



SPECIAL  
COLLECTIONS



DOUGLAS  
LIBRARY

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY  
AT KINGSTON

KINGSTON ONTARIO CANADA





Passion's Progress. 13-11-17

A

DISSECTION

OF THE

NORTH BRITON,

NUMBER XLV.

PARAGRAPH by PARAGRAPH.

INSCRIBED TO

The Right Honourable Earl TEMPLE.

*Fluctere si nequeo superos Acheronta movebo. VIRG.*



L O N D O N :

Printed for G. BURNET, at Bishop Burnet's Head in the Strand.

MDCCLXIV.

111. 111. 111. 111.

111. 111. 111. 111.

111. 111. 111. 111.

111. 111. 111. 111.

111. 111. 111. 111.

T O

E A R L   T E M P L E.

My L O R D,

**B**Y inscribing this Dissection to you, I apprehend I pay no small compliment either to your Lordship or to the piece. If I had not the greatest opinion of Earl Temple's heart, (however it may have been misled by false appearances) and if I did not strongly rely on the conviction of my arguments, he would have been the last man in the world I should have thought of addressing on the present subject.

My Lord, if I have taken some pains to anatomise the North Briton, No. 45. it is because I thought it a duty due to my country. My thoughts were written on this head some time ago, but I deferred the publication, because I would not be accused of an attempt to spur and irritate justice, beyond the bounds to which the lenity of government might be willing to circumscribe it. I publish them now, because I am desirous to shew the great mercy of the state, which the writer has so heinously offended, as well as to convince my countrymen in general, how highly he

is

## DEDICATION.

is deserving of a much severer punishment than it is likely he would have experienced, even if he had been presumptuous enough to have awaited the consequences.

I conclude, my Lord, with most fervently wishing, that those intestine differences may speedily subside, which greatly lessen our dignity in the eyes of foreign powers, and deprive us of all the advantages which would necessarily result from a combination of hearts and hands in the service of our country; and finally, I most heartily pray, that the people may become truly sensible of the wisdom of those measures which his majesty hath most patriotically adopted, with the great view of burying in oblivion the seeds of our destructive dissensions, together with those odious appellations of Whig and Tory, which, ever since the days of Charles the second, have served the purpose of POLITICAL TORCHES, to kindle in this nation the fire of civil discord.

I am, My LORD,

YOUR LORDSHIP'S

Most humble, obedient servant,

PHILANTHROPOS.

THE  
DISSECTION  
OF THE  
NORTH BRITON,  
NUMBER XLV.

**A**S the North Briton, No. 45, has made a great noise in the nation, and is undoubtedly a most interesting affair, I hope a true and impartial discussion of that piece will not be displeasing to the public; as thereby the mischievous effects which that seditious performance may have produced, will, it is to be hoped, be in a great measure, if not totally, removed.

This paper was published on the 23d of April, 1763, and begins with discoursing on the nature of speeches from the throne, which, that author says, are *always* to be considered as the speeches of the minister; and, upon this hypothesis, he uses, with

þ

it,

it, those freedoms, which drew upon him the displeasure of the state, and gave rise to those prosecutions against the author which have strongly attracted the public attention.

The whole world, indeed, knows, that *in* parliament it is usual to consider the King's speech in that light; but how far it is lawful for any of the subjects *out* of parliament, to analyse it as such, and especially in the manner our author has done, must be judged by my readers, after they have deliberately considered the scope of every paragraph of this production, as they shall be set forth hereafter. Much might be said here, by way of preface, to shew that it would be highly improper to allow those liberties to be assumed *every where*, which the members of parliament, *in the house*, are entitled to, for the sake of expediting the public service with a requisite accuracy; and, perhaps, a good deal also, might be alledged, on the other side of the question, in order to enforce the necessity of allowing, *in a free nation*, the measures of the ministry to be canvassed in this manner. But without proceeding to that matter, if we state fairly in what manner

ner



' daring Acts of violence committed by  
 ' any minister. The speech at the close  
 ' of the session has ever been considered  
 ' as the most secure method of promul-  
 ' gating the favourite court creed among  
 ' the vulgar, because the parliament which  
 ' is the constitutional guardian of the li-  
 ' berties of the people, has in this case no  
 ' opportunity of remonstrating or impeach-  
 ' ing any wicked servant of the crown.'

This remark, concerning the difference  
 of speeches, at the beginning or close of a  
 session, is most certainly *very judicious*, but  
 in this affair highly *impertinent*, in case it  
 should prove that the speech, which the  
 North Briton took upon him to consider,  
 was *not* calculated to propagate some state  
 creed, inconsistent with the proceedings of  
 parliament; and of consequence a preface  
 of this nature has a manifest tendency to  
 impress on that author's admirers in parti-  
 cular, and the public in general, a belief  
 that the speech in question contained some  
 propositions, which no minister dared to  
 avow the advising of, and such as some of  
 the officers of the crown would have been  
 in danger of being impeached for, if the  
 parliament had been to sit any longer; and,  
 of

of consequence, that those articles of the speech which the North Briton finds fault with, are to be regarded *in this light*; instead of being complied with, or respected, as the voice of the sovereign. What these are, this daring writer quickly informs us. ‘ This week, says he, has given the public the most abandoned instance of ministerial effrontery. The minister’s speech of last Tuesday is not to be paralleled in the annals of this country. I am in doubt (continues he) whether the imposition is greater on the sovereign, or the nation.’

This I apprehend is nothing less than a *plain* declaration, that the sovereign is the dupe of a designing minister, and so weak as not to understand what his minister thinks fit to make him speak.

Here let us pause, and consider if, even in the *parliamentary* debates, such freedoms were *ever* taken with a prince on the throne. I will venture to assert, that *no* prince, supposed fit to reign, was *ever* treated in this manner, *in* or *out* of parliament. History tells us, that our deposed princes were, indeed, represented in this light, by the parliaments that deposed them,

them, in order to justify their proceedings against them. But with respect to others, no *one* instance *can* be given, in the Debates, Journals, or Histories, of our nation, that any prince adjudged fit to reign, or any king, who possessed but a moiety of his present Majesty's virtues and talents, was ever so abused. I therefore submit it to my readers, if this clause of the North Briton doth not contain a most *traitorous* conclusion against a prince, whose wisdom and justice are eminently conspicuous to all, but such as are deluded by this author's diabolical fascinations; for it must be obvious to them that the North Briton's effrontery is so great, that he has thought fit to equalize his sovereign's character with, if not depress it below, those of our princes that were excluded from the throne, on account of their weakness and incapacity: Nor is this confined to a mere attempt to excite conspiracies against our sovereign, on account of his here alledged incapacity; for from the late behaviour of the deluded and lawless mob at the Royal Exchange, all our readers must be conscious of the undeserved success of this inflammatory writer's endeavours on this head;

so

so that there is, *de facto*, a conspiracy here declared, commenced, and in part executed, against the most gracious and patriotic prince that ever sat on the British throne; and if the whole together does not amount to a most treasonable overt attempt to dethrone the best of monarchs; neither words nor actions can henceforth be deemed to carry *any* meaning whatever.

