

S. Percival to H. Rd.

19128-9

Thursday Evng. Jan 16. 1811

Mr Percival presents his humble duty, to your
Royal Highness, and has the honor to acquaint your
Royal Highness, that he proposed the resolutions,
necessary, to introduce the Bills to provide for the
Household management, in a Committee of the House
of Commons this Evening; and that those Resolutions
were carried without a Division. In moving them
Mr Percival opened the whole Plan, with as much
distinctness as he could. No one made any comments
upon it, but Mr Bensonby, & Mr Tierney; and their
observations were upon the whole, of such a general nature
as to leave them pretty much at Liberty, to make their
observations in future, ^{to} any part of it. Upon the whole
the tendency of their observations was to express an
opinion, that the management was complicated when
it might have been simple, and as far as regarded
His Royal Highness
The Duke of York

19129

Mr Percival answered that he had nothing to urge on the subject of that claim; that it was well known that he had always been of opinion against that claim, and that his views & interpretation of what passed in 1803 on that subject was that the claim was abandoned; but that he had received no command from your Royal Highness, on that subject, and therefore wrote no authority, & only expressed his individual opinion on it. Upon this Mr Sheppard concluded that Mr Percival was quite wrong; & reading the message of your Royal Highness, delivered to the House of Commons by Mr Tynon, from the journal, concluded that the claim was not abandoned, but the suit only discontinued. Mr Percival maintained his construction of the message where Mr Sheppard persisted in representing to be erroneous.

The resolutions are to be reported tomorrow, and the bill cannot be brought in till Saturday if the House meets on that day, or till Monday.

Mr Percival moved to reappoint the select committee for examining into the amount of small payments made by His Majesty out of His Privy Purse —

The attendance on His Majesty^{or} was too costly, and also that it was establishing a second form of influence of which might be prejudicial. Mr Benson, also seemed to object to the 10,000 for the Majesty, to which Mr Tierney said he would make no objection.

As to the 100,000 the specific vote not being capable of being prepared, except in a committee of supply, the necessity of discussing it in detail, at that time, was disclaimed, and Mr Tierney, especially withheld his opinion, as not being prepared to say whether it was necessary, or not. Stating, however, as Mr Percival understood him, that he would not object to it, if Mr Percival should state on your Royal Highness's authority that it was necessary either for the support of the restricted regency, or for making preparation for the more permanent one — The whole was urged in terms of perfect respect to all the Princes of the Royal Family.

Some conversation arose upon a question, put by Mr Benson, with regard to the claim of your Royal Highness for the arrears of the Duchy of Cornwall; and whether that claim was to be resorted to this arrangement.

16 Jan 1812

Mr Percival

House of Commons

16 Jan 12