were often seen to laugh. Go on, my Lord; amuse yourself and the public, when it can be done innocently. But disquisitions, which you improperly term *religious*, are not of that description. They tend to keep alive that fatal enthusiasm, which has bound up the best dispositions of your nature; and on your followers they have a similar effect. I read with pain, a few days ago, an advertisement from the committee of the *Protestant Association*, signed *G. Gordon*. The renewal of ideas which have been once associated with circumstances of horror, must ever prove unpleasant. It seemed a prelude to something more, and I wish to give a timely alarm to those whose duty it is to take care that the republic receive no injury. The neglected spark has often produced a dreadful conflagration. In any other view, and were not apprehension the necessary effect of too recent precedent,

cedent, the advertisement I allude to, is really ludicrous.

After having taken into their *serious consideration*, the affairs of the associations of England and Scotland, the committee proceed to the following resolution.—“ Resolved unanimously, after *deep deliberation* on the distracted state of Ireland, and from the unsettled state of government at home, by the recent change of his Majesty’s ministry, that they think it more adviseable to withhold the pressing inclinations of the friends of the Protestant interest, for a public meeting, until the designs of his majesty’s new ministers, with respect to the desire of the Protestants, for the repeal of the Popery bill in England, can in some degree be ascertained.”

But far within,  
And in their own dimensions like themselves,  
The great seraphic lords and cherubim,  
In close recess, and secret conclave sit.

MILTON.

After

After *deep deliberation!* The importance of the subject required it. You deliberated on the distracted state of Ireland, and on the unsettled state of government at home. May I ask; what part of the Irish business it was, that called up your *deepest* deliberation, and produced the most anxious solicitude for the parent state? Was it the determination of that brave and loyal nation to be free and independent in all the essential rights of subjects? Or was it not rather the view of that generous and noble spirit, which has prompted them to relieve the sufferings of their Popish fellow-citizens? Here, I suspect lay the galling pressure. My Lord, had your souls been susceptible of the expanding influence of that godlike spirit, you had indeed deeply deliberated to some purpose: But there are seasons, when the sun, in his meridian splendor, makes no impression on the frozen regions which roll under him.

C

You

You deliberated on the state of government at home : The features of his Majesty's present ministers were brought out to your inspection. Was there a *deep* physiognomist amongst you ? Did you discover any of those lineaments, which mark the haggard visage of fanaticism and intolerant zeal ; such traits, as would not disgrace a committee-man of the Protestant association ?—No, my Lord, the King's new ministers are not of that description ; nature formed them of her best materials, and in the kindest hour of liberal distribution. Whatever this nation has greatest to boast of, in extent of abilities, liberality of sentiment, love of liberty, and ardour for maintaining the great rights of mankind, is, I believe, in their possession. They are not men for the purposes of Intolerance.

But you mean to wait till the designs of this ministry, with respect to the repeal of the Popery bill, can in some degree



gree be ascertained. Gentle creatures! you do not desire to fish in troubled waters: Like the halcyon you can only build your nests on the smooth surface of the deep! I admire your forbearance. Are then your expectations sanguine? Does the approaching gale, which begins to fan your nostrils, seem loaded with odours of a pleasing fragrancancy; such as an inquisitor inhales, when the helpless victim is burning at the stake? But remember, by whom that bill was originally introduced and supported: Remember, they are in honour bound to maintain their own work, and are partly pledged to carry it to perfection. If Papists continue to merit their protection, they must protect them: To desert them, because you demand it, would be indeed inglorious. Your day, I trust, is passed. My Lord, you were once an inhabitant of the Tower; a second visit to that mansion of dreary solitude may prove more fatal to you. Be cautious. The torpid languour, which be-

numbered the late administration, must be succeeded by energy and active exertion, or the English lion will remain prostrate in the dust for ever.

I understand you mean soon to publish a long chain of resolutions against the proceedings of the German Emperor, and those of the Irish Parliament. Your's is the solicitude of all churches. The step will give dignity to your general operations; and surely nothing can be more contrary to the doctrine of the associated Protestants than the wide principles of Toleration, on which that great business is by them conducted. To engage in the repeal of laws, or the extension of religious liberty, without your previous approbation, was an insult that should rouse resentment! Threaten the deluded Joseph with the vengeance of heaven; if he remain insensible, an army of Scottish crusaders shall be ready to march against him.—In a late edict he dares to say;  
 “ Convinced

“ Convinced that a restraint on men’s consciences cannot but be productive of very prejudicial consequences ; and considering the advantages that will arise to the church and state from a true Christian tolerance, his Imperial Majesty ordains, that all edicts concerning religion be from henceforth annulled, and that in future there be *no distinction between his Catholic and his Protestant subjects*, excepting only in the external splendor of religious worship.”——“ Protestants shall enjoy the rights of free-citizens, and be preferred to all literary dignities and civil employments. They shall not be obliged to take any other oaths, *than such as are conformable to their own religious principles*.——No sort of regard shall be paid to difference of religion in elections or promotions civil and military ; nothing on these occasions shall be attended to, but *the probity, moral character, and abilities of the Candidates*.”

I wonder

I wonder not that you should censure these Imperial edicts. The principles on which they move, are far too large for your Lordship's comprehension; who has yet been able to force a camel through the eye of a needle? The sentiments of Irish Protestants accord with those of the Emperor.—But Papists, you say, profess principles inimical to the civil and religious rights of Englishmen. An Hungarian persecutor would, by a similar argument, justify the oppression of his Protestant neighbour. No, my Lord, the Papists of England hold no such doctrines. From their own conduct and repeated declarations, learn what they really believe and practise. To take their character from the delineations of your association, would be as absurd, as to look for the genuine truths of Christianity in the koran of Mahomet.

