I further set forth, that I could not find the law of 1699 that Lib. No. 45 continued the Law of 1692 nor could your Committee that made the Report point out to me such a one but found on the Contrary two Repealing Acts, Out of both which the Law of 1692 was excepted. which made it plain that it was looked upon as a Perpetual law, & that it continued accordingly without any new force being added to it by any Act passed in 1699 till the year 1704 as above mentioned.

> Now let us see what you say in answer to this it hereby Appears to this house as it did to their Committee and which they were ready to Evince and to which purpose ordered their Clerk to attend that the Act made in 1692 Entituled An Act for Settlement of An Annual Revenue upon their Majestys Governor within this province for the time being and Recorded in Liber L. L. Folio 21 &ca was at a Session of Assembly held at the port of Annapolis the 28th day of June 1699 continued as a law of this province and as such is recorded among other Laws then past and continued in another Record Book L. L. folio 30 &c with some small Variation from the former and is likewise named in a Catalogue of the Titles of laws which are Continued in force by An Act passed at the said Session of 1699 and recorded in the same Book and which Act of 1699 is acknowledged to be such by both Houses of Assembly in several Messages which passed At a Session Anno 1723

> Now I must say that however you may Endeavour by this Paragraph to Palliate or Conceal such a fundamental Error in the Report as destroys the whole Frame of Reasoning in it it certainly neither denys nor contradicts what I advanced in the paragraph above Recited

I know very well that the Act of 1692 was at A Session of Assembly held at Annapolis the 28th day of June 1699 continued as a law of this Province but I affirm that it was no other way continued but by p. 900 not being repealed and I now desire your House to shew me the law of 1699 that Continued it and which law of 1699 you say Continued till the year 1704 if your House knows of such a law it is certainly using the Government very unkindly not to point it out and if you have found that there is no such law it is but doing Justice to the Government to own it the Committee did indeed order their Clerk to attend but I believe he will not say he told me where to find the said law of 1699 now in Question if he had I should not have applied to your Committee and now at last have been obliged to your House for Information

I Return you thanks for what you say of your readiness to do any Reasonable thing In your power to procure a good understanding between the Government and people and I can in return truly Assure you that this is all I desire of you and that I shall never