

the Upper House, when invited by the Lower House to make their Objections, if in the Course of their Consideration of that Bill any should occur to them, when the Lower House acknowledged that the Bill was *intricate in its Nature, and therefore might possibly be liable to Objections*; why, instead * of misreciting this Passage, and descending to the low Buffoonery of echoing it back, at every Turn, with an Air of Triumph, did they not endeavour to point out what to them appeared confused, absurd, unjust, unequal and oppressive?

And why did they content themselves with such general Objections to the Bill, and avoid attempting to reform what to them appeared exceptionable, merely because a Bill upon the same Plan had been adhered to by a former Lower House? The Bill itself is considerably different from that framed in 1758; the Foundations of some of the Upper House's Objections to that Bill are confessedly avoided in this, and in the present Lower House are a good many new Members; all which are Incidents which might reasonably have induced the Upper House to have entered

B 2

into

* *Message of the Lower House, April 9, 1762*: "We have formed it on such a Plan, as to us seems most suitable to the Circumstances of our Constituents, and in such a Manner as we conceive the best adapted to the Nature of the Plan; but as in a new System of such a Length, and of an intricate Nature, some Parts may possibly be found liable to Objections, which may have escaped us; and as we, out of a sincere Regard for His Majesty's Service, and an earnest Desire to effect a Termination of that Difference of Sentiment, which has unhappily too long subsisted," &c.

Message of the Upper House, April 24, 1762: This Plan you so lately as your Message of the 9th Instant, call "a new System, intricate in its Nature, and liable to Objections, which you suppose may escape your House."