

121-4

0401

5 6 7 8 9 10 1 2 3 4 5

AN
APOLOGY
FOR
His Royal Highness.
THE
DUKE OF YORK,

Against the Malignant Charges

PREFERRED AGAINST HIM

By a Mr. Wardle.

A Subject in which every Individual of the Country is concerned;

So far as an Invasion of the Peace and Happiness of a noble Character can interest him.—We are all bound by a Moral and Political obligation to repel the attacks of envy or malice, even though the sting be not directed to ourselves.

BY ASTRÆA.

LYNN.

PRINTED BY WILLIAM WHITTINGHAM,
AND PUBLISHED BY J. WALKER, NO 44 PATERNOSTER
ROW, LONDON: AND MAY BE HAD OF ALL THE
BOOKSELLERS.

Price One Shilling and Sixpence.

AN
APOLOGY

FOR THE
Duke of York,

With Animadversions on the Malignity displayed in the prosecution of that very important Business, where it is shewn that the Duke is innocent, and that nothing but the spirit of Party has succeeded in affixing odium on his character.

THE general ferment that has been occasioned by a late investigation of charges of corruption brought against the Duke of York by a Mr. Wardle, and the violent and factious spirit that has been generated from that enquiry, will sufficiently apologize for obtruding these few disinterested reflections on the notice of an impartial public.

Never should I have dared to assume the important charge of vindicating this great Personage from these foul unqualified aspersions; never should I have stood forward to apologize for any man, however dignified by titles, or exalted by power, had I not felt the full force of conviction

4

that he is innocent, and that, it is the duty we owe to each other, to afford mutual protection from the shafts of foul and malignant animosity. Who can silently hear the tongue of Slander garble the virtues of the Great, and not be roused to revenge the insult? Was it not the determination of the great Grecian Legislator, that an injury done to an Individual, was an injury done to the whole community? if so, shall we passively bear the wrong of which we, as members of the collective body, are participators? it cannot be, —but before we enter into a detail of this very important business, let us first direct a little of our attention to its origin, which possesses all the obscurity, that so dark, and disingenuous an affair, could be supposed to commence with.

Whilst we were enjoying the benefit of unison in our council, undisturbed by the clamor of party zeal, or bigoted opposition; whilst the affairs of the nation seemed conducted with that regularity which is the consequence of much ability, and consummate prudence, we were interrupted in this happy state of tranquility, by a subject of considerable importance, which, at first, threatened to destroy our peace, with the alarming approach of inevitable destruction. An obscure country Gentleman, by name Mr. Wardle, charged

5

the Duke of York with the grossest corruption in the regulation of the army. He said he was prepared to substantiate his allegations with the strongest testimony. He hoped for support from the Parliament in this perilous, and arduous, affair. What ought to have been the result of this serious presumption? ought not the Duke to have been found guilty of a crime the most dangerous, and to have received a punishment proportioned to its magnitude? Mr. Wardle, and his bigotted adherents, complain of the corrupt inflexibility of the ministerial party. Was there ever a more glaring evasion of public censure than this? Mr. Wardle, because his evidence has proved fallible, and his attempt frivolous, wishes to assign the failure to a corrupt House of Commons. Corrupt because they would not second his feeble, yet malignant designs. Before Mr. Wardle ventures to affix odium on any distinguished character again, let him previously contrive a shield that will hide him from the just indignation of an insulted people. There are certain vague charges, which may be brought against the most pure and spotless characters in the kingdom; but a liberal and honest mind, would disclaim the ignominy of preferring them; such charges have been directed to the Illustrious

Duke of York; who as a *man* has signalized himself in the service of his country, and as a *prince* has preserved that dignity and decorum, that conduct and honesty which every one must unreservedly admire; but happily for him a British Parliament has washed away the foul stain; and I see no reason why the decision of this Parliament is to be less respected, than those of preceeding ages. If human nature has degenerated, and men may be influenced to act in opposition to the fullest and most complete conviction of their own consciences; if there cannot be found any one sufficiently upright to judge with perfect and unquestionable purity, how are we to be assured that any one can be found, exempt from this general depravation, sufficiently *honest, to prefer charges of guilt and corruption?* happy would it have been for Mr. Wardle, had he lived in those days, when a superstitious Mob, could have thought him an instrument from Heaven, "to scourge offending sinners from the earth"—we are too enlightened for such shallow artifices.

