

Required And first we observe Thomas Maeremara Esq. is suggested to be a Banishment
with out taking the least notice of his practicing in the Courts here as an attorney. It is
Inimicately & never called upon or summoned to appear before the assembly to answer
any charge against him but that the Act was carried on with such secrecy that
he had not opportunity of justifying himself. We observe that the facts he stands
charged with in the preamble of that Law were so notorious that they needed not
Inquiry into and as to the secrecy he mentions w^{ch}. the Act was carried on its
well known to the Province it is not only Impracticable but almost impossible
and Inquiring his State of the Law the Province was not such but that he had
notice thereof and petitioned to be heard against the bill, he further proceeds
to Insinuate that no Order was made upon his Petition but after the assembly was
prorogued the Clerk returned it without any answer, where we note he twice mentions
[the assembly] seeming willing to be understood [the general assembly] whereas
it was to the Lower House only that he applied and not to them till after
it had been some days before them and the Great bill had past that house so
that it would have been unparliamentary for the Lower house then to have
Entered upon a Debate of that matter. But it sufficiently appears he had early
notice enough to have applied himself to the Upper house who could have relieved
him if he had shown any cause for doing so to his Excellency the Govern^r who had a
negative voice in the passing thereof his omitting to do which argues either his sense
of guilt or his Resolute Obstinacy. In the second paragraph thereof he alleges
the general Inimicities contained in the preamble are in themselves Groundless
and that his greatest Enemies have not been able to prove any undue or unfair
practices against him. Upon which State Mr. Stringer says gives his Opinion that
the Act seems to be arbitrary and unjust and that it ought to be Examined into
and if it proves as represented (to wit Groundless and that no undue or unfair
practices could ever be proved against him) there ought to be some redress
Sargent Congely that the passing the Act without hearing Mr. Maeremara is
Contrary to the Common Law Rules of Justice and a Denial of the Subjects Right
that the Nature of the Act being unprecedented and severe ought to be reexamined
and Dissented to if it appear unjust as is represented and that the matters suggested
against Mr. Maeremara are not of themselves suff^t to incapacitate him
Mr. Edward Northey - That Mr. Maeremara ought to have been heard and that the
allegation of the Act are too general and that he being of Council for Malefactors
the Council behaving himself with Duty and respect to the Courts is not to be
Objected against him, but that if a practitioner behave himself disrespectfully or
Insolently to any Court in Court such Court hath power to record the words which
make the offence and to suspend the offender from practice in such Court
and if the offender be ordered to submit to the Court and be regarded for his
offence and he refuse so to do or the offence be extraordinary or repeated the Court
may Deprive the offender of his practice in that Court and if such records
be made in several Courts or if he be convicted of offences against the Courts and he
refuse to submit or be generally Insolent and misbehaving himself to the
Courts of Justice and his offences are multiplied it will be just and reasonable
for the assembly on hearing such offender or giving him opportunity of being
heard and having satisfaction of his guilt for the direct admⁿ. of Justice and
the Supporting of the Courts by Act of assembly to make him Incapable to practice
(any)