



special  
collections



DOUGLAS  
LIBRARY

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY  
AT KINGSTON

KINGSTON ONTARIO CANADA





*Bodley, Dan*

ON THE PRINCIPLES  
OF THE  
*REVOLUTION.*



*Edmund Burke*

A

DISCOURSE

ON THE

*Real Principles of the Revolution,*

THE BILL OF RIGHTS,

*ACT OF SETTLEMENT, &c.*

IN WHICH

The REPRESENTATIONS of SIR FRANCIS BURDETT,  
Mr. MADDOX, and others are considered,

*Their ignorance and their falsehood exposed,  
and their real views detected ;*

BEING THE SUBSTANCE OF

**T H R E E L E C T U R E S,**

*Delivered in Trinity Term, 1809,*

BY

THE GRESHAM LECTURER IN CIVIL LAW,

---

Printed by J. Seeley, Buckingham.

SOLD BY HATCHARD, PICCADILLY, LONDON.

AC 911 1809. P34



## INTRODUCTORY ADDRESS

*To the Worshipful the Trustees of*

SIR THOMAS GRESHAM, KNIGHT.

---

SINCE the boasted liberties of this country know no partiality in their application, and the privilege of speaking and writing, and publishing what every one pleases, is arrogated alike by all, no man ought to be offended or surprized if in the exercise of that privilege, a difference of opinion on any point should happen to subsist. No person who is a lover of the truth, will be backward to consider any representation of a case or question, which professes to be founded on argument and fact, although it should differ from that view in which it hath been previously regarded by himself. And much good will always arise from such a consideration, for in

proportion as reason is exercised and prejudice laid aside, truth will prevail.

In all political questions every individual will have an opinion; but, comparatively, very few individuals have the study of politicks for their proper occupation, or have leisure for the just contemplation of any subject which is not the immediate business of their lives. Opinions therefore, in matters of this sort, will too often be adopted hastily on a partial view, which further consideration may correct, or be imposed by an authority which hath obtained a greater weight than it deserves, or founded upon a relation of facts which is not true, or a representation of them which is false and treacherous. In all these cases the cause of truth will be promoted by argument and discussion. Persons, however, no doubt are to be found, upon whom, because they are wedded to their own conceit, or because they have some private and unacknowledged object in view, argument exerts its force in vain, and truth shines but cannot enlighten. Such men must be abandoned to the error of their own minds; and, if they are

themselves only affected by it, they will be the objects merely of compassion. But if error extends itself to the perversion of the minds of other men, and especially if its views affect the state, it becomes every one's interest and a public duty to expose it. Private individuals will usually decline entering upon a controversy in which, as they are no more concerned than others, they are sensible of no proper duty of their own. But if any one standing in some public capacity, beholds the particular point which it is his office to illustrate and to teach, made the subject of perversion and misrepresentation by artful and designing men, it becomes his immediate duty to meet the effort and expose the fraud.

Upon these grounds I take the liberty of presenting the following discourse to the Trustees of the foundation of Sir Thomas Gresham, and trust that they will not be displeased with this attempt of their Lecturer in Civil Law.

It is only necessary to add, that in the prosecution of this subject, I have first produced the statutes and explained the Law; then exposed

the misrepresentations of those who would pervert it; and lastly argued their *real* objects from their own expressions; and that wherever I have had occasion to quote their words, I have taken them from the public papers of the day, considering that uncontradicted report, as an avowed publication. The particular paper which I have used, is the Morning Post of May the second.

ON THE

*Principles of the Revolution of*  
1688,

THE BILL OF RIGHTS, &c.

**T**HE throne of England has been at all times hereditary, and it was so acknowledged at the restoration of Charles the second by the two houses of parliament assembled in the solemn form of a convention of the states. Had it entered into the minds of the leading people of the day to have given that event another character, the times seem to have afforded no unfavourable opportunity of declaring it to be of the right and power of the people to elect their King. But we have reason to be thankful, that in the restoration of that monarch, and in a subsequent instance of Revolution, matters were conducted on the surer and the safer

ground; surer—in respect of argument; safer—in respect of experience.

Hereditary the throne of England is allowed to be, but not absolute. For the crown itself is subject to limitation as to the wearer, and the wearer to restriction and abridgement as to the exercise of his royal prerogative. Absolute power in every state must reside somewhere; but by the constitution of this realm it is here found in the triple state of Parliament alone. It is not in the King. It is not in the Lords. It is not in the Commons. It is not in any two branches to the exclusion of the third. Much less is it in one only to the exclusion of the other two. But in the three estates of Parliament together is vested the absolute power of making and declaring Law; which embraces without exception every case, capable of becoming the subject of Legislation, that is, every thing that relates to man as a social creature, and an inhabitant of these realms. The King therefore is no less subject to the power of Parliament than the meanest of his subjects; and the crown he wears no less assuredly than

the estate of a private individual. The instances, in which Parliament has exercised its power <sup>of</sup> enacting Laws, which affect the crown, from the æra of the restoration, I shall now proceed to consider.

Nothing material occurs in the reign of Charles the second to arrest our attention: and had any thing, which was then attempted, been accomplished, the new æra commencing at the Revolution <sup>w</sup>ould necessarily have obliged us to date all authority with respect to the acknowledgement of fundamental principles from thence.\* It is true however; that in that reign, (the reign of Charles II.) the House of Commons asserted its right as one branch of the supreme legislative power of interfering in the matter of succession to the Crown, and three times introduced a bill to exclude the Duke of York; which once passed their house, but was rejected by the Lords. On both the other

\* The Habeas Corpus Act, passed in the 31 Car. II, forms a singular exception to the above observation, no particular notice having been taken of it in the declaration of the Bill of Rights, probably because James' government had been clear of any gross imputations of it's infringement.

occasions their wish was defeated by a prorogation and dissolution.—The principle, on which they acted, viz: the competency of Parliament, was clearly assented to by the other house in their reception of the bill, and their debates upon it, though they did not agree as to the expediency of the measure; and still more directly was it allowed by the King himself, who was willing to have consented to any limitations, provided the measure of absolute exclusion might be given up. Indeed the propositions he made to the parliament held at Oxford, did in fact amount to an exclusion in every thing but in name. That nothing was done seems wholly owing to the great heat and party violence of the times. The object was the exclusion of the Duke of York, heir presumptive to the throne. But it went no further; and the Duke's Son, if he should have been educated a protestant and professing the protestant faith was to have succeeded: otherwise his daughters, Mary, and Anne, who did indeed afterwards succeed in pursuance of the same principle in the event of the Revolution. For



the great cause, for which the Duke of York's exclusion was so much desired, was no other than his being a papist, and the encouragement he gave to persons of the same persuasion, together with the known intolerance of that Church in matters of religion and its despotic principles in respect of civil government, and the danger to be apprehended from these circumstances in the event of his becoming King, heightened no doubt by the manifest intrigues at that time carried on by the Court of Rome through the great influence and unceasing activity of the society of Jesuits. Although the measure of exclusion was at the time lost, yet the principle on which it was founded in the end prevailed; for James indeed succeeded to the throne, but was quickly obliged by the united voice of the whole Kingdom,—the dangers before apprehended, being found real, and even exceeded by the event,—the desertion of all his counselors, and even of his own children, aiding the attempt of the Prince of Orange his Son in Law, who had married his eldest daughter, to relinquish it: and although to force James to such

a step does not seem to have been the immediate object of the Prince or of the People, yet nothing could happen more favourable for their views; and doubtless the presence of the armed force, which attended the Prince of Orange, and the general defection of the Kingdom were the means of inspiring such terror and despair into the King's mind, as induced him to relinquish the throne and kingdom. A step, which fortunately settled the business without strife or bloodshed, and justified the immediate transfer of the Crown to the heads of William and of Mary.

