

Mr. Fox said, he wished to trouble the House with a few words, and they should be but a few. He conceived it to be a question of a constitutional nature, as to the manner in which this vote was discussed. He could not however, feel a little surprised, that a Friend near him had lamented there had been any discussion on the Address, on a former occasion. He himself began the discussion. He could not blame himself for having done so, nor was there any thing said upon that occasion, that was in the least degree to be lamented. Upon the question now before the Committee, he confessed he had some doubts. His mind was ready to vote the present, as well as any other number of seamen. He was as ready to vote one number as another, and that was the very thing that made him doubt, because he thought the House was called upon the vote in the dark: that they had no better reasons for voting 10,000, than for voting 20,000 or 100,000. His objection, however, was of a constitutional nature, for he thought that by this course they were called upon to renounce the whole of their duty to their constituents, and to give unlimited confidence to the King's Ministers. It was the undoubted prerogative of his Majesty to make Peace or War—he agreed with his Hon. Friend, Mr. Francis, upon the subject of interference of Parliament in these subjects, for that we were bound by the acts of Government, as a party is bound by the act of his agent, and that the only security the public had was in the responsibility of Ministers. If therefore, there was this power given to any Sovereign who may be ill advised, and surely the history of this Country that such a "may be," was not a bare possibility, to involve a whole people in a war, the necessity of which they had no means of considering, and by which great part, perhaps the whole of their property was lost, and their

lives depending only on their own courage, there should be some check somewhere in the hands of the people; and so there was in England, but that was a check which was felt in practice, although it had in theory no existence, for his Majesty had the unbounded right of either making war, by which his people might be destroyed, or peace by which they might be enslaved, but in England there was a check on the Prince who might be thus ill-advised. What was this check? It was the power of withholding the means of carrying on destructive projects; that was the Privilege of Parliament; and that was effectually done by withholding the purse—and that made the Houses of Parliament so important to this country, for although they have neither prerogative of Peace or War, nor constitutionally, influence over peace or war, yet by the practical effect of the disposal of money by the prerogative of the purse, they had a very considerable check on the conduct of war or the maintenance of Peace: both Houses had this power, but now more emphatically the House of Commons. With respect to the present Administration, and the conditions of the peace of Amiens, he was one of those who do not admit that if this business should terminate in war therefore it is *prima facie* evidence that the peace of Amiens was not a good peace. He said that the Peace of Amiens was a good Peace, and that the terms of it were eligible to us, whatever may be the event of the present Negotiation or Discussion. By good terms, he did not mean in comparison with what some other persons might have suggested, but eligible in comparison with the alternative, which was that of continuing the War. As to the expression of his Hon. Friend, that ours was a Government from which all the ability of the Country was excluded, and as such was the case