

<http://stores.ebay.com/Ancestry-Found>

<http://stores.ebay.com/Ancestry-Found>

Digitized for Microsoft Corporation
by the Internet Archive in 2008.

From University of California Libraries.

May be used for non-commercial, personal, research,
or educational purposes, or any fair use.

May not be indexed in a commercial service.

<http://stores.ebay.com/Ancestry-Found>

COLONIAL TRADE OF MARYLAND
1689-1715

SERIES XXXII

NO. 3

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY STUDIES
IN
HISTORICAL AND POLITICAL SCIENCE

Under the Direction of the
Departments of History, Political Economy, and
Political Science

COLONIAL TRADE OF MARYLAND
1689-1715

BY

MARGARET SHOVE MORRISS, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of History, Mount Holyoke College

BALTIMORE
THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

1914

COPYRIGHT 1914 BY
THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

PRESS OF
THE NEW ERA PRINTING COMPANY
LANCASTER, PA.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	vii

CHAPTER I

STAPLE PRODUCTS AND CHIEF EXPORTS

Natural Resources and Food-Stuffs	10
Tobacco, the Staple Product and Chief Export	21
Amount of Tobacco Exported to England and to the Colonies ..	30
Price of Tobacco	36
Revenue Levied by the British Government on Imported Tobacco	42
Revenue Levied by the Colonial Government on Exported Tobacco	47
Naval Stores	52

CHAPTER II

IMPORTS

Variety and Amounts of Goods Imported from England	58
Manufactures in Maryland	65
Importation of White Servants	76
Importation of Negroes	79
Other Imports from Foreign Countries	81
Imports from the English Colonies	82

CHAPTER III

TRADE ROUTES AND ILLICIT TRADE

Number of Ships Concerned in the Trade with England	85
Conditions of Lading, and Protection of the Tobacco Fleets ...	89
Influence of English Merchants in the Regulation of the Trade .	95
Methods of Payment for Tobacco	103
Trade Routes from Maryland to Foreign Countries	107
Trade Routes to the English Colonies	109
Maryland Shipping	114
Illicit Trade	116
Trade with Pirates	129

APPENDICES

I. Naval Stores Exported from Virginia and Maryland, 1698-1717	134
II. List of English Manufactured and Foreign Goods Exported from England to Virginia and Maryland, 1699	139
Bibliography	147

PREFACE

The purpose of this paper is to show the place which the province of Maryland held in the British colonial system. Maryland was one of the two continental colonies which were regarded as satisfactory to the home country from the mercantilist point of view. As the connection with Great Britain was especially close during the twenty-five years when the colony was in the hands of the king, it has seemed best to analyze its trade relationships during those years. The attempt has been made to indicate its exact value to Great Britain: (1) as a source for the supply of raw material, that is, tobacco, which had to be shipped directly to England; (2) as a market for British manufactures and foreign goods through Great Britain as an entrepôt; (3) as the terminus of a line of trade which employed a large number of English ships and sailors. The description of British colonial policy as a whole is the task of Mr. G. L. Beer in the admirable series of volumes now appearing. The results reached in this presentation of trade conditions in Maryland between 1689 and 1715 tend to confirm the conclusions of Mr. Beer for the earlier development of the colonial system.

The materials used, aside from the printed records in the Archives of Maryland, have been found for the most part in the Public Record Office in London among the Colonial Office Papers. Of the greatest value was a volume of Maryland Naval Office papers for the period, containing lists of ships and their ladings. The Custom House Accounts in the Record Office furnished statements of the imports and exports to and from Virginia and Maryland between 1689 and 1715. Much general information has been secured from published and unpublished letters of the colonial gov-

ernors to the Board of Trade and the secretary of state. These were often largely concerned with trade conditions.

This study was undertaken at the suggestion of Professor Charles M. Andrews of Yale University when he was at Bryn Mawr College, and the author is indebted to him for very generous assistance at every stage of her inquiry. Professor William Roy Smith of Bryn Mawr College has made many valuable criticisms in arrangement and form. The year 1913-1914 has been spent by the writer at the Johns Hopkins University, and it is a pleasure to acknowledge the courtesy of Professor John H. Latané of that institution. The kindness of the editors of the Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science in allowing the dissertation to be published in that series is greatly appreciated. Thanks are due also to Dr. Frances Davenport of the Department of Historical Research of the Carnegie Institution for the use of unpublished references, to Mr. Hubert Hall for his assistance when the author was in London, and to Dr. Ellen D. Ellis of Mount Holyoke College for many helpful suggestions.

M. S. M.

COLONIAL TRADE OF MARYLAND, 1689-1715

CHAPTER I

STAPLE PRODUCTS AND CHIEF EXPORTS

Maryland became a royal province in 1692. At that time the belt of settlement was still comparatively narrow, although the colony had been occupied for more than fifty years. The chief means of communication between the different parts of the colony and between the colony as a whole and the outer world was by water. The result was that plantations were scattered from the head of the bay along both shores to the Potomac and Somerset Rivers and up the banks of all the navigable streams. The settlements were not evenly distributed within this narrow district, for the inhabitants were still clustered in greater numbers where the colony had first been seated,—along the Potomac and the Patuxent and around St. Mary's and Annapolis.¹ Across the bay, too, plantations were concentrated along the Choptank, Elk, and Chester Rivers and farther south in Dorchester and Somerset Counties. The controversy over the collection of taxes in the boundary dispute with Pennsylvania shows that there were a few settlements in Cecil County north of Chesapeake Bay.²

At the end of the seventeenth century there was little thought of the possibility of occupying the region back of this tide-water district. In 1695 Governor Nicholson complained to the Duke of Shrewsbury that on account of the scarcity of land young men were leaving Virginia and Maryland, "where land is grown scarce to be taken up, by reason

¹ N. D. Mereness, *Maryland as a Proprietary Province*, p. 105.

² *Archives of Maryland*, vol. xxiii, pp. 85, 87.

of the great Tracts that single persons have, and will not part with but at unreasonable rates. So that as our people increase, they are in a manner necessitated to look out for new Countrys."³ It was not until the Germans from the Palatinate came into Pennsylvania and the western part of Maryland that settlements in the latter colony spread appreciably beyond the tide-water.

The region to which the seventeenth century settlements were confined was a flat, thickly wooded country. Hugh Jones wrote home in 1698 that in the settlements there was "no Hill . . . fifty yards perpendicular but about 100 miles backe or west of us . . . the ground rises. . . . All the low land is verry wooddy like one continued forrest no part clear but what is cleared by the English And tho we are pretty closely seated yett we cannot See our next neighbours house for trees." He further explains that there had already been much clearing of land.⁴

The nature of the country that had been settled and the large number of waterways indicate what would supposedly be the chief resources of the colony. The thick woods which still surrounded so many of the plantations furnished an abundance of game,—deer, bear, and many varieties of wild fowl, especially turkeys. They also supplied enough mast to feed the stock, which for the most part ranged the woods. Thus the planters were assured of an abundant support from the natural products of the land with little effort on their own part, but although they lived largely by hunting and fishing, we shall see that from earliest times neither furs nor fish played a conspicuous part in the commercial activities of the colonists.

Of the fisheries this is especially true. There is abundant testimony that the bay and the rivers teemed with fish, as indeed they do today, and the different kinds were much

³ Colonial Office Papers, 5: 719, 18; see also a letter of Governor Nicholson to the Board of Trade, in C. O. 5: 714, 25; and Archives, vol. xxiii, p. 87.

⁴ Reverend Hugh Jones to Dr. Benjamin Woodroof, in Royal Society, Letter Books, I, i, 183.

esteemed for home consumption. The author of the Narrative of a Voyage to Maryland, writing in 1705, mentions perch of all varieties, rockfish, catfish, drum, of which we read, "an admirable fish the inhabitants make much account of 'em indeavering to Ketch as many as they can in a season salting 'em up to eat att other times," sheepshead, eels, herring, of which great quantities came up "to the heads of the Rivers into the ffreshes to spawne the inhabitants gett great numbers of 'em which are a mighty help to great Families," and abundance of shad and sturgeon, which were, however, not much esteemed, although their size was a source of wonder to the people.⁵ With all this abundance of fish there was no effort made to salt them for exportation. There is not a single record of fish exported to England between 1696 and 1715, and the same is probably true for earlier years.⁶ Apparently, also, none were sent to any of the other colonies.

During the early years of the colony the Indian fur trade was monopolized by Lord Baltimore, but by 1650, probably because it had not proved as profitable as was expected, it had been thrown open to the public. A statute passed in that year required each trader to obtain a license and to reserve one tenth of his profits for the proprietor, but all licenses were to be freely granted.⁷ Between 1650 and 1681 several licenses were issued, but the trade was evidently not sufficiently lucrative to prove very tempting.⁸ After 1682 the inhabitants, feeling perhaps that the proprietary percentage was too large, made a number of attempts to adjust the trade more satisfactorily. The Lower House of Assembly proposed at least twice that the necessity for obtaining a license should be removed and the percentage reduced.⁹ The Council, however, vetoed the proposals on the ground that it

⁵ Sloane MSS. 2291, British Museum. Printed in *American Historical Review*, vol. xii, pp. 327-340.

⁶ Custom House Accounts, Ledgers of Imports and Exports, vols. i-xvi. Inspector General's Accounts, vol. i.

⁷ Archives, vol. i, p. 307.

⁸ *Ibid.*, vol. iii, pp. 443, 445; vol. v, pp. 38, 84, 106; vol. xv, pp. 255, 352.

⁹ *Ibid.*, vol. vii, pp. 301, 381, 383, 385.

would be dangerous to allow free trade with the Indians, and thus the license system remained in effect throughout the proprietary period.¹⁰

After the establishment of the royal government, the question of fur licenses was again agitated by the Lower House and, apparently in October, 1695,¹¹ a decision was reached that a small export duty on furs should be substituted for the license system.¹² The customs collected were to be doubled for aliens or for those not trading directly with England. This law was reenacted at least once,¹³ and the money from the duty on furs was used for the benefit of the free school at Annapolis.

Although the effort to adjust the fur trade indicates that it played an appreciable part in Maryland commerce, the imperfection of the records makes it difficult to estimate its character and extent. Undoubtedly the principal skins exported were those of the smaller animals,—beaver, wildcat, raccoon, fox, mink, and muskrat, with occasionally a few

¹⁰ A law of 1692 prohibiting trade with the Indians without a license indicates that the same policy was continued at first under the royal governors (Archives, vol. xiii, p. 560).