The popular opinion follows that, which is generally called the Opposition. And why? not because they were actuated by motives less interested; not because their positions were more tenable; no such things—the reasons are obvious

to every one who is not unacquainted with the insinuating language of Oppositionists—they appeal in fine flowery language, to what they call the sense of the people. As I am a free member of the people, I should wish to have an exact definition of this hackneyed phrase; it often has rung in my ears, without ever reaching the understanding. Pray is not the House of Commons the voice of the people? are they not men of our own choosing? but some of the malecontents will say, all the ministerial party (meaning themselves to be sure spotless) do not act correspondently with the interest of the public, that they consult their own private, mercenary views, whilst their neglected country is mouldering to decay; what then, admitting this erroneous charge, are we to understand by the sense of the people? are we to *revolutionize?* are we to *steel our bosoms against each other as enemies?* **DETESTED DESIGNS!!!** the people are made *nominally* the object of their protection, but the *rancour of party spirit, disappointed ambition, or the hopes of reward, are the true* stimulants of all their eloquence.

In these few cursory remarks, it may not appear irrevalent to say something with regard to the nature and credibility of the testimony, on

which they ground the *whole* of their allegations. Has it been on that of a *number of persons*, whose lives have been uniformly marked by *prudence, consistency, and a rigid observance of all the moral duties*? has it been that of a series of coincident evidences, whose deposition tend to the establishment of this very important charge? No, the farthest from it possible. This very serious affair had its origin in the malignant fabrication of a *cast-off mistress*, whose whole life has been stained with a violation of all that is respectable or honorable in a woman. Mr. Curwen, a *member of the opposition*, confesses, that the *testimony of Mrs. Clarke is not quite unquestionable*, that there is room to justify suspicion with respect to its authenticity. If this great concession was made by a coadjutor of Mr. Wardle; if they will confess that the prompt details of Mrs. Clarke are incompetent to a conviction of the Duke, in what manner, and on what grounds, is he to be condemned? Mrs. Clarke is the *only evidence* that charges the Duke with censurable misconduct, and if hers is to be disregarded, do not the opposition entirely acquit the Duke of this scandalous defamation? The Opposition here, as well as in many other instances, have betrayed their aversion to Ministers, rather than ministerial measures; a

kind of proceeding, that by no means comports with that disinterested zeal, and steady perseverance in the public cause, which they so often jingle in our ears. Though the Opposition have here committed a blunder which they little suspected, and which, of itself, is amply sufficient to remove every doubt respecting the innocence of the Duke, a similar inference might be drawn from the conduct of Mrs. Clarke; a woman who frequently manifested a want of shame, and who appears tutored to prevaricate when closely questioned. It is usual to measure the respect paid to the alledgment of persons by their character thro' Life, their connections, and respectability.—How then, in the name of Truth, are we to give credence to those of Mrs. Clarke, where all these qualifications are wanting, and, more particularly, as we can account for her conduct, without supposing her actuated by the purest or most disinterested intentions? She had quarrelled with the Duke—the Duke had dismissed her from his favor, and perhaps had reduced her to despair of finding the protection of any other character, who could preserve her exalted station in life; as her friendship was too great for the vulgar, and too infamous for the great. What does she do? but ransack the records of memory, and call forth

all the fanciful trash, that could possibly possess the brain of one of the greatest visionaries within the walls of St. Luke's. Impelled with the spleen and hatred of a Dæmon, she flies to Mr. Wardle, (by the bye no great compliment, for an abandoned woman to think Mr. Wardle a fit person to become an accomplice in her scheme,) transfers all her papers to him, on which he (harmless creature!!!) builds a charge the most criminal and important, that, perhaps, was ever heard within the walls of the House of Commons. In such a manner did this vile affair originate; but it deserved no better an origin. How infatuated must the people of England be, if they will longer suffer themselves to be deluded by this specious, illgrounded, and malignant charge! My fellow Countrymen, I am one of your members, and would shew as determined an opposition to the introduction of corruption into our army, as any one of your respectable body. I would prosecute a charge with all the industry my feeble talent would allow, I should glory to see a public transgressor of justice bound to the wheel, or fastened to the block, but I confess it is my nature to wish innocence to be protected, to see injured worth sheilded from the arrows of detraction.—this feeling makes me sympathize with the Illustrious

Duke, who has been treated in a manner, that must wound the sensibility of every man, whose heart is open to the sufferings of others, and who can estimate the injury the noble Duke sustains by this calumny on his character. Having made a few general observations on the delusion of Mr. Wardle, and the minority, by this cunning insinuating woman; and the lamentable consequences that have resulted from it, I shall proceed to investigate more particularly, the nature of the crimes brought against the Duke, and prove, by commenting step by step, that like the visions of night, they are only terrible from being seen in the dark, there is nothing in several of them, but what every man is subject to be charged with, and, consequently, what no man could think highly criminal—but unless I combat these allegations by a more particular enquiry, the suspicious reader will think I am only palliating what I cannot justify.