If I am often obliged to blush for my country; it is only what I see done by  
every

every man of sentiment amongst us. For whilst other nations, hitherto the most bigotted and intolerant, are expanding under the genial influence of truth and philanthropy, we are retreating into those very shades, from which they have emerged. Whilst the courts of inquisition, those engines of religious tyranny and despotism, are closing in Popish countries, or at least are deprived of all power to hurt, we permit to rise, in the very capital of our empire, a self-created tribunal, whose principles and declarations are as inimical to the common rights of men, as any ever professed by the inquisitorial courts of Madrid or Lisbon.—“ To tolerate Popery, is to be instrumental to the perdition of immortal souls now existing, and of millions of spirits that at present have no existence but in the prescience of God; and is the direct way to provoke the vengeance of a holy and jealous God, and to bring down destruction on our fleets and armies, and ruin on ourselves  
and

and our posterity.”—These are the words of your committee addressed to the people of Great Britain. Such a rhapsody of enthusiastic nonsense has seldom, I believe, been equalled. But to be absurd is an innocent attribute ; of that I would not willingly deprive you.

It was said, on the 5th of February 1781, by a gentleman, to whom your Lordship has great obligations, that *the heads of the church are the constitutional guardians of the national religion*. There is great truth in the assertion. Apply it to yourselves : are you the *heads* of the church ? Yet you pretend to be the *guardians* of the national religion. *Constitutional* guardians you certainly are not. Take whatever appellation you like best ; but surely a religion, which stands in need of your support, is laid on bad foundations. My Lord, the transactions of 1780 have done more injury to the Protestant cause, than any shock it has experienced since its  
first

first establishment. Were Rome capable of the treacherous stratagem, I should be much inclined to think you had been suborned by that court, to bring disgrace and ruin on the religion, you profess to believe. The genius of Protestantism is humane and liberal; in your hands it is cruel and intolerant.

Yet who are these Papists, against whom such mighty designs are formed; against whom the Protestants of Great-Britain are called to associate? my Lord, you well know *who* and *what* they are: you know them to be a *handful* of as good subjects, and as upright citizens, as any within the circle of our empire. You know they have no wishes, but for the prosperity of England; no ambition but to be allowed the common rights of subjects. You know you have in your own veins much Popish blood. Were there truth in your assertions, that Popery is essentially unsocial and sanguinary, that I should suspect to be

the source of your present intolerance.—The cries you have raised against them, are notoriously the offspring of misrepresentation and malice. That also your Lordship well knows.—To be called to a chair of fancied eminence, may have charms for a young mind; and to such even the applauses of ignorance and servility can give pleasure. But the dream will soon be dissipated; unless perchance your mind should have really taken that bias, which the cut of your hair seems sometimes to indicate. Yet I am told, you do not possess all those stern virtues, which are supposed to enter into the composition of martyrs and other religious champions. Earthy beauty may sometimes have power to call down the man of God to inferior contemplation, and to the pursuit of less spiritual delights.

In speaking on this general business, the chain of my ideas naturally leads me to such other objects, as are connected with it.—Your Lordship has doubtless seen a  
work,



work, the second edition of which appeared not many months ago. I at least have read it, with pleasure and improvement. It is clear, I mean to speak of *The State and Behaviour of English Catholics from the Reformation to the year 1781*. The public opinion of that very spirited and informing pamphlet has been too decided, to require from my pen either praise or recommendation: suffice it just to say, that no facts were ever, from historical deductions, more clearly demonstrated, than that the Papists of this country did *at no time* merit the severest treatment they have experienced; that the popular cry against them was supported, through the long course of more than two centuries, by the arts, sometimes of wicked policy, and sometimes of religious phrenzy; and that there are not, at this hour, better subjects in his Majesty's dominions: consequently the penal laws, now standing against them, are unjust, and should be repealed.—My Lord, the hand that wilfully oppresses innocence is the hand of a tyrant.

I call on God to wither it! Felix, I see thee tremble. If the artillery of heaven, in the unfathomable designs of providence, is not suspended, it will break on thy head in fiery vengeance.

I was much pleased to find that the work I have mentioned, had been so much read, and so much admired. The people of his own persuasion have eternal obligations to him ; and I know many Protestants, who have cheerfully surrendered very inveterate prejudices, from the conviction he carried to their minds. But nothing can evince more strongly the author's very powerful display of truth, than that, in this country, where ideas of the plainest evidence are seldom allowed to pass unmolested, his work, which even attacked opinions rivetted on national prejudice, should so long have remained unanswered. My Lord, I beg your pardon ; it has been answered ; for I have now under my eye a hundred pages of *strictures*, lately published on that meritorious performance.

These

These *slight touches*, for so they are also called, have as little worth, as it is well possible for a production to possess. Yet they come into the world under the broad sanction of your committee; and I am told, you Lordship's *imprimatur* was affixed to the manuscript.—Whether by the signature W. is meant the venerable inhabitant of the *City road*, I neither know nor care. In decrepitude of mind he may indeed have been the author; if so—but his hairs are gray, and I respect them.—In this uncertainty, your Lordship will not be offended if I consider you as the adopted father of that hopeful progeny. You at least are the avowed *president* of that *association*, whose measures and immaculate reputation, it was designed to patronise.

When, by letter, I enquired from the author of the *State of Catholics*, whether he meant to take any public notice of it. His answer was—“ I certainly shall not.”—The laconic reply did not surprisè me; for  
I knew,

I knew, the eagle seldom amuses itself with catching flies.—However, though I am little connected with gentlemen of the Romish persuasion, and though I esteem these *strictures* most completely pitiful, yet they should not, I think, be wholly neglected. Your Lordship, or your friends, might triumph in the silence; and I am not willing that the smallest shred of laurel should, for a moment, decorate your brows. Indeed, the lively foliage of that plant would wither at the first approach. The funereal yew, or the deadly nightshade, might perhaps draw vigour from the spot. There let them vegetate.

My Lord, I shall select from the performance a few distinct points, and give them a very cursory discussion. A more minute inspection might dissipate their light texture into air (but it would be air of a noxious quality;) and to enter on matters of no interest would be to me loss of time, and to the public of no avail.

Mr.

