it does not depend upon any ques-
; but on the *power every owner has*
o dispose of it upon such terms, &
The advice of the council was not
ject. This regulation too you have
as arbitrary as the ship-money assess-
ual facility you may prove it to be a

nd council were twelve in number,
can be said (I mean with truth) to
in the effect of the proclamation,
not to be *directed* by the *suffrage* of
as to judge of the propriety of their
reasons they should offer. It cannot
n again with truth) that they were
hough the Citizen has the assurance
th the reproachful imputation of be-
ndants on *one man*. The proclama-
f the governor flowing from his per-
ty. He had promised, *publickly* and
at "if the prerogative should inter-
tlement of fees, *he* would take good
ature consideration, and what *he* should
t and just, would be the *only* dictate
conduct." He again, as publickly,
ared that, "so clear was his *convic-*
priety, and utility of a regulation to
on, and infinite litigation, if it was
ad of recalling, he would renew his
and in stronger terms threaten all of-
displeasure, who should presume to
of the people any fee beyond *his re-*
his proroguing speech he again *de-*
had issued the proclamation solely for
the people, by *nine tenths* of whom,
was so understood." But you, Mr.
erted, an absolute, direct, impudent,
give you, as it is upon paper, a *dis-*
that he was *not* determined by *his*
but by the dictate of *a man* whom
all a clerk, sometimes a register, and
, and that nine tenths of the people
proclamation issued for the purpose,
solemnly declared. The contradic-
confessed, is direct and pointed, and
ufficient grounds, the veracity, since-
or ——— would be ——— but
n infamous, impudent calumny (cha-
he author of it) prompted by the te-
ble malignity. To atone for this
axim, "the king can do no wrong,"
d on what principle? Not such as
application to a ——— who should
d, or middle-aged, or circumspect—
uthful, unsuspicious, &c. &c."—really
an innovation, rather arbitrary—*legal*
n understood to be *rather unpliant*;
n so easily *garble moral* ones, who will
ess in modifying the legal? Would he
ould—alas! would he but—then "he
le god below," and be *worshipped ac-*
ing *more* than a king. "The gover-
you say, is no king"—but yet again
ngs have *revoked* proclamations, and
gh the governor has *affixed his signa-*
disavow his act." Again, "He is
ed the king's *minister*, he is *rather* his
or *deputy*. He forms a distinct branch
ure, and he has the power of life and
s a representative, or deputy, cannot
t of the *capacity* of his constituent, or
have, Mr. Citizen, *clearly proved* in
le, that the governor is the *representa-*
the king, *because* the king *cannot* exe-
fice; and, the governor *can*—a grave
h nonsense *about* the governor's being
a king, would be, indeed, ridiculous.
ish servility of the intended palliative
to HIS understanding, *whose* sincerity,
onour you have so insolently attacked.
o Serjeant Hawkins, and answer the
in the triumph of ignorance, you have
ve not the officers who advised, and
who issued the proclamation, set their
No, I have shewn, they have not—
s nothing to the purpose, or I would
law. You may perceive, if not quite
ve not by silence admitted the imputa-
ve I denied the advice I gave "as far
" but I deny (what your impudence,
ve asserted) that *any one* man of the
dictator of the proclamation, though
my opinion, the measure was expedi-
I deny what you have asserted, and
charge you with having outraged truth
pudent, and flagitious malice, on the
ve of engaging the passions of those,
studied to delude by a feigned regard
welfare, to assist you in the gratification
rional, sordid enmity. Take this as
your desultory, base, malevolent asser-
rouling power of *a wicked minister*, and
ve any sense of shame left.

