

The MARYLAND GAZETTE.

[XXIst Year.]

THURSDAY, June 19, 1766.

[N^o. 1084.]

ELK-RIDGE, May 7, 1766.

to be SOLD for Sterling or Current Money, PART of a TRACT of LAND, called *Flogg Bottom*, containing upwards of 200 Acres, lying and being in *Prince-George's* County, about 10 Miles from *Bladenburg*, whereon is a Dwelling, and other convenient Houses. The Land well adapted either to the Planting or Farming Business, some good Meadow Ground, and a convenient Place to erect a Grist Mill. Time will be given on paying Interest, with Security, if required.

THOMAS SAPPINGTON.

N. B. All Persons indebted to the Subscriber, Current Money, either by Bond, Note, or Book Account, are required to make immediate Payment, or give Obligations in Sterling, to prevent Charges to themselves, and disagreeable Trouble, to

April 22, 1766.

TEN POUNDS REWARD.

RAN away from the Subscriber's Quarter, on the back of *Elk Ridge*, near *Poplar Spring* Chapel, on Sunday the 13th of *April*, a Country-bred Servant Man, named *William Billington*, about 5 Feet 6 Inches high, and pretty well proportioned thereto, fair Complexion, and wears his hair short black Hair, under a Cap, has a remarkable down Look when spoke to, and is also a remarkable Liar and Flatterer in Conversation. Had and with him when he went away, a short green bell'd Coat, trimm'd with Metal Buttons, one old blue Jacket, Oznabrig Shirt, Cotton Breeches, white Yarn Stockings, and an old Pair of Shoes. He formerly served a Term of Years with *Mr. John Hobbs*, in this County, and has since made very extensive Acquaintance, some of whom may possibly supply him with Money, and other Cloathing, and its likely he may change his Name. Whoever takes up the said Servant, and delivers him to the Overseer at the above-said Plantation, or to the Subscriber on *Elk-Ridge*, in *Anne-Arundel* County, shall have the above Reward, paid by

H. RIDGELY.

May 12, 1766.

FIVE POUNDS REWARD.

RAN away last Night, from *Mount-Royal* Forge, near *Baltimore-Town*, in *Maryland*, a Country-born Mulatto Slave, named *Ben*; he is a lusty well made Fellow, about 5 Feet 8 or 9 Inches high, 20 Years of Age, a very white Mole, pretty much freckled, and is sometimes taken for a White Man; had on when he went away, a double rivetted Iron Collar, old Cassock, Oznabrig Shirt, blue Fearnought Jacket, a pair of new, old Leather Breeches, a Pair of black worsted ditto old grey Yarn or Worsted Stockings, old Shoes, and carved Buckles, has short black Wool, and sometimes calls himself *Wash*. He has lately worked in a Smith's Shop, and he may endeavour to pass for a Blacksmith. Whoever secures said Slave, so as he may be had in, shall have, if taken in the County, FIFTY DOLLARS, and, if out of the Province, the above Reward, and reasonable Charges if brought in. JAMES FRANKLIN.

N. B. He has a remarkable brown-Spot on the side of one of his Ancles.

BALTIMORE-TOWN, April 28, 1766.

WHEREAS the Partnership of *Smith* and *Strett* will soon expire; therefore all Persons who have any Demands against the said Company, are desired to send in their Accounts, that may be adjusted; and all those indebted to them, by Bond, Note, Protested Bills of Exchange, Book Account, are desired to settle and pay their respective Balances before the first Day of the next, to prevent their being under the disagreeable Necessity of putting all those Bonds and Accounts, &c. of such Persons as refuse or neglect to comply with the above Request, into an Attorney's Hands, without Distinction or further Notice. SMITH and STRETT.

in *Charles-Street*: Where all Advertisements of a moderate long Ones in Proportion.

Mr. GREEN,

THE Duty we owe'd to our Characters, as Magistrates, oblig'd us to trouble the Public with some Observations, on a Paper call'd "The Remonstrance of the Grand Jury of this City," which contained many Aspersions against us of too malignant a Nature, to pass entirely unnoticed. We handled the Subject with as much Tenderness to our Accusers, as was consistent with our Defence, and were in Hopes, that both the Manner and Substance of our Observations, would at least have screen'd us from further Attacks, if not produc'd a Recantation of their groundless and injurious Accusations. But some of the Gentlemen, it seems, have very different Sentiments, as appears from the Reply publish'd in your Gazette N^o. 1077. It gives us, however, some Pleasure to find, that the most reputable and judicious among them, have prudently dropt the Contest, and that the Number is reduc'd from Thirteen, to Eight, who, it seems, think their Honour more interested in endeavouring to support, what they have once asserted, with the most egregious Quibbles and Prevarications, than in following the worthy Example of their Brethren, in candidly submitting to the Force of Truth, and tacitly acknowledging their Error. The Subject of this Controversy, it must be confess'd, is of very little Importance to the Province; but as our Accusers have thought fit to give it the most general Circulation by a Publication in your Gazette, we cannot think ourselves justly reprehensible for taking the same Method in our Vindication, which must be our Apology for troubling the Public with a Dispute, which, with more Propriety, would be confin'd to the narrow Limits of this City. We must now beg Leave to lay before the Reader a particular Consideration of the several Matters in the Reply, which are in any Respect pertinent to the Merits of the Dispute, and then submit to his candid and unbiased Judgment, how well the Replyers have supported the several Charges in the Remonstrance, and what Foundation they have for treating us with such an unbounded Licence of Scurrility and Abuse.