¹¹ In an account of the public revenue the collection of a duty on fur before October, 1695, is twice mentioned. One item records duties received from May 28, 1695, and the other states: "By ditto [Major Robert King] his account for Skins exported since the making the act to the 26 day 7^{ber} 1695" (An Acct of Cash for the Publick Revenue of the province beginning the 15th of October 1695 and Ending December the 11th 1696, in C. O. 5: 749). There is no record of a law establishing fur duties until October, 1695; and as late as October, 1694, it was definitely stated that the old license act was not to be changed (Archives, vol. xix, p. 85). The law may have been retroactive, but there is nothing in the bill to indicate it.

¹² Archives, vol. xix, p. 276. This duty was regulated as follows:—

Skin	Duty	Skin	Duty
Bear	9 d.	Wolf	1½ d.
Beaver	4 d.	Muskrat	4 d. per doz.
Otter	3 d.	Raccoon	¾ d.
Wildcat	1½ d.	Elk	12 d.
Fox	1½ d.	Deer	4 d.
Mink	1½ d.	Young bear	2 d.
Fisher	1½ d.		

¹³ Archives, vol. xxvi, p. 275. This law was to be in force for an indefinite length of time.

larger skins,—bear, wolf, or elk.¹⁴ Apparently no accurate record was ever kept of the number of skins exported, but the duty collected from furs for the four years from 1695 to 1698 inclusive was £154. 4s. 9¾d.,¹⁵ an amount which is comparatively small, even when the low rates of the duties are considered.

Moreover, the export was not only small in quantity but it was inconsiderable in value. The best general estimate—and only vague estimates are possible—would place the total value of the furs exported to England in 1695 at about

¹⁴ C. O. 5: 749, *passim*; Archives, vol. xxiii, p. 168.

Sample list of furs exported from Pocomoke District in 1695

	Number of Skins	Duty	Amount of Duty		
			£.	s.	d.
Bear	9	9 d.	0	6	9
Beaver	42	4 d.	0	14	0
Otter	70	3 d.	0	17	9
Mink	893	1½ d.	5	11	7
Raccoon	2084	¾ d.	6	10	3
Fox	445	¾ d.	1	7	9¾
Muskrat	239 doz.	4 d. per doz.	3	19	0
Cub	5	2 d.	0	0	10
Wildcat	20	1½ d.	0	2	6
Total			19	10	5¾

Account of the public revenue, 1695–1696, in C. O. 5: 749. This list is copied from the records. There are three errors of a few pence in the multiplication.

¹⁵ Records for the year 1698 contain an account of the money collected from 1695 to 1698 from the fur duty for the use of the free schools:—

	£.	s.	d.
By Maj. Whittington's account for furs	28	18	8
" " King's account paid governor	16	8	2
" " Smithson's account for furs	56	11	6
" Mr. Watkin's account for furs	28	16	0
" James Dashield's account in Mr. Bladen's hands	1	10	10
" Maj. Smithson's later account	3	9	7
" Mr. West's for account sworn to Sept. 1698	18	9	10¾
Total	154	4	9¾

Journal of Committee especially appointed to inspect the public accounts of the revenue of this province January 2, 1698/9, in C. O. 5: 749.

As the duties charged were not uniform, this list gives no idea of the number of skins of each kind exported annually. The duty collected per annum would be about £38, of which Pocomoke District paid slightly more than one half (cf. footnote 14).

£648;¹⁶ and the amount probably varied little from year to year. The inhabitants of Maryland never exported to England furs of sufficient value to tempt many people into the trade.

Fully eighty per cent of the furs were exported from the Eastern Shore,¹⁷ indicating that the trapping was probably done by white men within the settled parts of the colony, where there were still small fur-bearing animals.¹⁸ Governor Blakiston wrote to the Board of Trade that the people of Maryland, being afraid of the western Indians, did not want to trade with them.¹⁹

¹⁶ This estimate is based on the following calculation:—

Value of skins in Maryland for 1697 (an average year)	Original Cost or Value	
	s.	d.
Bear (cub probably worth ½)	6	6
Beaver	4	
Otter	3	9
Mink	2	
Raccoon	1	
Fox	2	6
Muskrat		4
Wildcat	2	6

Custom House Accounts. Inspector General's Accounts, vol. i, Imports from Virginia and Maryland.

The total value of the furs exported from Pocomoke District was therefore as follows:—

Number of Skins		Value		
		£.	s.	d.
Bear	9	2	18	6
Beaver	42	8	8	0
Otter	70	13	2	6
Mink	893	89	6	0
Raccoon	2084	104	4	0
Fox	445	55	12	6
Muskrat	239 doz.	47	16	0
Cub	5	0	6	3
Wildcat	20	2	10	0
Total		324	3	9

If, as is stated in footnote 15, the furs sent from Pocomoke for 1695 were one half the total for the year, the complete amount would be £648. 7s. 6d., the value of the furs exported from Maryland in 1695.

¹⁷ This is true because five of the officers contributing to the fur duty of 1695-1698 (footnote 15) held office on the Eastern Shore. The sums paid in by them amounted to £123. 17s. 9¾d., or more than 80 per cent of the total amount collected for the four years.

¹⁸ Sloane MSS. 2291, British Museum.

¹⁹ C. O. 5: 715, 39.

In the production of food-stuffs the colonists had no more interest than in trapping or fishing. When the province was first settled the virgin soil was extremely fertile, so rich in fact that, according to a contemporary authority, English wheat would not grow until Indian corn or tobacco was first planted to take off some of the rankness.²⁰ It was not, therefore, because the soil was unfavorable to the growth of grain that so little planting was done; it was because it was still easier and far more profitable to grow tobacco. In the first years of the settlement the colonists began to plant this commodity to the exclusion of corn, preferring to buy their grain from the Indians or to import it from other colonies rather than plant it themselves. The colonial government made great efforts to prevent the exclusive production of tobacco by decreeing that everyone who planted it should grow also two acres of corn. This law was renewed several times until 1654,²¹ and was then allowed to lapse, probably because the colony had been induced to support itself in ordinary years. Edward Randolph stated in 1676, however, that New England sent food-stuffs—peas, flour, biscuit, malt, codfish, and mackerel—to Maryland in return for tobacco.²² Evidently a watch had still to be kept over the food supply. Whenever there was a bad year or danger of Indian wars, proclamations were issued forbidding the exportation of food-stuffs, and the frequency of these indicates that the supply barely sufficed for the needs of the colony itself.²³

By the end of the century this condition of affairs had somewhat improved. The principal crop was Indian corn or maize, which, cooked with pork into a kind of hominy, formed the chief article of food among the lower classes.²⁴

²⁰ *A Relation of Maryland*, 1635. Sabin reprint, New York, 1865, p. 21; also in C. C. Hall, *Narratives of Early Maryland*, p. 81.

²¹ Archives, vol. i, pp. 79, 97, 160, 251, 349.

²² To the Lords of Trade. An Answer to severall Heads of Enquiry concerning the present State of New England. October, 1676. In Additional MSS. 28089, f. 16, British Museum.

²³ Archives, vol. iii, pp. 194, 293, 443; vol. xvii, pp. 48, 179, 269, 275; vol. xv, pp. 44, 194.

²⁴ Sloane MSS. 2291, British Museum.

The inhabitants also raised English wheat to a considerable extent, and many vegetables,—beans, peas, carrots, turnips, and potatoes.²⁵ The soil of the colony was light and sandy, and although its virgin fertility was gone, it still proved very favorable for the production of grain.²⁶ One writer declared that Indian corn would yield five or six hundred fold with from four to six ears on a stalk,²⁷ a statement which is without doubt somewhat exaggerated. The Lower House was agreed that because of the partial exhaustion of the land by many years of tobacco planting it “thereby becomes better for tillage.”²⁸ The supply of grain for home consumption was large enough to make the colony amply self-sufficing.

The question whether by 1689 the province had begun to grow food-stuffs for export is a different one and is harder to settle definitely. The evidence of the records is somewhat contradictory. Certainly in 1690 grain was sent from Maryland to New England.²⁹ On the other hand, as the result of a bad harvest in 1695 it was forbidden to export corn from the province.³⁰ In 1697 there was a plentiful harvest,³¹ perhaps because the people were beginning to realize that they must plan to raise sufficient grain to feed their stock, among which there had been great mortality. The Assembly, in reporting the exportation of some wheat and flour to Barbadoes in 1697,³² expressly stated that such exportation was unusual, as the harvest was ordinarily consumed at home.³³ The same year the grand jury of the

²⁵ Sloane MSS. 2291, British Museum.

²⁶ C. O. 5: 717, I. 106.

²⁷ Sloane MSS. 2291, British Museum.

²⁸ Archives, vol. xix, pp. 540, 580.

²⁹ Answer of Sir Edmund Andros to his instructions. Against the instruction to give an account of Massachusetts is written in part, “They get their meat from Plymouth, Rhode Island and Connecticut, grain from Connecticut, New York, Maryland and Pennsylvania” (Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, 1689-1692, no. 862).

³⁰ Archives, vol. xx, p. 327.

³¹ Ibid., vol. xxiii, p. 149.

³² Ibid., vol. xix, p. 540.

³³ Ibid., p. 542.

Maryland provincial court refused to encourage the exportation of wheat and flour to Newfoundland in spite of Governor Stoughton's appeal to the colony on behalf of the expedition to Canada, alleging that such encouragement would injure Maryland's trade in provisions to Barbadoes.³⁴ But the Barbadoes trade must have been small. The records indicate that in five years only one small vessel cleared from Pocomoke for Barbadoes with provisions, although the same district sent small amounts of grain to New York, Pennsylvania, and New England somewhat more frequently.³⁵ Other similar records have not been preserved, but if the figures are proportionate for other districts, certainly the exportation of food-stuffs from Maryland, either to Barbadoes or to any of the colonies, must have been inconsiderable during the whole period of the royal governors.³⁶

In general, then, the colony was only self-sufficing, and in northern Maryland food-stuffs were actually imported. Bread and flour were brought in by land from Pennsylvania.³⁷ One Pennsylvania writer indeed asserted that Maryland made little or no bread or flour and constantly obtained these commodities, as well as wine, rum, and sugar, from his colony.³⁸ However that may have been, it would certainly seem that in the last decade of the seventeenth century north-

³⁴ Archives, vol. xxiii, pp. 147, 267; C. O. 5: 741, pp. 371-373.

³⁵ For Pocomoke District from 1697-1701 there is a definite, although probably incomplete, record of the number of ships clearing for other colonies laden with provisions:—

For New England	4 vessels
“ Pennsylvania	4 “
“ New York	5 “
“ Port Lewes	1 “
“ Barbadoes	1 “

The amount of grain exported is in no case stated, but as the burden of the vessels was very small the quantity shipped must have been small (C. O. 5: 749).

³⁶ Indeed at the very end of the period the exportation of corn was again forbidden by the Council (Archives, vol. xxv, p. 294), but in 1712 Lloyd reported to the Board of Trade that Maryland sent some Indian corn and wheat to Lisbon, New England, and Madeira. This must have been a small amount, as there is no record of such shipments (C. O. 5: 717, I. 63).

