

Hon. Gentleman had said, he believed, that, though an invasion would be productive of much mischief, it would stop short of subjugation. But the whole question was, which, in case of invasion, would be the best means of defending the Country—the troops or the money? Twenty thousand men were far better than any equivalent sum of money in our pockets for such a purpose. Should the Hon. Gentlemen's opinion of the pacific disposition fail him, then another part of his argument comes in question—that of the Finances. But what was this but the same sort of comparative questions? He had kept out of sight the other great dangers arising from the French Revolution, as if that of an invasion was the only one. We ought to consider what was the French Navy, now that it consisted not only of French, but Spanish, Dutch, and other ships: and what were the French means of commerce? and how they could make their military power bear upon matters of trade? So far as to troops and money compared. Then as to the comparison the Hon. Gent. made between our establishments after former pacifications. No inference was to be drawn from an antecedent state, as no times resembled these. He had said that, starting with low establishments, we had obtained splendid successes. But does it follow, that a higher establishment would prevent similar success? At the commencement of the seven years war, we had very ill success, being the consequence of that fallen state we were placed in by a low Peace Establishment.—The Gentleman mentioned Ireland. Why, had we not had there two invasions? And was not that the most formidable which even disembarked her troops—that of Bantry Bay? Fleets may get across, then, and may land them in spite of our navy. Every measure was taken in France to promote con-

quest and hostility. This wonderful Representative Government that was to give such liberty to all the world, has lately made another compulsory Military Conscription. He did not hear these matters from such *high* authority as the Honourable Gentleman; but he heard from very judicious intelligent, and correct persons, who had been in France, that the idea of Liberty had long been treated by all sober people as a Government not fit for them; and the only consolation they had in view was the grand consolidation of the grand Empire of the World, by humbling, or destroying us under their feet. There was a Speech delivered in the course of debate by an Hon. Gentleman (Mr. Sheridan) of which he spoke in terms of very high praise, excepting one part of it; which, however, was not such as to make him alter his opinion of it as a whole. He did not like to speak of persons instead of measures and principles: but it was a custom to say of him, that he wished to plunge the Nation into a War. It was utterly incorrect and unfounded. When asked what way they would advise to the House and to Ministers, he had distinctly marked out the line. It was not to give up any thing which success or accident might have thrown in our hands, and that some places have been imprudently parted with all already. He would not give an opinion grounded upon imperfect evidence. Though or such as he had, his opinion might lean that way. But he readily supposed Ministers to have better materials to judge of than he had. Therefore, that we should have done well in making war at present, he could not take upon him to say. The Gentleman had said that French principles were the object of war with him and his friends. But he said his objection was to French principles and French *power*. His sentiments were, that their principles led