

**MORE TALENTS STILL!: BEING
LORD GRENVILLE'S LETTER
TO DR. GASKIN WITH THE
LETTER IN ANSWER THERETO**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649278251

More Talents Still!: Being Lord Grenville's Letter to Dr. Gaskin with the letter in answer thereto
by Anonymous

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

ANONYMOUS

**MORE TALENTS STILL!: BEING
LORD GRENVILLE'S LETTER
TO DR. GASKIN WITH THE
LETTER IN ANSWER THERETO**

18
14
\$9

MORE TALENTS STILL!
BEING
LORD GRENVILLE'S
LETTER

TO
DR. GASKIN,
WITH THE LETTERS
IN ANSWER THERETO.

LONDON:
PRINTED FOR JOHN JOSEPH STOCKDALE,
NO. 41, Pall-Mall.

1807.

(Price One Shilling, or Three Guineas per Hundred.)

22871. e. 8.

ADVERTISEMENT.

LORD GRENVILLE having published, and the zeal of his friends having republished his celebrated Letter to Dr. Gaskin, it has been thought a compliment to both, to give additional celebrity to that admirable epistle, and to the still more admirable answer thereto. We cannot help flattering ourselves that the public, as well as the parties concerned, will think themselves very much obliged to us for the republication of such celebrated STATE PAPERS, which we presume to be of opinion, will be as long remembered as *the Catholic Question* shall be recurred to in the history of the country.

TO THE REV. G. GASKIN, D. D.
SECRETARY TO THE SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING
CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

Loaving-Street, May 2, 1807.

SIR,

THE Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, of which I am a Member, has thought fit to publish, during a General Election, a Resolution, declaratory of its opinion respecting a political measure recently submitted to Parliament.

That measure, brought forward for purposes of peace, union, and public security, by men who yield to none of their fellow-subjects in loyalty to their Sovereign, and attachment to the civil and religious Constitution of their Country, is there stigmatized as hostile to the Established Church and Ecclesiastical Constitution of the realm, and as subversive of those principles which placed his Majesty's family on the British throne.

It is natural for those whose characters are thus aspersed, to enquire by what right

any persons have taken upon themselves, in the name of such a Society, to give countenance and currency to an injurious and groundless calumny, fabricated for the watch-word of a party, and calculated only to excite and uphold popular clamour.

The Society was instituted, as its annual publications declare, "for the increase of the knowledge and practice of our holy Religion, by the support of Charity-schools, and by the distribution of Bibles, Prayer-books, and Religious Tracts."

Those who have directed the present proceeding can best explain in what manner Christian knowledge, or Christian practice, will be increased by promoting religious animosities and civil discord, by stirring up the blind prejudices and ungovernable passions of the ignorant; and by circulating amongst our fellow-subjects, instead of the word of truth and charity, the libellous and inflammatory calumnies of electioneering contests and party violence.

As a member of the Society, solicitous for the promotion of its genuine objects, I desire to enter my dissent to a resolution purporting to express its unanimous opi-

tion. I object to the propriety of its taking part, at all, in the political divisions of the country : I object to its labouring to extend and prolong those divisions with respect to a measure publicly withdrawn, and of which there is consequently no longer any question. But, most of all, I object to the truth, and, may I not add, to the decency of a censure which, if it were founded either in justice or in reason, would apply to almost every description of public men, and would even implicate all those authorities which are the most entitled to our respect and reverence.

If to permit the King's subjects of all persuasions to serve him in his army be "an unconstitutional innovation," with whom, and when did it originate? It was first made the law in Ireland fourteen years ago, at the express recommendation of the Crown, delivered from the throne by one of his Majesty's present Ministers, then Lord Lieutenant of that kingdom.

If the adoption of a similar law in Great Britain would be "an act of hostility to the Established Church," to whom shall that hostility be ascribed? To those who

now proposed, or to those who long ago engaged, for that concession? To the framers of Lord Howick's bill, or to those members and supporters of the present Government, who in the year 1793, gave and authorised that promise to the Catholics of Ireland.

If the employment of Catholic Officers and Catholic Soldiers in the general service of the empire; if the permitting them to hold and exercise, at his Majesty's discretion, all military commissions, the rank and station of General not excepted; if the relieving them in this respect from all penalties and disabilities on account of their religious persuasions; if these things be matter of just alarm "to the ecclesiastical constitution of this country," when was the moment for that alarm? In the year 1804, all this, and more than this, was done in an act proposed by Mr. Pitt, with the concurrence of his colleagues now in administration, passed by the British Parliament, and sanctioned by his Majesty's royal assent. That act legalised a long list of military commissions, antecedently granted by his Majesty, with the advice of

the same Ministers; and it enabled his Majesty, prospectively, to grant at his discretion, all military commissions whatever to Catholics, not indeed to British or Irish Catholics, but to foreign Catholics; to men who owe his Majesty no allegiance, and who are not even required to disclaim those tenets which all our fellow subjects of that persuasion have solemnly abjured.

What ground of difference will then remain to justify these outrageous calumnies against the late proposal? Is it that men were permitted to aspire to the rewards and honours of a profession, to the toils and dangers of which the Legislature of their country had long since invited them? Is it that the same indulgences which had been promised and granted to Catholics by others, were not withheld by us from Protestant Dissenters? Or is it, lastly, that we judged our own countrymen and fellow subjects entitled, *under his Majesty's discretion*, to the same confidence and favour which Parliament had so recently extended to foreigners of all nations and all descriptions?

And let me further ask—if these conces-