

The MARYLAND GAZETTE.

[XXIst Year.]

THURSDAY, May 1, 1766.

[N^o. 1077.]

To be LET or CHARTER.

A NEW SCHOONER, of about 80 Tons Burthen, well Found and Fitted for Sea, for the West-Indies or any other Part, and will be ready to Load by the last of April. For further Particulars, enquire at the PRINTING-OFFICE.



SOME few Casks of Muscovado SUGARS, to be SOLD in ANNAPOLIS, by JOHN PITT.

WILLIAM WHETCROFT, GOLDSMITH, JEWELLER, and LAPIDARY,

BEING encouraged by several GENTLEMEN in Town, has Open'd SHOP, at the Hoofe of Mr. William Knapp, Watch-Maker, near the Town Gate, in Annapolis, where he Makes and Repairs all Sorts of SILVER and JEWELLERY WORK. He has at present for Sale, a new Assortment of PLATE and JEWELS, made up in the best Manner, and of the newest Fashions; and also, a large and curious variety of Stones, elegantly finish'd; together with a complete Apparatus for Cutting them agreeable to any Directions, either for Buckles, Buttons, Rings, Ear-Rings, Necklaces, &c. &c.

As he has been regularly bred to the above Branches, and the Work he has, being principally executed by Himself, the Public may depend on being served upon much better Terms than have hitherto been practis'd: And, as many LADIES and GENTLEMEN, are frequently oblig'd to be supplied from England with the above Articles, on Account of their Orders not being punctually complied with here; he assures all such as shall please to favour him with their Custom, that no Delay in the speedy and effectual Execution of their Commands, shall for the Future induce them to send Home: Therefore humbly Hopes for the Encouragement of the LADIES and GENTLEMEN of the Province; to Merit and Preserve which, shall be his constant Study, and greatest Ambition.

N. B. He gives the highest Prices for old GOLD, SILVER, and SILVER LACE.

THIS is to give Notice, That the Subscriber has a new Erected FERRY, on Patowmack River in Virginia, opposite to Cedar-Point in Maryland, 24 Miles distant from Westmoreland Court-House, 40 from Richmond, 12 from King George, 26 from Stafford; from Leeds-Town 15 Miles, from Port Royal 12, and from Frederickburg 34 Miles. There is a good FERRY kept, with ENTERTAINMENT, &c. by GEORGE W. SPOONER.

Prince-George's County, February 14, 1766.

RAN away from the Subscriber, a Negro Man named JEM, he is a likely, lively, strong made young Fellow, about 5 Feet 8 or 9 Inches high, is upon the yellowish Order, and has large Eyes. Whoever apprehends the said Negro, and delivers him to the Subscriber, shall have FIVE POUNDS Reward.

As he is a notorious Villain, it is requested that all Masters will make this known to their Servants, and by Way of Encouragement, promise them the Reward. He has a very extensive Acquaintance, therefore may Travel far from home. I am told that he pass'd for a Free Negro in Frederick County last Year.

ROBERT TYLER.

WILLIAM KNAPP, WATCH-MAKER, Hereby informs the PUBLIC,

THAT he is Removed from his late Dwelling near the COURT-HOUSE in Annapolis, to the House next but One to that wherein Mr. M'Leod formerly Lived, towards the TOWN-GATE; where he continues the WATCH-MAKING BUSINESS, and is ready to execute the Orders (with all possible Dispatch) of those GENTLEMEN and LADIES who shall be pleas'd to favour him with their Commands.

ICE, in Charles-Street: Where all; and Advertisements of a moderate; And long Ones in Proportion.

Mr. GREEN, BE pleas'd to insert in your GAZETTE, the inclosed Reply to the Observations on our Remonstrance by the Mayor and Aldermen of this City, and Oblige, Your humble Servants,

- ALLEN QUINN,
 - JOHN CAMPBELL,
 - JOSHUA FRAZIER,
 - ROBERT REYNOLDS,
 - WILLIAM WILKINS,
 - HENRY CATON,
 - SANDERS BALDWIN,
 - HENRY WILKINS,
- late Grand Jurors.

THE very elegant Answer, which the Mayor and Aldermen of this City have been pleas'd to give our Remonstrance, most certainly demands of Us, a very respectful and polite Reply, yet we honestly confess, that, but for the Purpose of exposing the Impotency of affected Superiority, and imaginary Greatness, as well as, the Folly of endeavouring to shut up our Mouths, by formidable and dilatory Invektive, we should have pass'd over that matchless Production in the profoundest Silence. The Mayor and Aldermen acting legally, and constitutionally in their Public Characters, are doubtless entitled to the Respect and Deference of every Citizen, but when prostituting the Dignity of their Political Station, they descend to the infamous Task of Personal Defamation and Abuse, so far from having a Right to Respect, Deference, or Superiority, they fall into Contempt, and dwindle into Insignificance.

