

“ By the senate, January 18, 1785: Read the second time and will pass.

“ By order,

J. DORSEY, clk.”

Which was ordered to be engrossed.

The house adjourns till to-morrow morning 9 o'clock.

W E D N E S D A Y, January 19, 1785.

THE house met. Present the same members as on yesterday, except Mr. Cellars and Mr. Swingle. The proceedings of yesterday were read. Mr. M'Mechen was excused for leaving the house without leave of absence.

The engrossed bill No. 69 was read and assented to, and sent to the senate, with the paper bill thereof, by Mr. Steret.

The engrossed bill No. 70 was read and assented to, and sent to the senate, with the paper bill thereof, by Mr. Seney.

Daniel Carroll, Esq; from the senate, delivers to Mr. Speaker the engrossed bills from No. 62 to 66 inclusive, with the paper bills thereof, which engrossed bills were thus endorsed; “ By the senate, January 19, 1785: Read and assented to.

“ By order,

J. DORSEY, clk.”

The resolution respecting Thomas Stone, Esq; endorsed; “ By the senate, January 19, 1785: Read and unanimously assented to.

“ By order,

J. DORSEY, clk.”

The resolution respecting major Nathaniel Smith, endorsed; “ By the senate, January 19, 1785: Read and assented to.

“ By order,

J. DORSEY, clk.”

A bill, entitled, An act for enlarging the power of the high court of chancery, endorsed; “ By the senate, January 11, 1785: Read the first time and ordered to lie on the table.

“ By order,

J. DORSEY, clk.”

“ By the senate, January 18, 1785: Read the second time and will pass.

“ By order,

J. DORSEY, clk.”

Which was read the first time and ordered to lie on the table.

And a petition from Hugh Young, of Baltimore town, praying a person may be appointed to defend a suit at law in behalf of the state, endorsed; “ By the senate, January 19, 1785: Read and referred to the consideration of the house of delegates.

“ By order,

J. DORSEY, clk.”

Which was read.

The paper bills from No. 62 to 66 inclusive, were sent to the senate by Mr. Bowie.

William Hindman, Esq; from the senate, delivers to Mr. Speaker the following message:

BY THE SENATE, JANUARY 18, 1785.

GENTLEMEN,

CONSIDERING the late period of the session at which your bill, entitled, An act to repeal part of the act for the better security of the government, was sent, the number of other bills now lying before us for consideration, and your impatience to rise, we think you might have been satisfied with our dissent, without calling on us to assign reasons for not concurring in a measure, the objections to which are obvious; but as you desire to know the reasons which influenced our conduct, we shall briefly state them, without any expectation that they will be deemed sufficiently weighty by you to induce a retraction of your opinion. We are by no means satisfied that you judge rightly, in supposing a repeal of the act for the better security of the government will reconcile and attach the nonjurors to our constitution. Lenity, persuasion and indulgence, in the early stages of a revolution or change of government, sometimes have drawn men to join the majority, who would have for ever been kept separated by compulsion or distinction; but when indulgence and persuasion have been tried in vain, and men, after sufficient time given for consideration, have taken a decided part in a great political revolution, and have fixed a character by acting conformably to the principles which governed in their choice, it has been very seldom found, that they have changed from fixed aversion to cordial attachment. The human mind, after cherishing any principles for a length of time, quits them with much reluctance, and perhaps is incapable of being so thoroughly weaned from them, as not to be under their influence. We have no kind of evidence, that the nonjurors have sincerely relinquished those principles and attachments which induced them to refuse declaring themselves friends to the American revolution in 1778, and which, by being continued and fostered through the war, must have taken very firm possession of their minds; this being the case, to admit them now into an equal participation of all the privileges of government, upon a supposition that it would work a change of principle, would be to act contrary to reasoning from general experience, without any argument in favour of the particular case. Supposing it probable then that you are mistaken in the effect of your measure, and that the bill, if acceded to, would increase the power without changing the principles of the nonjurors, or even supposing it doubtful, let us consider whether it would be wise, or in any degree reasonable with our duty to the state, to adopt it. It has been a maxim in all governments, admitted by the best writers upon the subject, that the surest rule to preserve the state, is to entrust the direction to counsellors firmly attached to its principles, and to prevent the influence of men averse to its prosperity. Conformably to this axiom, tests of affection have been required before admission to trust, proofs of attachment,

express