

particularly in your Letter dated the 10 Nov: 1757 that His Lop was desirous to distinguish by such Mark of Favour; If His Lop should be still of Opinion that it would be better to appoint some other I hope you will with His Lop's permission inform me whom His Lop thinks most worthy & proper that if I know any thing concerning such Gentleman which if known to His Lop might incline him to entertain a different Opinion I may advise him thereof, what induces me to make this Request is that paragraph of your Letter wherein you say "Others of Abilities not Lawyers are well deserving from continued just Behaviour" because I cannot tell to whom you therein allude. In my Letter dated the 29 of April I gave you the Reason which I presume induced Mr Goddorough & several others to be on the Affirmative Side of that Question whereon Dr Stuart's was the only negative Voice, & by the Journal which I now transmit, you will see that Dr Stuart during the late Convention found himself under a Necessity of acting the same part, he having Voted for the Appropriation of Ordinary Licence towards the Support of a College in Annapolis lest the Inhabitants his Constituents had he voted otherwise should have deemed him an Enemy to the City & have rejected him at the next Election & indeed if one was always to judge of a Member's Inclination by the Votes & Proceedings one should often entertain an erroneous Opinion, as for Instance in the Journal now sent you (pages 23 & 24) it appears that there was a Division upon a Question whether 200 or 400 Men should be raised for His Majesty's Service, & from the Entry a Stranger would be apt to think that those who Voted for only 200 were most averse to promoting the Service tho' the Truth is that they who were strenuous for a greater Number proceeded on this principle that if only a small Sum was to be raised they could have no pretence for introducing the Apportionment Bill again which