

is for ever excluded from any interference respecting that Nation. This is not only a *new*, but a *sweeping clause*, and applies to a great deal that the CHIEF CONSUL has done—probably to much more that he intends to do. “The English Government,” it is contended, “*cannot complain of what happens in Countries whose political existence she has not recognized, and with whom she maintains no public relations.*” If English Publicists, and English Ministers will admit this, the Sun of Great-Britain is indeed set for ever.

BONAPARTE altered the Government of *Switzerland*—England did not recognize the New Government. A Treaty was entered into by France, with one of our Allies, guaranteeing, as an important Condition to that Ally, the Independence of *Switzerland*. BONAPARTE then interferes to destroy that Independence; but “England must not complain, because she did not recognize the Government which was established.”—A new Government is given to *Piedmont*; and that Country is afterwards annexed to France; but “England has no right to complain, because she had not recognized the Government, which was made only to be destroyed.”—Would it not be shorter, and more to the purpose of the CHIEF CONSUL to say at once, that we shall not be suffered to interfere, or to have any Interest in the Affairs of the Continent?

“*The relations of France and England,*” it is asserted, “*are the Treaty of Amiens, the whole Treaty of Amiens, and nothing but the Treaty of Amiens.*” Now this we contend is, in the way in which it is explained, neither *the truth, the whole truth, nor any thing like the truth.* It is asserted to prove the accuracy of another position (certainly unfounded), that all the Powers of Europe have a right to settle

their interests *with each other* as they please, without the consent of this Country. If we deny the truth of this position, unqualified as it is, we shall not be disposed to deny it the less, when we see the manner in which the interests of *Piedmont* or of *Switzerland* are settled with France.

It occurred, however, to this Writer, that we might possibly have entered into Treaties of Alliance, that our Ally might be attacked, and that what the old-fashioned Publicists of Europe would call a *Claus Fidei*, might exist:—The rest of this Paper, therefore, is intended to shew those Nations with which we have had an Alliance during the last War, how much they have suffered by our Alliance, and to dissuade them from forming any more connections with this Country, by exasperating them against us. A kind hint is given to *Austria* not to pay the debt she owes us, but, instead of a *Debtor*, to become a *Creditor*, and make a demand upon us. The Russian Armies are falsely said to have been *abandoned and compromised in Holland*, and the Danes *massacred at Copenhagen*.

The dethroning the KING of *SARDINIA*—the loss of the *STADTHOLDEKATE* to the House of Orange—in short, all the conquests and acquisitions France has made from other Powers during the War, are attributed to their alliances with England. This may be tolerably good *Opposition declamation*, but how does it suit the CONSUL of FRANCE? For if all this has been gained to France by British Alliance, why is France so very anxious to prevent such Alliances from taking place in future? If the CHIEF CONSUL has gained so much by our Alliances with other Nations, his policy would be to encourage them;—but is this the fact? Has he been actuated by *our Alliance*, in the steps he has taken? What Alliance had the