Mr. Locke, p. 13, is profanely introduced to prove that Papists should not be tolerated. I venerate that great man; but in the judgment, he had formed of Roman Catholic principles, he was certainly mistaken. He wrote at a time, when the clamours against them were violent, and when the business of party was carried to outrageous lengths. But to fancy that Mr. Locke can be the abettor of oppression, or that his doctrine does not tend to universal toleration and freedom, is equivalent to the supposition, that the author of the *Essay on Human Understanding* is the avowed advocate of ignorance and error. Let the Papists be tried by their principles; they appeal to no other tribunal. But, my Lord, for the sake of common decency, never let the name of that immortal writer be again heard from the mouth of a Protestant associator. It should hang in his throat, like Macbeth's prayer, and choke him.

It

It has lately been said by an ingenious and benevolent writer of a sister kingdom (whose style, by the bye, is too strongly Irish for an English palate,) that the fifty-ninth page of Mr. Locke's treatise on toleration should be thrown into the fire; *because it is a jumble of nonsense*.—If so, let it rather be preserved, as a lesson of humility to future generations.

Page 26. you observe: “ Whether the many plots attributed to Papists were fictitious or real, I will not determine, *as it signifies very little to me*, who have no desire to find them guilty.”—It signifies very little to you, whether Papists were guilty of plots, or not! My Lord, I believe you; that is, you care not whether they suffer justly or unjustly, provided they suffer. The spirit is truly Christian! why, if these men were not engaged in plots, the laws which oppress them, are notoriously unjust; for they were all enacted on the supposition of  
treasons

treasons and conspiracies. “ The penal laws against Papists (it is your own quotation from the fretful Blackburne) were enacted upon the *evidence* of facts, and the repeated experience of their *perpetual plots and machinations* against government.” You quote another favoured author. “ Since the commencement of the reformation, the Papists have never been at rest, but have been embroiling the state, either by *plots, conspiracies, and cabals*, or by *insurrections and open rebellion*.”—“ Owing to this conduct, observes Sir W. Blackstone, (and him also you cite) were the penal laws, at several periods of our history, framed against them.”—

But now, though the author of the *State of Catholics* should have demonstrated, that these supposed plots and insurrections, as applied to the body of Papists, were all fictitious, to you it signifies very little; the laws must still subsist, and Papists must be punished!—If shame has not lost all its  
F. power

power to operate, you must, for once, blush, my Lord, though secretary Joshua Bangs should be ordered to enter it on the minutes of your committee in proof, that you are not completely formed to be their president.—*En passant* ; what is become of poor Jabes Fisher? I do not recollect his name on the list of those who were hanged in 1780 ; yet, since the summer of that year, he has not been publicly heard of.

The grand point of enquiry is now before me ;—the vindication of the Protestant association from the calumnious aspersions of the author of the *State of Catholics*.—I by no means conceive myself bound to defend that gentleman in all his assertions. He weighed your proceedings in the scales of reason and philosophic moderation ; and finding them light, pronounced accordingly. I well know with such dispositions, he was incompetent to judge. Speaking of your meetings there-  
fore,



fore, he says : “ Neither reason, humanity, nor religion, were ever permitted to enter the doors of their convocation ; wild uproar, ranting declamation, and low calumny, directed their councils, and dictated their resolves.”—The colouring is rather strong : but that the carnal-minded man should have thus expressed himself, I am not surpris'd. My wonder is, that you should not discover how much this view of your meetings brings honour to them, and exhibits the advanced perfection of your minds.

That *reason*, that *humanity*, that *religion* which, he says, you would not let in amongst you, had doubtless no pretensions to admission. And must you be censured, because that company was excluded, whose presence would have disconcerted all your schemes, would have dried up the eloquence of your lips, would have broken asunder those ties of cordial amity, which made you brethren of one mind and one spirit?

spirit?—Equally the effect of ignorance is his charging you, with *wild uproar, ranting declamation, and low calumny*; as if the use of these were criminal. Unknowing man! The *roar, the rant, the calumny* of the world are indeed not commendable; but in you they were the *arms of the spirit*; and you used them manfully. He vainly imagines, that the business of religion should be conducted by the means of gentle moderation, persuasive eloquence, and the strictest adhesion to truth. Herein lies the error: but how often do we dare to pronounce where we do not understand! So when the lord-seeking Cromwell threw a cushion at the head of Ludlow; and when, seizing the fatal pen, which was to sign the death warrant of an unfortunate king, he be-daubed with ink the face of Martin, and Martin practised the same frolic upon Cromwell; carnal men misconstrued the deeds into low and indecent buffoonery. But in fact they were parabolical actions, and included mysterious secrets.

Besides,

Besides had your behaviour been literally thus violent, as described, it was still without reproach. Popery was to be assailed with those weapons, which had so often been found successful against it. Other conduct must have argued want of skill in the arduous science of religious controversy.

Even your apologist, who professes to write from authentic documents (in which I really believe him) does allow, there was occasionally *much confusion and altercation* amongst you.—He also gives us extracts of *resolutions*, plans of *associations*, and *other matters*, truly descriptive of genuine intolerance.—Among these should not be forgotten your Lordship's reply to the committee's letter, requesting you to be their president. It breathes humility, an anxious solicitude for the cause of religion, great knowledge of the genius of Popery, a firmness hardly to be paralleled, but softened by benevolence and all the milk of human kindness.

ness. “ I trust, say you, that *coolness* and *temper* in our proceedings will soon demonstrate to the Roman Catholics, that we are far from being possessed of a *persecuting disposition*; and I hope the attention of parliament to the petitions of Englishmen will be so very *respectful and prudent*, as not to raise the apprehensions of the lower classes of the people.” Very just! you proved yourselves *cool and temperate*; and the Papists were soon convinced, that your intentions were *not* to distress them. But then how constitutional the doctrine, not that the petitions of the people should be *respectful and prudent*, but that the conduct of parliament must be such, whatever be the language of the petitioners!