The history of the Revolution forms no part of my present subject. Suffice it only to observe, that it was the danger of a popish establishment of the faith in these kingdoms through the influence of a popish King, which first suggested the measure of the exclusion; and that it was the same danger now become immediate, which brought about the Revolution. It was this principle, that interrupted the then succession, and placed the crown upon the heads of William and Mary; and it was the

same, that thereupon limited the succession to the protestant descendants of the abdicated monarch without further interruption to the direct lineal and hereditary right, and afterwards extended it to the Princess Sophia the ancestor of his present Majesty. And here I cannot dismiss the reflexion without observing, though it be somewhat foreign from the subject, that it is in perfect accord with this great-fundamental principle of the Revolution, which the advisers of such measures seem alone to have forgotten, that his Majesty has ever resisted those attempts, which would extend the toleration of the Roman Catholic faith to an admission of its professors to a participation of political power, and probably soon lead to a share of the execution, if not ultimately to the throne itself. We cannot on these occasions be too grateful for the steadiness of the King; nor too watchful, it should seem, over those, who would be his servants.

Yet the Revolution is a subject of too great importance to be passed over without further comment; especially in these times, when it's

true principles are so grossly perverted and misrepresented, and when under colour of it's authority the main assertion of, I know not what, opinions, by fraud, or force, to the perversion of the minds of the people, the confusion of their present peaceful and happy State, and the overthrow of good order and regular government, is held forth as just and glorious. Glorious indeed was the Revolution, which placed the protestant line upon the throne of these Kingdoms: glorious,—not merely as a Revolution and an assertion of the People's rights, as some seem to think; but rather glorious, as a great public measure involving a nation's weal, undertaken for a just cause, and pursued with temper and moderation; and although by arms, yet with peaceful intent:—a measure indeed of the last moment, fraught with extreme peril, and blessed by Providence with complete success. These are the glories of the Revolution. Let those, who have been ever since the advocates, as it were, of Revolution upon Revolution, who seem to wish reformation itself reformed, and in the greatness of their

Zeal and magnanimity of their patriotism step forth—to enfranchise even the free;—let them consider, what they have in common with the promoters of that great event. Let them consult history, if they can, with an unprejudiced mind, and perceive the folly and absurdity of their attempt. Or, if they apprehend no danger in loosening the restraints of government from a people too far advanced in profligacy of manners and corruption of sentiment, but abounding in wealth and means, let them but cast their eyes beyond the circle of this favoured land and behold to what results a Revolution,—tho' softened under the name of radical reform,—in such a state of things must lead;—a Senate for the houses of Lords and Commons:—a code de la conscription for a standing army and a militia:—a Man worshipped as a God;—and a people at his word, spreading violence, subjection, and desolation through the earth.

But since the true Glory of the Revolution seems to have been so much mistaken, and for particular purposes misrepresented, as consisting in the forcible assertion of the People's presumed

right of resisting the Chief Magistrate's authority, if ever they see or think they see just occasion; the deposition of a reigning Monarch at the People's will; and the appointment of another Prince according to their mere pleasure;—it is necessary only to observe, that the history of the thing is sufficient to determine, that such was not the fact. To which, it will be useful, if by way of authority we call to mind the judgment of one of the first expounders of English Law, and most enlightened advocates of well regulated liberty and just privilege in the subject. With respect to the Revolution, by which persons not in the direct order of succession were called to the throne, “the true  
 “ground and principle, upon which that event  
 “proceeded,” says Blackstone, “was an entirely  
 “new case in politics, which had never before  
 “happened in our history, the abdication of the  
 “reigning Monarch and the vacancy of the  
 “throne thereupon.”—“It was not a defeaz-  
 “ance of the right of succession and a new  
 “limitation of the crown by the King and  
 “both houses of Parliament. It was the act

“ of the nation alone upon the conviction that  
 “ there was no King in Being.”—“ The facts,  
 “ from which this conclusion was drawn were  
 “ obvious and notorious, and the consequences  
 “ which they necessarily involved, it belonged  
 “ to our ancestors to determine.” And, if it be  
 true in politics as in morals, that principles are  
 best illustrated by their effects, as men’s hearts  
 are by their manners, the things done will best  
 declare the real grounds and motives of the  
 Revolution, and the principles on which our  
 ancestors proceeded.

For it is manifest from all the provisions of the  
 different settlements of the crown, which fol-  
 lowed, that no such motive or cause, as is too  
 frequently, and with too much confidence attri-  
 buted to them, really obtained; and it is no less  
 manifest from the very words of the declaration  
 of the bill of Rights, in which they acknow-  
 ledged William and Mary to be King and  
 Queen, that they held no such thing, as the  
 right to call in, whom they would, to the vacant  
 throne in prejudice of the protestant branches  
 of the ancient royal family. For the settlement

included *all the protestant posterity* of King Charles the first, except such other issue as King James might at any time have, which was totally omitted, “through fear,” says Blackstone, “of a popish succession.”\* Thus while the irregular elevation of King William, who in the common order would have succeeded Queen Anne, took place with the consent of both the sisters, and is to be attributed to the necessity of the times, and the great service which he had rendered, the exclusion of the infant Son of James, and any future issue he might have, was evidently owing to the same cause which drove the Father from his throne, the danger of a popish Monarch—and the words of the declaration in the bill of Rights are decisive, “thank-

\* I admit of no general principles to be drawn from the events of which we are here speaking.—The events and the causes which led to them were singular and anomalous, as all writers on the subject agree. And therefore no principles of *general* application can be drawn from them. I also wish it to be observed that I am merely arguing *the principles which guided our ancestors* in their conduct of the revolution as *it's* principles; and that I deduce them from the events which they produced,—events indeed which carry their principles on their front.



“ing God for his wonderful Providence in pre-  
 “serving their Majesties’ royal persons to reign  
 “over us upon the throne of their ancestors;” and  
 acknowledging, that on the abdication of King  
 James, and their acceptance of the throne, the  
 vacancy thereof having been declared by the  
 two houses of parliament, “*they did become, were,*  
 “*are, and of right ought to be,* by the laws of this  
 “land, King and Queen of England, &c.”—

The Revolution being thus accomplished, it  
 remains for us to consider the enactments which  
 thereupon took place by the legitimate autho-  
 rity of King, Lords and Commons in parliament  
 assembled, declarative of the rights, privileges,  
 and liberties, of the subject, and limitations of  
 the crown. And this will further illustrate the  
 true principles of the Revolution, which is  
 justly considered as the last solemn assertion  
 and settlement of the Constitution.

These acts are principally found in the 1st  
 W. and M. Sess. 1. c. 6. and Sess. 2. c. 2; in  
 the 12th and 13th. W. III. c. 2; the 4th Ann,  
 c. 8; and the 6th Ann, c. 7.

The first of these prescribes the oath to be

taken by the Kings of England at their coronation.

The second is commonly known by the name of the "Bill of Rights."

The third by that of the "Act of Settlement."

And the two last are more especially connected with the subject as they repeal several prospective provisions of the Act of settlement, and substitute others in their place.

The coronation oath is too nearly connected with a question, on which I am persuaded, a very large majority of the people are of the same mind with the King,—a question of very great importance—the claims of the professors of the popish faith to be relieved from every incapacity in respect of office or power, which our ancestors by the Revolution thought it incumbent on them for their own and their children's safety to impose; urged,—through the encouragement which has been given them,—more like a *demand, which must be granted,* than a petition which *may and perhaps ought ever to be refused;* and artfully represented

under the false and specious title of *emancipation*:—the coronation oath hath too near a connexion with this question to be here passed over with the bare mention:—it is conceived as follows:

“ I solemnly promise and swear to govern  
 “ the people of this Kingdom of England, and  
 “ the dominions thereto belonging, according  
 “ to the statutes in Parliament agreed on and  
 “ the Laws and customs of the same.”

“ I will to my power cause Law and Justice  
 “ in mercy to be executed in all my judgments.

“ I promise to the utmost of my power to  
 “ maintain the Laws of God, the true profession  
 “ of the Gospel, and the *Protestant reformed*  
 “ *Religion established by Law.*

“ And I will preserve unto the Bishops and  
 “ Clergy of this realm, and to the Churches  
 “ committed to their charge, all such rights and  
 “ privileges, as by Law do or shall appertain  
 “ unto them or any of them.”

