

tions from the first lord of the treasury, and his pay from Mr. chancellor of the exchequer, I much wonder that one so learned in the law, and consequently skilled in our constitution, should not have been able to defend the cause much better. But the attempt at doing what was intended to appear like something, I presume was to make amends for the deficiency, in not having acted *openly* in conjunction with your coadjutors, the *wise* and *dispassionate* earls of Halifax and Egremont, in the apprehension and commitment of Mr. Wilkes; which being a matter of importance, the assistance of the third person was absolutely necessary towards fulfilling the declaration. Notwithstanding this aid (which I do not doubt was to the best of your abilities, *if you really had any hand in it*) I have not as yet heard that Mr. Wilkes has brought any action against you, so that I cannot help lamenting those labours are likely to escape any reward.

However, it is not my intention to reproach; I leave that to those whom you have both deserted and deceived. But were I to give the public but a very short sketch of your conduct from the time of your being a solicitor at the Old Bailey, to your holding (I hope for yourself, not *another*) the high office of first lord of the English treasury, I do not know whether your veracity, ability, or integrity, would most be doubted. But this I will not do: some part of it may relate to private life, with which the public, sir, have no concern; yet I mean it as a hint to the venal tools of your cause, who have daily in newspapers and pamphlets abused the private characters of several noblemen and gentlemen, which are not only as irreproachable as your own, but, perhaps, much less so than some of those with whom you are in league. The libels, however, which the *hired* advocates