

either. Now, in the case of High Treason, so dangerous to the being of the whole state, it may not, perhaps, at particular junctures, be improper to support, or indemnify at least, even Secretaries of State in the seizure of papers, and of every thing else, however illegal, that may possibly serve to a discovery and conviction of the Traitor. The doing of what may tend to dethrone a King, is of consequence to every individual; but, the dethroning of a Minister is not quite so momentous a matter.

And, after all, if in the warrants the Persons to be seized had been *named* (and not left conjectural to the discretion of the King's common Messengers;) and it had been alleged, that they were *charged upon oath*, and there had been *no direction to seize papers*: under what law, or colour of law, could they be committed to *close* confinement and imprisonment (*arcta custodia*) upon the *charge* of a *Libel* only? Another very great and important point for a constitutional inquiry! Is a man charged only with writing and publishing a Libel, to be deprived of his liberty at once, and so shut up in gaol, that no friend is to have it in his power to come near him? Will not common confinement be sufficient custody in such a breach of the Peace, when charged only, and that *ex officio*, and before one tittle of proof be given, and this too in the case of one of the Representatives of the Commons of England? I cannot help saying, I am surprized that this last point has never been agitated; for it seems to me to be of very great consequence. I am sure it was not owing to the Ministry, for they appear to have been very ready