³⁷ Archives, vol. xxiii, p. 87.

³⁸ C. O. 5: 1257, 4.

ern Maryland was still unable to grind and bake enough flour and bread for home consumption and was forced to import from the Quaker colony. The royal government, however, remained true to the proprietary policy of encouraging the province to become self-supporting. It also feared that the Pennsylvania merchants would draw off Maryland coin in payment for their bread. For these reasons it prohibited this trade with Pennsylvania, a prohibition which was continued with one short interval until after 1715.³⁹ By means of legislation Maryland was thus forced to plant at least sufficient corn to be independent of her neighbors, but it is evident that she was always little more than barely independent. The conclusion of the whole question of exportation of food-stuffs is well expressed in Governor Hart's answers to the queries of the Board of Trade in 1720: "The Soil is of different kinds, but most of it sandy and of various colours: which when cultivated with little labour gives a vast increase, and produces all things necessary for Life, that Great Britain affords; with which the Inhabitants plentifully provide for their subsistence, and might have sufficient to vend at foreign marketts but that the making of tobacco employs all their time and care."⁴⁰ There was no lack of food, and the colony had been made self-supporting partly by natural means and partly by legislation; but even at the close of the century there was practically no systematic export of grain or other food-stuffs to other colonies.

Fruit also was raised at this time for home consumption but not for export. When the first settlement was made, the colonists had planted a large stock of fruit trees,—apples, pears, and peaches. This planting must have been continued with good results, as many varieties of fruit were plentiful in the colony by the end of the century. A traveller to Maryland in 1705 described an "abundance of fruits of all sorts as aple Peare Cherry quinces in great quantitys and

³⁹ Archives, vol. xxvi, p. 314; vol. xxvii, pp. 172, 482, 574; vol. xxix, pp. 238, 310, 328.

⁴⁰ C. O. 5: 717, I. 106.

innumerable Quantities Peaches to that degree that they knock downe Bushells att a time for there hogs, besides what vast quantities they still and make a verry good spirritt off nott much inferior to Brandy."⁴¹ He also reported that brandy was distilled from cider, which was made in great quantities. This testimony to the abundance of apples is confirmed by an earlier letter from Maryland in which it was stated that cider was the chief drink of the country.⁴² In spite of the great quantity of fruit of all kinds, the exportation of fruit was limited to an occasional shipment of apples or cider from the Eastern Shore.⁴³

One other source of food supply remains to be noted. The first domestic animals, principally cattle and hogs, in the province of Maryland were imported from Virginia at the time of the arrival of the colonists. This stock increased rapidly, but toward the end of the century great mortality prevailed among the animals on account of the cold winters and the lack of food. At first no special provision had been made for food for the domestic animals, which were branded and turned out into the woods to fatten on mast until needed for use. Various attempts were made to secure the colonists against theft of their stock, and a system of wood-rangers was instituted to range for unbranded cattle and to protect the branded animals.⁴⁴ These efforts at protection were not especially successful. Men complained that the Indians were great thieves and that even the rangers were dishonest.⁴⁵ But the advantages of this easy means of ob-

⁴¹ Sloane MSS. 2291, British Museum.

⁴² Royal Society, Letter Books, I, i, 183.

⁴³ C. O. 5: 749, Accounts for Pocomoke District.

⁴⁴ Archives, vol. i, p. 418. In 1663 this law was repealed (*ibid.*, vol. i, p. 486), but during the period of royal government the rangers were again provided for (*ibid.*, vol. xxiv, p. 280; vol. xxvi, p. 309).

⁴⁵ To protect cattle ranging the woods it was made theft for a man to kill marked cattle, or those unmarked save on his own land (Archives, vol. i, p. 251; vol. xiii, p. 477). The wood-rangers were later accused of driving off and killing tame animals, as well as the unbranded ones to which they had a right (*ibid.*, vol. xxiv, p. 280). Laws concerning the Indians were first made as early as 1666, when the settlers were forbidden to buy flesh from the Indians lest they had procured their meat by killing the settlement stock (*ibid.*, vol. ii, p. 130; vol. xxii, p. 463).

taining food for the stock long outweighed the disadvantages, and on the frontiers people continued to allow their cattle and hogs to range the woods.⁴⁶ In the older settlements, where the woods had become less thick, the severe winters and the lack of food finally caused the loss of large numbers of animals,⁴⁷ and taught the inhabitants to house and feed their stock in winter.⁴⁸ Not until this lesson had been learned and the mortality at the end of the century repaired was Governor Seymour able to report that most of the people "have good Tracts of Land and Stocks of Cattle and hogs."⁴⁹

In spite of the adequate supply of stock, however, the inhabitants were on the whole little more willing or able to raise cattle for export than they were to grow grain or fruit. Before 1674 it may have been customary to make some small shipments of cattle from Maryland,⁵⁰ but in October of that year the exportation without license of all flesh was forbidden by proclamation,⁵¹ probably because the supply in the colony was barely sufficient for its own needs. Randolph's assertion that New England sent beef and pork into Maryland would tend to confirm this view.⁵² In 1695 a small duty, evidently not meant to be prohibitive, was substituted for the earlier prohibition,⁵³ but even after this date the exportation of beef and pork in any one year apparently never exceeded one hundred and eighty barrels,⁵⁴ shipped in small amounts to the other colonies.

⁴⁶ Sloane MSS. 2291, British Museum.

⁴⁷ An account of the cattle and hogs which died in 1694-95 places the mortality very high indeed: 25,429 cattle died, and 62,373 hogs (Archives, vol. xx, p. 269; C. O. 5: 713, 114; C. O. 5: 714, 6).

⁴⁸ Archives, vol. xxiii, p. 89.

⁴⁹ C. O. 5: 716, H. 41.

⁵⁰ The Earl of Shaftesbury wrote to Andrew Percivall, who was going to Maryland in 1674, to enquire in Bermuda the price of cattle so as to know whether "to furnish himself from Maryland, for he is not without further order to trade either to New York or Virginia" (Cal. St. P. Col. 1669-1674, no. 1284).

⁵¹ Archives, vol. xv, pp. 44, 194; vol. xvii, p. 48.

⁵² Add. MSS. 28089, f. 16, British Museum.

⁵³ Archives, vol. xix, p. 276.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 539; C. O. 5: 749, Accounts for Pocomoke District. In 1705 Governor Seymour reported to the Board of Trade that for

Most of the natural resources and forms of food supply that an agricultural colony situated near the sea produced, or could be made to produce, were evidently abundant in Maryland. During the period of royal government these products were amply sufficient to support the colony in ordinary circumstances, and, if the inhabitants had cared to do so, they could undoubtedly have exported any of them in considerable quantities to the other colonies or even to England, but except for a small quantity of furs they were not sent out of the province. The reason for this indifference to the possible commercial importance of fish and other food-stuffs is sufficiently well known. It did not pay the colonists to increase the amount of their various food products in order to export them. There was, however, one product which they raised primarily for export,—tobacco. They had discovered that its cultivation was easy and profitable, and to it they had long turned their attention. From the very beginning of the colony the tide-water region had been devoted almost exclusively to tobacco raising, so the years from 1689 to 1715 do not present any new phase of economic development; but, because the records of the royal period are more complete, they furnish a good point from which to review briefly the progress of the trade during the earlier days and to describe more fully the situation with regard to the staple at the beginning of the eighteenth century.

Before the settlement of Maryland the English government had already adopted a definite policy of regulation and restriction of the growth of plantation tobacco, and this restriction had become the most important factor in the development of the tobacco trade. For ethical reasons sentiment in England was in the beginning strongly averse to the use of tobacco, but the colonists in Virginia had dis-

seven years past Maryland had not exported one barrel of beef or pork, but had been forced to purchase these commodities from Carolina, Pennsylvania, New York, and other colonies (C. O. 5: 715, G. 25, 1705 bundle). A Rhode Island record of about this period says that Virginia and Maryland imported into Rhode Island pork, wheat, and English goods (C. O. 5: 1264, p. 90).

covered its value as an export and had consequently devoted themselves to its cultivation regardless of moral considerations.⁵⁵ The English government had been forced to recognize the existence of the industry and to attempt to regulate it temporarily, although the authorities still hoped that eventually the attention of the colonists could be diverted to other commodities.⁵⁶ Meantime on the whole the English regulation of the industry benefited the colonists by giving greater security to their chief export, notwithstanding the fact that certain concessions were required of them in return. In 1620 the Virginia Company agreed to pay duties on the tobacco they imported in excess of those to which they were liable by their charter, and the king prohibited the growth of the staple in England.⁵⁷ Later regulations bound the Virginians to send their tobacco to the home country alone,⁵⁸ but the government conceded that Spanish tobacco should be virtually excluded from England.⁵⁹ The proclamation against home-grown tobacco and the exclusion of foreign resulted in the practical monopoly of the home market by colonial tobacco and in the establishment of the trade as a permanent feature in the life of the Virginia colony.⁶⁰

⁵⁵ G. L. Beer, *The Origins of the British Colonial System*, 1578-1660, ch. iv. As late as 1662 Governor Berkeley of Virginia deplored the use of tobacco in England. "The vicious ruinous plant of Tobacco I would not name, but that it brings more money to the Crown then all the Islands in America besides" (Egerton MSS. 2395, f. 354, British Museum).

⁵⁶ Berkeley tried hard to induce the Virginians to turn their attention to hemp and flax but without success (Egerton MSS. 2395, f. 362, British Museum).

⁵⁷ T. Rymer, *Foedera*. London, 1704-1735, vol. xvii, pp. 233-235; Beer, *Origins*, pp. 112, 113.

⁵⁸ *Acts of the Privy Council*, Colonial Series, vol. i, p. 48.

⁵⁹ Beer, *Origins*, p. 132. The offer of the company to ship the product to England in return for a monopoly of the home market was accepted by the government (*Acts of the Privy Council*, Col. vol. i, p. 61). As a result of this agreement the king in 1624 by proclamation forbade the importation of all foreign tobacco (Rymer, vol. xvii, pp. 621-624), a policy which was continued by Charles I (*ibid.*, vol. xviii, pp. 19, 72, 73; *Acts of the Privy Council*, Col. vol. i, p. 89).

⁶⁰ For a full discussion of the regulation of the tobacco trade, see Beer, *Origins*, chs. v-vii.

