

CONGRESS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, April 14.

The following bills were read the third time and passed, viz.

An act making appropriations for the support of government for the year 1800.

An act to make appropriations for the navy of the United States during the year 1800.

An act to continue in force for a limited time an act intitled an act to prescribe the mode of taking evidence in cases of contested elections for Members of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to compel the attendance of witnesses.

An act to authorize the sale and conveyance of lands in certain cases by the Marshals of the United States, and to confirm former sales—and

An act to provide for rebuilding the Light house at New London; for the support of a Light-house at Clark's point, for the erection and support of a light-house at Wig-Wam Point; and for other purposes.

Mr. Harper, from the committee to whom was referred the amendments of the Senate to the bill to extend the privilege of obtaining patents, &c. reported, that it would be proper the house should concur.

The report was agreed to.

A message was received from the Senate, by Mr. Ows, their secretary, informing the House, that the Senate have passed the bill for the relief of the Corporation of Rhode Island College.

Mr. Wain presented a petition of James Thomas Bishop, merchant and mariner, praying to be admitted a citizen of the United States—Referred to a select committee.

Mr. Davis laid the following resolution on the table.

Resolved, That the next annual Meeting of the Congress of the United States, shall be held on the first Monday in November 1800.

Mr. Harper called for the order of the day on the bill to provide for the better organization of the courts of the United States.

Mr. Kitchell, after expressing his opinion that the principle of the bill had been already negatived, moved that the further consideration of it be postponed till the first Monday in December next. After considerable debate the question was taken by yeas and nays, as follow:

AFFIRMATIVE.

Messrs. Alton, Bailey, Bishop, R. Brown Cabell, Christie, Clay, Claiborne, J. Davenport, Davis, Dawson, Dent, Eggleston, Elmendorf, D. Foster, Fowler, Friedman, Gallatin, Gray, Gregg, Hartley, Holmes, Jackson, Jones, Kitchell, Leib, Lyon, Linn, Macomb, Mullenberg, New, Nicholas, Nicholson, Randolph, Shepherd, Smith, J. Smith S. Smith, Spraight, Stanford, Stone, Sumpter, Taliaferro, Thompson, A. Trigg, J. Trigg, Varman, R. Williams.

NEGATIVE.

Messrs. Baer, Bartlett, Bayard, Brace, J. Brown, Champlin, Cooper, Dana, F. Davenport, Dennis, Dickson, Edmond, Evans, A. Foster, Glen, G. Goodrich, E. Goodrich, Griswold, Greve, Harper, Henderson, Hill, Hugan, Imlay, H. Lee, S. Lee, Lyman Marshall, Morris, Note, Page, Parkin, Pinckney, Platt, Powell, Reed, Rutledge, Sewall, Sheafe, Thatcher, J. Thomas, R. Thomas, Wadsworth, Wain, L. Williams, Woods.

A message was received from the Senate; notifying that they have passed the resolution relative to the Copper Bed on Lake Superior.

A message was received from the President of the United States, by his secretary, Mr. Shaw, informing the house, that the President did on the 12th inst. approve and sign the following acts, viz.

An act to continue in force for a limited period the act intitled an act relative to certain fisheries of the United States; for the government of the fishermen employed therein; and for other purposes as therein mentioned—and

An act to alter the form of certain oaths and affirmations directed to be taken by the act intitled an act to provide for the second Census or enumeration of the inhabitants of the United States.

The house went into a committee of the whole on the resolution reported by the committee of revision and unfinished business, for continuing in force the act laying an additional duty on salt; Mr. Rutledge in the chair; and after a short debate, the resolution was agreed to, yeas 49; the committee then rose, and upon the question will the house concur with the committee in their agreement to the said resolution, it passed in the affirmative.

Yeas 54, Nays 38.

The house resolved itself into a committee of the whole on the report of the committee of claims on the petition of Stephen Savage; Mr. Rutledge in the chair.

The report, which is unfavorable to the petitioner, was opposed by Mr. Harper, who spoke at great length in favor of the claim.

The question was then taken, and the report agreed to, yeas 46, nays 27. The committee rose, and the house concurred, yeas 43, nays 24.

The bill to continue in force the act intitled "An act in addition to the act for the punishment of certain crimes against the United States," was read a third time and passed. Adjourned.

BALTIMORE, April 12.

A schooner of Messrs. S. Smith and Buchanan from Havana, arrived this day, and saluted; and a brig from Jamaica. Two other schooners were also below, from the West-Indies.

