The Works Of Horatio Walpole, Earl of Orford

In Five Volumes

Walpole, Horace

London, 1798

A Counter Address to the Public, on the late Dismission of a General Officer

A

COUNTER ADDRESS

TO

THE PUBLIC,

ON

THE LATE DISMISSION

OF

A GENERAL OFFICER.

Henri voit près des rois leurs insolens ministres :
Il remarque sur tout ces conseillers sinistres,
Qui des moeurs & des loix avares corrupteurs,
De Themis & de Mars ont vendu les honneurs :
Qui mirent les premiers à d'indignes encheres,
L'inestimable prix des vertus de nos peres.

HENRIADE, Chant vii.

A

COUNTER ADDRESS

TO

THE PUBLIC,

ON

THE LATE DISMISSION

OF

A GENERAL OFFICER.

A

COUNTER ADDRESS

TO

THE PUBLIC.

OFTEN as appeals on private grievances are laid before the public, it is ſeldom that they are brought to that tribunal with propriety. One of the caſes in which they are leaſt exceptionable, is, when the party appears as defendant. If public outrage be added to perſonal injuſtice, the impartial reader will receive with benignity, from the injured perſon, or his friends, a claim to their candour, if ſupported by argument, and offered with decency and temper. It might even be juſtifiable, with regard to the accuſer, to retort railing with invective; but the latter method not only diſgraces a good cauſe, but would imply a defect of capacity in the judges, as if their ſentence were to be extorted by clamour.

In the caſe now to be laid before the public, there is no intention of arraigning either thoſe who have oppreſſed, or thoſe who have inſulted. The former are too reſpectable, the latter too contemptible. Nothing is meaned, but an attempt to prove that a man who has been deeply wounded, did not deſerve puniſhment for his late conduct, nor could apprehend he had ſuch ungenerous enemies as would add the groſſeſt abuſe to the full vengeance which power had given ſome men an opportunity of exerciſing.

The title of this addreſs does not more clearly point out that general Conway is the ſubject of theſe ſheets, than I fear the deſcription does which I have juſt given. If the reſignation and patience with which he has borne

both

both diſgrace by authority, and the moſt diſingenuous calumny from hands I hope not authoriſed, had not convinced the author of this defence, that the general ſubmitted himſelf to the opinion of his countrymen, from the conviction of his own blameleſs integrity, and was determined to take no ſteps to refute his calumniators; if after waiting to ſee whether himſelf, or any other more able of his friends, would take up his defence, I had not been confirmed in that idea, I ſhould undoubtedly not have thought myſelf qualified to enter the liſts in his behalf, nothing making me a competent apologiſt in ſuch a controverſy, but the clumſineſs of the antagoniſts I am to encounter.

The two worthies whom I ſhall chiefly ſelect to oppoſe in this conteſt, are the authors of a letter firſt printed in the Gazetteer, May 9, and of an Addreſs to the Public on the late Diſmiſſion of a General Officer. If I pay them the compliment of diſtinguiſhing their productions from the reſt of their accomplices, it is at leaſt not from holding their abilities in higher eſtimation. No; it is to abridge my own trouble, as theſe, I was going to ſay gentlemen, have amaſſed the whole noſegay of nettles, which had been gathered in ſeparate weeds by their voluminous comrades.

The firſt of them (the illiberal part of whoſe invective, as it has already been taken notice of, ſhall be paſſed over in ſilence) gives an intimation that general Conway had the vanity to vie with the illuſtrious Wolfe for military glory. I ſay *intimates* this—the whole ſcope of his argument tends to ſhow that he meaned general Conway. Nothing elſe could lead to ſuch a ſuſpicion. Let them heap what ſlanders they pleaſe on this virtuous man, yet they ought to make them ſome how or other coincide with ſome, however latent, ingredient in his character. But is boaſting, is vain-glory, the ſmalleſt part of that character? Is he oſtentatious, or a man of the moſt ingenuous modeſty? When did he brag of his exploits? Where? Is his common behaviour aſſuming? Has he arrogated merit to himſelf? Has he fatigued miniſters with ſolicitation for rewards? Has he complained of neglected ſervices? Have his brother-officers heard him comparing himſelf to Wolfe? In parliament has he vaunted his military talents? or is it to this private confident, this *friendly* letter-writer, that he has unboſomed his high opinion of his own merit? His life has been ſpent in public ſervice: has his arrogance made him ridiculous to his ſuperiors, or inſupportable to the ſubalterns who have been under his command? His private friends have ever found his deportment

portment humble, baſhful, and condeſcending: it is ſtrange that no man living but the letter-writer ſhould have diſcovered his preſumption.

The compariſon of himſelf with that deſervedly favourite hero of his country, general Wolfe, had Mr. Conway made it (which the letter-writer will give me leave to doubt, till he gives better proof of it than a malignant intimation), would have been in every light prepoſterous; and therefore, as that author does not call Mr. Conway's underſtanding in queſtion, was probably never thought of by him. Wolfe was a very young man, but a genius. He achieved his glorious career in one important action, for ever memorable, and reflecting conſummate honour on his country, on himſelf, and on the great man whoſe councils he executed. General Conway has gone through a regular courſe in his profeſſion for near ſeven-and-twenty years; has been formed under thoſe heroes the duke of Cumberland and prince Ferdinand; has been engaged in ſix regular battles, beſides many ſmaller actions; and therefore whatever talents he has, or whatever military knowledge he has acquired (if either are allowed to him), have been improved and acquired by long and painful ſervice. Though eminently diſtinguiſhed for his gallant and indefatigable behaviour by thoſe illuſtrious princes, he has never had the happineſs of achieving any action of remarkable eclat, or of performing *alone* any act of ſignal utility to his country. The author of theſe ſheets has ſeen his ſolicitude for employment in the field, his thirſt of ſervice, but never knew him prefer himſelf to the meaneſt officer in the army.

I ſhall here quit the letter-writer, and take no farther notice of his invectives, than as they coincide with thoſe of his fellow-labourer, the author of the Addreſs.

The latter good-natured perſon, apprehenſive that the Engliſh language would not furniſh him with ſufficient terms of abuſe, has had recourſe to his Salluſt for a ſentence, whoſe bitterneſs ſhould comprehend all the gall which he intended to ſpread through three-and-forty pages. Rome, when Salluſt wrote, was arrived at the perfection of eloquent ſlander, and at the dregs of corruption. Such a writer, at ſuch a period, could not fail to furniſh a paragraph to juſtify the puniſhment of an *impious man*, who, void of conſcience and honour, had ſtopped at nothing to glut his abominable ambition, and undo his country. The very caſe of general Conway. Is there an Engliſh-

man living, who underſtands Latin, and does not ſee how applicable the following words are to this high offender? *Equidem ego ſic exiſtumo omnes cruciatus minores quam facinora illorum eſſe; ſed plerique mortales poſtrema meminere, et in hominibus impiis ſceleris eorum obliti, de pœnâ diſſerunt.* *The impious men* alluded to by the hiſtorian were the accomplices of Catiline, and were put to death. Thoſe were the men in whoſe ſtory the author of the addreſs fiſhed for a ſentence that might ſuit the criminality of general Conway. I will not ſuppoſe that this author, who in his motto and in his book mentions with alacrity the word *puniſhment*, wiſhes that the parallel had been carried farther, becauſe he knows that *as yet* our laws do not allow a man to be put to death for giving *a ſingle* * *vote* againſt the adminiſtration. I am perſuaded his lenity is content with having a man ruined for ſuch preſumption; but he owns, p. 27, his ruin ought to be *total*. It had been no puniſhment, unleſs all he had, had been taken from him. He had been too impious, not to be beggared, as far as it was in the power of government.