Therefore, although tobacco in Virginia had fallen in value from three shillings a pound, the price fixed in 1619, to less than two pence in 1630,⁶¹ and after that time fluctuated around six pence, it had still proved itself, because of its sure market in England, the only crop that could be grown with profit. So the Maryland colonists too, when they discovered that their extremely fertile soil was almost as favorable for the growth of the plant as that of Virginia, turned exclusively to the production of tobacco. Before 1640 it had become the staple of the country. From about 1640, also, owing to the scarcity of coin as a medium of exchange in both Virginia and Maryland, tobacco came to be used for this purpose.⁶²

As in Virginia,⁶³ so in Maryland the entire dependence of the colony on tobacco soon led to efforts to regulate both the quality and the quantity of the product. The inexperience of the planters, rather than any neglect on their part, had led to the production of a very inferior grade,⁶⁴ but they were forced by poverty to attempt to market the bad leaves as well as the good. To prevent this deterioration and to maintain the reputation of their tobacco, the Maryland Assembly during the seventeenth century passed various laws looking toward improvement of the quality;⁶⁵ but the con-

⁶¹ Beer, *Origins*, pp. 92-94.

⁶² J. L. Bozman, *History of Maryland*, vol. ii, p. 178. See also M. Jacobstein, "Tobacco Industry in the United States," in *Columbia University Studies*, vol. xxvi, no. 3, ch. i, p. 25.

⁶³ Virginia passed a number of early laws attempting to regulate the quality and quantity of her tobacco. An inspection act of 1630 (W. W. Hening, *The Statutes at Large*, vol. i, p. 152) was followed by a series of similar measures, and several statutes were also passed limiting the quantity of tobacco each inhabitant could raise (*ibid.*, vol. i, pp. 141, 142, 164, 165, 188-190, 203, 224, 225).

⁶⁴ P. A. Bruce, *Economic History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century*, vol. i, pp. 302, 303.

⁶⁵ In 1640 the Assembly passed a law decreeing that all tobacco intended for exportation should be examined by a sworn viewer, who would condemn the bad and seal the good (*Archives*, vol. i, pp. 97-99). In 1657 the packing of ground leaves or second crops was prohibited. This law was later renewed, indicating the continued necessity for it (*ibid.*, vol. i, pp. 372, 537). A later law (1676) declared that every planter should have a storehouse for his tobacco on his own plantation, so that his crop might be safely preserved (*ibid.*, vol. ii, p. 519).

tinued complaint against the Maryland product indicates that the laws were not so successfully enforced there as in Virginia, and that the Maryland crop was always regarded as slightly inferior in quality. In the second half of the seventeenth century the evils of overproduction were most seriously felt, and attempts were made to regulate the quantity as well as the quality. By 1662 the constantly fluctuating price had fallen very low, and the Privy Council, in response to an appeal from Virginia,⁶⁶ was induced to advise Virginia and Maryland to join in attempting to restrict production, in order to relieve the congested state of the English markets.

Several suggestions were made, therefore, by the colonies for the restriction of planting.⁶⁷ Unfortunately, in Maryland the question became a party issue between the large landowners of the Upper House, who could afford to cease planting for a year, and the small farmers, represented in the Lower House, whose whole livelihood was dependent on their annual crop, however low the price for it might be. When finally after heated discussion the Houses were induced to limit the quantity, Lord Baltimore, moved by the consideration of his revenue in tobacco, refused his approval. So all the attempts made between 1660 and 1685 to raise the price of tobacco by regulating the quantity proved ineffective, and in 1689 there was absolutely no law in the colony limiting the amount which any colonist could raise.

When the royal governors came to Maryland, therefore, tobacco was almost the only staple commodity,—“our meat, drinke Cloathing and monies,” as one of the inhabitants wrote home in 1698.⁶⁸ Another writes in 1705: “The Cheifest Comodity which is so much Looked affter is Tobacco which imployes all hands in every Family for with that they by there slaves and white servants as also there Cloaths and all there

⁶⁶ Cal. St. P. Col. 1661-1668, 301, 308, 312, 358, 368.

⁶⁷ Archives, vol. iii, pp. 480, 503-512, 547, 550, 558-562; vol. v, pp. 5-9, 15-20. For a later attempt to restrict overproduction see Cal. St. P. Col. 1681-1685, 3, 448.

⁶⁸ Royal Society, Letter Books, I, i, 183.

liquors as Wine, Brandy, Rum stout English Beere, etc.; and also Cattle horses sheep and they likewise buy there Land with itt there is more Paines taken to raise itt then any one thing in the world again."⁶⁹

By the end of the century the average quantity of tobacco grown annually by each colonist had fallen from about four thousand to two thousand pounds,⁷⁰ but because of the increase of population the total amount produced was much larger than in the early days of the province. The chief varieties were the sweet-scented and the Orinoco. The latter, which had a lighter and more chaffy leaf,⁷¹ was the kind produced in the greatest quantities in Maryland,⁷² whereas Virginia was famous for its sweet-scented tobacco. Although Francis Nicholson in a letter to the Treasury in 1697 expressed the opinion that the very bright Orinoco from Maryland would have a good sale in Holland,⁷³ Orinoco was in general regarded as inferior to the sweet-scented tobacco, and the Maryland product was never considered equal to that of Virginia.⁷⁴ Moreover, there was still in both colonies a constant tendency to lower the grades produced, due now not to the inexperience of the early part of the century, but to the demand of the outports in England for the poorer grades of the plant,⁷⁵ and also to the possibility of passing the poorer qualities into England customs free, as damaged by the voyage.⁷⁶ The packing of stalks⁷⁷

⁶⁹ Sloane MSS. 2291, British Museum.

⁷⁰ Sloane MSS. 2902, f. 290, British Museum.

⁷¹ C. O. 5: 727, p. 245.

⁷² C. O. 5: 717, I. 59, I. 75.

⁷³ Treasury Papers, xlvi, 39.

⁷⁴ This is indicated by the fact that in Virginia, when prices were low, it was the planting of Orinoco tobacco as the less profitable variety that was first stopped (C. O. 5: 1315, N. 8).

⁷⁵ Answer of the Commissioners for Trade and Plantations to an order of the Rt. Honble. the House of Lords of the 1st of June, 1714, relating to the Tobacco Trade, in House of Lords MSS., June 5, 1714; C. O. 5: 1317, P. 26.

⁷⁶ C. O. 5: 1316, O. 153, O. 154.

⁷⁷ Abraham Hill, who collected notes on Maryland among his "Papers concerning Trade, Taxes, etc.," in the Sloane MSS. in the British Museum, said that the unwholesome stalks of tobacco weighed one fifth part of the whole (Sloane MSS. 2902, f. 290, British Museum).

with the leaves tended further to lower the quality of the tobacco exported; but as this practice raised the amount sent over and consequently the customs, it was rather encouraged than otherwise by the authorities.⁷⁸ Some men concerned in the trade seem to have condoned the shipment of stalks to England because they could be sold dishonestly for good tobacco.⁷⁹ In spite of these influences tending to lower the quality of exported tobacco, the regulations cited below indicate that the colonial authorities in Maryland under the royal government made a somewhat greater effort to prevent deterioration in her staple commodity than they had done in the days of the proprietor. Laws were passed providing that storehouses should be erected in different places to maintain the quality of the leaf by protecting it from exposure to the weather.⁸⁰ In 1704 it was made a felony to alter the marks on hogsheads after they had been packed and graded,⁸¹ and a law was also passed against false packing of tobacco.⁸² Nevertheless, the interested endeavors of the planters to export a low grade of leaf could not easily be controlled, and Maryland did not attempt to go as far as Virginia in the passage of laws regulating quality.⁸³ Maryland tobacco, therefore, continued inferior to that of the southern colony. The efforts perhaps prevented further deterioration in the quality, but they were not successful enough to make any perceptible improvement.

⁷⁸ C. O. 5: 1308, 6.

⁷⁹ Harleian MSS. 1238, ff. 20-28, British Museum. This document asserts that stalks were often sold in England for good tobacco. "The next degree of Cheats are such as sell cutt Stalkes for best Virginia by putting a little best Virginia att one end of a pound of cutt Stalks and when people tasts it finds it to [be] best Virginia not perceiving the cheate gives them 18d. or 2s. a pound for these Stalkes Others that have sold three quarters of a pound of cutt Stalkes and one quarter of Birchen leaves for xiid. or xvid. a pound."

⁸⁰ Archives, vol. xiii, p. 469; vol. xxii, p. 516; C. O. 5: 748, A Journal of the Councell In Assembly April 27th, 1715, p. 96.

⁸¹ Archives, vol. xxvi, p. 231.

⁸² Ibid., vol. xxix, p. 328.

⁸³ In 1713 a law designed to regulate the quality of tobacco was passed by the Virginia Assembly (Hening, vol. iv, p. 37. Text not given. See also C. O. 5: 1317, p. 26).

Maryland tobacco was a staple that had constant sale in England, but most of the evidence seems to indicate that in spite of this fact the inhabitants of the colony considered themselves far from prosperous. In 1685 Mrs. Taney of Charles County complained to the king that the people in her section of Maryland were so very poor that they were not even able to support a minister.⁸⁴ The Council of Maryland, in answer to certain queries of the Board of Trade in 1697, stated that the poverty of the province was such that it alone would discourage any hostile attacks upon them.⁸⁵ Governor Nicholson suggested in 1695 and again in 1697 that this general condition of poverty and discouragement came from the action of the English merchants in spreading false reports as to the extremely low state of the tobacco trade, so that the people might not plant too much to be easily sold;⁸⁶ and Governor Seymour in 1707 supported this contention.⁸⁷ At the same time Seymour wrote à propos of some colonial disturbance, "Our poverty increases to fresh villanies;"⁸⁸ and several years later the president of the Council told the Board of Trade that many of the inhabitants were reduced to great poverty and others were in debt.⁸⁹ The Assembly of 1714 still thought the province very poor, though, as we shall see, conditions were actually somewhat better than at the beginning of the century. In answer to Governor Hart's address the Assembly said: "Tis great Satisfacon to us that your Exc^y is an Eye Witness to ye lowness of yt Ebb which this poor province in its Circumstances is reduced to, and that you are pleased to take such particular notice of it—our deplorable Condidcon being knowne wee hope ye speedier Reliefe from that Majesty that never yet denyed her royal Aid to any of her suffering Subjects that implor'd it, her

⁸⁴ Tanner MSS. xxxi, 137, Bodleian Library.

⁸⁵ Archives, vol. xix, p. 543.

⁸⁶ C. O. 5: 724, p. 197; C. O. 5: 714, 25 (iii).

⁸⁷ Seymour also said that the merchants would not send supplies to the colony, and that ships sailed from England with provision for the voyage only (C. O. 5: 716, H. 41).

⁸⁸ C. O. 5: 716, H. 41.

⁸⁹ C. O. 5: 717, I. 63, I. 46.

