

S. Percival to A. R. W.

Jan. 22 1812

19138-9

Mr Percival presents his humble duty to
Your Royal Highness; and has the honor to acquaint
Your Royal Highness that Mr M'Pherson's motion
respecting the Depts of Admiralty came on last
night, and has continued till about one o'clock
this morning - The substance of the Motion was to
declare the existence of such a fund in the hands
and at the disposal of the Crown to be unconstitutional;
and after ^{describing} ~~or length of description~~, the amount and
danger of the Fund to resolve that the House would
forthwith proceed to take measures for pulling it
under the ^{immediate} Control of Parliament.

His speech was long, & in many parts very
able & eloquent; but he was decidedly wrong in his
law, & as Mr Brevint says, extremely unfair
in his exaggerated statement of the amount of the
fund and the possible danger of the Constitution from
it.
A. R. W.
The Prince Regent

Jan 22 1812

from the abuse of it. The actual application
 what had taken place, ^{Mr Mungton} ~~the~~ likewise condemned with
 great severity. - The payments in aid of the Civil debt
 the advances to the younger Branches of the Royal
 Family, and some ~~the~~ two or three particular
 items he particularly objected to - He was met
 by an exposure of his errors in point of law, - by
 showing that as the Civil debt act left the fund with
 the Crown, on the arrangement of the hereditary revenue
 at the beginning of the reign, it was not open to
 us now to take it away. That there was no manner
 of impolicy in the application of the funds, that
 all governments in succession had so applied them,
~~except~~ indeed that as to the payments in aid of the
 Civil debt, it had not been so applied till the reign
 of George IV & Mr Fox's administration, where
 application however was considered to be
 as unobjectionable as any - That as to any
 particular Cases, they were all decided upon
 by a previous enquiry before the proper officers

19139 and the whole Case should be produced, if any
 gentleman thought that any one of them required explanation.

- The Speakers were
- | | | |
|----------------|---|-------------|
| For the Motion | — | Against it |
| Mr Mungton | | Mr Fox |
| Mr Brand | | Mr Pitt |
| Mr D. Giddy | | Mr Perceval |
| Mr Perceval | | Mr Fox |

~~Mr Mungton~~
 Mr Abercrombie could not concur with Mr
 Mungton in his Law, nor in his idea of breaking
 in now upon the Civil debt arrangement, but only
 in declaring his sense of Doubt with regard to the
 danger, & as to what ought to be done with it at
 the commencement of a new reign -
 Mr Perceval & Mr Fox concurred with
 Mr Abercrombie, & moved an amendment accordingly -
 Mr Perceval would not give to any amendment
 he had no difficulty in concurring in any vote for
 the production of the further account of the application

of the feud, but he thought the language of the
motion, & the nature of the argument by which
it had been supported so objectionable, that he
would not consent to get rid of it in any other
way than by a direct negative —

The numbers were for the motion 300
against it - 93

Done. In
Wed. Evng. Jan. 22. 1712

House of Commons

Mr Perceval
22 Jan 1712