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PREFACE.

"Go on in the straight line of duty: be not diverted from it, and believe me, it will do you honour at the last."

This piece of advice, which was given last year (Dec. 10) to the Gentlemen of Opposition by the Lord Chancellor, is, to say the truth, somewhat strange and distressing. I allow him to be learned, possessed of large powers of mind, and capable of political debate in no common degree. He is also said to be distinguished by urbanity and candour, and many amiable feelings of the heart. Yet how are these to be reconciled with the sentiment just quoted from him? For what can be less humane or considerate, than to deprive any set of Gentlemen,
however small, of that which appears to be the only delight of their hearts, the only business for which they wish to live? If patriotism is to be confined to the "straight line of duty," what is to become of those whose object it is (according to Mr. Pitt's description in the late Session), "at a moment of difficulty, when a general "gloom is spread over the country, and when "doubt and anxiety possess the public mind, to "increase the alarm and agitation, by impeding "the progress of every remedy that is proposed?"

And what is to become of those too, who, upon a disappointment, are resolved to shew their just resentment by opposing; though, to use Sir William Elford's expression concerning his own hesitations, they may "not yet be quite "clear what line of conduct they ought to pur- "sue?" Nay (to state a case more grievous to myself than any of the former), what is to be- come of this very book? If Gentlemen had al- ways followed the "straight line of duty," I could never have written it: and if they were now to return to it, the book must be ruined at once; for, to confess the truth, it is wholly em- ployed
ployed in celebrating those beautiful aberrations from the "straight line," with which the printed debates so happily abound.

This at once gives the reader an insight into the plan of the Elements. It has often been matter of surprise, that in a country so political as our own, where the views of Gentlemen in Parliament must be perpetually changing, either because their wholesome advice is not followed, or because themselves or their friends lose their places, &c. &c. &c. there was no set of rules for the proper expression of their disappointment, and the systematic conduct of their opposition. This defect it is now humbly attempted to remedy; and the present publication is intended as the First Part of a Manual, which Members may carry to the House, and consult for their guidance on all suitable occasions. To the younger Members, who may feel it their duty to be dissatisfied with Ministers, it will be of particular service: not that they have the appearance of wanting either the temper or the disposition which may qualify them for opposing, but that
that they do not yet know the best manner of conducting their patriotic hostilities. For their instruction, therefore, the following Elements are extracted from the speeches of the older and more distinguished Oppositionists: and it is hoped they will not refuse to tread in the footsteps of those whom I would call, by way of eminence, THE GREAT MASTERS OF DISCONTENT—men who, for the sake of their country, are inflexibly determined never to be pleased; or who have already arrived at such a pitch of agitation for the public welfare, that they can bring themselves to acquiesce in nothing.

So that, from this time, Lord Temple will know how improper it is to consult the convenience of Ministers in any thing; and will correct himself by the stronger proceedings of a more intelligent relation, as in Rule 35.

Mr. KINNAIRD may now, without fear, insist that the House shall sit on a Saturday, though there may be nothing to do; and afterwards he may as securely quarrel with Ministers for keeping the House together so late in the week, though
though a matter of great importance may demand it—for he has only to turn to Rule 29, and, after the intrepid example of Mr. Windham, allow that he has "no objection to inconsistencies in his conduct." This must be a considerable relief to him; for, when rebuked about his Saturdays in the last session, he betrayed symptoms of awkwardness, which, from his general carriage in the House, were not to be expected.

Lord Folkstone, instead of going privately to Duke Street, may now securely present himself in Cecil Street, and consult with the Editor of the Political Register on Sunday mornings, as in Rule 2.

These instances are just touched upon here as specimens of the whole, and to inform the reader what he has to expect as he goes along. Meanwhile, as to the Elements themselves, the judicious reader will see that they stand on the same footing with those of other sciences, which have generally been brought to perfection, before their Rules were composed. No Art of Poetry
was written, till Homer, and the "deep-mouthed" Pindar had sung. It is the same in the present case. Thanks to the events of the last two years, Opposition has reached its highest perfection, both in the temper and conduct of the parties concerned. It is time, therefore, that the Elements of Opposition should now be drawn forth from the practice of the Homers and Pindars of this branch of politics. They are equally "deep-mouthed" with any of those who have been celebrated by antiquity; they possess the same qualities, and produce the same emotions. With the Epic poets, they always delight in "contentions and warfare;" and with the Dihyrambic writers, they are generally "vehement and confused." With the tragedians too, they excite sometimes our "horror," and sometimes our "pity;" while that happy quality, which Aristotle distinguishes by the name of the TEAOION, is possessed by them in a remarkable manner, and may indeed be almost exclusively called their own.
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RULE 1.

How to get patriotic Assistance without doors.

As you may feel more resentment against Ministers, than even the present usage of Parliament will allow you to express within the walls; and as it may be of importance to you, on other accounts, to maintain an appearance of candour and moderation in your own language; it will be advisable to get some writer, of a genius calculated to do the coarser and more offensive sort of out of door work. Nobody can be more fit for your purpose, than the Editor of a Newspaper.

If you fix on a "Political Register," in preference to all other papers, you are justified in your choice, by its marked superiority in the requisite talents.
talents*. And if, notwithstanding its merits (which, it is strange, the world cannot be generally brought to allow), the sale of it may not defray the expenses, and satisfy the reasonable expectations of the Editor, you may lend him 3000 or 4000 pounds to help him on; certain of having your money again, if the work should ever succeed, and if, happily for yourself, the Ministry should be turned out.

Rule 2.

How to hold patriotic Consultations.

As an additional mean of strength (for "strength," as Solomon justly observes, "cometh from advice"), it may be prudent to secure occasional meetings at the house of some person friendly to your cause; if he should happen to have obligations to some of the party you mean to attack, so much the better, as he will be the last man to be suspected, and your meetings will be the more safe.—Some "vigorous statesman," no longer in office, will send his much-valued communications, till he abruptly withdraws, and chooses to act by himself. Some zealous War Minister, with no business at present on his

* It is hoped this compliment will be felt; for we have the authority of the Pol. Reg. itself, that the London press has been "always conspicuous for baseness!" Aug. 6, 1803.
hands, will attend in person, and bring with him, perhaps, some Clerk at War, equally disengaged, from another country.

These, with some Doctor of Laws (who has proved his attachment to Opposition, by forsaking every other "calling" for it), the Editor of your paper, and the host himself, will form a little senate, which Utica might envy for its patriotism and compactness. The time of meeting will of course be left to the host; his known discretion will not fail to fix on a Sunday morning.

Rule 3.

How to describe a Prime Minister.

Thus furnished, you may proceed with your offensive means. If you wish to disparage the Minifter himself, call him "an upstart of Reading"—Political Register, Sept. 10, 1803: "a low, talentless man"—Do. Sept. 17. "H. Addington, son of — Addington, M. D., raised no one knows why or wherefore, and supported in that situation no one knows how." —Pol. Reg. ditto.

If it is not enough to call him the son of a Doctor, make him a Doctor in his own person. Call him,

**Rule 4.**

*How to describe a whole Administration.*

Lest you should be accused of partiality in fixing upon the First Minister alone, you ought, in all conscience and delicacy, to bestow some general attention upon the Ministry in a body: call them, therefore, "a centipede Ministry," or "ignorant, low-bred, low-minded, selfish, crawling Ministers."—Pol. Reg. June 11. Compare them, in their management of public affairs, with the "idle and grovelling wretches who set fire to "the Abbey."—Pol. Reg. Aug. 6. Say, that "whatever there is of evil in the present state of "things, is their work; and whatever there is "of good (for, however grating it may be to al- "low any good, it cannot be denied), has been "produced in spite of them."—Pol. Reg. ditto.

If you wish to relieve your readers by a meta- phor, call your country a vessel, and say, that the vessel of state is committed "to an ignorant, "low-minded, and cowardly crew."—Pol. Reg. June 4. Then return to the old strain, call them "feeble creatures, whom God, in chastisement "for
"for our supineness, has permitted to be placed "over us:" and add, "I freely confess that I have "derided and contemned, and that I still do de- "ride and contemn the present Ministers." — Pol. "Reg. Sept. 3.

Rule 5.

How to characterize their Measures.

The measures of Ministers will, of course, be no better than their persons, and therefore should be described in the same manner; lest you should be charged with inconsistency. Accordingly, "the conduct of Ministers has been most scan- "dalous, if not highly criminal." — Pol. Reg. "Sept. 3. Their "acts are foolish, ungracious, and "wicked." — Do. Sept. 10. This "miserable, "selfish set of men have committed ten thousand "follies; for either of which, they would, at "any other period of our history, have been "driven from office." — Do. And altogether, "their conduct has been "the meanest, most dis- "honourable, most injurious, most silly, most "destructive, most disgraceful," &c. — Pol. Reg. "May 28.

If Ministers should be inclined to defend their measures, you may very properly say, that they are no gentlemen, and that you "will not be- "lieve anything they state, though accompanied "with
"with the most solemn affirmations."—Pol. Reg. June 4.

It is possible, indeed, that language of this sort may not please the generality of people, and the newspaper in which it is found, may be described by them, in terms borrowed from itself, as "nonsensical, as well as brutal and false"—Pol. Reg. June 11; or as "using every art to assist a bad cause, and taking a considerable liberty with facts."—Pol. Reg. June 25.

However, in all quarrels, the provocation is to be considered: if Ministers are in possession of those places which you ought to have, it is a manifest injustice on their part; and what can be said that is too bad for them?—Besides, the war you wage, is to be justified upon the footing of other wars. And if, in former times, it was lawful to fling serpent-pots * among the enemy's troops, and to bite, and sting, and poison them into a surrender; and if, in modern sea-fights, you are at liberty to heave stink-pots * and other noisome and noxious compositions on board the

* For the first of these particulars I am indebted to Hannibal; and for the second, to my much-esteemed acquaintance Hawfer Trunnion, Esq. a distinguished Commodore of his Majesty's navy.
enemy's ships; you have an equal right to employ Political Registers against the Ministry.

**Rule 6.**

*How to be moderate in Parliament.*

Such is the proper conduct of your hostility without doors, through the management of "Political Registers." Your own language in Parliament itself, should, as I just now said, be somewhat milder, though the animosity may be the same. Therefore you will be sure to state, that it was your earnest wish to give Ministers your support, for the good of your country; but that it is their own conduct, which alone has frustrated your disinterested and patriotic wishes. And you will take for your model the expressions of a great master in this branch of Parliamentary protestation, and say of Ministers, with an air of candid sorrow and solemn regret, that you are "unhappily disappointed" by them, and that you "no longer entertain any confidence in the "wisdom of their councils."—Lord Grenville, Dec. 15, 1802.

This is a sample of that "habit of tempered "pride," which, as the same great authority pronounced
nounced on another occasion, should always be brought to the "discussion of public business."

Rule 7.

How to be outrageous for the public Good.

However, if your habits of "tempered pride" should at any time forsake you, and you cannot help speaking out, you may say, after the same great authority, that "none but idiots or mad men" could have acted as Ministers have; that "you cannot help expressing your astonishment at the absurd conduct of Ministers"—that "every step of the conduct of Ministers has been a proof of their total incapacity to govern a great nation, in times of difficulty and danger"—that "they can form no judgment of the future from the comparison of the past"—that "they are men of weak understandings, and completely unfit for the elevated situation in which they at present move," &c. &c.—Lord Grenville, Nov. 23, 1802.

There may be people who will object to this language also, and suppose it part of an essay, intended originally for the "Political Register." And, indeed, the urbanity of Lord Lansdowne himself was so moved by a similar strain from the same quarter,
quarter, on a former occasion, that he pronounced it to be no better than "burting out "into a rant!"—Nov. 20, 1798. And on another such occasion he maintained, that the Noble Secretary "derived no inconsiderable aid "from a loud voice, a confident manner, and an "authoritative air."—March 1798.