Foreign Intelligence.

LONDON, February 6.

Yesterday Government received dispatches from Sir James Saunier, at Jersey, which in some degree confirm the last accounts from La Vendee. They state that a neutral vessel, from L'Orient, had brought intelligence that there had been two engagements between the Chouans and Republicans, in both of which the former had prevailed; but that 30 battalions of a gular infantry, and three regiments of horse, having arrived in the insurgent provinces, there was reason to apprehend that the Royalists would be unable to keep the field. Circuitous reports of this kind are, however, but little to be depended upon.

Two mails arrived from Hamburg this day: they do not, however, contain much novelty.

The Vienna Court Gazette of the eighth and ninth ult. are entirely barren of military intelligence.

Letters from Barentz state, that after the arrival of a courier from St. Peterburgh, the Russian army had been reviewed; and that after having received the necessary articles for their equipment they marched in columns consisting of between 3000 and 4000 men each, towards Franconia, by way of the Palatinate and Barentz in order to reassemble in the districts of Wurtemberg and Aschaffenburg, and from thence to march to the Rhine. The same letters add, that the new Russian army expected in Bohemia, would pursue the same direction, and that the campaign would soon be opened again by the siege of Mentz. The statement, however, is not official.

The report of the Cardinal Bellisiani having been elected Pope, is not yet confirmed.

Field Marshal Kray, it is now supposed, will be appointed to command on the Rhine.

Letters from Peterburgh and Czarow state, that 60,000 Russians are now on their march to reinforce the army of Prince Suwarow.

Lord Minto, the English Minister at Vienna, has been at Prague, to treat with Prince Suwarow, respecting the subsidies for the Russian army, which are said to have been agreed upon for 100,000 men. Their march to the Rhine will, it is said, begin in the middle of February at farthest.

From the Hague we learn, that a Secretary of Legation, belonging to the Embassy at Paris, had gone thither in sixty hours, to confer in secret with some of the members of the present Government, after which he again returned to Paris.

Private letters from Italy have been received at Vienna, stating that General Count Kleau had not been able to maintain himself in the advantage lately gained by him, but that he was obliged to give way to superior numbers, the reinforcements intended for him not being able to join on account of the badness of the roads.

BRITISH PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

February 7.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

The House upon the motion of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, resolved into a committee of supply.

Mr. Wallace called the recollection of the house to the vote of the navy last year. There was then voted 120,000 men, but from the a teration of circumstances since that time, particularly by the surrender of the Dutch fleet, it was deemed prudent to reduce the allowance this year 10,000 men. He should therefore move it as a resolution of the committee, that 110,000 men should be employed in the service of the navy for the year 1800, including 22,000 marines.

Mr. Nichols said, he felt himself bound to oppose any supply for the carrying on of the war upon the present avowed principles. It was now acknowledged by administration that he warred for the restoration of the Bourbon family—(A cry of no! no! no! from the ministerial benches.)—The honorable member then insisted that such was the necessary inference to be drawn from Lord Grenville's answer to Buonaparte: True indeed it did state other objects such as the utter reduction and crippling the power of France. This he insisted amounted to the same thing; because if ever the power of France was reduced to such a low ebb as that, they would be unable to resist any form of Government that he should be pleased to impose upon them. Indeed he had given credit to ministers in having acted wisely and manfully in having agreed that obj. A, because he considered that a nation at war ought always to know and be able to state with precision, the object for which they were contended. The honorable gentleman assumed this point, that we were at war to restore the Bourbon family, and from thence went into a long detail of the arguments which have been already used, to shew the improbability of accomplishg such a measure.—From the change of property—from the destruction of the nobles and ecclesiastics—from the unwillingness of the country to submit to feudal and ecclesiastical burthens—from probable future want of concert among the allies, &c. The honorable gentleman was proceeding, but was interrupted by

Mr. Barker, who stated, that he did not doubt the ingenuity of the honorable gentleman would be able to connect his arguments with the question, but he thought they were rather remote, and begged the question might be read.

Mr. Hobhouse said, that his honourable friend was in order, and was proceeded to explain the connection of his observations with the question, when

The Chancellor of the exchequer said that one honourable member had not a right to explain the speech of another honourable member, when any irregularity arise, the member should explain himself.

