

ment of other nations, her aggressions on the rights, and violation of the independence of other States, added to the criminality and deepened the atrocity of her conduct. Did not Jacobin France attempt the overthrow of every government? Did not Jacobin France arm her Governors against the governed; and when her politics suited it, did not she arm the governed against the Governors. What had been her conduct in Switzerland? In Italy the whole scheme of society was changed, and the independence of every government violated. The Netherlands, too, remain to exhibit to mankind monuments of the awful veneration with which the Republic has regarded the independence of other States. Was it part of the system formed to give permanence to their abhorrence of all interference with the internal Government of other countries, to their respect for the independence of all other nations to publish their memorable decree of November, 1792? That decree had not slept a dead letter on their statute book. No, it was still the active energetic principle of their whole conduct. It was that principle on which they acted when they dethroned Kings and plundered Princes. It was that principle, which still strong and still indefatigable, every Monarch of Europe must arm himself to resist and overcome. The whole world was interested in the extinction of that principle for ever. Having thus stated the question on those various views with much eloquence and force of language, his Lordship claimed it as the fair result of the facts he adduced, that the assertions of the Minister of France were contradicted and proved to be false, by a reference to the mere events of the war, and to the history of the rise and progress of the revolution. The assertions of M. Talleyrand being the declaration in great part of the altered sentiments and views of the rulers of France, their Lordships would readily perceive in the refutation of those assertions a proof also of the hollowness of that declaration. They would perceive, that far from having renounced all views of aggrandizement, far from being willing to respect the independence of other nations, far from being sincere in her proclamation of a love of peace, she is still Jacobin France, that France that urged Europe to a cruel and most destructive war, that has accumulated province on province, has overthrown state after state, has outraged the rights of humanity, and trampled on and destroyed the laws and constitutions of other nations. The application of all this to his first principle his Lordship considered inevitable. The House must have felt that every fact in the whole series tended directly to prove that no change has taken place in the genuine sentiments and views of the government of France. How truly the second principle was founded on just conceptions of the views and conduct of the Republic would appear presently. — It would appear "that no safe, honorable, and permanent peace could be made with France in her present situation, and with her present Rulers." The proofs in this case were numerous. Every power with whom the Republic has treated, whether for armistice or for peace, could furnish melancholy instances of the perfidy of France, and of the ambition, and injustice and cruelty of her Rulers. Did she agree to a suspension of arms, it was to be admitted into the state of the negotiating Prince, that she might more successfully undermine his Throne by corrupting the principles of his subjects. She has only wished for an armistice as a truce, in the course of which she was to plan the disorganization of feeble states, to excite the people to rebellion, depose the Magistrates, and seize on the revenues, and source, of powers for whom she vowed eternal friendship. In no stage of their progress have her generals disguised that they entered neighbouring countries, only to despoil the rich of their inheritances, and even poverty itself has been stripped of her rags, of those relics of wretchedness which the storm had not quite torn away, that the Republic might yet persevere in her war of extermination to all people and to all Kings. The fate of Switzerland, of that brave, honest and generous people, was in the recollection of Noble Lords. Switzerland concluded a truce with the Republic, the Republic excited insurrections in Switzerland, overthrew her institutions, oppressed her people with contributions, degraded or deposed, or exiled her Magistracy; seized on her strong

