

HISTORY OF IRELAND

FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES
TO THE PRESENT DAY

BY

THE REV. E. A. D'ALTON

LL.D. M.R.I.A.

HALF-VOLUME IV

1649 TO 1782

Barry College Library
Miami, Florida

LONDON

THE GRESHAM PUBLISHING COMPANY
THIRTY-FOUR SOUTHAMPTON STREET STRAND

FLIGHT OF JAMES II FROM IRELAND, JULY 12, 1690

FROM A CONTEMPORARY DUTCH PRINT



CHAPTER XXIV.

The Penal Laws.

At the accession of Queen Elizabeth all Ireland was Catholic; and the Parliament which met at Dublin in 1560, though it little represented the nation at large, was but ill-disposed to pass the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity; nor was it except through a trick of the Speaker that these Acts were passed into law. He declared that Parliament would not sit on a certain day, and, meanwhile, he sent summonses to a few members who were special friends of the Government. These assembled secretly on the very day Parliament was not to sit, and, assuming the powers of the whole assembly, passed the required enactments. The absent members, when next they attended, protested loudly against such fraud, and declared that such enactments were null and void. But the Viceroy, Sussex, solemnly assured them that neither Act would be enforced, and, on this understanding, the assent of all the members was obtained.¹ After a short session of three weeks this Parliament was dissolved by Sussex, "by reason of its aversion to the Protestant religion;" and it need hardly be added that the promise given by the Viceroy was soon forgotten. Like St. Leger, Sussex had been in turn both a Protestant and a Catholic, and now embraced the religion of his Queen. As he had carried out Queen Mary's orders to restore

¹ Rolhe's *Analecta*, p. 234; *Cambrensis Eversus*, Vol. III., pp. 10-23; *Our Martyrs*, pp. 9-11; Monk-Mason's *Parliaments in Ireland—Introduction*, p. 103.

Catholicism in Ireland, he now undertook to carry out Elizabeth's orders: "to set up the worship of God in Ireland as it was in England." Like most of the officials of these days, if asked how he continued to keep office under so many changes of government, he might have replied, as did the Lord Treasurer Paulett, that he was made of the pliable willow rather than of the stubborn oak.² His successors in office were of the same pliant material. They carefully carried out the Queen's orders, studied her caprices, anticipated her wishes, were more inclined to be severe than to be tolerant; and such was the rigour with which they carried out the laws, that even Elizabeth once declared that she feared the reproach which Bato made to Tiberius—that he had committed his flocks, not to shepherds, but to wolves.³

Against both laity and clergy their persecuting spirit was shown; but it was the clergy especially who were singled out for destruction, and for them nothing was too severe, and no torture left untried. In some cases a form of trial was gone through; in other cases they were put to death by martial law, perhaps on mere suspicion of being concerned in some conspiracy, or because they refused to reveal secrets which they were supposed to know. Nor do the cases of O'Hurley and O'Hely stand alone for cruelty and barbarity, for other cases there were, which excite equal horror. At Armagh, two friars were stripped of their habits and publicly scourged to death; at Youghal, a Franciscan was hanged head downwards; three members of the same Order were hanged at Down, another at Limerick, another at Youghal. A parish priest was hanged in his church at Coleraine, and the same fate befel a priest at Limerick; while the master of a vessel was hanged for bringing a priest from Belgium. Gibbon, Archbishop of Cashel, Tanner, Bishop of Cork, and Hurley, Dean of Limerick, died in prison, while Creagh, Archbishop of Armagh, after a long imprisonment, was poisoned in the Tower of London.⁴ Two Franciscans were taken and thrown into the sea, and another was trampled to death by horses. Three laymen, at Smerwick, had

² Olden's *Church of Ireland*, p. 322.

³ Moran's *Archbishops of Dublin*, p. 101, Note.

⁴ *Spicilegium Ossoriense*.

their legs and arms broken with hammers, and then were hanged, and similar torture was inflicted on the Abbot of Boyle. Three Franciscans, at Abbeyleix, were first beaten with sticks, then scourged with whips until the blood came, and finally were hanged. One Roche was taken to London and flogged publicly through the streets, and then tortured in prison until he died; another, after being flogged, had salt and vinegar rubbed into his wounds, and then was placed on the rack and tortured to death. And Collins, a priest at Cork, was first tortured, then hanged, and whilst he yet breathed, his heart was cut out and held up, the soldiers around crying out in exultation "Long live the Queen."⁵

