

Hog-stealing, as it was called, which usually meant the killing of ear marked swine running at large in the forest, was a sport indulged in only too frequently, not only by the servant class but by planters as well. That it was all too common is shown by the laws of increasing severity to stop it, which were passed by successive Assemblies. The law recognized it not only as a crime, but as a cause of action for damages against the offender, and rewarded the informer. Acts were passed in 1649, 1662, 1666 and 1671 designed to put a stop to it. The act of 1649 provided for the payment of twice the value of the animal to the owner, of 200 pounds of tobacco to the informer, and a fine of 300 pounds of tobacco to the Lord Proprietary, and in the case of unmarked swine killed on the Proprietary's land, a somewhat smaller fine and informer's fee. (*Arch. Md. i*, 251). The act of 1662 for the second offence added the penalty of a letter "H" branded on the shoulder of the culprit (*Arch. Md. i*, 455). In the 1666 act, for the first offence triple damages were to be awarded to the owner, and the culprit was to spend four hours in the pillory before the Provincial Court and to have both ears cropped; for the second offence treble damages and an "H" branded on the forehead; and for the third offence he was to be adjudged a felon without benefit of clergy, which of course meant the death penalty. The act further provided that any person reputed to be a common hog-stealer should not hunt with guns and dogs on another's land (*Arch. Md. ii*, 140). The act of 1671 further strengthened previous laws (*Arch. Md. ii*, 277). Some of the cases of hog-stealing noted in these county records represented small damages, or were first offences not involving such mutilations as branding or ear-cropping, and therefore came before the county courts, and did not reach the Provincial Court, which alone could handle more serious cases. Two cases which came before the Charles County Court are, however, entered in great detail by the clerk, and are of considerable human interest. One of these which was tried in this court involved no less a personage than Thomas Baker, one of the justices of the court, who was forced off the bench (pp. 234-239). Another case, that of Thomas Standbridge, charged in January 1664/5 with "the killing of hogs contrary to the rule and dignity of the Lord Proprietary", who was tried before the Charles County Court and confessed his misdoings, has already been referred to (p. xxi), as has the case of James Lee who charged four of his neighbors with hog-stealing (p. xxi). At the August, 1665, court, M<sup>r</sup> Seth Foster, a justice of Talbot County, sued a man for defamation who had called him a hog-stealer, but the evidence pointed to the defendant as being a chronic offender, so he was obliged publically in open court to apologize to the justice (*Arch. Md. liv*, 383-384). The case against Henry Lillie "convicted" in the Charles County Court, Oct. 23, 1660, was ordered up to the Provincial Court for trial, but Lillie died before his case could be heard (pp. 91, 93-94). The leniency usually shown by juries indicates that there must have been a good deal of sympathy for the poor man who occasionally secured a piece of fresh pork for himself and his family by this questionable means. Indians also occasionally appear as offenders.

Disputes between masters and servants, both those with and those without indentures, bearing on the time of expiration of the term of servitude, espe-