

“ independent as they are, have rarely, if ever, as-  
 “ serted to be in them, or attempted to exercise,  
 “ or if they have, the Assertions have ever been  
 “ positively denied, and the Attempt to exercise  
 “ the Right carefully frustrated by the House of  
 “ Commons; being looked upon by them as an  
 “ Invasion of the Rights and Privileges inherent  
 “ in them only. The like Rights and Privile-  
 “ ges, we do insist, are constitutionally inherent  
 “ in us, as the Representatives in Assembly of  
 “ free *British* Subjects, and we hope we shall be  
 “ allowed to exercise them without Controul,  
 “ unless it can be shewn (which we cannot con-  
 “ ceive) that our dependent State upon our Mo-  
 “ ther Country (of which we are duly sensible,  
 “ and in whose Determinations we shall always  
 “ chearfully acquiesce) necessarily deprives us  
 “ of any Part of them.” Now what can, by any  
 rational Construction, be intended by these *Rights*  
*and Privileges*, but the several *Rights and Privi-*  
*leges respecting the Mode of proceeding upon Money*  
*Bills*, the only Subject of Contest at this time  
 subsisting between the two Houses? But yet their  
 Honours have, upon the Authority of these Pas-  
 sages, charged the Lower House with arrogating  
 to themselves the *Rights and Powers* of a *British*  
 House of Commons, which must be understood  
 in a general Sense, though the main Scope and  
 Intention of the Lower House, and their Expres-  
 sions also, limit their Claim to particular Privi-  
 leges.

From what has been said, I hope it appears to  
 the impartial Reader, that the Lower House, in  
 their