

Contemporary Printed Pamphlet Md.Hist.Soc.

But to the Remarker's foregoing paragraph, page 29, [p. 386] concerning an agent's bill, he says, "I will just state the case in two words, and trouble the reader no further upon this point. The Lower House have sent up a bill, which they think a reasonable and equitable one. The Upper House have rejected it, because they think it unjust and oppressive. Say the Lower House, We will appeal to his Majesty, and let him decide between us. No, say the Upper House, we will submit to no such appeal."—This is very concise: But is it so? No certainly; which I will prove hereafter.

The Pamphleteer continues to go on in these words: "In the same paragraph is this remarkable passage; (Vide the Upper to the Lower House inserted in this discourse) Why then when other plans, more just and equal, less intricate in their nature, liable to fewer objections, and infinitely less dangerous to the undoubted prerogative of the crown and rights and liberties of the people, than their favourite assessment bill were framed, and proposed to those Houses; why were they no sooner proposed than voted out? But whatever were their professions, they had no intention of raising supplies for his Majesty's service; nor of affording this House an opportunity of coming to an agreement with them, at a less expence than that of his Majesty's prerogative, and the people's liberties, by a total subversion of our present constitution, and lodging the several powers thereof, now equally distributed for the preservation of the whole, in their hands? And if their warmest professions appear thus destitute of truth and candour, what regard are we to pay to those so often repeated by yourselves?" The Remarker says, "I have given you the passage entire, because it is a masterpiece both as to language and matter;" he continues, "It puts me in mind of a little county-court attorney, who has a right to speak last in a cause, and from that confidence, fumes, bounces and bullies, treats his antagonist with all the Billingsgate of the bar, loads him with calumnies and indecent reflexions, and utters in a style of declamatory vehemence, whatever may tend to blacken and vilify the whole party, without the least regard to truth, candour, or common decency."

The abovementioned paragraph of the Upper House inserted by the writer, seems a quibbling artifice and low craft, to turn the reader's mind from off his foregoing sentences, viz. "Say the Lower House, We will appeal to his Majesty and let him decide between us. No, say the Upper House, We will submit to no such appeal." The reader will be pleased to observe the subsequent paragraph to his assertions is not relative to the agent's bill, though he makes it subsequent, and subjoins it to his foregoing two sentences, saying, "In the same paragraph is this remarkable passage, Why then as other plans more just and equal, &c." as before recited; and at the end he says, "I have given you the passage intire." But he substitutes no reasons given by the Upper in their answer to the Lower House,