places; assumed the command of her armies; and to give permanence to the usurpation, imposed on her Government not merely new in form but in name. Here was a striking illustration of the good faith, the Republic observed towards powers with whom she concluded armistices. If again armistice has been followed by negotiation for Peace, negotiation for Peace has seldom been productive of little else than protracted ruin, or has been the prelude to more destructive war. The history of her negotiations was the history of wickedness, was the record of crime. It was the teeming annals of hollow, deep, inflexible perfidy, of treaties made to be violated without shame, and of alliances formed to be outraged without remorse. Through all Europe these truths were acknowledged, because through all Europe the effects had been felt, and deprecated, of the terrible wreck of Thrones and the overthrow of States, which were the issues of French alliance and the pledges of French faith. The Grand Duke of Tuscany was among the early sufferers by a Treaty of Peace with the Republic. In every thing that abused Prince strove to conform his conduct to the views of France, but the train had been laid, and at a moment when the honour of the Republic was pledged for the security of his State, he saw the troops of his Ally enter his capital, the Governor of that City (Florence) imprisoned, his subjects in a state of rebellion, and himself about to be exiled from his dominions. It was to this Prince, however, that the Republic repeated her assurances of attachment, but the Republic that sought not conquest, that would not interfere with the Government of other States, deposed the Sovereign, and gave a democracy to the Florentines. The King of Sardinia opened the gates of his capital to the Republican arms, and confiding in the integrity of the French Government, expected to find his possessions guaranteed by the treaty which recognized his title and his rights, and which guaranteed to France adequate advantages. He was forced to resign his Continental Dominions, while the citadel of Turin was treacherously taken possession of by the Republicans. History would record these events with the minuteness which belonged to them, and in that succession in which, for the misfortune of all nations they opened on mankind. The change of the Papal Government was part of that system. It was schemed by Joseph Buonaparte in his palace, and being by that Ambassador excited to insurrection, we saw the Revolution effected by him at the head of the Roman mob. In the example of Naples was displayed the same contempt of the laws of war and of the rights of peace. The King of that State might have hoped that towards him the faith of treaty would be observed, for he had done nothing to provoke the wrath, or excite the cupidity of the Republic. It was true indeed, that a war broke out between that Prince and the Roman Republic; but was there a man living who doubted but that that Republic, in itself neither inclined nor prepared to commence a war, was instigated by France to provoke hostilities. The subsequent events of the war most fully proved that France was in reality the author of it. For no sooner did the armies of these two States take the field, than the Republicans joined the troops of Rome, and, not satisfied with defending the Capital, carried their pillaging and destroying arms into the heart of Naples. Fortunately those Sovereigns regained their dominions, but so deep had the principles of anarchy & disloyalty been every where sown, that not even at this hour were the States of Italy in possession of half the comforts of peace, nay, it might be feared that they experienced rather those hardships which are the concomitants of war. Prussia could not be fairly said to have sustained no infraction of the rights of peace, though Prussia might possibly be considered as having peculiarly shared the tender solicitude of the Republic to avoid war. It was five years since France and the Court of Berlin ceased to be enemies in the field, but those who knew what was the sensation produced at that Court at the time, could clearly see an infraction of the faith of treaty, in the proceedings of France towards Hamburg. In this city, whose independence Prussia guarantees, the agents of the Republic imposed and levied large contributions, and all Europe must be convinced that Prussia regarded such conduct as a violation of the pledged

friendship of France. Holland and Spain, her Allies, or rather her Tributaries, how had her Treaties with them been observed? The privateers and armed vessels of the Republic, that swarm of Buccaneers fitted out to pirate the trade of the whole world, took and carried into the ports of France the vessels of those friendly powers. This was not all; for in contempt of the acknowledged law of nations, the Republic decreed the property of the subjects of her allies, lawful prizes, and to fill the measure of her injustice, even appointed Consuls in the ports of those very States to regulate the commerce in captured commodities—in the commodities of an allied Republic, and an allied Kingdom. Reverting to the intercourse of the Republic with the States of the Empire, the same want of faith was to be discovered throughout. The Armistice concluded by the Archduke with the General of the Republic was succeeded by the Treaty of Campo Formio; and was this Treaty better observed than any of those which went before? It generated the causes of war which now rages for the second time through Europe. The Republics of Italy that might hope to find some indulgence from the Republicans of France, were next outraged and overthrown by the same arts which we saw successful against Princes. After concluding the business of the Armistice with the Emperor, and the subsequent preliminaries to a Treaty, France directed her arms against Venice. Here they proclaimed that they came as deliverers, who would release them from the yoke of Austria, that, according to the French Generals, had long insulted, betrayed, and oppressed the Republican Venetians, but it was a mere proclamation, for in no long time was the Republic raised by themselves, annihilated, and Venice sold to that very Emperor whose vaunted aggressions and extortions afforded the original pretext of the invasion of the French. Genoa received them as friends, and that the debt of gratitude might be paid in the style of the new school. Genoa was revolutionized, a new Government hurried up, while under the authority of a mock Constitution, we saw the people plundered and the country pillaged. But if injustice against Princes and Aristocrats forms part of the creed of the modern revolutionist, was justice better observed towards the Republics raised especially under the wings of France, her own offspring and affiliated with her. Was it in any or in all those facts that Noble Lords saw the security to this country from a peace concluded with such a power? But it would be said those were not the acts of France more than they were inevitably the result of a state of war. This was easily answered by a reference to the report of a principal Member of the new Government, who tells the Committee of the Elders, that neither the Revolutionary nor the Constitutional Government was capable of maintaining the relations of friendship and peace with the powers of Europe, that treaties (as with Austria) were only made to be broken, and that there were no security for Europe, or even the Republic itself, while such a mass of absurdity, of folly, and error, continued to form the basis of the Government. So much did the actors in the last revolution believe the statement of this Reporter (Boulay de la Meurthe), that they found their claims to the approbation and assent of the people of France, on the declaration that their Government is founded on a profound view of those vices and defects, and on principles which are to stop the revolutions of the Republican order. If then the declarations of the Rulers of France so entirely support all his Majesty's Ministers have from time to time stated on the subject of war or peace, what other course would wisdom bid Great-Britain to adopt, but to await the event of things, to await the results of future experience, and not to enter on negotiation at a time when no one advantage can fairly be expected from it. To attempt to negotiate would in fact be to impeach all former decisions, to libel the past declarations of that House, to libel the good sense and spirit of the people of England; but above all, it would betray the interests of our allies at a moment when the whole world hails with impatience the renewal of that vigorous resistance to the aggressions of France, which has already produced such signal good, and which, under the blessing of God, may yet lead to the deliver-

