

" which made it plain, that it was looked upon as a perpetual Law, and
 " that it continued accordingly, without any new Force being added to
 " it by any Act passed in 1699, 'till the Year 1704, as abovementioned."
 Now let us see what you say in Answer to this: " It hereby appears to
 " this Houle, as it did to their Committee (and which they were ready to
 " evince, and to that purpose ordered their Clerk to attend) that the Act
 " made in Sixteen Hundred and Ninety Two, entituled, *An Act for Set-*
 " *tlement of an Annual Revenue upon their Majesty's Governor within*
 " *this Province for the Time being,* and Recorded in *Lib. L. L. fol. 21, &c.*
 " was at a Session of Assembly, held at the Port of *Annapolis* the Twenty
 " eighth Day of *June*, Sixteen Hundred and Ninety Nine, continued as
 " a Law of this Province, and as such is Recorded among other Laws then
 " past and continued, in another Record Book *L. L. fol. 30, &c.* with
 " some small Variation from the former, and is likewise named in a *Cata-*
 " *logue of the Titles of Laws which are continued in Force by an Act*
 " passed at the said Session of Sixteen Hundred and Ninety Nine, and
 " Recorded in the same Book, and which Act of Sixteen Hundred and
 " Ninety Nine is acknowledged to be such by both Houses of Assembly
 " in several Messages which passed at a Session *Anno Seventeen Hundred*
 " and Twenty Three."

Now I must say, that however you may endeavour by this Paragraph
 to palliate or conceal such a fundamental Error in the Report, as destroys
 the whole Train of Reasoning in it, it certainly neither denies nor con-
 tradicts what I advanced in the Paragraph above recited.

I know very well that the Act of 1692, was at a Session of Assembly
 held at *Annapolis* the 28th Day of *June* 1699, continued as a Law of
 this Province; But I affirm that it was no other Way continued but by
 not being Repealed, and I now desire your House to shew me the Law
 of 1699 that continued it, and which Law of 1699, you say, continued
 till the Year 1704: If your House knows of such a Law, it is certainly
 using the Government unkindly not to point it out, and if you have found
 that there is no such Law, it is but doing Justice to the Government to
 own it; The Committee did indeed order their Clerk to attend, but I be-
 lieve he will not say, that he told me where to find the said Law of 1699
 now in Question, if he had, I should not have applied to your Committee,
 and now at last been obliged to apply to your House for Information.

I return you Thanks for what you say, of your Readiness to do any
 reasonable Thing in your Power to procure a good Understanding between
 the Government and People, and I can in return truly assure you, that
 this