

“ independent as they are, have rarely, if ever, af-
 “ ferted to be in them, or attempted to exercise,
 “ or if they have, the Assertions have ever been
 “ positively denied, and the Attempt to exercise
 “ the Right carefully frustrated by the House of
 “ Commons; being looked upon by them as an
 “ Invasion of the Rights and Privileges inherent
 “ in them only. The like Rights and Privile-
 “ ges, we do insist, are constitutionally inherent
 “ in us, as the Representatives in Assembly of
 “ free *British* Subjects, and we hope we shall be
 “ allowed to exercise them without Controul,
 “ unless it can be shewn (which we cannot con-
 “ ceive) that our dependent State upon our Mo-
 “ ther Country (of which we are duly sensible,
 “ and in whose Determinations we shall always
 “ cheerfully acquiesce) necessarily deprives us
 “ of any Part of them.” Now what can, by any
 rational Construction, be intended by these *Rights*
and Privileges, but the several *Rights and Privi-*
leges respecting the Mode of proceeding upon Money
Bills, the only Subject of Contest at this time
 subsisting between the two Houses? But yet their
 Honours have, upon the Authority of these Pas-
 sages, charged the Lower House with arrogating
 to themselves the *Rights and Powers* of a *British*
 House of Commons, which must be understood
 in a general Sense, though the main Scope and
 Intention of the Lower House, and their Expres-
 sions also, limit their Claim to particular Privi-
 leges.

From what has been said, I hope it appears to
 the impartial Reader, that the Lower House, in
 their