The author having thus laid his seditious ground-work, proceeds to rear his traitorous super-structure. ‘ Every friend of  
 ‘ his country (says he) must lament, that  
 ‘ a prince of so many great and amiable  
 ‘ qualities, whom England truly reveres,  
 ‘ can be brought to give the sanction of  
 ‘ his sacred name to the most odious mea-  
 ‘ sures, and to the most unjustifiable pub-  
 ‘ lic declarations, from a throne *ever* re-  
 ‘ nowned for truth, honour, and un sullied  
 ‘ virtue.’ Here the weakness of our sove-  
 reign is manifestly set forth to be greater  
 than that of any of his predecessors in the  
 royal dignity; who are said to have sat on  
 a throne, ever, *till now*, (for this must be  
 the real meaning of the writer’s words) re-  
 nowned for honour, truth, and un sullied  
 virtue. What is this too, but, in other words,  
 most

most seditiously affirming, that the throne was never before disgraced, by being made a conveyance of falshood and lies. If this daring assertion (not more bold than false) was admitted, it would follow, that King James the second did not contribute so much to the debasing of the royal dignity, as our present illustrious sovereign; and that James's first speech from the throne, in which he *promises* (without ever fulfilling it) to maintain our liberties and religion, as by law established, was full of truth, honour, and un sullied virtue, compared with this of George the third; the natural and consequent intention, therefore, of the North Briton, must be of the most heinous and rebellious nature. ' I am sure all foreigners, especially the king of Prussia (says the North Briton) will hold the minister in contempt and abhorrence.' I so, in what light (were they to pay the least deference to this insolent writer) must they behold the King himself?

After all this treasonable parade about the lamentable weakness of the prince, and the wickedness of the minister, the North Briton goes on to give us a specimen of the *falshoods* set forth in this speech.

' He

\* He (meaning the minister) has made our  
 \* sovereign declare, “ *My expectations have*  
 \* *been fully answered, by the happy effects*  
 \* *which the several allies of my crown have*  
 \* *derived from this salutary measure of the*  
 \* *definitive treaty. The powers at war with*  
 \* *my good brother the King of Prussia, have been*  
 \* *induced to agree to such terms of accommoda-*  
 \* *tion, as that great prince has approved;*  
 \* *and the success which has attended my negotia-*  
 \* *tion has necessarily and immediately diffused the*  
 \*  *blessings of peace thro’ every part of Europe.”*

\* The infamous fallacy (the North Briton  
 \* goes on remarking) of this whole sen-  
 \* tence is apparent to all mankind; for it  
 \* is known, that the king did not barely  
 \* approve, but absolutely dictated, as con-  
 \* queror, every article of the terms of  
 \* peace. No advantage of any kind has  
 \* accrued to that magnanimous prince from  
 \* our negotiation, but he was basely de-  
 \* serted by the Scottish prime minister.---  
 \* He was known by every court in Europe;  
 \* to be scarcely on better terms of friendship  
 \* HERE, than at VIENNA, and he was betrayed  
 \* by us in the treaty of peace.’ The sen-  
 \* sible part of this nation are so well apprif-  
 \* ed of the truth of what his majesty, in

his speech, is here pleased to declare, that it is extremely lucky that the North Briton could charge no other part of this speech with falsity.

The stipulations in favour of Germany, whereby his most christian majesty engaged to withdraw his troops out of the empire, and his subsidies from the court of Vienna, are so well known to be the *sole* cause of the empress queen's yielding to the Prussian demands, that I am at a loss here whether most to admire the audacity or malice of this author. He has the effrontery to alledge that his Prussian majesty was betrayed or deserted by us, although we protected his dominions *during* the whole *war*, and at the *end* of it, stipulated with our reconciled foe, that he should withdraw from the enemy of Prussia those aids which enabled her to carry on hostilities against him. It is, indeed, true, that we withdrew from his Prussian majesty the stipulated subsidy in money; but not till we were convinced not only of the absurdness of the measure, in respect to any advantage accruing to England from it, but that that great prince had no further occasion for it, and was able, without assistance of that  
 fort,

fort, to cope with his enemies. Every understanding subject must be sensible of the wisdom, and well-placed oeconomy, of the ministry, in this important particular. And here, by the bye, the inconsistency of the North Briton very strongly appears. He rails at the ministry for withholding from our German ally the money pretended to by treaty, yet is always murmuring at taxes, which were made indispensibly necessary by that very subsidy.

Now the North Briton goes on, by way of interrogatory, to charge his sovereign, in name of his minister, with insolence and want of veracity, for only telling his parliament a truth, of which all persons, possessed of any degree of knowledge, are perfectly well satisfied. ‘ What a strain  
 ‘ of insolence is it, therefore (says he) in  
 ‘ a minister, to lay claim to what he is con-  
 ‘ scious all his efforts tended to prevent,  
 ‘ and meanly to arrogate to himself a share  
 ‘ in the fame and glory of one of the great-  
 ‘ est princes the world has ever seen?’ As all my readers may sufficiently judge of the propriety of this question from what has been already said, I shall now proceed to consider the North Briton as an historian.

‘ The King of Prussia (says he) has, how-  
 ‘ ever, gloriously kept all his former con-  
 ‘ quests, and stipulated security for all his  
 ‘ allies, even for the Elector of Hanover.’  
 Here is so glaring a falsehood proclaimed by  
 this incendiary, that it is amazing he can  
 find any defenders: for, in fact, the *King*  
*of Prussia* has given up his Saxon conquests,  
 and every inch of ground he made himself  
 master of during the war. He is reduced  
 to the territories which he had at the be-  
 ginning of the war, and has renounced all  
 the acquisitions which were made in it. On  
 the contrary, *We* have extended our empire,  
 and enlarged our commerce: But I do not  
 mean here to shew at large, that the peace  
 which we have made is more glorious and  
 beneficial to us, than the German pacifi-  
 cation is to the King of Prussia. This has  
 been so ably handled by other pens, and  
 is now so perfectly known, that I touch  
 upon it no farther than to prove the truth  
 of the King’s speech, and the falsity of the  
 North Briton; which being already fully  
 done, I shall go on to observe another un-  
 truth of this *worthy* author’s. ‘ The King  
 ‘ of Prussia, (says he) has stipulated secu-  
 ‘ rity for all his allies, even the Elector of  
 ‘ Hano-

