

“ well answer the Question proposed to us, with-  
 “ out that Reserve. For as your Honour had  
 “ never been pleased to communicate to us your  
 “ Reason for discharging Mr. *Bordley*, the Man-  
 “ ner of doing it, or the Power his Lordship had  
 “ given you for that Purpose, and for that *his*  
 “ *being a Member of the Upper House of Assembly*  
 “ *depended upon that of his being at the same time*  
 “ *of the Council*, we could not give an Answer to  
 “ the one, without making it conditional with  
 “ respect to the other. So that we hope you will  
 “ not interpret that Sentence *as questioning his*  
 “ *Lordship's Power,*” &c.

This Case is so fully in Point, that I shall only  
 observe upon it, in general, that the Right of the  
 Proprietor to discharge a Counsellor is asserted by  
 the Governor, and explicitly acknowledged by  
 the Council, and even by Mr. *Bordley* himself,  
 the Party immediately affected, and who perhaps  
 understood the Constitution of *Maryland* as well  
 as any Man now alive. It is a vulgar Notion that  
 the Proprietor has a Right to displace a Counsel-  
 lor, but that he cannot remove him from his  
 Seat in the Upper House, or annihilate his Legis-  
 lative Capacity; but the above Case is a solemn  
 Determination to the contrary, nor do I know it  
 has ever been contravened by any subsequent Pro-  
 ceeding, so that the Precedent remains in full  
 Force to this Day,

*Thirdly,* To prove that the present Proprietor  
 pursues the Policy of his Ancestors, in bestowing  
 the most lucrative Offices in the Government on  
 those Gentlemen, thereby the more effectually to