

SPECIAL
COLLECTIONS
DOUGLAS
LIBRARY



QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY
AT KINGSTON

KINGSTON ONTARIO CANADA

REFORM

NOT

REVOLUTION;

OR, AN ENDEAVOUR TO PROVE THE NECESSITY OF

REFORM

IN THE

CHURCH AND STATE,

WITH REMARKS UPON TRANSLATIONS, PLURALITIES, TITHES,
THE BUILDING OF CHURCHES, AND THE DIVISIONS
OF THE CHURCH CLERGY.

TO WHICH IS ADDED,

An Epistle,

DEDICATORY TO THE TWO HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT.

FOURTH EDITION,
MUCH ENLARGED.

By **JOSEPH SPARROW,**

AUTHOR OF SEVERAL POLITICAL LETTERS AND PAMPHLETS.

London:

PRINTED BY W. LEWIS, FINCH-LANE,
FOR THE AUTHOR,

AND MAY BE HAD OF HIM, 14, ANGEL-COURT, THROGMORTON-STREET,
NEAR THE BANK OF ENGLAND.

1831.

[*Price One Shilling and Sixpence.*]

PREFACE TO THE FOURTH EDITION.

I AVAIL myself of the opportunity afforded me, by the Fourth Edition of this little Pamphlet, most respectfully to solicit the especial attention of the Prelates and the Clergy of the Church of England to the following observations; for it is a truth, that cannot be denied, that if Reform is wanted in the State, Reform is equally requisite in the Church; and so great is the enmity of infidels and others towards the Established Church, that it requires no small share of discretion and prudence to avert those dangers that threaten to produce (if not the complete overthrow of the Church Establishment) certainly schism among the members, and, in too many instances, indifference and separation.

I shall divide these observations under the following heads:—

1. Translations.
2. Pluralities.
3. Tithes.
4. The Building of New Churches.
5. The Divisions of the Church Clergy.

1. Translations have ever been productive of great mischief; and, it is to be feared, that in too many instances the minds of some Prelates have been biassed in favour of certain measures introduced by the minister of the day, and have so voted from a desire to obtain those temporalities which are at the disposal of the Government; and, it is greatly to be doubted, whether so many Prelates of the Church of England would have ever voted in favour of Catholic Emancipation, if there had not been such things as Translations in existence. I do not mention this from a wish to reflect upon those Prelates who voted in favour of that measure, but human nature is human nature still, whether clothed in scarlet, brown, or black; and, as affecting the interests of the Church of England, a more ill-judged vote could hardly have been

given by those Prelates ; for what must Dissenters and others have thought, when so many Prelates of the Church of England voted in favour of giving political power to the members of a church, which church, according to the oaths such Prelates must have taken, teaches damnable and abominable heresies ? I speak not of the expediency or the in expediency of the measure as a political measure, but in a religious point of view, and as proving how dangerous the temptation is to persons who are looking up to translation to a better see, when they must either vote in favour of a particular measure, or give up all hopes of preferment if they vote contrary to the wishes of the individual who has the power of preferring them to a better temporality.

A human being so situated can hardly be said to be able to reason coolly and dispassionately upon any measure when he knows that his interest is at stake ; for these and the other reasons mentioned in the second and third editions of this Work, I sincerely hope that Translations, with the exceptions therein named, will, as speedily as possible, be abolished ; and I should rejoice to see the measure proceed from the church, and a bill introduced into parliament by His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, with the consent of the whole bench of bishops, to effect so desirable a purpose.

PLURALITIES.

2. No clergyman should be permitted to hold more than one Living, for Pluralities are dangerous to the welfare of the Church, and the spiritual good of her members. Every parish ought to have its resident Minister ; and enough, and more than enough, has that Minister to do who has the care of only one parish, if he discharges his duties faithfully, and performs, *as he ought to perform*, the Church Service, at the Parish Church, twice every Sunday.

But I will suppose a case, (it is to be feared too fre-

quent), that of an individual who has lived all his life “without God in the world,” arrived at the trying hour of death, and awakened to a sense of his danger, he is anxious to prepare for the awful change that is about to take place; educated in the religion of the Established Church, the good seed sown at his baptism, although trodden down by the dissipations of a mispent life, has not been altogether destroyed, and, it may be, “*a single corn*” has remained unperceived by the world, and unheeded by such individual, but it required the tears of a sick bed to water it and cause it to take root, and bring forth the goodly fruit of repentance; the Supreme Being afflicts him in mercy with that sickness, and the penitent requests his attendants to go to the regular Minister of the Church, and ask him to visit his sick bed, and to administer (perhaps for the first time) the Holy Sacrament, “before he goes hence, and is no more seen.” But where is the Minister of the Church? Why, he is not at home, for he is a Pluralist, and he has another parish afar off to attend to;—he cannot visit the dying penitent,—and He must die, “and make no sign.” Merciful Heaven, forgive the Sinner,—Pardon the Pluralist.

But this is not the only evil. The Pluralist cannot discharge the other duties of his sacred office, and, being frequently absent, the sheep are left without their shepherd, and wander where they list; and, having once quitted the fold of the Church, they are indifferent as to what fold they enter, or what shepherd they follow.

TITHES.

3. Upon Tithes it is not necessary for me to say much, as this subject is now under the consideration of the legislature; and a bill has been introduced, by His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, into the House of Lords, that I hope will produce beneficial results; and, coming from such a Prelate, this bill is entitled to the highest respect and the most serious consideration. It is

not my intention to offer the adoration of flattery to his Grace, fully assured, as I am, that it would be disgusting to that most excellent Prelate, but, I may be permitted to remark, that if all the Prelates of the Church of England had displayed the consistency and firmness of his Grace upon a late eventful occasion, the Church of England would have stood at the present moment upon higher ground. But to return to Tithes—one question upon this subject, I think, must now be completely set at rest, I mean the right of the Clergy of the Church of England to Tithes; as the Lord Chancellor, and all his Majesty's present Ministers are agreed that the Clergy of the Church of England have a clear and legal right to Tithes, as much so as any nobleman has to his estate,—for my part, I never doubted this for one moment,—but what right have the Lay Impropriators (as they are called) to Tithes? Surely this should be inquired into by the Legislature, for if some people complain (certainly erroneously) that the Clergy do nothing for their Tithes, what do Lay Impropriators do for their share of the produce of the land?