"pudet hæc opprobria dici,
uisse, & non potuisse refelli."

e more direct, and explicit in my disa-
unprincipled confidence should cast a
e honour of the other members of the
you aim to render *contemptible*, that
one man publickly obnoxious, who,
potence of it, bids defiance to all the
nalice.

ny former letter that the proclamation,
he officers, prevented extortion, and
e that the reader might form his own
says the Citizen "it ought rather to
as a *direction* to the officers what to de-
the people what to pay." This word
to be a favourite, it does not *assert*; it
nsinuation, what is meant by "di-

"rection?" It is a vague term, it is applied by the Citizen to the officers, and to the people *equally*, and having been substituted in the place of "restriction, "and *preventive of extortion*" it is proper to guard against *deception*, by *fixing* the sense of it; if it only means *pointing out*, it is harmless; but why then the substitution? If it means *order*, or *command*, it is fallacious: for the *people* are not *ordered* or *commanded*. I wish he had carried his appeal to the *feelings* of the people. If oppressed, they must feel the oppression—if they are not, let them not be persuaded by this political quack to think, that they are. Prudent men who possess the blessing of vigorous health, will hardly be persuaded to swallow the pill, or draught of an ignorant mountebank, who has the impudence to pronounce that they are distempered, and ought to take his drugs. It is true that the lower house called the settlement of fees by proclamation "*the usurpation of a* "*right*" and threatened an opposition, and their resolves were afterwards extremely violent; but if the settlement of fees was lawful, and expedient, it was not to be controuled by resolves, and a submission to such intemperate vehemence would have derogated from the dignity of government, and endangered the constitutional balance of power. The other branches of the legislature were as unanimous, and clear in an opposite opinion. Other reasons, besides what the Citizen has suggested may be assigned for the temporary duration of the inspection law. As a regulation it might, from an alteration of circumstances, become in every respect inconvenient, and the utility of a law, so extensive, and important, ought to be established by infallible experience, before its perpetuity is ordained. That a similar proclamation, in 1733, was the occasion of much clamour I believe, but not that the clamour was so general, and violent, as it has *since* been, *on another topic*: resolves have been as vehement, and more expressive of apprehension, *on another occasion*, when only *three* members ventured to vote against them; the number that divided against the last resolve, respecting the proclamation. The Citizen need not go far to have this matter explained, and, I imagine, he may be inclined to think resolves ought not *always* to fix mens opinions, since *sometimes*, they may be dictated by *passion*. His objection, that setting the fees is a prejudging of the question, has been answered, and besides an appeal to the supreme court of the province will hardly admit of supposition; for the sum must exceed £. 50 sterling, or 10,000 lb. tobacco, and it is not to be expected, that an officer would suffer any one to be indebted to him, in so large a sum. The Citizen seems desirous to be informed, how fees are to be recovered—all in good time—if in chancery, the Governor, acting upon his own judgment, in this sage gentleman's opinion, will deserve to be removed ab officio, and he will most cordially wish his removal—weighty opinion—tremendous wish! if a patriot stepping forth, *like Hampden*, in the glorious cause of liberty should be *iniquitously* compelled to pay an officer's fees, for services, *actually* performed, how alarming would be the event? The Citizen has thought proper to make me say that "Mr. Ogle met "with the most violent opposition any Governor ever "did, *on account* of his proclamation" but I must object to this substitution, because the fact asserted by him is absolutely false. The opposition he met with, and the railings, he despised, flowed from a very different source, and, I suspect, the Citizen only affects an ignorance of the *particular circumstances*. The proclamation was not issued by Mr. Ogle; but "he" fully atoned, "says the Citizen," by his "*subsequent* conduct, which was mild and equitable, for "the oppressions (or errors) of his *former* administra-"tion" here again I must object, because the Citizen falsely insinuates, that the decree I mentioned, was in his *first*, when in fact, it was in his *last* administration. The opinions of eminent counsel in England, in favour of the proclamation, having been intimated, a passage in a pamphlet was cited by him to this effect, "on a "question of publick concernment, the opinions of "court lawyers, however respectable for their candour "ought not to weigh more than the reasons adduced "in support of them &c.—for they have generally de-"clared that to be legal, which the *minister for the* "*time being* has deemed to be expedient" and hence he seemed to infer that the opinions in favour of the proclamation should be regarded with suspicion. I answered in my former letter, that the cases were entirely different, because the "proclamation was no point "which the minister aimed to establish &c." and what have you replied to this, Mr. Citizen? "You deny "the assertion, *if* the opinions are in favour of the "proclamation, because it is a point, which the "*minister of Maryland* aims to establish" the minister "of Maryland" pitiful sneaking prevarication—*a'n't you ashamed of yourself?*