But must a man's dignity and accustomed coolness never be departed from? If his general habits are those of a "tempered pride," most proper for the "discussion of public business," must he at no time indulge himself with "burting "ing out into a rant?" Is he perpetually bound to the same show of moderation? And shall he never have the privilege of losing his temper for the benefit of his country?

**Rule 8.**

*How to write about a successful Minister.*

But it is not enough to attack Ministers in the direct way, whether by a duly "tempered " pride," or " by rant, and a confident manner." There is another mode of attack, which may be called the "surprising mode." And this should be managed out of doors, in all cases where Parliament itself is sure to be against you.

If
If a Minister is rising fast in the public opinion, and you have good reason to hate him on that account; especially, if he has distinguished himself by any recent display of ability and conduct, which galls your mind, while it satisfies the nation at large; take a bold step at once, and have him represented as a "falling man."—"I address this to you" (Lord Hawkesbury), "not by way of insulting a FALLING MAN; but because," &c. —Pol. Reg. May 28, 1803.

The Correspondence with the French government had just been published, and we were cordially giving our approbation to the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, when, to our mortification, we discover that he is going down hill. This sort of attack, besides its other merits, has that of originality: for it would have been extremely difficult, perhaps wholly impossible, to find another person who could have conceived such a notion. It has the merit of boldness too; for none but a very brave man would have ventured on such a contradiction of the general prejudice of the country.

RULE 9.

_How to speak of any Thing which he defends._

There is another branch of this mode of attack: if such a Minister, as is above described, 

1  should
should support, with a marked degree of spirit, any institution or much-valued custom of your country, and if you should find it impossible to quarrel with his conduct, take a different, yet an effectual method: depreciate the thing itself, which he supports, and say, that he has thrown away his pains upon a foolish or a hurtful object.

The liberty of the press is more than usually dear to every Englishman; and in the dispatch of August 28, 1802, the Secretary for Foreign Affairs had strongly upheld this liberty. "His Majesty cannot, and never will, in consequence of any representation or any menace from a foreign power, make any concession, which can be in the smallest degree dangerous to the liberty of the press, as secured by the constitution of this country. This liberty is justly dear to every British subject." And, "His Majesty expects, that the French government will not interfere in the manner in which the government of his dominions is conducted, or call for a change in those laws, with which his people are perfectly satisfied," &c.

This, doubtless, is very proper and spirited, if the press has any real value in it; what then can be more advisable, than to deny that value altogether?
gether? Therefore, call the press a "folly," and you cut up a Minister's cause by the roots.

"The press has long been a favourite folly " in this island."—"To the press, we owe the " American rebellion—the rebellion in Ireland— " the rebellion, and the usurpation in France."—

The Editor's modesty stooped him short in his proof: but if the Minister will not yet allow his cause to be desperate, he cannot fail to yield, when it is added, that we are indebted to the press, not only for the rebellion of America—the rebellion of Ireland—and the rebellion and usurpation of France—but also, for the Political Register.

Rule 10.

How to correct Parliament and the People at large.

Your conduct has hitherto been so just and reasonable, so disinterested, as well as so calculated for the benefit of your country, that if you are listened to neither by Parliament, nor people, you have an undisputed right to abuse them all. As to the people at large, they are in the high road to ruin, and do not, or will not see it; and as to Parliament, it is grown so debased, that the honour
honour of the country is no longer an object with it. Thus, "a general and a deadly indifference pervades the land."—Pol. Reg. June 25.

And, "of nearly a thousand Lords and Commons, not one is found to wipe away the stain on the Government and the country."—Pol. Reg. June 11. And, the conduct of Parliament is "the most childish that ever was exhibited in any assembly of grown persons of either sex."—Pol. Reg. July.—And, "The Parliament supinely passes over folly after folly, and crime after crime."—Pol. Reg. Sept. 24.

It will be right also, not to spare the people in the galleries of the House; who, if they had any vigour in them, would interrupt the dull fittings of those lifeless legislators, and take the active part upon themselves, for the good of the nation. Call them a "tame and stupid crowd listening from the galleries: and say, that nothing can be so servile, "Buonaparte's mutes not excepted."—Pol. Reg. June 11.

Language of this sort, if properly persisted in, may some day have effect, and produce some beneficial commotion in the House.

Nor can it be reasonably supposed, that, under the present circumstances of the country, any body
body will object to your imputation of apathy to the people. The Ex-Minister at War declared in June last, that "no sense of its danger was manifested by the nation, but that sort of apathy, "indifference, and despair, which was a bad "omen of vigorous or effectual exertion." And we see by the present state of things (for not more than half a million of volunteers are enrolled in defence of their country), that this melancholy prediction has been fulfilled; as, indeed, have all the others which have proceeded from the same true quarter. But, to say the truth, this apathy has long hung upon the people; and a Noble Marquis can best tell us the fatal period from which the spirit of the country began to decline. Lord Lansdowne mournfully declared in March 1795, that "for some "years past the energy of Parliament appeared "to have been greatly on the decline." And not long after he expressed his patriotic hope, that "when Englishmen resumed their native "character, shook off the torpor that so strangely "numbed their faculties, and once more felt "as Englishmen, they would see, &c."

Alas! alas! England has not been what it was since the Noble Marquis himself left office!
Rule 11.

How to get rid of Malta.

If the Ministry are engaged in negotiations, that have for their object the obtaining of some important post, without which the interests of the country may be exposed to great danger from the enemy, it is highly just and proper to attempt to prove that they ought not to have it.

For instance: in order to demonstrate that the British Government has nothing to do with the disposal of Malta, say, that "the Maltese "allege, and with great truth, that they them- "selves subdued the French force, and won the "island."—Pol. Reg. May 23, 1803. At the same time say, that "the Maltese had nearly "gotten possession of all the forts on the side of "the Great Port opposite Valetta; but they failed "in the attempt, and they remained to the day "of the surrender of Valetta, in the hands of the "French."—Pol. Reg. Ditto.

If any ill-natured person should press you upon this point, and ask, who then took the island, and did that for the Maltese which they could not do for themselves? and if you should allow that "the British fleet appeared "off Malta, and assisted them with mortars, "cannon,"
"cannot," &c. ; that "General Pigot took the "command, and that the garrison capitulated to "him"—Pol. Reg. Ditto; doubtles the con-
fusion is an unlucky one, as it undoes the chief argument brought against the cause of your country. However, he is but a sorry oppositionist who can be blanked by one piece of mis-
fortune. There is another method of succeed-
ing according to

Rule 12. Or,

How to make Distinctions.

Put the whole case upon a new footing (for the old one will not do), and say, that if we had a principal share in the enterprife, our allies were to be considered in the final settlement; but that if they were principals, and we assisted them, we were indeed no allies at all, but only auxiliaries, and therefore entitled to nothing.

"If we were principals, our allies were engaged with us; and therefore, if we won the "island by force of arms, those allies were enti-
"tled to their share of the prize."—Pol. Reg.
May 28, 1803.

But "The Maltese being the principals, the "right of conquest belongs to them of course; for 
"the
the auxiliary has no right to any share in the
"booty or conquest."—Ditto.

Left any body should doubt the force of a distinction valid only against your country, put on an air of bravery, and say, "It is a maxim in which all the writers on public law agree."—Ditto. Having got thus far with some shadow of success (for the poor reader must be supposed by this time to be sufficiently dazzled by the quick changing of allies into auxiliaries, and of auxiliaries back again into allies), it will be advisable, as in all such cases, to wind up the whole with a strong and well-timed sally against the Ministers. Say, that "the conduct of Ministers as to Malta assumes a die particularly dark;" that "they are justly chargeable with wilful perverseness, or crimes of a still blacker nature;" and that "for confounding these characters (viz. allies and auxiliaries) so accurately distinguished by all the writers on public law, they are justly accused with attempting an act the most unjust, cruel, and perfidious, that ever entered into the heart of man," &c.—Pol. Reg. May 28.
Rule 13.

How to prove that the Maltese Deputies do not know what they mean.

If the Maltese Deputies declare a reluctance to return under the power of the Knights, dwell upon so favourable a circumstance, and say, "Here are the true griefs of the injured Maltese!"—Pol. Reg. June 11.

But if they afterwards write, that, in consequence of what has been done by the steadfastness of this country, they are perfectly satisfied, insist upon it that their letter is merely a private one; but that, if it bears any other construction (for it is of importance that there should be a public grudge from the people of Malta against the British Government), the language of the Deputies "must be regarded as of no validity."—Pol. Reg. Ditto.

Some people may wonder, perhaps, that you will risk yourself in this manner. But such people must be completely ignorant of the duties that are required in a good and faithful oppositionist, and therefore their opinion is not worth regarding. Besides, your discredit elsewhere is amply recompensed by the just applause of your own
own party. The Sunday Morning Senate will say, "Here is an intrepid man, who, for the sake of three or four of us, will utter such things as must infallibly ruin his name with every other person." And in what age of the world has not a virtuous patriotism been content with such an approbation as this? To shun the opinions of the many, and to think with the few, was always a mark of wisdom; and this distinction you enjoy beyond almost all former example; for as this sort of wisdom is generally understood to increase as the number of the party diminishes, of course you have very nearly the exclusive possession of so envied an honour.

Rule 14.

How to prove your Country in the wrong.

When the nation is engaged in a war of more than common importance, and it is impossible to deny the substantial justice of our cause; at all events contrive to say that appearances are otherwise; for, if so, of course every attempt to defend Ministers must fall to the ground. "The "war is generally regarded as unjust;" and to ninety-nine persons out of a hundred "England "appears to be the aggressor. This indeed is not "the fact," &c.—Pol. Reg. June 11. Now if a common reader should from hence conclude,
that therefore the cause of England is, notwithstanding appearances, a good cause, you must correct so wrong an inference by making the quantity of the ill appearance amount to a positive viciousness in the cause itself. "We are entered on the war on grounds absolutely false."

—Ditto. This is what is called "sticking to a man's text" in an exemplary manner. But there is a peculiar happiness in this mode of arguing, which must not be passed by without notice. The sentences above quoted follow each other in the same page; and every writer on the side of Opposition is desired to take notice, that when it is intended to bear out a contradiction, this is the best way of proceeding. Common

* The great failure appears to be this—"There is no single specific cause" for the present war; "nothing that can be named; and hence it is, that the French have all along had the better of the argument."—Pol. Reg. July.

The same sort of objection was made by Tom Paine against the Constitution: "There was no single book" of the Constitution "written by authority, and which might be taken down from the shelf for reference," &c.; and therefore the Jacobins "had all along the better of the argument."—N. B. Mr. Plowden's thick book of the Constitution was not then written. As to the war itself, the testimony of Sir Francis Burdett happily agrees with that of the Political Register: "We are engaged in a war, the object of which is as indefinite as that of the last war."—July 25.
writers contradict themselves tremblingly as it were, and at long and distant intervals. But to say and unsay in a moment is an undertaking safe through its very boldness; for the reader, not suspecting that you can be so adventurous without some foundation for your conduct, will perhaps give you credit for certain secret reasons which as yet he does not know, but which he will be inclined to allow for. And thus may people be taught to hesitate at least about that justice in their country's cause, which after all cannot be disproved.

Rule 15.

*How to make Apologies for the Enemy.*

When some part of the enemy's conduct is more than usually outrageous, and it would be wholly impossible to deny it, some management must be called in, by saying, that it is a difficult point, and that you cannot as yet make up your mind about it.

"Whether France has or has not a right to make war upon the Elector of Hanover by way of avenging herself upon the King of England, is a question, the discussion of which we leave to," &c. — *Pol. Reg. June 11.*
Rule 16.

How to be amused with the Sufferings of your Countrymen.

The former method is to be adopted when, whatever your wishes may be, you are conscious that you have little or nothing to say. But perverseness of any kind is better than silence. There is therefore a variety in this sort of justification, which is likely to be more successful. When you have done your utmost to serve the enemy's cause, but find you cannot avoid the conclusion that must be drawn in favour of your country, endeavour to spare the unpleasantness of a forced concession by raising a joke. Whether it be clumsy or not, no matter; it will at all events serve to distract the attention of the reader, and this is something gained.