Altho' in this last clause which relates to the privileges of the several orders of the established Clergy and their Churches, respect seems to be

had, from the future tense of the engagement in both members of the sentence, of Laws *to be* enacted, and therefore the King is not restrained by the terms of his oath from giving his assent to such alteration of the Laws, as may affect the same, by new enactments according to his discretion; yet <sup>the former</sup> it is to be observed that no such reference is made to any future alteration of the establishment of the Protestant faith, and the protection, which it should receive; and the King is therefore undoubtedly bound accordingly to resist any measures, which may be suggested to him, by which the same shall be brought in danger. And this, independently of any general adherence to the principles of the Revolution, which however ought the more to endear him to his subjects, who justly regard that event as the establishment of their liberty, prosperity, and security.

The bill of rights first enumerates by way of preamble the principal instances of grievous malversation in the government of the late King, and then proceeds with its declaration of thirteen articles;

1. “ That the pretended power of suspending  
 “ Laws or the execution of Laws by Regal  
 “ authority, without consent of Parliament, is  
 “ illegal.

2. “ That the pretended power of dispensing  
 “ with Laws, or the execution of Laws by  
 “ Regal authority, as it hath been assumed and  
 “ exercised of late, is illegal.

3. “ That the commission for erecting the  
 “ late court of commissioners for ecclesiastical  
 “ causes, and all other commissions and courts  
 “ of like nature, are illegal and pernicious.

4. “ That the levying money for or to the  
 “ use of the crown by pretence of prerogative  
 “ without grant of parliament, for longer time  
 “ or in other manner than the same is or shall  
 “ be granted, is illegal.

5. “ That it is the right of the subjects to  
 petition the King, and all commitments or pro-  
 secutions for such petitioning are illegal.

6. “ That the raising or keeping a standing  
 “ army within the Kingdom in time of peace  
 “ unless it be with consent of Parliament is  
 “ against Law.

7. " That the subjects which are protestants  
 " may have arms for their defence suitable to  
 " their condition, and as allowed by Law.

8. " That the election of members of Parlia-  
 " ment ought to be free.

9. " That the freedom of speech and debates  
 " or proceedings in Parliament, ought not to  
 " be impeached or questioned in any court or  
 " place out of Parliament.

10. " That excessive bail ought not to be  
 " required nor excessive fines imposed, nor  
 " cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

11. " That Jurors ought to be duly impanel-  
 " led and returned, and Jurors which pass upon  
 " men in trials for high treason ought to be  
 " freeholders.

12. " That all grants and promises of fines  
 " and forfeitures of particular persons before  
 " conviction are illegal and void.

13. " And that for redress of all grievances,  
 " and for the amending, strengthening and  
 " preserving of the Laws, Parliaments ought  
 " to be held frequently."

These Thirteen Articles, with respect to the

past, were then declared to have been “the true  
 “ancient and indubitable rights and liberties  
 “of the people of England;” and with respect  
 to the future, they are enacted to be “so es-  
 “teemed, allowed, judged, deemed and taken,  
 “and that all and every the particulars afore-  
 “said shall be firmly and strictly holden and  
 “observed,—and all officers and ministers what-  
 “soever shall serve their Majesties, and their  
 “successors according to the same in all times  
 “to come.”

Then follows in this celebrated bill the acknowledgment of King William and Queen Mary to be King and Queen, and the limitation of the Crown to Queen Anne and their several issues; in which, as was before observed, not a word is to be found of *election* or *appointment* by the People, of “*stipulation*” or “*condition*” on the part of the Crown; but the people by their representatives are seen blessing God for his Providence and Goodness to this nation, “manifest in his providing and preserving  
 “their said Majesties, most happily to reign over  
 “us upon the throne of their ancestors,” and that

King James having abdicated the government, —the two remaining branches of the absolute legislative power of these realms, the Lords and Commons, having declared the same and their majesties having accepted it,—“ they did become, were, and of right ought to be, by the “ Laws of this realm—King and Queen.”

Then follows the clause of exclusion founded upon the experience of the inconsistency of a popish King with the safety and welfare of this protestant Kingdom, by which every papist, or person marrying a papist, is rendered incapable of inheriting or possessing the crown; the people absolved from their allegiance to all such; and the protestant succession secured: and lastly, the declaration against the principal tenets of popery required of all public men by the 30th Cha. II. cap. 1. is here exacted of the Kings and Queens of England for ever. So that while the particular reference, which this famous Bill had to the circumstances of the times, is manifest throughout; the general principles to be deduced from its enactments may be reduced to three heads.



The rights of the subject as touching the restriction of the King's prerogative.

The rights of the subject, properly so speaking, both in respect of the private individual, and in respect of the representation in Parliament.

The rights of the subject in respect of the settlement and limitation of the Crown.

By the first of these the King is allowed to be in no case superior to the Law, but in every thing himself subject to it.

By the next, the *protestant* subject is allowed arms in his own defence, while the Subject's right to petition the King in any matter that concerns him, without fear of it's being deemed presumption, or of his suffering in any way for the exercise of that privilege, is maintained; and for the security of his rights, and of the Law, and for it's amendment from time to time, as occasion shall require, it is declared that the election to parliament ought to be free, and that parliaments ought to be frequently assembled: which doth not seem so much to mean

the frequent calling of a *new* parliament as the frequent convocation of that assembly.

And by the last, all the provisions for the settlement and limitation of the Crown concur in manifesting the design and occasion of the Revolution, viz: to preclude a papist from being King, and to secure the line of protestant Succession.

The Bill of Rights may be considered as the first great legal act touching the constitution, which followed upon the Revolution; and the same principle, which manifestly pervades it, afterwards led to the Act of settlement, which in some of its provisions went further to affect the Constitution, and guard against the crown's obtaining too great an influence, as was supposed possible, in the House of Commons, and the nation being thereby plunged into unnecessary wars. For when the Protestant line, recited in the Bill of Rights, seemed likely to become extinct, this was passed in the 12th William III. to declare the next protestant relation of the ancient royal house heir pre-

sumptive to the Throne. This relation was found in Sophia Electress of Hanover, the granddaughter of James I; and on her accordingly and her issue, the crown by the act of settlement was entailed. By the Laws already in existence—that is, by the common Law of the hereditary nature of the Crown of England, and by the statute \* limiting the same to persons professing the protestant faith,—the Princess Sophia, and her issue, would undoubtedly have succeeded to the throne, had the Act of Settlement never been passed, as the preamble to the bill in fact declares. However the circumstances of the times rendered such a measure highly politic and expedient.

With a view to obviate the possible inconveniences, to which the nation might become subject in the event of a Prince of foreign connections and attachments succeeding to the throne, such as an Elector of Hanover might be supposed to be, some provisions were added *in that case* and *not before* to take effect. These, with their particular preamble manifesting their prospective view, are in the following

\* Bill of Rights.

words,—“ and whereas it is requisite and necessary, that some further provision be made for securing our religion, laws and liberties from and after the death of his Majesty and the Princess Anne of Denmark; and in default of the issue of the body of the said Princess and of his Majesty respectively. Be it enacted, &c.

1. “ That whosoever shall hereafter come to the possession of this Crown, shall join in communion with the Church of England, as by Law established.

2. “ That in case the crown and imperial dignity of this realm, shall hereafter come to any person not being a native of this Kingdom of England, this nation be not obliged to engage in any war for the defence of any dominions and territories, which do not belong to the crown of England, without consent of Parliament.

3. “ That no person who shall hereafter come to the possession of this Crown, shall go out of the dominions of England, Scotland, or Ireland, without consent of Parliament.

4. “ That from and after the time, that the

“ further limitation of this Act shall take effect,  
 “ all matters and things relating to the well-  
 “ government of this Kingdom, which are pro-  
 “ perly cognizable in the privy council by the  
 “ laws and customs of this realm, shall be trans-  
 “ acted there, and all resolutions taken there-  
 “ upon, shall be signed by such of the privy-  
 “ council as shall advise and consent to the  
 “ same.

5. “ That after the said limitation shall take  
 “ effect as aforesaid, no person born out of the  
 “ Kingdoms of England, Scotland, or Ireland,  
 “ or the dominions thereunto belonging (al-  
 “ though he be naturalized or made a denizen,  
 “ except such as are born of English parents)  
 “ shall be capable to be of the privy council,  
 “ or a member of either house of Parliament, or  
 “ to enjoy any office or place of trust, civil or  
 “ military, or to have any grant of lands, tene-  
 “ ments, or hereditaments, from the crown to  
 “ himself, or to any other or others in trust for  
 “ him.