In our Observations upon the Remonstrance, we premis'd this general Remark, "that being finish'd and sign'd after the Adjournment of the Court, it can be consider'd only as the Act of private Men, usurping the Character and Authority of Grand-Jurors, and with what Decency or Propriety such a Body of Men (at the very Instant that they were violating the Constitution, by assuming unwarrantable Powers,) could charge the Court with an undue Exercise of Authority, we submit to the Consideration of the Public." The Replyers call this a suppos'd Capital Point, and declare it to be a Conception false and groundless, for which they give this shrewd Reason, "because the Paper entitl'd, The Remonstrance, &c. was (EXCEPTING ONE OR TWO trifling Articles unnotic'd in the Observations,) actually fram'd before the Court broke up." This EXCEPTION effectually admits the Charge; but even if the *whole* had been actually fram'd before the Adjournment, and the Signing done afterwards, the bare Signing, in Consequence of their Direction, by *Mr. Colin Campbell*, as Foreman of the Grand-Jury, after the Determination of that Capacity, must be consider'd as the Act of private Men, usurping the Character and Authority of Grand-Jurors. We beg Leave to illustrate our Meaning, by a plain, familiar Instance. Let us suppose, that the Lower House of Assembly had fram'd a Remonstrance to the Governor, and that a Dissolution had taken Place before the Speaker had sign'd it. Could the Gentlemen who had lately compos'd the House, have call'd themselves, after the Dissolution, the Representative Body of the People? Could they have directed the late Speaker to have sign'd the Remonstrance, under the Denomination of Speaker? Could they upon any Principle of the Constitution, have publish'd it as the Act of The Lower House of Assembly? The Cases are too obviously similar to need any Application. With what Colour then, can the Replyers call that posthumous Production, the Remonstrance, the Act of a really-existing Grand-

Jury? They may with equal Reason, under their present dismember'd State insist, that they still continue in the same Capacity, that like the Polyplus, whatever Amputations they may undergo, the Grand-Jury will still remain *whole*, and, if in any future Dissertation, for the Reformation of the State, their present Number should be reduc'd even to the Ninth Part of a Man, it ought to be consider'd as the Act of the *whole*, entire GRAND-JURY. The Replyers after endeavouring to palliate the Irregularity of the Remonstrance, and furnishing us with an ingenious Distinction between framing and finishing, almost admit the Charge, but at the same time make ample Atonement for the Offence, by a pious Ejaculation, in which we sincerely join. "May our excellent Constitution never feel a deeper Wound"! We presac'd our Observations with the general Remark above-mention'd, for no other Purpose, than to shew with what an ill Grace the Remonstrants affect'd so much Concern and Tenderness for the Constitution, at the very Instant that they were acting in direct Violation of it, and not from any Apprehension that it would receive a deep Wound from such Attacks, nor indeed shall we feel the least Alarm should these puissant Champions, the Replyers, execute their heroic Menaces of a Repetition of them. Our Capital Point then remaining firm and unshaken against all the weak and sophistical Cavils they have advanc'd against it, we shall proceed to shew that the rest of their Performance is equally futile and inconclusive.