My Lord, do you recognize yourself in the following descriptive portrait, which I take from the pencil of a person who drew it from the scene exhibited before him.—“ One of their meeting I attended. It had been postponed on account of the  
death

death of Lord George's mother. On the day of the meeting, the Dutchess of Gordon had not been dead much more than a week, if so much. The room, though large, was considerably too small for the assembly. There did not appear to be a *single individual* among them, who bore the appearance of any thing like a gentleman, that was led thither by any thing but curiosity. The business of the meeting was to settle about waiting upon Lord North to request he would support their petition. The puritanical head of hair of the president, lank, without curl or powder—his mild, quiet, calm tone of voice (for that evening at least) his deep mourning—the recollection of the recent cause of his mourning—an artful glance at the cause of it in the few words his Lordship said: All these circumstances could not fail to affect such a meeting, when they beheld and heard such a man, who, for the purpose of forwarding the public cause of religion, had, in some measure, neglected the duties of private affection,

tion, and deserted the tomb, which had hardly closed over the corse of her who bore him. An indifferent person, inspired neither by enthusiasm nor by treason, could not be without his feelings. Had matters been riper for execution, it was a moment for a Cromwell, with the waving of his hand, to have overturned an empire.” —The sketch is well taken.

Let me then infer, that the author of the *State of Catholics*, if he seriously meant to throw reproach on your meetings, has, in fact, unintentionally praised them ; or, at all events, that his description is verified by the authentic narrative of your own apologist.

The next branch of enquiry is not less interesting : Were the Protestant associators the *perpetrators of the riots* ? This the author, so often mentioned, is supposed to have asserted ; and this your apologist denies, again supported, I doubt not, by the  
certain

certain evidence of facts. He even seems disposed to think, that the infamy of the transaction should rather be given to the Papists themselves. We have then another *Popish plot*, to be entered on the black list of their former treasons and conspiracies; and which if real, will not, I think, disgrace the honourable catalogue.

However, as it always has been, and still is, my firm opinion, that your associators were, at least, the *first authors* of the riots, and that your Lordship, in particular was *answerable* for all the mischief which ensued, I was little moved by the arguments of the apologist. I thought it shamefully illiberal, that he should attempt to make those, for a single moment, appear guilty, whose innocence was as visible as the flames, which consumed their property, and threatened their lives. But perhaps that trait of infamy was wanting to complete the character of a Protestant associator.—My Lord, give me leave to draw,  
 F what

what I have now principally to urge, from the copy of a trial, in which your Lordship bore a very interesting concern. I shall do it in few words. But remember; at the bar of dispassionate reason you can have no advocate, armed with the powers of seductive eloquence.

At Coachmaker's hall, on the 29th of May, your Lordship declared to the meeting, that on the Friday following, you meant to present their petition to the house of Commons; that they should therefore meet on that day, in St. George's fields; that if there was one less than twenty thousand you would not present it. You recommended to them the example of the Scotch, who by their *firmness* had carried their point; and you concluded by telling them: "You did not mean them *to go into any danger* that you would not share, for you were ready to go to the gallows for the Protestant cause."—This was bold and animating. It seemed to indicate that, *probably,*  
in



in the course of their proceedings, *danger* might arise; but that they must be prepared to meet it with Scottish firmness. “I will not present the petition of a luke-warm people.”—These expressions are all sworn to.—But why was the *gallows* mentioned? have Englishmen who engage in a laudable and constitutional design, any thing to apprehend from that fatal tree? Your mind, my Lord, seemed conscious; or perhaps the demon of *second sight*, at that moment, disclosed the hidden secret to you.

The resolutions, that had been taken for the arrangements of Friday, were soon made public. The petitioners were to be formed into four divisions, *all wearing blue cockades in their hats, to distinguish them from the Papists, and those who approved of the act in favour of Popery.* This was your order.—The *blue cockade* was then to be the badge of distinction. He who wore it, whatever might be his character, or whatever his views,

views, was to be considered as a friend to the petition. Should he not have previously signed it; that mark admitted him: he instantly became a friend and an *affociator*: he who wore it not was an enemy. Your own hat, my Lord, received the sacred ribband; you were their leader. So when the crusaders of old were enrolled for the holy war, a badge was given them, by which they were known to be devoted to the business of devastation and bloodshed.—From these premises I must now be allowed to infer, that as they who put on the blue cockade were constituted petitioners, so were they to be considered as acting under your directing influence, till some public notification should be given, that it was no longer the badge of a Protestant affociator. This was not done; your Lordship even wore it on Tuesday.—What matters it therefore, whether all the rioters had *signed* your petition; they carried the distinctive ribband, and by that they were enrolled.

But

But your apologist pretends, and I find it to be your general plea, that the *rioters* were a very different description of men from the petitioners; that the latter only advanced peaceably to Westminster; that here they were assaulted by a *mob of miscreants*, who stole their flags, and then began that work of riot and devastation, in which the capital was soon involved. The petitioners, in the mean time, with all the meekness of Christian heroes, returned home, not resenting the insults they had received; and among more than forty thousand men not one was found, who when they smote him on one cheek did not turn the other!—I must prove that *the petitioners were the rioters*. I shall follow the order of your Lordship's trial.

Evidence for the crown.

William Hay.—“ The man, who carried the flag at the burning of the Fleet-prison, on Wednesday, was the same person  
son

son as bore it in St. George's fields, on Friday, and the same day at Westminster. It had on it the words—No Popery.”

Yet it is pretended that the flags were forcibly taken from the petitioners, on their arrival at Westminster. If so, how came this man to recover his, and to appear with it, on Wednesday, at the burning of the Fleet prison? And surely this gentleman was an associator. Is it otherwise probable he would have been appointed to bear the sacred standard, which preceded one of the divisions? It was a post of honour.

Mr. Anstruther.—“ On Friday *evening* there was a vast number of people in the lobby of the house of Commons, *with blue cockades*, to whom Lord George was addressing himself. He said; “ They had been called a *mob* within the house; that the peace-officers had been called in to *disperse them*.—They said to him—Do  
you

you desire us to go away? does Lord G. Gordon *desire us to go away?*—He replied—your are the *best judges* of what you ought to do.”