6. “ That no person who has an office or  
 “ place of profit under the King, or receives a

“pension from the Crown, shall be capable of  
 “serving as a member of the house of Com-  
 “mons.

7. “That after the said limitation shall take  
 “effect as aforesaid, Judges’ commissions be  
 “made *quamdiu se benè gesserint*, and their  
 “salaries ascertained and established; but upon  
 “the address of both houses of parliament, it  
 “may be lawful to remove them.

8. “That no pardon under the great seal of  
 “England be pleadable to an impeachment by  
 “the commons in Parliament.”

And the statute concludes with a clause con-  
 firming all laws, generally for securing the  
 established religion, rites and liberties of the  
 country, &c.—rehearsing the same to be the  
 birthright of the people of England.

But the Eight Articles above-cited, were  
 made law only in prospect, and not to take  
 effect until the actual failure of the <sup>x</sup>line of  
 Charles I. And so it happened that in some  
 respects they never came to be in force as  
 Law. For before that event took place, and  
 while the house of Hanover had no influence

restant

nor immediate interest in the realm of England, those provisions were partly modified or repealed: that especially, by which no person who has an office or place of profit under the King, or receives a pension from the Crown, could be capable of serving in the house of Commons, being afterwards thought extremely inconvenient and even incompatible with the regular administration of public business, by the 4th Ann. c. 8. was repealed; and by the 6th Ann. c. 7. two provisions of a far more reasonable and practicable nature were substituted in place of it. One, by which certain offices by name and all offices generally created after October 25th, 1705, are declared to render the holders of them totally incapable of sitting in the house of Commons. And the other, by which every person already a member accepting any office of profit whatsoever under the crown besides those, which by the former clause totally incapacitate, is made to vacate his seat, and is sent again to his constituents, who may re-elect him or not as they please; which is in fact no more or less, than making the cou-

stituent himself in every individual case, the enacter or repealer at his own discretion of the original prospective exclusion of the Act of Settlement, leaving it to him to choose, whether he will have a person, who is in possession of such or such an office, for his representative in parliament. These provisions took effect accordingly, and have ever since remained in force.

The Third and Fourth Articles also of the eight were afterwards thought inconvenient, and impracticable, and accordingly repealed; the fourth by the same statute of the 4th of Anne; and the third relative to the King's going abroad by the 1st Geo. I. c. 3. out of complaisance to his Majesty. For it was justly thought unreasonable to require a sovereign Prince to relinquish his dominions, or to preclude him altogether from visiting them; and especially to prohibit a man of the King's time of life from revisiting a country, where he had been born and bred, and connexions, with whom he had spent the better part of his life; and towards whom he must naturally have felt



a strong attachment: and that the more, when no material inconvenience appeared likely to result.

Thus have I endeavoured to bring into one view the several acts, which have asserted the power of parliament, to make laws restraining the Royal prerogative and limiting the succession to the crown, and at the same time defining, enlarging, or ascertaining the liberty of the people. These indeed do not form the constitution of our happy government of which we boast, nor any part of it; but rather serve to prove it's beneficial fruits. Yet they may be considered of the next greatest value to the constitution itself as principal and fundamental Laws, touching the rights of the subject and the prerogative of the Sovereign. I have thought it incumbent on me to be more diffuse and particular upon this head, on account of the mischievous and deceitful attempts which have been lately made, or rather renewed, to mislead the people, and particularly the inhabitants of this great city, attempts which I shall make it my further endeavour to expose.

My attention having been accidentally directed of late to this subject, it was not without surprize mingled with indignation, that I saw in the public papers, purporting to rehearse the speeches of Sir Francis Burdett, Mr. Maddox, and others at a meeting of a number of persons calling themselves "the friends of Reform," positions insinuated by Sir Francis, boldly asserted by others of less name, probably through ignorance; and solemnly and repeatedly sworn to, as much as any man could voluntarily swear himself, by Mr. Maddox; positions however directly contrary to the truth.

*Maddock  
said thus*

Sir Francis Burdett with much apparent art insinuated merely to others, who were not so well informed probably as himself, and implicated only what is not true. The resolutions proposed under his auspices rehearse the proposition much as Sir Francis stated it;—

“ That by the act commonly called the act of  
 “ settlement, which placed the house of Bruns-  
 “ wick on the throne of these realms, it was as-  
 “ serted and recognised as the constitutional  
 “ principle, that no person who has an office of

“ profit under the King, or receives a pension  
 “ from the Crown, shall be capable of serving  
 “ as a member of the house of Commons.”

How this matter really is, as far as it relates, or ever did relate, to the actual law and constitution of this country, I have already shewn at large. I apprehend, that Sir Francis Burdett and the framers of these resolutions know ~~that~~ ~~matter~~ as well as any body; and that they could tell, if they would, what they have omitted, and what on the other hand they meant their hearers to supply. It is impossible to suppose, that Mr. Maddox should be ignorant of this matter. Yet, when it came to his turn to speak,—and the strain to those who have a taste for fiction really is amusing, it is a perfect amœbæan,—Sir Francis praises the enlightened patriotism of Mr. Wardle. Mr. Wardle that of Sir Francis. Mr. Maddox both; the one for the virtues of his private life, the other for his sweet eloquence in public. And we might compliment with *equal justice* Mr. Maddox himself in both respects, his *eloquence* and his *virtue*.

“ Et vitulâ tu dignus et hic:”

There is a proverbial saying I think among the Scotch, "You claw me, and I'll claw you:" leaving therefore these orators to claw one another as they please, since such is the way with copartners in general in the pursuit of popular applause; and it means only not what they think of one another, but what they think ~~rather~~, every one of himself; let us hasten to examine facts and their manner of stating ~~them~~, by which means we shall be best able to determine what credit they really deserve for sound judgment, and upright mind.

Sir Francis Burdett simply insinuates what is not true. The resolution proposed by Mr. Cartwright repeats it as an assertion in form. Mr. Maddox seconds the resolutions, and begins and ends his speech with a solemn assertion in the legal form of a sworn witness,—

"That the resolutions which he had the honour of seconding, were *the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.*"

Whereas the fact is, that they contain in the particular point alluded to, in every clause just the reverse. And this Mr. Maddox did know,

or he did not know. If he did, what credit can be given to such a man for integrity? If he did not, what for information? So that every way he is the last person, who should be trusted in such matters.

It is also worth while to remark, that Mr. Maddox is a Reformer, and that he sits for Boston. Now Mr. Cartwright, says,\* and Mr. Cartwright once stood for Boston himself, that he understands “it to be the point of honour in a Boston election, for every candidate who stands a poll, to give five guineas a man to all such of the electors who vote for him, and will accept the money;” and that, because *he* (Mr. Cartwright) did not think proper to pursue this plan, he only got 59 votes out of 549.—How many votes Mr. Maddox got, and how many guineas by Mr. Cartwright’s account he must have given, he did not tell the good people at the Crown and Anchor. He only told them, that “*he*,” this Mr. Maddox,

\* Mr. C’s pamphlet “Reasons for Reformation,” page 11 ; but perhaps *Mr. Cartwright* does not speak “*the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.*”

Member for Boston, “ *had pledged himself to “ a parliamentary reform!!!”*”

Since, however, I have made a more general charge of falsehood and misrepresentation against Sir Francis Burdett, it will not be improper, if I bring together the various places to which I allude, expose the spirit which pervades them, and endeavour to obviate and defeat the mischief that seems intended.

The hasty rhetorical sketches of this faction, and the ephemeral productions of their pro-founder studies, which are printed *for the benefit of the fund*, are utterly incapable of any other answer. Visionary as they are, they have nothing of defined theory or abstract principle, which offers itself to our examination. They propose no certain line of conduct to be considered. Full of words, but without argument, there is nothing to refute. These men indeed despise both theory and principle, practice and argument. Their cause is so strong forsooth, that it is independent of all such things. The necessity of *their* reform is so manifest, that it is incapable of being ex-

plained. The practice they would have us embrace is so pure, so safe, so necessarily fortunate, that they dare not tell us what it is, lest we should be too soon surprised and frightened. But they deal largely in frothy declamation, and indefinite expressions; strong conclusions without regard to reason; irrefragable proof without having heard either side of the question; and bold reiterated assertion without the least regard to the truth of fact. Such persons are incapable of an argument in answer, since they advance nothing distinctly on which to found it. If we argue with them, the labour is lost,

“As easy may we the intrenchant air

“With our keen swords impress.”

