

L. H. J. words would of themselves obviate your Claim and much moore so
 Liber No. 46 when you have not been able to produce one Instance where those
 words upon any Complaint and solemn Determination of the house
 of Commons were ever construed agreeable to your Exposition on
 the Contrary I have shewed out of Petit what Instances he imagined
 to be within this Privilege of Speech before that Statute; And I dare
 say no one can suppose but that he who professedly wrote in Vindi-
 cation of the Commons and their Privileges would have mentioned
 Instances agreeable to your Reasoning if there had been any such
 of good Authority. But notwithstanding all this and my clear Expo-
 sition of that Statute in my former Answer you endeavour to dis-
 tinguish upon the words of that Statute and the Arguments in my
 Answer relating to it.

p. 650 You do not controvert my Exposition of that Statute according
 to a legal Construction, but you say that the Term legal as applied
 by me is equivocal This I deny for the Construction in our Dispute
 is to be made upon the Words of an Act of Parliament this Act binds
 the House of Commons as well as the rest of the nation and I pre-
 sume that House or the House of Lords or both together can no
 more put any Construction on the Words of that Act that is not
 strictly legal in Westminster Hall then they can of themselves repeal
 that Act and make a New one and which would be the Case if you
 are in the right There may be indeed a Difference of Opinions in the
 House of Commons what is the Legal Construction according to
 the rules in Westminster Hall but if that is once settled they are bound
 by it as well as other People since that Statute was made as well to
 ascertain the Liberties of the People as the Privileges of their Repre-
 sentatives; and were it in the Power of any one Branch of a Legis-
 lature by a Peculiar or arbitrary Construction of their own to give
 the words of an Act a different sense than what every Iudge Lawyer
 or other Inteligent Man would understand them in, It would be
 intraping the Subject instead of securing his Liberty and would be a
 setting up an Authority independent of the other Two Estates in a
 Point which had all their joint Concurrence and therefore could not
 be interpreted by any Rules peculiar to one Branch alone of the Leg-
 islature But what has (I really believe) led you into this great Mis-
 take is that you have found in Books the Expression of a Law of
 Parliament and therefore you have concluded that this Law of Par-
 liament must mean a Power to over turn a Law of the Land I hope
 you will Excuse me in remarking that Law Books may be said to be
 like Edged Tools which often hurts the Person who handels them
 without understanding their use, from hence it is that you ask me,
 Is their not a Law of Parliament as well as a Law of Ordinary
 Justice distinct from each other? I agree their is but not in any
 Sense proper for your purpose I think the Law of Parliament in the
 proper Sense is confined to the Usage and Custom of Parliament
 but in no sense and in no Case that I ever heard has the words Law