

of common Sense, who would give himself the Trouble of perusing those Messages, must consider those Objections as Unanswered (and in this we are supported by the Opinion of his Majesty's late Attorney-General upon that Bill and those Messages); the Lower House continued for Five successive Sessions to send the same Bill to the Upper House for their Assent, without paying the least Regard to any one of the many material Objections, pursuant to their Request so long before, by this House, pointed out to them: Had these Lower Houses been so earnestly desirous to raise Supplies for his Majesty's Service, would they so repeatedly have sent up the same Bill for that Purpose, without any one material Alteration in the Plan, or in any of the material Parts of that Bill? Would they not, had they been really desirous of Granting his Majesty the demanded Supplies, have given some Indications of that Desire by their Conduct, in taking the proper Measures to adapt a Bill for that Purpose to the Approbation of the Upper House, without whose Assent, they could not be so ignorant as to imagine it could pass into a Law? Or, Why did not that earnest Desire, and those repeated Professions of Loyalty towards his Majesty, produce some other Plan than that of a Confused, Absurd, Unjust, Unequal, and Oppressive Assessment? Were those Houses so barren of Invention or Genius, as to be incapable of forming any other? This was not the Case; Why then, when other Plans more Just and Equal, less Intricate in their Nature, liable to fewer Objections, and infinitely less Dangerous to the undoubted Prerogatives of the Crown, and the Rights and Liberties of the People, than your favourite Assessment Bill, were formed and proposed to those Houses, why were they no sooner proposed than voted out, but that, whatever were their Professions, they had no Intention of raising Supplies for his Majesty's Service, nor of affording this House an Opportunity of coming to an Agreement with them, at a less Expence than that of his Majesty's Prerogatives and the People's Liberties, by a total Subversion of our present Constitution, and lodging the several Powers thereof, now equally distributed for the Preservation of the Whole, in their Hands? And if their warmest Professions appear thus destitute of Truth and Candour, What Regard are we to pay to those so often repeated by yourselves?

Give us Leave therefore, *Gentlemen*, to say you could not flatter yourselves, that the Message accompanying your Assessment Bill to this House, would have produced an Agreement between the Two Houses about the Manner of raising Supplies for his Majesty's Service, because (amongst other Reasons) you express your Fear that it would not have that Effect; but if you were afraid of the Success of this Method, Why would you offer it? Surely a real Concern for his Majesty's Service would have suggested some other Method; but altho' you might fear, you were far from being *satisfied* we would not pass that Bill; And pray, *Gentlemen*, why were you not satisfied? Or, What will satisfy you, if Eight successive Refusals of such a Bill will not? Could you have any Reason to expect, or even to entertain, the most distant Hope, that the Ninth Offer of the like Bill could have better Success than the Eight preceding? But you were not satisfied that we would *at this Time* obstinately adhere to Objections made against a Bill in 1758: But why not at *this Time*? Have you any persuasive Powers in your House at present, to which the former Lower Houses were Strangers? We have hitherto seen nothing of the Kind: Or are there any late Circumstances without Doors, which may render *this Time* more unfavourable to our supporting his Majesty's Rights against Usurpation, and the People from Oppression, than existed during the last Meeting of the Lower House? Perhaps the War with *Spain* may by you be considered as an additional Advantage towards pushing your favourite Points, and induce you to wonder that *at this Time* we do not give up every Thing to obtain a little Money for his Majesty's Service: But, in whatever Light you may view this Circumstance, we cannot think ourselves Justifiable either to his Majesty, our Consciences, or your Constituents, in giving up his Prerogatives, and by subverting our present Constitution, introduce the numberless Evils consequent upon all the Powers of Government being lodged in your Hands, for so comparatively trivial a Consideration. But what Kind of Loyalty, or even Patriotism, must that be, which, amidst the Distresses of a heavy War, with several powerful Enemies, can not only withhold it's Assistance to the Common Cause, but sit calm and unconcerned at impending Ruin, and the Contempt of our Fellow-Subjects, by an obstinate Adherence to the same unwarrantable Plan, now a Ninth Time found unsuccessful, notwithstanding his Majesty's threatened Displeasure for such Behaviour, unless such Assistance shall be purchased at the extravagant Price of his Majesty's Prerogatives, and the People's Liberties, thrown into your Hands by this favourite and unconstitutional Bill? Such is the Nature of your Loyalty or Patriotism, and such has been and is the real Concern of the Lower House to raise Supplies for his Majesty's Service, in these Times of imminent Distress and Danger, to our Mother Country, our Fellow-Subjects, and Ourselves.

Why, *Gentlemen*, should you think it strange that we should adhere to our Objections made to a like Bill in 1758, and give the little Regard you have shewn to those Objections as a Reason for our being confirmed in an Opinion, that there was no Probability of the Two Houses coming to an Agreement upon the present Bill, and sending it down (as you express yourselves) with a flat Negative? If those Objections were insignificant, or not applicable to the present Bill, surely you might have shewn them in one or other of these