

special circumstances of the case; and, perhaps, even this they might not have done, had not a great, but moderate, Lawyer, not long before in high office, and then appearing, as it were, in opposition, said he "candidly thought, all things considered, the circumstances would amount to "a justification." It is otherwise not improbable the present Ministry, so open were they to conviction, would have found them guilty (that is, of acting contrary to the Laws, in executing a Warrant fundamentally illegal) upon this well known principle, so much before dwelt upon, that *nothing illegal in itself can be justified*, but have immediately afterwards declared the practice of their office, and the circumstances of their case, to be so strong a plea in mitigation of damages, that they thought it the properest case in the world for mercy; and have therefore excused them from all sorts of punishment. But such was this candid and much reputed Lawyer's influence and weight, with both parties, at that juncture, that they all submitted implicitly to what he had only dropped for law. Nay, the Ministry even offered, at last, to bring in a bill for settling the power of Secretaries of State for the future, upon a hint of the propriety thereof, that fell from the same candid Lawyer. And, by the bye, How could a party, at whose head was a chief, that acknowledged he had, when in office himself, knowingly issued an illegal Warrant, because he imagined the safety of the commonwealth required it, reject the indulgent offer of a bill for establishing for ever such a power in Ministers, under some few conditions, to be guardedly worded? Nay, when such a Bill was

actually

(1) Charles Yorke a little while before attorney
General
10th Pitt