Deſpotic acts, according to this writer, p. 26, give the idea of a tone of firmneſs and deciſion. Where he imbibed maxims ſo abhorrent from the genius of the Engliſh conſtitution, I do not pretend to gueſs. This is the firſt time we have ſeen it avowed *in print*, that total ruin was to be the portion of members of parliament who oppoſe adminiſtration. The galleys and the bow-ſtring give an idea of firmneſs and deciſion in the expeditious governments of France and Turkey——but Engliſh ears are ill-accuſtomed to ſuch ſounds, nor at a general election would it ſecure a majority to the court, if miniſterial candidates acknowledged ſuch a code. Even in eaſtern climes, baſhaws meet with terrible reverſes. A free nation, freſh from conquering in every quarter of the globe, will not eaſily ſubmit to domeſtic vizirs, who of all men living can claim leaſt merit from our ſucceſs.

The exordium of the work itſelf is ſarcaſtic on the people of England in general, to whom the author profeſſes ſubmitting his thoughts for their conſideration, though in the very next paragraph he lets them know, that they aſſume *too great latitude to themſelves in pronouncing their judgment willingly on all matters indiſcriminately*. He tells them they take this freedom of judgment for liberty, whereas it is *a cloak for maliciouſneſs, and an intemperance, which*

* It was not ſtrictly ſpeaking by a ſingle vote, differed with the adminiſtration. The term but on a ſingle ſubject, that general Conway *ſingle vote* is uſed to avoid circumlocution.

ought

ought deſervedly to be reckoned a reproach to a civilized people. The apoſtrophe is extraordinary, not over obliging to his readers, and ſurely little decent to a people *yet free:* For what is the context? A general officer is diſmiſſed for his behaviour in parliament, in a free parliament (ſo this daring author declares; we ſhall, perhaps, hear what the parliament next winter thinks of his aſſertion)—the people of England diſcuſs this ſubject—Licentious, audacious, uncivilized Engliſhmen! are you competent judges of ſuch a caſe? Let me tell you, in France, a civilized country, a man would be ſent to the Baſtile, who ſhould preſume to agitate ſuch a queſtion.

Yet farther: *Attempts*, he ſays, *have been made to render it the object of public clamour, and inſinuations have been thrown out that this was only the beginning of ſorrows; that ſuch an unconſtitutional act was not meant to ſtand ſingle, but was to be followed by the diſgrace of ſeveral other general officers; and leſt this ſhould be borne too calmly, it was induſtriouſly added, that the whole army was to be new modelled.* By whom theſe attempts and inſinuations have been made, I do not know: this author, I ſuppoſe, does, though a little apt to aſſert raſhly. Surely not by the general himſelf. The calm and decent reſignation with which he received the notification of his majeſty's pleaſure, the ſubmiſſion with which he acknowledged the receipt of it, his retirement in the country ever ſince, except for a few days, when he came to pay his duty to the king, and his forbearance of the leaſt murmur ſince, this behaviour will clearly diſculpate him from being party to the author's rhapſody. The reſt of this uncivilized nation, I fear, has not been ſo ſilent, though I believe no man living has ſaid *all* this author charges on many. Who has ſaid, this was the *beginning* of ſorrows? The proſcriptions of laſt year, the diſmiſſion of general Accourt, &c. muſt have been ſtrangely forgotten, if general Conway's diſgrace could be thought a *beginning*. That it has been reported, that a noble lord carried into the cloſet a liſt of ſixteen officers whoſe removal he adviſed, is certainly true—I mean ſuch a report; and their not being diſmiſſed, is no proof it was never propoſed. This author, perhaps, may think that to have ſpared them, gives *no idea of a tone of firmneſs and deciſion.* His notions of government are pretty high and deſpotic; he may cenſure too the time choſen for diſmiſſing general Conway, as weak and puſillanimous, not being done in the face of parliament, but reſpited till a ſeſſion was at the diſtance of many months. I, who think the preſent adminiſtration fully deciſive enough for the *preſent* conſtitution, applaud their temperance and their lenity. Their magnanimity I will wait for other occaſions of extolling.

But he adds, It has been induſtriouſly reported that the army *was going to be new modelled*—I had rather wave this point—it is too ſerious, and too delicate. Such reports I hope are falſe; from my ſoul I do. I had rather ſtigmatiſe the authors of ſuch whiſpers in the groſs, than enter into the diſcuſſion. No, there can be no ſuch intention—For what ſhould it be calculated? What could be propoſed to be done with the army when ſo modelled? The preſent army has conquered in every quarter of the globe—againſt whom could it be wiſhed to be employed, that it would not encounter with the ſame alacrity and valour that it exerted in the laſt war? Is there an officer in the army whoſe loyalty to his majeſty and ardour in the cauſe of his country have not been tried and approved? What enemies can the king or Great Britain have, whom the preſent army would not ſhed their blood to combat? What dark deſigns are there in agitation, which ſhould make it deſirable to remove the preſent officers, and place others in their room who would be more compliant, and of courſe deteſtable tp their countrymen? There are no ſuch deſigns, conſequently there can be no ſuch plan. The nation is united to a man, Jacobitiſm is extinguiſhed, Jacobites pardoned and received into favour; from what quarter could apprehenſions ariſe to the government? *Only two* general officers have been diſmiſſed, and, as the author aſſerts, for parliamentary diſobedience: no commiſſions have been given to men of problematic principles. I agree therefore with this author, that it is highly blameable to inſinuate that there is any intention of new modelling the army.

One word he has dropped in the paragraph I have been quoting, which muſt not paſs unnoticed. The diſmiſſion of general Conway, he ſays, is not *unprecedented*; and he alludes probably to the caſe of lord Cobham, the duke of Bolton, and lord Weſtmorland in the late reign. That thoſe officers were broken, is certainly true; but with a wide and material difference from the caſe of general Conway. They were engaged in the moſt offenſive and declared oppoſition againſt the court. Whoever recollects that time, knows to what an intemperance of language and behaviour their oppoſition was carried. How the meaſure of removing them was received by great part of the nation is well known; it was diſcuſſed in parliament, and followed by that memorable proteſt ſigned by ſeveral great lords now living. Whether the ſtep of breaking thoſe officers was wiſe or conſtitutional, is another queſtion; but it certainly bore no reſemblance to the caſe of Mr. Conway, who, as I ſhall prove preſently, was by no means in oppoſition, is of all men living the leaſt factious, and ſo far from having been guilty of any indecent language before

his diſgrace, that even ſince it happened, he has not expreſſed himſelf with acrimony, or varied from that uniform decorum which has graced every period of his fortune. Unprecedented the caſe then ſtands with regard to him; and that a new precedent would not take its date in his perſon, and in this reign, was reaſonably to be expected, by the recent reſtitution of ſir Henry Erſkine, accompanied with a retroſpective diſapprobation of caſhiering officers for their conduct in parliament.