‘ Hanover.’ This man must surely be sensible that he writes only to the meanest and most ignorant part of the nation, and can only gain credit with those that rejoice to hear an evil report of their superiors, else he would not publish such manifest falsehoods. But as every person who has read the preliminaries and definitive treaty, must know that the Electoral dominions of our sovereign, together with those of Hesse, and other German princes in alliance with us and the king of Prussia, were fully secured by those treaties before that of Hubertsburgh took place; I shall dismiss this allegation with marking it *Lie the second*, and go on to more of his astonishing and infamous assertions. ‘ I know (says he) in  
 ‘ what light this great Prince is considered  
 ‘ in Europe, and in what manner he has  
 ‘ been treated here: Among other reasons,  
 ‘ perhaps, from some contemptuous expressions he may have used of the Scot;  
 ‘ expressions which are every day echoed  
 ‘ by the whole body of Englishmen  
 ‘ through the southern parts of this  
 ‘ island.’

The Englishmen meant by the North Briton, who speak disrespectfully of Lord Bute,

Bute, are far from being the *whole* body of the people. Many Englishmen of learning, politeness, and popularity, have a great regard for that nobleman; nor has he a less respect for them. All his acquaintances, neighbours, tenants, and servants, love and revere him. None hate or despise him but the North Briton and his wickedly misled votaries, whose contemptuous expressions are mostly resolved in sneers on his country; in which it is impossible to suppose the king of Prussia will join them, as his affection to the Scots in his service is so well known, and the honours he did to marshal Keith so recent in Europe. That monarch's love to the Scots is so notorious, and his esteem for those persons in particular whom the North Briton daily vilifies so well known, that no credit can be due to this author in this matter; especially since we have already convicted him of misrepresenting the truth in other material points. The whole world knows that it was at the king of Prussia's intercession that our late sovereign, of most glorious memory, was pleased to pardon the earl Maréchal; so that it is totally impossible to be true, that that monarch expresses his  
resent-

répentment at lord Bute in such terms as are used by those deluded abettors of the North Briton, whom *he* is pleased to call the whole body of Englishmen. The displeasure of the king of Prussia at lord Bute is indeed as well known as its cause. He advised the withholding of the subsidy so soon as it appeared to be unnecessary: a measure which every honest Englishman ought to honour and esteem him for.

The North Briton goes on; ‘ The preliminary articles of peace were such, as have drawn the contempt of mankind upon our wretched negotiators. All our most valuable conquests were agreed to be restored, and the East India Company would have been infallibly ruined by a single article of this fallacious and baneful negotiation.’ It is most certain that the court of directors were consulted in the preliminaries, as well as in the definitive treaty; and in what degree the East India Company esteem themselves indebted to the ministry on this occasion, cannot be better expressed than in the words of the directors themselves, in their address to his majesty on the peace; and therefore I shall

shall lay them before my readers, that they may judge of the audaciousness of this extraordinary writer, by comparing *his* representation of the peace, and of his majesty's measures on that occasion, with the accounts of it therein given *by the directors*; by which his astonishing effrontery will incontestibly appear to all mankind.

We have heard the North Briton ; now let us listen to the directors of the East India Company on the subject of the peace.

‘ The re-establishment of peace is an event which cannot be uninteresting to  
 ‘ *any* of your majesty's subjects, but the  
 ‘ peculiar attention your majesty has, on  
 ‘ this occasion, been pleased to bestow on  
 ‘ the interests of that branch of national  
 ‘ trade which *we* have the honour to conduct, calls upon us, in a particular manner, for our just tribute of humble and  
 ‘ grateful acknowledgment. When we  
 ‘ reflect on the vicissitudes we have experienced *during the last eighteen years*, for  
 ‘ so long has the company been engaged  
 ‘ in an hostile competition with the  
 ‘ French in India ; we cannot but rejoice in a state of *superiority* and *security*,  
 ‘ which the successes of the British arms,  
 and

‘ and the WISDOM and FIRMNESS of your  
 ‘ majesty’s COUNCILS have at length *ob-*  
 ‘ *tained* and *established*. We feel, and shall  
 ‘ always retain, the most grateful sense of  
 ‘ the support and protection of government,  
 ‘ during the war, by which the com-  
 ‘ pany’s affairs have been recovered from a  
 ‘ more desperate to a more prosperous  
 ‘ condition, than has ever been known at  
 ‘ any former period.’

I would now ask whether our com-  
 merce is not every where in a more pro-  
 sperous condition than ever it was before,  
 as well as in the East Indies? In the West  
 Indies we have an acknowledged right to  
 the logwood-trade, which we never had  
 before. In North America the difference  
 is infinite. In Africa our factories are so  
 enlarged, that our former interest there is  
 nowise comparable to the figure we now  
 make in those regions.

But though truth and fact every where  
 refute the North Briton’s ravings, yet that  
 shameless scribbler goes on in the following  
 strain: ‘ No hireling of the minister has  
 ‘ been hardy enough to dispute this, yet  
 ‘ the minister himself has made our  
 ‘ sovereign declare the satisfaction which  
 D ‘ he

‘ he felt at the approaching re-establishment of peace, upon conditions so honourable to his crown and so beneficial to his people.’

Those who have abilities to compare the state which our commerce was in before the war began, with the situation of it at present, may plainly discern that our trade is put now upon an infinitely more beneficial footing, in every respect, than what it was then; which surely brings additional advantages to the whole people, and, of consequence, reflects a proportionable share of honour on the crown; whose greatest glory must always consist in conducting warlike enterprizes, and treaties of peace, to that great end, the interest of the subjects.

But as the preliminaries and definitive treaty have equally met with the approbation of parliament, the North Briton’s invective against these measures is as malicious an accusation of the parliament that *approved* of them, as of the ministry under whose management they were *concluded*; and consequently, an unjustifiable attack on the honour of that most respectable assembly.