They can only be dealt with by an exposure of their falsehood, their folly, and their ill-disguised intentions. The task would not be difficult in any of their speeches or publications, and were it not for the seriousness of the stake which it involves, it might be made the source of much amusement and recreation. The seriousness of that stake however, forbids us to treat the subject with levity; and the interest we all

have in it, gives every one a right to speak. In the part that I have undertaken, I shall confine myself to the proceedings of that meeting, which has accidentally crossed my view.

The business of the day seems to have been opened after the dinner was removed, (for without dining nothing can be done,) by a toast from the Chair;

*“ The King, and the principles which seated  
“ his family on the throne.”*

We cannot give the king of this civic feast much credit for the loyalty of the first clause of this toast, until we have ascertained what his views were in the second, and in the manner of it's connexion with the first.

The next toast which issued from holy Chair was ;

*“ The People, with three times three.”*

And then followed the speech, which may be considered as addressed to the subject of the latter toast with reference to the former. In this we soon find the following expressions.

“ Of late years—every period is marked with  
“ some encroachment on the rights, with some



“ deprivation of the comforts, with some at-  
 “ tempt on the property, and freedom of the  
 “ people. If we go back to the *obsolete statute*  
 “ *Magna Charta*, to the Bill of Rights, and to  
 “ the Act of Settlement, we shall there indeed see  
 “ developed, *those principles* of British indepen-  
 “ dence, which from time immemorial it has  
 “ been the pride of Britons to assert. If  
 “ we read over *the Bill of Rights*, and the  
 “ Act of Settlement, we shall see that it was the  
 “ assertion of *those principles*, which placed the  
 “ present Royal Family on the Throne.”

Sir Francis Burdett here says, that it was the  
 assertion of the principles which are developed  
 in Magna Charta, the Bill of Rights, and the  
 Act of Settlement, which placed the present  
 Family on the throne. To this we cannot  
 possibly object. Only we object to Sir Francis  
 Burdett's view of this business, and to the in-  
 ferences he with much art would teach his  
 audience to draw from it. He calls Magna  
 Charta “ *obsolete*,” with what view we shall pre-  
 sently see. But in the mean time, we must just  
 observe that if instead of saying, that from these

Laws “ British *independence*,” which is a vague term, had been developed, he had said, that from thence was drawn those principles of equal law, just Liberty, and safe Government, which are at this day the source of British happiness and glory, his language would have been more correct, and less liable to misapprehension and perversion. But this would not have suited his purpose. His purpose was to infer that all these principles have been, and are, by the King’s government trampled under foot. He says, “ that every period of late years is marked with “ some encroachment upon the rights, with “ some deprivation of the comforts, and with “ some attempt on the property and freedom “ of the people;” insomuch, that Magna Charta is become “ *obsolete*.”

Now Sir Francis Burdett said not a word specifically of the enactments of Magna Charta, the declaration of the Bill of Rights, or the provisions of the Act of Settlement. He took it for granted, all these things were known to all men; and he says simply, “ if we look into “ them.” However that might be with respect

to the multitude of his hearers, perhaps they are as well known to us as to Sir Francis Burdett himself; and we have looked into them, though not at his bidding, nor with his eye. Let us see then how he proceeds to substantiate the inference, that these principles have been thus contemned and trampled upon, and things come to that pass, that exulting as in the triumph of a sound argument, he concludes; “our present situation being compared with our former, we must needs be convinced, that relief is only to be found”—in the adoption of the views of himself and his associates.

He begins therefore with a general assertion that,

“Among various *stipulations*, which King William assented to as the *conditions* of his ascending the throne of these Kingdoms, there were many, which related to grievances at that time most oppressive, but which have since been so interwoven with the practice of our government, that we scarcely mention them as abuses, because we scarcely hope for their redress.”

This extraordinary sentence, if it has any certain reference at all, must refer to the declaration of the Bill of Rights, in which however, as hath been shewn at large above, there is not a word of "*stipulation*" or "*condition*" to be found. The grievances at that time, or rather that had been under James II, the most oppressive, so far from being interwoven with our present government, are themselves become most truly obsolete, insomuch that it seems futile to mention them any longer, as declarations of Right, being such as no one for the last 120 years has called in question, and no one has dared to transgress. We have only to refer to the declarations of the Act itself as above stated, where it is to be seen as well from the articles, as from their preamble, that by far the principal grievances then complained of, were those which related to the pretended power of suspending laws by Regal authority without consent of Parliament, and of dispensing with the execution of Laws in like manner; the new erection of the court of commission for ecclesiastical causes; the levying money

without the consent of Parliament; and the denial of the subject's right of petitioning. These indisputably were the prominent grievances of the day; and they are so literally become obsolete, and so very far from being interwoven with our present government, as Sir Francis Burdett affirms, that it is more than probable, that nine tenths of his hearers never dreamt of their having existed. And because the very shadow of them is unknown, therefore they are not complained of; not, as the speaker asserted, because from their inveteracy we scarce hope for their redress,— a reason in this case the most absurd that can be imagined, and worthy only of the head of that man whose heart is capable of such barefaced implications of falsehood as those, on which it is founded. But he proceeds,—

“ For instance, Gentlemen, *one of the reasons for which King James was driven from his throne was, because he persisted in keeping a standing army.*”

Sir Francis Burdett knew what he was about, and he evidently sinned wilfully. He knew,

that the grievances complained of in King James's government, were made the foundation of the declaration of the Bill of Rights. He knew the article, which in that declaration related to the keeping of a standing army. But he suppressed the article itself, and being pushed for proof, touched vaguely upon King James's practice, and left it to his audience to conclude that the declaration of rights contained some such article as this; "that keeping a standing army is illegal and against the constitution."

But what are the words of the real article which he suppressed, but which if he had given it, would have proved nothing? Its terms are these;

"That keeping a standing army within the Kingdom in time of Peace, *unless it be with consent of Parliament*, is against Law."

Now it is no less manifest, that the practice of the King's government hath in no respect been contrary to this article of the declaration of the Bill of Rights, than that Sir Francis Burdett by direct implication hath asserted that

to be an article in it, which he knew while he was uttering it, did not exist. It is in vain that this Gentleman is held up to us in private life as a model of truth and virtue, a Philip Sidney among his friends, an Algernon to the people, while such is his public conduct in addressing himself to those, who are looking up to him for constitutional principle and information.

But we have not half done with the Baronet yet. He proceeds to enumerate the instances in which “the principles that placed the present family on the Throne,” are, and have been, violated by the King’s government:—

“The assault on the freedom of elections, was one among other stated reasons for the expulsion of the family of the Stewarts. *Day after day* are fresh proofs adduced of fresh assaults on that freedom,”—directly inferring, if the connection of a sentence have any force at all, that his present Majesty is as guilty of the gross invasion of his People’s rights, as ever was James II. Sir Francis brings forward Lord Castlereagh.—Now I take this opportunity of asserting, that in respect of whatever is

really base, and fit for punishment, or calls for reformation, the People of England want no such advocate, no such public accuser, no such pure and patriotic champion as Sir Francis Burdett. The good sense of the People of England is able to appreciate the politicks of Sir Francis and his friends; is able to appreciate their patriotism; and does not undervalue their learning and their talents. The reform *they* call for, is not the reform that England wants,—the cause *they* advocate is not her cause,—“non tali auxilio nec defensoribus istis.”—But Sir Francis Burdett quotes Scripture. When he thus instances another’s crime, has he forgot his own offence? Has he forgot the perjuries of a Middlesex election? Was *that* no assault on the freedom of election? Has he forgot the punishment of it’s Sheriff? May we not retort upon him with justice from that sacred book, with the letter of which he, as well as some others, seems to be sufficiently acquainted, but of whose spirit, so far as now appears, he is, I fear, as utterly ignorant as he has proved himself to be of the real and genuine



principles of the British Constitution;—shall we not well say, “thou hypocrite, cast out first  
 “the beam that is in thine own eye, and then  
 “shalt thou see clearly to pull out the mote that  
 “is in thy brother’s eye?”