Again, there is another charge against the Clergy of the Church of England, of taking the Tithes from the Roman Catholic Church:—the reply to this is easy, viz. that the people of this country prefer Protestantism to Roman Catholicism; and therefore the law of the land has secured the Throne of these Realms to the House of Brunswick instead of the House of Stuart; and the same law of the land has declared the Church of England the Established Church of the Country, and consequently entitled to the tithes formerly paid to the Church of Rome. But, in point of fact, a considerable part of the church revenues in England were seized by the King at the time of the Reformation, and the revenues of the Church of England fall far short of the sum they would have produced at this time, if the property of all the monasteries

and nunneries had been assigned to the Clergy of the Church of England when the Reformation took place.

But the alteration of the Tithe System is quite another question, and good would it be for the Church if all the Tithes were disposed of, and the amount laid out in the purchase of land or other securities, and the whole divided more equitably among the clergy at large; for it is a lamentable subject of reflection that, in some country parishes, many of the farmers are in a state little short of heathen ignorance. Disputes have arisen between the clergyman and the farmer about tithes, and the farmer spends his Sunday without attending any place of worship at all, and lives and dies in the total forgetfulness of all his religious duties. This is a fact, alas! too well known, and one of the strongest arguments in favour of the alteration, if not the commutation, of the Tithes paid to the Clergy.

I shall only further add upon this subject, in reply to the common remark, that the Clergy of the Church of Rome supported the poor, that it will be recollected the population of that day was very small compared to what it is now; and the Romish Clergy had, in addition to their enormous revenues, other sources of revenue (unknown the amount to any but themselves) derived from granting pardons, indulgencies, and purgatorial exemptions, and frequently from immense legacies extorted from dying persons. Well then might the Roman Catholic Clergy be enabled to support the few poor of the then small population of England. But further yet—the barons of that day had each his number of vassals and retainers, whom he was obliged to maintain at his own expense, and whenever the King went to war, he was compelled to find the King his proportion of armed men. The comparison between the conduct of the Romish Clergy of that day with the conduct of the Clergy of the Church of England, proves nothing that can be brought as a charge against the latter in the present day. This veil is too thin not to be easily seen through. The fact is, there are too many

persons whose only object it is (if possible) to do away with a National Church altogether. It behoves, therefore, the Clergy and Laity of our Venerable Church to be upon their guard.

THE BUILDING OF NEW CHURCHES.

4. From whatever source the sum requisite for this purpose may be obtained, whether from private subscriptions or from a public grant, one truth must be apparent to every Churchman, viz.: that, let Divines preach with the most profound learning, the greatest eloquence, and the soundest reasoning upon the sin of schism, that sin will, in a country like England, prevail to a greater or to a less degree, as the want of church-room is more or less felt. If a century back the building of new Churches in populous districts had been more general, and, with some few exceptions, the Clergy of the Church of England had not been so much off their guard, so many wild enthusiasts and fanatics would not have had an opportunity, and probably would not have attempted to propagate doctrines which have only error for their basis, and mistaken zeal for their superstructure. If the Church of England wishes to keep her members within the pale of the Church, she must find Churches for them to attend, and able Ministers to perform the duty therein; if there is no Church near a populous district, what are the people to do? Of course, either stay at home, or go to the nearest Dissenting Chapel; and what then? having passed the rubicon they have only one step more to take, and thinking it better to attend a Dissenting Chapel than to absent themselves altogether from a place of worship, they by degrees are weaned from the Church of England, and then they are told they have been guilty of the sin of schism; and what is their reply? If we had a Church to go to, we should readily attend the Church, but there being no Church near, we are obliged to attend a Dissenting Chapel, or pass the Sunday without any

public worship at all. These are facts that cannot be controverted.

I do not justify those persons in forsaking the Church of England, but I blame those persons whose duty it is to prevent such desertion; and I feel convinced of the absolute necessity of affording every facility to enable persons (so disposed,) to build churches, by allowing such persons the power of the nomination (either alternately or entirely) of the clergyman, to such newly-erected Church, subject of course to the approval of the Bishop of the Diocese, as to such clergyman's learning and ability to fill the sacred office of a Minister of the Gospel; I believe formerly this was the case, or how have private individuals obtained the right of presentation to particular livings? I apprehend that such right of presentation arose, in the first instance, from the ancestors of such individuals having built Churches upon their estates, and thus they obtained the right of presentation to such livings for themselves and their posterity.

THE DIVISIONS OF THE ORTHODOX AND EVANGELICAL CLERGY, (SO CALLED,) OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

5. Without wishing to set up the cry of "the Church in danger," I think it will be admitted that great danger does threaten the Church of England at the present day, by all those persons who look with the eye of foresight to the signs of the times, and who reflect upon what has been the fate of other Christian Churches, and which churches have had Apostles and primitive Martyrs for their rulers and their guides; and the members of the Church of England will do well to remember, that *twice the Church of England has fallen!* once in her infancy, when a bloody and bigotted Queen swayed (not in mercy, but in terror,) the sceptre of England, and wished to re-establish in this country the religion of a Church, which, for so many centuries, had darkened and nearly

extinguished the glorious light of the Everlasting Gospel, by her idolatries and superstitious rites and ceremonies, and by the assumption of a power over the people, which can belong only to God Most High; the second time, fanaticism was her enemy, and again she fell.

An usurper, with religion in his mouth, and hypocrisy in his heart, first murdered his lawful sovereign, and then, as a necessary consequence, gave the Church of England her death-blow, for so intimately have the Church and State ever been connected together in this country, that if the one suffers the other suffers also, and the prosperity of the State has always been the greatest, when the Church of England has most flourished—witness the reign of Queen Elizabeth. But it appears to me that the danger to the Church at the present time is more to be apprehended from the divisions of the two parties, and the abuses which so long have existed within, than from her enemies without the Church; for “a house divided against itself cannot stand.” It becomes therefore the bounden duty of those Clergymen whose conflicting opinions now divide and distract the Church, to reflect most seriously, that their unprofitable controversies are doing a material injury to the Established Church, and afford an opportunity to the enemy to assail our most holy religion by bringing them forward, with the wish to prove the Church of England to be in error, by showing from their own works, that even the very clergy themselves are not agreed as to what the doctrines of the Church really are.—It would be well if the Clergy and Ministers, not only of the Established Church, but also of all sects and parties without her pale, were to remember, in all their controversies, that no religion can be orthodox or evangelical that is devoid of Christian Charity or Brotherly Love; and the observations of the Rev. Mr. Nott, in his Bampton Lectures, preached before the University of Oxford, in the year 1802, pp. 366, 367, “that the success of Mahometanism is to

be attributed principally to the divisions of the Christian Church," are equally applicable to the increase of infidelity and the schisms of the Church in the present day, for however necessary divisions may be in the two houses of the legislature, they are highly prejudicial when they exist in the Church of that Blessed Saviour and Redeemer, whose first disciples were all as one family, and had all things in common.