In

In former reigns, those proceedings only were supposed odious to the nation, or liable to censure, which were pursued by the ministry without, or in contradiction to, the known sense of parliament: but that august assembly being in *fact*, as well as in *presumption of law*, all the freeholders of England in miniature, it seems equally inconsistent with common sense and jurisprudence, to imagine a difference possible, between the sense of the nation, and the known sentiments of parliament; where the majority is a constitutional majority: I mean such a majority as in the political balance and judgment of discretion may be supposed large enough to be confided in: for surely the North Briton will not be so daring as to advance, that the judgment of parliament is not fit to be relied upon under any combination of circumstances whatever. With such as *totally* despise the authority of the British senate (if any such there *can* be) I reason not; such people must be held in so diminutive a light, that no man of common reason can suppose them worthy to be disputed with. To all others I address myself; and desire to know if two-thirds of any society, club, or meet-

ing, may not properly be denominated such a respectable part of the whole, as to render all contemptuous expressions levelled against their declared opinion, an affront on *every* member of that body, and an indignity done to the *whole* society? Or if a majority of *two-thirds* is not large enough to entitle that majority to assume the name of the *whole*, what majority is sufficient for this purpose? Hitherto, *under* two-thirds has been esteemed an honourable constitutional majority of parliament; or such a majority that their approbation, or disapprobation, may be denominated the opinion of the whole kingdom. A plurality of voices in parliament is the only means our constitution has afforded us (and an ample one it is) to know the sense or judgment of the nation, and, consequently, the vilipending epithets given to the measures of government, in the North Briton, No. 45, is a gross insult on the king, his privy council, every branch of the legislature, and all the freeholders of England, the constituents of the house of commons. The North Briton, however, goes on: ‘ As  
‘ to the entire approbation of parliament,  
‘ which is so vainly boasted of, all the  
‘ world

‘ world knows how that was obtained.’  
 If the North Briton could have proved that  
 any undue means were used in order to  
 obtain this approbation of parliament, we  
 should surely have heard of it ; but since  
 he is pleased to declare that this approba-  
 tion was obtained by those means that were  
*known to all the world*, we shall take his  
 word for it, and suppose that no other  
 means can be assigned by the most invete-  
 rate malice but such as all the world *might*  
 know, and, consequently, would approve.  
 ‘ The large debt on the civil list (says  
 ‘ he) already above half a year in arrear,  
 ‘ shews, pretty clearly, the transactions  
 ‘ of the winter.’ Such obscure hints de-  
 note malevolence and untruth, but not that  
 open patriotic boldness falsely arrogated by  
 this author. If any thing during the last  
 winter has been done amiss, why not dis-  
 cover it? why make the people uneasy  
 about they know not what? Such conduct  
 is no proof of either love for his country, or  
 of a regard for truth ! As such unmeaning  
 censures leave no room for a more particu-  
 lar criticism, I shall proceed. ‘ It is (affirms  
 ‘ the North Briton) remarkable that he  
 ‘ [the minister] dwells upon the *entire ap-  
 probation*

‘ *probation* given by parliament to the *pre-*  
 ‘ *liminary articles*, which I will venture to  
 ‘ say, he must by this time be ashamed  
 ‘ of.’ Ashamed of what? The entire ap-  
 probation of parliament? This sentence  
 either has no meaning at all, or impudent-  
 ly and infamously signifies, that the par-  
 liament’s entire approbation of the preli-  
 minaries is a disgrace to the minister, and  
 what he is now ashamed of. Is there an  
 advocate for the North Briton but what  
 must blush at this audacious sentence? or  
 is there one person who will stand forth  
 and vindicate such an arrogant assertion;  
 or justify such a daring insult on the legis-  
 lature? But to go on; ‘ He has been  
 ‘ brought (continues the North Briton)  
 ‘ to confess the total want of that know-  
 ‘ ledge, accuracy, and precision, by which  
 ‘ immense advantages both of trade and  
 ‘ territory were sacrificed to our inveterate  
 ‘ enemies.’ As the writer does not think  
 it convenient for his purpose to acquaint us  
 to whom, or on what occasion the minister  
 made this confession, and brings no evidence  
 of it but his own *ipse dixit*, no wise man will  
 believe, on *his* authority, that ever the  
 minister made any such acknowledgment,  
 especially

especially as we can discover no cause for it in this negotiation.

The North Briton, however, proceeds in his charge : ‘ These gross blunders are, indeed, in some measure, set right by the definitive treaty, yet the most important articles relative to cessions, commerce, and the fishery, remain as they were, with respect to the French.’

All persons, in the least conversant in politics, know, that *preliminary articles* are always drawn up in a vague and general manner; nor is that exactness of stile, or accuracy of expression, requisite in them, which is indispensibly necessary in definitive treaties; because preliminary articles are in no wise obligatory upon the parties till the negotiation is ended by a definitive treaty, duly ratified. ‘Till then each party may explain, retract, or offer new articles at pleasure. The only use of preliminaries is, to shew that the parties are so far agreed on general principles, that there is reason to hope for a peace from a continuation of amicable conferences: but the *definitive treaty* produces a LASTING obligation, and TERMINATES the negotiation. So if there were any blunders, as  
this

this writer pretends, in the preliminaries, and those mistakes have been remedied in the definitive treaty, the nation cannot be affected by what he may deem blunders in the preliminaries. And as the North Briton has been pleased to decline a specification of these pretended gross mistakes, he has rendered it impossible to give him as particular a reply as I could wish. He says, that the articles relative to cessions, commerce, and the fishery, remain as they were in favour of the French ; but in this assertion, the North Briton has greatly deviated from the truth. The *definitive treaty* ascertains in a manner more favourable to us, a descriptive account of our settlements in Africa ; conveys to us *by name* three valuable factories, of which no express mention is made in the *preliminaries* ; puts our affairs in the East Indies on a more advantageous footing, and contains a more special recapitulation of our coasts in and about the bay of St. Laurence, in such *precise terms*, as to cut off for ever from the French all possibility of claiming territory there. It is, therefore, far from being true, that the articles relative to cessions remain in the *definitive treaty* as they

they were in the *preliminaries*: And with respect to the Spaniard, the renunciation of the fishery made by him in the *definitive treaty*, is conceived in MUCH STRONGER TERMS than in the *preliminaries*; for in the preliminaries it is said that his Catholic Majesty desists from his claim to the fishery; but the definitive treaty bears, that that monarch desists from this claim, *as well for HIMSELF as his SUCCESSORS*; which is a full and ample obligation to *drop* that demand, and *never* renew it. But I shall give the North Briton's remark on this article in his own words, that his duplicity may be the more apparent. 'The proud and feeble Spaniard, (says this malevolent author) does NOT RENOUNCE, but only DESISTS from all pretensions which he may have formed to the right of fishing----Where? only about *the island* of Newfoundland, 'till a favourable opportunity arise of insisting on it there as well as elsewhere.'

