

vanced many things, which you yourselves must allow to be altogether new, however just and reasonable you may take them to be.

To what you now say of submitting the Affair of the *Twelve Pence per Hoghead* to our most Gracious Sovereign, from whom we may expect an impartial Determination in this or any other Point, on an equal Application and a fair and clear state of the Case, I readily agree; but the great difference betwixt us is, that you think the Report of your Committee is a true state of the Case, and I think I have shewn to a Demonstration in my Answer to it, that it is so far from being so, that the very contrary to what is there set forth is the real Truth.

Whoever will be at the Pains to read the same Report, will find that a Point greatly laboured, and for which many Acts of Assembly are Recited, is, that Laws given to the Crown for the Support of Government for the Time being, have not been looked upon by the Legislators that Enacted them as Perpetual, but only to have a Duration with such Governor or Government.

To this Purpose the Report sets forth, “ that when their late Majesties “ King *William* and Queen *Mary* of glorious, immortal and pious “ Memory, assumed the Government of this Province, and took the “ same under their Protection, an Act passed in the Year 1692 entituled, “ *An Act for the Settlement of an annual Revenue upon their Ma- “ jesties Governor within this Province for the Time being,*” which Act it is argued, was not deemed by the Legislators to be Perpetual, for that it was continued by another Act passed in the Year 1699, which Act of 1699, continued until the Year 1704, when another Act passed, entituled, *An Act for Settlement of an annual Revenue upon her Majesty’s Governor within this Province for the Time being, &c.*

In answer to this, I set forth “ that the said Act of 1692 appeared “ to a Demonstration to have been looked upon as a perpetual Law, “ that it continued in Force without any Re-enacting ’till the Year 1704, “ when a repealing Law that then passed, might make the Government “ think it necessary to have the said Act of 1692 re-enacted, or another “ perpetual Law made to the same Purpose, which was done according- “ ly, and the Law made by which the Government is at present Sup- “ ported.”

I further set forth, “ that I could not find the Law of 1699 that con- “ tinued 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 Laws, out of both which the Law of 1692 was ex- “ cepted, which made it plain, that it was looked upon as a perpetual “ Law, and that it continued accordingly, without any new Force “ being