Were not these men petitioners? your Lordship spoke to them as such; and the deference they expressed to your desires evinced the opinion, they entertained of you. They had been called a *mob*; the appellation you deemed an insult to them. Yet they were vociferous and unruly; and the Commons of England were then their prisoners.

Rev. Mr. Bowen.—“ On the same *evening*, he saw a great croud in the lobby, and Lord George speaking to them: “ You are a *good people*, yours is a *good cause* . . . . keep yourselves cool, be steady.”—He hears one in the lobby say! “ If *his Lordship* would come, and *say* it was necessary for them to go, *they would go*.”—Lord George speaks to them afterwards; among  
other

other things he says : “ The Scotch had no redrefs till they pulled down the mafs-houfes :” or, “ when the Scotch pulled down the mafs-houfes they had redrefs.”

A few hours after the mafs-houfes were pulled down, Who fo likely to have done it, as thefe men who had juft heard their leader *infinate*, that the attempt would give fuccefs to their petition ? And thefe men were furely petitioners ; they were *good people*, and *their caufe was good*.

Mr. Cater.—“ He hears the noble Lord fay to thofe in the lobby : “ Would not *you* wifh to be in the fame ftate they are in in Scotland.”—They answered : “ Yes, yes,”—and he faid : “ Well, well.”

My Lord, could you then fufpect, you were fpeaking to men of a *very different defcription* from the petitioners ; to men who were totally *unconnected* with thofe, you had  
feen

seen in St. George's fields? yet this your apologist now roundly declares.

Joseph Pearson.—“ The same day, he saw a great croud in the lobby, most, if not all, of whom had blue cockades. Their general cry was : *No Popery, no Popery ! A repeal, a repeal !*—*These persons* continued there till near *nine o'clock at night*, he believes.—Hears the noble Lord speak to them ; “ *Your cause is good, and you have nothing to fear.*”

Thomas Baker.—“ They continued in the lobby, calling out *repeal ! No Popery ! Till eight or nine o'clock.*”

Who were these men so urgent for the *repeal* of the bill, and the downfall of *Popery* ? And observe, they remained in the lobby till *eight or nine o'clock*.—It is the evidence of the two door-keepers.

G

Mr.

Mr. Rainforth.—“ He was in the lobby! The people he saw there were of the *lower sort*, some of them decently dressed; the *same sort* he had seen passing from Charing-crofs, with blue ribbands in their hats.”—“ He was also at the burning of the Sardinian chapel, the same night, at about *half past eleven*.—The cry here was *no Popery!* and most of them had blue cockades.”

They who passed from Charing-crofs were avowedly petitioners; those in the lobby were *the same sort*.—They left the lobby about *nine o'clock*; and about *eleven* the Sardinian chapel was destroyed. The cry was the same, *no Popery*, and they wore blue cockades!—The circumstances are strangely identifying. *The Scotch had no redress till they pulled down the mass-houses.* It was your Lordship’s declaration *a few hours before.*

Charles



Charles Jealous.—“ Those who insulted the bishop of Lincoln cried out *no Popery.*”

These *new men*, as it is pretended, were at least well-instructed in the language of your petitioners. An associator could not have vociferated more emphatically. Nor was it the first time that, under the cry of *no Popery*, the Protestant mitre has been trampled in the dust.

Mr. Gates.—“ The men who destroyed the houses of Roman Catholics, and the prisons, on Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday, wore blue cockades, and their cry was, *all the time, no Popery.*”

Strange indeed, if these were not the same men we have traced so far !

Justice Hyde.—“ They who destroyed the chapel in Warwick-street, on Friday night,

night, had blue cockades, and cried out *down with it : no Popery*.—Those he found round Lord Sandwich, when he was wounded on Tuesday, had also the same cockades, and they cried *no Popery*.”

Though I do not conceive *Lord Sandwich* and the *Bavarian Chapel* to have stood in the same predicament, (his Lordship will excuse the involuntary dissociation of ideas ;) yet the blindness of religious phrenzy had now so confounded objects the most distinct, that I am not surpris'd his Lordship, chapels, houses, and prisons, should have been marked out for general destruction.

Such devilish acts religion could persuade.

Lord Porchester.—“ Lord George had a blue cockade in his hat, on *Tuesday*, in the house of Commons.”

Had

Had your Lordship then no *connection* with those, who wore the same ensign out of doors? you came down to the house, attended by the same mob, with blue cockades, and colours flying; with those men who appeared to have been busied all that, and the preceding days, in the work of devastation. “ Can any man hesitate to say, that the noble Lord’s conduct, upon Tuesday, after so much mischief had been done, necessarily connects him with the whole? When I consider this circumstance, and consider that we hear of him at no fire, though every man knew the mischief; when I hear not of any attempt to stop its course, and see him again bring the colours of sedition upon his hat, I cannot possibly but conclude, that he then was, and meant to shew himself, the same man that he was upon the Friday; the partaker, the encourager, the friend to these outrages.” Trial p. 59.

The

The deduction, my Lord, is too evident : and your apologist's attempt to separate you and your petitioners from the mob of rioters, has only contributed to mark more strongly the link, which united you to them.

Mr. Turner.—“ The general cry among those who on *Wednesday evening* destroyed so much public and private property, still was, *no Popery! down with the Papists!* and they wore blue cockades.”

This was on *Wednesday Evening*, the last night of those fatal tumults !

Richard Pond.—“ *On Wednesday in the afternoon* he presented a written paper to Lord George, who signed his name to it. His house was tenanted by a Roman Catholic. He produced the *signed* paper to the mob, *and his house was not pulled down.* The paper was : “ All true friends to Protestants

testants I hope will particular and do no injury to *the property of any true Protestant*, as I am well assured the proprietor of this house is a staunch and worthy friend to *the cause*.”