This is equivocating criticism with a vengeance! As there was no dispute between Spain and us concerning fishing, except that of cod upon the banks of Newfoundland, it is manifest by the king of Spain's promising for himself and his suc-

cessors to *desist* from that claim, that we are sufficiently guarded against this pretension ; since engaging *never* to claim, is in every respect equivalent to *renouncing*. It is probable that the word DESIST has been used as conveying an idea of refraining from a prosecution of pretensions which still appeared to that monarch to be just, but were departed from for the sake of the public peace : so that his Catholic Majesty seemed willing to acknowledge our power to make him desist from his pretensions, tho' not to own, *contrary to his opinion*, the justice of our demands. However, since it was the sole right of fishing, exclusive of the Spaniards, upon the Banks, and about the Island of Newfoundland, and not their monarch's self-abasement which we desired, it is manifest that by this article we have obtained all on that head that could be in any way beneficial to us, viz. an obligation on the part of that power, for *himself* and his *successors*, to desist from this pretension, which secures to us that branch of commerce as strongly as words can convey it. The important advantage of debarring the Spaniards from fishing, not upon their own coasts, but where we  
 contested

contested their right, is *thereby* fully obtained.

Now we return to the North Briton.

‘ The minister, (he goes on) cannot forbear even in the king’s speech insulting us with the dull repetition of the word *oeconomy*. I did not expect so soon to have seen the word again, after it had been so lately exploded ; and more than once by a most numerous audience hissed off the stage of our English theatres.

‘ It is held in derision by the voice of the people, and every tongue loudly proclaims the universal contempt in which these empty professions are held by this nation.’ Does the North Briton imagine

we are reduced to so low an ebb that we are to gather the sense and meaning of the *nation* from the hisses and applauses of our *theatres* ? I am far from designing to treat those audiences with disrespect ; but it is notorious that persons of *very mean understandings* often mix in those assemblies, and by their overuling *bawlings*, assume a greater importance than is their right.

Such persons, however, must be humoured for the peace of the house. And hence it is that the good sense of the wiser part

of the spectators obliges them to submit to *foibles* which they despise, and consequently to avoid interposing in *uproars* of that nature ; their silence, therefore, is no proof of their assent to the opinion of the rest. The young and unthinking, not the best and wisest of the audience, are the hissers and applauders. From them we may learn the goodness of a joke, and now and then the poignancy of a witty expression ; but it is absurd in the highest degree, to talk of submitting matters of state to *their* judgment, or to suppose that from *them* we can learn the true sense or universal voice of the *nation*. Into what an abject situation must the authority of the government be fallen, if the proceedings of parliament, or the expressions of royalty, are to be submitted to the *canvass*, rejection, or approbation of such *sages* as abovementioned ? What a Solomon is this North Briton to summons *such* a jury to sit upon his prince, and exalt *their* wisdom above that of the legislature ! According to this wise author, we must not pretend to learn from the votes of the peers or commons the sense of this free people. No, we must abide by the decisions

sions of Drury-Lane or Covent - Garden, and accept of their applauses as the supreme test of wisdom and justice! Farewel king and parliament, farewel religion and law! Common sense and justice be gone! We have now got an infallible living law, an uncontrollable judicature, whose decisions are far superior in points of authority! The pit and galleries of Covent - Garden and Drury-Lane. To them we must henceforth appeal for redress of grievances, and instruction in matters of state. The *public*, like the *actors*, must attend to their decisions with profound submission, because *we are free* to make the best use we can of our own judgment.---But to return.

‘ Let the public be informed of one instance of oeconomy except in the household?’ How the North Briton came to ask this question I cannot conceive, when he well knows that the effects of the new oeconomy is apparent in every department of the state, and that in the treasury only there is an immense annual saving, by the regulations made by that board, since the earl of Bute first presided at it. ‘ Is a regiment, (says the North Briton) that was  
‘ completed,

‘ completed as to its complement of of-  
 ‘ ficers on the Tuesday, and broke on the  
 ‘ Thursday, a proof of oeconomy?’ This  
 is what is always done. It is the perqui-  
 site of the colonel to have all the commis-  
 sions filled up, and always has been so  
 since the Revolution; nor can any minister  
 prevent it: An act of parliament is neces-  
 sary to deprive the colonels of this perqui-  
 site, established to be their due by so long  
 a prescription. ‘ Is the pay of the Scot-  
 ‘ tish master Elliot, (says he) to be voted  
 ‘ by an English parliament, under the  
 ‘ head of oeconomy? Is this, among a  
 ‘ thousand others, one of the convincing  
 ‘ proofs of a firm resolution to form go-  
 ‘ vernment on a plan of strict oeconomy?’  
 The minister knew nothing of this affair of  
 Mr. Elliot’s till he was informed of it by  
 the channel of the North Briton, and as  
 soon as he did know it, he made interest  
 for the young captain to be broke. The  
 blameable dispositions that have for so con-  
 siderable a time crept into the army, can-  
 not be remedied by a minister by virtue  
 of his office. The parliament alone can  
 strike at the root of such an evil; and if it  
 be true, as is generally said, that the au-  
 I thor

thor of the North Briton is a member of parliament, and he saw any wrong proceedings in the conduct of the military establishment, it was his duty to have moved it in the house, in order to have obtained their interposition for the prevention of irregularities of the like nature for the future. This would have been acting in a becoming and constitutional method; but to trumpet in a periodical paper every error of government, and lay the blame where it ought not to be laid, for the sake of satisfying an unjustifiable spleen, denotes the *incendiary*, but *not* the *patriot*. However, as the North Briton can particularise no other instances of bad oeconomy, and both these observations only relate to the conduct of others and not of the minister, it is manifest that lord Bute *cannot* be answerable for either of these occurrences. Both of them were the consequences of appointments that took place in the army, long before that nobleman had any share in the administration. ‘ Many unnecessary  
 ‘ expences (he continues) have been incurred only to encrease the power of the  
 ‘ crown; that is, to create more lucrative  
 ‘ jobs for the creatures of the minister.’

This

This general position, unsupported by any particular instance of mismanagement, must go for nothing with every man of sense. But if it was really true, (though nothing can be more false) the North Briton, as a British senator, was guilty of a perfidious breach of trust to his constituents and the whole nation, for not having *disclosed* these criminal practices in that august assembly, of which he was so unworthy a member, in order to their being *duly* animadverted on, instead of trumpeting them forth in a paltry periodical essay. ‘ The staff indeed  
‘ (says he) is broke, but the discerning  
‘ part of mankind immediately compre-  
‘ hended the mean subterfuge, and resent-  
‘ ed the indignity put upon so brave an  
‘ officer as marshal Ligonier.’ Here the North Briton is guilty of proclaiming to the world a wilful falsehood. That brave officer was consulted, and fully acquiesced in that proceeding; and his majesty has since honoured him with a British peerage, in remuneration of his important services. But, says the North Briton, ‘ that step  
‘ was taken to give the whole power of  
‘ the army to the crown, that is, to the  
‘ minister. Lord Ligonier is now no more  
‘ at