CONCLUSION.

I now respectfully take my leave of the subjects which have attracted my notice in this Pamphlet, with the best wishes for the success of the most important measure of Reform in Parliament, and with the ardent hope that Reform in Church will speedily follow; but I should be wanting in my duty, as a sincere friend to Reform and to my Country, if I were not to warn the People of England from expecting that this measure will produce a cure for all evils, or that, like "the Alchymist," it will turn all things into gold; all it will do will be to remedy one evil, by producing a more equitable representation of the people in Parliament: more the people can hardly expect, for taxes must still be raised; the interest of the National Debt must still be paid, or universal ruin will follow, and, in a thickly-populated Country like this, it is in vain to expect that great distress at times, among individuals, will cease to exist, or all will be alike prosperous and happy in their temporal affairs; some must be rich, some poor—some must be masters, some servants—some must govern, the rest must be governed—the good of society requires this, and if all were upon perfect equality to-morrow, the next day that equality would cease. It is the will of Providence such should be the case, and that some men should be gifted with talents of a superior order, while others are in the enjoyments of more humble abilities; but the benefit and the happiness of the whole are the intention of the same "All-wise Being."

Contentment in the station allotted to us is our duty; and, if our lot was different, we should probably be less happy; increase of worldly prosperity is too frequently the cause of misery rather than happiness, by affording us the means of obtaining our superfluous wants and fancies; we then find these wants and fancies to increase, and that “All is Vanity and Vexation of Spirit.”

I am friendly to Reform, but I am no party-man;—I am not for overturning the distinctions of rank;—I am not for liberty and equality, but for liberty and that distinction of ranks which, beginning with the King, descends in a regular gradation to the peasant, and thus produces and promotes the good of all. Reform, not Revolution, is my motto;—Correction of Abuses, not the subversion of rank and the destruction of ancient bulwarks, is my wish. Rotten Boroughs are the decayed stones, not the bulwarks of the constitution. They require removal, that more solid supports may be substituted in their stead. The happiness of all is my desire; and if the good of my country can be promoted by any exertions on my part, ample indeed will be my reward. “For England, Old England, with all thy faults, I love thee still.”

JOSEPH SPARROW.

London, Aug. 8, 1831.

EPISTLE DEDICATORY

IN THE

THIRD EDITION.

To the RIGHT HONOURABLE and HONOURABLE the MEMBERS of the TWO HOUSES of PARLIAMENT.

MY LORDS AND GENTLEMEN,

I most humbly pray permission to dedicate to you, My Lords and Gentlemen, this Third Edition of my *Address to the Electors of the United Kingdom*.

At a time like the present, when other abuses, besides those in the church and in the state, require your particular notice,—when infidelity on the one hand, and fanaticism on the other hand, prevail to so alarming a degree,—when individuals are permitted, with impunity, to preach openly, at noon-day, the most horrid blasphemies, in places of Public Resort, and to poison the minds of the weak, the young, and the ignorant, by exhibiting to the view of passengers, passing through the most public thoroughfares in the metropolis, books, pamphlets, and pictures, turning our holy religion, and her sacred ministers, into ridicule and contempt;—and, in all parts of London and Westminster, at shops hitherto supposed to be respectable, close by the side of pictures describing the Crucifixion of the Saviour of the World, and the most sacred subjects are displayed to the public gaze with the like impunity; the most disgusting, immoral, and indecent prints, only equalled in their indecency by similar representations upon the outside of the snuff-boxes in the fashionable cigar-shops; as if there was not vice quite enough in England already, without increasing it by every possible means that infidelity and immorality can conceive;—at a time, like the present, when, if an individual has but the name of a Christian, it is totally unnecessary, as taught by some persons, to burden such individuals with creeds or articles, and quite a work of supererogation to believe in any of the essential doctrines of christianity.

At a time like this, when the Liturgy of the Church of England is looked upon as little better than an old garment that requires mending,—and when some people think even the Christian religion itself should change with the times, and become more liberal, and more adapted to persons of the present day than it was eighteen hundred years ago,—and as oil has given way to gas, and sailing to moving by steam, so in like manner Christianity should give way to Infidelity; and the Venerable and Apostolic Church of England give place to Arianism, Socinianism, or any other *ism* that people “*who think for themselves,*” as they say, may be pleased to adopt; and the glorious light of “The Everlasting Gospel” itself be blown out by the Blast of Infidelity, or extinguished by the Breath of Fanaticism, under the idea that a more brilliant light would arise in its stead. In a word, that Truth shall give place to Falsehood.

At a time like the present, when even the Religious World itself is disputing as to what is, or what is not, Evangelical Religion, with a spirit of hostility towards each other, displaying any thing rather than Evangelical Charity, which teaches peace on earth, and good-will towards all men;—when men assemble together in large halls for the most charitable purposes, of most charitably relieving the bodily wants and the necessities of their starving fellow-creatures; but, instead of so doing, most uncharitably quarrelling with each other about questions of theological controversy, and very uncharitably allowing the bodies of their starving fellow-creatures to perish for want of food;—while they, with superficial sophistry, are deciding the question, whether the souls of such famishing human beings can get to heaven by believing in the errors of Roman Catholicism, rather than by assenting to the contracted notions of Protestant Evangelicism, (improperly so called); as if the Redeemer of the **WHOLE** World died to save only a few bigoted Roman Catholics, or a few narrow-minded Calvinists, when it is most expressly declared, in the sacred volume, that **HE** gave Him-

self a “Ransom for ALL.” In the present day of high profession, when there is an abundance of external religion, but far too little of practical piety;—when men meet together at Bible Societies to circulate the Holy Scriptures, and most vehemently, if not “bite and devour,” most certainly rail at and revile each other, in direct opposition to those duties of brotherly-love and kindness which those Holy Scriptures so strictly enjoin and command.

At a time like the present, when (as it has been very lately declared from the pulpit) the children coming from the Sunday Schools are stopped in the streets of the metropolis by persons who would persuade them to barter the hopes and the consolations of the Christian religion, for the cold and cheerless infidelity which conceals its most dangerous doctrines, under the specious name of Unitarianism; and thus try to rob the poor little child of its peace upon earth, and its hopes of eternal happiness (through the merits, the death, and the atonement of a Crucified Saviour) in heaven hereafter.

