

...of the human heart were exhibited in the service, and all the most depraved ingenuity of the human intellect, tortured to devise new contrivances for fraud. Mr. Grattan thus reports the language of Lord Castlereagh in reference to the corruption which might become necessary to carry the Union. "I will now read a speech made by Lord Grey in the year 1800, on the reprobance of the Irish nation to the Union:—"Twenty-seven counties," said his Lordship, have petitioned against the measure. The petition from the County of Down is signed by upwards of 17,000 respectable independent men, and all the others are in a similar proportion. Dublin petitioned under the great seal of the city, and each of the corporations in it followed the example. Drogheda petitioned against the Union; and almost every other town in the kingdom in like manner testified its disapprobation. Those in favor of the measure, professing great influence in the country, obtained a few counter petitions. Yet, though the petition from the county of Down was signed by 17,000 the counter petition was signed only by 415; though there were 707,000 who signed petitions against the measure, the total number of those who declared in favor of it did not exceed 3,000, and many of these only prayed that the measure might be discussed. If the facts I state are true, (and I challenge any man to falsify them) could a nation in more direct terms express its disapprobation of a political measure, than Ireland has done of a legislative union with Great Britain? In fact the nation is nearly unanimous, and this great majority is composed, not of bigots, fanatics or Jacobins, but of the most respectable of every class in the community." Let me now request your attention to a description given by Lord Plunket of the mode in which the Union was carried:—"I will be bold to say that licentious and impious France, in all the unrestrained excesses to which anarchy and atheism have given birth, has not committed a more insidious and against her enemy than is now attempted by the professed champion of the cause of civilized Europe against a friend and ally in the hour of her calamity and distress—at a moment when our country is filled with British troops, when the loyal men of Ireland are fatigued and exhausted by their efforts to subdue the rebellion—efforts to which they had succeeded before those troops arrived—whilst the habeas corpus act was suspended—whilst trials by court martial are carrying on in many parts of the kingdom—whilst the people are taught to think they have no right to meet or to deliberate—and whilst the great body of them are so palsied by their fears, or worn down by their exertion, that even the vital question is scarcely able to rouse them from their lethargy; at a moment when we are distracted by domestic dissensions; dissensions, artfully kept alive as the pretext of our present subjugation, and the instrument of our future thraldom." That is Lord Plunket's description of the means by which the Union was carried, and yet it is only a partial account. One million two hundred and seventy-five thousand pounds were spent in purchasing rotten boroughs. Three millions besides in hard cash were paid in actual bribery to persons who voted for their connections. There was no office, even from the highest in the Church, to the lowest in the constabulary—no, that force did not then exist—but there was no situation from the highest to the lowest, sacred or profane, which was not in the market. There was nothing of contract—nothing of argument in the carrying of the Union, all was shameless fraud and undisguised corruption, involving more of moral iniquity than ever accompanied any public transaction. Gentlemen of the Jury you can easily imagine what were the results of such a measure, so carried; you feel them in your daily avocations of business; you see them in the state of your streets; you know them from the position of your trade and commerce. I have shown what has been the general spirit of the English government, whenever it had power, from date of the first settlement in 1782. I have established that there was an extraordinary advance in property under the Irish Parliament. I have shortly described the means by which the Union was carried, and I shall proceed with as much brevity, as I can; but I fear at a greater length than I could wish to lay before you evidence of the evil results of the Union as affecting Ireland. In 1794, the Irish debt was only seven millions, the debt of England at the same time 350 millions. At the time of the Union the Irish debt was twenty-one millions. I know it has been since stated that it was twenty-three millions; but that was a resolution of the House of Commons of England, passed in 1811, by which it was resolved that the separate debt of Ireland should be charged with all the expense of carrying the Union. With the Irish debt was 21 millions, the English, 446 millions. Of the 37 millions of annual interest upon this sum, it was agreed that Ireland should not be charged any thing for the principal. Were these terms complied with? No. Ireland is charged with every penny of that 446 millions principal and interest, in spite of the promises of Lord Castlereagh; and the lands, the industry, the labor of the nation are mortgaged for its payment. As a proof of the total management of our finances, detrimental to Ireland, and to show the progressive accumulation of our debt, I will read an extract:—"Half a million or more were expended some years since to break an

