

friends in the consequence of such a confession, I could not expect to find it.

Under such an idea I began to read with diffidence, not suspecting that the conduct of a very respectable part of the representative and legislative body of this kingdom in matters of the most public nature, and quite recent in the memory of the nation, could be traduced by audacious falsehood and base misrepresentation.

But the object of the author discovers itself in the sixth page, where we are told, "that the unanimity and concert which their Sovereign requested for the support of the interest and honor of the nation, exist only in them (the Opposition) for the *ruin of the one, and the tarnishing of the other.*" And again, p. 47. "That an opposition begun in ambition has degenerated through disappointment into a species of insanity, and that in attempting to ruin the ministry, *the party have given a fatal stab to the honor and interest of their country.*"

Scurrilous and general invective never produce the effect expected: it cannot persuade, because it confounds reason by irritating the passions: it carries no terror with it when it issues from the pen of an anonymous pamphleteer; and it can leave no sting, when it is directed against characters of tried virtue and approved services to their country.

To you therefore without passion I shall appeal, and where the votes and public acts of the last sessions have not already confuted the charges produced, I shall suggest a plain answer—either by pointing out contradictions in the pamphlet itself, or by exposing the fallacy, by which alone the charges are supported.

To