

THIS corresponds with the Idea I have suggested, and the Difference therefore between the Acts of 1692, and 1704 is merely verbal, the one giving Twelve Pence per Hoghead to support the *Governor*, and the other, *the Office of the Governor*.

THE Two following Acts of Assembly that passed in the Year 1716, and 1717 come up exactly to the same Sense.

By the former entitled "An Act ascertaining the Gauge and Tare, &c. and for laying Impositions on Tobacco for the Support of Government, &c. Twelve Pence out of the Fifteen Pence per Hoghead was given to his Lordship's Governor to support the Honour, and Dignity of Government."

By the latter with the same Title it is provided that "the Money arising from the Duty on Tobacco shall be applied to those Ends and Uses, for which it hath been hitherto raised (to wit) Twelve Pence of the Fifteen Pence to the Support of the Government."

THE End, or Use, for which the Twelve Pence per Hoghead were given by the Act of 1716 was to the Governor to support the Honour, and Dignity of Government, and the Act of 1717 declared that the Twelve Pence given for the Support of Government were given for the same End, or Use.

IN the Queen's Time Anno 1714, the Assembly passed an Act giving Three Pence per Hoghead for the Use, and better Maintainance of her Majesty's Governor during his Government over and above the One Shilling per Hoghead heretofore granted for the Support of her Majesty's Government.

THIS is a direct Proof that the Shilling per Hoghead given by the Act of 1704 for Support of the Government was for that of the Governor for the Reference was to this Act in the Act of 1714 there being no other Act in Force then, under which the Shilling was payable.

IN the Year 1723, when the Controversy ran high on the Question, whether the Allowances claimed by the Council should be made in the Journal, the Upper House quoted the Journals in the Years 1696, and 1697 in favour of their Pretensions, and the Lower House, in one of the Messages, supposed to have been framed by Thomas Bordley, Esq; answered, that in those Years the Acts in being had settled the whole Revenue for the Support of Government, and referred to the Act of 1692, which gave the Revenue for the Support of the Governor, alledging that this Act, leaving no Room for the Council, but applying the whole Revenue to the Governor's Support, made it reasonable in the Years 1696, and 1697 to pay the Council in the Journal, there being then no other Provision for them.

IN this Message the Terms *Government*, and *Governor* were used as synonymous, according to the above Definition, the Idea of the Assembly in 1704, and the Sense of the Legislature deducible from the Acts I have cited, some of which under a Title to support the Governor give the Revenue for the Support of the Government, and other, under a Title to support the Government, give the Revenue to the Support of the Governor.

OLD Instances of the same Kind before the Act of 1671 might be cited.

FURTHER—of the various Applications to the Support of Government in Acts granting Revenues, and inflicting Fines, and Forfeitures no Account hath ever been rendered, or even asked till lately, and it is hardly to be conceived that, if the Law-makers had believed there had been any Abuse, they would not have remonstrated against it, or that they would still have continued in the Use of the same Expression, when it might have been so easily varied. Ambiguity of Expression is a great Defect in a Law, and a Repetition of it still greater, after it hath been experienced in the Execution of a former Law, to give an Opportunity, for the Commission of Fraud, always embraced, if the Terms, "Support of Government" are as extensive, as some have contended. Wherefore it is not to be imagined, that, if the Idea annexed to the Terms had not been established, and the Practice, or Execution of the Laws answerable to that Idea, so many Assemblies in such a Variety of Instances would have held the same Style.

SUPPOSING that I have ascertained the Sense, or Meaning of the Terms, it is very obvious why no Account of the Revenue for the Support of the Government hath ever been rendered.

You may call this Revenue *public* Money if you please; but it wou'd be too hasty to conclude from this Admission that an Account ought to be rendered.

THE Revenue granted to his Majesty for the Support of his Household, or to any of the Royal Family, may be called *public* Money, because granted by the Community, or because the Community is interested in their maintaining the Pre-eminence, and Dignity of their Stations; but no one ever thought that a particular Account was to be given of their Disbursements. If, indeed, an Addition to former Grants should be asked for the same Purpose, some Enquiry into their Sufficiency might be made, and Estimates, perhaps, be required.