

ed with Difaffection to the King, and an Attempt to fubvert the Liberties of the Subject; for they go on and fay, “ would not they (the Lower Houfe) *had they been really defirous of granting His Majefty the demanded Supplies*, have given fome Indications of that Defire, by their Conduct?” How? “ In taking proper Meafures to adapt a Bill for that Purpofe, to the Approbation of the Upper Houfe.” This indeed is talking in an unufual Strain of dictatorial Infolence. The Lower Houfe, it feems, are not to confider the Equity of the Mode, they are not to exercife their own Judgments in framing of Money Bills, but they are to take proper Meafures to know the Senfe of their Mafter, and to be the fervile Instruments of carrying their arbitrary Dictates into Execution; fo that they would be juft in the fame Situation with the Parliament of *Paris*, who have nothing to do but to know their Mafter’s Will, and to publish their Arrêts accordingly.

But the Reason they give, why the Lower Houfe fhould not have perfifted in what they thought right, is very curious, and furnifhes a further Illuftration of the arbitrary Schemes of thofe Gentlemen, in fubjecting the Lower Houfe to their Controul; and that is, *that the Lower Houfe could not be fo ignorant, as to imagine it could pafs into a Law without their Confent*; the plain Import of which is, that the Lower Houfe ought therefore to fend up a Bill which they knew would be agreeable to the Upper Houfe. This is in one Word to exclude the Lower Houfe