As I am unwilling to ſwell this addreſs to too great a length, and to engage in matter foreign to my purpoſe, I gladly paſs by two or three ſenſeleſs and declamatory paſſages in the author I am examining, whoſe injudicious warmth betrays the ſore places of his patrons, with as little ſkill in finding remedies. The club at Wildman's every body knows is a terrible grievance, and this quack cannot help tattling what he hears; fooliſhly enough, God knows, on this occaſion, as general Conway belongs not to that meeting, nor ever dined at that tavern; though this author inſinuates it (for what does a falſehood coſt a man who writes for pay?) by ſaying, *You ſee there are ſome general officers among them.* His grace's favourite nephew (who that is I don't know), the inſtances of the king of Pruſſia and Contades, and ſuch rubbiſh, nothing at all to the purpoſe, I likewiſe paſs over, and ſhall not meet this author again till page 7, where affecting ſolid reaſoning after empty flouriſhes, he deſires us *to ſet aſide from the queſtion every perſonal conſideration.* What his own practice will be, we ſhall ſee preſently; and as we ſhall find that practice to be directly the reverſe of what he demands from others; as he, inſtead of omitting, drags into the queſtion every perſonal conſideration which he can invent to aſperſe general Conway, it is evident that *all* he begs in the paſſage above, is, that we would forget the general's virtues and ſervices. If we agree to that one candid poſtulatum, if we will promiſe not to think that virtue and ſervices ſhould have had ſome weight in ſoftening the general's fate, he hopes by ſome arguments, or what he would have paſs for arguments, and by more contradictions, with the ſuper-addition of abuſe, to convince us that there never was an act of a more harmleſs nature to all the world, nay even to the general himſelf (*vide* p. 23.), than taking away the profeſſion of an officer who has ſerved for twenty-ſix years, has been in ſix battles, and who came home recommended to favour by prince Ferdinand, for the ſingle offence of having voted on a conſtitutional point againſt the adminiſtration. With all the obſtacles he overleaps, and with all the foreign helps he calls in to his aſſiſtance, the taſk

our author has laid on himſelf ſtill ſeems to be difficult; difficult with regard to the public, to the army, and to the parliament, hitherto not accuſtomed to be told, contrary to their petition to his majeſty at the beginning of every new meeting, not to have offences committed in parliament queſtioned out of it, that ſuch offences are puniſhed by the crown. In the caſes I have mentioned of the duke of Bolton, &c. the then miniſter certainly never preſumed, never dared to acknowledge that they were removed for parliamentary conduct. Every body knows how that age would have flamed at ſuch an avowal.

My author begins with telling us, p. 7. that "our concern for the general, as a man, would be more properly expreſſed for the conduct occaſioning this diſmiſſion." The outſet is unlucky, and promiſes ill for what is to follow. The voice of the nation went along with the conduct of Mr. Conway. They were, and are ſtill of opinion, that general warrants are radically and alarmingly dangerous to liberty. They love the man who was ready to ſacrifice to the liberties of his country thoſe emoluments which he had obtained by defending it againſt its domeſtic and foreign enemies. They regard him as a martyr to their freedom, and to his own conſcience: and let me tell this author, that they will deteſt a ſcribbler who defends, recommends, puniſhment for integrity. His next ſtep is to reduce his argumentation to method, which he ranges under three heads:

"1. What hurt has been done to the army in general by the late diſmiſſion?

"2. What particular hardſhip has fallen on the individual who is the object of it?

"3. What detriment has the public received from a meaſure, repreſented as ſo highly injurious to it?"

The queſtions are of moment: the author takes the negative on all, and defends each as ably as I believe each can be defended. If I ſucceed in confuting him on every one, it will certainly not be from ſuperior abilities, but from the impoſſibility of defending tenets ſo abſurd. A genius, from Rouſſeau down to this writer, loves a paradox; but even ſuch a genius as Rouſſeau is apt to miſcarry in the attempt.

Diſmiſſions

Diſmiſſions in general, he ſays, are ſanctified by cuſtom, though ſtate phyſicians have conſidered them as a kind of extraordinary remedy, not to be had recourſe to in the uſual ſtages of a diſorder, but only to be preſcribed when every other treatment has been found ineffectual. This deſcription of diſmiſſions he muſt mean, if he means any thing, to apply to the caſe of general Conway. What was that? Why, on a queſtion in parliament, certainly of a conſtitutional, and of the higheſt nature, on which the opinions of all men were ſo nearly balanced, that 232 were on one ſide, and 218 on the other, general Conway agreed with the leſſer number. This was the *diſorder* which, from this author's words, we are to ſuppoſe the miniſters thought ſo dangerous an one, that they tried every treatment to cure it. Indeed!—What are the noſtrums which miniſters *can* apply to parliamentary oppoſition? I know none, but bribes and threats. Did miniſters really preſcribe theſe emollients and cauſtics on a conſtitutional vote in parliament? And do we live to hear this avowed? Away with magna charta, the bill of rights, and the revolution, if men dare utter this language in the face of day. The boldeſt ſtate empyrics in the days of any Charles or James would not have ventured to profeſs ſuch doctrines. But if we have ſuch leeches, the patient, it ſeems, ſcorned both their drugs and their bliſters; he has proved his conſtitution ſound, and would not be doctored out of his honour and his virtue.

The next words of this defendant of the political faculty are not leſs amazing: "One ſingular property," ſays he, p. 9. "attending this regimen is, that as it is very *violent* (indeed it is) in its operation, and conſequently often annihilates the patient, (with what glee this butcher talks of violence!) yet it is often found to act collaterally, and produces the moſt ſurpriſing effects on perſons in the ſame diſorder." Am I awake? Do I read right what is before me? Have members of parliament ever ſuffered themſelves to be treated in this contemptuous and profligate ſtyle? Is the parliament of Great Britain ſo corrupt, ſo loſt to ſhame, that it deſerves to be told that its votes are to be intimidated in this manner? that the repreſentatives of the people tremble when one of their body loſes his employment, and become obſequious, compliant, ſlaviſh? Or is it to officers alone that this inſult is offered? Are the fifteen other gentlemen, ſaid to have been in the black liſt, of that very timid complexion, that they can hear this language with patience, and without indignation? Can any other officer in parliament endure to have it ſuppoſed

poſed that he gives a vote from fear or lucre? That he does mean the officers in general, who have ſeats in parliament, I am inclined to believe, as in the next paragraph he directly applies it to them: and he begins to ſoften his tone, by allowing that length of time and confeſſed ability in the profeſſion ſhould not be lightly ſet aſide: not, ſays he, but the beſt pretenſions may be cancelled by a ſequel of conduct which no ſituation can juſtify, no exertions of military proweſs can atone for. Yet leſt even this palliative ſhould reach that indecent perſeverer in oppoſition, Mr. Conway, he takes care to inſinuate, that the general owed his riſe ſolely to parliamentary connexions. He had allowed a little to length of time; but, as contradictions coſt him nothing, that conceſſion is ſoon forgotten, and the general's every promotion reſolved into parliamentary intereſt. Twenty-ſix years of very ſharp ſervice in two wars and a rebellion, go for nothing: the approbation of ſuch commanders as the duke of Cumberland and prince Ferdinand for as little—yet to this ſpiteful, invidious inſinuation we will oppoſe nothing but the teſtimonial of every officer in the army. If there is a ſingle one who will ſay that general Conway has been promoted beyond his deſert, we will allow this author all the weight that his ill-nature can demand. Had Wolfe himſelf lived, and acted as uprightly, as there is no doubt but he would have acted, it is not unfair to ſuppoſe that he would have received as little quarter from this martial legiſlator, who, though he would ſtigmatiſe general Conway with the imputation of owing his promotion to parliament, holds, in ſo many words, that time-ſerving in parliament ought to be the great rule of judging of an officer's merit. Do I miſ-ſtate his arguments? If I do not, what a heap of contradictions!

His next poſitions are ſo abſurd, that I ſhall only quote them, not deign to give them an anſwer. They are, that civil employments are acquired by greater induſtry, are more difficult to be obtained than military; and that if the progreſs in the former be more rapid, they are the ſure marks of uncommon genius and proficiency, ſeldom beſtowed, and not to be acquired nor maintained without a great degree of merit. We beg our readers to take the little red book, and examine the liſt of thoſe at the head of the army and of the ſtate, by our author's rule.

