

of an Annual Revenue upon their Majesty's Gov<sup>r</sup> &c is By the very Terms a Perpetual Law without Limitation of Time or Duration Whatsōver. That it could never be understood to have duration only with such Gov<sup>r</sup> or Govern<sup>t</sup>. The Act made in 1692 when M<sup>r</sup> Copley was Gov<sup>r</sup> who Died in Sep<sup>r</sup> 1693. It continued in force his Govern<sup>t</sup> & during the Presidentship of Col: Greenbury then again in the Govern<sup>t</sup> of S<sup>r</sup> Edmund Andros, The President<sup>p</sup> of S<sup>r</sup> Tho<sup>s</sup> Lawrence & the Govern<sup>t</sup> of Col: Nicholson so that it continued from 1693 to 1698. And the Act of 1699 mention'd in the Report was made in the 1<sup>st</sup> year of the Govern<sup>t</sup> of Col: Blackiston. Therefore the said Inference made by the Report is from a Supposed frequent continuance & re-enacting the said Act of 1692. Whereas Only one Continuance & as to re-enact<sup>s</sup> is Alledged, Viz<sup>t</sup> that of 1699. Moreover to put this point beyond dispute. The Act of 1699 was Dissented to by King William, Notwithstand<sup>s</sup> w<sup>h</sup> the Act of 1692 as it continued in force before the Act of 1699 & the Support of Govern<sup>t</sup> was raised thereby during the Govern<sup>t</sup> of M<sup>r</sup> Copley &c as before mentioned in the Reigns of W<sup>m</sup> & Mary & K. William So after the Dissent of the Act 1699 the Support of Govern<sup>t</sup> was raised by the Act of 1692 during the Govern<sup>t</sup> of Col: Blackiston. The President<sup>p</sup> of M<sup>r</sup> Tench & part of the Govern<sup>t</sup> of Col: Seymour from the time of his coming to the Govern<sup>t</sup> to the time of making the aforesaid perpetual Law of 1704.

(Vide the Dissent & Let<sup>r</sup> April the 4<sup>th</sup> 1700 from the Council at Annapolis)

The next observation made by the Com<sup>it</sup>tee in their Report is, "That it was the sense of the Legislature, That Acts grant<sup>s</sup> to the Prop<sup>ty</sup> for the Support of his Govern<sup>t</sup> did not Extend to that of the King as they said was manifested in the Act of 1692; that of 1676 being still unrepealed & having expresly its Duration with the Life of Charles Lord Baltimore Lord Proprietary of this Province" The meaning of this is that Act made for support of Lord Baltimore's Govern<sup>t</sup> cannot be Extended to, or be Suffi<sup>ent</sup> to raise a Support for his Majesty's Govern<sup>t</sup>. This may be very true, and yet it will not follow from thence, that Acts made for the Support of his Majesty's Govern<sup>t</sup> will not be Sufficient for the Support of Govern<sup>t</sup> of w<sup>h</sup> Lord Baltimore by himself or his Deputy Gov<sup>r</sup> has the Administration for in the one Case, the whole Cause or Purpose for w<sup>h</sup> such Act is made (Id Est) for Support of the Lord Baltimore's Govern<sup>t</sup> is intierly gone & Ceases upon the Kings taking to himself the Govern<sup>t</sup> But in the other case, the whole Cause or purpose for w<sup>h</sup> such Act is made (Id Est) for Support of the King's Govern<sup>t</sup> does not Cease upon Lord Baltimore being again Admitted to the Administration of such