At a time like the present, when it is absolutely necessary to have Sunday Dinner Parties, in order to prevent servants from being too religious, and consequently too honest, which might be the case if they were permitted to attend their respective churches and chapels on that sacred day;—when it is particularly unfashionable to “keep holy the Sabbath-day,” and a mark of the greatest ill-breeding to look upon Sunday as any thing but “a terrible bore;” unless, indeed, it is selected (in contempt of the divine law) as a day peculiarly adapted for travelling a long journey, or for sporting a splendid equipage in the Park, and astonishing the weak minds of those “would-be great people,” who love to imitate the vices and to copy the follies of their superiors.

At a time like the present, when Foreign Singers and Dancers (whose avarice is only equalled by their insolence, their affectation, and their ingratitude,) are paid

enormous salaries, (larger in amount than the incomes of several Peers of the Realm), and are rolling in their dashing carriages, and sporting their stylish liveries, and faring sumptuously every day; salaries cheerfully paid them by the sons and daughters of Fashion and Folly, who will shed the bitter tear of anguish at the fictions of song and mimicry, while they can pass by, with the smile of ridicule and contempt, the humble dwelling of the poor neglected Minister of their National Church, who is existing (not living) upon a petty, paltry pittance, (all he has for himself and his numerous family,) a sum often far less than the pampered menials of such singers and dancers receive from their proud and haughty employers, who pocket His Gold, and then, "Ah! Ah! Ah! How they laugh at Johnny Bull!"

At a time like the present, when talent, which barely approaches mediocrity, receives the greatest encouragement, because it is of foreign growth;—while native talent, of infinite superiority and of first-rate excellence, is neglected and despised, for no other reason than because it is the produce of England;—when English landlords live in foreign countries, and there spend their incomes, derived from landed and funded property in England, and leave their countrymen at home to struggle with all their difficulties, and with the loss of trade which their absence occasions;—when, still worse than this, persons receiving pensions and allowances from this country, are actually spending the sum their countrymen labour hard to give them, in the country of England's greatest rivals and most bitter enemies.

In one word, My Lords and Gentlemen, at a time like the present, when people are much more anxious to reform the Church, the State, and their Neighbours, than to reform themselves,—at such a time this little Pamphlet, My Lords and Gentlemen, craves your especial attention, with the Author's earnest prayer that, while the Work of Reformation is going on in the Church and in the State,

that other and equally, if not more dangerous abuses which exist, and to which I have briefly alluded in this, my humble *Dedication*, will not escape your most particular notice; and that you will be pleased to reform those abuses also accordingly, and thus receive the thanks of all sincere friends to Religion, Morality, and the Prosperity of the Country at large; and so promote the temporal and the eternal Welfare of the People over whom you are appointed as Legislators by HIM, through whose permission alone “Kings reign and Princes execute justice;” and the Nobles, and the Mighty of the Earth, are endowed with wisdom to make Laws which have Equity for their Basis, and Mercy for their Superstructure. Then shall REAL REFORM be produced WITHOUT REVOLUTION, Harmony reign where Discord now dwells, and Charity prevail where Envy, Hatred, Malice, and all Uncharitableness have hitherto existed.

In conclusion, My Lords and Gentlemen, I most humbly beg leave to submit to your especial notice this my humble *Dedication*, and my *Address to the Electors of the United Kingdom*, and to pray your most kind attention to my own particular case, as described in my Humble Petition, printed by order of the late House of Commons, as proving the corrupt influence of Parliamentary Interest, under which I have been so very severe a sufferer, and which all parties admit to be a case of peculiar hardship; but which I hope, through your notice and kind interest in my favour, His Majesty’s present upright Ministers will be pleased to take into their serious consideration, and to grant me such relief as in their wisdom they may see fit.

I have the honour to subjoin the following very flattering acknowledgments I have received, which are peculiarly gratifying to me, as coming not only from the friends, but also from one of the strongest opponents of the important measure of Reform.

It being the fashion, at the present day, to call all persons who are in favour of Reform in the Church, the

followers of Lord King, I think it proper to state that I am not a follower of his Lordship, and that I highly disapprove of Mr. Locke's plan for a "Society of Pacific Christians," as described in his Lordship's *Life* of that eminent Logician, and which appears to have met with the approval of his Lordship;—on the contrary, I am a sincere friend to the Church of England: but I certainly think a Reform is wanting, (not in the Church Service, which I should be very sorry to see,) but in the stipends of the Poorer Clergy, and in the Tithe System altogether; and I wish to see that Reform proceed from within, rather than from WITHOUT.

I beg leave to observe, in proof of my friendship to our Venerable Church, that I have written a little Book in favour of the Church of England, and have received the following Letter from the Highest Dignitary in the Church:—

(COPY.)

Croydon, Sept. nine, 1829.

Directed Mr. J. Sparrow, 14, Angel-court,
W. CANTAUR. Throgmorton-street, London.

The Archbishop has to acknowledge Mr. Sparrow's Letter and Packet, and to thank him for his Book; but is prevented, by his general rule, from giving the sanction of his name to the Work, in case it should be re-published.

Croydon, Sept. 9, 1829.

It may be necessary to state, that the Book alluded to was a Copy of the Second Edition of my Second Letter to the late Bishop of Winchester.

The following, My Lords and Gentlemen, are the copies of the acknowledgments alluded to above:—

(Second Letter from His Grace the Duke of Richmond.)

London, May 13, 1831.

SIR,—I beg to thank you, and to acknowledge the Receipt of your Letter of this day's date, enclosing to me the Second Edition of your Pamphlet.

I have the honour to be,

SIR,

Your obedient humble servant,

To Mr. Sparrow, &c. &c.

(Signed) RICHMOND.

(From Lord Viscount Goderich.)

Col. Office, May 16, 1831.

SIR,

I am desired, by Lord Goderich, to thank you for the Copy of the Second Edition of your "Address to the Electors of the United Kingdom," and have the honour to be,

SIR,

Your obedient humble servant,

(Signed) CHARLES DOUGLAS.

To Joseph Sparrow, Esq.

(From Lord Viscount Palmerston.)

For. Office, May 16, 1831.

Lord Palmerston presents his compliments to Mr. Sparrow, and begs to acknowledge, with his thanks, the Receipt of his Pamphlet.

J. Sparrow, Esq.

(From Lord Viscount Howick.)

Lord Howick presents his compliments to Mr. Sparrow, and is much obliged to him for the Copy he has sent of his "Address to the Electors of the United Kingdom."

Col. Office, May 19.

