

Contempo-
rary Printed
Pamphlet
Md.Hist.Soc.
p. 95

You will be pleased to observe, that not one word is to be found, either in the foregoing messages of the Lower House, or in the answers of the Upper House, of what the Remarker mentions about an agent's bill in page 29 [p. 386], where he says, "The Upper House have rejected it, because they think it unjust and oppressive. Say the Lower House, we will appeal to his Majesty, and let him decide between us. No, say the Upper House, we will submit to no such appeal."

I leave to the impartial reader to determine, what must be the religious principles of the Remarker, who could so wantonly and wrongfully asperse the untainted integrity and duty of the Upper House, by the above-cited injurious assertion.

The Remarker says, page 37, to 39. [pp. 390-391] "If the objects of the bill (i. e. the supply bill) had been a total subversion of the constitution, the destruction of his Majesty's prerogatives, and an usurpation of all powers of Government, I dare say, they would not have escaped the animadversions of the penman of the objections in 1758, who would have been as quick-sighted in spying such exceptionable passages, and as ready in pointing them out precisely, and exposing their fatal tendency, by apposite remarks and arguments, as the authors of the present message, have been hardy in imputing them without the least colour of evidence, to the Lower House; there is, I will venture to assert, nothing in the bill, which can give any countenance to the charge of encroaching upon prerogative, or claiming any share of the executive powers of Government, unless it be the nomination of commissioners, and what does that much boasted opinion of the late attorney-general declare upon this point? Why [sic] That the sole nomination of these commissioners, who are new officers appointed by this bill, belongs neither to the Proprietor nor the Lower House *stricto jure*; but, like all other new regulations, must be assented to by both, but can be claimed by neither. The Proprietor's charter intitles him to nominate all constitutional officers, and all others, which by the laws are not otherwise provided for. But I do not conceive my Lord has any original right to nominate new officers, appointed for the execution of a new law, without the consent of the two Houses; nor, on the other hand, have the Lower House any such independent authority, and therefore I think, the Upper House are right, notwithstanding this claim, in which they ought to be supported by the Proprietor; because it is unreasonable for one branch of the legislature to assume a power of taxing the other, by officers of their single appointment."

The Remarker says, "Here it is explicitly declared, that the appointment of commissioners is not comprehended among the prerogatives of the Proprietor, but should be made by the concurrence of the several branches of the legislature. If this be the case, how was there, in this instance, any attempt to invade his Majesty's pre-