

Contemporary Printed Pamphlet
Md.Hist.Soc.
p. 50

be so inattentive to our own rights, regardless of propriety, and negligent of all order, as to suffer any of them to pass into law.

“By the uniform scheme of these bills, your excellency, ourselves, and every man in the province without distinction, who has any property in tobacco, were to be taxed, and the money arising from this tax was to be lodged in the hands of such persons as the Lower House might appoint, to be applied as the Lower House only should direct, and the agent to be employed was to be nominated also by them, to act by their instructions only, to correspond with them alone, and to be removed at their displeasure.

“In these bills, aggrievances and oppressions have been in a general manner mentioned; but they have not yet been specified, much less has their existence or reality been proved, or any application made to his lordship for a redress of them.

“Our rejection of these bills has been loudly sounded as an aggrievance, but we cannot help observing, that whilst men are possessed with such transcendent ideas of privilege, as these very bills testify, they will have an inexhaustible spring of aggrievances, ’till they are at length complimented with a surrender of all authority into their hands, and the other branches of the legislature will be content with the honour of becoming their conduit pipes for the passage of such regulations into the forms of laws, as they shall be pleased in the plenitude of their power to dictate.”

The bill aforesaid, with the replies of the Upper and Lower Houses, for and against that bill and other bills, about an agent, &c. similar to that inserted, will easily lead the mind of the reader how to determine which of the two Houses are right or wrong in their arguments; whether sense does not so far preponderate with sound reason and justice on the side of the Upper House, as to warrant their return of negative to such extraordinary unfair propositions from the Lower House.

The Lower House says, “The people of Maryland think the Proprietor takes money from them unlawfully.” The Proprietor says, “He has a right to take that money.” This was in the late Lord-proprietor’s time a dictum of the Lower House; if they meant the money raised by the perpetual act of 1704, for the support of government, that money his Lordship’s present Lieutenant-governor receives.—I remember an opposition was made by the Lower House in the year 1732, to that act of 1704. The Lower House of Assembly were then apprized of that act of 1704; and that the government of Maryland would rely on that act for a support, if that government should not be by another perpetual law at least as well supported: notwithstanding which notice of this act, the matter was debated in the Lower House, and a temporary bill for support of government was sent by the Lower House to the Upper House, who returned the bill to the Lower, with amendment to this effect, viz. to leave