Persecution does not generate conviction, and these cruelties did not succeed in winning the people from their faith. With admirable courage the bishops and priests clung to their posts; they felt the confidence with which the soldiers of the Lord should be inspired; and, when one was struck down, another was ready to take the place of his fallen brother. The religious orders did notable service, and their devotion and zeal nothing could surpass. The Jesuits were especially active; the Dominicans and Cistercians also freely shed their blood; but most of all, the sons of St. Francis, who were found in every position of danger, whom no terrors could appal, and who, in greater numbers than any other Order, endured suffering, and tortures, and death. A Jesuit, David Wolf, was sent to Ireland by the Pope in 1560, as Apostolic Nuncio; and when he died, in 1578, after many hardships and trials, another member of the same Order was sent from Rome to fill his place, and with equally ample powers.⁶ Against such zeal and perseverance the selfishness and greed of the Reforming ministers were ill-calculated to succeed, and Sidney had to confess, in 1575, that no progress was being made; Dr. Loftus of Dublin declared fifteen years later, that the people were still in revolt against the new doctrines; and Spenser had to tell an equally mournful tale.⁷ And, when Elizabeth died

⁵ *Our Martyrs*, pp. 90-219.

⁶ Moran's *Archbishops*, pp. 82-3.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 153; Mant pp. 298-9, 323-8; Spenser's *View of the State of Ireland*, p. 254.

in 1603, with a reputation for cruelty which Nero might have envied, the Irish people, exclusively Catholic, rejoiced that the persecutor of their faith was gone; and the hope was universal that, under a Stuart king, their deliverance from persecution had come.

A royal proclamation, in 1606, and two others in 1614 and 1635, commanding all bishops and priests to quit the kingdom under pain of death, and the martyrdom of O'Devanny, Bishop of Derry, and many others, showed how futile were these hopes.⁸ At the close of James's reign there was a period of toleration; and the Archbishop of Dublin, writing to Rome, reports that the Church was then manned by four archbishops, five bishops, vicars in every diocese, and parish priests in every district, and to these were subject 800 secular priests. In addition, there were 40 Jesuits, a few Cistercians, 20 Dominicans, a few Augustinians and Capuchins, and 200 Franciscans, whom he specially extols, "because they never suffered themselves to become extinct in the kingdom, and were the only religious who maintained the fight in some districts."⁹

If the advice of Usher had been taken, there would have been no toleration of Catholics during the reign of Charles I.;¹⁰ but, happily, his advice was rejected, and until the war broke out between the Parliament and the king, there were no fresh penal laws; and those in existence were mildly enforced. For nearly twenty years the Catholics were but little disturbed on account of their religion. But, with the advent of the Puritans to power, there was a disastrous change. Fighting for religious liberty themselves, they would allow no such liberty to others. They hated episcopacy in any form, but they hated Catholicism most of all. It was an abomination which could not be endured, and those who professed it should be placed outside the law. The horrors of 1641 still further inflamed their resentment. The lies of Temple¹¹ and others to some extent were believed. The

⁸ *Our Martyrs*, pp. 229-62.

⁹ Moran, p. 290.

¹⁰ Mant, Vol. I., p. 408.

¹¹ *The Irish Rebellion*.

Irish Catholics were regarded as rebels and murderers, whose crimes must be wiped out in blood; and Cooke, and Broghill, and Cromwell and their friends, soon showed that these were no idle threats. Cromwell would allow no Mass, and whoever received mercy from him, the priests received none. His friend Inchiquin killed 20 priests and 3,000 laity at Cashel, and, at the taking of Drogheda and Wexford, no priests were spared. When Broghill captured the Bishop of Ross he first cut off his hands and feet, and then hanged him; a Dominican arrested at Jamestown had his fingers and toes cut off, and then was put to death; a Franciscan, at Clonmel, was put first on the rack, after which his hands and feet were burned off, and finally, he was hanged; the Parish priest of Arklow was tied to a horse's tail, which was urged furiously on, and thus was dragged along the road to Gorey, where he was hanged;¹² and the numbers who were cut down by the common soldiers, or who died in prison, or were shipped as slaves to Barbadoes, will never be known. An edict was issued, in 1653, commanding all priests to leave the kingdom, and it was repeatedly published and rigorously enforced.¹³ On the head of a priest the same price was put as on the head of a wolf. Those who informed against them not only received rewards, but were declared to have deserved well of the State; and, in woods and caverns, and desert places, they were sought out and dragged to torture, or banishment, or death. In 1658, an oath of abjuration was prescribed for all Catholics, in which the authority of the Pope in Church matters was denied; and the reverence paid to the Blessed Virgin, the belief in the invocation of saints, the Real Presence, Purgatory, and the forgiveness of sins, were condemned.¹⁴ A Catholic refusing the oath, if rich, suffered the loss of two-thirds of his goods, if poor, was sent as a slave to Barbadoes. The rich were thus made poor, the poor driven into exile. The soldiers were gone, and were fighting on foreign fields; famine and war had decimated the masses of the people; the churches were in ruins; the altars overthrown; the images broken; the sacred

¹² *Our Martyrs*, pp. 328, 355.