Having at length dismissed this article of our grievance, Sir Francis Burdett proceeded to another no less artful, no less unfounded; to which indeed I have already referred for Mr. Maddox’s sake, and must apologise for introducing here again, lest Sir Francis should have reason to complain.

“Gentlemen,” he continues, “in referring to  
 “the old constitutional Laws, to which when-  
 “ever the constitution is mentioned, I suppose  
 “a reference is always intended, we shall find  
 “principles recorded for the assertion of which  
 “I have frequently been accused, *and that too*  
 “*by persons whose reading ought to have taught*  
 “*them better*, of a love of novelty. A grand  
 “provision of the Act of Settlement of the  
 “Crown is, that no placeman, or pensioner, or  
 “person holding an office under the Crown,  
 “shall sit in the Commons House of Parliament.”

Now there is no such “*principle of the constitution*” asserted in the Act of Settlement. Such a *provision* is indeed there found, but why did not Sir Francis Burdett hold that term throughout? Why did he not tell his unlearned auditory that the *provision in question*—no assertion of a *constitutional principle* like the declarations of the Bill of Rights, was a prospective provision only, and that not certain but only eventual, never to take place until, nor unless, the whole protestant line of the House of Charles the first, had failed? Why did he not add, that this *prospective* provision was repealed before the time came when it might have taken effect, was repealed within four years by the same authority that enacted it? Not as a *principle* of the constitution which being the source of Law, never can be either enacted or repealed by Law; but as a mere provision deemed inexpedient and impracticable?—Repealed, yet not without substituting in lieu of it a clause which virtually left the judgment in every case to the constituent him-

self; and which, as it was far more convenient and advantageous, so did it partake much more of the nature of real liberty, and of the principles and spirit of the constitution, than the absolute exclusion by Law of all public officers would have done, had that exclusion ever obtained. But Sir Francis Burdett said no more; and he left it to others to supply the omission. He first uttered the falsehood virtually; and Mr. Maddox bore solemn witness to its truth. He forgot, or he lost sight of, or he regarded not, the laws of his country. He seems not indeed to enjoy the real blessings of which they are the source, nor sees them in the same light with the rest of his fellow citizens. With him every act of the Legislature is naught; every act of the Executive is tyranny;

“ All seems infected, that th’ infected spy,

“ As all looks yellow to the jaundic’d eye.”

The blessings of a regular government administered upon just and upright principles, of laws framed in wisdom and executed with integrity, of the greatest degree of practical

liberty united to a greater degree of security and quiet and enduring for a longer term of years than the history of the world can shew among any other people at this or any former time, hath this country from the æra of the Revolution enjoyed, and in most eminent degree doth enjoy at this day. We know the blessings of our lot; and we acknowledge them. From the bottom of our hearts we acknowledge, in the pious stile and sober language of the Bill of Rights, the undeserved goodness of the Almighty, for that in these days of vengeance, when, for the support which they have furnished to the corruptions of the Church, and for their share in that general depravity of morals, which ever accompanies the corruption of religion, and the increase of infidelity, the thrones of Europe have been cast down and the families that long filled them have been humbled, he hath withdrawn that of our beloved sovereign from the devoted continent, and hath happily preserved him *here to sit upon the throne of his ancestors*; and given us to enjoy the beneficent effects of his mild, paternal,

and constitutional administration. Neither, however, do we presumptuously confide that this our present happy state is *for ever settled*. We are not ignorant in this age of knowledge, that like causes, in like circumstances, must ever produce like effects. We know that if irreligion and vice, notwithstanding the warning which the times afford, maintain their ground, they must increase; that if they increase, our overthrow will not be less terrible because it shall have been so long delayed. But as things are at present, only let the attempts of that wild enthusiasm in politics, that lawless fanaticism in civil life, which hesitates at no means to attain it's object, which seems too plainly to "despise dominion," and loves to "speak evil of dignities," only let these attempts be properly exposed, resisted, and suppressed; and let corruption, where it really exists, in the private bosoms of too large a portion of the People be corrected and reformed; and we may laugh to scorn even the gigantic power of the continental foe. But I am entering upon reflexions which seem proper to a conclusion, before I have done justice to

my subject. I must recur again to the instances of false and malicious insinuation which made up the speech of the Chairman at the Crown and Anchor.

He says, that, "it is known to all, that the present war originated with the defence of the King's German Dominions!!" He speaks of the House of Commons itself with contumely and reproach on account of the borough representation. And he speaks of it to the People as an infringement of the Constitution. Yet he knows well that, as long as the House of Commons has existed, that representation has formed a part of it; that, in the language of the Bill of Rights itself, it formed a part, and an essential part, of "*the lawful, full, and free representation of all the estates of the people of this realm.*"

And he knows that at the Revolution nothing of this sort was made the subject of complaint as grievance; and that, had any persons then dared to calumniate that palladium of liberty and guardian of the people's right as he has done now, they would have stood in danger, with a vigorous and enlightened parliament, of a

very different sort of treatment from that which the modern patriot has received, and with the people themselves would inevitably have been taken for disguised jacobites or madmen.

It is barely necessary to recite the sentiments and assertions of this would-be Reformer to expose both their falsehood and absurdity. Who has not known the lenity of our Laws, and the mildness of their execution? Who has not seen the thief escape for want of legal evidence, and knows not the acknowledged difficulty of bringing an offender to justice? Who has not seen the liberty of the land abused to the mad purposes of sedition, until the passions of mankind have been inflamed to blood, and then at last heard the disappointed authors of rebellion accusing government of the murder? But Sir Francis Burdett knows nothing of all that which all the world besides knows. He shamelessly affirms, alluding to the Irish rebellion, to the trials of Tooke, Hardy, and, we must conclude, (for he makes no distinction or exception) to Despard and his associates,—

*“ I cannot forget the long, the cruel, and the unjust imprisonment which individuals have*

“endured. I cannot forget the years which have  
 “passed, marked by the Government of this  
 “Country, with every trait which distinguishes  
 “the conduct of the governments of Countries,  
 “that we have been in the habit of considering  
 “as under the iron hand of despotic power. Not  
 “only have we seen innocent men enduring a  
 “cruel and arbitrary imprisonment, but we  
 “have seen our seas covered with exiles, and our  
 “shores stained with blood”—the blood of inno-  
 cents no doubt he means—“for years and  
 “years,” he goes on, “did the country endure  
 “the grossest violations of the Law, &c.

This no doubt alludes to the period sometimes  
 called by this sort of declaimers “the reign of  
 “terror,” which at the utmost extended from  
 the passing of the Treason and Seditious Bill,  
 to the expiration of the suspension of the  
 Habeas Corpus Act at the peace in 1801, and  
 which the speaker here by a beautiful figure  
 designates by “years and years.”\*

\* Upon another occasion the King’s German Legion, an use-  
 ful body, but in point of numbers a mere handful of men  
 to our military establishment, is marked as “thousands of  
 “thousands of foreigners in arms upon our coasts, while a  
 “jealousy seems to exist of the natives!!!”



But what is still more worthy of observation, a little below he adds ; “ *I do most sincerely believe that the only object that the people had in view at the period to which I have alluded, is the just and rational object, the attainment of which we are here met to facilitate.*” This little sentence deserves a comment, but I shall reserve the notice I mean to take of it until I come to enquire and endeavour to unfold what the views of these *Reformers* really are. He here, however, identifies his own cause with that of the *innocent men* he had above alluded to ; but he would seem to identify the same again with that for which “ Hampden ” is said to have “ bled in the field and Sidney on the “ Scaffold.” But although he may be better acquainted with the object of Horne Tooke and his fellows than we pretend to be ; yet in the cases of Hampden and Sidney our knowledge is equal. And I trust the instances that have been already adduced of Sir Francis Burdett’s falsehood and misrepresentation in points of history, are sufficient to prove that no such mind as that which actuated a Hampden or even a Sidney, is to be found in him or his associates.

