

DA  
68  
.12  
W4K55  
1818

UC-NRLF



⊕B 746 867

RESERVE  
LIBRARY  
UNIVERSITY OF  
CALIFORNIA





57

A  
L E T T E R

TO

THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON,

*&c. &c. &c.*

*Price Two Shillings.*

---

Printed by R. CLAY, at the "Globe" Press, No. 7, St. Dunstons Lane, London, E.C. 4.

H. M. T. H. H.

or

THE HOUSE OF WASHINGTON

1793

THE HOUSE OF WASHINGTON

---

**CHARLES WOOD, Printer,**  
**Poppin's Court, Fleet Street, London.**

A

L E T T E R

TO

THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON,

ON

THE ARREST OF M. MARINET.

---

---

BY

LORD KINNAIRD.

---

“ Il n’y a point de plus cruelle tyrannie que celle que l’on exerce a l’ombre des lois et avec les couleurs de la justice, lorsqu’on va pour ainsi dire noyer des malheureux sur la planche même sur laquelle ils s’étoient sauvés.”

GRAND. ET DEC. DES ROMAINS, chap. xiv.

---

SECOND EDITION.

---

London:

PRINTED FOR JAMES RIDGWAY, PICCADILLY.

1818.



L E T T E R

THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON,

THE ABSTRACT OF M. MARSHALL.

BY LORD KINNARICH.

Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2008 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation

SECOND EDITION.

1814.

PRINTED BY J. JOHNSON, ST. PAULS CHURCH-YARD.

1814.



DA68

.12

W4K55

1818

A

**L E T T E R,**

*&c. &c.*

*London, May 16, 1818.*

MY LORD DUKE;

I OWE no apology to your Grace for this public Address. My appeal to the French Government in favour of an individual imprisoned on your account, and, as it now appears, with your concurrence, has been met by a reference to your Grace's authority, and decided by your peremptory denial of its justice\*. Upon that decision,

\* See the Appendix A, which contains the Report made to the Chamber of Peers.

B

and upon the share your Grace has taken in it, I must be allowed to comment. I shall not condescend to dwell upon the personal wrong which has been done me, but I am bound to protect my own character against any imputation that may be made against its sincerity, by openly protesting against the statement you have made. Although I could be content to leave the argument as it now stands between us, yet there are many, who, knowing my willingness at all times publicly to defend my conduct, might consider silence upon this occasion to be an acquiescence in a proceeding which I equally condemn and deplore. I will not waste time in commenting upon the Report itself; not from any want of respect for the Chamber of Peers in France, which has done itself honour by its ready attention to the claim of a

stranger, but because I attribute the unsatisfactory result of that appeal to the incomplete information which was furnished to that assembly. The whole weight of the refusal falls upon your Grace, who must have decided unwillingly (so the Reporter observes) between a fellow countryman standing in the relation in which I did to you, and a Government honoured with your special good will and protection. The question lies in a small compass. Your Grace justifies the Minister of the French Police, and, identifying yourself with him in an act of arbitrary authority, you declare, that "you were not a party to any agreement, authorizing the man who had warned you of a meditated attempt against your person to proceed to Paris." Upon this point we are at issue. I assert, that on the 17th of February,



an *extract* of a letter from your Grace was communicated to me by the British Secretary of Legation at the Hague, in the presence of the Duke of Richmond, and of the Attorney General of the Low Countries, which extract stated “*the offer of the French Government to treat with the Informer.*” I assert, that this extract, *without any context or comment whatever*, was shown to me as a security to be offered to the individual alluded to, and as an inducement to him to fulfil the promise he had made, by removing all fear of personal risk and danger.

I solemnly declare, that it was to the unanimous opinion of the gentlemen present, who considered the personal safety of the Informer was sufficiently guaranteed by the *phrase quoted*, that I yielded my natural distrust of the good faith of the French Minister; and I will fairly add, that the

confidence felt by the Duke of Richmond (whose energetic manner of expressing it I have strong in my recollection), that your Grace would *compel the faithful execution of the agreement*, was necessary to remove from my mind certain recollections, of a nature which made me somewhat less sanguine as to the support which might eventually be expected from your Grace.

