

Richard the Second was of quite a different Nature, and took its Rise, not from his Parliament refusing to grant him Money, but in that having obtained very large Sums in a legal Parliamentary Process, he immediately afterwards exacted a heavy Contribution from each wealthy Individual of the Nation, under the Name of a Benevolence or free Gift. For there was not, as *Rapin* observes, a Lord, Prelate, Gentleman, or rich Citizen, but was obliged to lend a Sum of Money, though they knew the King had no Design ever to repay them.

In the same Page, we are told, that “*Edward* the First was refused Money by his Subjects, to defend his Territories in *France* against the *French*.” In this Case, as well as in those already mentioned, the Author happens to be wrong in his Evidence; for the Parliament in this very Instance granted the Subsidy that *Edward* demanded. But to shew how willing our impartial Letter-writer is to foist in any the least Appearance of a Negative from the Parliament against the King, I will explain this remarkable Epoque of our *English* History. In the Year 1297, *Edward* the First convoked a Parliament at *St. Edmund's Bury*, in which a large Subsidy was granted to him, for the Service of the ensuing Year. But as the Intentions of the King were publickly known, some Time before the Parliament was called, the Clergy privately obtained an Edict from Pope *Boniface*, inhibiting them, under Pain of Excommunication, from paying any Tax or Contribution whatever to any secular Prince. So that when the King came to levy the Monies granted to him by Parliament, the Clergy (who then possessed One-third of the Revenues of this Kingdom) alledged in
Excuse