

we could not go to War, he should only observe, that in any War in which this country was engaged, it would depend a great deal on its naval force; and while Earl St. Vincent was at the head of the Admiralty, to say that all the ability of the country was excluded from Government, was to say that which would not easily be assented to in any part of this habitable globe. There was not any man who could consider the state of this Country, and the state of its Finances (which was in some respects, highly prosperous,) who must not feel that War carried on with uninterrupted prosperity, successful in every Expedition, fortunate in every plan, there was no man, he said but must feel that War, carried on even under such circumstances, must be grievous, calamitous, and perhaps in the event ruinous. He certainly should not oppose the Motion, but he only wished for further information upon the subject, for he did not recollect any instance in former Wars, when a measure of this kind was adopted without a greater degree of information than had been laid before the House of Commons upon the present occasion.

Mr. FRANCIS explained.

Mr. BURROUGHS said, that Ministers had been called on to enter at large into every particular connected with the present question. He thought that the business before the House did not demand more information with respect to the affairs between this country and France, than what had been already stated by the Right Hon. the Chancellor of Exchequer. At present, the measure to be adopted by the Vote of the House, was not expressive of an intention to enter into a War with France; it only went to prepare for the worst—to protect our Laws, and every thing that was dear to us, by the increase of our Sailors and Soldiers.

LORD HAWKESBURY said, his prin-

cipal object in rising was to advert to some points which had been touched upon by the Hon. Gentleman (Mr. Fox). He differed with that Honourable Gentleman in so much with respect to the principles advanced, as to the mode of their application. He perfectly agreed with that Hon. Gentleman as to the distinction between the prerogatives of making Peace and War. It was unquestionably the prerogative of his Majesty to make Peace, but Parliament might consider the terms of that Peace, and impeach the Ministers who made it, or address His Majesty for the removal of those Ministers, if they thought proper so to do. As to the question of War as it was different from that of Peace, so the power of the House was and ought to be differently exercised upon that subject: His Majesty was invested with the prerogative of making War; but it was truly stated, that it was the prerogative of that House to refuse the Supplies. The House, therefore, though they had no negative upon the making of War; yet they had a practical negative upon its continuance; this grew out of the Constitution itself, and was extremely essential to the interests of the Country. He would wish to apply these principles to other circumstances, namely to the question after the conclusion of a Negotiation, as to what information it would be necessary to produce respecting that Negotiation. Of this His Majesty's Ministers must judge, and if the House did not think the information produced sufficient, they could address His Majesty for further information. He should say, that in a case of War, there would be required all the *prima facie* information which could be necessary to justify that War; but in a case of Peace, which was satisfactory to the House, all the *prima facie* evidence relating to it need not be produced.