J. Sparrow, Esq.

(From His Grace the Duke of Wellington.)

Directed Joseph Sparrow, Esq., 14, Angel-court,
Throgmorton-street, near the Bank.

The Duke of Wellington presents his compliments to Mr. Sparrow, and begs leave to acknowledge the Receipt of his Letter of the 24th inst., and the Inclosure.

Walmer Castle, May 25, 1831.

I have the honour to be,

With the highest respect,

My Lords and Gentlemen,

Your most obedient humble servant,

JOSEPH SPARROW.

London, June 4, 1831.

PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION.

AN objection having been taken to the example I have given in my Second Edition of the Bishop of Llandaff's Case, it having been stated that his Lordship's was not the strongest Case, as his Lordship is obliged to be in London "*ex officio*," independent of his Lordship's attendance at the House of Lords; and, therefore, he can attend to his Deanery at St. Paul's during the six months he is in London. It was not stated who was to do the Dean's duty during the six months his Lordship was in Wales. But my argument was not of a personal, but of a general nature. With the System of Pluralities, not with his Lordship, I am at issue. As stronger proofs are required, I will produce them; they are as follow:—

Extract from Gilbert's Clergyman's Companion for 1830.

The Rev. ROBERT GRAY.	{	Bishop of Bristol, Somersetshire.
	{	Prebendary of Durham, County of Durham.
Hon. and Right Rev. HUGH PERCY - - - - -	{	Bishop of Carlisle, Cumberland.
	{	Prebendary of St. Paul's, London.
	{	Chancellor of the Church of Sarum, Wiltshire.
Right Rev. WM. WARD	{	Bishop of Sodor and Man, Isle of Man.
	{	Prebendary of Salisbury, Wiltshire.
	{	Rector of Great Horkeley, Essex.

Extract from the British Critic and Quarterly Theological Review, July 1830.

State of the Dioceses.—Deaths.

CHICHESTER.		
Arlington V., and Ashburnham V., with Penburst R., and Willingdon V.	{	SUSSEX—WILLIAM TRIVETT.
HEREFORD.		
Chancellor in Cath. Ch. Preb. in Cath. Ch., and Bishop's Eaton R.	{	Hereford—M. COVE, D. C. L.
LITCHFIELD AND COVENTRY.		
Etwell V., and Norton-in-Hales V.	{ Derby } { Salop }	L. D. H. COCKBURN.

Here is Transubstantiation again with a vengeance. But, it may be replied, that the above Bishopricks and

Livings are so poor, that they are, singly, inadequate to the support of the Bishop or the Incumbent. Admitting this to be the case, what does it prove? Why that Reform in Church is as much wanted as Reform in State, for certainly the labourer is worthy of his hire; therefore the Church Property should be more equitably divided, and the Working Clergy be better paid.

But there is another Reform in the Church, besides the Reform of Translations and Pluralities, greatly wanted, which is, to prevent clergymen and others from altering the Singing Psalms just as they think proper. For, what is the consequence of such alterations? Why! The Church is made a Bookseller's Shop, for the sale of Hymn Books. But this is not the only evil. Strangers, who may be travelling, and servants and other persons who are continually changing their residence, are hindered from joining with the congregation when the Psalms are sung, because such Psalms are different to what they find in that admirable specimen of human piety, the *Book of Common Prayer* of the Church of England; which, God forbid that the Legislature should ever consent to alter, to meet the capricious whim and fancies of the Liberals (as they call themselves) of the present day. If such churches and chapels must have their peculiar Singing Psalms and Hymns, let the Ministers *be compelled* to provide a sufficient number of Hymn Books "*gratis*" for strangers and the persons in the isles and pews, as is done at the Magdalen, and similar institutions; or, if necessary, let a new Version, for general use, be agreed upon by authority. The necessity for this will be sufficiently apparent when I state, that one Sunday I attended three different churches, morning, afternoon, and evening service; and, although I had my Prayer Book in my pocket, I could not join with the congregation at either, for at each church there were different Psalms and Hymns. Surely this wants REFORMING. If the Singing Psalms are deemed necessary to be altered, let them be

altered by authority, and be generally used. But I most sincerely hope the Prelates of our Church will *not* give their sanction to any other alteration of the *Book of Common Prayer* : and, if they are firm, the *Laitie* will support them.

The Old Heresy, the Attack upon the Doctrine of the Trinity, seems about to be revived again, with all its pristine violence ; and it becomes the duty of the Church of England to be the first of all Christian Churches to rally round the Standard of the Cross, and to repel the assaults of all open enemies and pretended friends against these most essential, these most vital, Doctrines of Christianity, the Divinity of our Blessed Saviour, and the Doctrine of the Trinity, not with the fire of persecution, but with the Sword of the Spirit, which is **THE WORD OF GOD**.

It is worse than folly for persons to call themselves Christians, who deny the divinity of our Saviour. I have the most perfect charity for all who differ from me in opinion ; but no sophistry, no metaphysical reasoning, will ever convince me, that a person who disbelieves the Doctrine of the Trinity is a Christian. The mere acknowledging our Blessed Saviour to be a prophet, sent from God, and a good man, is nothing more than Deism or Mahometanism. *It is not Christianity*. To be a Christian, we must believe that the Father is God, the Son God, and the Holy Ghost God ; and yet they are not Three Gods—but **ONE GOD**. This can be sufficiently proved from Scripture ; and, therefore, after the most minute, the most impartial, and the most careful inquiry and examination of the subject, I firmly believe the doctrine of the Trinity to be true. Let us have Reform in the Church and in the State, which every thinking man must admit to be requisite, and absolutely necessary to a certain extent. But let us beware of being misled by Infidels on the one hand, and by Revolutionists on the other hand ;—for Infidelity and Revolution would, most certainly, be **CHANGES** for the **WORSE**, *not REFORM* for the **BETTER**.

Having made a short quotation from that much-calumniated Creed of St. Athanasius, (so called), I will briefly remark, that, according to the best and most learned commentators, the damnatory clauses are not imprecatory; but, if I may be allowed the word, they are "*Admonitory*," in compliance with those words of our Saviour, Mark, c. xvi., v. 16, "*He that believeth not, shall be damned.*" For the words of the Creed mean nothing more or less than this, that a belief in the doctrines of the Incarnation,—the Death,—the Atonement,—the Resurrection,—the Ascension,—and the Divinity of the Redeemer of the World. The Personality of the Holy Ghost, and a Trinity of Persons in the Unity of the Divine Essence, are the absolute conditions required, in order to render a person capable of salvation. If an individual does not believe this Creed, or refusing to inquire into its truth, he rejects the doctrine altogether, because it is above his comprehension; the most perfect charity itself can draw no other conclusion than this, viz. that such person, by wilfully and obstinately rejecting the offers of salvation, has left himself no other alternative than that of being, in his turn, rejected by the Supreme Being; and, consequently, being so rejected, "without doubt, he will perish everlastingly."