It is amazing to us, say the Replyers, that the Gentlemen should so wretchedly blunder, to interpret any Part of our Remonstrance, as charging the Corporation with a Misapplication of Monies, arising from Lotteries, &c." This wretched Blunder, as they unnaturally style it, we hope, upon Consideration, they will adopt with the same parental Fondness, as they have many others, for not a Tittle to the Purpose, is to be found in our Answer. We did not alledge that either the Court or Corporation are charg'd in the Remonstrance, with the Misapplication of Monies arising from Lotteries, but of Monies arising from Fines and Forfeitures, for thus stands the Charge in the Remonstrance.—That other considerable Sums have accrued by Fines and Forfeitures to the Use of the Corporation, the greatest Part of which Sums, we have Reason to believe, has been misapplied or sunk.—This is the Charge we complain'd of as affecting the Court, and perhaps the whole Corporation, for, without extending the Words beyond their natural Import, surely the Corporation, as having the principal Disposition of the Monies, arising from Fines and Forfeitures, must be accountable for the Application of such Monies, and consequently when it is alledg'd, that the greatest Part is misapplied or sunk,—are the Persons affected by the Censure. It must appear then, that we had a better Reason for interpreting this Part of the Remonstrance, as charging the Corporation with a Misapplication of Monies, than "possibly to draw in among us, Men of real Merit," for the Passage will bear no other Construction, since none but the Corporation can be accountable for the Malversation of Monies, subject to their Management and Direction. But what Reason had the Replyers for shifting the Charge from the Fines and Forfeitures, to the Lottery Monies? Because perhaps, they have since discover'd, that as Members of the Corporation, some of themselves were equally obnoxious to the former Charge with the Court, and consequently with all their real Merit, must have come in for their Share of the Censure. Upon comparing the Passage above quoted, from the Remonstrance, with several Passages in the Reply, the little disingenuous Fallacy of transferring the Charge of misapplied and sunk—from the Fines and Forfeitures, to the Lottery Monies, will be apparent. We must beg the Reader will turn to our Observations, and he will find, that it was on this Charge, viz. the Misapplication of the Fines and Forfeitures, and not of the Lottery Monies, we grounded our Complaint of an injurious Imputation against the Court, and perhaps the *whole* Corporation, and that it was on this Head we call'd upon them to make good their Allegation. How

well these Gentlemen have answer'd the Challenge, the following Extracts from their Reply will evince. "The Misapplication of the Lottery Monies, is by Construction of the Gentlemen extended to the Corporation."—"One Lottery is complaisantly admitted, for that, possibly, the Money only of one Lottery can be legally accounted for, the Money raised by the other, being misapplied or sunk."—"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."—"Do the Gentlemen challenge us to shew a Misapplication of the Lottery Monies?" &c. Many other Passages to the same Effect might be quoted; but these are sufficient to shew, that the Replyers have thought fit to change the Subject of Accusation, by substituting Lottery Monies in their Reply, in the place of Fines and Forfeitures which stood in the Remonstrance.—If indeed the Remonstrants had express'd themselves in this Manner, and confin'd the Charge of Misapplication to the Lottery Monies, and if moreover they had declar'd as the Replyers do, "that 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," i. e. of misapplying and pocketing the public Money,—we should have taken no Notice of the Charge, as it could not be applicable to the Court: But as this was so far from being the Case, that they have at least comprehended the Fines and Forfeitures, if not entirely confin'd them in the Charge of misapplied or sunk,—we thought ourselves as Members of the Corporation, and participating in the Disposition of those Monies, indifferently oblig'd to call upon the Remonstrants to make good their Assertion, and instead of doing it, we have plainly shewn, that the Replyers have given up the Point by a total Silence, and shifting their Charge to a different Object, in which by a direct Deduction from their own Principle, the Court have no kind of Concern.

From the Replyers Confession, we might stand well excus'd from the Task of making any Animadversions upon their Declamation about the Lotteries; but as their Misrepresentations on that Head will serve to shew of what kind of Spirit they are, and how licentious they asperse the Characters of their Betters, not only in Rank, but in every Species of real Merit (as will readily appear upon a comparative View of their Names and the Two Lists of Managers) we will trouble the Reader with a short Digression on that Subject.—"Do the Gentlemen, say the Replyers, 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 Gazette*, in 1753, and 1758,—and Blush.—"In 1753, say they, was publish'd "A Scheme of a Lottery for raising the Sum of 300 Pistoles, &c." And "in 1758 was also publish'd, A Scheme of a Lottery for raising the Sum of £. 435." &c.—When a Question is put in the Manner above-mention'd, it is always by Way of strong Affirmation, and therefore it amounts to this positive Assertion, that LARGE Sums of Money have been actually raised by the true Lotteries for the Benefit of this City, and by a Reference to the several Schemes, it is plain, that the Replyers intended them, as Proofs of their Assertion, by which inattentive Readers might very naturally be led to conclude, that the Nett Sum of Three Hundred Pistoles was rais'd by the first Lottery, and the Sum of 435 l. by the last.—In another Part of the Reply, they say, that "the Money propos'd to be rais'd by the first Lottery amounted to the Sum of 300 Pistoles."—Here we find the guarded Expression *propos'd* is inserted; but speaking of the other Lottery, they positively assert, that "the Money by the last Lottery amounted to 435 l. and left the Reader shou'd be led to infer from the Word *propos'd*, that a less Sum than what was *propos'd* by the Scheme might have been rais'd, he is diverted from

that