The chairman said, that a member certainly had a right to shew himself in what manner his speech bore upon the question, and hoped the honourable member would limit himself strictly to the question, and assign his reasons, why he opposed the resolution of the supply.

Mr. Hobhouse said, that his hon. friend connected the restoration of the Bourbon family with the war, and hence the reason of his entering on that part of the subject, as it would connect itself with the resolution of the committee.

Mr. Tierney defended Mr. Nichols, as being perfectly in order, provided he could shew how his observations connected themselves with the question. He did not expect to find at so early an hour so much impatience to decide the question, for the purpose of accommodating gentlemen who wish to withdraw, and though that all should be on an equal footing in the house on such occasions.

Mr. Pitt begged to say a few words:—In what had been said it could not be presumed that there was any intention to fetter the freedom of debate. The only wish was to save time; but if all the hon. gentleman's speech was to be connected with the question, not only by his own ingenuity, but also by that of his hon. friends behind him. The house had made a bad arrangement for the good disposition of their time, and they had much better permit the hon. gentleman to go on.

Mr. Nicholls accordingly resumed, and continued his arguments to shew the improbability of succeeding in the attempt to restore the Bourbon family. From thence he adverted to the commencement of the war, which he said was pushed forward by some of his Majesty's Ministers, not from principles of justice or national advantage, but from principles of private interest—and it became the country to consider whether they would support them in the disastrous contest? He could not conscientiously do it, as he was persuaded that every thing depended upon the speedy restoration of peace.

Mr. Addington professed himself greatly surprized that the hon. gentleman should oppose the supplies, and he was equally surprized at the reasons by which he had attempted to justify that conduct. The hon. gentleman had gone into the question of war, a question which was so ably discussed the other night, and to completely answered by his honourable friend below him.—Upon that therefore he should say nothing, but content himself with calling the attention of the house to one argument of an hon. gentleman (Mr. Secretary Dundas), which was supposing you had made peace, could you wish safety diffin? He did not recollect that any answer was attempted to be given to this by any gentleman on the other side. He would put the case, that the hon. gentleman was one of his Majesty's Ministers, and then he would ask him—If under the present circumstances of France, he would advise his Majesty to disband his forces, even admitting a peace to be concluded? If the hon. gentleman answered in the affirmative, he would say, that it would be unadvised to pursue such conduct; and if the hon. gentleman answered in the negative, he would ask him what sort of a peace that could be called, when we dared not lay aside our arms? It would not be a peace, it would be merely an armed truce. If peace could not be obtained, why should we negotiate? it would be only to beat down the spirit of the nation; to disunite our allies, to disseminate discord among the confederates, and destroy our most flattering hopes.

Mr. B. Edwards pressed great attachment to the naval service, and therefore he could not oppose any vote in their favour. But he could not agree to the doctrine which he had lately heard advanced. If words and language had any distinct meaning, the note of Lord Grenville did most certainly imply that we were engaged in the war for the restoration of the Bourbon family, and he believed that we were bound by treaties to attempt the effecting of that point. He thought that we even had an opportunity of treating for peace without any loss of honour, without being asked for it. The events of the war ought to represent us from being too sanguine of success. Look at St. Domingo, or look nearer home, at Holland, when a British army had been obliged to pass under the yoke. It was easy for them to draw battles who were not to fight them, but the events of war were in the hands of the Lord Almighty, and he had said, "That the race was not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong;" and if Scripture did not teach us this, yet the experience of this war ought to have taught it us. For by it we might have learned that nothing is so formidable as an enemy reduced to desperat on.

Mr. Wilberforce expressed his intention of shortly stating the grounds upon which he gave his vote. He thought gentlemen came to a decision upon this point just as they happened to view it in different lights, or as they were predisposed. The question to him seemed to be, whether by voting for a communication with the chief consul he should have accelerated a safe and permanent peace? if he had thought it would have produced that desirable object, he for one should have voted an address for negotiation; but unless that could be effected, he thought that gentleman should not reason from the general evils attendant upon all wars. The question was, could they hope for security and permanency? At the first hearing of the communication, he confessed that it gave him great pleasure, and he was inclined to think we ought to open a negotiation; but

more mature reflection convinced him of the painful necessity of abandoning that pleasing thought. The honorable member then went into an examination of the personal character of Buonaparte, and the stability of his power; of the probability a permanent peace, and the chance that he was not sincere in his propositions. He thought that the conduct of ministers fully evinced that they were desirous of peace, as they had attempted negotiation, but were defeated by the pride, arrogance, and insincerity of our enemies.