We can only judge of the iniquity and magnitude of the crimes charged on the Duke, by the consequences resulting from them; this I believe is a maxim observed by the Legislators of every country, and seems to be established on reason and equity—though, perhaps, Mr. Wardle and his colleagues, by examining through the micro-

scope of opposition, could enlarge them to such a monstrous degree, as to be unable to find any punishment commensurable with the guilt. I confine myself to the *crime*, Mr. Wardle to the *person*, from whence springs the difference in our conclusions. There is no one amongst us but has felt the sting of unmerited criticism, which private enmity has darted at our peace; we can feel the wrong, we can resent the injury.— Though 125 violent members of the Commons have deluded themselves with the general cry of destruction, fatal innovation, corrupt practices, we will more dispassionately examine the question, and draw a disinterested conclusion. I well know that many well disposed persons reason thus—If the Duke is not guilty, why are the people of England so dissatisfied? why are there so many meetings held in London to thank Mr. Wardle? these self proposed questions have determined many to incline to the murmuring side, but let them be truly answered, and no one will see the least occasion for sanctioning this factious declamation. Hear my answers, they are the answers of a person who neither knows, nor expects any protection from the Duke. The people of England are dissatisfied, because the most industrious means have been employed by the Opposition to

propagate their foul and venomous calumny. Have not the Opposition caused to be printed in every Antiministerial Paper; the most dark hints, and disingenuous reflections? Have they not employed all their unprincipled Hirelings, to defame the Duke with disgusting, and indecent caricatures? Have they not in every instance cherished the expansion of slanderous report? Yes, they have done all these things, and yet some persons wonder how the deluded populace should favor the party of Mr. Wardle. These very reasons will answer, in some measure, the second question—the people being inflamed with the cries of corruption, were prepared to hear, with a favorable prepossession, the declamatory harangues which the Opposition members have every where delivered to their deceived constituents—hence Mr. Wardle was commended, because the people were deceived. The third question is one of rather a different nature—The Livery of London having lately made some acquisition to their body, of Oratorical powers, found it inconvenient to concur in the propositions of ministers, as there would then be no occasion for debate, and a great deal of splendid eloquence would be then consigned to oblivion. They do not so much wish to favor any party, as to make themselves

respectable. Let these notices be taken into consideration, and we shall remove the wonder working blind, which has so long kept us in the dark. We shall see that the Duke is innocent, and that none but the factious, the malignant, or the captious, can find any thing to disapprove.

When was there a time in the records of History, that Appointments were not made thro Court influence? Have not the friends of Royalty ever been considered as the most deserving objects of Public favour? In whom can that important trust be Confided so well as Princes; who by their intimate connection with the prosperity of the country, must be active in its welfare? Is it in the least probable, that a man born to fortune, titles, and honors, should, so soon, yield to the seductions of mercenary acquisition, as he, who, from his cradle, has been taught that an accumulation of riches is the first of temporal virtues? Is it in the least likely, that a Prince who has honors and reputation to lose, would hazard them for the contemptible stake of a few Pounds?

The inconsistency of the supposition is too glaring to be entertained for a single moment. Besides these irrefutable objections to Mr. Warde's charges, there is another which I think will remove the least doubt, (if there be any yet re-

maining) and set the Duke free from the malicious suspicions of an unthinking rabble. Has not the Duke, from his earliest youth, manifested a dereliction to every thing base and corrupt? to what solitary action can the finger of reproach dare to level itself? has he in any one instance betrayed the interests of his Country, sacrificed the fortunes of his friends, or violated the sacred bond of domestic peace? No—whenever he has been entrusted with Power; that Power, so far from being prostituted to any private censurable views, has been uniformly directed to further the prosperity of the country, improve its safety, or extend its commerce. These virulent accusers of the Duke, have betrayed their vile machinations, by the want of policy in preferring their charge. They should first have shewn that the Duke had been making rapid strides towards corruption, that he had yielded that spotless character which dignifies him more than titles, and that he has openly declared himself an enemy to his Father, his Country and his Friends; for it an as axiom with Ethical writers, that *nemo repente turpissimus*—but they care not whether he is guilty or not; whether he has forfeited his claims to respect is a matter of indifference to them—his crime is, his steady adherence to consistency, his support of his Father,