¹³ Moran's *Persecutions under the Puritans*, pp. 118-20.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 187-8.

vessels turned to profane uses; and the Irish Church, which in 1640 had 27 bishops, and priests in every parish, a few years later, had to lament the loss of a thousand priests driven into exile. Nor was there a single bishop in the country but the Bishop of Kilmore, who, weighed down by age and infirmities, was unfit to discharge his episcopal functions, and even unable to seek safety in flight.¹⁵ The horrors of Elizabeth's reign were equalled and surpassed. But a few years more of Puritan rule and Catholicity would have been extinguished in Ireland.

To a land thus drenched with blood the Restoration was a welcome relief. Charles, indeed, like all the Stuarts, had little gratitude, and ill requited the services of his Irish subjects. But he had little sympathy with the persecution of Catholicism. Yet the bigotry of the Parliament in England, and of Ormond in Ireland, sometimes forced his hand; and his reign was disgraced by the death of Talbot, Archbishop of Dublin in prison, and, still more, by the death of Oliver Plunkett on the scaffold. This period of toleration with intermittent persecution, was followed by the short reign of James II., when Catholicism was raised to a position, not only of equality, but, of predominance. With the surrender of Limerick the era of predominance, and even of equality, was ended, and a new and shameful era of penal legislation was ushered in.

By the Irish Catholics this turn of affairs was little expected. They relied on the Treaty of Limerick, and believed it guaranteed toleration of their religion, and protected them against further penal laws. Its Military Articles, 29 in number, were only of a transient nature, and affected those actually in arms, with special reference to their shipment beyond the sea. The Civil Articles numbered 13; they affected the nation at large; and it is round these articles, and their proper interpretation, that so many fierce contests have been waged. The phraseology in which they were embodied was not happy, and lent itself to equivocation and ambiguity; and it is a mild censure on Sarsfield and his friends to say that, in the drawing up of this solemn treaty, on which so much depended for good or ill, they might have shaped it with

¹⁵ Moran's *Persecutions under the Puritans* pp. 121-2.

more caution and care. The Catholics were to enjoy "such privileges in the exercise of their religion as are consistent with the laws of Ireland, or as they did enjoy in the reign of Charles II.;" and, in either alternative, much or little might be meant. The Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity were still on the statute book, and what amount of toleration did these Acts contemplate, or what amount would the Catholics enjoy if these Acts were enforced? Nor was it safe to appeal with confidence to the reign of Charles II. Sometimes, indeed, there was a feeble and contemptuous toleration, when the Church might be said to emerge from the catacombs; when, in fear and trembling, schools and churches were opened. But on the other hand there were times when the spirit of persecution was unrestrained; when the Catholics were disarmed, and excluded from the magistracy and the corporations; when all schools, colleges and convents, were closed; when the Mass was prohibited, and the clergy commanded to quit the kingdom, and the Catholic inhabitants expelled from the garrison towns, and forbidden to meet even to discuss their grievances.¹⁶ It was consistent with the laws of England to believe Oates and Bedloe, and to send multitudes of innocent men to death, as it was with the laws of Ireland that Oliver Plunkett's life should be sworn away by perjured hirelings. If, then, the reign of Charles II. was to be set up as an example to be followed, the question arose, were the Catholics of Ireland to live in hope or in fear? were they to expect a caress or a blow? was the outlook to be a clear sky with the sun shining in the heavens, or were the clouds to be dark and menacing, the atmosphere thick and heavy, while the thunder rolled and the lightning flashed through the gloom? It might be one or the other; all depended on the sense in which the first of the Civil Articles was construed.