He is fond of this hypotheſis, and, in conſequence of it, tells a long ſtory about I really do not know whom, in the courſe of which he works himſelf up

up into ſuch a fit of tenderneſs, that he almoſt weeps over a poor gentleman who broke his heart on being turned out of his employment. I am heartily ſorry for it, and hope, among the numerous proſcriptions of laſt year, which raged even againſt old domeſtics whoſe faithful ſervices had been rewarded with little offices, that not one of them was reduced to a like tragic extremity.

This moving tale, which, if applicable to the preſent queſtion, turns againſt the author's argument, becauſe the man did not die for being turned out of a *civil* employment, but becauſe he was turned out of his employment at all; for a man who wants bread, wants it equally whatever his profeſſion *has been*—This ſilly ſtory, I ſay, is followed by two or three pages of reaſoning equally abſurd, in which the author would prove, that if it is held right not to diſmiſs an officer for a conſcientious vote in parliament, it would follow that the army would become perpetual, and the officers would think themſelves hardly uſed if their regiments were to be broken by act of parliament. What ſort of underſtandings this writer thinks are the underſtandings of military men, I cannot tell; but here is the reaſoning he puts into their mouths. *If we do our duty in parliament, we ſhall of courſe be of opinion that we ought to reſiſt the parliament, ſhould its acts interfere with our intereſt, for being conſcientious neceſſarily makes men unconſcientious.* Was it really worth while to waſte four pages in ſtating nonſenſe, which you ſee can be ſtated in four lines? Yet on this flimſy foundation the author erects the ſolution of his firſt queſtion, that the army is not injured by the late diſmiſſion: whereas, if there was the leaſt ſhadow of argument in his poſition, it would, according to cuſtom, make againſt himſelf. For inſtance, if officers were not to be puniſhed for their conduct in parliament, and from not being puniſhed would find their commiſſions perpetual, would not the conſequence be, that they are hurt by being puniſhed? In fact, his argument is good no where; and if it could be good any where, it would not be where he has placed it. It could only have the appearance of an argument under his * third head, not under the firſt, and there I would have given it an anſwer, to which here it has not the ſhadow of a title; for, when a fooliſh man anſwers himſelf, he receives the only reply he deſerves.

* Becauſe it might be pretended, that it would not hurt the public to have the officers undeceived in the opinion that the army ought to be perpetual.

Yet,

Yet, while he flounders from abſurdity to contradiction, he drops ſome ſentences that muſt not paſs unnoticed. *The army*, ſays he, *cannot but think that the general ſhould have given his aſſiſtance to government if he expected their ſupport.* Very decent words when they come to be analyſed. Is it avowed that the diſcuſſion of the legality of a ſecretary of ſtate's warrant was a meaſure which government wanted to carry? I thought it was a mere parliamentary enquiry how the law ſtood. If not, it was an aim at extenſion of the prerogative, a point on which parliament always has been and ought to be exceedingly jealous. The general, ſays our writer, ought to have given his aſſiſtance to theſe views. In what capacity? If as a member of parliament, his duty, as ſuch, forbade it. But he ought, if he expected ſupport from adminiſtration. Indeed?—Are thoſe the bargains which government makes with officers? Does it ſay (I aſk for information), Vote for the extenſion of prerogative, and you ſhall have a regiment—or—to come nearer to the point—if you do not, you ſhall loſe your regiment? If this is the language of government, we have reaſon not only to dread the perpetuity of the army, but to fear its exiſtence for an hour. Why is it kept up? Becauſe we apprehend becoming a province to France——I have no longer any ſuch dread, if government holds the language which this author imputes to it. It is indifferent to me whether I am a French ſlave or an Engliſh one—perhaps there is leſs diſgrace in becoming the former. It is leſs ignominious to be chained by a brave enemy, than by baſe uſurping countrymen, and their treacherous tools. I affirm, an officer who ſhould act in conſequence of ſuch a compact as this author would eſtabliſh, would be a traitor—and for thoſe who would employ him—they would want a name. Yet hear *how* he goes on. *They*, the officers, *will ſoon bring themſelves to be of opinion, that as he went out of his way and of his profeſſion, to perplex and haraſs the ſervants whom the king thought proper to employ, it is no wonder that, in ſome ſort, retaliation ſhould take place.* It is difficult to ſay whether my aſtoniſhment at that man's boldneſs, or my contempt for his folly, is the greater. Turn over all the fawning ſermons of the court-chaplains in the reign of the firſt James and Charles; and all the prerogative tracts written to flatter the ſecond Charles and James, and cull any paſſage that ſurpaſſes the aſſumptions in this. What! Does a member of parliament *go out of his way*, who oppoſes the power of a ſecretary of ſtate? Are the officers of the crown ſuperior to parliament? Or is not parliament to check and controul them, nay, to watch over them, even when exerting the moſt legal powers? Is not this man's doctrine a ſubverſion of

the

the whole conſtitution? Does a member of parliament go out of his way who calls the higheſt officer of the crown to account? Parliament is the ſupreme court of this kingdom; nor has it been heard ſince the Revolution, that the meaneſt member in the houſe of commons is not authoriſed to queſtion any miniſter, be he whom he will. How the general *went out of his profeſſion*, I do not ſo clearly ſee. He and every officer ſits in parliament as repreſentative of ſome county or borough. To act in parliament as an officer, might not be going out of his profeſſion, but would undoubtedly be going into it in a ſtyle for which he would deſerve to be hanged; the conſtitution not being juſt upon the ſame foot it was when Cromwell appointed his major-generals.

I take up this audacious ſentence, becauſe I perceive there are daily ſycophants who attack the conſtitution with repeated inſults. Such was that ſcandalous book, called *Droit-le Roy*. The parliament deſervedly ſtigmatized it. Even the miniſters declared they would have complained of it, had it come to their knowledge. It is very ſtrange, that men ſhould act the part theſe profligate ſcribblers act! They expoſe themſelves to the indignation of their countrymen, by writing in defence of prerogative and tyranny, ſubmit to the ſhame of appearing to pay court to miniſters by the worſt kind of flattery, and yet take infinite care not to let that adulation reach the ears of thoſe for whom alone it can be deſigned. I have heard that virtue is its own reward, but this is the firſt time that ever infamy appeared to be ſo. Should theſe ſheets be fortunate enough to reach the eye of any miniſter, I truſt it will not be from the Oppoſition that we ſhall hear next winter of the Addreſs to the public being complained of in parliament, as attacking the deareſt privileges of that auguſt aſſembly.

The flatterer in queſtion ſoon relieves our indignation with a jocoſe concluſion of his inſolent paragraph. *The general*, ſays he, *went out of his way to haraſs and perplex the king's ſervants*. Poor gentlemen! I heartily grieve for them. Be they whom they will, that are ſo eaſily haraſſed and perplexed; as his majeſty *thought proper to employ them*, they ought not to be teaſed and vexed and bewildered. However new and droll the complaint is, it ought to have ſome weight. When our miniſters are ſo liable to be put *out of their way*, it is barbarous to moleſt them; and the only ſpecious reaſon which the author has given in his whole book for the diſmiſſion of general Conway, is this—*Retaliation in ſome ſort ſhould take place*. A general officer ought to be

broken for perplexing and haraſſing the king's poor miniſters. There have been miniſters, indeed, who would not have thought that turning a troubleſome ſpeaker out of his employment, would be the wiſeſt method to prevent being haraſſed by him——But theſe poor gentlemen were perplexed too, and therefore no wonder they did not act wiſely. *They were charged*, ſays he, *with ignorance and inability*. Here again a great miniſter would have confuted his opponent with proofs of knowledge and talents. Revenging one's ſelf on a man's profeſſion, is rather confeſſing the charge.