and his diligent endeavours to preserve the Love and Admiration of his Country. Such a man must be obnoxious to characters dead to every principle of justice. Justly may we exclaim with the Roman Orator *O tempora, o mores.*

Let us now proceed to examine these heinous crimes committed by the Duke, and judge whether they deserve most our censure or esteem—that he has appointed persons to offices in the army we will not dispute. His very office obliges him to do so—were he to neglect, he would not discharge the duties of his situation—is this a crime meriting our indignation?—There might be some ground for complaint, if our Commander in Chief had appointed persons unqualified by Birth, by Habits, or by Situation. But he has not done such things. He has considered men eminent for their talents or services, as deserving his interest. He consequently raised them to offices of trust. What injury can result from this? Will any one complain that persons of tried experience are appointed to important posts in the army? But several Letters have been published concerning the Duke's inconsiderate liberality of favors in other situations beside those in the army. Before we censure him for that, let us candidly estimate the injury sustained.

One of the instances is, that of Mr. Beazley, who was desirous of preaching before Royalty—he had interest with the Duke and succeeded—shall we stain the character of His Royal Highness for this mark of Friendship, particularly when it is remembered, that the person recommended is acknowledged to be distinguished for his virtue and talents?—for my part, I shall be happy to see every department of the Church filled with such unexceptionable Characters. We should then have oftener the principles of christianity from the pulpit than the enthusiasm of party. Instead of hearing questions of policy canvassed with such vehemence, we should learn to draw closer that federal bond which unites our prosperity and happiness. This subject we may dismiss without farther observation, as none will cavil but the Opposition, and their bigotted adherents. Having in the preceeding remarks examined the nature of the crime with which His Royal Highness is charged, we will now turn Mr. Wardle's own battery against himself. Let us suppose that this pure, inflexible patriot; this disinterested Mr. Wardle, who has dared to prosecute an enquiry for which nature never formed him, should be interrogated in the following language, in what manner would he acquit himself to the world, or

how would he venture to urge this insidious investigation?

Have you Sir, never exerted your interest for the service of your friends, for persons you may have been attached to, either for their virtues, or some other quality that appeared deserving your assistance? have you never been seduced by the wily artifices of a Female favorite? have you never preferred the praises of a faction to the soothing consolation of principle? if you have never done any of these things, the reasons are obvious. Your interest has been too contemptible to solicit! or you have had no friend on whom you could confer a favor. Your breast has been shut against the invasive charms of female beauty; but I fear that you hear too frequently sacrificed the counsels of your own bosom, to the declamatory views of party, to feel yourself entirely exempt from some bitter stings, some poignant reflections.

Your political career is begun in violating one of the primary duties of Life; by endeavoring to traduce a person you should reverence, vilifying a conduct you should imitate; and cutting yourself from a connection you should have cherished. Be mindful of your present Friends, they like yourself live on the smiles of the people they deceive. The mask has been worn too long already

if must soon fade, and they whom the multitude now admire, will meet with the detestation they so justly merit. The paths of Fame are slippery to him who pursues them through the medium of virtue; to him who seeks them through the aid of vice, they are impassible—many characters

Tolluntur in altum

ut lapsu graviore ruant

Be mindful that this reflection is not verified in yourself—you have more to fear than a less conspicuous character—your conduct claims attention, and praise or censure must necessarily follow—a few friends, a hired mob, may echo your name with reverence—they would do the same for any one that will pay them. The glittering turrets of popularity which allured you to seek the temple, will guide you to infamy—they are not built on the hearts, but the folly of the people. You thought by standing forward in a daring enterprise, you must be admired; but it is first necessary that the enterprise be just. These few reflections may correct an error which will lead inevitably to disgrace. They may stop the progress of a zeal in the cause of faction, they may sooth the severe remorse of conscience. Be not deaf to instruction, but learn from one who has no interest to be your enemy, and who would re-

joice if you were his friend, and the friend of the King, and the friend of the People.

