

impose new Terms upon old Grants, you would have Reason for your Exclamation; but as he has made no such Attempt, you have none.

You ask, "If the undertaking the sole Burthen to Defend the Province, was a Consideration in our original Grants, Why did the Proprietary alter the Conditions of taking up Lands from 2 s. per 100 Acres to 4 s. and from that to 10 s. Rent? And, Why the Purchase from 2 l. to 5 l?"

Any one unacquainted with the Terms upon which Lands are Granted here, who should Read this Passage in your Message, would suppose that the present Rent reserved upon every 100 Acres is 10 s. and that where 10 s. Rent is paid for 100 Acres, the Caution or Purchase-Money has been 5 l. and therefore it is proper for us to observe, that the Rent reserved is 4 s. only per 100 Acres, that there have been but very few Grants ever made, upon which a Rent of 10 s. per 100 Acres has been reserved, and that in the Instances wherein there has been a Reservation of 10 s. Rent per 100 Acres, the Caution or Purchase-Money was only 40 s.

We supposed it to be Part of his Lordship's Consideration, or Expectation if you please, when he Granted his Lands, whether under the old or new Terms, that his Tenants would defend them, and support every other necessary Expence of the Government, and therefore he was the more moderate in his Demands; and we thought also that his Tenants considered his Grants in this Light, from their never having called upon him to contribute to these Purposes out of the Rents they paid him; and as we think it can't be denied that the Lands lately Granted under the new Terms are as valuable to his Tenants, as those were originally which were Granted upon the old Terms, and his Tenants are equally enabled by the Smallness of the Rent they now pay (tho' greater than what they formerly paid) to defend their Lands, we are not convinced that any Alteration of the Terms can give his Tenants a Right to claim now a Contribution from his Lordship out of his Quit-Rents, which they had not an equal Title to whilst the old Terms subsisted. The Act of Assembly we cited, seems very material when duly considered, tho' it is not now in Force. We don't think that Lord *Baltimore* ought to be exempted from Contributing with the rest of the King's Subjects to the Common Cause of Liberty: All that we have said, is, that in Respect of his Quit-Rents we are not satisfied, for the Reasons we have mentioned, that he ought to be Taxed in that Contribution which may be expected from the Property of this Province here, and in the Application whereof we hope to be defended.

He pays, without Doubt, his Proportion of the Taxes imposed in *England*, however clear you may be that the Proprietary, if he thought himself unjustly Taxed, would not Dissent to the Bill from a Tenderness to those by whom he might think himself injured; we think the Probability of it's happening an unanswerable Objection. We can't guess what you mean by the Words *had be Power*: Surely you don't mean that his Power to Dissent to Bills is doubtful; if you do, we wish you would speak out, and not involve, in the Darkness of Ambiguity, what, if directly asserted and fairly brought to Light, might be easily confuted.

The Distinction you have taken, to justify your intended Imposition of a Tax upon the Governor in respect of his personal Estate, and his Offices of Chancellor and Surveyor-General, must have appeared as immaterial to you as it does to us, if you had any Reason for exempting him at all. To make Laws without Sanctions to enforce the Observance of them, would be to little Purpose, and it would be as ineffectual to insert Sanctions to compel, which can't.

We don't presume that the Governor would Refuse to pay the Tax if it was imposed upon him, nor that the Collector, upon his Excellency's Refusal or Omission to pay it, would put him in Prison, or that he would be charged by the Lower House with a Failure of Duty if he declined to put your Sanctions in Force; but we think the Governor would have more Reason, than either House ought to give him, to Resent the Indignity offered to him by such an absurd Imposition.

Your Promise to make good any Deficiencies, however it might be relied upon by the good People of this Province, we are afraid would not be sufficient to support the Credit of our Money with Strangers; and as a longer provisional Continuance of the Bill might be easily inserted, it ought not to be neglected.

It would be to no Purpose to propose a Conference, whilst you adhere to such Points as we cannot agree to.

The Three Bills you have sent up to us, you would seem to think have not met with that Deference and Respect, which, in your Apprehension, they merited. Why, when we rejected the First, a Second and a Third Bill, with very immaterial Alterations, as you say, have been sent up to us? It would be difficult to assign any other Cause than the Opinion you seem to be possessed with, that Pertinacity would at length prevail against Right, Reproach, extort Assent, and that it would be more eligible to establish Error, and the very inconvenient Consequences of it, in this Instance, by an obstinate Adherence, than to acknowledge it by a candid and ingenuous Retraction.