Majty's prevailing endeavours in ye promoting of that peace that has removed soe many burthens from our trade Justly claims ye most hearty and sincere acknowledgmt that can be made from dutifull and loyall Subjects to ye best of princes; but yet Wee fear soe farr have Wee been influenced by ye Warr that without our Sovereigns more particular Grace and favour extended to us Wee shall not be able by any endeavours of our owne to recover our lost Circumstances, nor prevent ye totall Ruin of our Tob^o trade being our onely Staple."⁹⁰ The statement of the Reverend Hugh Jones is the only one that contradicts these assertions. Tobacco, according to him, was a "Comodity so vendable especially in these Last Seven years past that thousands have gott good estates by itt Most of our planters when they began this sort of husbandry have not where wthall to Cloath themselves whereof Severall now are worth thousands of pounds. Indeed this Country hath been cheifly Seated by poor people whose Industry hath raised them to great Estates."⁹¹ Although the governors and the colonists may have somewhat exaggerated the condition of affairs, surely their evidence is on the whole of greater value than that of the comparative newcomer to the province. The poverty of many of the planters seems unquestionable.

One reason why the people were not prosperous was that they were dependent on tobacco as almost their only form of currency. It was clumsy as a medium of exchange, and its fluctuations in price led to great uncertainty in trade. It is true that there was more money in the province between 1689 and 1715 than in its earlier days, but the amount was never so great as materially to alter the use of tobacco as legal currency. Jones says: "Not but that we have money both Spanish and English pretty plenty which serves only for pockett Expenses and not for trade tobacco being the Standard for trade not only with the Merchants but alsoe among

⁹⁰ C. O. 5: 746, pp. 8, 9, Journall of the house of Delegates from 22d, June 1714 to 3d July 1714.

⁹¹ Royal Society, Letter Books, I, i, 183.

our Selves."⁹² In 1700 it was suggested that there was enough money in the province to admit the collection of the public levy for the year in coin instead of in tobacco.⁹³ The statement was made at this time that the levy had been so paid before, though evidently without legal warrant.⁹⁴ The Assembly argued that coin would make a more elastic currency and that its use would give an impetus to trade. According to the Assembly, also, the planters had not imported coin from England because they had had no use for it. Should the levy be paid in money, they would be forced to import it, and more would soon be in circulation in the province.⁹⁵ The proposition was rejected that year without comment,⁹⁶ because of Governor Blakiston's opposition.⁹⁷ At the next session the question was again raised, in spite of the fact that the Board of Trade had advised Blakiston not to make innovations in the payment of taxes.⁹⁸ The Lower House of Assembly adopted a committee report providing that the sheriffs should be obliged to receive all public dues either in money or in tobacco at the election of the payer, on the ground that, while it was desirable to have those pay money who could, it would be impossible for the poor inhabitants to procure enough coin to meet the levy.⁹⁹ Even after this date, however, it happened only once, in 1709, that there was a sufficient supply of money in the treasury for the annual disbursements to be made in coin.¹⁰⁰ The desire to keep all the coin possible in the colony was shown in the anxiety to

⁹² Royal Society, Letter Books, I, i, 183.

⁹³ Archives, vol. xxiv, p. 48.

⁹⁴ C. O. 5: 715, 8 (viii).

⁹⁵ C. O. 5: 715, 8 (viii).

⁹⁶ Archives, vol. xxiv, p. 52.

⁹⁷ C. O. 5: 715, 8, 39. Blakiston forwarded the petition of the Assembly without endorsement.

⁹⁸ C. O. 5: 726, p. 107.

⁹⁹ Archives, vol. xxiv, pp. 171-173. The report of the committee to the Lower House, though accepted by it, was apparently not referred to the Upper House, nor was it embodied in the laws of the province. As a mere report it could not have been actually put into force.

¹⁰⁰ Archives, vol. xxvii, pp. 453, 463; C. O. 5: 747, Journal of the Committee of Accounts for 1709. All the disbursements in the account are reckoned in money, not tobacco.

raise the value of Spanish money to the rate at which it was current in the proprietary colony of Pennsylvania, lest the greater cheapness of money in Maryland should drain the province of its Spanish coin.¹⁰¹ This proposal was frowned on by the Board of Trade,¹⁰² and eventually the rates of foreign coins in all the colonies were settled by the English government.¹⁰³ Later the queen was asked to send over a quantity of copper coin to pass current in Maryland alone for sums less than £5 and to be of the value at which it was designed to pass, in order that petty payments might be made more easily.¹⁰⁴ The Board of Trade apparently approved this plan, but there is no record of the receipt of any coin.¹⁰⁵ None of these efforts brought about the substitution of coin for tobacco as a medium of exchange.

Such are the general facts with regard to tobacco in Maryland during the years between 1689 and 1715. Fortunately it has also been possible to ascertain with a fair approach to accuracy, if not the actual amount of this all-important staple raised in Maryland, at least how much was exported annually to England and to the other colonies; what was its price in the colony and in the home country; and the amount of revenue which this chief export trade of the colony paid to the imperial and to the colonial government. The extent and importance of the tobacco industry in Maryland can be much more fittingly appreciated when these facts are known.

By the Navigation Act of 1660 tobacco grown in the English colonies could be exported only to England or to the English plantations. The trade was therefore to be confined to those places, and the amount sent to England and to the colonies included all that could legitimately be exported from the province of Maryland. As the home consumption could not have been large, the exportation represents approxi-

¹⁰¹ C. O. 5: 715, 39.

¹⁰² C. O. 5: 726, p. 106.

¹⁰³ In accordance with the regulations made by the queen's proclamation of June 18, 1704, and the subsequent Act of Parliament in 1707, the Maryland Assembly finally adopted rates of foreign coins (Archives; vol. xxvii, p. 350).

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, vol. xxvi, p. 530, April 8, 1706; C. O. 5: 716, H. 20, 22.

¹⁰⁵ C. O. 5: 726, p. 430; Archives, vol. xxvii, p. 439.

mately the whole amount grown in the colony.¹⁰⁶ The annual export of tobacco to England from 1689 to 1715 was as follows:—¹⁰⁷

Year	Amount	
1689	3,085	hhd ^s . ¹⁰⁸
1690	20,077	" 109

¹⁰⁶ The amount of tobacco illegally exported from Maryland is discussed in Chapter III of this monograph. This amount, so far as I have been able to discover, was not large. But since, except for the general fact that it was small, it has been impossible to make an exact estimate of the amount, it will have to be left out of this consideration along with that used in home consumption. Neither of these amounts would appreciably alter the results reached below.

¹⁰⁷ These estimates are taken partly from the list given in the Maryland Archives (vol. viii, p. 236), and partly from the Naval Office Lists for Maryland from 1689-1701 (C. O. 5: 749). The lists do not extend beyond 1701, and from that period the Custom House Accounts, Ledgers of Imports and Exports, 1698-1714, and the Inspector General's Account for 1697 must be used. A considerable amount of uncertainty must be admitted in these two sets of accounts, as the lists are sometimes missing for parts of certain years in the first set of figures, and the second set deals with Virginia and Maryland together and takes into account only the tobacco exported to England. The Naval Office Lists cited were added from Lady Day (March 25) to Lady Day as the accounts were originally arranged in that way, while the Custom House Accounts run from Christmas to Christmas. But as practically the whole export of tobacco was made in vessels sailing from the colonies in the summer months, the two winter months of January and February make very little difference in the estimates. This is, however, another reason why the results of these computations must be taken in a general way and not as specifically accurate. It must be noted, finally, that the crop which was exported was always the one grown the previous year and kept in the colony during the winter. This fact will sometimes explain discrepancies between the annual export recorded and the official statements sent home the same year telling the size of the crop then in the ground.

¹⁰⁸ In detail the amount is as follows:—

1689.	From Patuxent	2678	hhd ^s .	(Archives, vol. viii, p. 236)
	"	Pocomoke	407	" (C. O. 5: 749)
	Total	3085	"	

The records for 1689 do not give the exports of Potomac, the third district in Maryland, and in other respects are evidently very incomplete. They do not include the tobacco exported by the London fleet of that year, which may have carried away a large part of the crop of 1688 before the list of exports begins.

¹⁰⁹ 1690. From Patuxent 19,330 hhd^s. (Archives, vol. viii, p. 236)

" Pocomoke 747 " (C. O. 5: 749)

Total 20,077 "

1691. From Patuxent 5109 hhd^s. (Archives, vol. viii, p. 236)

" Pocomoke 964½ " (C. O. 5: 749)

Total 6073½ "

1691	6,073½ hhd.
1692	31,703 " ¹¹⁰
1693	24,250 "
1694	15,580½ "
1695	25,862 "
1696	17,267 " ¹¹¹
1697	32,379 "
1698	27,623 "

The great falling off in the accounts for 1691 may have been due to the disturbance and unrest caused by the government of the Associates in Maryland during the revolution. Clearly the first upheaval in 1689 did not perceptibly affect the crop exported in 1690. The decrease may have been caused by delay in shipment during the autumn of 1691. John Twitt, a skipper trading in Maryland and Delaware, wrote in December, 1691: "It is generally reported in Maryland that half the crops of corn and tobacco failed, and that of fifty or sixty ships only two or three will be ready to sail in less than three months' time" (Cal. St. P. Col. 1689-1692, 1951). This statement could not refer to the crop harvested in 1691, which must have been unusually large. Possibly the figures for Patuxent are incomplete.

¹¹⁰ 1692. From Patuxent 27,377 hhd.

" Potomac 3,306 "

" Pocomoke 1,020 "

Total 31,703 " (C. O. 5: 749)

These figures may include some of the crop of 1690, which was held over for shipment until 1692, when an unusually large fleet was in the colony.

1693. From Patuxent 20,003 hhd.

" Potomac 2,795 "

" Pocomoke 1,452 "

Total 24,250 " (C. O. 5: 749)

1694. From Patuxent 12,355 "

" Potomac 2,205 "

" Pocomoke 1,020½ "

Total 15,580½ " (C. O. 5: 749)

1695. From Patuxent 21,619 "

" Potomac 3,334 "

" Pocomoke 909 "

Total 25,862 " (C. O. 5: 749)

1696. From Patuxent 6,571 "

" Annapolis 4,092 "

" Cecil Co. 616 "

" Wm Stadt 1,951 "

" Potomac 3,767 "

" Pocomoke 272 "

Total 17,260 " (C. O. 5: 749)

In 1696 Annapolis, Cecil County, and Williamstadt were given deputy naval officers, and consequently separate lists for those districts were sent to England.

¹¹¹ The records of the years from 1696 to 1698 are good examples of the unreliability of the reports sent home in letters by the governors and by private persons as to the size of the crops each season.