I declare, too, that, urged by the confident opinion of all who assisted at that meeting, that the presence of Mariné at Paris might be essential to the preservation of your life, I did not hesitate to offer to that person *your* protection as the ground of his security; and to the confidence so created I unequivocally attribute his ready determination to fulfil the promise he had made.

I verily believe, that no man of honour can doubt that we fairly interpreted the

communication then made, and least of all did any one imagine, that the difficulty, if any should be created, could be started by your Grace.

But since you have been pleased to contradict the accuracy of the meaning then assigned to your Letter (although you have not condescended to add *what you did mean*), it becomes my duty to prove, in the face of all cavil and special pleading whatever, that I *was entitled* to hold out the promise of security to Marinnet, and above all that *he was* induced by that offer to afford you the assistance you required.

Your Grace asserts, that in the letter, of which *only the extract already quoted* was communicated to me, you say nothing about the journey, and that you declare you leave all to *official and judicial proceedings*.

For what purpose then, my Lord, did



you think it right to inform Lord Clancarty (whose secretary was empowered to repeat the words to me), that the *French Government was ready to treat with the Informer?*

Was not this an *extra-judicial* and an *extra-official* measure employed by your Grace to procure the assistance of Marinét?

This *phrase*, as the Reporter calls it, must have had *some* meaning, and the communication of it to me could not have been made without an object.

The *object* of the communication is manifest. To me, who had the secret of the Informer's name, it was imparted in order to tranquillize my scruples as to the danger of revealing it; and to Marinét it was offered as an inducement to complete the information he had voluntarily announced.



But if the *object*, in thus selecting a phrase of your Grace's letter for my edification, is clear, can the *meaning* of the phrase itself be equivocal? Let us first inquire, what it could *not* mean. It is impossible, that your Grace could have used it as a *trap* by which to obtain unconditional surrender, or in the hope that I could be thereby induced to forfeit my word, trusting to a capricious explanation of the offer at a future period.

Such a supposition is incompatible with the great respect I have for your Grace's character, and that of the persons engaged in the inquiry on your behalf.

Why, then, *something* it must mean. Now, as the proposals of the Informer were in the hands of your Grace since the 8th of February, and as his personal safety in Paris and return to Brussels

was the condition *sine qua non* of the arrangement, could any man of common sense and honour doubt that *this* condition at least was undisputed by the French Government? Was it to be believed, that when your Grace informed us, that the French Government *was ready to treat*, you supposed it could be upon the condition that the party it treated with might *bargain* to be hanged or imprisoned?

Was it meant to persuade me to say to the man, whose testimony was the object of your research, “The French Government *is ready to treat with you—* which phrase means, that it will accept your assistance, then act towards you as it shall think fit, or accordingly as the Duke of Wellington shall afterwards be content or not with your intelligence?”

Finally, does your Grace believe, that, *knowingly*, I would have induced any man

to abide the capricious clemency of the French Government ; or that, *knowingly*, Marinét *did* consent to serve your Grace at the risk of his own life and liberty ?

Why then it is clear as the sun at mid-day, that the communication of *that single passage in your letter, not weakened or modified by any parenthesis whatever*, did produce in the minds of the Duke of Richmond and of myself, the conviction of its offering personal security to Marinét, and did obtain from him the ready consent to fulfil the engagement he had made to go to Paris, whenever that condition should be granted. I believe that *we were entitled* so to interpret it ; but that we *did* so interpret it, and that your assurance alone was the ground of our acting, is placed beyond the possibility of a doubt. Here then your Grace can not repeat the argument by which you de-



feated the claims of the French authorities that negotiated the Convention of Paris; *namely*, that the parties themselves had not counted upon the indemnity they afterwards claimed. In the present instance, it would have been treachery on my part, imbecility on that of the Duke of Richmond, and madness on the part of Marinet, if we had advised and acted upon any other conviction than that we had obtained not only the positive engagement of the French Government, but moreover, that we were backed by the good faith and certain assistance of the person most capable of enforcing its fulfilment.

