

all, or to return them with an absolute Negative, the former of which was the Case in the very last Session; so that their Honours have not even this flimsy Excuse with regard to these Bills, which they have urged in their Behalf with respect to the last Assessment Bill, that they would not make any Objections to ~~it~~ ^{in the present}, because they had made some to ~~the former~~ ^{the late} House. Hence it may fairly be concluded, that their Honours are Enemies to the very Spirit and main Intention of such a Bill, *the submitting of our Disputes to His Majesty's Decision*; for they cannot with any Face say they rejected the Bill, because it was liable in its Mode to Objections; for the Answer will be ready, Why did not their Honours propose Amendments, and thereby shew that their View was not to condemn the Bill, but to make it more perfect? They claim a Right to amend Money Bills; why did they not exercise that Right upon this Occasion? They claim a Right to *frame* Money Bills; if the Bill sent to them, by the Lower House, was so fundamentally defective and exceptionable, that no Amendment could render it perfect or proper to its End, why did not their Honours form and send down a Bill to the Lower House? It is very probable indeed it would not have been received, but this they cannot urge in their own Justification, since it is the Duty of every Branch to exercise the Rights they think themselves invested with, for the public Good. Wherefore, *if His Majesty should hereafter be disappointed in His Expectations of Supplies from this Province, it will be entirely*

owing