

The design and intention of the bill being among other things, to prevent men who are really disaffected practising the law, the amendment made by the senate was necessary to effectuate that intention, because if the legislature had not been thus explicit, their act might have been misconstrued, and their intention defeated; and this amendment is perfectly consistent with the principles of those who were for the bill, to those indeed who were against the bill altogether, and wished the disaffected to be admitted to privileges, this amendment was particularly offensive, because it cut off the only remaining hope of their views being gratified, by the design of the legislature being defeated in the construction of their act. Though it is not intimated that the whig lawyers are debtors to British subjects, nor have I any reason to believe the fact is so, yet it is suggested, that a monopoly among lawyers is dangerous, and will produce combinations not to bring suits for British debts; and from this source the real design of the bill is traced by the protester. A monopoly, I conceive, is the engrossing a particular branch of business to which *all* the citizens have an equal right, by *particular men* for their private and exclusive emoluments; but, according to the ideas of the protester, there is to be a monopoly by *all* those who have any right to this branch of business, to wit, *qualified lawyers*, and this monopoly is to produce a combination *not to do business*, upon the doing of which *great emoluments* would arise to the *monopolists*; and the whole profession of the law, it is feared, acting upon *interested motives*, will combine not to bring suits for British merchants, upon which no doubt considerable *profits* would arise. This is a new kind of monopoly, and a combination as contrary to the common and general conduct of monopolists, as the protester's observations are to fair argument and just reasoning. But it is said combinations have been talked of—what the protester has heard talked of, I can't pretend to determine, I can only say, that no combination not to bring suits for British subjects exists to my knowledge; I have heard, indeed, whig lawyers declare, that such was the state of the affairs of our people, in consequence of the laws of the state, that they would not bring any suits for British subjects, until restriction upon our own citizens was taken off, or the law imposing it expired, and until the legislature had a fair opportunity of doing justice, and preventing the ruin of many worthy citizens, by a revision of past laws. The reasons for these declarations were, that if suits were brought for British debts before our own people could sue for their debts, the latter must be ruined, or at least be left entirely at the mercy of their creditors. That if suits for British subjects were brought, before the legislature had an opportunity to revise their past laws, many citizens of this state, who received continental money for their debts, must be totally ruined by being compelled to pay sterling money for their British debts, before they could have a chance of recourse to their debtors, if indeed the legislature should neglect to do justice between our own citizens. The same lawyers have declared, that they will consider themselves bound by good faith to execute the treaty, and the legislature will be justly chargeable with the distress and ruin of the citizens, and not the lawyers, or those who made the treaty. I own that I was among those who made this declaration, and have acted conformably to it, and I have never heard any lawyer make a declaration to any other or different effect; and it will be incumbent on the protester to shew, that a combination, or declaration, more extensive than is here stated, has been made, or it may be inferred from his complaints upon this head, that it was his design to break up this wicked monopoly of *all* the whig lawyers, and to destroy this combination not to make money, by introducing the more *virtuous disaffected* for the purpose of bringing suits to recover British debts, *before* the restriction upon the citizens of this state was taken off, *and before* the legislature had an opportunity of preventing the ruin of some citizens, by doing justice between all; but though the protester should not be able to prove such combination, or declaration, and though in that case the conclusion would follow directly from the premises, yet I should wish to believe, that a scheme so inconsistent with humanity and justice did not exist, but that the observations on this subject were thrown out to catch the unthinking, and wound those whom the protester styles the *patronisers* of the bill, without duly considering, how the inferences to be drawn by men of reflection and discernment would affect himself. A wanton departure from the naturalization act, is also alleged to be among the vices of this bill, and it is said, that this act was passed in the heat of war, when there was more danger of British emissaries than since the preliminary articles of peace. There is no doubt but that the bill in question will operate as a repeal, or rather modification, of the naturalization act, so far as relates to the privilege of practising as attorneys, but the law referred to, like all other acts of assembly, is subject to repeal, or modification, whenever the legislature esteems it proper to make such repeal or alteration, it creates no compact I presume, and it is an act which, in my opinion, ought never to have passed in the extent it did as to this subject, for it gave privileges to our enemies which our friends had no chance of enjoying. As to the privilege of practising the law, it must, from the nature of the thing, be confined to British subjects, neither a Frenchman, Spaniard or Dutchman, could be supposed capable of practising the law *immediately* on their coming into this country, and therefore, as to them, the privilege was nothing, and I think it will be difficult to reconcile, with justice or policy, an act, which though supposed in theory to confer equal benefits, yet in practice is found to be partial, and that partiality to be in favour of our political enemies; but I deny, that it was more dangerous to admit even lawyers from England in the course of the war than it is now, then the contest was to be decided by arms alone, mens conduct was narrowly watched, and there was little communication between us and the British, through which to carry on intrigue. We have gained the victory, and England must, unless events very unfortunate for us take place, relinquish America, or by intrigue and corruption endeavour to open the way to regain what she has lost. In time of peace