

or to Retain 1^s out of every 20^s Rent to be Estimated upon a Presumption on the sum wth the ffee simple wo^d sell, to be determined by the Assessors imaginary Annual Value Obj^t to a Tax upon ready Money in hand not just or reasonable & subject Even to Domestick Serv^{ts} to Rapine “ Agree to the Tax of the Proprietors Manors & Reserved Lands But Obj^t to the Tax upon his Quit Rents as ag^t an Express Law of Maryland in 1651. Enacted.

That all Charges Arising from time to time by defence of the Province or the Govern^t Establish’d herein & under the Lord Proprietary & his Heirs Lords Proprietaries of this Province shall be defray’d by this Province by an Assessment upon the Persons & Estates of the Inhabitants thereof which Method of Assessm^t is further Explain’d by an Act in 1661 to be an Assessm^t p Poll according to the Usual Custom of this Province observe that the Men on Service ought to be left to the Comand^r in Chief. Obj^t to the Proviso as absurd to Subject the Effects of the Supreme Magistrate to Distress & Sale & his Person to Imprisonment the Objections of the Up^r House to the Bill are too numerous & Extensive to set by Let^r The Stability of their Objections are support’d & defin’d by Cogent Reasons in Law & Equity, so really undeniable as admits no Contradictⁿ The whole Bill from the Lo: H: is unessay’d & repugnant to the Usage of the Province, Multiplying offices, an attempt to strip L^d Baltimore of his Right of appointm^t of Officers ag^t the Origin Constitution and Corresp^{dt} usage of the Province & to Vest such Power in the Lo: House, an Attempt fruitless as the Upper House observes, & wo^d be unjust & co^d tend only to an Unsettled & turbulent state of things, the Baneful Consequences of Disunion. It is too vexatious to Enumerate the Reply of the Lo: House in Gen^l & then to Comment. However, touching the Laws mention’d in 1651. & the Poll Tax in 1661. they say The Laws w^{ch} you mention being long since repeal’d, we shall not at present take any notice of them. Why did not they? why, because that in 1651 to the Proprietors is a Noli me tangere, a Law Exempting from Tax Lord Baltimore’s Quit Rents, Now in force Even in the Repealing Act of 1704 there is an Express saving of all claims under the former Acts. No act to effect the Act of 1651, if there were, they wo^d have noted it. Again their Stretch of Compl^t to Tax his Quit Rents, they say, because the Proprietor has alter’d his Conditions in Value of taking up Land pro rata why not Tax Quit Rents they have Grafted & advanced on Lands they sell, they had of the Prop^{rs}? prove Quit Rent tax’d in England & Defeat the Law & Equity his