

from principle, this was the man?—But if we refused our interference, we became accessories and participators in the most diabolical and disgraceful infamy that ever tyranny exhibited. Those unfortunate gentlemen were exposed to a degree of savage refinement in barbarity hitherto unprecedented, Distributed into different jails to deprive them of the comfort of being ever under the same roof, immersed in subterranean dungeons where the only view they could have was the barred execution; which not Law, but Tyranny inflicted within their sight and hearing. This he affirmed, positively to have taken place at Magdeburg; where, M. Fayette earnestly intreated, to value, to be indulged in the melancholy satisfaction of being at least under the same roof with the companions of his misfortunes; but which the barbarous inhumanity of his jailors refused; and they were actually dispersed into different jails. It will be said, What was the British nation to do with all this? He asked, did Custom prevent this interference of one nation with another in cases of humanity; or was there no precedent of this kind to justify us in the present instance. It was not so long ago but to be within the memory of most gentlemen upon the unfortunate situation of Captain Rowley C. Aigill, when this court applied, and succeeded too, for the interference of the Court of France to save his life. What then was there to prevent our following one of those few good examples which the old government of that devoted country afforded us? But if there existed no instance of this kind to unite us, were there wanting motives to induce us to the adoption of the present proposition? Is the declaration of the king of Prussia of no weight? Does not the right hon. gentleman know it was made? Was it not made frequently and in the most public manner? But he had said the king of Prussia, in using those words must mean other allies. The fact is, his majesty wished to divide the odium which must ever attach itself to this transaction among the combined powers, and they must, if they wished to shake it off, deny it one by one; and it was not enough that a minister should deny it in that house, and in such terms as might hereafter perhaps be denied or done away; but it should flow from the king himself, that is, by such a public renunciation, such of this nation, who might hereafter be upbraided with it, might be enabled to refute it. But is this the only ground upon which we are called upon to interfere? the hon. gentleman said, that his majesty's declaration to the people of France could not apply to M. Fayette. He on the contrary maintained, that he must be expressly included in it, inasmuch as at the signing of it, it had express reference to the transactions at Toulon, and there expressly guaranteed that constitution, which M. Fayette had a principal hand in establishing. But he had made a distinction in dates, and asked, whether he followed that promising protection to those who should hereafter join them, they should also protect those who had acted a certain time. To which he answered most certainly it did, or the declaration multibe considered as a mere quibble—for if we were ready to accept of promises us a good ground of protection, how much stronger were we bound to those who had actually performed eminent services in the cause we undertook to support, and as in the present instance had sacrificed so much to his attachment to it. Suppose, for instance, M. Fayette could not have made his escape out of France, but was wandering and concealed, as many others are stated to be, he would ask, whether in consequence of our declaration he had continued to join us, whether or not we were bound to protect him? Nay more, suppose him to be imprisoned by French instead of Prussian tyranny, and within reach of our arms, should we not, if possible, liberate him by force, and shall we then hesitate to endeavor to do so by entreaty? When the arguments that humanity and justice dictated, were so many and so strong, he was ashamed to mention that which policy suggested; but could any one doubt, even in this point of view, the propriety of our interference. To prove this, he stated the use M. Fayette might have been to the cause at Toulon, or may hereafter be in any future attempt upon France, as one whom they would so naturally look up to; the injury it would be if they saw those who opposed the present powers in France treated, by flying from one captivity to a still worse; and the necessity of our remonstrating to the allied powers against so imprudent a conduct, if they pursued the same objects which we professed to do.

The mode likewise of the capture of this unfortunate gentleman and his associates, he shewed was of a piece with all that followed, and was equally worthy such actors, namely by downright treachery. At the time of his flight there were about forty persons of them; these were met by a few, of whom it was demanded, whether they might have safe passage into Holland? This was promised, and in violation of this promise they were afterwards made captives, and exposed to all the subsequent brutality. Upon the subject of the right by which they were to be considered as captives, he contended that either they were to be considered as prisoners of war, and as such entitled to be treated with the lenity which custom has indulged to such; or else, as indeed they were called prisoners of state. As such then, he would call upon any man to shew by what law of nations it could be held, that a man is to be punished by those in whose power he was, for crimes supposed to be committed, not in the territory of him in whose hands he is, but in his own country. Their treatment therefore, could only be traced to that savage and unjustifiable law, the law of violence, and the will of an individual. Upon the whole, the question resolved itself into this simple and narrow consideration, to those who think the treatment of these unfortunate men, no injury to the common cause, they would vote against the motion. On the contrary, those who saw in those cruelties a violation of every principle of justice, humanity and prudence, they would give it their support. If ministers have done any thing on the subject, then they would clearly have to consider, whether what was done was rightly done; if they meant to interfere, then it would be proper to wait; but if neither of these was the case, it behoved

that house to consider, whether they were not called upon to consult their own feelings, and the success of that cause which they professed to support. Upon these grounds, therefore, he declared his assent to the motion of his hon. friend.