I have ſtated the author's premiſes; now let us ſee how he draws his concluſion. *The army will not* THEN *think themſelves aggrieved in this particular diſmiſſion. The cauſe in which this general was engaged, related no way to the defence of their profeſſion:* they will not therefore lament him as one "fallen in their behalf. And with reſpect to the ſituation of military men in general, whenever they incur the diſpleaſure of their maſter in matters wholly foreign to the military, they will be ſo far from making a cauſe commune, or from applying to themſelves as any mark of diſgrace, that it will prove rather a means of keeping them more cloſely attached to the reſpective buſineſſes before them, as the ſureſt means of preſerving a connection between their merits and their advancement."

This is the logic of our court-advocate; and ſince the beginning of time, I believe no court-cauſe was ever worſe defended. Whatever the miniſters are, the officers, I am ſure, muſt be men of very perplexed and perplexable underſtandings, if they can for a moment be the dupes of ſuch puerilities. For what is his argument? Officers cannot think themſelves aggrieved, if one of their corps loſes his employment for ſomething not relating to his profeſſion. Now the very reverſe of this is true, and is an anſwer to his whole firſt diviſion. They do think themſelves aggrieved, becauſe general Conway was diſmiſſed for nothing relating to his profeſſion. They do think it hard that the rewards of years, of blood, of bravery, ſpent and exerted in the ſervice of their king and country, ſhould be of ſo precarious a tenure, that they are to be ſacrificed to the vengeance of fretful and perplexed miniſters——Nay, that the rewards of honour are incompatible with the dictates of conſcience: that the merit of ten campaigns can be obliterated by one ſeſſion: that to ſerve their king and country is not enough; they muſt ſerve miniſters alſo: that the only ſecurity of honours, is the forfeiture of honour; and that they are

are to be told at laſt, after encountering all the hardſhips and dangers of their profeſſion, *that the ſureſt means of preſerving a connection between their merits and their advancement*, is to tremble when a brother-officer is caſhiered for his virtue, and to abandon him :—in other words, that a coward may riſe to the higheſt poſts in the army, and that a ſlave is ſure of doing ſo.

I ſhall be much more brief on the two following ſections. The defence of general Conway's character was the principal view of this tract; but that can be eſtabliſhed beyond contradiction, in few words. Yet even the excellence of his character would not be ſufficient to demonſtrate the injuſtice he has ſuffered, unleſs I had ſhown too, as I have I think unanſwerably, that it is unjuſt and unconſtitutional to take away the profeſſion of an officer for his behaviour in parliament. In the courſe of that argument, I have had occaſion to expoſe the alarming doctrines that are daily propagated, repugnant to this conſtitution, deſtructive of the unqueſtionable rights of parliament, dangerous to liberty in general (without which every thing we enjoy is contemptible), ſubverſive of the whole ſyſtem of the Revolution, and threatening deſtruction to the illuſtrious houſe of Hanover, whoſe ſucceſſion to the crown was founded on that revolution. No man therefore but a Jacobite can wiſh to ſee an extenſion of the prerogative, as every extenſion of it under a new family would be ſo far a juſtification of king James's meaſures. The defence of liberty, and of the preſent royal family, againſt dark and inſidious traitors, was a cauſe well worth expending a few pages upon.——I paſs to our author's ſecond diviſion.

His queſtion is, What particular hardſhip has fallen on the individual who is the ſubject of the late diſmiſſion? A poſition too ludicrous to deſerve a ſerious anſwer, and yet as capable of being maintained as either of his other ſections. In the ſchools we know ridiculous tenets are often given out for argumentation; but this is the firſt time that ſuch a queſtion was ever agitated in a political controverſy. As I have no leiſure to waſte on ſuch boyiſh impertinences, which carry nonſenſe in their face and contradiction in their mouth, let it ſuffice to repeat his arguments. The firſt is, that the general having a large independent income, which income by the way is his wife's jointure, conſequently precarious, cannot be accounted a great ſufferer by loſing the greateſt part of the income. The ſecond, that he has enjoyed ſuch large appointments, that, if he had never ſpent a farthing of them, he would

be very rich — But I trifle with my readers, and ſhould be as inexcuſable as the author I quote, to fatigue them by the repetition of ſuch abſurdities, to which, in truth, the author truſts ſo little, that he ſoon quits them for the more favourite topics of defamation. On this head he is ſo candid, firſt, as to beg we will believe nothing we hear in the general's favour; ſecondly, that we will liſten to every thing he can ſay to his prejudice: when both theſe conceſſions are obtained, he hopes to prove, that the general is no ſufferer. Any commendation of the general he pronounces *ſuſpicious information*, p. 24. Detraction in the mouth of a profeſſed adverſary is to paſs for unqueſtionable; though he will give me leave to ſurmiſe, that if the diſmiſſion of Mr. Conway could have been defended by reaſons, ſo much recourſe would not have been had to defamation: and yet I am of opinion, that it is eaſier to juſtify the removal of him than to ſully his character.

The firſt reflection we find is an indirect attack upon his political behaviour; though, while the author makes it, he tacitly gives up the whole ſcope of his preceding argument. *I do know*, ſays he, p. 25, *that altogether he has received much public money, and I have no room to doubt (as the greater part of it was given under his grace's adminiſtration) that an equal ſervice was performed.* Now, if there is any meaning in this paragraph (a ſuppoſition I only hazard, and may wrong the author by imputing any meaning at all to him), it implies that the duke of N. paid Mr. Conway for his behaviour in parliament——And is this at laſt become an imputation? I thought it was not only the moſt ſure, but the moſt right *means* for officers *to preſerve a connection between their merits and advancement.* Was the ſame conduct wrong in the duke of N. that is right in *perplexed* miniſters? That the author did mean this, is probable from the very next paragraph, in which he mentions the general's late conduct in parliament. But though he contradicts himſelf to get at an argument, he has not got at truth. General Conway's preferments came in the regular courſe, were generally conferred after particular ſervices; as his firſt regiment, which he obtained after the battle of Culloden, by the recommendation of his royal highneſs the duke of Cumberland; and in none of them had the duke of Newcaſtle more ſhare than in common with the reſt of the late king's ſervants.

Having now, as he thinks, cleared his way, and removed all objections of hardſhip on the general, both as an officer and an individual, the author's next

next ſally is an attempt to ſtate the diſmiſſion as almoſt the object of the general's choice. As if nothing was more common than to take away military commiſſions for parliamentary behaviour, and as if that practice had not been peculiarly ſtigmatiſed on the reſtoration of ſir Henry Erſkine, the author affirms that Mr. Conway could not but foreſee the conſequence of the part *he choſe* to take in public buſineſs: a part which in the next ſentence this writer terms *braving his royal maſter in his bedchamber*. This language is ſo much that of a half-converted Jacobite, that it is impoſſible not to be ſtruck with it. How little is this man acquainted with the virtues of that royal perſon whoſe name he raſhly introduces into a libel! Has this man forgotten, or did he never hear of, that gracious declaration which characteriſed the very dawn of the preſent reign, that elections ſhould be free, and not a ſhilling ſhould be ſpent in obtaining a partial repreſentative? Is it likely that a virtuous prince, who truſted the uprightneſs of his meaſures to the free voice of his people, would imbibe partial reſentments againſt conſcientious members? Let this author take what liberty he pleaſes with miniſters, and aſcribe the late diſmiſſion to their vengeance, but let him beware of confounding their ſquabbles with the perſon of the ſovereign, who is the juſt and equal father of all his ſubjects, and who does not entertain prejudices againſt virtuous men for obeying the dictates of their conſcience. His majeſty may have been adviſed to remove general Conway, and has taken that advice; but he does not thereby become a party in a miniſterial quarrel, nor look upon himſelf as inſulted becauſe his miniſters have been *perplexed*. All acts in this country are conſidered by the law as the acts of thoſe who adviſe the crown, and as ſuch only I ſpeak of them. The veneration I have for the excellent prince with whom we are bleſſed, would not permit me to name him, but to reprimand this ſcribbler; nor would general Conway hold any man as his friend, who ſhould pronounce that royal name but with duty, reſpect, and affection. He would lay down his life for that amiable ſovereign; nor has there been, I believe, one moment ſince his diſmiſſion in which he has not felt the ſame ardour of love and zeal, which warmed him in thoſe happier hours when he had the honour of ſtanding nearer to his royal maſter. Let this ſuffice as a reply to two or three pages of rancour and indecency. One word, however, muſt be taken up: the author ſays, he does not remember in the ſeveral ſtages of Mr. Wilkes's affair, on which the greater part of the time before the Chriſtmas holidays was ſpent, that the general took any part in reſenting the inſult which had been ſo groſsly offered to his maſter. I might aſk him, whether he remembers that

