

termed Reason, and a proper Method to reconcile our Differences in Judgment.

However little obliged to us, his Lordship might think himself by our Opinion of his Right of Levying Money merely because you had not shewn Reasons for denying it, we think you had no room to insinuate our Opinion was grounded merely on Want of Reasons from you for your Denial: Be pleased to recollect, that we Found our Opinion of his Lordship's Right on the Act of 1704, you, instead of offering any Arguments to us against that Law, barely tell us in your Message of the 4th Instant, that "you deny his Lordship's Right of Levying that Money, because "his Lordship never had any such Right by such Law," which is just the same Thing, as if you had said, That his Lordship had not the Right, because he had not the Right: And are we not then well justified in saying upon this Point, that we could not be convinced barely by the Authority of such a Denial, without some Reasons to enforce it?

If that Part of our Message which mentions an Attack on the Government, in order to deprive them of a Support they are in Possession of, is (as you say) of a piece with the rest of our Message, we readily conclude the rest is, as well as that Part, supported by Reason; and then the Argument is very short; you expressly confess in your Message of the 4th Instant, That "His Lordship has been in Possession of the Support of Government ever since the Year 1733;" It is very manifest you now endeavour to deprive him of it; And pray may not that Person be with the greatest Propriety said to be Attacked, who is in Possession, and attempted to be thrown out or deprived of that Possession? The Case put by you, of one Man violently taking another's Money, &c. we presume is designed as a Point of Law, and not as a Matter pertinent to the Dispute between us; for we cannot by any means agree that the Fact is as you have stated it in that Paragraph: We say his Lordship has Right to the *Twelve Pence* per Hogshead by Virtue of the Law of 1704, and at the same Time give our Reasons for not passing the Revenue Bill; you deny such Right, and give no Reasons for maintaining the reasonableness of the Revenue Bill; and yet seem Angry that we do not Concur with you: But if you are desirous of having our Opinion on the Point of Law, we may venture to say, There may be a Possession, which some Persons may think fit to call Tortious, and yet Methods may be pursued to take away that Possession, which would make the Persons taking such Methods Aggressors in the Eye of the Law. As perhaps neither House has much reason to Boast of their Art of Ratiocination by the Rules of Logick, we shall not contend with you for Superiority in that part of Learning.

As you were not surprized at our Negative to the Bill for Payment of an Agent, we presume that you were conscious such a Bill could not be expected, in Reason or Justice, to have a Passage in this House; and we declare that we cannot with Candour assume to ourselves the whole Glory of using the Word *Minister*, since the Agent described in that Bill, very readily