Mr. Burke, with his usual warmth, commented on the affairs and misfortunes attendant on the events of France; the miseries of which he principally attributed to M. Fayette, contending that we were not called on in any manner to interfere in his favor, and declaring that when he contemplated the numerous and aggravated series of misery which desolate that unhappy country, all compassion for the individual was swallowed up in the general calamity.

Mr. Grey observed, that the right honorable gentleman who spoke last, had declaimed loudly against the cruelties and atrocities of the French. He did not mean to argue on the irrelevancy of the various topics which he had introduced, but he conceived that we may draw a lesson from their cruelties, by abstaining from that injustice, which cruelly confined the unfortunate Marquis la Fayette in a loathsome dungeon. He maintained, that as we had no right to interfere with the internal government of France, so it was not just to inflict a punishment on that unfortunate gentleman, for whatever constitution he may wish to have established. He trusted that the unfortunate queen, in her dying moments, esteemed la Fayette for his assiduities, and the part which he had taken in behalf of the royal family. He observed, that by the declaration of Lord Hood to the Toulonese, they were promised the constitution of 1789, which was the very constitution for which the wretched Marquis la Fayette was an advocate. If therefore it were the object of the confederates to restore the ancient Monarchy, in preference to the constitution of 1789, he affirmed that Great-Britain would be justified in withdrawing herself from the present alliance to make a separate peace. Principles of justice and policy should induce this country, he insisted, to interfere for the enlargement of these unfortunate gentlemen, whose chief crime was, in supporting that constitution which Lord Hood offered to the Toulonese.

Mr. Pitt said, that Lord Hood, in consequence of previous information with the Toulonese understood that they had no objection to enter into a negotiation with the English. If they made a declaration in favor of Monarchy, he agreed to supply them and contribute to their wants, which was accepted, and afterwards they declared in favor of the constitution of 1789.

Mr. Fox declared that he conceived the fact exactly as stated, which did not alter the circumstance, that this country had bound itself to what had been stated by his hon. friend.

Sir Robert Thornton affirmed that all parties with whom he had conversed, exclaimed against the confinement of la Fayette. He conceived that justice and policy should induce us to interpose in his favor, and he was of opinion that there was something extremely unmanly and unmilitary in the court of Berlin, respecting its conduct to that unfortunate officer.

Mr. William Smith said, that he was impelled to lay in his claim to argue against our interference with the internal government of France. We were actually falling into such error by punishing la Fayette for the part which he had taken in the revolution of France. It gave him, he said, deep concern to find that in the lapse of five years, nothing had occurred in a country struggling for freedom, that could induce the nation, the most free in the world, to interfere in its behalf. Had that been the case, it were probable that those crimes which had been imputed to the French never would have happened. He concluded by declaring, that this country will suffer severely if the present motion were not carried.

Mr. Milford spoke against the motion.

Mr. Cox adverted to what had fallen in debate. He insisted, that it went to sow the seeds of that system in this country, which in France had grown into maturity, to the destruction of every elegance, every comfort both in this life and in the next, and which must ultimately destroy every species of Liberty, and it had given the death blow to Justice. He insisted, that La Fayette was extremely culpable, and as such could not vote for the motion.

Mr. Fox declared, that from the con-

versation which he had with several persons at Brighton, who had just returned from Paris, and who were not the least attached to the Marquis La Fayette, he was convinced that none of those crimes could be fairly attributed to him, with which he was charged by those gentlemen who opposed the motion.

Mr. Jenkinson affirmed that he was in Paris at the time to which the Right Hon. gentleman had adverted, when it was generally acknowledged that he could, if he pleased, prevent many of the circumstances so much reprobated.

Mr. Martin returned thanks to the gentleman who had brought forward the motion, as it gave him an opportunity of demonstrating his abhorrence of the confinement of this unfortunate gentleman. He declared, that his severe punishment was the conversation of all parties throughout the country, and he trusted that the House would vote for the motion, not less through the motives of mercy, than through the motives of sound policy.

Mr. Stanly declared, that he was in Paris at the time adverted to by several gentlemen who had spoke. He must in justice to the unfortunate La Fayette declare that he not only did every thing in his power to prevent the circumstances that had happened, but risked also his own personal safety. He would therefore vote for the motion.

Mr. Courtney insisted, that instead of giving offence to the King of Prussia, he would be pleased to have this country interpose for the liberation of his prisoner. He had disclaimed wishing to keep in confinement, and did it merely to please the Confederates. He thought this court would do him a favor in removing him from the situation of a Royal gaoler.—It was strange logic to state, that all the crimes of Roberfpierre, Marat, and Danton, were to be attributed to La Fayette; it would be equally just to impute the riots of 1780 to his Majesty's Ministers, or Lord Amherst who was the commander of the forces. Lord George Gordon himself was made a prisoner by the mob, but he never impeached the ministers for the circumstance. Much idle declamation had been used with respect to the atrocities committed at Paris, while not a single cruelty committed by the Royal anarchists was ever mentioned. He did not conceive why these Lords anointed should have a patent for fomenting anarchy and confusion. He thought that a popular ferment was necessary at times, to clear the political atmosphere; and would rather suffer all the troubles attendant on Democracy, than breathe for a moment the pestilential air of Regal Despotism.