every

every groom of the bedchamber ſpoke upon that occaſion; and if not one of them did, as I believe they did not, why ſilence was more criminal in him than in the reſt? Had he defended that inſult, he might indeed have been ſaid to have braved his maſter. The fact is, every man in the houſe condemned that inſult in his heart; but it was impoſſible every man in the houſe ſhould expreſs his abhorrence. But hear a little further:—General Conway, as is well known, was often up to ſpeak, but was never pointed to. It is much leſs known, but not leſs true, that his intention was to declare his deteſtation of the inſult, and to ſeparate it entirely, as it was in its nature ſeparated, from the power claimed by the ſecretaries of ſtate. After Chriſtmas, in the very ſpeech repreſented as ſo offenſive, Mr. Conway did make that diſtinction: but the author choſe a ſilent period preferably to one of activity, becauſe ſilence could be miſinterpreted, but actual words could not be tortured to mean the very contrary of what they expreſſed. Thus we ſee this author's malice is as unlucky when built on the general's ſilence, as it has been when catching at what he really acted.

If the libelliſt has been unfortunate hitherto, both in his facts and inſinuations, he will not redeem his credit by the ſubſequent pages.

One of the principal complaints made on this diſmiſſion has been, that it was for a ſingle vote. As the author admires *a tone of firmneſs and deciſion*, one might have expected that he would have applauded the adminiſtration for the promptneſs of authority exerciſed on a man who had offended but by one vote. How, on the contrary, he comes to be ſenſible that ſuch ſummary proceedings are not quite conſonant to the ſpirit of our conſtitution, I do not know: but ſo it is, that he endeavours to ſhow that Mr. Conway was not diſmiſſed for a ſingle vote. He does not, indeed, ſucceed in that attempt; yet I allow that, by the very endeavour, he is candid enough to own that the meaſure of caſhiering an officer for one vote is not to be defended: *Si Pergama dextrâ defendi poſſent, etiam hâc defenſa fuiſſent.*

I will ſum up his account of Mr. Conway's parliamentary behaviour, and then we ſhall judge whether our author has made out that the general was actually engaged in a ſyſtem of oppoſition.

Before Chriſtmas general Conway ſaid nothing.

Between

Between January 16 and February 17 he never happened to be of the ſame opinion with the king's ſervants, except on ſome one point in which Mr. Wilkes was concerned; the particulars of which our candid author chooſes to forget. I ſhall help his recollection preſently.

It was not adminiſtration alone that conſidered him as their opponent; the oppoſition were daily vaunting of him as an important acquiſition, and indeed gave out, at one time, that he had undertaken to lead them.

What doubt could be entertained of his inclinations, after the virulent charge of ignorance and incapacity which he poured forth againſt the miniſter * ?

Whenever, therefore, the diſmiſſion is mentioned, together with the conduct in parliament, let the public be aſſured that the general was vigorous and active; and, in ſhort, totally in oppoſition.

Thus ſtand the proofs. Now hear the anſwer.

Not only from Jan. 16 to Feb. 17, but from Nov. 15, the day the parliament met, to April 19, when it roſe, general Conway was not once of a different opinion from the king's ſervants, but on the ſingle affair of the warrants: and I do not take advantage of many queſtions on which there was no diviſion; but when there was, he voted with them, as on the cyder-tax, the ſecond great point of oppoſition; and aſſiſted the miniſtry on the bill for regulating franks. Is that aſſertion, therefore, of our author proved a falſehood?

The caſe he chooſes to forget is no leſs remarkable, and the very mention

* The author, who in his firſt ſtate of this charge had uſed the expreſſion *the king's ſervants*, here names *the miniſter*. Who *the miniſter* is, I really don't know; nor whom the author means is it my buſineſs to enquire. As every thing *perſonal* is carefully avoided throughout this whole treatiſe, I ſhall not take up the term *the miniſter*, but continue to argue, as I have done, in generals. I deſire, too, to have it obſerved, that I have not introduced a ſingle argument foreign to the ſubject of diſmiſſions, and to the warrants which occaſioned the late diſmiſſion; not chooſing to imitate the conduct of the author I anſwer, who has dealt indiſcriminate abuſe on variety of perſons no way connected with the general in queſtion, and whoſe names, in this place, ſerve no purpoſe but that of calumny.

of

of it will ſhow why he choſe to forget it. It was the affair of Alexander Dun, in which general Conway was peculiarly active, and aſſiſtant to the miniſtry, and by which he demonſtrated that his behaviour on the warrants was ſimply conſcientious, and that he was no partiſan of Mr. Wilkes.

He had declared to a miniſter, before witneſs, in the moſt expreſs terms, that he was not, nor intended to be, engaged in oppoſition. He had declared the ſame to ſeveral chiefs in the oppoſition. Which, therefore, is to be believed, the general or the author? For that mob appendix, of its being given out, that the general had undertaken to lead the oppoſition, I queſtion whether even the garreteers of the minority went ſo far as to make ſuch an aſſertion to any compeer in the majority.

We have ſeen what was the general's conduct, and what were his declarations. As they were repugnant to the author's aſſertions, his laſt reſource was to gueſs at the general's inclinations.—Was he then at laſt diſmiſſed for a gueſs—and that a wrong one? Leave out the word *virulent*, which is *gratis dictum*, to make ſomething of nothing, and I believe there never was a ſet of miniſters, who, not only by Mr. Conway, but by the whole oppoſition, were ever ſo gently treated as the preſent have been. Would not one think, by the manner in which this author has ſtated the charge, that general Conway had accuſed the miniſters of ignorance in the revenue, of inability in making the late peace, in ſhort, of being the moſt incapable adminiſtration that ever diſgraced government! But reduce the charge to plain truth, and all it amounted to was, accuſing the miniſters of not knowing the preciſe extent of power for granting warrants veſted by law in the ſecretary of ſtate.

With what truth, with what juſtice, therefore, does this frontleſs man take upon him to aſſure the public, that general Conway was totally in oppoſition? Had it not been wiſer to defend the meaſure of turning him out of the army for a ſingle vote? The author has no more ſucceſs in falſifying *for* his maſters, than *againſt* thoſe they perſecute.

Diſſatisfied with his own endeavours, and ſtill ſuſpecting that the diſmiſſion for parliamentary conſcientious conduct would ſhock the nation, the author flies to abuſe, and plunges to the bottom of that mud in queſt of ſomething that may abate national pity for an oppreſſed and worthy man. I rejoice, and

and have ever rejoiced, at theſe ſhifts of a deſpotic party. When collateral reaſons are called in, one is ſure the true reaſon is not tenable.

