

make here? The Duke de Chartres's¹ balls once a week, Madame d'Egmont's at Versailles, the opera, masked balls which you once loved—I must repeat it, all this will be over whilst you are staying in England to attend a question² of which you know the fate must be before decided.³

The event of the last day⁴ has however surprised me. The amendment⁵ proposed to the motion⁶ is, I think, the worst piece of language I ever read and the least intelligible,⁷ and it puts the opposition to the resolution proposed on the weakest foundation it can stand.⁸ You tell me a great many particulars which entertain me much, and help to raise that good opinion I had before formed of the most considerable performers in the drama. My brother is on all hands allowed to make a very considerable figure; I hope therefore the promoters or advisers of his dismissal are by this time severely punished by their own reflection.

1. Louis-Philippe-Joseph de Bourbon (1747-93), Duc de Chartres; Duc d'Orléans 1785; 'Philippe égalité' (DU DEFFAND i. 159).

2. On the dismissal of officers.

3. Meaning that the Administration was certain of winning the division.

4. 29 Jan., when the question of general warrants was again renewed. HW evidently wrote Hertford a missing letter on this debate, which he recounts at length in *Mem. Geo. III* ii. 37-45 and to Mann 11 Feb. 1765, MANN vi. 283-4; see *post* 12 Feb. 1765, where he mentions that he sent to Hertford 'two packets together by Mr Freeman,' one of which contained his extant letter *ante* 27 Jan. 1765.

5. 'An amendment . . . [was] proposed [by Dr George Hay] to be made to the question, by prefixing thereto these words, 'That in the particular case of libels, and of no other crime, it is proper and necessary to fix, by a vote of this House only, what ought to be deemed a law in respect of general warrants; and for that purpose, at the time when the determination of the legality of such warrants, in the instance of a most seditious and treasonable libel, is actually depending before the courts of law, for this House to declare' (*Journals of the House of Commons* xxx. 70); the House subse-

quently agreed that the words 'and of no other crime' be left out of the proposed amendment (*ibid.*).

6. 'A motion was made [by Sir William Meredith], and the question . . . proposed, That a general warrant for apprehending the authors, printers, or publishers, of a libel, together with their papers, is not warranted by law and is an high violation of the liberty of the subject' (*ibid.*).

7. A 'strange and scarce intelligible sentence' (*Mem. Geo. III* ii. 39).

8. However, HW, in *Mem. Geo. III*, states that the ministry actually mitigated the unpopularity of their opposition to the resolution by forcing the amendment upon its proponents. 'The ministry, to load Sir William Meredith's question with absurdity, made use of their power, as the majority, thus to amend the question, and forced the opponents to debate it thus hampered, or withdraw it; and even the latter could not be done without leave of the House, that is, of the majority, who probably would not have granted that permission, that they might give a negative to the question thus loaded, instead of rejecting Sir W. Meredith's plain question, which it would have been more unpopular to do' (ii. 40). The amendment was prefixed to the question by a vote of 224 to