This salutary advice may prevent much disgrace; and as it is ever held to be easier to avoid an error, than correct one, I would seriously admonish you to be circumspect in what you undertake, so that, if you never rise to fame, you may never sink to infamy. He who emerges through the slime of obscurity, and suddenly flashes upon the world, like other meteors, excites fear and apprehension whilst he is seen; and like them vanishes from the world, without leaving any thing behind him but plagues and pestilence. I should not have been led to introduce these remarks, but from a conviction, that they will prove His Royal Highness innocent in the eyes of every one but Mr. Wardle and his adherents. That they will prove that His Royal Highness has done nothing incompatible with his office; nothing but what every person should be proud to do, if they had the same extent of power; and finally, to shew how much easier it is to carp at the foibles of other men, than avoid them ourselves. "Let no one censure but himself excel" is a precept that would have silenced the distracted fury of the late Opposition, had they first challenged their own conduct, before they ventured to impeach

that of another. They should have remembered that an inquisition of conduct, like Charity, should begin at home. Be yourselves free from impeachment, before you impeach me—this is a christian doctrine—it carries too much the appearance of justice with it, to be admitted into the practical decalogue of maxims of our violent Oppositionists—they would much rather revile the Duke, than acquit themselves—the first requires only impudence, the latter must be supported by reason and virtue. Let us only advert a moment to the evils this ridiculous and malicious accusation has produced. Every member now finds a tongue to slander—every department of the Government is suffering from their foul charges—impeachments, accusations, votes of censure, are every day jingling in our ears—The Opposition, finding it in vain to combat the just arguments of Ministers, wish to divert the country at the expence of their reputation. The House of Commons will soon be obliged to relinquish all other business, for the transaction of these domestic clamours, and then they will say to the country—see the glorious conduct of your Ministers! what have they done the last ten or twelve Sessions? how, in the name of justice! is it possible for men to answer these illiberal charges

and at the same time to conduct the affairs of the nation? Let us put the case to ourselves—if we were obliged to answer all the accusations that envy or malignity might fabricate, how should we be able to conduct our Trades and Professions? it is impossible—so that, if the measures of Ministers should not be so circumspectly or politically conducted, we must ascribe their errors to these oppositionists; a set of men who exult at every loss the country sustains; and would glory if we were involved in inextricable ruin; so that it would but bring opprobrium on the Ministers. We are not blind to their views; we have too long felt their opposition to be insensible of it; and I hope we shall from this moment, cease to give them our suffrages, while they manifest the least hostility to the prosperity of the country. I was once a favorer of Mr. Fox's principles, and am proud to say, I gloried in many things he did for his country; but these are not copies of that Great Statesman. They are originals of a very different cast, of a cast that I hope no one will think it prudent to imitate. They have no claims to respect; they have forfeited their title as men, they have attained none as statesmen; unless we can think (which God forbid) that opposition for the sake of opposition, or more dan-

gerous views can qualify them for our esteem.

Perhaps this decided vindication of His Royal Highness, may be imputed to me as a crime; for who, in these days, can stand forward the assertor of Innocence, or the friend of Justice, but shares the malignity of this opposition? to escape their censure, you must subscribe to their narrow and illiberal sentiments; and what man would do that, who has ever considered the dictates of his own conscience as a principle of action?

Something has already been said with respect to the deference which the decision of a House of Commons has a right to claim from the people; much more might be advanced to shew that their determination, in many political cases, ought to implicitly respected—if six hundred, independent, able men, assisted by every document and testimony which the subject can afford, should declare their opinion, would it not evince an unpardonable temerity to question that decision? would any private number of individuals be justified in prevaricating with the resolutions so pronounced, when perhaps they have no better arguments to support their caviling, than the cry of corruption? what would be the consequence if every private disaffected member of the country, were allowed to disturb the public tranquility by his specious and