ance of Europe from the principles and the arms of the common enemy of man. Thus much he had detained their Lordship's attention to a mere statement of facts, and so conclusive did those facts appear to him, that he would not attempt to diversify their aspect by arguments. He had observed with how much grave attention their Lordships followed him in his statement; and he would now assume, as proved most completely, the two propositions above stated. There had just occurred to him a topic which, in the order of just arrangement, should have preceded much of what he had been stating. This was the assertion in the note of M. Talleyrand, that this country was the original aggressor in the war. Here his Lordship entered into the detail of that question, and urged with great ability the arguments of Ministers to prove that France was the aggressor.

He disclaimed all alliance and connection with any Power or Powers whatever for the purpose of overthrowing the Government of France, especially the pretended treaties of Pavia and Plinitz; and observed, that so far was the Emperor from meditating such interference, that he expressly notified to all the Courts of Europe, that he considered the acceptance of the new French Constitution by the King as the proper act of the King. The effect of this declaration was however but too soon felt by his Imperial Majesty. For in 1792, when the French invaded his dominions, so unprepared was he, that the Netherlands speedily fell into the hands of the Republic. England not only did not mean to interfere with the internal affairs of France, but actually authorized her Ministers on the Continent to become the mediators between the powers at war. Even M. Chauvelin himself, and M. Talleyrand, admitted this. In fact, the latter in his declaration as an Ambassador contradicted his declaration as a Minister. Here his Lordship took a general view of the correspondence of that period, and insisted that in all respects it proved the aggression to have originated with France. He next took a rapid view of the limited question of the practicability of negotiation at this time, and maintained that the reception of our Ambassador at Paris and at Lille, the final result of the negotiation there attempted, the present temper and conduct of the Government of France, were in all respects such as to warrant no man in considering negotiation practicable. But were negotiations even practicable, were we quite sure that it would not be converted against us as an engine of destruction? Had not the same thing happened to other Nations, and did we all at once forget the sworn hatred of the Jacobins against England? Here his Lordship commented with much success on the Note of the French Minister; and with respect to the assertion in it that the powers of Europe had originally provoked the Republic, by refusing to recognize her, "to the exertion of her own strength and of the courage of her Citizens," his Lordship observed, that more was meant in the original than could be expressed in any translation with appropriate spirit and face. It was an artful insinuation that the Republic was dragged into the war, by the spirit of the original was, that she carried her arms into neutral States, to make her claims valid against Nations at war. In other words, if a Neutral State would not commit aggressions on States at war with the Republic, or supply the wants of her soldiers, she was to resort to the execution of her strength, and the courage of her Citizens, to subjugate and plunder them. It was in this spirit they invaded and seized on Egypt; and in the same spirit might England expect to be invaded, if, unlike the other Powers of Europe which, unfortunately for them, surrounded the Republic, we were not separated by a Channel that, under God, will ever be impassable. The words in the Note which appeared to him so insidious were *Elle a porté par tout ses armes desensifs*. His Lordship having expatiated on those different topics with great ability, and enforced arguments with uncommon clearness and energy, proceeds to an investigation of the degree of credit to the personal character of Buonaparte could be considered as justly entitled.—

"Let us now my Lords, examine the proofs, the recorded evidences of which we are in possession: and which can enable us to form a correct opinion of the personal good faith of the first Consul! We shall not be destitute of sufficient