Now, what is the answer of your Grace? Not only that you did not promise anything on your own account, but that you did not *mean* to convey any engagement on behalf of the French Police. Strange! that it should be your Grace,

*not* the French Government, which denies the fact of a safe conduct being given. The Minister of Police *qualifies* the agreement. Your Grace *denies* it altogether. How are we to reconcile these discordant declarations? M. De Cazes eagerly leaves the whole responsibility with you; being conscious that he did in your presence recognize the engagements made by me, immediately on my arrival, which assurance he repeated to the British Ambassador at an after period. It is to be observed, that the *only* engagement made by me was upon the authority of your Grace's letter, which authority the Minister recognizes and you disown! So the *phrase* upon which I acted, and which, according to your explanation of it, *meant nothing*, has in the doctrine and practice of the French Government received an interpretation which justifies the value we

put upon it ; namely, that it did *offer* a security, but that it would require *your* support to insist upon the faithful execution of a promise it was impossible to deny !

Alas ! how have we been deceived in the expectation of that support !

Why, my Lord, is it necessary to satisfy any one of the *intention* of the French Government (even if your letter to Lord Clancarty did not prove that it was so) to grant Marinetti the condition he required ? Is not your Grace aware that other efforts were made with that specific view, at the very moment you wrote that letter ? Are you not aware that the French Ambassador at the Hague did himself repair to Antwerp for that purpose ? If, then, the French Police counts another illustrious dupe on its list, and has actually concealed its proceedings from you, I entreat you to inquire whether that Ambassador did not,



on the 19th of February, state his authority to give passports to Marinet, and to agree to the entire acceptance of the conditions he had proposed? If this circumstance be true, and I have no doubt of being able to prove the material parts of it, what shall we say of a Minister, who, with such damning proofs against him, has dared to impose upon your Grace, who, without the concealment of that fact, would never have consented to countenance so glaring a violation of political and private faith?

One word, my Lord, upon the documents which the Report states you to have produced. I presume they are the same which your Grace voluntarily promised to shew me, which promise you afterwards thought fit to retract, in order, perhaps, to add by surprise to the weight of the evidence which was to crush your



countryman in his contest with the French Police. These documents I collect to be;

1. Information from the British Embassy at the Hague.
2. The declaration of the Attorney General of the Low Countries;—both of which relate to the safe conduct I stated to have been given.

With respect to the first, I know that Mr. Chad cannot deny having communicated to me the extract of your letter above quoted, and having communicated to me that extract alone: he cannot deny having himself interpreted the meaning of it as I have done, though he avoided giving any official opinion; which conduct I so entirely approved, that, in concert with the Duke of Richmond, I declined to ask him to revise the passport with which I went to Paris.

As to the second, if the Attorney Ge-

neral pretends that I quitted Brussels (as the Report insinuates) without a full communication to him twenty-four hours before, and a notification made to him the following forenoon, I say in the face of the world that the very reverse is the fact: and I have in my possession, as your Grace is aware, the complete refutation of that error, under the hand of the Duke of Richmond, to whose honour you, as well as I, are at all times ready to appeal. What instructions that legal officer had received I know not, but convinced as I believe him to have been, that the best course for the detection of the assassin was followed by me, he did not exert any of the numerous means he possessed to prevent my departure. The assertion that I left Brussels without his knowledge, is as *false* as M. De Cazes' pretence, that I left Paris in a similar way, is, to your

Grace's knowledge, devoid of decency and truth\*.

But if I am indifferent to the knowledge of the documents your Grace may have produced, I own I am curious to know whether there are any which you *did not* furnish for the information of the Chamber of Peers.

My reliance on the honour and firmness of the Duke of Richmond was such, that, mortified as I was by your Grace's abandonment of me when I appealed to you on Marinet's first arrestation, I resolved to leave it to that noble person to act as he should think fit, without a private appeal to his friendship. I knew what must be his sentiments upon the occasion, and I was convinced he would voluntarily and frankly communicate them to your Grace.

