

Contemporary Printed Pamphlet Md.Hist.Soc. p. 153

because they by rejecting the agent's bill, so often offered them, have prevented the dispute's being carried before his Majesty in Council; it might be said, that if the Lower House were really willing to have the matter brought to an issue, they ought by the same bill to have impowered the Upper House also, to support an agent in London, as well as the Lower House, since his Majesty would not otherwise be fully acquainted with both sides of the question and the merits of the cause, nor well informed of the reasons each House had to offer in their own justification; for the dispute (whatever might be pretended) was not in fact between the Proprietor and people, but between the Members of the Upper House, and a part of the Lower; for the rest of the Lower House, with a great number of the inhabitants, are people of the opposite side.

Moreover, it could not be reasonably expected, that the Proprietor should put himself to any expence about the matter, or retain an agent or sollicitor in London, to defend or justify the measures of the Upper House, or the opinion of such of the inhabitants as were averse to the assessment bill, about which the controversy subsisted; and therefore, it is reasonable, to prevent partial or unfair representations being made by the agent of one party, than the other party should have an agent likewise; and that if the expence of either is, the expence of both ought to be paid out of the Provincial Treasury. The Lower House could not expect the Upper would by passing such agent bill, put weapons into their adversaries hands, and be content to remain unarmed themselves, and at the mercy of the Lower House. But the truth is, (as appears) the leading Members in the Lower House did not desire to have an end put to the dispute: foreseeing it would put an end at the same time to their own consequence.

I shall pass over the other disagreements, which have arisen from controversies between the Upper and Lower Houses of Assembly, and shall not venture, as the Pamphleteer has in his remarks, to purloin fragments out of the public debates of either House, and then wrongfully and acrimoniously to expatiate upon arguments relative to such debates, and make an outcry to Parliament.

As to all grievances, which have or may subsist in the Province; the party injured or discontented, may address their remonstrances to the Lord-Proprietor; his Lordship can and will redress them, when properly and regularly laid before him.

I remember such proceedings have been in the late Lord-Proprietor's time, to wit,—Jacob Henderson, clerk and rector of Queen Anne's parish, in Prince George's county in Maryland, presented a petition on the behalf of the clergy of Maryland, as it appears by a committee of the Privy-Council, Dec. 18th, 1729, viz.

His Majesty was pleased to refer unto the consideration of this committee, the petition of Jacob Henderson, complaining of an act