First, you may put on a carelessness as to the sufferings of Englishmen, and hint (as under the former rule) that, "as to the illegality, injustice, or cruelty, of throwing the English in France into prison, you can have very little to say."—Pol. Reg. June 4.

If your readers will not bear this, take an early opportunity of confessing, that to be sure such
such a proceeding is somewhat cruel and unjust; but insist, at the same time, that it is so much a matter of course, that every body ought to be aware of it; and then apply your joke—"If you will play with a tiger, you must take care of his claws."—Pol. Reg. June 11.

Rule 17.
How to choose the Time of calling for Peace or War.

During a peace, it is your duty to call for war at all events. When a war is forced upon your country, whether we would have it or not, it is equally your duty to say, that "we ought not to have begun it without allies."—Pol. Reg. June 16. And then by way of accommodating your country, to whose prosperity you are always attached, endeavour to persuade the rest of Europe to stand aloof, and give us no assistance whatever. "This is the only reply "Ministers ought to receive to every overture "they may attempt to make towards obtaining "continental allies."—Pol. Reg. Ditto.

Rule 18.
How to make Maps.

If you dislike a peace upon the principle on which you dislike a war, get a map made, on purpose to shew the prodigious extent of any ceded
ceded territory. Manage it so as to make one degree of latitude stretch as far as two, and confound the Arawari river with the Amazon. This will extinguish, in the minds of your readers, every remembrance of the poor Portuguese, who are still left in quiet possession of the intermediate country. Then triumphantly tell the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, that had it not been for the "shoeless wretch upon Garlick Hill," who chiselled out your map for you, he would never have known how much territory he had given away; and that, to the eternal shame of England, and the irreparable loss occasioned to a faithful ally, he had brought the French down upon the very bank of the Amazon.—Pol. Reg. April 24.

It will also be proper that the same thing should be said in Parliament itself, lest the world should not believe it. Accordingly we find, on the authority of a "vigorous statesman," as well as of the "shoeless" geographer, that the French have now a "naval arsenal at the mouth of the "Amazon river!"—Lord Grenville, Nov. 3, 1801.
Rule 19.

How to believe the Enemy in preference to your Country.

If you dislike an administration, it is an approved method to believe all that the enemy says. Assert therefore with boldness, upon the faith of Talleyrand, notwithstanding the satisfaction of the country at large at the late correspondence with the French Government, that "the French accusation is just, of our omitting the necessary papers in the Correspondence." — *Pol. Reg.* June 11. You may add, that "for aught you know to the contrary, the papers offered to Parliament may be forged." For do not the French themselves hint this? and, as Autolycus reasonably asks, why should it be supposed that they "carry lies about?"

In short, this sort of conduct is highly amiable; and whatever the opinion of the public may have been as to the past brutality, &c. of the writer, he is to be congratulated on the recent acquisition of so gentle a spirit*: for to believe

* Upon the recommendation of friends he was, some time since, put to school to learn a few of the graces. This happy change is said to have taken place from the time Lord Folkstone thought proper to visit him in private. And now he introduces common phrases with "as the vulgar say," &c.
a public enemy is only to shew that, notwithstanding the provocation of hostilities, truth is your whole and sole object.

Rule 20.

How to talk of what you do not know.

None of the common opportunities of injuring Ministers will be neglected of course. But if there should be an happy prospect of doing them a disservice by introducing his Majesty's name into any transaction of which the enemy may chose to talk, it ought on no account to be passed by. For instance, if a French newspaper afferts, that the capitulation of Hanover was sent over to be "ratified by the King of "England," take it for granted that the Council which met soon after the arrival of a messenger from the continent, was held for the purpose of this ratification, and for no other. Then say, here is the "disgraceful secret." The French must have to declare our fall to all the world.—Pol. Reg. July. And then with much appearance of feeling for his Majesty (for a breach between him and his Ministers ought to be your object in the different treatment of them), you may launch out against the mischievous advice of those to whom the King "owes the degrada-

tion of this compliance," &c. If, indeed, a subsequent letter from the Hague says (for the
disavowal must not come from Paris itself), "the King of England has refused to ratify the "Convention concluded with General Mor-
"tier," &c. Still you are to be commended, for you have done your best. When you asserted the ratification, people in general might think you spoke truth; and surely it was not your business to take away from the effect of your own assertion, by confessing that, for aught you knew, it was false. But, indeed, the blame can belong to none but the Ministers themselves, who are so provokingly prudent that they will not speak out, and betray the public business to the Political Register. Your proper revenge is therefore to propagate the worst kind of rumours against them for their obstinacy: and if the falsehood of your report should afterwards be known to everybody, at all events you have had the benefit of it for a certain time. When a member of the French Convention was reminded that what he had just affirmed would be known to be a mensonge in four-and-twenty hours, he answered, with the intrepidity of a true patriot, "And what need have "I of my mensonge for a longer time?"

**Rule 21.**

*How to justify yourself.*

If people are inclined to condemn you for believing the enemy in these instances, justify your-
self by your own conduct on former occasions; for "precedents are always valuable." At the opening of the campaign in St. Domingo, which you always predicted must fall under the arms of France *, Leclerc wrote home, that after a general and obstinate action, he had "ten men " killed and forty wounded." Accordingly, with all love of truth, you stated them to be exactly "ten men killed, and forty wounded." —Pol. Reg. During the late war, indeed, when your "vigorous" friends were in office, and you had no reason to hate Ministers, your language was, that if the French papers talked of the loss of "hundreds," the number was always to be interpreted into "thousands." But when an administration is changed, a man has a fair right to act according to circumstances, and to

* This "always" must be understood from the time when it became necessary to use arms against Toussaint. When first the armament failed from France, we all know the attachment of Toussaint to Buonaparte; and that the projected reduction of St. Domingo was in fact no more than a feint to cover the real plan against Jamaica. "That Toussaint is "to all intents and purposes an officer, and a faithful officer "under Buonaparte, is a fact which, in Mr. Cobbett's Let-
ters to Mr. Addington, is established upon proof as good as "that which our laws require to decide on the death of a criminal. "This being the case, the reduction of Toussaint to obedience "must be regarded as a mere cover to some hostile designs "against the possessions of England."—Pol. Reg. Jan. 16, 1802.
change his method of argument. Accordingly, you may now, with due preservation of your consistency, let French figures stand as they are. It was upon the same principle that, when the French Admiral wrote privately to Jamaica, that the Cape was "reduced to ashes," and demanded succour, and when the French papers at home narrowed the loss to three or four houses only, you very humanely preferred the latter statement.

Upon the same principle too you asserted (Pol. Reg. June 11), that the French "were "still in possession of every important post and "town in St. Domingo, and had from 25 to "30,000 European troops, and 10,000 blacks," &c.

Early in July indeed it became necessary to confess, that "it was credible that the French "part of St. Domingo had been evacuated!"—However, before you allowed this, you proved that you had done every thing to justify your first assertion in favour of France, and to establish the credit of their statements. And never yet was it known in any country where justice was at all esteemed, that a man should not write as well as speak in his own defence. You did right, therefore, in keeping up the French army as long as possible,
On stately tilts exulting, though undone."

And the consistency of your present conduct is proved by these instances of your patriotism on other occasions.

**Rule 22.**

*How to prevent Ministers from raising Money.*

Your purpose being to embarrass the Minister in every thing, you must be on the watch, and object to whatever he does. The contradiction, as it is called, must not be too seriously thought of. It is too common a case to be much regarded, and you must bring yourself off as handsomely as you can. For instance, if a Minister is disposed to raise money by loan, endeavour to terrify him from it, and say, "the national debt has arrived at that point beyond which it cannot go."—Pol. Reg. June 18. If he endeavours to raise a chief part of the expenditure within the year by strong taxes, endeavour to make him forget the first alarm you gave him, and return to a preference of what you had before declared to be impracticable. "As to the principle (viz. of raising the money within the year), it may, in a pecuniary point of view, be good sometimes, but not always. To begin a "funding system, and to continue such a system when begun, are measures widely different from each
"each other," &c. And when a poor Minister is once more set afloat by this suggestion, and is looking wistfully towards the loan which you had made him abandon, address yourself to the loan-mongers; tell them, that whoever furnishes another loan to the Minister, "deserves to "die in a workhouse." Then terrify the small stockholders, who are the most easy to be alarmed, and, at the same time, the least likely to find out your true secret: tell them, "let the "widows, the orphans, the aged, the infirm, "the helpless stockholders of every description, "take care; let them beware in time."—Pol. Reg. June 18. These are the true methods, if a Minister will but hearken to them, of reducing him to a complete stand; for all things are equally impolitic or unjust, the moment he ventures upon them, and thus is he reduced to sit still, and do nothing at all.

Rule 23.

How to help Ministers out with Advice.

However, there may be people who perhaps will hardly think it reasonable to offer a Minister nothing but contradiction for his choice; therefore let there be an inlet for some kind of plan, though it will be prudent not to make it too inviting; the comfort you mean to offer should rather
rather border upon the terrible: say then that there is still a way left for retrieving the national credit; it is—a "national bankruptcy!*"—Pol. Reg. July.

If people should look with amazement on such a proposal, you may say, that "credit, capital, and confidence did once depend upon the "moral character of nations;" and that "the "character and pecuniary means of the nations "of Europe respectively" were a good support in other times; but now, &c.—Besides, "what "we gain in credit, we lose in courage."—Pol. Reg. Sept. 10.

Then express your confidence, that what you advise is "the only thing that can save the mo-""narchy:" and if people are in more and more consternation, and cannot comprehend you, as-"sure them at once that your plan would "raise "this nation to a degree of power and glory "that it never before attained."—Pol. Reg. July.

* And again, "We have an enemy within as well without, "I mean bank-notes."—Pol. Reg. Oct. 8.
Rule 24.

How to prove your Patriotism against Calumniators.

The above proposals on your part, which are quite voluntary (for your advice was never asked), manifest, beyond a doubt, that you have the welfare of your country at heart: you have therefore the best right to stand upon the integrity of your conduct, and to disclaim the imputation of all unhandsome proceedings. You may affirm (and you have the countenance of Sir F. Burdett in holding such language), that "the insinuations which you have observed in "the public prints relative to your opinion of the "funds, are malignant."—Pol. Reg. July. Or you may say, "Shall I be told that I am here ex-"pressing a wish to see the credit of my country "destroyed?" (viz. by preventing Government from raising any money whatever by loans or taxes.)—"Very like I may; but far different "are my wishes."—Pol. Reg. June 18.

There is no person that ought not to believe you. He is no skilful Oppositionist who wishes to see the credit of his country destroyed. The only object is to see it distressed; and just so far distressed, as to make a change of Ministers acceptable to the nation. When that is accomplished,
plished, we all know how loudly the welfare of the country is proclaimed: then every thing pro-
spers, which was so lately in the "gulf of destruc-
tion;" then the "Saturnian age" returns, &c. &c. But till then, you have a right to express your persuasion, that the contractors for loans will never be able to make good their payments; nay, you have an equally good right to say that "you should not be at all sorry for it."—Pol. Reg. July. For this ruin of the contractors, and the consequent distress of Government, are precisely the things calculated to hasten the "Saturn-"nian age."

**Rule 25.**

*How to recommend new Ministers.*

This patriotic desire of saving a falling coun-
try, qualifies you at once for saying, that there can be no hope of any help, while the present Ministry "have the conducting of the national "concerns."—Pol. Reg. June 11. Indeed, you are justified in calling upon Parliament to suspend even the most urgent measures of self-de-
defence, and to leave the country exposed to the attacks of the enemy, rather than owe your safety to such Ministers. "Why does Parlia-
ment amuse itself with questions about the for-
tifying of London, &c.? Why do they not

If, then, the present Ministers are at all events to be discharged, and if the country will not be content without a Ministry of some sort (notwithstanding the wholesome advice of Mr. Grey), of course you will recommend your own friends. Some one of them in Parliament will lead the way for you, and express his fears that "the "spirit of the country will be broken, unless its "councils are directed by 'abler men."—Lord Grenville, May 1802. And then it will be easy for you to point out those "abler men," who could not so conveniently name themselves.