\* See Appendix B.



Was this the fact? and if it was, did you afford to the Chamber of Peers the advantage of so material an evidence? I trust that you did so; and that the unofficial nature of that communication did not prevent the impartial testimony of such a witness being afforded to the tribunal which was to decide upon my claim.

But if it were possible, which I am far from allowing, that my desire and that of the Duke of Richmond to contribute to the preservation of your life, may have betrayed me into a precipitate measure, even then I should be less ashamed of having misinterpreted a phrase than of having been mistaken in the dispositions of its author; for it is manifest, that my facile adoption of its favourable meaning was the result of an entire confidence in the magnanimity of your character, and of my persuasion that, *in a case peculiarly your*

own, you would protect those, who were thus compromised, against the perfidy of the French Government! Your Grace may have read in Congreve, or at least in Junius\*, that every man who has been deceived “does not commence fool immediately.”

I do not seek to know what were your Grace's motives in acting as you have done. I know they must have been honourable, although I am convinced they were mistaken; but as the French Commission deduces the strength of your conviction from the circumstance of your consenting to abandon a fellow countryman, I take leave to state on the other hand, that I reckoned it no advantage in my position to have your Grace's arbitration, when I was in dispute with a government still honoured with your favour and guardianship.

\* Letter liii.

I must acknowledge too, and can perfectly account for the irritation created in your mind by the conduct of the Police, which made you feel that any interference might be used as a pretext for continuing a system already exhibiting strong appearances of duplicity. The early and insidious advice of the Minister, that your Grace should ask for the pardon of the assassin *when he should be taken*; the indecent jeers permitted in the public journals; the *official and judicial* doubts expressed as to the reality of the danger; insinuations of the most offensive nature as to the real author of the explosion; and in general the futility or treachery of the measures pursued by Mr. De Cazes, were but too well calculated to disgust you, and to make you refuse to furnish any excuse or apology for them. Still, my Lord, the consciousness of having yourself, by the publicity you



gave to my letter, prevented the detection of the assassin, or at all events diminished the chances of ascertaining the good faith of the informer, must have rendered the rigour of the French Government peculiarly irksome to your feelings. Your Grace excuses yourself by pleading the necessity you were under of communicating such an event to all the courts of Europe, whose armies you commanded; but it is no less true, that this notion of your duty did in point of fact deprive the man, who had given you timely warning of an approaching peril, of the means of proving his own innocence and the fidelity of his original report.

Of the participation of Marinet in the meditated crime I have no means of judging, having received from no one but from himself any indication or warning of that crime: his guilt or innocence have however nothing to do with the question of the faith



to be observed towards him; and indeed in all similar cases it is presumed such participation may exist. One thing is clear, however, that to justify the wrong already done him, no effort will be spared to involve him in the suspicion of guilt. Nothing can prove this fact more clearly than the sophistry by which, to justify his arrest, subsequent *suspicious* are confounded with *subsequent acts*; the latter being at all times a legitimate cause for breaking an agreement of indemnity, but the former being naturally in contemplation of the contracting parties, and therefore never to be admitted as an excuse for violating a safe conduct. Add to this, the miserable and false pretext used, that he contributed in no way to the detection of the man now supposed to be the assassin, when it is clear, that the notice given by him in the first instance did turn the eyes of the Police to the quarter where

that person was sought for, and, so it would appear on the face of it, to the very person himself.

When the manœuvres of the Police shall have ceased, and if a fair trial should be granted, we shall perhaps see how far other motives have operated to produce his arrestation, how much sincerity has been shown in the measures pursued, how many victims have been sacrificed with the absurd and injurious notion of satisfying your Grace, how far, in fine, and at what period, the French Police took an interest in the affair, and what object it proposed to itself from the crooked paths it has pursued.