Mr. Whitbread insisted that the Royal word was pledged to give France the Constitution of 1789, and if he retreated from it, or rather his Minister, it would be a violation of his promise; and in doing so, they could not escape with honor. He next took notice of the conduct of Langara and Lord Hood, which was highly contradictory, but he said it was useless to call on Mr. Pitt for an explanation to their curious declarations, who had been repeatedly questioned as to the subsidizing the king of Prussia to the amount of 700,000. to which he thought fit to make no reply. Probably it was his wish to postpone the question, till late in the session, in the same manner that he did in the introduction of the Sardinian treaty.

Mr. Pitt replied, that when the question respecting a subsidy to the king of Prussia was brought forward, and was regularly before the house, then he would give every explanation required. If it was necessary to subsidize any prince, he would at a proper period give every information on the subject.

The question being loudly called for, the house divided, Ayes 46—Noes 153.—Majority 107.

LONDON, March 19.  
DECLARATION

Of the King of Prussia against a general armament of the inhabitants of the empire.

I. When the proposition for a general armament of the subjects of the empire was made at the assembly of the Diet, the king of Prussia represented such essential difficulties against this measure, that he could not have expected that the proposition would have been carried to a conclusion.

II. For this reason his majesty finds himself under the necessity of laying them

again once more before the nearest circles, with this observation, viz. "That if the said circles cannot determine with themselves to withdraw the said conclusion, and render it of none effect, he will be forced, however contrary to his inclination, to withdraw his troops, as he cannot expose them to the danger which must necessarily result from this measure."

III. The reasons that his Prussian majesty opposes to a general armament of the inhabitants of the empire, are the following, viz.

1. By employing the peasants against the enemy, agriculture will want hands.
2. That there are not arms sufficient to give to such a mass of people.
3. That it is impossible, in so short a time, to teach the manual exercise to the inhabitants.
4. It has been found, by the experience of the two last campaigns, that the soldiers opposed to the French must be perfectly exercised to make head against them.
5. Lastly, independent of the above reasons it is infinitely dangerous, at a time like the present, when the French are watching every advantage to insinuate their principles, to assemble such a mass of men, whose ideas upon forms of government must be various, and among whom consequently dissensions might arise, disastrous in their consequences, both to the armies and to the constitution of the Empire.

For the GAZETTE of the UNITED STATES.

Mr. FENNO,  
A writer in the American Brussels Gazette, of the 5th instant, appears to be wonderfully tickled with the number, object and description of those persons who were present at the Civic Feast on Saturday last. That the writer and his companions experienced much pleasure on the occasion is possible, and if he had remained satisfied with giving us a description of his feelings, without exaggerating some of the circumstances upon which he found his triumph, it would have been very well. In order therefore to draw some further information from this impartial biographer, relative to the occurrences of that ever memorable day, I shall beg leave to ask him the following questions:

Whether any body besides himself and the Editor of the Brussels Gazette aforesaid, was at the pains of ascertaining the number of persons who went out for the laudable purpose mentioned in his publication, and whether they amounted to two hundred or eight hundred?

Whether all those who walked in the procession or followed it, are to be considered as partakers of the feast, or members of the Twin Societies?

Whether it is customary at entertainments given by subscription, and upon the modern principles of democracy, for all the best viands to be placed at the head of one table only?

Whether it is true, that a member of one of the Twin Societies was seen walking in the streets with the head of a barbecued pig in his pocket, after it had been resolved that the fragments of the feast should be applied to a charitable purpose?

Whether the toasts said to have been given at the entertainment, were repeated aloud, and applauded by all the company?

To the Editor of the Gazette of the United States.

SIR,  
So then, sir, we are to have no more democratic squibs from the Citizen General Advertiser: he declares he will no more answer the attacks on him. But what are his reasons? "Forsooth," because "his time is pledged to his numerous PATRONS," and because he prints nothing "without being PAID for it." Without being paid for it, Citizen! I hope there is no one that doubts of the General Advertiser's BEING PAID! I dare say the Pere du Cheze himself (whose motto was bougrement democrate) was never better paid.—We certainly cannot doubt of the citizen's having a great number of patrons; he has told us the other day, with a "zounds" at the end of it that he has eight hundred. But this word Patron, how came it to be admitted into the haughty democratic dictionary? Who would have thought that this trumpet of equality was so pledged to his patrons, that he could not find time to defend himself?—But when a man is "paid" for it, it is another thing.—A patron necessarily implies a dependant. Now here is a distinction of ranks or classes, which is contrary to every principle of sterling Sans Culottism; and though it is more than probable that the citizen is, in a very humiliating state of dependence, yet the avowal is unworthy of his professed principles, and if he were in the neighborhood of the Jacobin Society of Paris, this avowal might probably procure him the honor of following his predecessor CARA. Barrere observed very justly "that liberty (French liberty, I mean) is a privileged creditor; that she has a right to our property, our persons, our talents & even our thoughts." According to this principle, as the allies are now taking the field, it is reported that the