But where ſhall defamation be faſtened? How aſperſe one of the moſt ſpotleſs characters that this or any country has produced? It muſt be done with a nice hand, and with uncommon addreſs. His virtues as a man, a huſband, a father, a ſubject, a ſenator, are unqueſtionable. His diſintereſtedneſs is conſpicuous, his modeſty moſt amiable, his attention to his profeſſion laborious, his courage unqueſtionable——It is true, and yet there we will attack him. In order, too, to appear candid, we will begin with allowing what we cannot deny. When we are ſo candid as to confeſs his bravery, we ſhall be the more eaſily believed when we inſinuate that he is a coward. We will drop the word Rochfort; and that ſingle little word, like a ſpell, will hint to all the world, that if general Conway had been the hero he is ſuppoſed, Rochfort would have been taken: and when that is believed, will not the miniſters be juſtified in breaking a man in the year 1764, who might have taken Rochfort in the year 1757?

This may be artful, and much good may ſuch art do any man that poſſeſſes it! It will lead him into as many ſcrapes as this author has involved himſelf in.

This interpretation muſt ſtrike every man as the evident intention of recalling the idea of Rochfort. Yet, as the author allows, and no man living queſtions, *the ſpirited courage of the general*, and as I would not load even this libelliſt with more odium than he deſerves, let us ſee if the revival of the affair of Rochfort will admit of a leſs malevolent explanation.—Perhaps the author, conſcious that no direct imputation would ſtick, yet officious to raiſe unfavourable ſentiments of the general in the minds of his readers, no matter on what foundation, might mean to call in queſtion Mr. Conway's judgment. An officer who has been taken priſoner after charging three times in the village of Fontenoy; keeping his regiment to the laſt in the field, in order to cover the retreat; and whoſe whole conduct has been a ſeries of intrepidity, cannot be written out of his reputation as a ſoldier—No, that will never do—We muſt try whether his capacity is not leſs proof againſt miſrepreſentation. Whatever was the author's meaning, the inference, as I have ſaid, is, that general Conway deſerved to be caſhiered for not having taken Rochfort

in 1757. But general Mordaunt commanded that expedition, not general Conway. Does an inferior in command deſerve to be puniſhed for that miſcarriage, when the principal did not, but was honourably acquitted? General Conway was urgent in adviſing ſome attempt. Did that make him more criminal than his ſuperior? General Mordaunt votes with the adminiſtration; general Conway voted, on one queſtion, againſt it—Perhaps this may have made ſome difference in the degree of their criminality.

Thus far I have argued upon the foot of ſome blame; but I have other difficulties to propoſe to the objector. The plan of ſurpriſing Rochfort was one of the vigorous meaſures of that great miniſter, Mr. Pitt. The patrons of our author always called that ſcheme one of Mr. Pitt's viſions. Mr. Conway could not in any degree be to blame that Rochfort was not taken, unleſs the attempt was practicable. I beg this author to chooſe which he will cenſure, Mr. Pitt or the generals concerned. It will be difficult for him to revile both the one and the other. If, to ſerve a preſent emergency, he admits the practicability, he will be ſo good as to ſhow that it was practicable; a fact that I have never yet heard aſcertained: and when he has done this, Mr. Conway will remain blameleſs, who was innocent of the miſcarriage, and who never acquieſced in abandoning the project till it was too late to undertake it. And, upon this occaſion, I will tell the author an anecdote, and from very good authority. When the affair of Rochfort was public talk, the earl of C——— told the following ſtory:—Mr. Conway, ſaid his lordſhip, I am ſure is brave; I know it from the beſt hands. I was commending George Stanhope (his lieutenant-colonel) for what I heard of his behaviour in Germany. 'Faith, my lord, replied that gallant young man, I believe I do not want ſpirit more than other folks. Indeed, I do not pretend to the intrepidity of Harry Conway, who walks up to the mouth of a cannon with as much indifference as if he was going to dance a minuet.

Our author, however, who is ſo blundering an arithmetician as to ſuppoſe that many cyphers will make a ſum, adds a new nothing to the account, and infers from the ſilence of gazettes, that England can loſe no ſervices by this diſmiſſion. Have we heard of him, ſays he, p. 34. diſtinguiſhing himſelf in Germany, as we *did* of Moſtyn and Waldegrave? Ergo, he ought to be broken. A man muſt have as bad a heart as this author, who could even wiſh to detract from the merit of thoſe brave officers. Their country has ſignal

obligations to them. They contributed to that vaſtneſs of fame which made us the terror and admiration of the univerſe. Nor is it on gazettes alone that their reputation is founded. They are loved and admired by their profeſſion, and by no man more than by general Conway, who would as little wiſh to raiſe his own glory at their expence, as thoſe gentlemen would deign to countenance a ſcribbler in malicious inſinuations. He names the plains of Minden. Does he know that the preſence of mind and gallant conduct of general Waldegrave gave the deciſive turn to the fate of that day? I ſpeak of theſe officers, becauſe I eſteem them; not, like the author, to ſerve one party and depreſs another. Unleſs that had been his motive, why, in the number of our heroes, did he omit general Monckton, and forget lord Albemarle, the conqueror of the Havannah? Had this author ever ventured upon truth, he would not have denied that he had heard of general Conway in Germany. Was it a ſecret, though known to every officer in the army, that when the hereditary prince was wounded, general Conway was ſelected by prince Ferdinand to command in his place? Aſk that idol of every Engliſhman's affection, the marquis of Granby, whether general Conway was an uſeleſs ſecond? Aſk Germany, whether prince Ferdinand recommends incapable and undeſerving ſubjects to the favour of their maſter?—No; all this ſhall be ſunk in malicious oblivion, and general Conway ſhall alone preſide in councils of war at Wildman's, p. 34. where he never ſet his foot.

A fellow labourer in the ſame worthy cauſe, whoſe talent for poetry is upon a par with our author's logic, inſtead of giving the general a command at Wildman's, has, with as little truth, ſent him to St. Cas, where, too, he never was. As the lines are worthy of the cauſe they are intended to ſerve, the bard will, I hope, forgive the liberty I take of re-printing them. When the author of the Addreſs is appointed hiſtoriographer, his friend, I truſt, will be made poet laureat. Here they are, and they do honour to the age!

In future annals ſhould our children read
That Conway's fate was ſuch a day decreed,
They'll turn ſome pages back the cauſe to find,
Knowing that George was gracious, juſt, and kind:
High in the liſt of faction's crewbehold,
A Rochfort gen'ral, Conway ſtands enroll'd!

Whoſe coward's tongue a quick diſmiſſion claim'd
(His honour, valour, at St. Cas remain'd).
The ſtigma falls; our loyal children view
Reſentment fall, where moſt reſentment's due:
Great in his praiſe, they'll bleſs the happy hour,
When Britain's honour dar'd be king, and Pitt no more *.

Such are the encouragements held out to virtue in the preſent times: ſuch the productions of a party who breathe nothing but vengeance againſt the liberty of the preſs, as the vehicle of ſcandal and ſatire! Believe theſe men, and the oppoſition exceed all their predeceſſors in calumny——but read their own productions, and you will wonder at their confidence. Their writings teem with the moſt illiberal railing. Whoever ſcorns corruption, is the mark at which every dart is aimed from the janizaries of the faction. Look high, look low; is there a great man, is there a good man, who has eſcaped the arrows they ſhoot in the dark? Yet they, good men, complain of ſecret ſtabs. When there is a miniſter as virtuous as general Conway, and who has been *only as much* abuſed, I will allow that he has reaſon to harangue againſt invectives.

I now come to the laſt ſection: What detriment the public has received from the late diſmiſſion. This the author tells us has been in great meaſure foreſtalled. As far as nonſenſe can anticipate nonſenſe, that is, forbid the expectation of ſenſe, this great logician has, indeed, already done the buſineſs, and might well caution us to throw by unread the ſequel of his performance. Yet, it being my buſineſs to ſhow that the public has been injured, I ſhall ſift our caſuiſt to the bottom, and leave him as naked of proof on this head, as I truſt I have done on the two former.

