

however, stated the case as to the power of making Peace or War, very correctly. He had said, that such power (wisely, Mr. Addington thought though the Hon. Gentleman doubted it) was given to the Chief Magistrate of this country. If Peace was made on terms inconsistent with the honour of this country, his Majesty's advisers in such case would be deeply responsible to that House; that was a principle broadly stated by the Honourable Gentleman, and to that principle, Mr. Addington said he was ready to accede, but the Hon. Gentleman had said, that Ministers were deeply responsible, if it should appear that it was by their conduct this country was placed in its present situation. To that he acceded also, for ministers were deeply responsible, if it should appear that the country was brought to suffer from any fault of theirs; he should therefore say, that Ministers would be responsible indeed if it should appear that they had deserted the principles on which they had proceeded in the first instance, and changed the motives which actuated them in recommending to his Majesty to conclude that Treaty of Peace, which had been applauded, though in qualified terms by the Hon. Gentleman; if they had deserted these principles, and changed these motives they would deserve and meet with the reprobation of the House and of the Public; but he could assure the House there had been no such change of motive or desertion of principle. There had been no discussion between his Majesty's Government and France, that had not originated in the spirit of Peace; all that had been done on our part, had been done with a purpose of improving Peace, and that was the spirit with which they advised his Majesty to adopt the conduct which he is now pursuing in the negotiation with France, and here he might be permitted to observe, that he would have expected

the talents of the Hon. Gentleman at definition, would not have deserted him on this important occasion, but would have suggested to him that the duty of a Member of Parliament did not compel him to call much for information in the House of Commons pending a Negotiation. This was a subject which had been discussed over and over again in that House, and without one exception the House had upon sound constitutional principles, disclaimed the right to interfere, or to break in upon Negotiation by the Executive Government, the contrary to which would be highly dangerous. He appealed to the House whether the prudent consideration of restraint, pending a Negotiation, was not a matter perfectly understood to be constitutional and wise? With respect to the motion now before the House, the Hon. Gentleman had expressed nothing but an unqualified approbation; he had indeed said, that if a motion were made for a larger number of Seamen, he should support it and therefore he should have no observation to make on that part of the Speech of the Hon. Gentleman: he would only add, that he begged the House to remember that he did hold Government to be deeply responsible for all they had done; he trusted it would be found that they had never deserted their principles, but that they had pursued a course at once firm and moderate—moderate, not to pusillanimity, but to prudence, not to compromise our own interests, but to attain security, and preserve our honour.

Mr. DENT thought the number now proposed too small. He lamented the effect which the present course of public affairs had on public credit. He thought the present vote inadequate to that end, and therefore he should move, that instead of 10,000 there should be 25,000 men voted for this service.