Thus much I will venture to say, that if its object has been to *bring to justice* the assassin, it has followed a most devious course, and time will show whether it has not paralised, I will not yet say designedly, the powerful means it possessed for that

purpose. If, on the other hand, the Minister's object has been *political*; if he has grasped at an opportunity to persecute French subjects in a foreign country; if he has sought a pretext for interference in, and for the exertion of, an indecent influence over a neighbouring and independent Government; if he has found, in the *warning* given and the plot presumed, some secret political profit, then indeed a sufficient reason is found for the tortuous and unjust proceedings of the French Government.

Until judgment is passed, I will not be tempted even by the example of a British Minister to pronounce, to what quarter we are to look, to what cause is to be assigned the imagining of such a crime. I cannot consent to follow Lord Castlereagh's example\*, by attributing to the

\* See Lord Castlereagh's Speech on the renewal of the Alien Bill, May 15, 1818.



bad conduct of the Government of the Netherlands the existence of that conspiracy! I cannot, like his Lordship, libel the Sovereign of that country, in whom I long witnessed the desire to imitate the conduct and to maintain the principles of his venerated ancestors, the determination to resist the imposition of fetters unworthy his name, and the will to uphold the independence of his crown, by affording to persons of all nations the protection of a Constitutional Government. Lord Castlereagh attributes the meditated assassination of your Grace to the adoption of this liberal policy. It may be so, and though I may be indulged in expressing my admiration of *what was*, yet I shall not presume to give any opinion of *what is*, now that certain *improvements* are introduced in the system, the whole of which, it may be hoped, if not owing to his counsels, receive at least his Lordship's

countenance and approbation. Perhaps, indeed, his Lordship's profound knowledge might have furnished him with the fact, that the power of sending away aliens, *if it does exist now*, did from the beginning exist in the constitution of that country; and his sagacity might have suggested to him, that as we have no evidence of any plots during several years in which the King did *not* exert that power, it is scarcely advantageous to the defence of such a measure to quote the plot against your Grace, which, if imagined there at all, must have been formed during the period when the law against aliens has been constantly and vigorously put in force.

I repeat, that, awaiting with patience the promised trial, I will not hazard a conjecture on the reality of the conspiracy denounced by Lord Castlereagh, nor will I examine the more probable suspicion,

that the Police of France, taking advantage of the warning communicated to your Grace, did itself procure the explosion, with a view to produce certain effects on your mind, and to justify its own operations in other countries. I will fairly acknowledge, however, that having repeatedly declared to your Grace, that, from observations I had made, I was convinced that the detection of the assassin was a minor consideration with the French Minister of Police, whose intrigues in Belgium were a constant source of influence with him at home, I was not a little struck with the coincidence, when I heard Lord Castlereagh make a similar use of your Grace's name to influence the deliberations of Parliament. How far that was indicative of a general scheme I pretend not to decide; but so bold an assertion, prejudging a case of such magnitude, recalled to



my mind the many stratagems to which I have been witness elsewhere, having for their object, like the arrestation of Marinnet, not the punishment of a crime, but the advancement of a political manœuvre.

To conclude. An unsought for confidence offered the probable means of preserving your life; a fortunate chance afforded me the counsel of the person whom, above all others, your Grace as well as I would have chosen to advise in so delicate a situation. We acted in complete unison, and agreed in considering your Grace to be pledged to maintain the engagement made by us. Your Grace disavows the interpretation we gave to your communication, and has refused the aid we called upon you and expected you to afford.

The conviction, that in defending the rights of others, whom in honour I never



can abandon, I am called upon to justify my own character (which would deservedly suffer had I acted without reflection, and without sufficient authority in such a matter), imposed upon me the painful duty to dispute the wisdom and justice of your Grace's conduct upon this occasion. But the confidence in my strong right, as it destroys the asperity, which a sense of the manner in which my personal feelings have been disregarded might perhaps excuse, has, I trust, excluded all symptoms of irritation from this address.

