

over, and again, have exposed the Province to such an alarming, and oppressive Abuse of Power, as his Lordship's Conversion, to his own *private* Concerns, of a Revenue granted for the most *public* Uses, and compelling the Assembly to tax the People a-new for the same Purposes, or that they would have expressed themselves in such Terms of Regard, and Affection for his Lordship, and his Son, if they had demerited the Reproaches contained in the Act of 1692.

In the Year 1676, Lord *Baltimore* intending to return to *England*, "in Consideration that his Lordship had lived long in this Province, and from Time to Time done the People many signal Favours, and that his Lordship's Voyage could not but be very chargeable to him, and that his Lordship might know that they were heartily sensible of all his noble Favours, and gratefully accepted them, the Lower House voted *Nemine Contradicente*, as a Token of their Duty, Love, Fidelity, and Respects to his Lordship, all the public Tobacco, then remaining of the Country's, and desired his Acceptance thereof, and the Concurrence of the Upper House to their Vote."

Is this the Language of Men defrauded, and impoverished? Is it conceivable that this Token of Duty, Love, Fidelity, and Respects, these Expressions of the utmost Gratitude, for signal Favours conferred, would have been bestow'd upon one, who had trampled upon the Rights, and Privileges of the People, despoiled them of their Property, and reduced them to Poverty?

In the Year 1682, or 1683, the following Message was presented to his Lordship, "the Assembly, to demonstrate their Gratitude, Duty, and Affection to your Lordship, do pray your Lordship's Acceptance of a Hundred Thousand Pounds of Tobacco to be levied this present Year."

To this his Lordship answered "by returning his Thanks for their kind Tender, but that, considering the great Charge of the Country, he did not think fit to accept thereof."

Was this the Conduct of a Man bent upon impoverishing the Province to enrich himself? Is it imaginable that if he really had been so avaricious, and regardless of Right, and Justice, as the Act of 1692 charged, he would have been so delicate, and tender on this Occasion, when he might have received a large Sum (considering the Time, and what Price Tobacco was then at) without Reproach?

Lord *Charles* (who had succeeded Lord *Cæcilius* in the Year 1676, and was Proprietary at the Revolution) died in the Year 1715, and as I have observed that it called for all his Benevolence to forgive the cruel Treatment he received in the Year 1692, so did the Message of the Lower House soon after his Decease prove, that he exerted this his [] amiable Disposition, for he was expressly characterized in that Message; "not only as a generous Landlord, but a generous Friend to the Province."

I HAVE taken Notice, that the Tonnage being Part of his Lordship's *private* Estate, and not connected with the Government, it was determined by his Majesty in Council his Lordship should receive it, notwithstanding he was deprived of the Powers of Government; but the One Shilling being granted to his Lordship by the Act of 1671 to enable him to defray the Charges of Government, a Royal Order was made directing the Payment of it to Mr. *Copley*, who in Virtue of his Commission, bearing Date in 1691, had those Powers of Government conferred upon him, of which his Lordship had been stripped, and that this One Shilling per Hogshhead was accordingly received by Mr. *Copley* under the Act of 1671, till the further Provision was made by the Act of 1692 for the Support of the Governor, in Pursuance of the Royal Instruction—That, upon the same Principle, when Lord *Baltimore* in the Year 1692 applied for an Order of their Majesties Council to receive the Fines, and Amercements, he failed in his Suit, because these, being connected with the Government, attended it as an Incident, and therefore upon their Majesty's Assumption belonged to the Crown's Governor.

UNDER the Act of 1692 the One Shilling per Hogshhead was successively received by all the Governors from Mr. *Copley* to Mr. *Seymour* inclusively till October Session 1704, when the Repealing Act, I have mentioned above, was passed.

AMONG many other Acts the Assembly in 1704, who passed the Repealing Act, thought it expedient to re-enact the Act of 1692 "for settling an annual Revenue on the Governor," and tho' there appears to be some Variation from the Act of 1692 in the Expression, yet it is plain that the Legislature in 1704 did not intend, there should be any Difference in the Operation.