This is neither the act nor the wish of the framer of this Creed in the first instance, or of those persons who conscientiously believe its doctrines to be true. The act is wholly, solely, and entirely the wilfully obstinate unbeliever's own act and deed. But, to use the words of Dr. Waterland, "As to the allowances to be made for invincible ignorance, prejudice, or other unavoidable infirmities, as they will be pleadable in the case of any other sin, so they may, and they will be pleadable also in this. And Dean Vincent very forcibly and very properly remarks, "That a Creed, which is 1300 years old, and which has been generally received into the church for 900 years, ought not to be treated lightly or irreverently, as has been

the case in our own country of late, *or be neglected without considering its merit.*"

To conclude the whole, I again repeat, the People of England want Reform, both in the Church and in the State; but the Wise and the Good do not want Infidelity or Revolution. Suppose an alteration was made in the *Book of Common Prayer*, would that alteration please every one? *Most certainly not.* Other alterations would be required, until the whole of the present Church Services were frittered away to nothing. Of those who object to the length of our services, I will only ask, do they object to the length of a Play?—of an Opera?—of a Dance?—of a Party? or of any of the frivolous amusements of the day? No! They can devote a whole day, or a whole night, at the Shrine of Fashion and Folly—and *that* day after day, and night after night. But they think the service of their Creator, and *that* for an hour or two, only once a week, far too long and tedious. "*Ohe! Ohe! jam satis est.*" I will only add, **BEWARE OF INFIDELITY AND SOPHISTRY!**

JOSEPH SPARROW.

London, June 4, 1831.

P. S.—I had forgotten to notice another Reform much wanted. With the *most prudent and praiseworthy simplicity*, the week when the Epsom Races are held is selected for the Anniversary of the Sons of the Clergy; and the week of the Ascot Races is chosen for that of the Meeting of the Charity Children at St. Paul's,—from the anxious fear, of course, that too many of the Nobility and Gentry should attend upon those charitable occasions. "This is marvellous, indeed!" But, perhaps, in time this will also be REFORMED.

PREFACE TO SECOND EDITION.

BROTHER ELECTORS,

IN publishing the Second Edition of my *Address to the Electors of the United Kingdom*, I beg leave to submit to your perusal the following Copy of an acknowledgment I have received from His Grace the DUKE of RICHMOND in favour of my Address :—

(COPY.)

“ The Duke of Richmond presents his compliments to Mr. Sparrow, and returns him his best thanks for his Letter of the 28th of April, and the Pamphlet.

“ *London, April 30, 1831.*”

The cause of Reform, as far as regards the electors, may be said to be now completely triumphant. I have made a calculation of the numbers that will, upon a division in the new Parliament, be in favour of the Bill; and, I am

decidedly of the opinion that there will be a majority of 200 in its favour. My calculation is as follows:—

For the Second Reading in the late Parliament	303
Against it	302
	1
Majority in favour of the Bill	1

But, according to the returns of the present election, up to the present time, there is an addition of at least 100 members in favour of Reform. Add these 100 to the 303, and deduct them from the 302, there will be 403 in favour and 202 against the Bill, and the case will stand thus:—

In favour of the Bill	403
Against it	202
	201
Majority in favour of the Bill	201

But I calculate further, that there will be several gentlemen who will feel disposed to vote in favour of the Bill in the new Parliament, who were against it in the old Parliament, and this will still further increase the majority.

There is one very important consideration I most humbly submit to the notice of His M^{ajesty}

Majesty's Government, which is, whether it will be expedient to reduce the number of the English members? If so humble an individual as myself might venture to offer an opinion, I should most certainly submit that the number of the English members should not be reduced; but, as this is a question more properly belonging to the Committee upon the Bill, I very readily, and with perfect satisfaction, leave it in their hands, as I feel convinced it will receive all due reflection; and the more so, as it does not affect the principle of the Bill, nor the extent of the Reform proposed.

I most sincerely congratulate my Brother Electors upon the success of our glorious cause, and, I think, that all impartial persons must allow that great credit is due to the people of this mighty Empire, that they have displayed so much moderation during these most important elections

But, again I repeat, "Let us be unanimous,—let us be peaceful." We want Reform in Parliament, and that Reform procured in a peaceable and constitutional manner. We do not want to see our country devastated by riot and revolution. Brother Electors, we have now

discharged our duty. Let the new Parliament as faithfully discharge theirs. Then shall we all prove ourselves worthy of that noble-hearted, patriotic, and beloved Monarch who reigns over us,—and give that support and confidence to his able, and, I firmly and conscientiously believe, well-meaning Ministers, which both so richly deserve at our hands.

But, Brother Electors, allow me most respectfully to impress upon your minds the great, the very great, necessity of our proving to our enemies, that while we consider it our bounden duty, as good subjects, and faithful citizens of this United Kingdom, to support our beloved King, and those Ministers whom his Most Gracious Majesty has been pleased to call to his councils, in this their most arduous struggle against boroughmongers and corruption, that we should feel it equally our duty to express our determination to oppose most strenuously every attempt that may be made to subvert those rights and those privileges which have for ages been confirmed to the higher orders of society, and which orders form a necessary and a component part of the three estates of this realm ;—I mean the Aristocratical part of the Legislative Assembly of the Empire,—the House of Lords ; for far be it from

me to condemn the whole of the Peers of the Realm for the acts of one or two of their members,—or for one moment to suppose that the majority of that house will be so blind to their own interests, and to the welfare of the state at large, as to deny to the people those constitutional rights and privileges which were granted to them by Magna Charta, and confirmed to them by the Bill of Rights. The constitution of England is balanced with the greatest accuracy and nicety. We have a King, who (as has been lately proved) has the power of exercising his just and undoubted privilege and prerogative of dissolving the Parliament whenever he sees a fit occasion so to do,—we have a House of Peers, as a check upon the House of Commons,—we have a House of Commons, without whose grant of supplies neither the King himself can carry on (although he may declare) war, nor the people be taxed; but if, as has been proved, the House of Commons requires reformation, (and who can say that it does not require it?) let it be reformed accordingly, as, I doubt not, it will be reformed.