illiberal objections? I am not an advocate for abridging the Liberty, but the Licentiousness of the Subject—it never was my intention to impose fresh fetters on the freedom of discussion, which freedom is entailed on us by our birth—no—but I do sincerely wish, that all intemperate zeal, all factious discord, were totally extinguished amongst us—enthusiasm in the cause of party, has subverted many Empires as firmly established as our own—it saps the basis of the constitution, by alienating its members from its support; no people would be so ready for rebellion if Faction did not first disseminate discontent. The Opposition, which is now become a byword of reproach, was originally a distinguishing mark of integrity—they once were mere checks on the conduct of Ministers, to preserve the liberty of the people. Heu! quantum mutatus ab illo! they have entirely forgot, or neglected their original intentions, and are become checks on that liberty, and those rights, which they originally defended. If this Opposition be suffered to exist in its present licentiousness, can civil society be preserved? what will become of that social compact which binds the nation in indissoluble union? where shall we look for the energy of Ministers, when no worthy man will accept an office beset with so many thorns

and briars? to be the scoff and reproach of malice? He who has the feelings of an honest man, will be obliged to refuse a situation, which now would entail disgrace on his posterity. But which once was as fruitful in honors and respect? if, as some complain, there exists a radical evil in our parliamentary arrangements; if a reformation is desirable, shall we effect it vi et armis; and disregarding the consequences of so ill concerted a measure, rush on a danger that may, perhaps, prove destructive to us as a people? where is there a precedent that intemperate zeal, misguided fury, and deaf malignity, have ever executed any thing conducive to the good of mankind? where is there an instance of a sudden and unpremeditated change, ever being productive of a permanent benefit? yet such designs have been entertained by the party, who so violently-accused His Royal Highness? what are we to understand by the resolutions of the Livery of London? what do they mean by reform? is it to change the features of the existing Government for a model of their own? is it to put in power their own Declaimers? or what is this reform to do? for myself, I have lived peaceably under the present Government; nor do I see any just occasion for complaint against Ministers;

they have acted like every other set of men in power; they have adhered to His Majesty in the greatest difficulties. I had hoped that the absurd distinction of Whig and Tory had been entirely forgotten; and that we should no longer have been divided by a mere jargon which has no definite meaning affixed to it. But this opposition find it convenient to amuse us with words, without convincing us by arguments or facts. In every instance it is found, that fury increases as conviction fails; and that the populace would rather support a doctrine beyond their comprehension, than a simple one which directly appeals to their understandings. This renders them very serviceable instruments in the hands of the Cunning. Who know how to work on the frenzy of the multitude, kindle them to irresistible fury, or tame them to the most abject servitude. Let us banish these misconceived notions, which have been generated by our intercourse with men, avowedly hostile to civil order, and who are always ready to kindle the spreading flames of disaffection. If a change must be effected, the people are the arbitrators in the affair. Let them wait with determined resolution to change the object of their choice for next Parliament, if they think *that* will induce any advantage; for my part, and I am

persuaded that the deliberate, disinterested part of the kingdom will join with me in sentiment, there is no necessity for a change.

Sir Francis Burdett has declared in the Commons, that he believed the present Ministers were as free from corruption as any set of ministers that ever were in office.—This declaration is not from one who has always adhered to the ministerial party; but must be considered as a truth that will remove every attack of obloquy or disgrace. — If then, ministers are confessedly qualified for their respective offices; if they have talents and integrity to assist them in the discharge of the public duties, by what sophistical mode of reasoning are we to infer, that their decision is unjust or inconsistent?—this is really trifling with our understandings too far. We are told that honest men are guilty of the most flagrant crimes.—That men of sound judgments, and unbiased conduct, have committed themselves in the most egregious and nefarious manner.—How are we to reconcile these absurdities?—that a good man may commit an error, and a reasonable man incur censure, are very evident; but that either of these should be in a very criminal and obvious degree, is hard to be admitted by the impartial, however long it may have been received amongst the dogma's of

the opposition. If a criminal were brought before a common court of judicature, and should be acquitted of the charges prefer'd against him; the Law has wisely provided him with powers to curb the illiberal tongue of infamy and detraction.

He goes unspotted into the world, and no stigma affixes itself to any one, but the vile and detestable prosecutor! by a parity of reasoning, we should infer, that a tribunal like the commons, where none but characters of distinction are arraigned; where none but persons whose reputation is more valuable than life are impeached; I say we should infer, that a similar, or more ample provision, would be made. Are the laws of England so unfortunately constituted, as to protect the lowest character subordinate to them, and at the same time expose the happiness, the fortune, and the reputation of one of its principal members, to the scorn and virulence of a disaffected party?—surely not—it cannot be—shall then a few anti-constitutional persons be suffered to vent their malignity with impunity, and self-erect themselves into a community, paramount to the commons of England, and rejudge their decisions? is such a power recognis'd by the legislature of Britain? from whom have they received their delegation? and to what controul are they themselves subject?—