His firſt argument is as inconcluſive as all the reſt. *If it appears to your ſatisfaction*, ſays he, *that neither the army has reaſon to complain, nor that he himſelf has been injured as a private citizen, it follows of courſe that the public, which muſt conſider him in one of theſe two capacities, has not received any detriment.* Having confuted him in his two former poſitions, I might, perhaps, with reaſon reſt the argument here, by his own conceſſion; for, if in neither

* Printed in the London Chronicle, Saturday March 26, 1764.

of

of the two former diviſions he has ſatisfied the public, the reſult of two unſatisfied queſtions will certainly not be ſatisfaction. But Mr. Conway ſtands in a third light, in which any injury received by him affects the public in a higher degree than in either the character of ſoldier or private citizen. He is a member of the Britiſh parliament; a repreſentative of the people of England, and one of the guardians of their liberties. He cannot be injured in that capacity, without a wound being given to his conſtituents, and to the people in general. The author had not forgotten this capacity, though he choſe to ſink it. He confeſſes in the next ſentence to that in which he had omitted it, *that it may be urged ſpecioufly enough, that the general has ſuffered in the cauſe of his country, for maintaining that freedom which is our glory and our birthright. This*, adds he, *has been artfully enough endeavoured to be conſtantly inſinuated.* How prevalent is truth, when it can force its way even through the mouth of falſehood! This we do aſſert was the probable cauſe of the diſmiſſion: this the author's whole tract aſſigns as the cauſe, and this, perhaps, will ſome day or other be proved to have been the cauſe. In the mean time we defy this author, or his patrons, if he has any, to aſſign another. And if this *was* the cauſe, is the public not hurt, is liberty not wounded, the rights of parliament not violated, the freedom of debate not checked, integrity of conſcience not oppreſſed? Anſwer, thou ſcribbler, and trifle not with the ſacred rights of mankind——And how doſt thou anſwer? By ſhifting and doubling, and changing the queſtion, and ſetting up a phantom, which thou haſt as little ſkill to combat as if it was a reality.

To prove general Conway was not alarmed for the liberty of the ſubject—that he was not conſcientious in the part he took for declaring the warrants illegal—what does this man do? He gives an account of a fooliſh bill brought in on a ſubſequent day, and exploded by both ſides of the houſe, and thence would infer that general Conway had not been in earneſt on a ſerious debate on the Friday, becauſe that ſimple bill was almoſt univerſally rejected on the Tueſday. This very argument was handled by ſome wiſe controvertiſt in the daily papers, was printed and reprinted with much ſolemnity, and ſome expence. It will not probably make its appearance again, after the full and fair anſwer I ſhall give to it.

In the firſt place, the bill was brought in by a gentleman whom the warm advocates for liberty, and the old friends of the houſe of Hanover, never peculiarly affected. They remembered ſomething of a bar-gown put on to plead

plead for ſomebody of ſtill leſs equivocal principles, and of ſubſcriptions in defence of the king and conſtitution during the late rebellion, preſented as illegal in Weſtminſter-hall. The ſuſpicious gentlemen of the minority perhaps *timebant Danaos et dona ferentes*; poſſibly their jealouſy was increaſed by ſeeing a gentleman who had defended the legality of the warrants tender a bill for pronouncing them illegal. They were authoriſed too in this coolneſs towards the bill by the damp thrown on it by miniſters themſelves——And here it is proper to aſk this blundering advocate a queſtion, How came it to be in the power of the minority *not to ſuffer the point to be ſettled by bill?* Thoſe are his very words, p. 37, and they are congenial with the reſt of his aſſertions. I might aſk him, how this rejection affects general Conway, who happened not to be preſent? How he knows which way the general would have voted if he had been preſent? If he anſwers, he ſuppoſes againſt the bill, I reply, he would then have voted with the miniſtry, who, being the majority, were thoſe who rejected it. Now, has not this able ſophiſt proved, that general Conway's conduct was not conſcientious? Has not he ſatisfied you all, my countrymen, that you have received no detriment by the late diſmiſſion? Has not he proved that neither the army, nor the general himſelf, have been injured? And has not he vindicated the miniſtry as completely as it is poſſible to vindicate them? Leſt his arguments ſhould have ſlipped yonr memories, I will ſum up the principal.

The duke of Bolton, lord Weſtmorland, and lord Cobham, were turned out of the army for being in oppoſition to the court: therefore it was right to diſmiſs general Conway, who was not in oppoſition.

This is a free country, in which it is inconſiſtent with the freedom of parliament for a miniſter to uſe bribes or threats; but when they have been employed without effect, it is right to uſe violence: therefore it was right to diſmiſs Mr. Conway.

Officers ought to riſe by their behaviour in parliament; therefore it was right to diſmiſs Mr. Conway, who did not riſe by his ſervices in parliament.

General Conway was ſecond in command at Rochfort; therefore he, on whom that expedition did not depend, ought to be caſhiered for a ſingle vote, while the principal commander, who votes with the court, is not caſhiered.

His

His name was not mentioned in the *gazettes* ſo often as general Moſtyn's, or general Waldegrave's; therefore it was right to take away his regiment.

Mr. Conway gave no vote againſt the court when there was no diviſion, and two votes to one with them when there was; therefore he was in oppoſition.

He had a large income from the army, and a leſs from his wife; therefore depriving him of the larger is no injury.

The minority would not ſuffer a bill to paſs, which the majority rejected; therefore Mr. Conway had no conſcience: conſequently the public is not injured by the diſmiſſion of a man, who would not have been diſmiſſed if he had not been conſcientious.

I check my pen at this laſt word, which, though uttered in raillery, is but too ſerious. I weep over my country, not over my friend——his honour is ſafe, would theirs were ſo!——But how will this ſtory be read hereafter? How will poſterity reconcile ſo much mercy with ſo much ſeverity? When all proſcriptions on rebels and jacobites are taken off; when we all enjoy a common parent; when every beam of mercy is directed to men ſo culpable, and every phial of wrath is reſerved for a man ſo virtuous——how will they reconcile ſuch apparent contradictions?——Why, by the exact and preciſe diſcriminations of truth. The mercy will be aſcribed to that pure fount from whence alone it can flow; the rigour, to thoſe ill-judging ſervants who eſtabliſh ſuch uncommon ideas of rewards and puniſhments.

I will now conclude with ſumming up my anſwer, which will be compriſed in few words.

The late diſmiſſion is prejudicial to the army, to the general, to the public, for theſe reaſons:

1. It muſt ſlacken the zeal of officers, when they ſee that, after a life ſpent in the ſervice, they are liable to be turned adrift, to ſatisfy the vengeance of miniſters, and for cauſes no way connected with the profeſſion. It affects the honour of officers, who are by this author declared the tools of a miniſter; it makes their fortune precarious and deſperate, if they obey their conſcience; and inclines men without doors to queſtion the honour of thoſe who vote with

with the court, as a rod is held over their heads, and it is known that they act under fear of losing their employments. It indispose their countrymen to choose them into parliament, as an officer can no longer be supposed a free agent.

2. The general is hurt in his fortune; he is deprived of the rewards of long and painful services; and he is treated with the same disgrace as men are treated in all countries who have proved themselves unworthy of their profession.

3. The public is hurt, if the rights of parliament are violated, and if punishment, which is only due to crimes, is inflicted on incorruptible honesty and conscientious virtue. It is hurt, if ministers revenge their own animosities on the servants of the king and the nation, and if they in effect declare, that to defend the liberties of the people subjects the guardians of those liberties to proscription.

END OF THE SECOND VOLUME.