The Citizen wishes "that the opinions of the Eng-"lish lawyers in the opposition; would face the day" —for two reasons his request will not be complied with —the first, that he has no kind of right to make it—second, I have no power to grant it, but that I may not seem to be a mere churl, I inform him—that, besides the attorney, and solicitor general of England, serjeant Wynn and Mr. Dunning were of opinion, that the King could *lawfully* settle the fees of *constitutional* officers in the royal governments, and that this power was conferred on the Proprietor of Maryland by the charter, under which we derive the power of making laws for our good government. In New-York, the fees of officers have been settled by the Governor, and council, in virtue of the royal commission, and the people there (not much inclined to submit to violations of their rights) submit to the settlement. By this royal commission the Governor, with the advice, and assistance of the council, was authorized to make a table of fees, and thereby a reasonable provision for officers, and in virtue of this commission, such table of fees was made, and is the fixed rule, or standard, though an act of assembly in New-York for the settlement of fees had passed a little time before, and received the royal dissent—all this, Mr. Citizen, has been "endured" in New-York, for want of the exertion of men of *your* principles civil, and religious.

The short extract from Petit affords a just specimen of the Citizen's candour—the Citizen did not choose to state the nature of the proclamations mentioned in Petit, but has left the reader to infer a *great deal* from his *little scraps*. To obviate this disingenuous purpose, it is necessary to observe, that the proclamations complained of "as altering some points of law, and mak-"ing new" directed, who should not, and who might be *chosen* to *represent the people*, and ordered "if re-"turns should be made contrary to this direction, "they should be rejected, and warranted any person "to seize starch, and to dispose, or destroy any stuff "&c. and restrained all men, not licensed (by the "crown) to make starch"—the proclamation made "for matter directly rejected the precedent session" ordered, that "houses should be built with brick"—the proclamations "touching the freehold livelihood "of men" directed "the razing and pulling down "houses, and prohibited them to be rebuilt, and ap-"pointed the owners land to be let by other men at "what price they pleased"—former proclamations vouched "ordering country gentlemen out of Lon-"don, and against buildings"—"confiscations of "goods, fine, forfeitures, imprisonment, seizure, "standing in the pillory threatened"—now the reader may make his application, without danger of being deceived, and he may not improperly, judge too of the Citizen's *real patriotism*. *(D)* The Citizen it must be allowed, has a happy talent at *explanation*—I asked in my former letter, what was meant "by dragging "to light"—"made to feel the resentments of a free "people—punished with infamy, exile or death—dread "of such a fate"—and his ingenuity has proved, nothing more was meant, than a removal from office, and a different supposition proceeded from the "con-"scious guilt of" a wicked minister "trembling, "and dismayed"—despicable tribunal, and yet you complain of ridicule—"Sarcasms, says he, on person-"al defects have *ever been* esteemed the sure token of "a base degenerate mind"—but I insist upon this exception. "Where there is an apparent corres-"pondence between the form, and the disposition, "cum forma, et mores consimiles sunt," when the features and lineaments of the one, are directed by the motions, and affections of the other, when the countenance does the office of a dial plate, the wheels, and springs within the machine actuating its muscles.

"The figure such, as may the soul proclaim—
"We pity faults by nature's hand impress'd
"But with his mind, Thersites' form's a jest.