Mr. Hobhouse said, that he had been prevented by illness from attending during the debate on Monday last, he hoped he might claim the indulgence of the house for a little time, while he made some observations on the subject of the late overtures for negotiation; particularly so as the honorable gentleman who just sat down, had dwelt upon it. It was not his intention to enter into the question, who were the aggressors in this war, or whether any opportunity had been lost for concluding a peace; because these distinctions were irrelevant to the question then before the house. He would however, reply to one argument that had been made use of on the subject of aggression, because nobody else had done so. To shew that Great Britain was not the aggressor, the minister on a former night mentioned a letter which Louis the XVI. had written in 1792 to his Majesty, thanking him for not having taken a part in the war in which France was engaged with Austria and Prussia. It should be recollected that that letter had been written before any acts of aggression had taken place on the part of Great Britain; before she had prohibited the exportation of corn to France; before she dismissed the Ambassador of that country, &c. all which happened previous to the declaration of war by France in Feb. 1793. Now with respect to reason assigned by ministers for refusing to meet the overtures from France, he must observe that they had never before urged such plea as that of instability in the government from the circumstance of its recency. They had shewn themselves ready to treat with the last government in the very infancy of its establishment; they were ready to treat with the new Directory, which was then composed of men who had embued their hands in the blood of that monarch whose murder this country was endeavoring to revenge. Therefore the plea of recency was not only new, but inconsistent with the conduct of those who used it. What was this conduct? At the very time it had been echoed in that house that the finances of France were ruined, ministers were ready to treat with her. After the victory gained in the councils by the party, hostile to the negotiations thus carrying on by Lord Malmesbury at Lisse, and after the unanimous dismissal of his Lordship, the British government, notwithstanding, declared itself ready to negotiate. But ministers would not treat now because they did not know whether the present government of France had any stability. How could they wait to make a trial of the stabilities of that government, which they were labouring with all their efforts to overthrow? How were they to wait until they perceived that stability? What space of time would be sufficient to testify them?

"In God's name (said Mr. H.) let the country know the criterion by which you are to judge of the stability of the French government!"—There was as great a spirit of moderation now in France as at any time since the revolution. This spirit had shewn itself in the council of elders, shortly before the arrival of Buonaparte. If France was now so weak and ruined as had been stated this country has in that weakness a security which she could not have under any other form of government that might exist in France. There was as much security and as little perfidy to be expected after a peace made with Buonaparte as with any of the Bourbons. But from the whole line of conduct pursued by ministers, he was clearly of opinion, that their object was to carry on the war till they had made the throne of France Buonaparte's would say the same thing now to the people of France; and would make use of the rejection of his overtures as a means of consolidating the whole power of that country in his own hands. It was England then which furnished him with the best means and the best arguments. The object of restoring the Bourbons was as unattainable now as at any period since the commencement of the war. Every means had been already tried to effect it; powerful considerations had been excited—great armies had been brought into the field under the most experienced Generals; yet we were not nearer to the attainment of the object. He deplored the resolution which the house had come to on the subject of the late overtures, and he was sure this country would be obliged to make peace on worse terms than it was now in its power to obtain. The conduct of ministers then was as rash as it was inconsistent. They were obliged on this occasion to say, that they were not bound by their former professions in favour of peace; and this they did at the very time they were charging the enemy with a breach of his professions, besides his other crimes.

Lord Hawkesbury observed, that the arguments of gentlemen on the other side of the house appeared to rest on an assumption that there was a sufficient degree of stability in the government of France; and that, if there was none at all, that might not be a reason against treating with it. As to the stability of Buonaparte's government, it was only to be judged of by the fate of all those that had gone before it, in a country where a revolution had taken place almost every year; and with respect to the propriety of negotiating with the government that was established in consequence of the last revolution, there was no other ground by which it could be judged, except that of the character of the individuals who were at the head