The Catholics had no doubt that it should be construed to spell toleration. When these articles were agreed to, Limerick was still in their hands; its defenders were numerous and well armed; its defences had been much strengthened since the

¹⁶ Cox's *Hibernia Anglicana*—(Reign of Charles II.,) pp. 12-15
Journals of the Irish House of Commons, Vol. II., pp. 73-4.

preceding year, and it was, therefore, better able to resist than it had been when it hurled back the attack of King William. There was, further, an assured hope of help from France, a hope which was soon realised by the arrival of Chateau-Renaud and his fleet and army in Dingle Bay. On the other hand, the winter was approaching; the enemy's trenches would soon be filled with water; the Irish climate, especially in winter, always told severely on English troops; and, in a few months, the horrors of disease which, two years before, had decimated Schomberg's army at Dundalk, might again decimate Ginkle's army before Limerick. Meantime, King William was at war with France, and the forces at Limerick were badly wanted for foreign fields. For the Irish to lay down their arms in these circumstances, and get nothing in exchange but slavery and chains, would have been to act as madmen. "Since the Irish had it in their power to give us the town of Limerick," says Story, "or keep it for themselves, I see no reason why they ought not to make a bargain for it and expect the performance of their contract."¹⁷ Nor was it so bad a bargain if it had been carried out in an honest spirit, and not with the desire to overreach and play false.

Not only was there to be such toleration as there had been in the reign of Charles II., but, in addition, the first Article promised that their Majesties would call an Irish Parliament, and endeavour to obtain a further relaxation of the penal laws in force. Those in arms in the several counties and those under their protection were secured in their estates; and from all who submitted to the new dynasty only the oath of allegiance was exacted, a stipulation plainly inconsistent with the oath of Supremacy and its vexatious provisions. The position of the Catholics, then, was that they could vote for members of Parliament, and sit in both Houses, become members of corporations, engage in trade, inherit and possess landed property, practise all professions, and have their churches and schools. All this did not place them on an equality with the Protestants, but it took away many vexatious restrictions, and it raised them

¹⁷ Story's *Continuation*, p. 279.

beyond the level of outlaws and slaves; and, if the Protestants rejoiced at the triumph of William, and looked to the future of their church without fear, the Catholics also could rejoice that petty persecution was over, and that an era of peace and religious freedom had begun.¹⁸

It soon became evident, however, that these bright hopes must be abandoned. While yet Limerick was in their hands, the Catholics got a foretaste of what was to come. In the second of the Civil Articles, which protected the soldiers and inhabitants in the Catholic quarters from forfeiture of their estates, the additional clause, "and all such as are under their protection in the said counties," was agreed to; but when the articles were engrossed this clause was found to be omitted. The fraud was detected and protested against by the Catholic leaders; the omission was made good; and the King, in confirming the articles, included the omitted clause, adding that he knew it had been in the draft copy.¹⁹ This attempted fraud was soon followed by successful and flagrant spoliation. Magistrates and sheriffs, presuming on their power, and without law or justice, robbed the Catholics of their goods and lands; and from all quarters came to the Lord Justices, complaints of ill-usage suffered by those who had their Majesties' protection, and were included in the Articles of Limerick.²⁰ Nor was this all. Dr. Dopping, the Protestant Bishop of Meath, preached before the Lords Justices that no faith ought to be kept with Catholics. They kept, he said, no faith with others themselves, and therefore, it seems, the Protestants were justified in imitating their perfidy. To the honour of those in authority, Dopping's name was struck off the list of Privy Councillors; and the following Sunday, in the same pulpit which Dopping had disgraced, the Bishop of Kilmore preached the obligation of keeping public faith. This was too much for the bigots, who hated the Catholics, and longed for further confiscations; and on the third Sunday, Dean

¹⁸ Story, pp. 239-54. Copy of the Articles, Civil and Military; Curry's *Review of the Civil Wars*, Vol. II., pp. 207-21.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 272.

²⁰ Harris's *Life of William III.*, pp. 350-5.

Syngé preached in Christ's Church, maintaining that the Treaty of Limerick should be kept "if possible." But even this attenuated adherence to truth and honesty was too much. The cry went forth that the Protestants were being betrayed; that the insolence of the Catholics should be curbed; that their lands should not be left to rebels and outlaws; and that the Irish Parliament dared not confirm in their entirety the Articles of Limerick.²¹

