

“ tion you have for this indecent and untrue
 “ Suggestion, *viz.* *their Tendernefs for the Pro-*
 “ *prietary Eftate, and the great Offices?* What
 “ Foundation have you for inlinuating, that this
 “ House ever was under any Restraint with re-
 “ gard to either of thofe Points?” Their Ho-
 nours Argument in thefe Questions, and what is
 fubjoined a little lower, “ Your having Recourfe
 “ to thofe Objections in 1758, will not ferve
 “ your Purpose, for you *will there find no Objec-*
 “ *tions to either of thefe Particulars being at all*
 “ *taxed;*” feems to proceed upon this Principle,
 that as they have never *explicitly declared* their
 Objections to thefe Points, the Lower Houfe
 therefore had no Right to *fuppofe*, that they had
 any fuch in their View; whereas if their Honours
 had made *such a Declaration*, *Suppofition* muft
 have been excluded, and *absolute Certainty* taken
 its Place. If indeed the Lower Houfe had *posi-*
tively afferted that thofe were the Objections of the
 Upper Houfe, the Question had been pertinent,
 becaufe pofitive Affertion requires pofitive Proof;
 but Suppofition is well warranted, by Circum-
 ftances of ftrong Prefumption. And it muft be
 fubmitted to the confiderate Reader, whether,
 from the Nature of their Conftitution, their par-
 ticular Conduct relating to this Bill, and the in-
 variable Attachment they have ever fhewn to the
 Proprietor’s Intereft, the Upper Houfe had any
 Right to charge this *Suppofition* with a Difregard
 either of Truth or Decency?

Their Honours then proceed to another
 Question — “ Or what Reafon have you to
 “ hope