

“ hope we are now more at large than heretofore ?”

To hope without Foundation, I grant is a Weakness, but never thought it a Crime, though their Honours, from their next Question, seem to think it so.—“ If you have no Foundation for this Behaviour, what Regard will any Thing you say deserve ?” The Truth is, the Lower House were anxious that their Bill *for His Majesty's Service* might pass into a Law, and when Men are sanguine in the Pursuit of a particular Object, it is a very common Frailty to be buoyed up with fallacious and delusive Hopes. This is however catching at less than Straws, for the Expression is, not that they hope, but that they are *willing* to hope. But whatever Opinion the Lower House might entertain of the Disposition of the Upper House, with regard to the Passage of the Bill, I do not think the Merits of the Cause in the least influenced thereby, since their own Persuasion of its Preference to every other Plan, will afford a sufficient Vindication of their Perseverance, till His Majesty, to whose Decision they have always been desirous of submitting, shall shew a different Sense of it. But to return to the Point.—

It is as difficult for me to believe, that their Honours are, from the Nature of their *Constitution, the Guardians and Protectors* of the Peoples Rights, as that they acted with that independent Spirit they profess, when they tamely acquiesced under the Appointment of a menial Scrivener, with Qualities that have rendered him generally