opposition; the same or greater sum may be necessary now," and Grattan added, "that Lord Castlereagh had said so in the most extensive sense of bribery and corruption. The threat was proceeded on—the people sold—the castles of extortion were every where—in the lobby, in the streets, on the steps, and at the door of every Parliament leader; offering titles to some, office to others, and corruption to all." "This is the way in which our affairs have been managed. The Irish Parliament had an interest in keeping the Irish nation out of debt. The best proof of this is, that Ireland owed but 14 millions when England owed 350 millions. The Irish Parliament has been often assailed; but I fearlessly ask, could anything have been more protective than to keep the people out of debt? Whilst the English were squandering profusely, the Irish were thrifty; but from the moment they were placed under England the proportion of increase went on in such a manner that whilst it was for England as 16 to 20, it was for Ireland as 23 to 10. Hear now the language of Sir John Newport in 1822:—"Ever since the Union, the Imperial Parliament had labored to raise the scale of taxation in Ireland as high as it was in England, and only relinquished the attempt when they found it was wholly unproductive. For twelve years he had remonstrated against this scheme; and had foreseen the evils resulting from it, of a beggarly gentry and a ruined peasantry. Ireland had four millions of nominally increased taxes, while the whole failed as a system of revenue, and the people were burdened without any relief to the Treasury. [Hear, hear.] It would be found, as it was in some other countries, that the iron grasp of poverty had paralysed the arm of the tax-gatherer, and limited in this instance the omnipotence of Parliament. They had taxed the people; but not augmented the supplies; they had drawn on capital—not income; and they, in consequence, reaped the harvest of discontent, and failed to reap the harvest of revenue." It was objected to Lord Lansdowne that the effect of his proposition would be to make Ireland the rival in trade and manufactures of England and Scotland. He was accused of this. He disclaimed any such intention, and now, I ask you, could this occur in an Irish Parliament? What must have been the spirit of the assembly where it became necessary to disclaim, as something outrageous, atrocious, and abominable, the idea of making Ireland the rival in trade and manufacture of England and Scotland? Do you not, gentlemen, perceive the fatuity, the folly of leaving your affairs to the management of those amongst whom it is considered a reproach to seek a rivalry with other countries. Oh, the declaration speaks trumpet-tongued. I hope it will thunder in your ears and excite in your minds a spirit of just indignation that any attempt should be made, through the medium of a court of law, to prevent the uprising of that power and public opinion which will procure for our country a Parliament to legislate for her interests. I shall now read an extract in reference to the proportion of the English and Irish debts. You have seen how the Irish debt was kept down by the Irish Parliament; but in sixteen years after the Union the Irish debt had increased 230 per cent, whilst the British in the same time only increased 60 per cent. These facts are so little known, and so much, intervenes to prevent a knowledge of them that I feel delighted at the opportunity of again circulating them. (laughter.) "The enormous excess of British over Irish debt at the Union left the British minister no excuse for their consolidation, and accordingly it was arranged that the two debts should continue to be separately provided for. The active expenditure of the empire, (i. e. the expenditure clear of charge of debts) was to be provided for in the proportion of two parts from Ireland to fifteen for Great Britain. These proportions were to cease, the debts were to be consolidated, and the two countries, to contribute indiscriminately by equal taxes, so soon as the respective debts should be brought to bear to each other the proportions of the contributions, viz: as 2 to 15, provided also that the fiscal ability of Ireland should be found to have increased. Now, the 2 to 15 rate of contribution was denounced at the time by Irishmen as too

high for Ireland; and afterwards so admitted by the British ministers themselves. Its consequence was to exhaust and impoverish her to such a degree that her debt in sixteen years increased 230 per cent, while the British only increased 66 per cent. This disproportionate and unjust increase of the Irish debt brought the 2 to 15 proportion between it and the British debt. Advantage was taken of that single branch of the contingency contemplated in the Union act, although the other branch of the contingency, viz: the increase of Ireland's ability had not only occurred, but, by the confession of the English ministers themselves in 1816, the very contrary had occurred, namely, Ireland had become poorer than before. Advantage, we say, was taken of that single branch of the contingency to consolidate the debts, to do away with all measure of proportionate contribution, and place the purse of Ireland, without restriction or limit, in the hands of the British Chancellor of the Exchequer, thenceforward to take from it, and apply as he liked, every penny it did then and might at any future time contain, and rob Ireland of all chance of benefit from any surplus of revenue thenceforward and forever.

General Abstract of Taxes Repealed or Remitted in Great Britain and Ireland.

