

money that has been granted, and to consent to no peace, unless we are to retain all, or very near all, our conquests. Thus the City of London usurp the right of making peace and war. But is the government to be dictated to by one town? By no means. But suppose they are not—what is the consequence? How will the money be raised? If it cannot be raised without them, Mr Pitt must again be minister: that you think would easily be accommodated. Stay, stay; he and Lord Temple have declared against the whole Cabinet Council.⁴ Why, that they have done before now, and yet have acted with them again. It is very true; but a little word has escaped Mr Pitt, which never entered into his former declarations; nay, nor into Cromwell's, nor Hugh Capet's, nor Julius Caesar's, nor any reformer's of ancient time. He has happened to say, he will *guide*.⁵ Now, though the Cabinet Council are mighty willing to be guided, when they cannot help it, yet they wish to have appearances saved: they cannot be fond of being told they are to be guided; still less, that other people should be told so.⁶ Here, then, is Mr Pitt and the Common Council on one hand, the great lords on the other. I protest, I do not see but it will come to this. Will it allay the confusion, if Mr Fox is retained on the side of the Court?⁷ Here are no Whigs and Tories, harmless people, that are content with worrying one another for 150 years together. The new parties are, *I will*, and *You shall not*; and their principles do not admit delay. However, this age is of suppler mould than some of its predecessors; and this may come round again, by a *coup de baguette*, when one least expects it. If it should

4. In the demand for the recall of Lord Bristol and an immediate declaration of war against Spain (*ante* HW to Lady Ailesbury 10 Oct. 1761 and n. 11).

5. Pitt, in his letter to Beckford, 15 Oct., which produced the letter of thanks from the Common Council, had written: 'I resigned the Seals on Monday, the 5th of this month, in order not to remain responsible for measures which I was no longer allowed to guide' (*Chatham Corr.* ii. 158-9). According to Newcastle's account of the Cabinet meeting on 2 Oct., Pitt had made similar remarks there: 'In his station and situation he was responsible and would not continue without having the direction: that this being his case, nobody could be surprised that he

could go on no longer, and he would repeat it again, that he would be responsible for nothing but what he directed' (quoted in *Hardwicke Corr.* iii. 280).

6. Pitt's letter was printed in the newspapers, e.g. *Daily Adv.* 19 Oct. and *London Chronicle* 15-17 Oct., x. 376. HW echoes the sentiments of a satirical answer to Pitt in the *London Chronicle* 20-22 Oct. (x. 388): 'If you are to *guide* always, you alone constitute the *whole* Cabinet Council.' See the correspondence between Newcastle and Hardwicke on Pitt's letter (*Hardwicke Corr.* iii. 333-4), expressing special indignation at Pitt's revealing the opinions of ministers in Council.

7. Fox was not enlisted by the Court for another year; see *post* 13 Oct. 1762.