The freedom with which I have spoken to your Grace on all subjects, during an intercourse of some years, while it is a sure pledge to you, that in public and in private I shall at all times express entirely what I think; so it will prevent any false interpretation of the motives which have urged, and the manner in which I have

conveyed, this remonstrance to the notice of your Grace and of the public at large. I feel assured, that in a discussion affecting public right and morals, even the possession of well merited honours will not obtain for your Grace an undue partiality from that tribunal to which we have both appealed; and that, in a case involving a question scarcely less national than individual, all unprejudiced minds will readily distinguish between the language of passion and of truth.

I have the honour to be,

My Lord Duke,

&c. &c.

(Signed)

KINNAIRD.

APPENDIX.

A

CHAMBER OF PEERS.

ADDITION TO THE SITTING OF APRIL 25.

*Report made in the name of the Committee of Petitions  
by the Vicomte de Montmorency, one of the Mem-  
bers of that Committee.*

GENTLEMEN;

YOUR Committee would not have wished for one moment to suspend the interesting discussion, which has been entered into, had they not conceived themselves bound to render you a special account of a Petition which has occupied their serious attention, and which will doubtless command yours, not merely because it differs from the ordinary class of petitions, but because



it revives the recollection of an affair which has afflicted every good Frenchman, and in which names of the highest respectability stand connected with others less imposing. Lord Kinnaird, a Peer of Great Britain, or, to speak more correctly, a Peer of Scotland, who by that title is eligible to a seat in the British Parliament, has transmitted to your Committee of Petitions a letter addressed to the Peers of France, in which he expresses himself in the following terms:—

“ Gentlemen ;

“ A Frenchman condemned to death by a pre-votol court, offered to prevent a meditated assassination of the Duke of Wellington, some days before that crime was attempted, in the month of February last. The informer, who solicited no other personal condition than a safe conduct to proceed to France, and to return to Brussels, having seen in a letter from the Duke of Wellington, who declared that the French Government was ready to treat with him, a guarantee which appeared perfectly satisfactory to the Duke of Richmond as well as to me, came to Paris, where every thing gave reason to hope that he would be of the most essential service. The Memorial annexed to this Petition will explain to you, Gentlemen, the proceedings by which this man, who relied on the promises of his Government, has been thrown into con-



finement. I have in vain demanded of the King's Ministers the strict fulfilment of the conditions entered into with this man through my agency. As a Peer of Great Britain, I consider it a duty incumbent on me to acquaint the French Chamber of Peers with this violation of a right which ought to be the most respected, and to solicit the Chamber to deign to second my claim on the Ministers of his Majesty.

"I have the honour to be, &c.

(Signed) "KINNAIRD."

"Paris, April 13, 1818."

To this Letter was added a note or memorial of considerable length, which it would occupy too much time to read to the Chamber. We shall confine ourselves to stating the essential fact, the only fact worthy to excite interest in an affair which is in every respect foreign to the jurisdiction of the Chamber, and which essentially regards the Government and the tribunals. We allude to an appeal of this kind made by a foreigner of distinction to the good faith of the French nation, through the medium of its hereditary magistrates. This appeal has given rise to an apprehension, carried, perhaps, to too scrupulous an extent, that our indifference or our silence might leave

an appearance, however slight, of a deviation from the good faith of Frenchmen in the violation of a promise or a contracted engagement.

We were led to believe, as you are, Gentlemen, that the King's Government had manifested the same feeling of delicacy, and had either entered into no engagements, or had fulfilled them.

But being anxious, when we should come to address you respecting this affair, to bring with us the authentic confirmation, the entire certainty of that which was more than probable, we thought it necessary to enter into an official communication with the President of the Council of Ministers. The Duke de Richelieu intended to have been present in the Committee of Petitions, but was prevented by a diplomatic conference. The Count De Cazes became his substitute, and furnished the Committee with all the information that could be desired, and the fullest explanation of every thing that had taken place.

1st. It appears from this information that no safe conduct was either given or promised, and that whatever guarantees might have been proposed were all conditional.

