

cised by the Commons, but not claimed from Usage, but from this Principle, *that the free-born Subjects of England, and consequently their Representatives, have a Right to grant their own Money in their own Way.* Their Honours say, that the Lower House have not a Right to the Privileges of the House of Commons, because the Foundations of the two Bodies are different. This implies, that if the Foundations were the same, the Rights would be the same. Now, as I said above, the House of Commons do not claim the Privileges respecting Money Bills from Usage, but from this Principle, *that the Freemen of England, and consequently their Representatives, have a Right to give their own Money in their own Way.* If the Inhabitants of *Maryland* are *free British Subjects*, then the Principle must be common to the House of Commons in *England*, and to the Lower House here, and consequently, according to their Honours own Argument, the Foundations being the same, the Privilege must be the same.

The Rights of the Lower House, say their Honours, “are founded only on the Royal Charter, their particular Usages, and the common Law of *England*.”—I should be glad to know what their Honours Rights are founded on. Not on the Royal Charter I am very confident; not I conceive on the common Law of *England*, nor can they support their present Pretensions, I mean as to the Case of Money Bills, by Usage; for the Usage has been both Ways, and therefore decides nothing, but leaves the Right upon its original Principle. But let it be supposed, for Argument’s Sake,