There is yet one point remaining which above all others affords an instance of the insidious craft and depraved mind of this most honourable and virtuous of patriots, who in his private circle, extraordinary to tell, bears the reputation of a *virtuous* and *upright* character! If Sir Francis Burdett were a real patriot, and a really good and virtuous citizen, one “that feareth God and escheweth evil,” and had found it necessary to mention certain scandalous practices in high life at all, he would rather have expressed his sense of them in the spirit of the Roman poet, and said—“*hoc fonte derivata clades;*”—but on the contrary, with all the malice and falsehood of an evil spirit, he declares:—

“ I have no hesitation in saying that we should even *shut our eyes to those follies*, if on *the other side we saw our rights, our liberties, and our constitution respected. We are not to expect from Princes, feelings and actions equal to those of human beings in general, much less superior. We are willing to grant them indulgence, but we are only willing to grant it on the security of our liberties and our rights.*”

Upon this most diabolical sentence, and upon the no less diabolical compliment which follows, I feel myself utterly unable to comment. One sentiment only fills my breast, and takes possession of my whole Soul,—horror of the corrupt heart, and indignation at the audacity and impunity of the speaker.

With Sir Francis Burdett individually I have now done. I knew him not but as he shewed himself in speech; and I have read somewhere that “out of the fulness of the heart the mouth speaketh:” Sir Francis Burdett sought a place where he said publicly what it pleased him to say; and it hath been everywhere printed and dispersed. In the notice I have thought fit to take, I too have exercised the privilege of an Englishman, that of speaking what I think; a privilege of which I trust, notwithstanding the cant of these self-inspired prophets, neither *sooner* nor *later* we shall be deprived. The love of truth hath warmed me, and the impudent protrusion of falsehood hath provoked me. I have vindicated the honour of the chair I fill, and they, to whom I address myself, will testify that I have done my duty.

Having thus, I hope, satisfactorily exposed the gross misrepresentations of a set of persons, who, if they would be received as the Apostles and preachers of no *new* doctrine, but only of a just and rational reform, a “*renovation*” they say, of the ancient constitution, a “*restoration*” of that, which formerly existed, ought to be the most accurate and correct of all men in their account of things past; but having shewn how greatly they are deficient in this respect, and having thence inferred the insincerity of their professions in regard to the object which, they say, they would obtain, it only remains for me to endeavour to shew, what that object really is. In this attempt there is certainly more of difficulty, and less of material wherewith to work; but yet, I think, sufficient, to convince and to convict.

None so foolish, runs the proverb, as the false. We have seen how shamefully deficient these persons are in truth; now let us try their wisdom. They seem indeed upon this occasion to have been somehow beyond measure elated, with a prospect they thought they saw of present success. They triumphed *before* the fight,

to the end, I trust, that we may triumph *after* it. Watchful of events, and eager to seize every opportunity, they gladly took advantage of a late enquiry, and used every means with the most industrious activity of publishing and magnifying the mischief. So much indeed of real infamy appeared;—do not let me be mistaken,—of infamy on the part of the would-be dealers, and the number of *buyers*, gentlemen, who by becoming willing parties in that traffick, where the thing offered for sale ought never to be *bought*, have shewn, that they valued promotion above principle, and have indeed sacrificed honour to obtain it;—the infamous dealings, which thus were brought to light, and the scandal which the conduct of great characters, whom I will not insult the Almighty by supposing less capable of virtue, from the very eminence of their situation than other men, but of whom I should rather say, that the more therefore was required;—the scandal I say, which the conduct of great characters, and the detection and exposure of these things necessarily involved, had such an effect upon men's

minds, that the passions of the people were inflamed; and, blinded by what they saw, they would not admit of a question being made of that, which was by no means proved to have existed. Thus did the *reforming set* easily contrive to procure popular resolutions from various quarters, London, Reading, and the rest, the striking similarity of whose language argues them the production of almost *one pen*, while the remarkable attention to *veracity* and *fact*, which they exhibit, as strongly lead us to infer *whose* that pen was. However they came in from all quarters, and *reformers* intoxicated with their present success, proceed to develop other views in other measures. Although they did not think prudent even yet to tell the People all at once the extreme object of their hopes and wishes, their infatuation was so great that they plainly said so: and, if they have not *explicitly declared* their views, nor said *much*, the *little they have said* is worth attention; and perhaps will open to us more than they may desire.

Now I say, *Reform* is not their object;

or, if it be, it is that, which certain ancient writers would have called *a reform which is no reform*. And this I mean to prove.

When Mr. Wardle first made his attack upon H. R. H. the Duke of York in the house of Commons, a member\* is said to have charged him with the views of a certain set of desperate wretches, who some sixteen years ago, would have set the country in a flame, but for the vigour of the then administration, and the good sense of the nation at large; and to have declared, that he considered that attack as a preconcerted measure of the reviving party. I own, that not seeing the necessary connection between the charge against his Royal Highness, and the views of this set, I for one thought the allusion to Mr. Wardle's prejudice unhandsome and unfair. I am now inclined to think, from what has since happened, that the honourable member, who made it, knew well what he was about, and had sufficient grounds for the conclusion, and deserved not the obloquy that was cast upon him.

\* Mr. Yorke.

Some such expressions as the following, are said to have fallen from Mr. Wardle in his speech at the Crown and Anchor, where every thing seems to have been the effect of a pre-concerted plan, and the playing off of perfect parts previously gotten. \*

“Great numbers of people,” he said, “not only in the metropolis, but all over the country had joined the standard of reform—— something *was due to those who were now joining them*, and they ought not to go any lengths to frighten them.”

This is too plain to be mistaken. If their object, if *Mr. Wardle's* object, went no further than the apparent purpose of the meeting; if *they had no further lengths to go*, the caution would have been altogether superfluous. But it seems there were other persons not then present, who suspected the probability of such really being the case. Mr. Cartwright read to the following

\* The general cry, when Mr. Cartwright proposed to put the resolutions singly, of “*all, all,*” and when Mr. Maddox stated, that he had prepared a paper, which he declined to read and the cry forthwith of “*read, read,*” savour too strongly of the trick.



effect, purporting to be a letter from Mr. Fawkes of Farnly Hall, once member for Yorkshire;

“The people of Yorkshire would not come forward,” Mr. Fawkes said, “*till they saw what was the conduct of the Reformers of the South. If they sent forth the genial heat, which belonged to the temperate zone of the British Constitution, they would be joined; but if it was the scorching heat of the Revolutionary furnace, others would shrink back from them.*”

This communication clearly betrays a doubt at least upon the minds of some persons, *not unfriendly to reform*, what the intentions of these *Reformers of the South* really were. Whatever therefore they may be, I infer, that they are not *certainly known even to the friends of Reform*; I infer, that they are not necessarily those, and those only, which appeared to be the purpose of the meeting at the Crown and Anchor. Still more, from *Mr. Wardle's* own words, I conclude, that *there were “lengths” in their contemplation*, to which if they proceeded hastily, they might alarm

the good people, who upon the Duke of York's business have too readily joined them. What these "*lengths*" are, and what *the real object is*, remains to be discovered.

Now there was yet further a very singular sentence delivered by the Chairman of this meeting, Sir Francis Burdett, which I have already noticed, but my observations on which I purposely reserved for this place. Sir Francis Burdett alluding to the sufferers in the Irish rebellion, to the trials of Tooke, Hardy, Despard, and others here at home, said;

*" I do most sincerely believe that the only object, that the People had in view, at the period to which I have alluded, is the just and rational object, the attainment of which we have here met to facilitate."*

Nobody doubts that Sir Francis well knew the *real object*, to facilitate which the meeting at the Crown and Anchor was called together; which we have seen there is ground enough to conclude was not that simply, which was professed, namely, *a just and rational reform*. We all know what was the *object, real and pre-*

*tended*, of the Irish Rebels, and of the Conspirators in this Country: and it may be presumed, that *Sir Francis Burdett knows what they were, at least as well as we do.* And he says, that “*he verily believes they are both the same,*” that the object of the friends of reform now is no other than what was formerly the object of the Irish Rebels and the *English Conspirators.*

In the further prosecution of this enquiry, I assume therefore upon their own authority, rashly and unwittingly, I know, afforded;—but upon their own authority I assume it, as a certain fact, that the real object of these *supposed* Reformers, is the same with that of Lord Edward Fitzgerald, M<sup>c</sup>Nevin, the two Sheares, O'Connor, Tooke, Hardy, Thelwall, Despard, and their associates.