1699	28,825	hhd.s.
1700	21,903	"
1701	25,686	" 112
1702	33,625	"
1703	17,797	"
1704	31,718	"
1706	17,731	"
1707	25,331	"
1708	27,925	"

1696 was reported as a bad year for tobacco (C. O. 5: 719, Bundle 4, no. 12, June 12, 1696), while 1697, on the other hand, was supposed to have been unusually good (C. O. 5: 714, 25, 36). But the shipment of the crop of 1696 in the following year was, as may be seen, very large,—larger, in fact, than the amount which went home in 1698, although that too was a fairly good crop. This discrepancy in the figures was partly due to the fact that sometimes the fleets which went to the colony were not large enough to carry away the whole of one year's crop, which had, therefore, to wait over for the next season. The size of the fleet must have had something to do with the unusual shipment of 1697, in which year there were seventy-nine vessels in Maryland as against sixty the year before (C. O. 5: 749). In this case the difference is undoubtedly due also to carelessness in the rough estimate of the size of the crops. Robert Quarry, for instance, in 1706 wrote home that nearly three hundred ships were going back from Virginia and Maryland laden with tobacco (C. O. 5: 1315, N. 63). This was an extremely large fleet, but the official figures show that the amount of tobacco imported in 1706 was rather less than usual. It has, therefore, been necessary to discount all unofficial statements about the tobacco export and to rely exclusively on the Naval Office and Custom House figures.

¹¹² From 1697 to 1701 the records of the amount of tobacco exported from Virginia and Maryland may be found also in the Custom House Accounts. The figures are for both colonies together, but a comparison of them with the Naval Office Lists, relating to Maryland alone, will show the average proportion of the whole export which came from Maryland. As the Naval Office Lists for the years 1700 and 1701 are manifestly incomplete, Potomac being excluded, it has been thought more accurate to consider only the years 1697, 1698, and 1699 in computing the percentage of all the tobacco that came from Maryland alone.

The complete lists of figures for the five years from both sources are as follows:—

1697.	From Patuxent	21,022	hhd.s.
	" Annapolis	25	"
	" Wm Stadt	3,652	"
	" Cecil Co.	907	"
	" Potomac	6,122	"
	" Pocomoke	651	"
	Total	32,379	" (C. O. 5: 749)

From Virginia and Maryland 35,328,637 pounds (Custom House Accounts, Inspector General's Accounts, vol. i).

From Maryland 32,379 hhd.s. or 12,951,600 lbs.

This calculation allows 400 pounds to the hogshead, which seems

1709	31,537	hhds.
1710	21,365	"
1711	25,711	"
1713	19,739	"
1714	26,762	" 113

to have been customary (Archives, vol. xxii, p. 481). Maryland, therefore, exported 36.6 per cent of the total export for the year.

1698. From Patuxent	14,423	hhds.
" Annapolis	6,721	"
" Wm Stadt	2,333	"
" Potomac	4,146	"
Total	27,623	" (C. O. 5: 749)

From Virginia and Maryland 31,096,571 lbs. (Custom House Accounts, Ledgers of Imports and Exports, vol. i).

From Maryland 27,623 hhds. or 11,049,200 lbs. Percentage 35.5 per cent.

1699. From Patuxent	16,729	hhds.
" Annapolis	6,575½	"
" Wm Stadt	1,094	"
" Potomac	3,137	"
" Pocomoke	1,289½	"
Total	28,825	" (C. O. 5: 749)

From Virginia and Maryland 30,640,914 lbs. (Custom House Accounts, vol. ii).

From Maryland 28,825 hhds. or 11,530,000 lbs. Percentage 37.9 per cent.

1700. From Patuxent	12,391	hhds.
" Annapolis	7,828	"
" Pocomoke	1,684	"
Total	21,903	" (C. O. 5: 749)

From Virginia and Maryland 37,166,454 lbs. (Custom House Accounts, vol. iii).

From Maryland 21,903 hhds. or 8,761,200 lbs. Percentage 23 per cent.

1701. From Patuxent	13,367	hhds.
" Annapolis	10,751	"
" Pocomoke	1,568	" and 28,240 boxes (C. O. 5: 749. It is impossible to tell how many hogsheads this would make).
Total	25,686	"

From Virginia and Maryland 31,754,126 lbs. (Custom House Accounts, vol. iv).

From Maryland 25,686 hhds. or 10,274,400 lbs. Percentage 32 per cent.

Using only the first three years in computing the average proportion of tobacco which was exported from Maryland alone, it is found to be about 36.6 per cent of the total for the two colonies. It is upon the basis of this percentage that the figures for the years from 1702-1714 are reckoned.

¹¹³ The complete records from 1702-1714 are as follows, all the figures for the two colonies being taken from the Custom House

Excluding from these estimates as manifestly imperfect the records for the years 1689 and 1691, it is seen that the average annual export of tobacco from Maryland during the years when the royal governors were in the colony was about 25,000 hogsheads or 10,000,000 pounds.¹¹⁴

Moreover, when the complete list is inspected it becomes evident that the amount of tobacco produced for exportation did not increase either in Maryland or in Virginia between 1689 and 1715. The low price received for the staple in England at the end of the century may account for this fact. At any rate, some of the inhabitants were so discouraged

Accounts, Ledgers of Imports and Exports, and the Maryland proportion of the crop being reckoned as 36 per cent.

Year	Exportation from Virginia and Maryland	Estimated Exportation from Maryland	
	In Pounds	In Pounds	In Hogsheads
1702	36,749,192	13,450,204	33,625
1703	19,451,094	7,119,100	17,797
1704	34,664,639	12,687,257	31,718
1705
1706	19,378,550	7,092,549	17,731
1707	27,684,398	10,132,489	25,331
1708	28,716,339	11,170,180	27,925
1709	34,467,005	12,614,923	31,537
1710	23,350,735	8,546,369	21,365
1711	28,100,265	10,284,696	25,711
1712
1713	21,573,111	7,895,758	19,739
1714	29,248,366	10,704,901	26,762

¹¹⁴ Since the foregoing account was compiled I have found in the Colonial Office Papers another record of the amount of tobacco exported from Maryland between 1689 and 1701. The figures are not given for each year separately, and the total is much less than that made by the addition of the Naval Office Lists of ships' ladings. The account must therefore be incomplete, but it seems worth while to insert it here for comparison both with the amount of tobacco sent to England and with that exported to the other colonies as given on page 36.

Account of Tobacco exported from Maryland

Period	Hhds.	To England		To Plantations	
		Boxes	Lbs.	Hhds.	Lbs.
1690-February, 1691/2	1,661		199	300
1692-one half 1693	1,663		469½
1693-1694	16,903		497½	5,000
1694-1696	33,427		709	21,200
1696-1698	34,736		134	23,925
1698-1700	39,343		98,729	42	1,525
1700-one half 1701	28,251	28,240	7,450	53½	5,400

C. O. 390: 6, p. 145.

with tobacco raising that they tried to turn their hands to other industries in spite of efforts made by the authorities to foster the tobacco trade.¹¹⁵ No actual decline in the trade resulted, however, for the majority of the colonists, following their naturally lazy inclinations, continued to plant tobacco as the easier although not always the more profitable occupation. On the other hand, its production did not increase, and the twenty-five years of royal government brought no marked change or improvement in economic conditions in Maryland.

In addition to the tobacco sent to England a small amount was exported to the other colonies,¹¹⁶ the figures for the years 1689-1698 being as follows:—

Year	Amount	Year	Amount
1689	220 hhds.	1694	618½ hhds.
1690	305 "	1695	244½ "
1691	285½ "	1696	237 "
1692	252 "	1697	395 "
1693	398 "	1698	250 " ¹¹⁷

The average amount exported annually from Maryland to the other plantations was therefore about 320 hogsheads or 128,000 pounds, a very small proportion of the total export.

In all probability, then, neither the amount exported to England nor that sent to the other plantations increased in the years between 1689 and 1715. Furthermore, the price which the Maryland planter received for his tobacco in the home country or in the colony also continued more or less stationary until nearly the end of the period.

¹¹⁵ C. O. 5: 716, H. 41.

¹¹⁶ In a paper on the state of New England, written by Randolph in answer to certain queries (1676), it was stated that tobacco was imported into New England from Virginia and Maryland (Add. MSS. 28089, f. 16, British Museum). Nicholson also remarked on the tobacco carried to New England (C. O. 5: 719, 18, Bundle 3, 1695), while the Virginia Council in 1708 recorded the export of some tobacco (C. O. 5: 1316, O. 25). A trade was also carried on with Barbadoes, which seems, according to most accounts, to have been somewhat larger than that with New England (Archives, vol. xx, p. 125; vol. xxv, p. 202; C. O. 5: 1309, 24; C. O. 5: 1316, O. 25; C. O. 5: 716, H. 74).

¹¹⁷ C. O. 5: 749, *passim*.

There were two ways in which the Maryland planter sold his crop. The first one was to ship it, at his own risk or insured, to a commission merchant in England, trusting the merchant to sell it for him at a price which would pay the freight, the duties, and the commission, besides insuring a profit to the planter himself.¹¹⁸ The merchant then returned European goods to the colonial exporter to the value of what he thought the profit on the tobacco consigned to him would be. If, however, he was later forced to sell at a loss or contracted a bad debt, the loss was the planter's and the latter fell into debt to the merchant. This would force him, in an effort to clear himself, to send his next crop to the same merchant. If that, too, were not profitable, the poor planter might become heavily indebted to his London firm. This was the way in which many of the London merchants preferred to conduct their trade.¹¹⁹ A paper in the British Museum shows how small the exporter's profit would be by this method of trade even in a favorable year. A hogshead of tobacco in England about 1730 brought £21. 10s., but of this amount the duty was reckoned at £16, the freight at £4, and the merchant's commission at 15s., leaving a net profit of 15s. for the planter.¹²⁰ In Rogers's *History of Agriculture and Prices* the retail prices of tobacco from 1681 to 1715 are cited somewhat higher than this figure, ranging from 2s. 6d. per pound, £50 per hogshead, for the best quality down to 1s. 3d. per pound, £25 per hogshead.¹²¹ In any case the wholesale price which the planter received would be much smaller than this retail rate. His profit therefore in the most favorable circumstances would not be large, and was always uncertain.¹²²

¹¹⁸ Add. MSS. 22265, p. 102, British Museum.

¹¹⁹ C. O. 5: 1315, N. 20, 21; Add. MSS. 22265, p. 102, British Museum.

¹²⁰ Add. MSS. 22265, p. 102, British Museum.

¹²¹ J. E. T. Rogers, *History of Agriculture and Prices in England*, vol. vi, pp. 440-448; vol. vii, pp. 372-375.

¹²² I have been unable to discover any list of the prices which tobacco brought when sold in this way in England between 1689 and 1715. All general statements about the price are therefore based entirely on the lists of prices of tobacco sold in the colonies.