G. Gordon.

In your hand then, my Lord, was the government of the *mob*, in the depredations they were committing; and *your* signature was the only protection against their violent proceedings. To insinuate, that you did not conceive yourself to be *their leader*, or that they did not view you in that exalted light, is an insult to common sense. The *mob* then was composed of *petitioning Protestants*; for why was a band of rioters *totally unconnected* with them, to look up to your Lordship in the prosecution of a business, in which it is pretended, you had no more concern, than any other noble Lord, who was then trembling for the capital of the British empire?—I make no comment on the paper you signed,

ed, because in the tumult of a mob, your Lordship might not have sufficiently attended to its singular contents.

### Evidence for the Prisoner.

Lord Stormont.—“ On *Wednesday*, between ten and eleven in the morning, Lord George was at the Queen’s house. He was there asked by Lord Stormont, what he wanted? His answer was, that “ he desired to see the king, *because he could be of material service in suppressing the riots.*”

How could *he* be of material service *in suppressing the riots*, who had no *connection* with, and consequently could have no *influence* over the *rioters*? But your Lordship undoubtedly, best understood what was the *connection* or *influence* you held with them. This also was on *Wednesday morning*!

Mr.

Mr. Evans.—“ In St. George’s Fields he asked Lord George, what his plan was: he said; he intended to go to the house alone, and sometime after he had been there, *the petition was to follow him* to the lobby of the house of Commons, and there to wait till he came out to receive it.”

So it was: the petition was carried, in all the pomp of processional solemnity, at the head of the London division. Yet it is now said, that it neither was your Lordship’s, nor the Committee’s *intention*, it should be attended to the house by such an awful escort.

William Smith—“ Before the Protestant Association came into the neighbourhood of Guildhall, Westminster, he did not see *any other collection* of people there.”

Your apologist says: “ But when they arrived at Westminster, they found a *very*

H

*large*

*large mob assembled, so that they could proceed no farther than Westminster Abbey; there they were assaulted by this mob.”*  
(p. 58.)

Alex. Johnston.—“ He marched at the end of the London division; did not find *any but associators in Palace yard*, when he arrived there.”

I cite the evidence *for* the prisoner, and consequently *for* the Protestant Committee!

Sir P. J. Clarke.—“ On *Tuesday*, in coming out of the house of Commons, he was near Lord George, in the crowd, and said to him, “ Lord George *you must protect me.*”  
—Soon after they both got into a chariot; the *mob* closed round, took off the horses, and dragged them to the other end of the city, to Alderman Bull’s house.—Near the Mansion-house they stopped, came up to  
the



the chariot, and said: " Lord George, *let us hear the resolution of the house.*"—They remained at Mr. Bull's *as long as his Lordship staid there.*—Before this Lord George had said often to *them*: " For God's sake go *peaceably home* ; whilst you *assemble* in this tumultuous way *your petition* will never be complied with, the house will never consent to it."

The *rioters* were a *very different description* of men from the *petitioners* !—And whilst the noble Lord was thus triumphantly proceeding through the city, Newgate, and many private houses were rising into flames !—The single evidence of Sir Philip has alone *demonstrated* my assertion.

Sir James Lowther.—" On *Friday* he took Lord George in his carriage. Some of the people who were still remaining, *who were supposed to be the mob*, came about the carriage, and asked : " Is *the bill* to be

H 2

repealed."

repealed."—Lord George said: " I do not know ; I hope it will : but go home, be quiet, make no riot, nor noise."—It was *then dark*, and the guards were come."

They were supposed to be the *mob*, and they were anxious for the *repeal of the bill!*—Lord George speaks to them as to friends; he advises them to be quiet; but they had just heard his declaration about the mass-houses; they knew the *real* temper of his mind.—The Sardinian and Bavarian chapels were, in a few minutes, surrounded.

I undertook to prove that the *Petitioners were the rioters*. If I have not done it, I own myself incapable to judge of facts the most clear and palpable. Perhaps the sun does not shine, though at this moment its brightness quite dazzles my sight! Every tittle of the *evidence* I have adduced is *extracted verbatim* from that, which was given in *upon the oath* of witnesses.

Having

Having advanced thus far, it is unnecessary I should attempt to exculpate the Papists from the *charge* so illiberally brought against them. The labour would be useless. I do not however pretend to assert, that *no Papists* were concerned in the riots. Bad men they have amongst them; and such undoubtedly would be ready to avail themselves of the general confusion, to practise destruction and "rapine.—Nor is it at all my wish even to insinuate, that out of the forty thousand petitioners there were not *many thousands*, who as sincerely execrated the evils, to which innocently they had given rise, as the best and most peaceable portion of his Majesty's subjects. From this number I beg leave to except your Lordship.

Some Papists therefore, I am ready to allow, rushed into the riots, from the most abandoned motives; whilst common curiosity led others (as it did many unpetitioning

tioning Protestants) into the scenes of mischief; and not a few were present at the destruction of the chapels, drawn thither by an anxious solicitude for their places of worship. Of the latter description, with my own eyes, I saw many; and of these, I believe, some were apprehended on suspicion, but discharged the next day. *They were found to be young men of excellent characters, and had been at work all day.* But your apologist from this description dares to infer, that a scheme had been by them preconcerted, in order to throw odium on the petitioners. It was surely an useless attempt: the petitioners required no such external co-operation; their own conduct entitled them to a very sufficient share of detestation and public infamy.

I cannot, however, find that any of those were Papists, whom justice brought to execution; at least *not one* died in the public profession of that religion; that is, had the assistance of a Popish clergyman, which  
on

on such occasions, is always allowed.—The proofs of some Papists being killed, and of others being taken, tried, and executed, which the apologist professes to take from the periodical prints of the time, are surely of little weight. “A known Jesuit (says he from the *Political Magazine*) was killed at the Bank. One of the rioters shot in Fleet-market was Bryant a Papist.—Three men shot in Cornhill were of that religion; one of whom appears to be a *noted Jesuit*, who has resided in this kingdom for many years.”—Who was this noted Jesuit? The whole narration is evidently puerile; a groundless fabrication, manufactured by designing malevolence to answer the views of party.

