

Reading in the afternoon - The Committee of Laws bring into the House the Report of their Sentiments on the Opinion of the Lawyers in Great Britain, on the Act for better Supporting the Magistrates in the Administration of Justice within this Province and for disabling Thomas Macnemara Esq. to practice the Law within this Province, Which was read and ordered to be entered as follows: viz. -

By the Committee of Laws May the 22<sup>d</sup>. 1719.

In Pursuance of an Order of the 19<sup>th</sup> Instant - we have considered the Opinions of the Lawyers in Great Britain in respect to the Act for the better Supporting the Magistrates in the Administration of Justice within this Province and for the disabling Thomas Macnemara Esq. to practice the Law therein - but find it necessary to make some Remarks on the Manner of the stating the Case in relation to the Act of Assembly on which the Opinions were required - and first - We observe Thomas Macnemara Esq. is suggested to be a Barrister at Law without taking the least Notice of his practicing in the Courts here as an Attorney which he intimates he was never called upon or Sumoned to appear before the Assembly to answer any Charge against him but that the Act was carried on with so much 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 inquiring into and as to the Secrecy he mentions with which the Act was carried on its well known to the Province it is not only impracticable but almost impossible.

And in pursuing his State of the Case he owns it 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 Engrost 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 shewn any Cause for so doing or to his Excellency the Governour who had a Negative Voice in the passing thereof his omitting to do - which argues either his Sense or Guilt or his