"The best security would be, first of all, the "removal from power of those persons who "were concerned in advising the peace. The "next thing that naturally presents itself, is to "give the power to those who disapproved of the "peace."—Pol. Reg. May 28.

Nor does such a recommendation on your part at all take away from that character of disinterestedness which you should appear to possess; for all recommendations ought to flow from knowledge; and it is clear, from the manner in which you speak of your friends, that you
are far better acquainted with their talents for government than the rest of the world.

Rule 26.

How to talk about secret Affairs.

If you would be thought to be better acquainted than the generality of people with the interior of affairs, it will be for your credit to lay open to the public from time to time the secret causes of great events. Why was the peace of Amiens made? From no serious wish of relieving the country from the heavy burden of a long and exhausting war, but merely from the desire Ministers had of "keeping their places!"
—Pol. Reg. passim.

On the other hand, why are the same Ministers who made the peace, now engaged in war? Apparently, from no resolution whatever to maintain the honour of the country, but with the sole intention of losing their places. This must be their only object, for we have the authority of the Pol. Reg. over and over, that they are not competent to conduct the war.

But till the true cause of the actual spirit of Ministers makes its appearance in the Pol. Reg. you
you may inform us of the secret springs of the conduct of one person, with which, if you are able to explain it, certainly you alone are acquainted. Why, on a late occasion (the debate on the correspondence with the French government), did Mr. Pitt refuse to vote against Ministers? Not because he did not wish to oppose them, but (audiant coeli & audiat terra) he feared the ascendency of Mr. Windham!

"He would not contribute to raise Mr. Windham to that eminence to which he knows "him to be better entitled than himself. "This is the great and leading object," &c. &c.—Pol. Reg. June ii.

Left this should be doubted, reference may be made to a former number of the Pol. Reg. which was a well-judged preparation of our minds for the true cause of the secret jealousy of the late Minister against the ascendency of Mr.

* More secrets of Mr. Pitt. "It is right the public should know, that, with respect to Malta, Mr. Pitt was most shamefully deceived by the Ministers. They laid before him every statement in favour of the surrender of that invaluable possession; but all the statements against it, all the remonstrances of the Maltese themselves, and all the memorials of other persons, they carefully hid from his sight; and thus they cheated him into an approbation of the most flagitious part of their conduct."—Pol. Reg. Sept. 17. If it is right the public should know this, it is right Mr. Pitt should know it too.

Windham.
Windham. "All the sound part of the nation "look to him (Mr. W.) at this crisis for the "reasons whereon to form their opinions both of "men and measures!"—June 4.

That this opinion concerning Mr. W. is well founded, and justly formidable to Mr. Pitt, must farther appear from the exemplary discharge of his parliamentary duty in the late session. "Mr. "Windham is attentive to his duty*, lending "all the weight of his talents," &c.—Pol. Reg. July.

Mr. Windham has talents of another sort, though not in such plenty as might be desired. If he lends the weight of these talents too (see Rule 1), it will naturally help the reader to account for some of the secret causes of things, and particularly for the jealousy of Mr. Pitt against the ascendency of Mr. Windham.

Rule 27.
How to decide national Quarrels.

If the enemy threatens your country, and it becomes necessary to defend it, you may say that

* Not so Mr. Pitt. In the last session he pretended "illness" as an excuse for absence; and at present does nothing but "listen to his own praises from the lips of five hired "hackney fingers."—Pol. Reg. Oct. 8.

the
the measure is "more calculated to increase the "danger, than to diminish it."—Pol. Reg. July. And left it should be supposed that it is only the present method of defence which you dislike, go to the principle itself, and cut up all defence, root and branch. Say, that "a defensive system "is ruinous, and ruinous in proportion as the "system itself is complete."—Ditto. This being so, we have only to hope that Ministers may blunder; for if they succeed in making us invulnerable, we are infallibly undone. But to save trouble in forming plans for the security of the country, it might be more advisable to adopt the quick and efficacious measure recommended by the Political Register: for the only way to meet Buonaparte, is "to abolish Sunday-schools, "soup-shops, and Philanthropic societies."—Ditto. That is, to turn out one entire nation of beggars and infidels against another, and to let them fight it out!

Rule 28.

How to approve Measures, and censure Men.

In Parliament itself, indeed, a different language must be used upon any proposal of an increase of the forces in time of danger. If you cannot but allow the proposal to be in itself a proper one, still you will remember who you are,
are, and what is naturally expected from you: you will therefore be sure not to commend the measure too much, but, while you vote for it, contrive to have a drawback on other accounts. You may say, that "the proposition receives "your hearty concurrence, because it is the "strongest censure on the Ministry" from whom it came.—Lord Grenville, Nov. 23, 1802. Or if this strain is too lofty for you (for none but a great master can manage well this sort of "concordia discord"), you may still give your vote from "a conviction of the necessity of the "measure, but not from any approbation of the "Ministers who advised it."—Lord Temple, Dec. 1802. To this you have a right to add (for acquiescence, however forced and ungracious, is yet acquiescence, and ought to be allowed for in some other way), that though Ministers are, in the present instance, doing what you must commend, yet they are unfit for their office, and that you know but "one gentleman proper for "the station of Minister," &c.—Ditto. "And "now I remember me, his name is ———."

Since last year, indeed, another gentleman has been proposed for saving the country; a Gentleman (see Rule 26) better entitled to do us that service than the one gentleman himself, and justly formidable to him from his ascendancy: a Gen-
a Gentleman, in short, to whom "all the sound "part of the nation look at this crisis," &c.

But whether we are to be saved by one or the other Gentleman, it is proper, as a previous measure, to get rid of the present Ministers; therefore you will not fail to say, that "you and "your friends see the danger of the country, "and are ready to confess the almost impossibility "of success under the present circumstances."

And if people complain that you dispirit the country by such talking, you may very truly reply, that you are not rightly understood. "You "know the country possesses energy and re- "sources" (which of course would presently shew "themselves if your own family were in office), "but the present Ministry are unable to call them "forth."—Lord Temple, Nov. 24, 1802.

**Rule 29.**

*How to describe a new Minister.*

However, as the country may not like the exclusive claims of one family, and as another candidate has been proposed, it is every way fair and proper to state his qualifications. His particular friends, indeed, to whom he lends the weight of his talents, are content with promising the
the country that he is more fit for the eminent station of First Minister, than any other person; that Mr. Pitt is jealous of his ascendancy; and that all the sound part of the nation look to him at this crisis, &c. This is too modest, and it ought to be shewn by particulars, how just, as well as disinterested, such a recommendation is. The qualifications, therefore, for a First Minister ought to be the following:

1.

He should be himself alarmed, and fond of alarms in other men. Such a man will compliment Lord Mornington for having described things “in so masterly and alarming a manner.” Accordingly we find, that these very words were used by Mr. Windham Jan. 1794.

2.

Such a man, if accused of inconsistency, will immediately allow it, and disarm an opponent at once; for where is the use of urging a man upon a point which he readily grants, and about which he appears to be utterly careless?

“He had no objection to suppose inconsistency in his language on two occasions of a similar nature,” viz. voluntary contributions.
He would not answer how far "an eager desire to carry his immediate purpose, might have hurried him in the assertions he made use of." And, "perhaps in the eagerness of debate he had employed expressions with inconsiderate warmth." Mr. W. April 7, 1794.

After this, Mr. Grey had no need to express the "pain he felt, that a Gentleman should treat even his own opinions so lightly, as to say he had inconsiderately taken up arguments which he could not justify, for the sake of carrying his purpose for the moment; and that he should do this at a solemn meeting of his county. And what must be thought of a Gentleman acting with such levity?"

Mr. Grey, we all know, is very properly tenacious of an opinion once expressed. But the future Minister of this country is well read in that great master of nature, Shakespeare, and acts upon the magnanimous plan of indifference to any thing he may have said or done. When Justice Shallow upbraided Falstaff with having broken into his park, and stolen his deer, "I have, Master Shallow," replied Falstaff, "I have—so I hope that's answered."
3.

Under the protection of this courageous indifference (a better protection than a "sevenfold shield"), such a man will securely praise in 1795 a motion concerning volunteer corps, because it went farther than the former measures of 1778 and 1782, and "made the force applicable to the defence of the whole of the country." And in 1803 he will as securely condemn the measure which establishes and extends the principle itself of 1795, and will prove that the volunteer force is no better than an "armed rabble," fit only to "consume provisions," to "choak up the roads," and to "stand in the way of the regulars."

4.

Such a man will say in 1803, that the country cannot meet France single-handed, for it is "out of condition to go to war."—March 9. Nor will he care if an opponent reminds him, that in Dec. 1794 he maintained, "it was not the character of the English to despond. Fer-
severance and invincibility were their characteristics: they had met France single-

* "I despise the rabble of volunteers."—Pol. Reg. Sept. 17.
"handed in her proudest day." Or that in Jan. 1795 he "warned the House not to be led away by the motives that induced Gentlemen on the other side to paint the situation of the country as they had done!"

Let other men be sure when contradictions are proved upon them; nothing of this sort can move the man who has "no objection to suppose inconsistencies in his language."

5.

Such a man will say in 1803, that regular troops alone are fit to meet an enemy, and that "the militia and other corps are no better than a mob" in comparison of them: nor is it any thing to him, if in Nov. 1795 he undertook to answer Gen. M'Leod's objections to fencible troops (viz. that they could only defend the kingdom from invasion, or preserve its internal tranquillity), and to maintain, that "it might as well be asked, Of what use were any troops at all? They were of double use, because they might be employed against the attacks of a foreign enemy; and they might be raised with greater facility than other troops, because they were not to go out of the country." And it is equally immaterial to him, that in Dec. 1797 he proved the sencibles to have also this advantage,
tage, that "they partook more of the nature of a "militia, than of regular troops!"

But other men may contradict themselves, and forget it after a few years. The future Minister of this country will, in the same year, and very nearly in the same debate, contradict himself, and forget it, or (which is the same thing) will care nothing for the consequences. He will talk of the merit of regular troops alone for all purposes, offensive or defensive; and in a moment these invaluable regulars shall be turned about their business. "Nothing but the line can defend us, and all levies should be into the line." But "the best method of defending the country, is to fight like the Vendeans—that is, "behind trees, and bushes, and walls!" Now, a common debater would endeavour to secure himself in the best manner he could, when pressed by an opponent under circumstances so unexpected and untoward. If upbraided with abandoning the country to the protection of bush-fighters, he would answer, "All the world knows "with what vehemence I dwelt on the exclusive "advantages of the line." And if attacked on this undue preference of the line, he would turn upon his antagonist, and briskly ask, "Did I "not extol an armed peasantry above the line "itself?" And, to say the truth, it is conve-
nient enough to set out with two principles of opposite natures, and to take refuge in either, as necessity may require. But the destined Minister of this country scorns these subterfuges, which are more calculated for ordinary men. He has "no objection to suppose inconsistency" in any thing he says; and though some people may not like inconsistency in a Minister, surely much more is gained on the ground of intrepidity; a quality particularly acceptable in dangerous times like these.

6.

Such a man will go to war for any thing. "Any spot upon the earth or sea, though fit only for the contention of seals and sea-gulls, may assume a much more important aspect, and become a legitimate subject of diplomatic interference, if honour is connected with it." —Mr. Windham, Nov. 1801.

And hence we may see how unreasonable Burnet was in saying that it seemed an odd thing for France to go to war formerly about some old furniture of the Dutchess of Orleans. But, on the other hand, the future Minister of this country shall say whenever he pleases, that honour is nothing, and interest every thing; nor shall he care for the contradiction.

"I will
"I will put the point of honour out of the question. I will not push it to a wild, extravagant, and chivalrous excess; for national honour, when rightly understood, is, generally speaking, nothing more than national interest. In general, there is nothing dishonourable in giving up this or that, when it is not disadvantageous to the national interest."—Mr. Windham, Nov. 1802.