“Enoch Fleming, hanged in Oxford-Street, was a Papist.”—Perhaps he was.—But then says your *truthful* apologist; “It is, on the other hand, *a certain fact*, that of forty-four thousand who signed the Protestant petition, *not one* was found amongst  
the

persons either tried, executed, or slain." The proof is—The names of the petitioners have been printed, in alphabetical order, and thus was the fact ascertained.—Were it really so, I own it would be an event truly astonishing; though still it would not prove, that the petitioners were not the authors of the riots. Other men had undoubtedly mixed with them, and *possibly* they only might have suffered. But the fact, as stated, is too incredible. It will sooner be thought, that you printed a spurious list of names; for this clearly is more within the line of *probability*.

By another supposition it may also be accounted for. It is well known, that many of those who die at Tyburn, during the course of *business*, have assumed very different names; alias Smith, alias Jones, alias Martin, alias Sixteen-string-Jack. When the sacred roll of parchment was presented for his signature, this man might have given you a name, which afterwards,  
on

on examination before a Justice, he either did not choose to mention, or might have forgotten. If ordered to execution, he would die under a name, which would not appear on the list of petitioners.—Your Lordship may conceive the supposition to be insulting to the *fair characters* of the associated Protestants. Interiorly many of them well know, that no disgrace would have been derived from the society.

But is not the name of *Pateman* on the list of petitioners? He was executed in Coleman-street, *for destroying the house* of Mr. Charlton, a Papist. Of him it is related: “It was with the utmost difficulty, that the ordinary of Newgate could prevail on James Pateman to strip his hat of a *blue cockade*, which he insisted before he left the prison he would wear; declaring that *he died a martyr to the Protestant cause*, and should leave the world cheerfully.”—  
 If like the Papists, the Associated Protestants were to pray to saints, undoubtedly  
 I James

James Pateman would have an honourable place in their litany. Yet you even pretend, he was not a petitioner. His merit should have called him to the committee. What an example of religious heroism! He died a *martyr to the cause*—because he was hanged for *pulling down the house of* poor Mr. Charlton, a *Popish apothecary*!—I understand, the Rev. Mr. Erasmus Middleton, the Hugh Peters of your committee, is now busily employed in compiling the life of that egregious saint!

I have proved the truth of my positions in opposition to the insidious views of your apologist; and in so doing have vindicated the just assertions of the author of the *State of Catholics*. Other matters there are, which may seem to require discussion: I shall say a few words on each.

1st.—The author's idea, that in *doctrinal points*, the two churches are but *thinly* divided, and his consequent wish, that an  
*union*



*union* were effected, have given you offence. I am not surpris'd : for the termination of religious dissentions would be to you a painful event ; it would stab enthusiasm to the heart. But why, my Lord, should you fear ? your principles are of a specific character ; they can never coalesce either with those of Papists, or of real English Protestants. As soon shall the Thames run northward, and mix his placid stream with the chilling waters of the Tweed. English Catholics have no desire to shake hands with you—the contact would infect them.—But with the *national church*, *could certain obstacles be removed*, they would unite in the strictest bonds of Christian amity. However, so long as the business of controversy is conducted on the narrow plan of illiberal recrimination and pious acrimony, so desirable an event must be thrown far into the regions of futurity.

2nd.—You ask (p. 88) “ If the English Catholics did not object to take the oath proposed by the act of the 18th year of his

present Majesty?—And if a council was not held at Paris to deliberate on the subject.”—They neither objected to the oath: nor was any council held on the subject.—From *political* ideas, some few might have objected; as non-juring Protestants would have done. They all took it, and I doubt not, with sincerity.—The idea of a *council* evinces the futility of those charges, which are daily conjured up against the Papists.—You, my Lord, had your meetings, your councils, and your conclaves. The ruins even of Newgate proclaim them. The Papists had none. With avidity they seized the first occasion that was offered, to attest their loyalty and patriotifm,

3d.—(p. 90.) The apologist sounds a dreadful alarm; swarms of Jesuits have landed, and taken possession of every strong hold in the nation! “There are few coffee-houses, says he, or taverns, and few Noblemen’s *suites*, in which there is not *one at least*. There are people who know  
this

this to be a *fact*. A Jesuit can act his part in any condition of life, either in the circle of the polite, or among waiters, valets, or hair-dressers."

Omnia transformat sese in miracula rerum !

The information is truly alarming.—Wantonly I would not add to the consternation of my fellow-citizens; but duty compels me to speak my own apprehensions. Who knows then, (as every thing is possible to that wily creature) whether those numberless *insects*, which now threaten destruction to our trees and gardens may not also be *Jesuits*, cloathed for a time in singular disguise, and waiting to begin the work of desolation?—My Lord, summon a meeting of your committee: the enemy is at your doors; if they once burst their teguments, means of defence will come too late; not a cabbage will be left for poor associator to dine on.—Enter into *deep deliberation*; publish your resolutions; re-assume the blue cockade; *no Popery!*

*pery! down with the Jesuits!* Light about them the fires of June, one thousand, seven hundred and eighty; their habitations are surely more combustible than the flinty walls of Newgate.

Those who are less violent in their fears, I wish at the same time to inform, that all this report about Jesuits is a groundless fiction. Very few of that order have come into England, since its suppression; and the public may rest assured that in the course of fifteen or twenty years, there will hardly be one left, who ever was entitled to that unpopular appellation.

(P. 94, &c.) Much is said about the *increase* of Popish schools.—Will the voice of malevolence never be silenced? your Lordship knows, their schools have not increased; the public also knows it. But as soon shall the north wind soften into social benevolence, the heart of a Scotch presbyterian, as a member of your committee shall

shall cease from calumny, or dare to speak truth.—If Popish schools have increased, wherein lies the evil? should they not give education to *their own children*? Would you debar them from that first of parental duties? A Goth must have blushed at the idea. They wish to have no concern with the Protestant youth, nor have they. Let instruction be given where there are minds to receive it. The more schools of every denomination the better. He that would throw impediments in the way, is an enemy to man; but the bears of Siberia would decline his company, for they love their young.

