

the two Counties had endured. So that this very Precedent is a Case in Point which might be brought not only in Justification, but in Commendation of the great Vigilance and prudent Conduct of the present Administration, who have already taken those Measures, which the Duke of *Lancaster* is censured for having neglected.

In the same Page our Author tells us, "that in the Reign of this King (*Richard* the Second) the Parliament was so tender in granting Subsidies and raising Taxes for foreign Wars, that they added to the Act, *Quod non trabatur in consequentium*; that it should be no Precedent to Futurity for levying Taxes." It will not be amiss here to observe, that this Parliament took extraordinary Care that the Subsidy they granted should be applied *only* in repulsing the *French* and *Castilians* in League against *England*; so that I should think this Parliament can't properly be said to have been *tender in granting Subsidies for foreign Wars*. As to the Scrap of *Latin* which our Letter-writer has ventured to insert; and which, thro' Ignorance of the Language, I suppose, he has tortured into quite a different Meaning, I will give my Readers its proper Explanation. The Parliament declared the Subsidy granted to the King, who was then a Minor, should not be drawn into a Precedent, which plainly shewed, says *Rapin*, that they were resolved to be upon their Guard *during the King's Minority*.

I cannot say I am thoroughly satisfied with the Comment of this Historian; I shall offer a Remark of my own, which is, that the Parliament, knowing the *Necessity* of opposing the *French* and *Castilians*, granted the Subsidy; but clogg'd it