

“ any Thing in his said Lordship's Grants to the contrary notwithstanding, nor that his
 “ Lordship's Receivers, and other Officers contrary to the said Law have, and do utter Oath
 “ of their said Offices not only refuse to receive Tobacco, as by the said Law is provided, but
 “ exact Sterling Money to the great Aggrievance, and Oppression of the good People of this
 “ Province.”

THE second Article contained a Complaint against the Secretary for charging Fees not due by Law—The third related to the Act for Advancement of Trade, and alleged that proper Officers were not appointed to carry it into Execution—The fourth asserted the Force of Laws passed by the Assembly, and required Information whether his Lordship intended to annul a Clause in the Law about bringing Tobacco to Towns, which they insisted could not be without a Repealing Law. The fifth was a Complaint of Oppressions committed by the Attorney General. The sixth against Persons who, under a pretended Authority from some Militia Officers, had in Time of Peace pressed Provisions. The seventh against a late Adjournment of the Provincial Court to the last Tuesday in *January*, a Time most incommodious for the People to give their Attendance. The eighth, against the Officers of Towns who had exacted Three Pence Sterling per Hoghead tho' not brought to the several Towns according to the Letter of the Additional, and Supplementary Act to the Act for Advancement of Trade. [9]

YOU perceive that the first Article contained an Allegation, that the Receivers of his Lordship's Rents, and Alienation Fines, had infringed the Act of 1671 by obliging the People to pay the Sterling Money, in Lieu of Tobacco at the Rate fixed by that Act, and can you conceive that, when the Assembly enumerated the Aggrievances set forth in their Remonstrance, and an Infringement of the Act of 1671 was complained of, they would have been silent on so flagrant a Violation of the Rights of the People as the Misapplication of the Duty of One Shilling per Hoghead raised by that Act would have been, had his Lordship received it to his own Use, and cast upon the Province the Burthen of defraying all *Public Charges* (as the Act of 1692 alleged) *arising for Support of Government?*

IN the Year 1674, the Act of 1671 was continued during the Life-time of *Charles Calvert, Esq.* Heir apparent of Lord *Cælius* by an Act entitled “ An Act of Gratitude to his Excellency *Charles Calvert, Esq.* Captain General of *Maryland.*”

IN the Session of 1674, when this Act was under Consideration, the following Message was sent by the Lower to the Upper House “ this House, taking into Consideration the great Charge, and Weight of Government, which rest upon his Excellency, and his Readiness to comply with us, being our Intercessor for the gaining of several Rights, and Immunities for the Province, and also in securing our Lives, and Fortunes against our Enemies the *Indians*, propose to make a *grateful* Acknowledgment to his Lordship, and assure him of our Affections by settling the Duty of Two Shillings per Hoghead upon his Excellency, his Son, after the Death of his Lordship.”

IN 1676, after the Death of Lord *Cælius*, the Act of 1671 was further continued during the Life-time of *Cælius Calvert Esq.* the Heir apparent of Lord *Charles*, in case he should survive his Lordship.

THESE continuing Acts are so many direct Proofs of the just Application of the One Shilling per Hoghead granted by the Act of 1671, since it is not to be imagined that the Assembly would,

[9] The Answer to the Lower House was given in the Council Chamber by the Deputy Governors to the following Effect.

“ To the first; The Tenor, and true Intent of the Act of Assembly shall be pursued. To the second; They are willing that a Law, relating to Officers, and their Fees, may be made to explain that Clause mentioned in the second Aggrievance, in order to clear up Doubts for the future. To the third; They are apprehensive that his Lordship, as well as the People were Losers thereby, and therefore would write to his Lordship to acquaint him therewith, and hope for his Instructions as desired. To the fourth; His Lordship did not intend to annul the Clause of the Act about Advancement of Trade without an Act of Repeal. To the fifth; If such Proceedings have been practised, the Law is open against the Offender, who is not countenanced by the Government. To the sixth; They know not of any such Offenders, when informed they will proceed to question them, and give Judgment according to Law, and the Matter of Fact. To the seventh; At the Request of the Lower House, they will adjourn the Provincial Court by Proclamation. To the eighth; They refer to the Act in that Case made, and Justice shall be done.” “ The Lower House return their Thanks for the above favourable Answer, take their Leave, and repair to their own House.”