

and not condemned, although clearly unwarrantable; it will look to posterity as if, upon examination, it were found to be legal, or, at most, but dubious. This, therefore, becomes the great grievance; for otherwise, perhaps, no indifferent man would care at all for the fate of the person who occasioned the question. So common, indeed, is it for mankind to err without design, in the exercise of legal power, that, by a late act of parliament, all Justices of the Peace have a month, after notice of their having abused their authority, to make or offer amends to the Party injured, before he shall be at liberty to bring any action for the recovery of damages. Now, Great Ministers are hardly more knowing in the Laws, or more cautious in the execution of their offices, and might therefore very well expect a similar indulgence. The practice, in truth, in the Secretary of States offices, has always been to ask no advice at all, but that of their own law-clerk, and to issue these General Warrants as occasion required, and to take the form from any precedent that happened to be among the papers of their office. And a State Law-clerk knows even less of the law than an Attorney, or any Solicitor to the Treasury. However, if any person within the last description, taking upon himself to do the legal part, should not only once execute an illegal warrant, but should a second time, and some days afterwards, when it was thought proper to take up other people, upon being desired and directed to make use of fresh warrants for the purpose, officiously and arbitrarily say, "No, no, the old will do well enough;" and should

there-
 (1) Philip Carteret Webb, member of Parliament
 & solicitor to the Treasury, for many years
 practicing as an attorney & latterly called