It is the privilege of greatness to be careless about itself, while it draws the attention of all towards it. Thus the destined Minister of this country talks as his humour suggests; and all parties look to him as their patron. To the high-flying spirits he carries himself, as he well expresses it, in a "wild, extravagant, and chivalrous excess." And while he is in this humour, he will deplore neither the destruction of commerce, nor the decay of manufactures, nor the loss of resources, nor the total annihilation of national wealth."—Mr. Windham, 1797.

Nor will he have any objection (if he is pushed upon the question) to hold out to his brave countrymen, the inviting prospect of a never-ending war, if the country should be so fortunate as to have him for First Minister!

"It is asked, Are we, on the principles I have laid down, to wage an eternal war?—I answer, that,
"that, on the principles I have stated, it is clear
"that there is an eternal resolution on the part
"of France, to destroy this country: and I am
"unable to see any other alternative!"—Mr. Wind-
ham, Nov. 7, 1801. But in a moment, this high
fire shall stop, and to the money-getters it
shall be proclaimed, that the beginning and the
end of all wars, is interest alone; for "honour,
"when rightly understood, is nothing more than
"interest:" and the nation may give up any
thing, when it is not "disadvantageous to the
"national interest" to part with it. Who does
not see, from all this, that Mr. Pitt has great
reason to be "jealous of the ascendency of Mr.
"Windham," and that the one gentleman,
who "alone is proper for the station of First
"Minister," is far exceeded by the other gen-
tleman; who "lends the weight of his talents,"
and to whom "all the sound part of the nation
"look, at this crisis, for their opinions" con-
cerning honour, and interest, and everlasting
hostilities.

7.

Such a man will say, "he had learnt from ex-
perience, that when he rose to deliver an opi-
inion in the House, it was necessary to do it
"with caution and moderation." The same
man will be in a passion whenever he pleases;
and when called to order for his excesses, will defend his intemperance, and maintain that "anger has its privileges."—Mr. Windham, April 1796. And surely, if any person is to be thus privileged, it should be the First Minister of this country; and the House may look forward with satisfaction, to the experience it will have of it, when the "Saturnian age" arrives.

8.

Such a man will occasionally draw other men's characters, as if he did not intend to go far from home in the mean time. "Some people interpret matters with a foolish sort of nicety, the fence of poverty or chicane."—Nov. 1795. And the same man will profess to call his hearers to a "common sense view of a question."—Feb. 1799.

9.

If people doubt of his "common sense views" of things, he will soon speak in such a manner, as to convince them of his accuracy and judgment. On the case of O'Connor, for example, he will prove himself better qualified for discussion than any other person; because he knows nothing at all of the subject. "Being totally unacquainted with the facts in the case, he came to the discussion, better qualified to consider it: \[5\] with
with respect also to the law in the case, he did "not pretend to know very accurately how it "flood. Thus, was he, in his own mind; most "free from all those feelings, which the know-
"ledge of such circumstances might excite, and "fully prepared," &c.—Mr. Windham, June 1798.

10.

If people cannot yet enter into his "common "sense views" of things, he will not fail to con-
vince them by the following reasonings:—if his argument is boxing, he will prove the dignity of human nature to consist in the strength of a man's fist; "for boxing is connected with ideas "of personal merit and individual dignity."—Mr. Windham, May 1802. This reconciles things apparently opposite; and Marcus Cato and Belcher are happily made to shake hands.

If he is to talk of bull-baiting, he will say, that the tendency of it is "to improve the war-
"like spirit of the country." Then, in order to excuse the practice of it, he will say, that, so far from having increased, it has "of late years con-
"siderably diminished."—Mr. Windham, April 1800. Then he will add, that the English are the bravest people in the world!—Ditto.
Again, in order to show the importance of bull-baiting to the constitution, he will say, that "bull-baiting is an ancient sport," and "that respect for antiquity is the best preservation of "the church and state."—May 1802. So that all the world must acknowledge the preservation of church and state to depend upon the preservation of bull-baiting.

Again, "The Staffordshire militia were chosen "to do duty about the King:" therefore we have "a pretty good proof that bull-baiting does not "produce bad effects on the morals of the people."—Mr. Windham, May 24, 1802.

Again, "The bull exhibits no kind of terror:" therefore it is demonstrable proof, that he feels "some kind of pleasure."—May 5, 1802.

But this method of representing the cogent reasonings of the future Minister of this country, is injurious to them. In order, therefore, to convince those who may yet be incredulous, as to his "common sense views" of things, some of these arguments shall be stated in a logical way. If they will bear this test, no one will hereafter dare to dispute them; for it is allowed on all hands, that logic is nothing but common sense reduced to shape and method.
Bull-baiting improves courage.—But, Bull-baiting has diminished.—Therefore, We beat all the world.

This syllogism appears to fall under DARII, as follows:

\[ \text{DA- (All) Bull-baiting improves courage.} \]
\[ \text{RI- Bull-baiting (in England) has diminished.} \]
\[ \text{I. We (Englishmen) beat all the world.} \]

But I do not know if BARBARA itself will not do better for it; for the term bull-baiting in the major, was probably used with a view to England alone, though universal in its possible application. But even thus, it may be used for an universal in this place; and then the minor and conclusion will be universal too. For, if Socrates may be an universal, because (as logicians say) "Omnis ille Socrates tantum unus est,"—bull-baiting (though meant of England alone) may well have the same force; because, "Omnis illa taurorum agitatio tantum una est" (unius scilicet regionis, id est, Britanniae). I only mention this, for the sake of shewing how strong the argument must be, which is equally proved under two of those direct modes that are allowed by all to be "certo ac necessarió consequentes."

The
The next syllogism may be placed at once in **Barbara**.

**BAR** - Love of antiquity preserves church and state.

**B A -** Bull-baiting is ancient. — Therefore,

**RA.** Love of bull-baiting preserves church and state.

Indeed, it is obvious, that the future Minister of this country is fond of reasoning in the Barbarous mode. There is this further convenience in it, that it allows you to draw from it "conclusiorem quamcunque," as the logicians express it: that is, I suppose, any inference you think proper.

The next syllogism is of the hypothetical kind, though it must be confessed, Aristotle was rather shy of them.

If bull-baiting is immoral, the lovers of it will not be chosen to do duty about the King. — But,

The Staffordshire militia (lovers of bull-baiting) have been chosen to do duty about the King. — Therefore,

The Staffordshire militia are not immoral.
The remaining syllogism, which proves the positive pleasure of the bull, from the negation of terror, is of the enthymeme kind. I shall not attempt to reduce this to form, as the gap between the two parts of it is so considerable, that it would require the addition of a good many terms to fill it up. But it is perfectly convincing as it stands; and the moment the reader casts his eye upon it, he must know what to make of it. All the world is aware, that logicians reckon only thirty-eight "modi tolerabiles" of enthymemes. The "in-" tolerabiles" have never yet been counted, as far as I have heard. But this now before the reader is one of them, and may serve to convince posterity, that the present is not inferior in logical fame to the fourteenth century, and that we too can boast of a Gulielmus "Invincibilis."

It is now abundantly manifest, that the future Minister of this country is capable of "common sense views" of things. And if a man will add to all this, a few recommendations of sports on sacred days, upon the authority of the ancient heathen, reminding Gentlemen, that "if they would look back to the ancients, they "would find the religion of those people so in-"terwoven with sports and ceremonies, that "almost every day appeared a holiday with "them"—Mr. Windham, June 1800; or, if he
he will bid his hearers look to the laxer sort of Christians, and observe what were the "practices in Roman Catholic countries;" he will not fail to recommend himself to the people at large, as a promoter of the purity of Protestant manners, and an upholder of the established religion of his country, as well as excite in Mr. Pitt, a well-grounded jealousy of his ascendant genius.

II.

Finally, a man with ideas like these, ought also to have a language of a loftier cast than ordinary men can rise to. Accordingly, he will say of this revolutionary age, not that it has overturned altars and thrones, &c.; but that the late events of it have "destroyed the magnetism and "polarity of the mind!" And if ignorant people flare at such sounds, and cannot conceive their meaning, he will have a right to be offended at their perverseness, and to complain of " a sort of "vitality in misrepresentation!!"—Mr. Windham, Nov. 1795, and March 1796. This sort of language was always the torment of Sir G. P. Turner, and the late Sir Robert Clayton, and is supposed to contribute to the actual uneasiness of Mr. Langmead and Sir Wm. Elford.
The qualifications, therefore, by which the defined Minister of this country may best oppose the present Minister, and give the Ex-Minister (his only rival) just reason to be jealous of his ascendency, will be these: he will have a constitutional hurry about him, and will be equally alarming and alarmed; so that the danger of the country shall never be thrown away upon him.

He will allow inconsistencies in his conduct, as fast as any body can charge him with them; so that it will be in vain for Opposition to attempt to lay hold of his words—he will applaud or condemn at pleasure the defence of his country, and thus will be ready for any emergency. He will boldly defy France, and be persuaded too, that we cannot meet her single-handed, so that peace or war will be at all times alike to him. He will disparage the militia and every irregular force, for the sake of the line; and he will disparage the line too, for the sake of bush-fighters; and will prove how impartial he can be in his observations upon the whole of the service.

He will be a Hotspur, and, for honour's sake, magnanimously quarrel about Gull Island; and presently, for interest's sake, he will hush up these honourable hostilities, and equally please the army and the Exchange. He will begin a de-
bate with caution, and end in a rage, and be conversant in every sort of temper "proper for " the discussion of public business." He will "interpret matters with a - - - sort of nicety," and at the same time be professor of "common " sense." He will shew his superiority of understanding, by speaking the better on a subject, because he is "totally unacquainted with it." He will discover, that the true superiority of man, is in his fifts: he will prove (with as much ability as my Lord Peter did, in the case of brown bread), that in bull-baiting is contained the essence of courage, of respect for antiquity, and the stability of church and state. And he will, in a surprising manner, infer the virtues of bulls, from the residence of the Staffordshire militia at Windsor. He will also have flights of language, fit to follow the "wild, extravagant, and chivalrous excess" of his thoughts; and will abundantly convince the House, that, to qualities like these, the fortunes of this country must finally be intrusted; and that the one gentleman cannot choose but encourage that "system " of misrepresentation" (Pol. Reg.), the success of which has alone been the cause that the Ex-
Minister at War is not at this time Chancellor of the Exchequer.

But
But it is time to lead the young Oppositionist to a different view of the conduct that may be proper for him. The last example, indeed, which was so copiously detailed for his benefit, may be more amusing to him, on account of its singularities; but the one on which he is now to enter, will shew him, that he may, with much advantage, throw a solemnity over his vexation of Ministers, and that his discontent may assume somewhat of the grand and lofty. The former may be recommended to the brisk talents of Mr. Kinnaird; the latter to the stronger mind of Mr. Grey.

Rule 30.

*How to be consistent in spite of yourself.*

Though you may set out with a strong declaration, as in the former example, that you will "never hold ambiguous language, or deny what "you have said"—Lord Grenville, Oct. 1795; yet your conclusion will be different; for, instead of allowing your contradictions, you will inflexibly maintain, that, let your language have been what it will, you are consistent in all things; and you may boldly ask Parliament, "which two (of your declarations) can be produc, which contradict each other?"—Ditto. And you may prove your consistency in the following manner.
If Preliminaries of peace are presented to Parliament, and you have good reason to be displeased that it was not your office to present them, still you may give a solemn pledge, that, notwithstanding these unhappy preliminaries, and the definitive treaty to which they may lead, you will support the Administration, from the great and predominant love you bear to your country.

"So far from being in opposition to the measures of His Majesty's present Ministers generally, I now declare, that, should these fatal preliminaries end in a definitive treaty, I should be found one of their firmest supporters; not so much from any personal regard for myself, as to that which I must always have for the interests of my country."—Lord Grenville, Oct. 30, 1801.

