

but the Peers of this Realm, the only *Medium* I know of between King and People. If I might be permitted to speak my Mind on this Point, I should think the Power of the Lords very little to be suspected at this Juncture, nor can I readily persuade myself that I am singular in this Opinion.

Page the fourth we are told, that "whoever dares to assert, that an *Englishman* has no Right to oppose the *exorbitant* Power of a Prince upon the Throne is an Advocate for Passive Obedience, and an Enemy to the Revolution."

I grant that an *Englishman*, under certain Restrictions may have such a Right: But then he is not like another *Matthias*, (*vid. Selden, de Zelotis*) to rush upon him, and slay him at the Altar. A Zeal of this Nature I imagine would not be accounted to him for Righteousness in any Court of *Europe* at this Day. If a Monarch is to be opposed, it ought to be done with the Sanction and Authority of those Laws which he himself has subscribed; and even then with all the Respect and Deference due to his super-eminent Dignity. For as to all other Oppositions, it is obvious to Persons of common Discernment, that they are only the natural Effects of a disaffected Heart, or a disappointed Ambition. But, instead of allowing this Concession, I might ask you, to what Intent is it that you inform the People of this Nation, that "an *Englishman* has a Right to oppose the *exorbitant* Power of a Prince upon the Throne?" Would you cast any such Reflection on his present Majesty? The Word *exorbitant* implies, that the King has acted *ex orbe*, out of his Sphere. If you will make use of Words that have a Meaning, why don't you produce Facts to corroborate, or confirm, what you seem so desirous of maintaining? Can you charge his Majesty with having made any