As regards the Church of England, I freely admit that here again Reform is necessary. I am a member of the Church of England by birth, by education, and by conviction, and I firmly be-

lieve her doctrines to be true ;—I venerate her holy ministers,—I respect her rites and ceremonies. But, if I am asked if Reform in Church is necessary, I answer, most certainly, that Reform is necessary ; “ For no man,” our Blessed Saviour himself has said, “ can serve two masters ;” and, therefore, no clergyman ought to hold two livings ; no bishop should be a bishop of one see, and a dean of another see, for it is impossible he can perform the duty in both places at one and the same time. For example, a Clergyman of the Church of England should not be a Bishop of Llandaff, in Wales, and the Dean of St. Paul’s, in London, because this is as bad as Transubstantiation itself, or the belief of the possibility of a person’s body being at one and the same time at two places, far removed from each other.

But still I must be permitted to observe, that, as I would not destroy the constitution in State, because it requires Reform, so neither would I overturn the constitution in Church, because pluralities and translations are permitted to exist in our venerable Church ; I would rather reform the constitution in State, as now proposed by his Majesty’s Ministers, and I would abolish all translations and pluralities in the Church, and so preserve the constitutions of both Church and State to the end of time.

As regards tithes, which every thinking man must see will be the next subject of consideration, I would humbly suggest, that all clerical and lay impropiators should receive a fair equivalent from the Government for their respective tithes, after the decease of the present holders ; and then let the bishoprics, deaneries, prebendaries, rectories, and vicarages be re-valued, and a fair and equitable sum, or stipend, be affixed, and the working clergy be more equitably paid ; while “ *in futuro,*” archbishops and bishops should be paid a sum sufficient to support their respective dignities, and be totally independent of the Crown, as the judges now are ; and, with the exceptions of the translations from London to Canterbury, and from Durham to York, no translations to be allowed, for this reason. First, because translations make bishops too dependent upon the minister of the day ; and, secondly, they make the bishops themselves too careless of the welfare of the sees, where they may, in all probability, remain only a very short time. Translations and pluralities ought both to be abolished as speedily as possible. If we wish to preserve both our Church and State, we must have Reform, or we most assuredly shall have Revolution ; and, as I am a most decided and uncompromising enemy of Revolution, I consider it my bounden duty to be a friend to REFORM.

But I most sincerely hope, that every means will be used by both the opponents and the promoters of the cause of Reform (as the question may, as far as the voice of the country goes, now be considered as completely set at rest) to endeavour to assuage all those little animosities which hitherto have existed, and to remember that, as we all wish well to our country, so we all should make every allowance for those little differences of opinion which will sometimes exist among the best of friends, but which ought never to divide **FRIENDSHIP.**

In conclusion, I must be permitted to express my decided opinion, that the windows that were broken on the night of the illumination were not broken by the Friends of the Reform Bill. I have witnessed several general illuminations in the metropolis, and I was in the streets on the night of the 27th of April, and until two o'clock the next morning, and, I can positively say, that I never saw a mob upon such an occasion less disposed to be riotous; for they appeared much too happy to wish to do mischief, and much too wise to throw away penny-pieces for the purpose of breaking windows. Who, then, it may be replied, did break those windows? Aye, there's the rub. Perhaps, as usual, that terrible Rogue—No-BODY! But who paid No-

BODY for this? Why, I don't know ; but, possibly, the NOES themselves,—as likely as ANY-BODY. Or No-BODY, being a man of many cousins, perhaps he did it himself, from pure good-will, to oblige the No-REFORMERS. As many as are of this opinion say, AYE,—on the contrary, No—I think the AYES have it. But, enough, REFORM FOR EVER!—NOT REVOLUTION. VIVANT REX ET REGINA! GOOD LUCK TO MINISTERS!—BAD LUCK, BOTHERATION, AND BLACK-BALLS TO BRIBERY, BOUGHT VOTERS, AND BOROUGHMONGERS. Sportsmen have a common expression—Ware-HAWK. Even the Sparrows themselves don't like that bird. *Brother Electors, the Battle is not yet Won.* BEWARE of being thrown off your guard. Much remains yet to be done. If the Bill passes the House of Commons, it still has to pass through another house. Immediately Parliament assemble, petition both houses as earnestly as you did before. Many a general has been defeated because, instead of following up his victory, he has reposed upon the laurels already gained. Let us beware of being too highly elated at present success, and so be thrown off OUR guard. I most sincerely rejoice that the good cause has hitherto prospered so triumphantly. But we must not relax our efforts, nor

consider the day is our own until the Bill has received the ROYAL ASSENT, and become THE LAW OF THE LAND.

I remain,

BROTHER ELECTORS,

Your's most faithfully,

JOSEPH SPARROW.

London, May 14, 1831.

TO THE
ELECTORS OF THE UNITED KINGDOM
OF
GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

BROTHER ELECTORS,

I respectfully beg leave to submit to your perusal my humble petition, presented to the House of Lords, by His Grace the Duke of Richmond, on the 17th March, and to the House of Commons, by Mr. Alderman Thompson, on the 22d March, 1831, and printed by order of the Honourable House, as proving the corrupt influence of Parliamentary interest, (as the House of Commons is now constituted,) to the prejudice of old and faithful servants of the Crown.

Brother Electors, compare this case with the cases of some of the individuals upon the Pension List, and then think what would be your feelings if the case were your own.

But, a different era is approaching, and a General Election is about to take place. The late Parliament was weighed in the balance; it was found wanting, and,— it was dissolved.— Our Beloved Monarch has done his duty most nobly —The Ministers have discharged their duty most faithfully—What then remains for us all, as Electors, to do?—I respectfully submit to you, our duty is, to rally round Our Most Gracious, Our Beloved, Our Patriotic King, and his noble-minded Ministers, and to return such men to Parliament who will pledge themselves to support the important measure of Parliamentary Reform, and, by so doing, rescue our Country from that thralldom to which it has so long been subjected, and thus prevent Pensions unmerited from being granted in future, and those places which are necessary to be kept up, for conducting the business of the State, from being bestowed, as they have hitherto too often been bestowed, as a bribe to carry on a system of profuse expenditure, and the vilest corruption, instead of being given, as they ought to be given, to deserving persons, as a reward for long, faithful, arduous, and important services rendered to the state.