‘ at the head of the army, but lord Bute  
 ‘ in effect is; I mean that every prefer-  
 ‘ ment given by the crown, will still be  
 ‘ found to be obtained by his enormous  
 ‘ influence.’ The whole power of the  
 army has been again and again solemnly  
 recognised by parliament to be in the  
 crown, so that there was now no step ne-  
 cessary to be taken for that purpose; and  
 if the king had thought fit (though that  
 was not the case) to put the direction of  
 the army in lord Bute, no reasonable ob-  
 jection could be made to it: but, in fact,  
 the preferments in the army, neither now  
 are, nor ever were, at lord Bute’s dispo-  
 sal, as is very notorious. The posts in  
 every regiment are always filled up by, or  
 with the consent of the colonels; who,  
 by rotation, or the recommendation of  
 field officers, are preferred to regiments;  
 and in like succession rise to higher com-  
 mands. If the commanders of regiments  
 ever give up their own rights, it is their  
 own fault. The North Briton then goes  
 on to affirm, that all the posts in the army  
 are ‘ to be bestowed on creatures of the  
 ‘ Scottish faction.’ Is lord Granby, and  
 divers other illustrious English noble-  
 F men,

men, now in important employments in the army, to be accounted creatures of the Scottish faction? 'The nation is still (he goes on) in the same deplorable state, while he governs and can make the tools of his power pursue the same odious measures, such a retreat as he intends, can only mean that personal indemnity, which I hope guilt will never find from an injured nation. The negotiations of the late inglorious peace, and the excise, will haunt him wherever he goes, and the terrors of the just resentment which he must be sure to meet with from a brave and insulted people, and which must finally crush him, will be for ever before his eyes.' Though the North Briton inveighs in such bitter terms against the minister *only*, for the peace and for the excise; yet as the latter took its rise in the committee of the house of commons, called the committee of supply, where all impositions on the people ought, by law, to begin; and as both these measures were approved of by the whole parliament, it is manifest that this commination is pointed at all concerned in making the peace, and raising that excise, and consequently

was

was designed to expose and ultimately annul the authority of the sovereignty itself.

‘ In vain (proceeds this daring scribbler) will such a minister, or the foul dregs of his power, the tools of CORRUPTION and DESPOTISM, preach up, in the speech, the spirit of concord and that obedience to the laws which is essential to good order.’ Here the minister, supposed to compose or advise the speech, is stigmatized as the dispenser, abettor, and patronizer, and the privy council that approved of it, are called the tools of CORRUPTION and DESPOTISM. If they deserve that name, the administration must be arbitrary and despotic, must act entirely repugnant to the constitution of our country, and, of consequence, it is *lawful*, nay the *duty* of every good subject, in this *free* realm, to resist and rebel against it. Is not this preaching up rebellion, and persuading the nation to enter into treasonable combinations against the state? He disputes not, indeed, the title of his king, but he seditiously avers, that the administration, which his sovereign has legally and constitutionally appointed, is arbitrary and despotic. If this be not setting up the

standard of rebellion, we should be glad to know how' treason can be committed in *words* or *writing*? I shall not here endeavour to prove (and which might easily be done) that this is also an audacious calumny on all the persons concerned in the administration, and that every one of them might sue him for *scandalum magnatum*, because this attempt on the fountain of peerage is so grossly malevolent, that meaner considerations must give way to discussions on that more important point. I shall, therefore, go on to consider this essay as it relates to the authority of the sovereign, without observing the injury thereby done by the author to his fellow subjects concerned in the administration. 'They have sent (says he) the spirit of discord through the land; and I will prophesy that it will never be extinguished, but by the extinction of their power.' I shall leave to the sages of the law to determine how far the North Briton has here incurred the pains of *præmunire* in terms of the statute of Elizabeth, against foolish and phantastical prophesying, and not repealed. That the spirit of discord has been sent through the

2

land,

land, as the North Briton avers, by the peace and the excise act, is *unhappily* (because there were no *just* grounds for it) very apparent; it is also evident, that in this sentence, the final end of THEIR power is foretold, who (by approving measures which every reasonable man must applaud) have unfortunately sent that spirit through the land; and, of consequence, the end of our great constitutional support is the matter seditiously prophesied by the North Briton. And this is still more manifest by what follows, ‘ for (says this ingenious  
‘ author) is the spirit of concord to go  
‘ hand in hand with the peace and excise  
‘ through this nation? Is it to be ex-  
‘ pected between an insolent exciseman  
‘ and a peer, gentleman, freeholder, or  
‘ farmer, whose private houses are now  
‘ made liable to be entered and searched at  
‘ pleasure? Gloucestershire, Herefordshire,  
‘ and in general, all the cyder countries are  
‘ not surely the several counties which  
‘ are alluded to in the speech. The spirit  
‘ of concord has not gone forth among  
‘ them; but the spirit of liberty has, and  
‘ a noble opposition has been given to the  
‘ wicked instruments of oppressions. A  
‘ nation

‘ nation as sensible as the English is, will  
 ‘ see that a spirit of concord when they  
 ‘ are oppressed, means a tame submission  
 ‘ to injury; and that a spirit of liberty  
 ‘ ought then to arise, and I am sure ever  
 ‘ will in proportion to the weight of the  
 ‘ grievance they feel. Every legal attempt  
 ‘ of a contrary tendency to the spirit of  
 ‘ concord will be deemed a justifiable re-  
 ‘ sistance, warranted by the spirit of the  
 ‘ English constitution.’ Is it not clear  
 from this passage, that the power that he  
 says we ought to RESIST, is the power that  
 has laid on the late excise on cyder? It is  
*they* he means who oppress; and it is *their*  
 power that he asserts ought to be RE-  
 SISTED, and it is *their* dominion whose  
 end is here traitorously prophesied: that is,  
 the power and authority, of KING and  
 PARLIAMENT, exerting their constitu-  
 tional right of making peace and of levying  
 taxes. If this is not openly inciting the  
 subjects to *resist* the power and *rebel* against  
 the authority of *king* and *parliament*, I  
 do not understand English. In my opinion,  
 the person who can have the assurance to  
 say (but I believe no one will have the  
 audacity to attempt it) that such endeavours  
 should

should not, in every well regulated government, be considered as treason, and that the author and promulger of such dangerous tenets is not richly deserving the punishment of a traitor, I say the man who can have the confidence to assert this, may, with equal propriety, affirm, that anarchy is order, and rebellion loyalty.