I well know that if these questions are answered, they will tell us the people are their sovereign; that to them they owe their power and obedience; but when did the people ever evince any discontent till *they* employed all their insidious arguments to pervert our understandings, and disturb our peace? never—we are no longer to be glossed over with such shallow deceits.—The principal part of the greivances we feel arise from this Opposition.—They are not unfrequently sinister agents of our enemies.—They strike at our existence, though they strike unseen.—They know the advantages of exciting our enemies to war.—It brings them into pay, and that obtunds the prickings of conscience for a season. I confess myself to be a person, whose views are to live in peace with all men.—To promote to the greatest extent of my individual exertion, the benefit of my country; and to extinguish with the most determined opposition every ember of detraction or malignity that I can; yet I cannot submit peaceably to hear one of the greatest and most illustrious personages of the country, wantonly abused by a party of dissolute, and factious persons. Nothing so evidently indicates a degeneracy of morals as the frequency of defamation. Corrupt men are capable of corrupt practices; in times of purity there are

none who feel disposed to prefer charges of guilt, and there are none guilty to demand them.

Having, in the preceding pages; prov'd incontrovertibly that the charges brought against the Duke are of a frivolous nature; that though frivolous they have not in one solitary instance been substantiated; that the person who prefer'd them was actuated more by malignity than justice, forgetting the memorable maxim *ne sutor ultra crepidam*—that the Duke stands acquitted in the eyes of all dispassionate members of the Country, that the High Court of Parliament is to be revered in its decision, and that decision has pronounced him free and innocent of all crime—that a great deal of disingenuous reflection was employ'd by the accusing party in the prosecution of the charge—that they have endeavour'd to disseminate the seeds of discontent thro the Country—that the charges against His Royal Highness were a mere pretext to cover their factious, and more dangerous designs.—I say, having prov'd all the above positions, I shall proceed to make a few remarks on the consequences likely to result from the in politic introduction of this ferment at the present moment—a moment, when the united exertions of all parties are required to transact the important business of the State—it is

not a little surprizing that men who declare themselves the warmest advocates of their Country, and who manifest so much disinterested Zeal in the promotion of public good, should act in diametrical Opposition to these professions; and strive with all the industry of enemies to disunite us with enquiries that are agitated with the views of separating the hearts and voices of the people from that attachment they have been accusom'd to feel for the Government, that protects and cherishes them, from becoming the prey of an inveterate enemy —

What measure was ever likely to entail so much loss on this Country, as the resignation of His Royal Highness? a man every way qualified for the discharge of that office.—His Birth demands it—his education has prepared him for it—his conduct merits it—and the success with which he has uniformly administered that important trust, will make every man lament that he has resigned it. Who can be appointed to succeed him? perhaps they wish to establish a military Council—however beautiful that may be in theory, it will never suit the temper of these times, every proposition will then be so long struggling into action, that the moment of emergency will be lost; we shall then be amused with the jarring opposi-

tions of this military convention—glorious prospect! though I wish every government could have the purity of a well regulated democracy, without the inconvenience; yet Liberty, when accompanied by Licentiousness and anarchy, can never be desired by the dispassionate, and can never be enjoyed by any people—if, instead of entertaining these speculative opinions, which can never be realized whilst human nature remains in its present state, we were to petition His Majesty to restore his son to the important office he has left, we should then be discharging our duties as good men, and good citizens—never will our military operations be conducted with so much effect; never will that success, which makes every Briton proud of his country, attend our arms, as when they were guided by the persevering diligence of his Royal Highness. To conclude these few disinterested remarks, which were begun with a view of shielding innocence from the shafts of censure, I must beg leave to offer up a fervent wish that the country will no longer be hurried on by an inconsiderate zeal to oppose ministers, without first being fully convicted of their guilt.

That they will subscribe to the resolutions of oppositionists no longer, then they comport with the general principles of Liberty and Right,

Rights, acknowledged by our Constitution — that they will resent with becoming indignation every endeavour to impose on their peace,—that they will not consider that man a proper object to represent them in Parliament, who commence'd an accusation which has been proved fallacious; but which has kindled a flame of discontent, that may before it be extinguished, involve us in a general destruction,—at which time it will destroy itself.

FINIS

0418