of its government. And if he found that those persons had been parties to acts of the most criminal and atrocious kind, it was good reason to conclude that no confidence could be placed in them. He would not attempt to defend the conduct of the princes of the house of Bourbon. He would admit that it had often been perfidious; but it was necessary to consider that there had been a system in Europe, to which these and other Princes had been obliged to cling, and which had confined their actions; bad as they might be, within certain limits. No question ever arose with respect to the stability of their governments. These could not be changed, had they been ever so bad. But to enter into a treaty of peace with a government that had no character; that was infamous for its crimes; that had no stability, and which nobody knew the moment it was likely to be changed; that was a policy which nothing but madness could dictate; particularly so when it was considered how great were the power and resources of the country at this moment; and that its revenues were increased to an amount beyond what they had ever been at. There was no country in the world; between whose peace, and war establishment there was so great a disproportion as Great Britain. To make peace now would be to put away a force which could not be procured in case of a breach of treaty; to put down the war machine, which it would take a long time to raise again; to open the ports of France, and give her commerce an opportunity of reviving, and her government an opportunity of putting the country in a better condition to make war again. Every body must, and he himself did rejoice at the failure of Lord Malmesbury's negotiations; because the most atrocious acts of the government with which we had offered to make peace took place since those failures. It was since then that they had practised such infamous conduct towards Italy and America; and that they had committed that perfidious, gross and scandalous violation of their treaty with the Porte by the invasion of Egypt; at the very time when a Turkish ambassador resided at Paris. Every thing that happened since the last experiment should make this country cautious how she negotiates again.—With respect to the restoration of the House of Bourbon, he should be ashamed if he did not say he wished such an event to take place. He wished it on the principles of humanity and public justice, as it was the only means of blotting out of the page of history, and ridding the world of the crimes of the French Revolution. But let any gentleman shew him another government in France with which a peace could be made, consistently with security against those principles which endangered the safety and peace of the world for the last ten years, and with that government he would be ready to negotiate; but let there be a sure test for this security. An honorable gentleman asked what was the criterion of that security? He could answer the question no other way than by stating, that the test required was a display on the part of the enemy of different principles from those hitherto acted upon, and such as could be looked up to with security. He hoped then that this country would persevere with firmness and manliness until the present contest was brought to an honorable termination. He had it from the first sources of information, that the British character never stood so high on the Continent of Europe as at the present moment; for this character we were indebted to the vigor and resolution with which we supported the contest even when we stood alone; and the only persons who appeared to speak against the character of Great Britain were those few who composed the minority of that and the other house of Parliament. The question was then put and carried.—Adjourned.

of its government. And if he found that those persons had been parties to acts of the most criminal and atrocious kind, it was good reason to conclude that no confidence could be placed in them. He would not attempt to defend the conduct of the princes of the house of Bourbon. He would admit that it had often been perfidious; but it was necessary to consider that there had been a system in Europe, to which these and other Princes had been obliged to cling, and which had confined their actions; bad as they might be, within certain limits. No question ever arose with respect to the stability of their governments. These could not be changed, had they been ever so bad. But to enter into a treaty of peace with a government that had no character; that was infamous for its crimes; that had no stability, and which nobody knew the moment it was likely to be changed; that was a policy which nothing but madness could dictate; particularly so when it was considered how great were the power and resources of the country at this moment; and that its revenues were increased to an amount beyond what they had ever been at. There was no country in the world; between whose peace, and war establishment there was so great a disproportion as Great Britain. To make peace now would be to put away a force which could not be procured in case of a breach of treaty; to put down the war machine, which it would take a long time to raise again; to open the ports of France, and give her commerce an opportunity of reviving, and her government an opportunity of putting the country in a better condition to make war again. Every body must, and he himself did rejoice at the failure of Lord Malmesbury's negotiations; because the most atrocious acts of the government with which we had offered to make peace took place since those failures. It was since then that they had practised such infamous conduct towards Italy and America; and that they had committed that perfidious, gross and scandalous violation of their treaty with the Porte by the invasion of Egypt; at the very time when a Turkish ambassador resided at Paris. Every thing that happened since the last experiment should make this country cautious how she negotiates again.—With respect to the restoration of the House of Bourbon, he should be ashamed if he did not say he wished such an event to take place. He wished it on the principles of humanity and public justice, as it was the only means of blotting out of the page of history, and ridding the world of the crimes of the French Revolution. But let any gentleman shew him another government in France with which a peace could be made, consistently with security against those principles which endangered the safety and peace of the world for the last ten years, and with that government he would be ready to negotiate; but let there be a sure test for this security. An honorable gentleman asked what was the criterion of that security? He could answer the question no other way than by stating, that the test required was a display on the part of the enemy of different principles from those hitherto acted upon, and such as could be looked up to with security. He hoped then that this country would persevere with firmness and manliness until the present contest was brought to an honorable termination. He had it from the first sources of information, that the British character never stood so high on the Continent of Europe as at the present moment; for this character we were indebted to the vigor and resolution with which we supported the contest even when we stood alone; and the only persons who appeared to speak against the character of Great Britain were those few who composed the minority of that and the other house of Parliament. The question was then put and carried.—Adjourned.