The president of the Council of Maryland, writing home to the Board of Trade in 1710, said: "The Generallity of the Planters, especially such as have shipped their Tobo's to their Correspondents in London are become Greately Indebted to the Merchants, and very many of their Plantations and stocks are wholly mortgaged and forfeited to them and others Dayly Desert their Abodes for feare of being imprisoned and repair to the southern Colonys, viz^t south and north Carolina or Elsewhere to seeke new Settlem^{ts}."¹²³

The other method of selling the annual crop was to dispose of it as it stood packed in the plantations, either to the merchant's factors living there or to the ship-captains who carried it to England. Most of the outport vessels purchased their ladings in this manner.¹²⁴ This method was more certain for the planter, but gave him no opportunity to take advantage of any possible rise in the market at home. Probably, too, he had more difficulty in disposing of his crop in the colony, as so many of the merchants preferred the other method of shipment—and the planter, because he was entirely dependent on the English fleets, was at the merchant's mercy. Some tobacco, however, was annually sold in this way in Maryland, and a list of the prices paid in the colony may be compiled for a number of years.¹²⁵ These figures are as follows:—

Year	Price per Lb.
1697	1½ d.
1698	1¾ "
1699	2 "
1700	1¾ "
1701	" "
1702	" "
1703	" "
1704	" "

¹²³ C. O. 5: 717, I. 46.

¹²⁴ C. O. 5: 1315, N. 20.

¹²⁵ The figures given in the Custom House Accounts, Ledgers of Imports and Exports, of "the original cost or value" of the tobacco exported into England must represent the price paid for that part of the crop which the planters sold in Maryland.

Year	Price per Lb.
1706	1 $\frac{3}{4}$ d.
1707	" "
1708	" " 126
1709	" "
1710	" "
1711	2 $\frac{1}{4}$ "
1713	" " 127
1714	" " 128

On the whole, whether the colonist sold his tobacco in England or as it stood packed in the colony, the price which he received for it was a low one, even in good years not much more than sufficient to pay him for the expense of growing it and hardly enough to support himself and his family. The people therefore frequently complained of the low prices,¹²⁹ and threatened to cease planting if the conditions of the trade were not improved. The men most interested in the province attributed the continued low value of colonial tobacco to several causes, for some of which they suggested possible remedies. One cause was undoubtedly

¹²⁶ In 1708 Governor Seymour stated concerning the price of tobacco in the colony that those who laid out their crop with the merchants in the country got only 3s. 6d. per hundredweight, or less than $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per pound (C. O. 5: 716, H. 74). Lloyd reported in 1710 that the price of tobacco was not above 4s. per hundredweight (C. O. 5: 717, I. 46). In view of the official figures these statements are probably exaggerated, but on the other hand they may indicate that in some cases the official figures must be modified.

¹²⁷ In July, 1712, President Lloyd of the Maryland Council reported to the Board of Trade a rise in the price of tobacco (C. O. 5: 717, I. 63).

¹²⁸ During all this period tobacco was passing current for money in the plantations at the rate of 1d. per pound, although the Upper House apparently succeeded in 1704 in having it pass at the rate of 10s. per 100 pounds in payment of salaries (Archives, vol. xxvi, pp. 201, 202). Since 1671 Lord Baltimore had been accepting tobacco for his quit-rents at the rate of 2d. per pound in return for the duty of a shilling per hogshead on tobacco exported from the province (*ibid.*, vol. xxvi, p. 312; vol. xxix, pp. 161, 166, 185; vol. xxx, pp. 80, 316, 364).

¹²⁹ C. O. 5: 714, 25; C. O. 5: 717, I. 63, I. 75, I. 78, document following I. 78, not numbered; C. O. 5: 1315, N. 37; C. O. 5: 1316, O. 7, O. 60, O. 88, O. 154; Archives, vol. xxix, p. 352. A. MSS. vol. 6, letter 107, in the records of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel refers to the low price of tobacco in 1711. A clergyman in the colony writes that he "can't subsist without some assistance as Tobacco our Money is worth nothing and not one Shirt to be had for Tobacco this Year in all our Country."

the great wars which cut off from English merchants the foreign markets where they had been accustomed to dispose of their tobacco. This deprivation taught other nations from necessity to grow the plant for themselves,¹³⁰ but war alone was not felt to be a complete explanation of the distress of the tobacco colonies. After peace was declared in 1713 the Lower House of Assembly presented an address of gratitude to the queen, but stated at the same time that war was not the only reason for the poverty of the country.¹³¹ The other cause, which the colonists resented as a great hindrance to their prosperity, was the high duty levied on colonial tobacco in England, and earnest petitions for redress were sent from both Maryland and Virginia.¹³² The suggestion from the colonies that conditions might be bettered if the import duties were lowered naturally fell on deaf ears in England, and nothing was done in this direction.

The colonists had a third grievance, possibly more serious to their minds than either of the other two. They asserted that small scattered fleets often came into the colony at irregular intervals, returning home whenever they pleased with all the tobacco they could secure, a practice which interfered with the well-ordered management of the trade. This grievance was brought to the attention of the Treasury Department in February, 1706, by Robert Quarry of Pennsylvania.¹³³ He asked that only one fleet a year might be sent to the colonies, as there was but one crop of tobacco annually. The certain coming of one fleet, he claimed, would settle and fix the price in England and abroad, whereas when there was no such certainty the price tended to fluctuate more widely. Heated controversy followed in England over the effect which the adoption of this suggestion would have on the trade. The merchants of London favored an annual fleet,

¹³⁰ C. O. 5: 717, document between I. 78 and 79, Representation of the President's Council and Assembly in Maryland to the Lords Commissioners for Trade and Plantations; C. O. 5: 3, Feb. 2, 1705/6, 153; C. O. 5: 746, pp. 8, 9.

¹³¹ Archives, vol. xxix, p. 354.

¹³² C. O. 5: 717, I. 75; C. O. 5: 1316, O. 154.

¹³³ C. O. 5: 3, Feb. 2, 1705/6.

because they knew that a large part of it would come from their city. The outport merchants on the other hand, realizing that this scheme would place them at a disadvantage, contended that it would be better to have the annual crop arrive in separate consignments and be sold gradually in order to prevent the market from becoming glutted.¹³⁴ The colonies naturally supported Quarry in his contention, objecting strongly to the arrival in the provinces of small fleets at frequent intervals.¹³⁵ The representations of Quarry and the London merchants were successful, probably because of the pressure which the latter could bring to bear on the Board of Trade as well as because of the strength of their arguments; the Board therefore approved of Quarry's suggestion,¹³⁶ and in February, 1706/7, an Order in Council was issued directing a convoy to be prepared for Virginia and Maryland for that season as soon as possible, and succeeding convoys to be sent annually.¹³⁷ Unfortunately it is impossible to discover from the records whether the order was carefully observed and, if so, whether it had any effect upon the trade. As the price of the commodity was not raised until peace was in

¹³⁴ C. O. 5: 1315, N. 20, Protest of Whitehaven merchants; C. O. 5: 1315, N. 23, An anonymous letter arguing for one fleet annually; C. O. 5: 1315, N. 26, Sentiments of the merchants from Liverpool; C. O. 5: 1315, N. 31, 33, Quarry's answer to objections against his plan; C. O. 5: 1315, N. 21, An argument of some merchants trading in London against this plan.

¹³⁵ In 1695 Sir Thomas Lawrence seems to have objected to the fact that fleets came only once a year to Maryland by reason of the convoys (C. O. 5: 713, 115); but from 1697, when Nicholson asked that the fleets arrive before April, 1698 (C. O. 5: 714, 25), the colony was firm in the opinion that an annual fleet was necessary for its prosperity. Later Nicholson seems to have wanted this fleet to arrive in the autumn (C. O. 5: 1313, 4 (i), 16 (i)). "This method [the one fleet]," Virginia stated, "would be attended with abundance of good Consequences [to] the Trade, Time would be allowed for the consumption of one years Crop before the market were troubled with another, and the plenty of ships and goods in this Country at one time would make Tobacco to be more in demand, and goods more plenteous, and vendible at more reasonable Rates, and the carriage more safe and secure before the winter, which season proves commonly fatal to the Fleets, and impossible to keep Convoy in" (C. O. 5: 1315, N. 37).

¹³⁶ C. O. 5: 3, 121, April 26, 1706.

¹³⁷ C. O. 5: 1315, N. 64.

sight, it is improbable that the provision for one fleet a year made very much difference.

With the year 1711, however, the price of tobacco sold in the colony increased by $\frac{1}{2}$ penny per pound, rising from $1\frac{3}{4}$ pence to $2\frac{1}{4}$ pence per pound, a price at which it remained at least until 1715.¹³⁸ The History of Agriculture and Prices does not show an increase in the price of tobacco sold in England during this period,¹³⁹ but the evidence of the official figures for sales in the colonies indicates that even the prospect of peace with France, contrary to contemporary impressions,¹⁴⁰ must have had a somewhat favorable effect on colonial commerce. The war was about to end and the danger from French ships to disappear. Trade tended to become less restricted. The price of tobacco was still low, only $2\frac{1}{4}$ pence a pound, but at least it was higher than at the beginning of the century. This increase at the end of the period of royal government would seem to indicate that an era of somewhat greater prosperity in the production of their staple commodity was about to dawn for the colonists of Maryland.

The revenue furnished by the tobacco trade, both to the king and to the proprietor, is also of importance in the consideration of this chief export of Maryland. Although the planters, discouraged at the prevalent low prices, were not inclined to increase the amount of tobacco which they were producing, the English government, on account of the revenue, was careful to extend protection to the trade. In the beginning, it is true, the English had opposed tobacco culture and had tried to establish other industries in Maryland, but it was not long before the importance of the new commodity was seen and its almost exclusive growth was zealously encouraged. By the end of the century every governor who went to Maryland was convinced of the importance of preserving the staple and discouraging all other forms of

¹³⁸ See page 39.

¹³⁹ Vol. vii, pp. 373 iv, 374 iv.

¹⁴⁰ See the passage from the Assembly Journal of 1714, quoted on pages 27-28.

industry. Sir Thomas Lawrence, secretary of Maryland, wrote home in 1695 complaining that when few ships came into Maryland some counties in the colony "almost cloath themselves by their linnen and woollen Manufactures and plant little Tobacco which learning of one another they leave off planting." He "humbly offered" it to "Consideration whither an Act of Parliament in England ought not to pass for Prohibiting the planting of Cotton in these Colonys."¹⁴¹ The Board of Trade in a letter to Governor Seymour, 1708/9, remarked: "We are glad to find, the Inhabitants of Maryland do not apply themselves to Manufactures, which ought to be imported from this Kingdom; And We doubt not but they will be Supply'd therewith from hence, that they will not need to turn their thoughts to anything but the Culture of Tobacco."¹⁴² Again, the reason that the Commissioners of the Customs gave for repealing the bill for ports in Virginia in 1709 was that such an act would increase the ease of manufacturing in towns and prevent the due cultivation of tobacco.¹⁴³ Several other instances might also be given to show the anxiety of the home government to foster the trade. This anxiety may be easily understood when one considers the number of imperial duties levied on tobacco imported into England and the amount of revenue those duties produced.

