

is with this Caveat, *Quod non trahatur in consequentium*, merely to shew, that they distinguished it from other Supplies, as a Measure of Necessity. For it is a well-known Maxim in the Civil Law "*Necessitate factum, non trahitur in consequentium*;" or, in the Words of *Paulus*, "*quæ propter necessitatem recepta sunt, non debent in argumentum trahi* \*."

Page 47. " Shall this Kingdom be totally drained, by grievous Subsidies, in Support of foreign Princes Dominions, among whom there is One, whose untold Sums lie *useless and untouch'd*, even for the Protection of that State which is so dear to him." This is a new Species of protecting, at least I never heard before of Money being esteemed any kind of Protection to a Country, while it lay *useless and untouch'd*. But tho' we are not to expect correct Writing from so unacademical a Scribbler, yet certainly a Decency is due from every Writer when he speaks of a Crown'd Head; but in this last Paragraph of yours it would be difficult to determine whether the Badness of your *English*, or the Badness of your Heart, be the more perspicuous. However, Sir, if you have the good Luck to escape a corporal Chastisement, impute it not altogether to the Lenity of the present Administration, but attribute it in some Measure to the real Service you do the Minister and the Crown, by attacking them with such Impotence of Argument, that even the very Fauteurs of your Party must begin to be ashamed not only of their Advocate, but even of the Cause itself, which they have so obstinately, and unwittingly, espoused. I say, you have done the Government some Service; for certainly it is no slender Proof

---

\* *Paulus, l. 70. ad Edictum.*