And, that people may not mistake you, repeat with confidence the same pledge in such words as these: "I feel for the members of the present Administration every kind of personal respect; but I differ from them most decidedly in this instance. Still, I appear not before you as a professed Oppositionist. I will strenuously and zealously support them, after this unfortunate business is disposed of, in every act of firmness."
"nefs and vigour, which they may display, in repelling those efforts, and reprefling thole principles, which have produced the present war."—Lord Grenville, Nov. 3, 1801.

However, after this business is disposed of, you may, if you please, abandon Ministers, and still prove yourself consistent. "When I pledged myself to give my support to Government, I did it in a clear and distinct manner, and I kept my promise as long as I could do it consistently *. But I felt myself in honour bound to withdraw that support, from the moment of the convention with Russia; and still more from the conclusion of the treaty of Amiens."—Lord Grenville, Dec. 15, 1802.

And you may wind up the whole with saying, you "have the consolation to think, that you are justified by every principle of consistency."

And who shall doubt this? Indeed, the thing speaks for itself. For, if a man promises his support to Ministers, after a certain given time, and if he does all he can to annoy them before that

* "When I declared I would die a bachelor," says Benedick (who was equally anxious with Lord Grenville to maintain his "consistency" in all cases), "I did not think I should live till I was married!"
time comes, it will be difficult to prove him guilty of a breach of faith. If he is to support Government after a definitive treaty, and if he opposes after a convention with Russia, which takes place previously to that treaty, how is he inconsistent? And, if he should oppose, after the definitive treaty itself (the period from which his promised support is to begin), he will still be excusable, since he will then be kept in countenance by his opposition before it: for, as he began to oppose before the time of his promised support, why should he change sides when that time really comes, and be inconsistent with himself, for the sake of keeping his own word?

Besides, no reasonable person will have any further objection, when it is considered what sacrifices the opponent makes, for the sake of his opposition. He had promised his support to Ministers (when the definitive treaty should be concluded) on the noblest of grounds, "not from any personal regard to himself, but from that which he must always have for the interests of his country." And, if a man gives up this greatest of all motives; if, for the sake of thwarting Ministers, he is content to surrender even the regard he has "for the interests of his country;" what right has any person to call upon him for support,
support, on account of any inferior considerations?

The Lord Chancellor was therefore wrong, in expressing his regret, Dec. 15, 1802, "that Ministers had lost the Noble Lord's confidence:" for it appears from the Noble Lord's own statement, that Ministers had lost his confidence, before he promised that they should certainly have it.

Thus, may the young Oppositionist learn to prove, that "no two" of his declarations "can " be produced, which contradict each other." Thus may he boast, that he "never holds am-
"biguous language, or denies what he has once "said;" and shew, that whatever he says is con-
"fident, notwithstanding what he does.

**Rule 31.**

*How to improve in Consistency.*

In the same manner, if you have ever propose a peace yourself with the same enemy, and upon terms not at all more advantageous than those you now condemn, you may save yourself by a convenient distinction. "What was it we "offered to renounce to France?" said Mr. Pitt, Nov. 10, 1797. "In one word, all we "had
"had taken from them. What did this consist of? "The valuable, and almost impregnable island of Martinique, various other West India pos-
"sessions, St. Lucia, Tobago, the French part of "St. Domingo, the settlements of Pondicherry "and Chandernagore, all the French factories "and means of trade in the East Indies; and the "islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon. And, for "what were these renunciations to be made? "For peace, and for peace only!"

Therefore, if you are driven to compare the 
treaty at Lisle with the preliminaries of 1801, 
you may say, that you "disdained to retract what "you have done; but, that the present question "ought to be decided by arguments of higher "importance, and drawn from the nature of things "themselves."—Lord Grenville, Nov. 3, 1801.

Not so the future Minister of this country, 
whose intrepidity has been already proved in so 
many instances. When he opposed the same 
preliminaries, after submitting to the same treaty 
of Lisle, he did not fly for refuge to "argu-
"ments drawn from the nature of things them-
"selves." No: he magnanimously confessed the 
inconsistency, and despised the consequences. "I "admit that I did give my consent to the treaty "at Lisle; and, if any inconsistency exists be-
"tween
"tween the opinion I then held, and that which "I now support; let Gentlemen, if they are dis-"posed, enjoy all the advantages of such an in-"consistency."—But to return.

Rule 32.

Precedents of Consistency.

With the same "preservation of consistency," you may condemn Ministers in 1803, for hav-"ing suffered so much insolence on the part of the enemy, before they came to a rupture; although in 1797, you may have taken credit to yourself for a similar forbearance, under provocations of every fort.

"The conduct of the enemy, even at the com-
"mencement of the negotiation, was so bad, "that he would not fully his lips with mentioning "it." The "agreement with the Emperor" (viz. for summoning the allies to a congress for preli-
"minaries) was "openly violated."—"They would "not take into consideration the existing treaties "with others, though France itself was a party "and guarantee to them. This was contrary to "the established usage of all negotiation."— "Still his Majesty, anxious for peace, condescend-
"ed to overlook these difficulties, new and unpre-
"cedented as they were." In the very "passport

k "which
"which was sent over for the person whom his
"Majesty was to send to treat, the form was a
"direct and intentional departure from positive
"agreement, from all decency and established
"custom;" and the whole was without any pur-
pose "but that of a perfidious determination to
"throw every obstacle in the way of peace."—
"Base and unworthy insinuations were also thrown
"out in the early correspondence of the French
"Government against the character of the very
"person whom his Majesty had chosen to con-
"duct the negotiation," &c.—Lord Grenville, 
Nov. 1797.

Doubtless the calm contempt of so much in-
folence, for the sake of peace in 1797, was a
sufficient ground on which to call for the appro-
bation of Parliament. But to allow the same rea-
sions for the late forbearance of Ministers would
be wrong; for arguments must now be drawn,
not from a love of peace, which is "inclined to
"overlook difficulties," not from any consider-
ation of the past practice of the country, but
"from the nature of things themselves!"

If the young Oppositionist should wish for
any farther illustration of this sort of parlia-
mentary retreat, he will find a happy instance
of it in a man of much experience in this way.

When
When Lord Lanfdowne (1798) had directly charged Ministers with giving wrong statements of the revenue, and when he was refuted by Lord Liverpool from the papers on the table, he very opportunely threw a discredit on figures as matters of no consequence. He "called the "consideration of the House to something of "higher importance; to principles, and not to "pence; to the constitution, and not to arithmetic; "because the principles of the Constitution were "not only more important, but more intelli-"gible!!!"

Rule 33.

More Precedents of Consistency.

If people are not yet persuaded that the marked patience of this country with France in the proceedings at Lisle, ought to have been no warrant for Ministers in their late forbearance, they will doubtless be pleased to see their opinion supported by an additional specimen of patience, drawn from the conduct of the last Administration amidst insults of every kind, under their own eyes, and in the heart of London itself.

We know that those who felt "more tenderly "than others" for the honour of their country, once said of Chauvelin and his agents, what has been lately said by persons equally "tender"
of the honour of their country, concerning the Commercial Agents; viz. that the Government was criminal in hazarding the safety of the country through their residence among us, &c. The excuse of Ministers at that time was (it must be confessed), that they bore so long with "Chauvelin's intrigues; his insolent and shameful behaviour," &c. only that they might "avert the war and preserve the peace."—Duke of Leeds, Feb. 1794.

It must also be confessed, that this excuse was accepted with gratitude, and confirmed by one who, in order to prove beyond a doubt that no provocations ought to deter a government from a great and beneficial purpose, allowed, that "Chauvelin had left no means of seduction or corruption untried to effect the purposes which those who sent him wished to accomplish in this country."—"The Government behaved with exemplary mildness to him, even while it was known, from undoubted authority, that he and others of his countrymen were employing every art and intrigue to wean the affections of the people from their loyalty, and to embroil this nation in the same misfortunes that had rendered France one scene of devastation, blood, misery, and massacre."—Lord Grenville, Ditto.

However,
However, if a man should happen to find these arguments inconvenient to him, when he wants to prove that the Commercial Agents ought to have been earlier dismissed, he may very properly set them aside. For if he should not be able to shew, that the behaviour of the Commercial Agents was equally bad with Chauvelin; if, upon inquiry, he should find, that, however suspicious their appearance might be, they were so watched and controlled as to be incapable of serious mischief, and that they had committed no acts which shewed, "from undoubted authority," that they were embroiling us in "devastation, "and blood, and misery, and massacre;" he will do wisely to shut his eyes upon Chauvelin, and consider the Commercial Agents upon quite another ground. For when it is not advisable to compare one case with another, you may always tell the world, that "the present question ought "to be decided by arguments of higher import-
"ance, and drawn from the nature of things "themselves."

Rule 34.

How to oppose for the Benefit of Posterity.

If, amidst your desire of opposing, you should feel that you are inconvenienced by any pledges given to Parliament of a contrary conduct; if, when the time arrives for that support of Mi-

isters
nisters which you have indiscreetly promised and are determined not to perform, you wish to save your consistency by a gradual breaking; account for your present hostility by the affection you bear to future ages. Therefore, when the Definitive Treaty comes (from which time you are expected to join Ministers, on account of the "regard you must always have for the interests "of your country"), propose to address the King upon it. As a peace made by the King's prerogative is of course not valid without your concurrence, the terms of your address will be, that "it is an obligation upon the country to main-
tain it inviolable." After this very necessary declaration you may add, that you "cannot con-
ceal your awful apprehensions at considering "the situation which had been the result of the "peace" just concluded by the King's preroga-
tive. And you may ask the House with all can-
dour, "what objection could possibly be urged "against pointing out the injurious consequences "likely to follow" from a peace, which "it is "the duty of every body to maintain." And if the House begins to be amazed at this proposal, and expects to hear you burst forth against the Ministers, and to call for their dismission, save your honour by saying, that you have no imme-
diate views in what you propose. "The object "of what he should state was prospective; viz. "to
to deter future Ministers from making such another peace."—Lord Grenville, May 1802.

This distinction is as happy as it is convenient, and exhibits that dexterous union of acquiescence and irritation at which none but a great master can hope to arrive. It is commonly reckoned sufficient praise if two birds are killed with one stone; by the present method you kill three. You harass the King; you alarm the people; and you concur in the peace at the same time!

Rule 35.

How to be obdurate for the public Welfare.

But under any circumstances, whether your hostility is direct or otherwise, perseverance in attaining your object is indispensable. Therefore when you have once set your mind upon forcing intelligence from Ministers which may distress them, or be unseasonable, or not of a proper nature to be laid before the House, let no consideration of irregularity, let no remonstrances from the House, prevail with you to desist from your motion. Thus, if a day in a following week is fixed for discussing preliminaries of peace, what can be so natural as to express a wish for immediate information "what is the nature of the treaty of Badajoz;—whether
"ther the provisions of the treaty of Madrid, as to the territory of French Guiana, are super-
vided by the preliminaries," &c. &c.—Lord Grenville, Oct. 30, 1801. But if the House should think otherwise, and fix an immediate and general reprobation on demands which it may deem vexatious and premature, the Oppositionist must bear up against it all, unabashed and undismayed. If one Peer (Lord Pelham) "deprecates all previous discussion as irregular," still you will persist. If a second Peer (Lord Thurlow) calls to order, you will quickly invent a distinction, and stiffly urge it, and will point out how "you may, if you please, get rid of the "order of the day by a motion."—Lord Gren-
ville, Ditto. If a third Peer (Lord Hobart) "deprecates at least the irregularity of the dis-
cussion," observing, that "it cannot have "escaped your known accuracy," and begging you to reflect "how you would act, if you stood "in the situation of his Majesty's present Mi-
nisters;" still you will scorn to recede from your point. If a fourth Peer (the Lord Chancel-
lor himself) then censures your motion in de-
cided terms, observing, that "no man in the "House who had an adequate knowledge and "experience of his duty, could countenance "such a motion; and that an instance could "not be shewn, in which the production of such Redação13
"papers was agreed to:" if he also "deprecates the affection of candour, which, in passing by the regular course of a motion, puts it to the feelings of any Noble Lord, to obtain the desired information, and remarks the ill tendency of such a motion, and the delay of the regular business of the House by it;" even this will not drive a thorough-bred Oppositionist from his purpose. You have made your motion, and you will stand to it. If Lord Thurlow should again object, that "even the motion thus made is irregular," he will gain nothing by his observation, for you know this already as well as he can tell you; but it is not your business to find fault with your own motion. Your only care is to make it pass in some shape or other. Insist, therefore, if you should be pushed upon it, that you can make your motion regular in another way, by proposing it as an amendment of the motion for the order of the day."—Lord Grenville, Ditto. If a fifth Peer (Lord Darnley) should then tell you, that "you have already been answered much more fairly than you have ever been known to answer others on similar occasions;" and if the business should at length grow desperate, it may become advisable for some friend (Lord Spencer) to stand up and draw off the attention of the House for a few minutes. This is a healing measure; and after this, all will
will be quiet and well, till another opportunity shall be offered for proposing other motions, equally well timed, and equally calculated to promote the welfare of your country, "which "you must always have at heart."