While the public mind was thus agitated, the Parliament met in Dublin, in October, 1692. Porter and Coningsby had ceased to be Lords Justices, and the Earl of Sydney, just appointed Lord Lieutenant, opened the session with a speech. He was a just and fair-minded man, and wished the Parliament to confirm by law the Articles of Limerick in their entirety. But those whom he addressed had little sympathy with his views. In the preceding year the English Parliament had enacted that no one could sit in the Irish Parliament without taking the Oath of Supremacy, and subscribing to the Declaration against Transubstantiation.²² The Irish Parliament, on other questions, might be disposed to resent being thus bound by a purely English Act, in the passing of which their assent had not been obtained; but when it was a question of fresh disabilities for the hated Papists their acquiescence was readily given. The Catholic members of both houses—they were but a few—presented themselves at the opening of the session, and were tendered the oath and Declaration as a necessary preliminary to taking their seats. They refused both, and were not allowed to sit; and thus the Parliament which Sydney addressed was exclusively Protestant. Its members were quite ready to thank King William for his efforts against "Popish tyranny;" and they willingly passed a Recognition Act, by which he and his heirs were declared the lawful sovereigns of Ireland.²³ They were ready also to encourage French and Flemish Protestants to settle in Ireland, and guaranteed them full freedom of their religion, even though they did not subscribe to the Established Church. But

²¹ Froude's *English in Ireland*, Vol. I., pp. 248-9.

²² Macaulay's *History of England*, Vol. II., pp. 300-1.

²³ *Commons Journal*, Vol. II., p. 506.

in other directions they could be neither led nor driven. Their tone was querulous and critical, and regarding Catholic demands, they were more disposed to coercion than to concession. They declared it a great grievance that Papists should have arms, or serviceable horses, or boats; they expelled one of their own members because he had served King James; they protested against the number of outlawries that had been reversed, and the number of pardons that had been given; and they peremptorily refused to give legislative sanction to the Articles of Limerick. Finally, they refused to vote part of the money asked by the Government for supply, on the ground that the money bill had not originated with themselves.²⁴ An obstinate assembly, such as this, which would do nothing but wrangle and complain, was ill-suited for legislative work; and Sydney angrily prorogued Parliament on the 3rd of November following, and subsequently it was dissolved.²⁵ For the moment Protestant Ascendency was powerless, and a practical toleration of Catholicity went on. But the Ascendency party had friends in England; intrigues were set on foot against Sydney, who was recalled in the following year, and three Lords Justices, Capel, Wych, and Duncombe, took the government of Ireland in hands. The two latter were known to share Sydney's views, but these also were got rid of, and Capel, raised to the peerage, became Lord Lieutenant, and in 1695, a new Irish Parliament was called.

At last the party of intolerance was in power, and was determined to use its power to the full. The defenders of Derry would revenge themselves on the defenders of Limerick; they would teach the Catholics to be submissive, and to remember that they were a conquered race; they would pay off old scores—the rebellion of 1641, the brutality of De Rosen at Derry, the attainders and outlawries of James's Parliament, the robberies of the Rapparees; they would retaliate on their own fellow-countrymen the sufferings endured by the Huguenots of France and the Waldenses of Piedmont; and, unmindful of a solemn treaty, they proceeded to fashion a penal code, the most shameful of which there is

²⁴ *Commons Journal*, pp. 600, 602, 615.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, Vol. II., pp. 629-30; Macaulay, Vol. II., pp. 418-19; Harris, *Appendix*, 65—(Sydney's Speech).

record. There was nobody to say them nay. The Viceroy was a man after their own hearts, "without any regard to equity or justice," says Harris;²⁶ and he was as much opposed as they were to the Articles of Limerick.²⁷ The King, cold, austere, selfish, without a spark of chivalry, finding the Catholics troublesome and impotent, abandoned them to their foes, and made no serious effort to carry out the engagements he had made; and the Catholics themselves, were entirely unrepresented in Parliament, and had no hope of again trying the fortune of war. Thus free to indulge their animosities and to give them expression in legislative enactments, the Protestant Parliament had a long series of penal laws passed in the session of 1695. They re-enacted those portions of the Acts of Settlement and Explanation which disqualified Catholics from being members of corporations, from voting for such, and even from inhabiting in corporate towns. They were also forbidden to have schools and colleges at home, and if they sent their children abroad, to be educated in a Catholic college or convent, they were at once placed outside the pale of citizenship, rendered incapable of being guardians or executors, or administrators, of filling any office, of inheriting property, and, further, they forfeited all the real and personal property which they already possessed. After the 1st of March following, no Catholic could have arms or ammunition, and, if it was suspected he had any such, two magistrates might search his house. If he concealed arms after that date, he was, for the first offence, fined and imprisoned; for the second offence, he incurred the penalty of *praemunire*. A few noblemen and gentlemen, specially included in the Articles of Limerick and Galway, or those specially licensed, could carry a sword and pistol. In addition to this, no gunsmith could take a Catholic apprentice, nor could any Catholic possess a horse of value more than £5. There was also an Act prohibiting Catholic holydays.