Upon this principle, to ascertain the real object of the “*Friends of Reform,*” it will be only necessary to recall to mind the avowed objects, the proceedings, and the confessions of those “*innocent men,*” to whom Sir Francis Burdett alluded in his speech at the Crown and Anchor.

On referring to the history of the times these persons seem to form three distinct Bodies; the political societies of England and Scotland; the society of United Irishmen; and the conspirators engaged with Colonel Despard.

\* Colonel Marcus Despard was the author of a conspiracy to subvert the government and constitution; and the object as stated in the oath administered by the conspirators to each other, professed to be; “ *The Constitution—The independence of Great Britain and Ireland—An equalization of civil, religious, and political rights, &c.*” To accomplish this he endeavoured to seduce the soldiery; he plotted to seize the Tower, Bank, &c; and to seize or murder the King on his way to the House of Lords. These treasons were proved against him; and he suffered the sentence of the Law. And this was one of those “*innocent individuals,*” who according to Sir Francis Burdett, “*endured a long, cruel, and unjust imprisonment;*” and whose object he most *sincerely believed* was not different from that of the *Friends of Reform.*

\* See his Trial.

The Irish Rebellion \* was the effect of a more formidable combination, but of similar views; and the measures pursued had a more fatal issue. The authors of it were the principal leaders of the society of United Irishmen. The *professed* objects with which they set out were “*Parliamentary Reform,*” and “*Catholic Emancipation;*” but their *real* object was a Revolution by the overthrow of the present government, and the establishment of a democratic republic upon French principles. To prepare the public mind for this great change, much art, and many gradual advances in the disclosure of their real sentiments were necessary. The first watchword was “*Parliamentary Reform;*” afterwards it became “*a more equal representation of all the people of Ireland.*” At length things ripened, and the mask was quite thrown off. To accomplish their ends they entered into negotiation with the enemy, and invited a French invasion of the country. They declared in a memoir presented to the

\* See the Report of the secret Committee in Ireland, the Trials of the Rebels, the confession of O'Connor, and others.

French Minister, that, "the *delusions* of *reform* and *emancipation* were beginning to fail from delay, and that there was danger to the *true* *Republicans* of being abandoned and lost." Arthur O'Connor and Lord Edward Fitzgerald, settled with General Hoche the treaty of invasion. McNevin afterwards was their resident in France. The rebellion with all its horrors ensued. Some of the promoters of it perished in the field, some by the executioner; others were banished, and many were pardoned. The truth of all these facts, especially that of their revolutionary object, and the making a *pretext* of "*reform*" and "*emancipation*" rests upon their own confessions. And these again are the "*innocent* individuals," to whom Sir Francis Burdett alluded, when he said, that we "had seen our seas covered with exiles, and our shores stained with blood." The object of these men is known upon their own confession. The object of the "Friends of reform" is not known. But Sir Francis Burdett declared his "*most sincere belief*," that they are the same.

\* In like manner the *avowed* object of the English and Scotch societies in the beginning was “*reform in Parliament,*” vaguely asserted, as by the reformers of the present day. The means by which they worked were just the same as those attempted to be put in practice now. They disseminated industriously such representations, true or false, as tended only to make the people dissatisfied with the government of the country, drawing frightful pictures of the general state of things, and affirming that the constitution was lost and overwhelmed in the universal abuse and corruption of the state; or, more consistently indeed, and with more audacity, that it was in itself naught, and an invasion of the natural rights of man. For the attainment of the proposed object, a convention first assembled from the different societies in Scotland, which stiled itself “The British convention of the delegates of the people associated to obtain—*universal suf-*

\* See the proceedings of the several societies as published in the papers of the day; the trials of Hardy, &c.—and the appendices to the reports of the several committees of secrecy.

“*frage* and *annual parliaments*.” To this assembly the English societies sent delegates, and here in England they took measures to procure a similar meeting, which was to assume the character and powers of a national representation, and to supersede the authority of Parliament. They declared, “that the whole proceedings of the Scotch convention claimed their approbation and applause.” They called it “a legal representation of the people.” They sent an address “to the friends of the constitution at Paris known by the name of “Jacobins.” They sent delegates to the French Convention, adopting the enemy’s cause, and making use of the cant phrase and language of the Revolutionists of France. They advised their correspondents at Norwich “to continue petitioning for reform *as a cloke to their real designs*.” They returned thanks to Hamilton Rowan who was implicated in Jackson’s treason, and exhorted “*the United Irish to persevere*.” Finally, they exhorted each other to “prepare *courageously for the struggle they meditated*,” and avowed openly that they meant to obtain



redress, “ *not from Parliament but from themselves, and from their own strength and* “ *valour, from their own Laws and not from the* “ *Laws of those*” whom they termed, “ *their* “ *plunderers, enemies, and oppressors.*” These were the men, whom Sir Francis Burdett stiled “ *innocent.*” These were they, whose object he “ *most sincerely believed to have been the same* “ *with that, the attainment of which, the* “ *Friends of Reform had met on that day to* “ *facilitate.*”

And truly there seems a great similarity in the manners of the two, an extraordinary coincidence in their views and measures. The Societies declared, that the constitution was lost and gone, “ *that they expected not to obtain* “ *redress from Parliament but from themselves,* “ *their own arm and valour.*”—Mr. Maddox declared, that “ *it was impossible for him or* “ *any one, who wished, to do well for the* “ *people in the present state of the House of* “ *Commons, unless they were supported out of* “ *doors.*” Conscious of his own meaning he then “ *thanked God that the cry of Jacobinism*

“ was over. If their enemies said to them”  
 (’twas the voice of conscience still that spake,)”  
 “ you want revolution, they ought to throw”  
 “ back the accusation and say; no, we want  
 “ only *restoration*,—*restoration* in the consti-  
 “ tution of the Country and of Parliament:” as  
 of a thing lost, and overwhelmed in corruption  
 and abuse. Mr. Wardle declared that, “ till  
 “ *the whole system was changed*, it mattered not  
 “ to the people of England, who the ministers”  
 “ were.” And Mr. Hare Townsend improved  
 upon the sentiment, and said, “ it mattered not  
 “ whether we fell to a *foreign foe* or to a minis-  
 “ ter at home.” The same gentleman also  
 agreed perfectly with Mr. Maddox that “ no-  
 “ thing could be done in such a House of Com-  
 “ mons *unless backed by the people out of doors.*”  
 And in the spirit of the sentiment he toasted  
 Lord Cochrane, who was then present;”

“ The gallant castigator of our foreign foes,  
 “ and may he meet with equal success and better  
 “ support, *when he joins the patriotic band*  
 “ *against our domestic enemies.*”

So that from the similarity of their manners,

and from their apparent views, Sir Francis Burdett, if *he knew nothing*, had grounds enough for “*most sincerely believing* that the only object the people had in view, at the period to which he alluded was the same *just and rational* object which the friends of reform had met on that day to facilitate.”

Colonel Despard's object was not reform but revolution. The object of the Irish, Scotch, and English Societies were the same; and of these last *Reform* was the avowed *pretext* covering an ulterior object.

From these premises argued upon their own words, we must certainly conclude that the *real* object of this faction, Sir Francis Burdett, and “the Friends of Reform,” is *not reform*. “It was no temperate reform” Sir Francis himself said, “it was *complete reformation* alone which could benefit the country, it was a *substantive, just, and upright government*, for which they must contend.” Reform in parliament is the cloke which these men hold up to their real designs; it is the cry with which they endeavour to seduce the people, as their

predecessors did before them; whose views they themselves have identified with their own. Presently they would throw off the mask, and proceed to greater "lengths," as Mr. Wardle intimated; "but now they had recently been "joined by great numbers, whom they must "not go any *lengths to frighten?*"

No reform therefore would satisfy the Faction. A change, a radical change in the constitution is their object; which is not reform, but Revolution.

FINIS.



*J. Seeley, Printer, Buckingham.*

*God bless 'em*