These particulars have been detailed at length, in order to shew the young Oppositionist in what manner to twist and turn an improper or an ungracious motion, and to increase the chances of its being somehow accepted. Nor will I conceal, that the good of a Noble Lord in the Lower House has been particularly in my view. For on another occasion he declared, that "he did "not mean to press any question on the Noble "Lord (Hawkesbury) that was unpleasant or "inconsistent with his duty to answer."—Lord Temple, Nov. 4, 1801. And he really did not ac- accordingly. This forbearance, however, is ma- nifestly injudicious, unless it is meant only as a soothing preface to some determined perseverance that is to follow it. The Noble Lord, it is hoped, will excuse this hint; especially, as, since the event which gave occasion to it, he has very considerably improved. Nor indeed can he do otherwise than improve, if he only looks to those lessons of unbending patriotism and inflex- ible perseverance in this part of public duty, which some branch or other of his illustrious fa- mily
mily will not fail to afford him. Meanwhile, if the young Oppositionist wishes to know how to act in such cases, let him proceed in this way. If he wants to have a definitive treaty debated, before the treaty itself is exchanged; and if on that account he is to move for papers, &c. let him begin the business with a smooth profession, that "he wishes to anticipate nothing."—Lord Grenville, April 8, 1802. But he must act as if the profession were not made at all; therefore he will be sure to add, "I cannot suppose there can be any unwillingness to concur immediately in my motion," &c.—Ditto.

Thus only can the young Oppositionist arrive at a masterly discharge of his duty. Mere candour, or at least the appearance of it, is too common a thing to draw much attention; but to make an apparent candour and a genuine obstinacy go hand in hand, is the privilege only of a few.

Rule 36.

How to justify Motions for Papers.

The above specimens will amply shew the Oppositionist how he is to move for papers, &c.; but he must also have his justification at hand. Therefore if it should happen that you have been heretofore in office, and if you have made your-
felf remarkable for furly refusals of papers, &c. on the demands of others, still your present right of calling for intelligence remains, and is as good as any man's. You may have said, indeed, that motions for papers, &c. "were irregular," and that "you wondered any person should be either so little acquainted with the forms of "the House, or so little attentive to the conven-"nience of Ministers," as to make such motions; however, that "you were determined to do "your duty, whatever might be the unacquaintance "or inattention of others," &c. Nay, you may have gone so far as to say, you remembered with pleasure "the just disdain with which you had "treated applications for intelligence, papers," &c. when it was not convenient to grant them. —Lord Grenville, Dec. 1802. But it is always in your power to distinguish between your own case and that of other men, and to prove the reasonableness of the demands you make by arguments drawn "from the nature of things "themselves;" besides, a change being made in circumstances, a change is necessarily called for in your mode of proceeding. A man ought to "labour in his vocation," whatever it be. If you have the laudable ambition to discharge your duty well, you will, in your character of Oppo-
fitionist, be as remarkable for insisting upon pa-
pers, &c. as you were, when in office, for dif-

"daining
daining to grant them; and surely no reasonable person will quarrel with you for wishing to be informed of what you do not know. It is true, Ministers may be on their guard. The watchfulness of a Lord Chancellor, for instance, may disconcert you by a discovery of your views, and a declaration that "any Minister who could permit himself to be surprised into a communication such as had been so irregularly called for, would act in a manner highly reprehensible." — Reply to Lord Grenville, May 1802.

In this case you miss your object, but you have done all you could to obtain it. On the other hand, there is a chance of succeeding; and if so, you have the advantage of inconveniencing Ministers, and perhaps of disturbing the progress of the public business, which it is quite patriotic to do, as the Ministers manage it so ill.

Rule 37.

How to assert any Thing you please of Ministers.

It is hinted above, that you may well ask to be informed of what you do not know. If Ministers are slower than you wish in granting you such intelligence, turn the tables upon them, and inform them of things which they do not know themselves. Let the subject therefore be, the conduct of Ministers under the encroachments of
of France upon the rest of Europe, and you may instruct Parliament about it as follows:

"The Definitive Treaty was signed in March and ratified in June. In the month of August France took upon herself to regulate and new-model the several states in Europe. As our Ministers made no complaint or remonstrance on the occasion, it may be fairly presumed, that they gave their acquiescence to the encroachments of the French."—Lord Grenville, Nov. 23, 1802.

And again: "Our Ministers viewed the passing scene with the greatest indifference. In the height of their friendship and pacific disposition to the French, they never made the smallest attempt at complaint or remonstrance for these daring encroachments, which threatened the total subversion of the liberties of Europe and of mankind. Instead of a proper and manly interference, our Ministers sunk into a state of submission to the will of France; instead of the laudable resilience of injustice and oppression, we suffered the most abject humiliation," &c.
—Lord Grenville.

To be sure, it will happen somewhat unluckily for such assertions, if it is afterwards found that on October 3, Mr. Merry wrote to Lord Hawkebury
bury concerning the violation of the Swiss liberties, and that in the following week Ministers actually remonstrated with the French Government. "Lord Hawkesbury has received his "Majesty's commands to communicate through "M. Otto to the French Government, the senti-
"ment of deep regret which has been excited "in his Majesty's mind by the address of the "First Consul to the Helvetic people," &c.; and in conclusion, that Buonaparte must alter his behaviour if he values at all "the good under-
"standing which his Majesty is desirous of pre-
"serving with the Government of France."—Cor-
respondence with the French Government, No. 17.

And it will be still more unlucky if it should appear, that at the same time, October 10, were drawn up those instructions for Mr. Moore which Mr. Grey censured, as indifferently spirited, likely to precipitate us into hostilities, and to take away the benefit of the peace almost as soon as we had got it! All these may be unlucky facts against you; but still you have your right to charge Ministers as you do. For though the King's Speech might have prepared you to suppose that there had been an interference on the part of this country*; and

* "In my intercourse with foreign powers, I have been "actuated by a sincere desire for the maintenance of peace. "It
and though it may now fully appear, that every thing was done which ought to have been done, yet, at the time, you did not know it. You gave to Parliament the same intelligence, that is, the same want of it, which you had yourself; and surely no reasonable or moral person will require a man to speak otherwise than he knows. The Ministers themselves indeed are the only persons to blame; for though they must have known the contrary of all they heard, they did not let the House right about it. The moralists seem to be agreed, that he who suffers a falsehood to go un-contradicted, knowing it to be a falsehood, may act worse than even an ignorant propagator of the falsehood; and in the present case, they certainly knew that to be false which you asserted for truth, not knowing whether it were true or not.

In all such cases, therefore, though the fact may be against you, you have your right of presumption:

"It is nevertheless impossible for me to lose sight of that established and wise system of policy, by which the interests of other states are connected with our own; and I cannot be indifferent to any material change in their relative condition and strength. My conduct will invariably be regulated by a due consideration of the actual situation of Europe, and by a watchful solicitude for the permanent welfare of my people."—King's Speech, Nov. 3, 1802.
against it, and of withholding a too candid interpretation which may turn out unfounded. Accordingly, you may assert freely, whether you know it or not, that Ministers have made "no complaint or remonstrance" against France; and therefore that they have "given their consent" to what they never complained of.

It may happen too, that a new Parliament may be assembled at the time you thus "give your support to Ministers on account of that regard which you must always bear to the interests of your country." In this case, you are less bound to candour than in common times; because it is of more than usual importance to in-dispose the Members to the Government, before they have time to set themselves right by their own observation, and to find out who is to be believed, and who not.

Rule 38.

How to be submissive.

As it may also be of consequence to your personal influence, that you should sometimes give the House a notion of how accommodating a spirit you are (especially if you have any general imputation against you of an arrogant or offensive conduct), you will take some well-judged opportunity
opportunity of refuting the calumny and establishing your proper character. You may say therefore that "it had been your intention to submit to Parliament your sentiments (viz. against the barbarity of the Slave Trade), had you not been precluded by the Noble Duke (of Clarence) with whom you can have no debate!"—Lord Grenville, July 1800.

Such a declaration as this must be very striking to Parliament, from its novelty as well as its extraordinary forbearance; and the former stages of the question will go to increase the force of it. For you may have significantly told the House, that you "will not anticipate the approaching debate; but you trust you shall be able to state to their Lordships strong and weighty reasons, why, as honest and just men, well-wishers to their country, they ought to pass the bill, with which the character, honour, and safety of the country were closely connected."

—Lord Grenville. The expectation raised by such a promise will of course be very great; and nothing can be more favourable to your present purpose than to disappoint it all, on account of the opposite opinion of a part of the Royal Family, "with whom you can have no debate."—For Falstaff had long ago asked, "Was it for me to turn upon the Blood Royal?" and
And doubtles the same reverence is proper in parliamentary fighting. Indeed, the other Peers may not be of your mind; they may be hardy enough to reprobate such a display of humility, and to stand upon a pretence of equality of right, &c. in that House. But it is proper that somebody should have juster notions of the differences of ranks and degrees, especially in these levelling times. If, therefore, you do at length enter upon the question, notwithstanding the opinion of the Noble Duke, "with whom you "can have no debate," you will be careful to convince the House that your modesty would have made you refrain even from the support of the "character, honour, and safety "of the country," were you not absolutely driven upon it by the strong calls, the "agentia "verba" of that daring man, Lord Thurlow.

This is the proper way of rectifying the common opinion about you. If people deem you unusually presumptuous, shew them that you can be unusually submissive: and as, in mechanics, a spring unduly bent one way is to be drawn back forcibly to the other side, in order to find its true direction in the middle, the same must be your political remedy. There must be a revulsion in your character equal to its first excess; and an extreme pride must be strongly corrected
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by
by an humility to which no other person will submit.

But it is impossible at present to enter into all the particulars of those great characters which the young Oppositionist ought chiefly to study; it shall be reserved for some future opportunity to display them more fully. Meanwhile, that the pupil may not be left wholly without precedents on the minor occasions, a few miscellaneous instances shall be given him before this part of the Elements is closed.

**Rule 39.**

*How to speak on the 1st of April.*

If you should be seized with a strong inclination to say something to the House in the auspicious month of April, you may express yourself in this manner: "I am going to commit a sort of impropriety, though not an intentional one." *Mr. Grey, April 1802.* If you should write in any other month what properly belongs to April, your phrase may be, "This fact being established, as there is every reason to suppose it will be." —*Pol. Reg. Sept. 17.* And again, the convention between "America and France is as yet unknown to me. This convention, together with"
Rule 40.

How to speak after a Disappointment.

If you cannot get yourself made Secretary of State, you may call the Ministers swindlers. "He charged the Ministers with something like "swindling."—Lord Carlisle, May 5, 1802.

However, it may be proper to disclaim all wish of place, notwithstanding disappointments. "I "have no feeling so paltry and contemptible, as "a desire of usurping places of power."—Lord Carlisle, Dec. 1802.