The first Conception of the Gentlemen, in that masterly Performance, furnishes them with a supposed Capital Point, "That our Remonstrance was framed after the Adjournment of the Court." And then triumphantly charging this, a Violation of the Constitution, they submit to the Public, "with what Propriety or Decency we can impeach them, of an undue Exercise of Power." Unhappily for them, this first Conception is groundless and false, for, "it is a Fact too notorious to be denied, that the Paper entitled a Remonstrance, &c. was (excepting one or two trifling Articles, unnoticed in the Observations) actually framed before the Court broke up." But being Judges and therefore learned in the Law, the Gentlemen may start a Distinction upon us, between framing and finishing; and contend, that admitting our Remonstrance was actually framed before the Court broke up, we nevertheless assumed an unwarrantable Power in finishing it, after the Adjournment of the Court;—so far as this, they are extremely welcome, to charge us with a Violation of the Constitution;—and may our excellent Constitution never feel a deeper Wound! And we do confess, we are such incorrigible Offenders, that should the Mayor and Aldermen hereafter, obstinately persist in the Violation of Law, or undue Exercise of Authority, and by sudden Adjournments endeavour to defeat the constitutional Ends of Grand-Jury-Remonstrances, we, if Summoned again for a Grand-Jury, will, without Fear of Magisterial Frowns, or insolent Language, exercise the same "unwarrantable Power," and repeat the same Conduct.

It is amazing to us, that the Gentlemen so wretchedly blunder, to interpret any Part of our Remonstrance, as charging the Corporation with a Misapplication of Monies, arising from Lotteries subject to their Management and Direction; and it is equally amazing, that they admit One Lottery subject to such Management and Direction. This Conduct can only be reconciled upon uncharitable Principles, which we are very unwilling to adopt for our Rule of Judgment. The Misapplication of the Lottery Monies, is by Construction of the Gentlemen extended to the Corporation, possibly to draw in among them, Men of real Merit; and one Lottery only is complaisantly admitted, for that, possibly the Money only of One Lottery can be legally accounted for, the Money raised by the others, being misapplied or sunk.

See the GAZETTE, No. 1071.

Do the Gentlemen really and sincerely controvert, that, "Large Sums of Money have been raised by LOTTERIES for the Benefit of this City?" Let them turn to the Maryland Gazettes, in 1753, and 1758—and blush.

In 1753, was published, "A Scheme of a Lottery, for raising the Sum of Three Hundred Pistoles, for purchasing a TOWN CLOCK and cleaning and securing the DOCK in ANNA-POLIS." Managers were appointed, partly of the Members of the Corporation, and partly, of other Gentlemen of the City, and the Lottery was drawn in September, 1753.

In the Gazette 1758, was also published, "A Scheme of a Lottery for raising the Sum of £. 455 for further securing the DOCK in ANNAPOLIS and other Public Uses within the said City." Managers were appointed partly of Members of the Corporation, and partly of other Gentlemen of the City.

This Lottery was drawn in April, 1759.

Which of the above Lotteries, the Gentlemen would admit, as subject to the Management and Direction of the Corporation; or by what Rule of Logic, or common Sense, they can infer a Right in the Corporation to the Direction of One, and not of the other; or upon what Principle, they object a Falstiy to us, in representing, "That large Sums of Money have been raised by LOTTERIES for the Benefit of this City," we do not know, nor can comprehend. It is extremely clear to us, that the Corporation had the Management of neither of the above Lotteries, or of both; and with Respect to our Remonstrance, it is not of a Fig's Moment, whether they had, or had not; for with Submission, we apprehend, that the Disposition of the Monies arising from the above LOTTERIES, is a PUBLIC TRUST, for the Benefit of this City; and that the Gentlemen, who took the Management of the LOTTERIES, are in Nature of Trustees and as such accountable to the Corporation, for the Execution of their respective Trusts. The Fact is well known, that there has been a blundering Application of Part of the Lottery Monies, and hence the Ground of our Remonstrance in this Particular.

The Gentlemen call upon us, to point out, who the Persons are, that we suspect of misapplying or pocketing the Lottery Monies: As they are infinitely polite, and obliging, we will not be so extremely uncivil, to particularize the Gentlemen, among them, but will refer the Public to the Gazettes, for the Trustees of the respective LOTTERIES, and them, or such of them, as have the Lottery Monies in their Hands unaccounted for, we mean, and suspect, upon the maturest and most impartial Deliberation.