of its government. And if he found that those persons had been parties to acts of the most criminal and atrocious kind, it was good reason to conclude that no confidence could be placed in them. He would not attempt to defend the conduct of the princes of the house of Bourbon. He would admit that it had often been perfidious; but it was necessary to consider that there had been a system in Europe, to which these and other Princes had been obliged to cling, and which had confined their actions; bad as they might be, within certain limits. No question ever arose with respect to the stability of their governments. These could not be changed, had they been ever so bad. But to enter into a treaty of peace with a government that had no character; that was infamous for its crimes; that had no stability, and which nobody knew the moment it was likely to be changed; that was a policy which nothing but madness could dictate; particularly so when it was considered how great were the power and resources of the country at this moment; and that its revenues were increased to an amount beyond what they had ever been at. There was no country in the world; between whose peace, and war establishment there was so great a disproportion as Great Britain. To make peace now would be to put away a force which could not be procured in case of a breach of treaty; to put down the war machine, which it would take a long time to raise again; to open the ports of France, and give her commerce an opportunity of reviving, and her government an opportunity of putting the country in a better condition to make war again. Every body must, and he himself did rejoice at the failure of Lord Malmesbury's negotiations; because the most atrocious acts of the government with which we had offered to make peace took place since those failures. It was since then that they had practised such infamous conduct towards Italy and America; and that they had committed that perfidious, gross and scandalous violation of their treaty with the Porte by the invasion of Egypt; at the very time when a Turkish ambassador resided at Paris. Every thing that happened since the last experiment should make this country cautious how she negotiates again.—With respect to the restoration of the House of Bourbon, he should be ashamed if he did not say he wished such an event to take place. He wished it on the principles of humanity and public justice, as it was the only means of blotting out of the page of history, and ridding the world of the crimes of the French Revolution. But let any gentleman shew him another government in France with which a peace could be made, consistently with security against those principles which endangered the safety and peace of the world for the last ten years, and with that government he would be ready to negotiate; but let there be a sure test for this security. An honorable gentleman asked what was the criterion of that security? He could answer the question no other way than by stating, that the test required was a display on the part of the enemy of different principles from those hitherto acted upon, and such as could be looked up to with security. He hoped then that this country would persevere with firmness and manliness until the present contest was brought to an honorable termination. He had it from the first sources of information, that the British character never stood so high on the Continent of Europe as at the present moment; for this character we were indebted to the vigor and resolution with which we supported the contest even when we stood alone; and the only persons who appeared to speak against the character of Great Britain were those few who composed the minority of that and the other house of Parliament. The question was then put and carried.—Adjourned.

of its government. And if he found that those persons had been parties to acts of the most criminal and atrocious kind, it was good reason to conclude that no confidence could be placed in them. He would not attempt to defend the conduct of the princes of the house of Bourbon. He would admit that it had often been perfidious; but it was necessary to consider that there had been a system in Europe, to which these and other Princes had been obliged to cling, and which had confined their actions; bad as they might be, within certain limits. No question ever arose with respect to the stability of their governments. These could not be changed, had they been ever so bad. But to enter into a treaty of peace with a government that had no character; that was infamous for its crimes; that had no stability, and which nobody knew the moment it was likely to be changed; that was a policy which nothing but madness could dictate; particularly so when it was considered how great were the power and resources of the country at this moment; and that its revenues were increased to an amount beyond what they had ever been at. There was no country in the world; between whose peace, and war establishment there was so great a disproportion as Great Britain. To make peace now would be to put away a force which could not be procured in case of a breach of treaty; to put down the war machine, which it would take a long time to raise again; to open the ports of France, and give her commerce an opportunity of reviving, and her government an opportunity of putting the country in a better condition to make war again. Every body must, and he himself did rejoice at the failure of Lord Malmesbury's negotiations; because the most atrocious acts of the government with which we had offered to make peace took place since those failures. It was since then that they had practised such infamous conduct towards Italy and America; and that they had committed that perfidious, gross and scandalous violation of their treaty with the Porte by the invasion of Egypt; at the very time when a Turkish ambassador resided at Paris. Every thing that happened since the last experiment should make this country cautious how she negotiates again.—With respect to the restoration of the House of Bourbon, he should be ashamed if he did not say he wished such an event to take place. He wished it on the principles of humanity and public justice, as it was the only means of blotting out of the page of history, and ridding the world of the crimes of the French Revolution. But let any gentleman shew him another government in France with which a peace could be made, consistently with security against those principles which endangered the safety and peace of the world for the last ten years, and with that government he would be ready to negotiate; but let there be a sure test for this security. An honorable gentleman asked what was the criterion of that security? He could answer the question no other way than by stating, that the test required was a display on the part of the enemy of different principles from those hitherto acted upon, and such as could be looked up to with security. He hoped then that this country would persevere with firmness and manliness until the present contest was brought to an honorable termination. He had it from the first sources of information, that the British character never stood so high on the Continent of Europe as at the present moment; for this character we were indebted to the vigor and resolution with which we supported the contest even when we stood alone; and the only persons who appeared to speak against the character of Great Britain were those few who composed the minority of that and the other house of Parliament. The question was then put and carried.—Adjourned.