“ The Rev. Mr. Jesse, you say, informed the Protestant Association, that now at York, the *Roman Catholics give ten pounds* to any man, who will *embrace their religion*, in order to *educate the children of such converts in their persuasion.*”—If the Rev. Mr. Jesse is not of your committee, it is not  
surely

fully from want of merit. My Lord; the information is *false* in every particular.

Drawing to the conclusion of his *strictures*, your apologist demands an explicit answer to the following queries.

“ 1st. Whether the opinions ; *that faith is not to be kept with heretics ;—that princes may be dethroned ;—that dominion is founded on grace ;* were ever doctrines of the church of Rome,”

2nd. “ If the Papal church has rejected, and now disowns them ; and when such alteration took place in her sentiments.”

3dly. “ Whether they have the cordial assent and approbation of Papists.”

Such idle controversy will never have an end.—Of the above three opinions, what has the last to say to Papists? It was the doctrine of Wickliff, Hufs, and the  
English

English regicides in the time of Charles the First; and therefore may have no weak claim to your Lordship's belief.—The other two were *never* held by the church of Rome.—Your three queries are answered.

He then finally concludes with five other most important questions.

“ Can Papists be good subjects to a Protestant state, when there is a Popish Pretender to the throne ?”

*Answer.*—They *can* be, because they *are*. The Popish Pretender will rather look to Scotland for support. What has been, may be.

“ Is not the *King of Great-Britain*, according to the canons of the council of Trent, a *heretic*, and *anathematized* ?”

*Answer.*—Yes.

K

“ May

“ May not an *anathematized prince*, when circumstances favour, be *rightfully deposed* for the *interest of the church* ?”

*Answer.*—No.

“ Ought not a *good Papist* to desire the welfare of the church, and consequently the deposition of such princes, whenever the times will permit ?”

*Answer.*—A good Papist will be a good subject. The welfare of his church is best promoted, by giving to Cæsar what is Cæsar’s, and to God what belongs to God.

“ Is it not altogether fitting, that in a Protestant state, men of such principles be laid under certain restraints ?”

*Answer.*—Who are the men of such principles ?—But should not they be restrained, whose dearest solicitude is ever busied in misrepresentation and calumny ?

I shall



I shall here close my address.—My Lord, what I had principally to say, I have said; and I have said it with freedom. Language less sincere would have ill-become me; because I was speaking in the cause of truth and humanity. Besides, not much respect, I thought, was due to those, who had no respect for others.—I was advised to treat the subject ludicrously. So much, they said, had been urged, without success, in a serious and exhortatory style, that to pursue the same line of argument, would be loss of time. I meant therefore to try the edge of ridicule, and to laugh. But really the temper of my mind so ill-accommodated with the attempt, that I could not proceed. Feelings of a more painful nature were ever uppermost; and they had a right to speak their own language. I have not, however, been always solemn, though I have been always serious.

What effect this address may have on your Lordship's mind, I cannot tell. My  
           K 2                                    expectations

expectations are not sanguine. Sensible, however, that some degree of success were possible, I strove to collect in a narrow compass the extended parts of my object, that so the blow might be more penetrating. I should otherwise have been more diffuse, for I did not want materials.

My Lord, I wish to make you think. The pursuit you are engaged in, is no trivial business. To it, a man of common villany should not aspire; transcendent qualities are requisite, and your Lordship must excuse me, when I say, that I really think you have still some virtue left.—Did you ever ask your own conscience, by what motives it was actuated? Erasmus Middleton may deceive you;—that faithful monitor will not. Do you wish to oppress the Papists, because you deem them deserving of oppression? or is it, because the presidency of an association, and the applause of a mob, were flattering to your vanity? Had any other post of eminence  
 been

been offered, I am mistaken, if you would have refused it; though its object had been to support the very men you now aim to exterminate. Even the inquisitorial chair of Lisbon might have held out charms to your mind, greater far than those of the Protestant Committee. But once find an object big enough for the grasp of enthusiasm, and adapted to its nature, it will seize it, whatever be its complexion, whether to fix Mahometism, or to pull down Popery; to espouse the cause of infidelity, or to extirpate the religion of Christ.

Had the Papists, a few years ago, provident of the future, courted your assistance, and called you their protector; you would have assisted and have protected them: but they relied on that claim, which every honest man has to general protection. Other men, of a different description indeed, looked up to you; and with avidity you seized the proffered honour, though

though infamy was stamped on its front.— Should the Roman Pontiff not survive his German expedition; and the sacred college of Cardinals, directed by a singular inspiration, nominate you his successor; what think you, my Lord? would you spurn the triple crown, as only fit to circle the brows of Antichrist? would you not rather press it to your own, with ecstatic ardour? when the day arrives, your committee must not be forgotten. The Rev. Mr. Wesley shall receive the scarlet hat: it will diffuse a blushing radiance over the wan countenance of declining age. Erasmus Middleton and Joshua Bangs— But it ill-becomes me to dispose of honours in which I can never have any interference. Only let me beg, that the author of *Strictures* be remembered, *when it shall be well with thee.*

Should your Lordship wish to know, who the man is that thus freely addresses you;

you; I can only say, that he is a *friend to humanity*, and therefore an enemy to oppression. He knows that the English Catholics are honest men, and he must therefore protect them as far as his power goes. He also knows, that the designs which have been formed against them, are the offspring of ignorance, of malice, and of enthusiasm: of these it is his aim to stem the progress. With this consciousness within him, silence would become criminal; it should almost make the dumb man speak.—In any other view, he is not attached to party; he loves his country, and his country's friends. Were it in his power, he would give an unbounded liberty to the thoughts and actions of all men; for he deems it an *equal* violation of common justice, to restrain the conscience of an unbelieving Indian, who falls down before the god his own hands had made, as to persecute the most sincere and upright man, who professes to believe in the

Gospel

Gospel of Christ. He alone should be deprived of this liberty, who refuses it to others. My Lord, *thou art the man.*—

I am,

Your Lordship's

Most Obedient,

and

Humble Servant,

---