Do the Gentlemen challenge us, to shew a Misapplication of any Part of the above Lottery Monies?—What has become of the £. 80 voted by the Trustees, for building a Wharf at Severn Ferry?—Can they with a safe Conscience reply legally expended upon such Wharf?—Where is the Wharf?—When was it built?—and how long did it stand?—It is a public Truth, within the Knowledge of every Man in Annapolis; that HERE was a most shameful Misapplication of a considerable Part of the Lottery Money.

But sunk—kindles up the Resentment of the Gentlemen, to an alarming Height.—Surely we were enormously criminal, in Remonstrating against a flagrant Breach of Public Trust, and glancing at a private Application, of Public Money? and could nothing gratify the Resentment of the Gentlemen, but wantonly lashing us with all the Virulence of Scurrility and Abuse;—If the Drift of such Eloquence was to shut up our Mouths, by Intimidation, it was vain, idle, and infamous to the last Degree: We dare draw forth the Public Criminal, tho' Chin-Deep entrenched in WEALTH, POWER and GRAND-DEUR.

As for the Ground of our Belief, that the Lottery Money has been sunk,—we shall submit to the Public, whether we are not justified in that Belief, after stating a few Facts. The Money, proposed to be raised by the first Lottery, amounted to Three Hundred Pistoles, which Lottery has been executed almost Thirteen Years ago: The

Money, by the last Lottery, amounted to Four Hundred and Thirty Five Pounds, which has also been executed above Seven Years ago. What has been done with these considerable Sums of Money?—Is there not at least, a large Balance somewhere? Why has there not been an Application of that Balance, for the Purposes for which the LOTTERIES were made?—Where is that Balance?—placed out in Loans at 6 per Cent?—If so, who has pocketed the Interest for such a Length of Time, the Public or the MANAGERS?—

As to the Sixth Article, we appeal to the Minutes and Proceedings of the Corporation, and the Memory of the Citizens, for a Justification of our Assertion, "That many Aldermen and Common Council Men refuse, and neglect to give their Attendance at the Corporation."

The Opinion of the late Recorder will always have Weight with us, and we sincerely lament his Resignation. Can it be the Opinion of that Gentleman that Non attendance, for a long Space of Time without Reason, is not a legal Forfeiture? Can it be contradicted, that Mr. Taffer has wilfully neglected to give his Attendance for a Number of Years? Has he not signified by Letter to the Court his Desire to resign? Has he not purposely and designedly to vacate his Seat in the Corporation declined to qualify as an Alderman since the Accession of his present Majesty to the Throne? Was not the Resignation of the late Recorder taken by Letter to the Court? Why then is Mr. Taffer's Seat kept vacant and the Election of an Alderman in his Room so long delayed and neglected? Is it not inconsistent with our Constitution to Monopolize judicial Authority and a direct Infringement of the Charter of this City?—Perhaps it is the Opinion of the Mayor and Aldermen, that there is not a Gentleman to be found among the present Common Council, fit for the elevated Station of an ALDERMAN.

As for the Ninth Article, we refer the Gentlemen, to Mr. John Campbell's Affidavit, "That Mr. Maccubbin has declared, that he never will attend the Corporation," which we have published with this for their better Information.

While the Mayor and Aldermen are violently resenting, even a Suspicion of their Honesty, and vehemently charging us, with Falsties, and Lies, we are surpris'd, that they should be so absent, and regardless of the Virtues they profess, as to give us an Opening, to deal a Retaliation upon them. Is it Truth, that the Gentleman chosen Recorder, upon Mr. Dulany's Resignation, did, upon Application to him, decline to Qualify at that Time, for Reasons, which the Mayor and Aldermen might expect in a little Time to be removed? The Gentlemen are certainly possessors of Superlative Modesty: When Mr. Key was chosen Recorder, the Clerk was ordered to wait upon him, to acquaint him of his Appointment; he desired the Clerk to inform their Worshipps, "that he esteemed the Honour offered him, but that he could not, nor would he accept of it." Did they then decline proceeding to another Choice, because Mr. Key did not choose to Qualify at that Time, for Reasons, which they expected in a little Time would be removed? When the Mayor and Aldermen hereafter, find themselves disposed to Publish to the World, their Veneration for Truth, we sincerely recommend to them, to handle the Subject with more Caution, and in a straiter Line with the Sentiments they trumpet forth.

The Gentlemen in the Twelfth Article uncharitably alledge, that "we, utterly regardless of Truth, affirm, that by the Laws of the Corporation the Mayors Court is directed to sit the last Tuesdays in January, April, July and October, Whereas there is not the least Foundation for the Assertion, for no such Law exists in the Corporation." Can this be the Opinion of the Judges of the Corporation Court?—By what Authority is the Mayors Court held at particular and stated Times? Has not this Court, for many Years past, been held on the last Tuesdays of January, April, July and October? Has not this been the constant and invariable Practice, from almost the first Existence of the Corporation? Is not a long and uniform Practice legally,