Brother Electors! my address to you is short, although words are plentiful, and I could write to

you upon this all-absorbing question until the dawn, like the herald of a powerful monarch proclaimed the approach of the god of day. But I will not trespass long upon your time and patience, for, behold ! the Morning Star of Hope appears, chasing, before it's bright rising, those dark and gloomy clouds of dismal forebodings which for ages have o'ershadowed our land.--Yes ! Brother Electors ! that brilliant star, which cheers the way-worn traveller on his journey through this life, has indeed, (thanks to our Beloved King, and his excellent Ministers,) at length arisen ;—the harbinger of the glorious sun of Reform, which soon, I trust, will shine upon our much-loved country in all its meridian splendour. And England—Old England—will yet be merry England once again. To accomplish this most desired event, it is not to words, but to actions, we must look, in this hour of our country's trial.

Electors of England !—Scotland !—Ireland !—Wales !—the People of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland now expect that “ every Man will do his Duty.” Woe to that man who does not do his. The Liberties !—the Destinies !—the Rights !—of the People of this mighty Empire, now hang upon a thread—“ *The thread of a General Election.*” Henceforth let our motto be “ **DEEDS, NOT WORDS.**” Let

us cry aloud for patriot votes—not long speeches. For reform—not revolution. For purity of election—not for bribery and corruption. In one word, Brother Electors! let us be unanimous, and the day is our own. Beware of splitting your votes! A single vote brought the late Bill into Parliament, and eight votes caused the first clause proposed by Ministers to be lost. Nothing will, I feel convinced, save the country from anarchy and confusion, but this important measure of Reform. And, as I love my King and Country, I vote for Reform, that, as far as in me lies, I may prevent Revolution.—Brother Electors! allow me, although a very humble individual, to call upon you to support His Majesty's Ministers, by supporting this measure with all your strength. They have, one and all, declared that they will stand or fall by the Bill, and if this measure is lost, and they should resign, I tremble to think of what will be the consequences, for where will you find a set of men, if competent, who would be willing to take their places? I again repeat, it is my firm conviction, there must be Reform, or there will be Revolution. By our votes, let us secure the success of the cause of Reform. By our peaceful and loyal behaviour, let us prove ourselves the enemies of riot and revolution.—Brother Electors, farewell!—Saint George, for merry

England!—Saint Andrew, for Scotland!—Saint Patrick, for Ireland!—Saint David, for Wales! On—on, ye Brave Electors; and, by your deeds of valour, in the defence of the glorious cause of Reform, defeat your opponents; and, by your victorious triumph over Boroughmongers--Rotten Boroughs—Yea! even over Borough Bridge itself—gain the Applause of the Wise—the Smiles of the Fair—and the Civic Crown of VICTORY!

I remain,

Brother Electors,

Your's most respectfully,

And most affectionately,

JOSEPH SPARROW,

A Freeman and one of the Livery of the
City of London.

*No. 14, Angel Court, Throgmorton Street,
London, 26th April, 1831.*

(COPY.)

22^o die Martii, 1831.

(APPENDIX, VOTES, &c. fol. 988, 989, No. 1571.)

A PETITION of *Joseph Sparrow*, of No. 14, *Angel Court, Throgmorton Street*, near the Bank of *England*, in the City of *London*, a Freeman and one of the Livery of the said City of upwards of twenty years standing, was presented, and read; setting forth, That the humble Petitioner is most deeply impressed with the absolute necessity which for so long a period has existed for a Reform in Parliament, and that he gave his cordial support and vote to the measures proposed by His Majesty's Ministers to effect so desirable a purpose at the late numerous and most respectable unanimous meeting of the Livery of *London*, in the Common Hall of the said City, assembled on Monday the 7th day of March instant; the Petitioner humbly prays permission to lay before the House a case which he most humbly thinks will prove the absolute necessity of Parliamentary Reform, in order to leave the Government at liberty to reward old and faithful servants of the Crown for past services, by appointing the sons of such persons to situations as they become vacant, instead of bestowing them upon strangers, who may have friends possessing strong Parliamentary interest, which Parliamentary interest, owing to the present defective state of the Representation, the Ministers

are compelled to secure to enable them to carry on the necessary business of the Country, but which in a reformed Parliament might be carried on without any such influence, and more to the ease of the Ministers and to the satisfaction of the people at large of this mighty Empire ; the humble Petitioner's father, the late Mr. *Joseph Sparrow*, held for the very long period of nearly fifty-five years an arduous and highly responsible situation in the Civil Department of His Majesty's Ordnance, having, during that time, acted in the illness of the then Secretary, Mr. *Boddington*, as Secretary to the honourable Board ; the humble Petitioner's father was twice married, first to the honourable Miss *Torkington*, grand-daughter of a former Earl of *Harborough*, by whom he had children, who died in their infancy ; his second wife was the Petitioner's mother, and the Petitioner is his eldest and only son who arrived at the age of manhood ; the Petitioner's father was most anxious to procure for the Petitioner a situation in the same department in which he had served his King and Country so faithfully for so long a period, and he repeatedly solicited an appointment for the Petitioner as junior clerk in the same office as he was in ; the justice and equity of his claim was admitted, but he had grown old, his interest was all gone, and the son of a gentleman who happened to have strong Parliamentary interest was appointed to that vacancy, which, as a reward for long, faithful, and arduous services, and as being the first and only favour he had ever asked, the Petitioner's father hoped would have been granted to the Petitioner, his only son ; the Petitioner's father repeatedly applied for an appointment for the Petitioner in any of the offices in the Ordnance, in the Tower, or at *Westminster*, but

although this favour was granted to others, far his juniors ; in the service, not having any Parliamentary interest to promote his views, all his solicitations were unsuccessful ; at length, to the deep regret of the Petitioner's father, an appointment was made out for the Petitioner at a distant outpost, at the small salary of £50 *per annum*, and about two years afterwards the Petitioner's father having arrived at the advanced age of fourscore years, he was allowed to retire upon a superannuation allowance of £427 *per annum*, but he did not live to receive the first quarter's allowance, and he died a poor man ; the humble Petitioner, shortly after his father's death, seeing what he considered great abuses in the department in which he was placed, stated, with all the thoughtlessness of a youth of nineteen those abuses to the proper quarter, and the result was, that here again strong interest prevailed, and the Petitioner lost his situation, and he has ever since that time been struggling with all the cares, losses, and anxieties of trade, instead of now enjoying a comfortable situation in the Tower of *London* of £600 *per annum*, which would have been his case if the Petitioner's father had happened to have had Parliamentary interest ; the humble Petitioner, being fully convinced that a Reform in Parliament will tend to remedy what has proved to be so great a misfortune to him, he humbly prays the House will be pleased to grant such Reform as, in their wisdom, they may see fit, and to the extent now proposed by His Majesty's Ministers.



