

“ A great deal had been said, at different times about persons looking only at measures and not at men; he confessed he was very much inclined to consider this as mere cant and hypocrisy, or at least as proceeding from ignorance. In one sense, and to a certain degree, they must go together. If any Gentleman brought a charge against Ministers, it was absurd to suppose that a man could condemn measures and not wish to remove the men by whom they were adopted. If that House were to agree in a resolution to censure the conduct of the King's Ministers, it ought to be followed up with a Motion for removal of those Ministers. Nothing in his opinion could be more absurd than to suppose, that the system of Ministers could be disapproved of, and yet that they ought to be kept in Office, in hopes that they would adopt a line of conduct contrary to that of which they were known to approve. But this principle had been pushed a little farther, and to an extent to which he could not assent. If a Gentleman said he disapproved of the Measures of Administration, and therefore he would, if possible, remove the Ministers, he could understand him; it was fair, constitutional language.— He would even go farther, and admit, that if the measures of Ministers were even not condemned, but only not approved of, still it might be fair to propose to remove the Ministers, but he had no conception of gentlemen saying they approved of the measures, and would still, if possible remove the men. If this principle was once adopted, in what a situation would the Constitution be placed. The right of that House to address his Majesty to remove his Ministers, on proper grounds, was incontestible; but to suppose that the House had a right to remove Ministers without assigning any public ground whatever, was inconsistent

with every principle of the Constitution. It would take from the Crown the right of choosing its own servants, and make the office of Minister the subject of personal canvass. It was true, that in 1784 there was an address to remove Ministers, without any charge against their public conduct; but even in that case there was an allegation of their having come improperly into office, tho' that was found by no means to be the public opinion. He wished merely to be tried by his public conduct, and he could answer for himself and he believed for his colleagues in office, that if Parliament disapproved of their measures, they would not wish to continue one moment longer in office. If their measures were not found to be consistent with the honour and interests of the country, they would not attempt to set up Prerogative against Privilege, in any case where the exercise of the latter was really constitutional. If the King had the nomination of his Ministers, Parliament ought to control them, to watch over them, and to examine their measures; and upon this principle the safety of the Constitution depended. He hoped the Parliament would always endeavour to preserve to the Crown its proper place in the Constitution, while they maintained their own Privileges, and to the opinion of Parliament His Majesty's Ministers would always submit themselves whenever it was expressed.”

Sir Francis Burdett, condemned, in strong terms, both the present and the former administration; and concluded with giving his voice against the resolution.

The debate was continued by Mr. H. Browne, Mr. Calcraft, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Fox, and Lord Castlereagh, in support of the motion; and by Dr. Lawrence