When an adversary exerts all his *mischievous* powers; and the person assailed attempts to ridicule them "he "gives" according to the Citizen's maxim "a sure "token of a base, degenerate mind" but the extreme *mendacity*, and malice of the assailant are *just* proofs of his publick spirit—I am as little apprehensive of any attack upon my person or house, by a party of free men led on by the Citizen, as I am that the Ægyptian superstition, cultus Ægyptius cercopitheci (the worship of a monkey) will succeed the demolition of our religious establishment.

Dialogue, as he has managed it, is a manner of writing very suitable to the tenuity of the Citizen's genius, he takes care that his opponent shall always be discomfited, and himself complimented on his victory. In the short one introduced into his last piece he has very cleverly, disclosed, or concealed just so much as answers his main purpose of misrepresentation: but the officer, *in fact*, has it in his power, in various instances, to receive his fees *immediately*. If a writ be applied for, or a copy of any record, or paper in his custody—if a warrant of survey, or patent—if letters testamentary, or of administration, if an account is to be passed, an inventory to be received, a commission to be issued, if the examination and passing a certificate, if a survey is to be made, certificates of it to be made out &c. &c. the respective officers have it in their power to receive their fees immediately for their services, and, if not restrained, might oppress, so that the Citizen's expedient, "not pay," is the "baseless "fabrick of a vision" the officers, who are thus paid, save the expence of collection, suffer no loss from insolvencies, and are not put to inconvenience from the irregular, or negligent conduct of sheriffs.

There is a *little mischievous* insinuation of the Citizen, which deserves some animadversion: speaking of the affair of ship-money, he says, "that the judges," the guardians of law, and liberty ("*reflects on this* "*good reader*") gave a corrupt opinion—the words, "reflect on this good reader"—seem to have been thrown out to raise a suspicion of *other judges*. That judges have been corrupt, that juries *too* have been corrupt, that Kings have been tyrants, that men have professed the utmost purity of intention, and after they had gained, by the arts of simulation, the popular confidence, basely sacrificed the rights of the people, and that personal enmity has assumed the fair appearance of publick virtue cannot be denied: but are all judges, all juries to be suspected of corruption, all kings of tyranny, all patriots of venality? and is *every* man, professing a regard for the publick welfare to be suspected of a narrow, personal, rancorous enmity, because the Citizen's furious temerity has laid aside the mask, and betrayed all the turpitude, and deformity of the basest, and the blackest malignity!

Notwithstanding *your averment*, Mr. Citizen, the strong probability, on which I founded my opinion, who were concerned in the unprovoked virulent attacks, contained in the papers, still remains in full force.

(D) Proclamations are lawful, or not, according to their subjects. That they have been employed as instruments of tyranny is not to be denied: but they have, too, been expedient to invigorate legal sanctions. Instances may be cited of proclamations, particularly such as have affected the order, and profession of certain religionists, that have been received with great popular applause. Eos tamen lædere non exoptemus, qui nos lædere non exoptant.

The many instances, in which you have shewn your utter disregard of truth in your assertions and of the most disingenuous prevarication in your answers, and explications, render *your* testimony extremely suspicious; and such is your casuistical ingenuity that *all possibility* of mean cavil and illiberal subterfuge must be absolutely precluded, before any credit will be due to *your averments*. "Advice," suggestion, "assistance, are not terms of sufficient comprehension—if, however, when attacked in the dark, I have mistaken the assailant, and directed some resentment against a person *really not privy to*, nor *approving* the outrage, it is a strong reason to dissuade from these dark attacks, which may involve men, *in no manner* concerned.