At the same time you will hint, that a change would be advisable. "If the tone and spirit of "the country would, under the management of "men of more commanding talents, be better "supported, &c. he would certainly wish to see "the government of the country in the hands of "such men."—Lord Carlisle, Ditto.

You may, indeed, be modest as to the classing of yourself among the "abler men." But when a man's works are published, he may spare himself
self other pains; for every body knows at once in what class he ought to be placed.

**Rule 41.**

*How to talk of your Country.*

If a father and son have to state the effect of peace upon their country, they may make their accounts vary in a few particulars, in order to shew how faithfully they can repeat things: for Dr. Paley says, "that circumstantial variety" is one of the marks of genuine testimony. "He lamented that he could not give his consent to the preliminaries on the table, because he thought them highly humiliating and disgraceful to this country."—Marquis of Buckingham, Nov. 1801.

"He was happy the peace had taken place, though there might not be reason to rejoice at all the terms of it. The principal event on which it was founded, had given universal satisfaction in the county of which he was the representative; and he thought it would be an injustice to his constituents not to state their feelings on the occasion."—Lord Temple, Oct. 1801. This well accords with the call for peace by a "vigorous" relation before the peace came.

"Peace
"Peace was the wish of every man he spoke to."

Lord Grenville, March 1801.

It accords too with his opinion of the Ministers who were to make the peace that was "the wish of every man," &c. "I know them well; I respect them highly, both for their principles and capacity*; and have no doubt they will choose the fittest time and fittest means to negotiate for peace, and to conclude it."—Lord Grenville, Ditto.

If there are people who think that this variety in the testimony about one and the same event, is somewhat too strong, and if they are tempted to wonder that a father should pay so little attention to the feelings of his county, stated by a son, they are unreasonable. The son has said what he ought: but if a father does not represent a county, it cannot be expected that he should give himself any concern about their feelings.

* Compare Rule 7.
Rule 42.

*How a Bishop should talk of Peace.*

If a Bishop has a disinclination to peace, he may prove, in a summary manner, that no excuse is wanted for his warlike propensities. "It might seem to require some apology, that he, "a minister of the Gospel, should rise to oppose "peace; but his duty to his country was PARA-"MOUNT TO ALL OTHER CONSIDERATIONS."—

*Bishop of St. Asaph, Nov. 1801.*

It is probable the Bishop of Arras had this patriotic excuse in his eye, when he lately declared to a great visitor, that "the glory of pos-"sessing his diocese with a sense of attachment "to Buonaparte, was PARAMOUNT TO ALL "OTHER CONSIDERATIONS."

Rule 43.

*How to have tried Men for Ministers.*

If you want to disparage Ministers, and have no other fault to find with them, say they are "untried men" *(Marquis of Buckingham)*; and that "you can have no confidence in them, be-"cause they are untried" *(Lord Temple)*. Mr. *Pitt* may have replied to you indeed, that the
fame objection had once been made to himself. "In the outset of his administration, he un-
derstood it to be held by some people, that no person was entitled to common and ordinary confidence, until he had given proof of his having deserved it."—"But to urge this stupidly as an argument, was strange indeed: for it was absurd to say, that a man should not have any confidence shewn him in a situation, because it was new to him; since that must be applicable to every human creature, whenever he entered at first upon any employment: he must, at some time or other, be new in his employment," &c. But this is a great multiplying of words upon a plain case. The "common sense view" of the question (as the future Minister of this country loves to call it) is this: no man ought to begin to be a minister, "who has not been a minister before."

**Rule 44.**

*How to live without Ministers.*

If you dislike a Ministry, and people are inclined to thank them for their exertions, in time of danger to the Crown, deny the danger altogether, that you may get rid of their supposed merit. "The Crown never was in danger; and if it had been, there was a sufficient share of

"loyalty
"loyalty and good sense in the country to defend it, without any of their assistance."—Mr. Grey, May 1802.

**Rule 45.**

*How to be dissatisfied with the Triumphs of your Country.*

If the arms of your countrymen are eminently victorious in one part of the world, you may hint (though you know the House will not flip its vote of thanks), that it might be as well if they had been employed in some other. "If it were necessary to shew our military skill, could no other country be found except Egypt? Or might not Portugal have afforded a sufficient field for the display of British valour? Was not the preservation of an ancient, faithful, and useful ally, an object fully as much calculated to support the glory and to secure the advantage of the country, as combating a "French army in a distant land?"—Mr. Grey, June 1801.

The young Oppositionist may learn from this specimen sometimes to hazard speeches of the most forlorn nature: indeed, he will not be able to check the expression of the national gratitude; but he may contrive to spoil the comfortable
able feelings of the House by such observations. And this is some good; for it is an ancient maxim in common life, that if you cannot do worse, you may, at all events, endeavour to fret or irritate those whom you dislike, or wish to injure.

Rule 46.

How to oblige the Enemy.

If the enemy seize a country, and, after a provisional holding, make it an integral part of their territory, defend them in their usurpation, and say that your own Government has no right to complain of it. Thus, when France incorporated Piedmont with itself, there was no harm done; for "they held it before as a military arrondissement."—Mr. Grey, 1802. No wonder, after this, that Buonaparte defends his own ambition so well! As to the incorporation of Piedmont, said he to Lord Whitworth, it was so natural, that "it ought to have been expected," and therefore you have no right to complain. And whatever objection some people may make to this, as unbecoming an Englishman, and hostile to the interests of your country, it may be very fairly insisted upon as good policy, to have somebody in Parliament who will allow himself to talk in such manner; for, in all pro-
bability, Buonaparte will look upon it as an obligation, and Mr. Grey will have a very good right to plead his services, and to intercede for his country, if France should at any time have us at her mercy.

Indeed, such is my persuasion of the meritorious conduct recorded in this and the two former Rules, that it is to be lamented they were not placed in the body of the Elements, and among the higher models of patriotism.

May it be pardoned me to have made this late acknowledgment, and to charge such of the young members as may be thinking of the best method of shewing their attachment to their country, to bear in mind these happy specimens, and most of the others coming from the same quarter.

--- Vos exemplaria Greyca
Nocturnâ versate manu, versate diurnâ.

**Rule 47.**

*How to quote Authorities.*

The common wish in quoting authorities, is to strengthen your opinions by those of other men. But there is a way of multiplying testimonies in your favour, and of leaving your own credit ex-
asily where it was before. If you have influence with a "Political Register," say something mischievous, which the Moniteur will gladly copy. Then bid the Political Register quote the Moniteur in support of your original opinion.

Say, for instance, that the Ministers are such wretched people, that the continent must be mad if it has anything to do with them.—Mr. W. Then say that the Moniteur adds its authority. "Not one of its Princes will make a common 'cause with you."—June 1803. This naturally leads to some ejaculation, such as, "What hands "are the interests of the nation trusted to!" And here again the Moniteur will support you; for "To what men is the fate of nations some- "times committed!"

This may be farther illustrated by the example of the King of Sardinia, the abandonment of whom by England will of course terrify the other Princes of the continent, and make them keep aloof from all future connexion with us: for the future Minister of this country had exclaimed, "We have left Sardinia," &c.—Pol. Reg. June 11. And the Moniteur soon repeated, as a matter of course, "If England had not left "Sardinia," &c. &c.
There is something at once imposing and easy in this proceeding: it has the appearance of two separate testimonies, though, in fact, the two are but one and the same; and your own credit ends where it began—in your own affirmation; which of course may be had, for the good of your country, at any time.

Rule 48.

How to qualify your Assertions.

But sometimes, in quoting on the credit of an enemy’s paper, it will be proper to provide for an escape in case of falsehood: therefore qualify it with an if; for “your if” is still, as it was of old, “a great peace-maker.” “If this charge (from the “Moniteur) be well founded, what will the world think of us? What a selfish and perfidious “nation must we be?” &c.—June 11. This is sufficient to save you in case of need: meanwhile, you may securely reason on the event, as if it were a true one, notwithstanding the if; and the consequence may be, that some person or other, seeing the vehemence with which you dwell on the supposition, may be inclined to rely on it for a certainty. It does not matter that you may yourself suspect it to be false; it is quite enough if other people take it to be true.

Rule
Rule 49.

How to foretell what will come to pass.

For your own credit, too, you will sometimes insist upon the exact accomplishment of your predictions, whatever the event may have been.

If, when the late peace was made known, you affirmed, that on account of the unexampled secrecy which had been observed, nobody would believe the news, and that the preliminaries had "dropped upon us from the clouds"—this is no hindrance to your saying, a year or two after, that, "from the moment you (Lord Hawkebury) began negotiating with M. Otto, I fore-" "saw the result of that negotiation!"—Pol. Reg. June 4.

Rule 50.

How to be accurate.

In order to recommend yourself as a politician, first commit errors, then correct them; then correct your corrections; and then add, that you never advance any thing that is not fact. "Woronzow is the avowed enemy to "this country."—Pol. Reg. Aug. 6. "In the "last Register it was stated, that Russia had "views
views upon Malta, and that Prince Czartoryski (why not Count Woronzow?) was devoted to France. From more recent and more authentic intelligence, this statement appears to be erroneous; and it is believed by those who are well acquainted with that subject, that Count Alexander Woronzow is by no means an enemy of England. One fact may be regarded as certain; Russia does not disapprove of our blockade of the Elbe; and as to the "Russian ships in the Baltic," &c. &c.—Pol. Reg. Aug 13. But in the next week,

"Russia is afraid to stir with Ministers such as we have at present."—Pol. Reg. Sept 3. The whole of this is therefore to be believed, for "We never advance any thing as fact, without the very best authority. We have as good information as any body, and the reader may place perfect reliance on what we say," &c.—Pol. Reg. Aug. 7, 1802.

Rule 51.

How to bear with Rebellion and Murder.

If insurrection bursts out, and massacres take place, and if Ministers apply to Parliament for immediate measures against the offenders, endeavour
vour to delay the proceedings. "While the de-
tails were withheld" (viz. of the length, and breadth, and depth of the wound of which Lord Kilwarden died), "while the House was
refused time for due consideration, he could
not reconcile his mind to a vote that should
pledge him to any specific measures."—Mr.
Windham, July 28. It is true, more murders
may be occasioned by the delay: but this ought
not to be regretted; for the public indignation
may meanwhile be so raised against the supine-
ness of Ministers, that they may be turned out;
and when we consider what a blessing such an
event must be to the country, the present loss of
lives and property ought to be cheerfully sub-
mitted to. "I heartily wish," says the Doctor
in Peregrine Pickle, "that my dear friend Pallet
may be murdered in the Bastile; for his death
would convince all the people of France
that they ought to rise up as one man against
the tyranny of their government," &c.

Some people perhaps, not attending to this
illustration, may wonder that "insurrections
and massacres" are placed in this part of the
Elements, among the minor occurrences: but
if any Gentleman in Opposition chooses, for his
own satisfaction, to consider "insurrections and
massacres" as but trivial matters, it is only to
please
please him that they are thus estimated on the present occasion. I do not write for my own gratification, but to accommodate the feelings of others.

Rule 52.

How to Second an Address.

If you follow the mover of an address, be sure to speak of him, let him be who he will, as a prodigy of wisdom. "The speech of the Noble Mover of this address (viz. Marquis of Buckingham) has added to the difficulty and embarrassment which I naturally feel," &c.—Lord Grenville, Sept. 1799.

It is the invariable custom of Mr. Serjeant Cockel, when he is to plead after any body, to observe, that "All that can be suggested by human ability, has been adduced by his learned brother," &c.

Rule 53.

How to be "content with a little."

If your party cannot be made, by any contrivance, to amount to more than four or five, try to turn your want of influence into a compliment. "He and his friends did not understand, at least they did not exercise, the art of
“drawing the people after them.” — Dr. Lawrence, Aug. 12. This is philosophical, and might well strike large majorities with shame. But even this is outdone by the inventive genius of Lord Stanhope, who having voted alone on a motion of his own, upon which depended all the safety of his country, struck a medal on the occasion, and, round his own triumphant bust, wrote “The glorious minority of 1793.”

——— in seipso totus teres atque rotundus.

THE END.