‘ A despotic minister (he continues) will  
 ‘ always endeavour to dazzle his prince  
 ‘ with high flown ideas of the prerogative  
 ‘ and honour of the crown, which the  
 ‘ minister will make a parade of firmly  
 ‘ maintaining. I wish, as much as any  
 ‘ man in the kingdom, to see the honour  
 ‘ of the crown maintained in a manner  
 ‘ truly becoming royalty. I lament to see  
 ‘ it sunk even to prostitution.’ By the  
 former part of his paper it is apparent, that  
 the North Briton means, that the speech in  
 question, from the throne, has sunk the  
 honour of the crown even to prostitution.  
 But why. or how, doth this happen? The  
 speech preaches up obedience to measures  
 approved by parliament: if it reflects so  
 great a dishonour to the crown to recom-  
 mend the measures which have been ap-  
 proved of in parliament, what sort of a  
 parliament

parliament must this incendiary insinuate we have? Let any man seriously ponder what is here represented, and I dare pronounce that he will immediately observe, that the true design of this performance is wickedly to represent king, parliament, and minister in a light equally odious to the nation; and to stir up the people to throw off all manner of respect for the most amiable sovereign, the most patriot parliament, England ever experienced, and the best constitution any nation ever knew. Is not treason, resistance to, or an attempt to overthrow, the supreme power of the country to which we owe our allegiance? Sure then, *this* is treason, in the utmost sense of the word!

‘ What a shame (says he) was it to see  
 ‘ the security of this country, in point of  
 ‘ military force, complimented away con-  
 ‘ trary to the opinion of royalty itself, and  
 ‘ sacrificed to the prejudices and to the ig-  
 ‘ norance of a set of people, the most  
 ‘ unfit from every consideration to be con-  
 ‘ sulted on a matter relative to the secu-  
 ‘ rity of the house of Hanover?’ Tho’ we  
 see no occasion for this reflective question,  
 and could easily detect its fallacy, yet as  
 it

it is confined only to an imputation on the *sagacity* of the ministry, we shall go on to more material points.

‘ I wish (says the North Briton) to see  
 ‘ the honour of the crown religiously  
 ‘ asserted with regard to our allies, and  
 ‘ the dignity of it scrupulously maintained  
 ‘ with regard to foreign princes. Is it  
 ‘ possible such an indignity can have hap-  
 ‘ pened, such a sacrifice of the honour of  
 ‘ the crown of England, as that a minister  
 ‘ should already have kissed his majesty’s  
 ‘ hand on being appointed to the most in-  
 ‘ solent and ungrateful court in the world,  
 ‘ without a previous assurance of that re-  
 ‘ ciprocal nomination, which the meanest  
 ‘ court in Europe would insist on, before  
 ‘ she proceeded to an act otherwise so  
 ‘ derogatory to her honour? But electoral  
 ‘ policy has ever been obsequious to the  
 ‘ court of Vienna, and forgets the inso-  
 ‘ lence with which count Colloredo left  
 ‘ England. Upon a principle of dignity  
 ‘ and oeconomy, lord Stormont, a Scottish  
 ‘ peer of the loyal house of Murray, kissed  
 ‘ his majesty’s hand, I think on Wednesday  
 ‘ in the Easter week; but this ignomi-  
 ‘ nious act has not, yet, disgraced the  
 G nation

' nation in the London Gazette. The mi-  
 ' nistry are not ashamed of doing the thing  
 ' in private; they are only afraid of the  
 ' publication.' Here is a round asser-  
 tion, that the court of England named a  
 minister to that of Vienna, without any as-  
 surance that the Imperial court would make  
 a reciprocal nomination to ours: how true  
 it is, I shall leave my readers to determine,  
 when I have informed them, that by an  
 article in the Vienna Gazette of the 20th  
 of April, it appears that their Imperial ma-  
 jesties had, SOME TIME AGO named count  
 Sellern to reside at our court; and even  
 made a *public* declaration of this nomina-  
 tion *before* lord Stormont kissed his ma-  
 jesty's hand on being appointed ambassador  
 to Vienna. Doth not this manifestly shew  
 that the North Briton has no regard to ve-  
 racity? for it is absurd to suppose that so  
 deep a politician doth not read the foreign  
 news-papers. As to what the North Bri-  
 ton says in respect to lord Stormont, it  
 arises from nothing but the rankest malice  
 and revenge: a near relation of lord Stor-  
 mont's, who is most deservedly at the head  
 of the law, as well on account of his great  
 abilities as inflexible integrity, some time  
 since

since *obliged* the *supposed* author of the  
 North Briton to an act of justice in favour  
 of an injured wife ; and in return the en-  
 raged scribbler takes this and every oppor-  
 tunity, to rail against every individual of  
 that noble family. Now having detected  
 the North Briton in one falshood more, we  
 shall go on with the rest of his piece :  
 ‘ Was it a tender regard for the honour of  
 ‘ the late king, or of his present majesty,  
 ‘ that invited to court lord George Sack-  
 ‘ ville in these first days of peace, to share  
 ‘ in the general satisfaction, which all good  
 ‘ courtiers received in the indignity offered  
 ‘ to lord Ligonier, and on the advancement  
 ‘ of ----- . Was this to shew princely  
 ‘ gratitude to the eminent services of the  
 ‘ accomplished general of the house of  
 ‘ Brunswick, who had so great a share in  
 ‘ rescuing Europe from the yoke of France,  
 ‘ and whose nephew we hope soon to see  
 ‘ made happy in the possession of the most  
 ‘ amiable princess in the world ? or is it  
 ‘ meant to assert the honour of the crown  
 ‘ only against the united wishes of a loyal  
 ‘ and affectionate people, founded in happy  
 ‘ experience of the talents, ability, inte-  
 ‘ grity and virtue of those who have had

‘ the glory of redeeming their country  
 ‘ from bondage and ruin, in order to  
 ‘ support by every art of *corruption* and  
 ‘ intimidation a weak, disjointed set of  
 ‘ ——, I will call them any thing but  
 ‘ ministers ——, by whom the favourite  
 ‘ still meditates to rule this kingdom with  
 ‘ a rod of iron.’