	GREAT BRITAIN.	IRELAND.
Customs,	£7,923,567	£635,200
Excise,	14,093,638	365,530
Stamps,	443,634	152,600
Post Office,	139,000	13,193
Property Duty,	14,617,823	
Window,	1,577,773	179,408
Houses,	250,000	53,073
Servants,	472,061	42,938
Carriages,	391,796	71,036
Horses,	1,172,034	67,524
Dogs,	6,376	
	£41,055,202	£1,581,211

The taxes repealed or remitted in Ireland being one twenty-sixth part of those repealed in Great Britain.—These figures, gentlemen, will tell you that England increased the taxation of Ireland by four millions, and what was the result?—why, as was to be expected, the actual revenue fell upwards of 500,000, so that the attempt to tax us four millions actually cost England one half a million. They increased our debt 235 per cent, while they increased their own only 60 per cent. Now gentlemen, allow me to ask you what prosperity can we have while we allow the management of our monetary affairs to be invested in the hands of strangers? Can we be prosperous while the management of our revenue is in the hands of English government? Would any of you leave the management of your affairs in the hands of a stranger?—or would you not expect that any man doing so would soon find himself a beggar? As it is with individuals, so it is with nations. I may be told that there has been a diminution of taxation. Yes, gentlemen, there has been a diminution done? England has been relieved to the amount of 41,852,000, while Ireland has obtained a diminution of her taxes to the amount of only 1,584,000, or in the proportion of one to 41. That, gentlemen, is the justice with which we have been treated. But, gentlemen, this is not all, for by the change which was made in 1826 in the currency of the country, they added at least one fifteenth to the debts of Ireland. So much, gentlemen, for the justice with which we have been treated. Let me ask you, gentlemen, how can we prosper while we allow the hands of others to rummage in our pockets? An Irish Parliament, while it would pay every shilling that is honestly due, it would at the same time save us from the folly of paying that which is due by England alone.—Now, gentlemen, I mean to leave this part of the case, trusting that I have shown

you the evil mercantile effects which the Union had on our common country. I will now, gentlemen, call your attention to the protest of the lords against the Union. I will not weary you by reading all the documents. I will content myself with citing the 10th reason of the noble lords, which says:—"Because when we consider the weakness of this kingdom at the time that the measure was brought forward, and her inability to withstand the destructive designs of the minister, and coupled with the act itself the means that we have employed to accomplish it, such as the abuse of the place bill, for the purpose of corrupting parliament, the appointment of sheriffs to prevent county meetings, the dismissal of the old steadfast friends of constitutional government, for their adherence to the constitution, and the return of persons into parliament who had neither connection nor stake in the country, and were therefore selected to decide upon her fate—when we consider the armed force of the minister, added to his power and practice of corruption—when we couple these things together, we are warranted to say that the basest means have been used to accomplish this great innovation and that the measure of Union tends to dishonour the ancient peerage for ever, to dismember both houses of parliament for ever. Such circumstances, we apprehend, will be recollected with abhorrence, and will create jealousy between the two nations, instead of that harmony which for so many centuries has been the cement of their union."—This protest, gentlemen, was signed, Leinster, Meath, Chattermott, &c., and by the Bishops of Down and Lismore. This is the authentic declaration of the peers of that day; and I feel certain that their descendants of the present day must be proud of the deed of their ancestors, and that they will yet assist in carrying out the intentions of their ancestors, and yet take their seats in their places at College-green. Amongst the other evils to which the Union gave rise, none was so oppressive as the total inadequacy of the representation of Ireland in the Imperial Legislature; and the great deficiency of voters created by the state of the registry. I am the more anxious to point out the defect because I find that there is now a disposition to concede upon the point. They are now willing to do something in respect to the franchise; but let me ask how long has the injustice been allowed to exist? Let me call your attention to the following document, and it speaks trumpet-tongued of England's injustice:—"First Report on the Franchise in two Counties. "The result of the injustice done to the people of Ireland by the restriction of the elective franchise, is made manifest by a contrast between the population of the several counties in England and the number of registered voters therein, with the population and number of registered voters in the different Irish counties. We take our statement of numbers from the Parliamentary papers, and by comparing the least populous counties in England with the most populous in Ireland—Westmoreland and Cork, for instance—we find the following result:—the rural population of Westmoreland is 43,464, and its number of registered votes after the reform act amounted to 4,392. Nearly one out of every ten inhabitants. Whereas, in the county of Cork, the population is 703,716, and the number of electors registered after the Irish reform act, was only 3,835, being scarcely one out of every 200 of the inhabitants. "We ask, therefore, is this to be endured? "Here is Westmoreland, with less than one-fourteenth of the population of Cork, and yet it has an absolute majority of 567 registered voters! Is this to be called reform?"