After all, who is this man, that calls himself a Citizen, makes his addresses to the inhabitants of Maryland, has charged the members of one of the legislative branches with insolence, because, in their intercourse with another branch of the legislature, they proposed stated salaries, and has *himself* proposed a *different* provision for officers; contradicted the most publick, and explicit declarations of the governor, represented *all* the council, but *one*, to be mere fools, that he may represent *him* to be a political parricide; denounced infamy, exile, and death; expressed a regard for the *established* church of England? Who is he? He has no share in the legislature, as a member of any branch; he is incapable of being a member; he is disabled from giving a vote in the choice of representatives, by the laws and constitution of the country, *on account of his principles*, which are *distrusted* by those laws. He is disabled by an express resolve from interfering in the election of members, on the *same account*. He is not a protestant.

In my former letter I intimated, Mr. Citizen, that the Governor's conduct in the proceedings relative to the proclamation had been honoured by the royal approbation, and yet you have *vehemently* pronounced, that the proclamation "*must not be endured*." Softly; magnanimous Citizen, fool!—you have already stretched the *skin* too much, and raise not your voice to so great a pitch of *dissonance*, as, peradventure, may be *intolerable*. "Must not be endured!" These are naughty words. What then are you to do? Are you to have no employment, no amusement? Yes, be employed, be amused; but before you resolve upon a plan, consider seriously, what you are able, and what you are not able to bear,

———quid ferre recusent,
Quid valeant HUMERI——

and, if you are not very perverse, you will follow my advice, (though I have shewn what, stripped of disguise you are—"stultus invidiæ furore abreptus," a foolish fellow, hurried away by the rage of malice) instead of making yourself ridiculous, perhaps, obnoxious, by endeavouring to gain the confidence of the people, who are *instructed* by the spirit of our laws, and constitution, by the disabilities you are laid under, not to place any trust in *you*, when their civil, or religious rights, may be concerned. My advice to you is to be quiet, and peaceable, and with all due application,

Ædificare casas, plostello adjungere mures,
Ludere par impar, equitare in arundine longa.

to build baby houses, yoke mice to a go-cart, play at even or odd, (or push pin for variety) and ride upon a long cane.

ANTILON.

TO PATUXENT.

SIR,

YOU have swallowed the bait, which Mess. Chase and Paca threw out for you. Every other effort to draw me off from the single point I undertook to dispute with them, having failed, the address was published, with the fond hope of drawing down upon me the resentment of dissenters, whose alacrity to enter into a controversy concerning an American episcopate, has been sufficiently manifested. They are obliged to you alone, that the artifice has not been wholly unsuccessful.

That there should be *inaccuracies* in the things I have hastily written, is not much to be wondered at: but that so indifferent a writer as you appear to be, should seriously sit down to point out two such venial peccadillos, is an instance of puddling criticism, *not easily pardoned*. It happens, however, that your first remark is an hyper criticism; and the last, though more plausible, very improperly termed a *bull*.

I forgive your warmth on the subject of the address: if, as I suppose, you are a dissenter, it was natural. But why exaggerate, and make it worse, than it is? Truth, Sir, needs not the aid of falsehood to support it. And, I greatly wrong your *brethren*, if they thank you for thus defending their cause. It had been more candid, and not less prudent, in you to have waited, till you had seen a true and fair account of the clergy's real aims in petitioning for a bishop, which, if you read my reply, you must have seen, I have laid myself under an obligation to give the publick—and which, I mean to perform. A recent instance might have taught you, that *untrue* and *unfair accounts* are sometimes given of very plain matters of fact, even in print.

Willing to believe, that you mean well, I will not be extreme to mark what you have said amiss. And yet, I am sorry to find a man, who *seems to be religious*, and who certainly is very little likely to do service to any cause, impotently endeavouring to do disservice. You hint at *somebody*'s having *profaned the sacred desk*; and that this *somebody*, moreover, is some *Maryland parson*. Now, Sir, if you really know of any such man, name him aloud; and not thus indiscriminately cast suspicions on a whole order of men. Till you do this, really religious men will consider you as an assassin, stabbing in the dark.

One instance of good fortune, you will have, which, I fear, many of us scribblers are little likely to share