Nothing can be more satisfactory than the declaration of the Duke of Wellington, whose decision on a point of honour and generosity is unquestionable; and who must

have been *principally interested in claiming the fulfilment of a promise given to his countryman.*

In a letter addressed to the Minister of the General Police, he expresses himself in the following manner :—

“ Your Excellency will judge for yourself, whether my letter, of which I send you an exact copy, mentions a syllable respecting the journey of the Sieur Marinet to Paris, or offers him any guarantee whatever.

“ You will see that I never took upon myself to make promises to any one, on the part of the French Government; and that those from whom it is pretended these guarantees were obtained, deny having given them.”

The French Government, anxiously desiring to discover the criminal and the accomplices of a crime so base and odious, *declared their intention of entering into negotiations with any individual who should reveal them.*

The Duke of Wellington, in his letter to the British Ambassador in the Netherlands, whilst he declared this intention of our Government, added, that he would take no part in the affair on his own account, and that he would confine himself to an official or judicial measure for the discovery of the criminals.

This single sentence in the Duke's letter, however, induced Lord Kinnaird to proceed to France with the



Sieur Marinet. He not only received no kind of authority or encouragement from the civil or judicial authorities of Brussels; but it is very certain that these authorities would have adopted direct means of opposing the journey, had not the parties departed privately, and without their knowledge.

2d. It is equally certain, that the Sieur Marinet, who was for several days at liberty in Paris, was not arrested on any charge, either directly or indirectly, relating to his former condemnation, but in consequence of being suspected, according to posterior information, of a participation in the plot which he promised to discover, and concerning which he revealed nothing of importance. He was arrested in virtue of an order of the Judge of Instruction.

3d. Since we are addressing the Chamber on this afflicting affair, we think it our duty to state, that the magistracy have at present under confinement, but by means unconnected with the confessions of the Sieur Marinet, the man, who, there is every reason to believe, is the assassin: but as it is not our place to excite any prejudices against him, we shall wait for the lights which may arise out of the examinations. We might confine ourselves at present to passing to the order of the day, grounded on the con-



sideration that this affair is foreign to the jurisdiction of the Chamber; but to enter more completely into the sentiments which we have expressed, with the confidence that you will participate in them, and entertaining no doubt respecting the wisdom of the measures which the King's Government will adopt in this affair, we propose that the whole shall be referred to the President of the Council of Ministers.

The Chamber ordered this Report to be printed.

### B

UP to the hour I quitted Paris, I had no reason to complain of the personal treatment I received from the French authorities: on the contrary, I learnt from the Duke of Wellington, that they were not unaware of the sacrifice I had made of my time and personal convenience on his Grace's account; and that, above all, they had nothing to object to my proceedings.

Upon my arrival at Brussels, I was summoned by the *Juge d'Instruction*, and questioned, to my utter astonishment, upon the manner in which I had quitted Paris, it

having been communicated (by telegraph, I believe), that I had departed without the proper authority, and in spite of a legal citation which I had received. It would have been sufficient to show my passport; but for my own satisfaction I added the following detail:—

“ I had obtained my passport above a month before I left Paris. It was given by the British ambassador, and *visé* by the Duke of Richlieu. I was requested to remain a few days, and was then asked to give my *parole* to remain in Paris; which, after consultation with the Ambassador and the Duke of Wellington, who considered that I was not called upon so to do by legal forms, I refused to give. I remained, however, a fortnight, and then Sir Charles Stuart officially informed the Duke of Richlieu and M. De Cazes of my intended departure — no objection was made. The same persons were again informed of it three days before I applied to have my passport revised, which was done at the Hotel of the Ministry of General Police, and at the Prefecture. The next morning I obtained the usual permission to use my own horses to leave Paris, and quitted it at twelve o'clock. The assertion, that I received an invitation to give evidence before the judge, is *absolutely false*.”

A few days after, I found the explanation of this base

calumny in a new examination I underwent upon a series of questions transmitted from the Minister, De Cazes, to be *put by the tribunal of an independent Government*, upon the subject of a conversation held by me with his Excellency about the 22d of February.