Before we more minutely consider this paragraph, we beg leave to make a previous remark, that the North Briton has here, contrary to a solemn declaration formerly made (in No. 20.) left two blanks; the reasons of which we shall shew our readers, that they may from thence observe how sedulous this writer is in inflaming the people against the government, as well by suppressing the truth as by inventing falsehoods. The first blank is left, lest he should be the instrument of conveying to his vulgar readers information, that the marquis of Granby, an English nobleman, of a most amiable and distinguished character, is set at the head of the ordnance. As to the second blank, it is obvious that that space is intended for some abusive epithet on the ministry, which the North Briton wanted courage to insert. But, to  
return

return----As to the North Briton's representing, in this passage, the whole executive administration as instruments of tyranny, &c. that charge has been already considered in the former parts of this Dissection, and fully confuted. In respect to the recall of lord George Sackville to court, I shall not observe how disputable the *justice* of the sentence past against him is, for that is not concerned in the present question. By the sentence, that gentleman was suspended from his command *for a year only*; so might have been employed at the end of that space of time, without thereby experiencing the exercise of mercy, that darling prerogative of royalty. The late king was indeed pleased to dismiss him entirely. But no restraint was by that measure imposed on his majesty, or his successor, never to employ that officer again. Though his late majesty was pleased to take that, perhaps too *rigorous step*, yet he or his successor might surely change his mind in that respect, without being responsible to the North Briton for so doing: wherever a royal resolution is founded *on the will of the king ONLY*, we cannot be so absurd as  
to

to think a prince should be debarred a privilege which the lowest of his subjects is justly entitled to, viz. a faculty to alter, at pleasure, any resolution they may have made whatever. Our late most glorious sovereign, most undoubtedly might have changed his mind without giving a just cause of offence; nor can we be so weak as to argue, that his successor may not lawfully, and with the most equitable propriety, re-employ a displaced servant. Neither prince Ferdinand of Brunswick, nor any other prince, or person whatever, has a right to prescribe to the king in these matters; so cannot be supposed to be offended at the favours dispensed by our sovereign to his own subjects, unless indeed, we can imagine an almost impossibility, namely, that that general, or any other man, can be half so presumptuous as the daring author of the North Briton.

The North Briton goes on; ‘ The Stuart  
 ‘ line has ever been intoxicated with the  
 ‘ slavish doctrine of the absolute independ-  
 ‘ ent unlimited power of the crown;  
 ‘ some of that line were so weakly advised  
 ‘ as to endeavour to reduce them into  
 ‘ practice. But the English nation was  
 ‘ too

‘ too spirited to suffer the least encroach-  
 ‘ ment on the antient liberties of this king-  
 ‘ dom. The king of England is only the first  
 ‘ magistrate of this country, but is invest-  
 ‘ ed with the whole executive power ; he  
 ‘ is however responsible to his people for  
 ‘ the due execution of the royal function,  
 ‘ in the choice of ministers, &c. equally  
 ‘ with the meanest of his subjects, in his  
 ‘ particular duty. The personal character  
 ‘ of our present amiable soveraign, makes  
 ‘ us easy and happy that so great a power  
 ‘ is lodged in such hands, but the favou-  
 ‘ rite has given too just cause for him to  
 ‘ escape the general odium. The prero-  
 ‘ gative of the crown, is to exert the con-  
 ‘ stitutional powers entrusted to it, in a  
 ‘ way, not of blind favour and partiality,  
 ‘ but wisdom and judgment ; this is the  
 ‘ spirit of our constitution. The people  
 ‘ too have their prerogative, and I hope  
 ‘ the fine words of Dryden will be en-  
 ‘ graven on our hearts ;

‘ *Freedom is the English subjects preroga-*  
 ‘ *tive.*’

By

By a due consideration of this concluding paragraph, we come at the true undoubted meaning of this seditious paper. It has hitherto been held an inviolable maxim in our law, *that the king can do no wrong*; the ministers in whose department each royal act is exercised being answerable for *all* the measures of the crown. This maxim is compatible with the greatest wisdom, and agreeable to the highest justice; for as no public measure is taken by the king, but by and with the *advice* and *consent* of these ministers, it is truly equitable that they, and they only, should be answerable for proceedings, which would not have been adopted but by and with their consent. The North Briton has throughout his whole paper inveighed against the ministry, and represented them and their administration, as *arbitrary, tyrannical, corrupt, weak,* and utterly *disregardful* of the honour of the nation, and then sums up the whole, by traiterously affirming, that the king is responsible to his people for the due execution of his royal function IN THE CHOICE OF MINISTERS, &c. I believe I shall not torture the sense of this passage to a differ-

rent meaning from what the author intended it, (for it is too obvious to be misunderstood) when I declare that the true construction of this new and rebellious doctrine, can be no other than this, *if the king makes a wrong choice of ministers, he must be responsible for their faults*; and consequently the whole of the North Briton's calumnious epithets against the administration, are altogether wickedly levelled at his sovereign. The alledged oppressions and deceits of the ministry, according to his rebellious reckoning, thus become the crimes of the prince. I have already shewed how daringly the North Briton has endeavoured to wound the legislative body through the sides of the ministry; this alone would have been sufficiently deserving an exemplary punishment.

The light in which he represents the king, a prince replete with every royal virtue, ought, however, to carry with it consequences of an infinitely more fatal nature. The new doctrine he has broached, by which he transfers on the king all the supposed crimes of the ministry, is of the most dangerous tendency. 'The king,' says this incendiary, 'is responsible to his  
H people

people FOR HIS CHOICE OF HIS MINISTERS.' This is the very language of the regicides in the reign of Charles the First. Upon this principle those traitors proceeded, when they erected their mock-court to try their prince. If a king of England is responsible to his people for the exertions of such royal powers as the constitution vests him with, *in the choice of his ministers*, as the North Briton affirms, (but to which every loyal subject will give the negative) I would ask this writer, by whom and where the sovereign is to be brought to the bar to answer. Not by or in the parliament: There he is the head, and can dissolve that assembly at his will; much less in the ordinary courts of law; for it is manifest they cannot call to account the person from whom their jurisdiction is derived. Where then must the prince answer his people? The constitution, it is plain, (and that too from very wise and very urgent reasons) is not furnished with any court where this is to be done. I hope this seditious writer did not mean to recommend to our great and mighty lords, the mobility, the erecting another occasional high parricidal court,

on

on the plan of Oliver's, for this very purpose; and at the same time propose the *presidency* for *himself*. I hope, I say, this Bradshaw of a North Briton did not mean any thing so utterly traitorous and rebellious; and yet I fear this his treasonable purpose is but too incontestibly obvious.

Thus we have traced this inflammatory author through every paragraph of the most daring piece that ever was publicly printed, in this or any other well-governed state in the world, and have sufficiently shewn that his principles and doctrines tend to the dissolution of our happy constitution, and are an absolutely overt attempt upon royalty itself, naturally and intentionally paving the way for a general insurrection, in order to accomplish the most destructive and diabolical ends. To point out the means of punishment for this worst of attacks upon the best king and the best government in Europe, did not come within my view in this publication. All I proposed by it was to open the eyes of too many deluded people, by convincing them, with just and candid reasoning, that if recording untruths for facts, to the prejudice of his prince, is a breach of his allegiance,

legiance, and if a public call to the subjects to rebel, comes under the denomination of treason, the author of the North Briton, No. 45, is undoubtedly a most finished and seditious liar, and a most abandoned traitor. Here the pen of the critic ends his remarks, which must hereafter give place to the louder voice of avenging JUSTICE.

F I N I S.