of its government. And if he found that those persons had been parties to acts of the most criminal and atrocious kind, it was good reason to conclude that no confidence could be placed in them. He would not attempt to defend the conduct of the princes of the house of Bourbon. He would admit that it had often been perfidious; but it was necessary to consider that there had been a system in Europe, to which these and other Princes had been obliged to cling, and which had confined their actions; bad as they might be, within certain limits. No question ever arose with respect to the stability of their governments. These could not be changed, had they been ever so bad. But to enter into a treaty of peace with a government that had no character; that was infamous for its crimes; that had no stability, and which nobody knew the moment it was likely to be changed; that was a policy which nothing but madness could dictate; particularly so when it was considered how great were the power and resources of the country at this moment; and that its revenues were increased to an amount beyond what they had ever been at. There was no country in the world; between whose peace, and war establishment there was so great a disproportion as Great Britain. To make peace now would be to put away a force which could not be procured in case of a breach of treaty; to put down the war machine, which it would take a long time to raise again; to open the ports of France, and give her commerce an opportunity of reviving, and her government an opportunity of putting the country in a better condition to make war again. Every body must, and he himself did rejoice at the failure of Lord Malmesbury's negotiations; because the most atrocious acts of the government with which we had offered to make peace took place since those failures. It was since then that they had practised such infamous conduct towards Italy and America; and that they had committed that perfidious, gross and scandalous violation of their treaty with the Porte by the invasion of Egypt; at the very time when a Turkish ambassador resided at Paris. Every thing that happened since the last experiment should make this country cautious how she negotiates again.—With respect to the restoration of the House of Bourbon, he should be ashamed if he did not say he wished such an event to take place. He wished it on the principles of humanity and public justice, as it was the only means of blotting out of the page of history, and ridding the world of the crimes of the French Revolution. But let any gentleman shew him another government in France with which a peace could be made, consistently with security against those principles which endangered the safety and peace of the world for the last ten years, and with that government he would be ready to negotiate; but let there be a sure test for this security. An honorable gentleman asked what was the criterion of that security? He could answer the question no other way than by stating, that the test required was a display on the part of the enemy of different principles from those hitherto acted upon, and such as could be looked up to with security. He hoped then that this country would persevere with firmness and manliness until the present contest was brought to an honorable termination. He had it from the first sources of information, that the British character never stood so high on the Continent of Europe as at the present moment; for this character we were indebted to the vigor and resolution with which we supported the contest even when we stood alone; and the only persons who appeared to speak against the character of Great Britain were those few who composed the minority of that and the other house of Parliament. The question was then put and carried.—Adjourned.