I could have contented myself with refusing to answer any thing to the disgraceful and unprecedented manner of examining in *one* country upon the subject of a conversation held with *the Minister of Police* of *another*. The questions, which in fact *were assertions*, contained however so many falsehoods, and substitutions of my language for his own, that I thought fit to notice them in the following manner:—

“ It would have been more honourable (*loyal*) on the part of the Minister, if, during the *month I passed* at Paris since my last interrogatory, he had caused me to be examined upon a conversation held with me ten weeks ago. I then might have been confronted with his Excellency, and I should have desired nothing better. But as he has thought fit to let me be questioned here, as to what he seems to have had some reason for declining to examine me upon in Paris (namely, words uttered to him), I have no objection to answer. I declare, then, that certain assertions (*I here stated them*) are utterly false; that the



words attributed to me were used by *M. De Cazes himself*, and the respect I entertain for the judge alone prevents me from giving to those assertions the *character*, which, upon all other occasions, I should certainly assign to them." But, *quanta dementia est vereri, ne infameris ab infamibus!*

**T H E E N D.**

---

CHARLES WOOD, Printer,  
Poppin's Court, Fleet Street, London.



*Published by J. Ridgway, Piccadilly.*

1.

INTERESTING FACTS

RELATING TO THE

FALL AND DEATH OF JOACHIM MURAT,  
KING OF NAPLES,

the Capitulation of Paris, in 1815, and the Second Restoration of the Bourbons; Original Letters from King Joachim to the Author; with some Account of the Author, and of his Persecution by the French Government.

BY FRANCIS MACIRONE,

Late Aide-de-camp to King Joachim, Knight of the Order of the Two Sicilies, &c. &c.

Third Edition, with Additions, One Volume, 8vo.

Price 8s in Boards.

2.

L E T T E R S

FROM

THE CAPE OF GOOD HOPE,

IN

REPLY TO MR. WARDEN,

with Extracts from the great Work now compiling for Publication, under the Inspection of Napoleon.

Third Edition, price 8s.

E

*Published by J. Ridgway, Piccadilly.*

3.

A

**S K E T C H**

OF THE

**MILITARY AND POLITICAL POWER OF RUSSIA,**

IN THE YEAR 1817.

Fourth Edition, with a Map, price 8s.

4.

**CHRISTIANITY**

AND

**PRESENT POLITICS,**

how far reconcilable, in a Letter to the Right  
Honourable W. Wilberforce.

BY ARCHDEACON BATHURST.

Price 3s.

5.

A

**LETTER MISSIVE**

FROM

**SIR PHILIP FRANCIS, K. B.**

TO

**LORD HOLLAND.**

Price 3s. 6d.

*Published by J. Ridgway, Piccadilly.*

6.

PLAN OF A REFORM

IN THE

ELECTION OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS,  
adopted by the Society of the Friends of the Peo-  
ple, in 1795; with a new Introduction and other  
Documents.

Republished by Sir Philip Francis, K. B.

Price 1s. 6d.

7.

HISTORICAL QUESTIONS

EXHIBITED IN THE

MORNING CHRONICLE

IN JANUARY, 1818.

Enlarged, corrected, and improved. Price 2s.

8.

L E T T E R

FROM

SIR PHILIP FRANCIS, K. B.

TO

EARL GREY.

Second Edition. Price 2s.

*Published by J. Ridgway, Piccadilly.*

9.

LETTER  
TO THE  
COMMON COUNCIL AND LIVERY  
OF  
THE CITY OF LONDON,  
ON

THE ABUSES EXISTING IN NEWGATE;  
showing the Necessity of an immediate Reform in  
the Management of the Prison.

By the Hon. H. G. BENNET, M. P.

Price 3s.

10.

THE SPEECH  
OF  
EARL GREY  
in the House of Lords, May 12, 1817, on  
LORD SIDMOUTH'S CIRCULAR.

Price 3s. 6d.







*Gaylord*

PAMPHLET BINDER

Syracuse, N. Y.

Stockton, Calif.

