

venture to do, should such another at any time ever arise? Perhaps a Majority in the House of Commons offering such a bill, may not soon be seen again; for we all know, that when the Peers had framed such a bill, passed and sent it down in 1692, the then Commons rejected it, "thinking those limitations gave a legal power to commit, in cases where they were observed; whereas, they thought the safer way was, to indemnify the Ministry, when it was visible they did not commit any but upon a real danger, and not to set them any rules: since, as to the committing of suspected persons, where the danger is real and visible, the public safety must be first looked to, and supersede all particular laws." I say, therefore, it is a rare thing to find a majority of members in a House of Commons disposed to grant such a bill; and such good humoured seasons are, one would think, to be caught at, and not slighted. It seemed to me a wonderful perverseness in the Minority. In short, the great personage who led them, would rather, I find, put himself upon his country, and run the risk of their disapproving what he had done on a particular exigency, than arm his successors in office with new powers, at present unknown to the laws, which might warrant them at any time in stepping out of the ordinary road of Justice, whenever they themselves might judge it proper so to do. And yet, surely, we can have no settled constitution without some such bill. But, from hence it is plain, that nothing will please people who are thoroughly forward, except it be something of their own choosing, and that too exactly in their own way. The