of its government. And if he found that those persons had been parties to acts of the most criminal and atrocious kind, it was good reason to conclude that no confidence could be placed in them. He would not attempt to defend the conduct of the princes of the house of Bourbon. He would admit that it had often been perfidious; but it was necessary to consider that there had been a system in Europe, to which these and other Princes had been obliged to cling, and which had confined their actions; bad as they might be, within certain limits. No question ever arose with respect to the stability of their governments. These could not be changed, had they been ever so bad. But to enter into a treaty of peace with a government that had no character; that was infamous for its crimes; that had no stability, and which nobody knew the moment it was likely to be changed; that was a policy which nothing but madness could dictate; particularly so when it was considered how great were the power and resources of the country at this moment; and that its revenues were increased to an amount beyond what they had ever been at. There was no country in the world; between whose peace, and war establishment there was so great a disproportion as Great Britain. To make peace now would be to put away a force which could not be procured in case of a breach of treaty; to put down the war machine, which it would take a long time to raise again; to open the ports of France, and give her commerce an opportunity of reviving, and her government an opportunity of putting the country in a better condition to make war again. Every body must, and he himself did rejoice at the failure of Lord Malmesbury's negotiations; because the most atrocious acts of the government with which we had offered to make peace took place since those failures. It was since then that they had practised such infamous conduct towards Italy and America; and that they had committed that perfidious, gross and scandalous violation of their treaty with the Porte by the invasion of Egypt; at the very time when a Turkish ambassador resided at Paris. Every thing that happened since the last experiment should make this country cautious how she negotiates again.—With respect to the restoration of the House of Bourbon, he should be ashamed if he did not say he wished such an event to take place. He wished it on the principles of humanity and public justice, as it was the only means of blotting out of the page of history, and ridding the world of the crimes of the French Revolution. But let any gentleman shew him another government in France with which a peace could be made, consistently with security against those principles which endangered the safety and peace of the world for the last ten years, and with that government he would be ready to negotiate; but let there be a sure test for this security. An honorable gentleman asked what was the criterion of that security? He could answer the question no other way than by stating, that the test required was a display on the part of the enemy of different principles from those hitherto acted upon, and such as could be looked up to with security. He hoped then that this country would persevere with firmness and manliness until the present contest was brought to an honorable termination. He had it from the first sources of information, that the British character never stood so high on the Continent of Europe as at the present moment; for this character we were indebted to the vigor and resolution with which we supported the contest even when we stood alone; and the only persons who appeared to speak against the character of Great Britain were those few who composed the minority of that and the other house of Parliament. The question was then put and carried.—Adjourned.

of its government. And if he found that those persons had been parties to acts of the most criminal and atrocious kind, it was good reason to conclude that no confidence could be placed in them. He would not attempt to defend the conduct of the princes of the house of Bourbon. He would admit that it had often been perfidious; but it was necessary to consider that there had been a system in Europe, to which these and other Princes had been obliged to cling, and which had confined their actions; bad as they might be, within certain limits. No question ever arose with respect to the stability of their governments. These could not be changed, had they been ever so bad. But to enter into a treaty of peace with a government that had no character; that was infamous for its crimes; that had no stability, and which nobody knew the moment it was likely to be changed; that was a policy which nothing but madness could dictate; particularly so when it was considered how great were the power and resources of the country at this moment; and that its revenues were increased to an amount beyond what they had ever been at. There was no country in the world; between whose peace, and war establishment there was so great a disproportion as Great Britain. To make peace now would be to put away a force which could not be procured in case of a breach of treaty; to put down the war machine, which it would take a long time to raise again; to open the ports of France, and give her commerce an opportunity of reviving, and her government an opportunity of putting the country in a better condition to make war again. Every body must, and he himself did rejoice at the failure of Lord Malmesbury's negotiations; because the most atrocious acts of the government with which we had offered to make peace took place since those failures. It was since then that they had practised such infamous conduct towards Italy and America; and that they had committed that perfidious, gross and scandalous violation of their treaty with the Porte by the invasion of Egypt; at the very time when a Turkish ambassador resided at Paris. Every thing that happened since the last experiment should make this country cautious how she negotiates again.—With respect to the restoration of the House of Bourbon, he should be ashamed if he did not say he wished such an event to take place. He wished it on the principles of humanity and public justice, as it was the only means of blotting out of the page of history, and ridding the world of the crimes of the French Revolution. But let any gentleman shew him another government in France with which a peace could be made, consistently with security against those principles which endangered the safety and peace of the world for the last ten years, and with that government he would be ready to negotiate; but let there be a sure test for this security. An honorable gentleman asked what was the criterion of that security? He could answer the question no other way than by stating, that the test required was a display on the part of the enemy of different principles from those hitherto acted upon, and such as could be looked up to with security. He hoped then that this country would persevere with firmness and manliness until the present contest was brought to an honorable termination. He had it from the first sources of information, that the British character never stood so high on the Continent of Europe as at the present moment; for this character we were indebted to the vigor and resolution with which we supported the contest even when we stood alone