The following year Capel died, and was succeeded by Porter who also died in the same year. To him succeeded Ruvigny, Ear.

²⁶ Harris, p. 417.

²⁷ Moran, *The Catholics of Ireland under the Penal Laws in the Eighteenth Century*, p. 6; Harris, pp. 418-19; *Commons Journal*, Vol. II., pp. 659, 743.

of Galway. Exiled from France, because he was a Protestant, what he had suffered for his own faith had not taught him to be tolerant to others. He was as bitter and as bigoted as Capel; and when he opened the Irish Parliament, in 1697, the Catholics had before them a fresh crop of penal laws. A law was passed commanding all bishops, vicars-general, and regular priests to quit the kingdom before the 1st of May following. If they failed to go they were imprisoned till transported; if, after going abroad, they returned, they were guilty of high treason; and for concealing any such bishop or regular, the penalty was a heavy fine, and forfeiture of goods and lands. To bury the dead in an old ruined church or monastery was also punishable by a fine; and the Protestant heiress who married a Catholic suffered the loss of all her property, which was transferred to her Protestant next-of-kin. Nor could a clergyman assist at such a marriage without the penalty of a fine, as well as contracting perpetual incapacity to fill either civil or military office. Further, those who refused to work on Catholic holidays were liable to be fined or whipped. In the teeth of the Limerick Articles, an Outlawries Act was passed, declaring forfeit the estates of those who had been killed in rebellion, or had died in foreign service, and this though they had been pardoned by the King. An exception was made in the case of Sarsfield and a few other noblemen; but the exception was made at the suggestion of a strong party in the Irish House of Lords, and not at the suggestion either of Lord Galway or the King. By another Act the Articles of Limerick were confirmed, but with the omission of the disputed clause, the preamble stating that so much only of the Articles was confirmed "as might consort with the safety and welfare of his Majesty's subjects in Ireland," a fatal use of the loose wording in which the first of the Civil Articles was drawn. Even in a Parliament from which truth and justice seemed to have fled such shameful perfidy was condemned. A small minority in the Commons protested; but the protest in the Upper House was stronger and bolder, and only by a majority of one as the Act "confirming" the Articles of Limerick passed into law. Fifteen members recorded a protest, which was entered on the Journals of the House, and in which they declared, and with

truth, that the Act left the Catholics worse than they were before, and that many, previously included within the Articles, were now excluded from them. Five of those who protested were bishops, from which it may be concluded that not all of the episcopacy were of the base character of Dopping.²⁸

About this time the English woollen manufacturers took alarm at the importation of the woollen manufactures from Ireland, and petitioned the English House of Lords to put down their rivals. The Lords petitioned the King, who promised that "he would do all in his power to discourage the woollen manufactures of Ireland," and in the session of 1698, an Act was passed prohibiting the exportation of woollen cloths to any country except England, and to England itself, except subject to ruinous tariffs. Nor could Irish wool be sent to England except through the one port of Barnstaple. This was a measure which affected the Irish Protestants as well as the Catholics, yet but one member of Parliament—Molyneux—protested. It was easy and safe to tyrannize over Irish Papists; but in dealing with the English Parliament the Irish members were quick to recognise their master; and only the feeblest resistance was offered to a measure which destroyed the Irish woollen trade at a single blow.²⁹ The English Parliament also took into consideration the question of the recently forfeited estates. The commissioners appointed by them found many abuses. Some Papists, they said, were treated with too great leniency and pardoned too easily; and King William had made enormous grants to his friends—to the Earls of Galway and Albemarle, to his special friend Bentinck, and worst of all, to his discarded mistress, the Countess of Orkney. All such grants were declared void; and by the Act of Resumption, in 1700, the English Parliament appropriated these lands to the public revenue; at which William was so displeased that, though he gave his assent to the law, he at once prorogued Parliament, without even making

²⁸ *Commons Journal*, Vol. II., pp. 938-40; Froude, Vol. I., p. 283. (Extract from the Journals of the House of Lords); Harris, pp. 420-3.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, Vol. II., pp. 997, 1104, 1122; Macaulay, Vol. II., pp. 658-9; Froude, pp. 296-8; Harris, pp. 461, 466.