

Poissiers, end of so many successive generations of heroes, was stated to be designed to reward an assassin for executing his horrible design? On the same principle, that the English newspapers were, in all these cases, innocent and unaccused, Peltier was equally innocent in this publication. If it was in fact only the republication of the work of another writer, the republication was certainly blameless; and if it was even written by Mr. Peltier, with a view to give a dramatic character of the faction, by putting its principles in their natural language in the mouths of its leaders, he was equally innocent; or if there was any crime, it was a libel against Chenier or Ginguenet, to whom the article was imputed, and not against the First Consul. It was natural to think that a remnant of the jacobin faction still existed in France; it was known that it did exist, and it was the nature of that faction to seek a refuge from the maledictions of those whom it had formerly oppressed and tortured in the resumption of its former power. The faction was active, and such a piece as this ode might well be among the means it employed. Mr. M. having, in the course of this last argument used the word republican, in a sense which may appear to convey some censure, explained; he did not use the term as meaning Citizens of Republican Governments, many of which he respected, and particularly a new Republic of British growth. Neither did he mean it as any imputation on those whose political opinions favoured a republican form of government, but a just sarcasm on those pretended republicans of France who used the name to cover the worst and most fatal hostility to freedom. It could not be that Mr. Peltier wrote this seriously for the purpose of promoting the royal cause. It would be madness in him to call upon the French citizens of the present day, to avenge the cause of Robespierre and Barras, the worst enemies of royalty. If he could seriously address such language to French citizens for such a purpose, he was a much sicker object for a commission of lunacy than of a prosecution for libel; and this madness was rendered still more outrageous by adding to the council the name of the most declared and decided enemy of the party to which it was addressed. It may indeed come within the policy of a royalist to excite republicans to insurrection, with a view to profit by their broils; but if such a royalist meant not to defeat his own purpose, he would conceal his name. It was however evident, from the context, that the Ode in question was not the work of Mr. Peltier. It appeared from the passage already cited, and of which a poetical translation had been read, that it was written by a fanatical republican, once hostile to England, now a little reconciled in his judgment, but not yet perfectly reconciled: it speaks of the people relying on the law, resisting and setting at defiance the exertion of regal power; this certainly could not be mentioned with praise by the Royalist Peltier. My learned friend, said Mr. M. cannot forget that Swift did not mean, by his arguments in defence of Atheism, really to support that doctrine; but, on the contrary, by that unvarnished specimen of irony, to ridicule and shame all such unprincipled tenets. Such were the motives of Butler for putting such odious sentiments in the mouths of Hudibras and his squire, and such were Peltier's for putting such sentiments in some places he did put into the mouths of the

jacobins. Not that even they, bad as they are, can be suspected, by me, of any design to shocking to human nature as assassination: and I own I am surprised to hear my Learned Friend say so seriously, that any allusion to the apotheosis of Romulus, or to the affair of Brutus and Cæsar, must necessarily have such a shocking and abominable object, as if these events, so much the themes of school-boy declamation, were not too familiar to excite any extraordinary propensity to imitation.—With respect to that part of the paper which alluded to the assassination of Cæsar, Mr. M. denied that when that event was spoken of, every man who used it, intended to recommend or justify assassination. He stated a variety of cases, in which that event had been alluded to in many authors who were never suspected of a wish to excite the commission of assassination. Nor could it be more safely inferred from the allusion to the apotheosis in use among the Romans. It might be that a man, disgusted with the numerous addresses which had been poured from all quarters, might fairly say, I even wish him the apotheosis as soon as he can have it; many of the Roman Emperors received the honours of a divinity, and yet lived; their apotheosis did not necessarily imply their death. He next adverted to the imputation of free discussion, and elucidated this part of his argument by precedents drawn from our own history. At the time when Queen Elizabeth, that wise and patriotic princess, was beset around with formidable enemies, a powerful faction in the heart of her kingdom, and no resources but in her own mind, she, and it was a curious piece of history, published the first newspaper. Her Gazettes were still preserved, and by means of that dissemination of public opinion she roused the feelings of her subjects to a pitch equal to withstand any attempts that could be made upon them. Since that period newspapers had multiplied, and discussion had become more extended. During the reign of Louis XIV. who had formed the most gigantic plans of guilty ambition, he who attacked a free nation merely for his glory; he who had made subservient to his interests the guilt and infamous prince who then governed England—yet his conduct was most freely canvassed. Nor did a venal court dare stop the inquiry and investigation of free minds, even when a jesuitry disgraced the bench which his Lordship adorned, nor even then did a venal judge and a corrupt court dare attack the freedom of the press. In later times, to come to the partition of Poland: did that infamous transaction and public robbery pass without examination and censure? We loudly spoke our indignation, though the robbers were our great allies; but our free presses spoke of them, not as according to the greatness of the characters, but according to the greatness of their crimes. He would put it to the Attorney General to say, what would have been his conduct if we had been at peace with France during part of the awful crisis which had convulsed her. When Robespierre presided over the Committee of Public Safety, was not an Englishman to canvass his measures? supposing we had then been at peace with France, would the Attorney General have filed an information against any one who had expressed due abhorrence of the furies of that sanguinary monster? When Marat demanded 250,000 heads in the convention, must we have contemplated that request without speak-