In 1660 a law of Charles II granting a subsidy of tonnage and poundage to the king levied a duty of a penny a pound on tobacco at entry and an additional penny a pound payable nine months after importation.¹⁴⁴ No other duty was imposed until 1685, when, in spite of some opposition on the ground that any further levy would greatly discourage the trade,¹⁴⁵ a new impost of three pence a pound, payable

¹⁴¹ C. O. 5: 713, 115; C. O. 5: 1314, M. 62.

¹⁴² C. O. 5: 727, p. 112.

¹⁴³ C. O. 5: 1316, O. 44, 45, 50.

¹⁴⁴ Statutes of the Realm, London, 1810-1822, vol. v, p. 181. 12 Charles II, c. 4. In this study the references to the laws of England are all made from the Statutes of the Realm.

¹⁴⁵ Harleian MSS, 1238, f. 2, British Museum, The Advantages of the Tobacco Trade.

eighteen months after importation, was laid on all tobacco.¹⁴⁶ The duty was not again raised until 1698, when another subsidy of tonnage and poundage, increasing the rate another penny, and payable this time within three months, was given to William III.¹⁴⁷ Finally, in 1703 Anne received from Parliament a one-third subsidy grant which made the duty one third of a penny higher.¹⁴⁸ This brought the duties up to six and one third pence a pound levied on all tobacco imported into England. Certain reductions or allowances were made, however, for cash and for the prompt payment of all those duties which could be bonded for three, nine, or eighteen months as the case might be. One half of the first subsidy of a penny a pound and the whole of all the other duties were drawn back or refunded to the merchant who reexported within twelve months any tobacco that had paid the duties. In 1685 the time allowed for reexport was increased to eighteen months.¹⁴⁹ Debentures were allowed for all damaged tobacco that came into the kingdom, the collectors allowing for the amount of damage after an examination had been made by two disinterested judges.¹⁵⁰ Allowances were made for shrinkage of the amount imported during the voyage to England. To sum up: During most of the period of royal government tobacco that was consumed in England paid six and one third pence per pound duties, while that reexported was liable to a duty of one half penny per pound, both duties being materially lessened by various allowances.

That the London merchants and the colonial planters felt these duties to be too high and the regulations for their payment extremely hard, even with all allowances made, is amply demonstrated.¹⁵¹ The case of the merchants whose ships

¹⁴⁶ 1 James II, c. 4.

¹⁴⁷ 9 William III, c. 23.

¹⁴⁸ 2 & 3 Anne, c. 18.

¹⁴⁹ 1 James II, c. 4.

¹⁵⁰ 12 Charles II, c. 4.

¹⁵¹ House of Lords MSS., June 5, 1714. Mr. Beer has pointed out that of course these import duties were ultimately paid by the consumer, but that the English government and the colonists thought

lay in the Thames ten months with four thousand hogsheds of tobacco on board because the importers could not afford to pay the duties was a particularly hard one, but it well illustrated the necessity for more lenient regulations.¹⁵² The English government was too much in need of revenue to lower the duties, but the act of 1713, which encouraged the trade, besides relieving the specific case of the ships in the Thames made all the duties payable under easier conditions and made uniform allowances for damage, shrinkage, and so on.¹⁵³ This law was, however, passed only at the very end of the period of royal government in Maryland, and the revenue from tobacco which the English government received between 1689 and 1715 was for the most part collected under the old regulations.

It is possible to indicate only in a general way the actual amount of such revenue.¹⁵⁴ The gross receipts from the tobacco duties seem to have averaged about £350,000 annually,¹⁵⁵ and the net income to the government was probably

that the latter paid them. As he says, they really "affected the colonial producer only to the limited extent that they restricted the available demand by enhancing the retail price" (*The Old Colonial System, 1660-1754, part i, vol. i, pp. 35, 36*).

¹⁵² Treasury Papers, clxiv, 7.

¹⁵³ 13 Anne, c. 8.

¹⁵⁴ I have used a number of documents in attempting to find out the amount of revenue from the tobacco duties: Declared Accounts, Audit and Pipe Offices, several different collections of Treasury papers, and Stowe MSS. 316, 324, Sloane MSS. 2902, and Harleian MSS. 1238, in the British Museum. No two accounts for the same year agree at all closely, and it has been next to impossible to tell which set of figures was most nearly correct. Even the comptroller general's account and that of the receiver general of the customs in Declared Accounts were evidently in some way based on different calculations because their figures for the imposts on tobacco are quite unlike. Sometimes the accounts are made out from Christmas to Christmas, and again from Michaelmas to Michaelmas, or from Lady Day to Lady Day; some are probably not complete for a whole year, and others do not include all of the several duties. There is no way of telling what they do include. The most that can be done is to look over all these accounts carefully, and, by using those official figures which seem most nearly correct, to compute an average amount which will at least give some idea of the revenue received by the Custom House during a year.

¹⁵⁵ This account is compiled from Sloane MSS. 2902, f. 114, British Museum, for the years from 1692-1695 inclusive; and from Declared Accounts, Audit Office, Bundles 621-644, from 1695-1715.

not far from £100,000.¹⁵⁶ Of this revenue Maryland tobacco must have paid a little over one third, or about £36,000. It may be easily understood, therefore, that, for this reason if for no other, the careful protection of the tobacco industry in Virginia and Maryland was the consistent policy of the English government. Principally from this care for their revenue came the consideration of the government for the petitions of the London tobacco merchants, the anxiety to increase the continental trade in tobacco, and finally the law of 1713 for encouraging the trade. Tobacco was an import of great value to England, and the preservation and increase of the industry were objects of much care.

The interests of the British government led them not only to encourage the trade by concessions, but also to pass laws to prevent the evasion of the high duties. The importation of tobacco in bulk rather than in hogshead was prohibited mainly on this score. The chief difficulty with which the authorities had to deal was the ease with which the duty could be drawn back by debenture for reexport and the tobacco landed again without paying the duty. Proposals were made by several persons to remedy this and other defects in the customs regulations,¹⁵⁷ and a law was passed inflicting a severe penalty for any attempt to evade payment of the duties in this manner.¹⁵⁸ So, hand in hand with the systematic encouragement of the legitimate trade in tobacco went naturally a severe repression of any attempt at smuggling the commodity into England, both policies being the result of the anxiety of the government to preserve and increase its revenues.

¹⁵⁶ Treasury Accounts, Revenue Yearly, vols. i-iv, give the net receipts on tobacco after all duties have been paid as about £90,000. Harleian MSS. 1238, f. 2, British Museum, makes the net revenue on tobacco larger than this, but the figures are in round numbers and there is no way of verifying them. The revenue is given in the Harleian MSS. as from £100,000 to £130,000. Compare also Mr. Beer's account of the revenue derived from the tobacco impost between 1688 and 1692 (Old Colonial System, vol. i, p. 166).

¹⁵⁷ Harleian MSS. 1238, f. 1, f. 29, British Museum; Sloane MSS. 2717, f. 48, 54-61, British Museum.

¹⁵⁸ 8 Anne, c. 14.

Not only did the tobacco trade pay a large sum in import duties in England, but the English officials in Maryland were almost entirely supported by the income derived from an export duty levied on the commodity. The most important of the tobacco duties through which the colony obtained its revenue was the export duty of two shillings per hogshead. This duty was first levied in 1671 and continued to be imposed between 1689 and 1715. One half was used for the support of the government, while the other half went to the proprietor. When the royal government was established in Maryland, the proprietor was allowed to keep his half of the duty,¹⁵⁹ while three fourths of the half for the support of the government was paid to the royal governor and one fourth for arms for the defence of the province. Two other duties on tobacco were collected during the period of royal government. The first one, levied in 1692, was three pence per hogshead for the use of the governor during his term of office. This provision continued to be made for every governor up to 1715.¹⁶⁰ By a law, passed in May, 1695, and re-enacted in 1696, 1701, 1704, 1708, and 1714, a second duty of three pence per hogshead was levied to defray the public charges of the province.¹⁶¹ The money gained by this duty was used at first for building the church at Annapolis, but was later put to other uses as the need arose. These three laws together made the customs duty two shillings and six pence on every hogshead of tobacco exported from the province.

If it may be taken for granted that Maryland exported about 25,320 hogsheads of tobacco annually,¹⁶² then the income derived from the shilling duty, which was entirely devoted to the support of the government each year, must have been about £1266. One fourth of this, or about

¹⁵⁹ Archives, vol. viii, p. 235.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., vol. xiii, p. 441; vol. xix, p. 455; vol. xxii, pp. 480, 496; vol. xxiv, p. 416; vol. xxix, p. 442.

¹⁶¹ Ibid., vol. xix, pp. 193, 375; vol. xxiv, pp. 202, 414; vol. xxvi, p. 347; vol. xxvii, p. 372; vol. xxix, p. 443.

¹⁶² See above, pages 35, 36.

£316. 10s., was supposed to be spent annually for arms for the province, and the remainder went to pay the governor's salary. But the additional duty of three pence per hogshead, also paid to the governor, secured to him an annual salary of £1266. The extant records for specific years naturally do not agree with this estimate of the salary, which is based on the Custom House figures, but their evidence does imply that it could not have averaged less than £1266. The Account of Revenues in the Plantacons in America by John Povey (August 26, 1701) stated that in Maryland one half of the impost applied to the use of the government amounted in 1700 to £1786. 12s. 6d.¹⁶³ Mr. Blathwayt in a Report Concerning the Revenues of the Plantations in America, dated March 22, 1702/3, estimated that the half of the two shillings duty appropriated to the government for the year 1701 amounted to £1605. 15s. 6d.¹⁶⁴ A report of the Board of Trade for 1703 gave the salary of the governor of Maryland for 1701 as about £1700.¹⁶⁵ A list of governors, presented to the Committee of Accounts in England about 1711, contains the following statement with regard to Maryland: "John Corbett, Esqr appointed Govern^r. by Her Maj^{ty} in the room of the late Coll Seymour deceas'd, to whom ye Assembly had given for his Life $\frac{3}{4}$ of 2^s p Hhd on Tobacco exported & ye whole Addit^l Duty of 3^d p Hhd on Tobacco exported & 3^d p Tunn on all Ships & Vessells trading thither and not belonging to the Province, which all together amounted yearly to about £1600."¹⁶⁶ In some years, therefore, the governor must have received considerably more than £1266.¹⁶⁷ His salary was always increased by certain

¹⁶³ Treasury, 64: 89, p. 48.

¹⁶⁴ Treasury Papers, lxxxv, 22.

¹⁶⁵ Acts of the Privy Council, Col. vol. ii, p. 430.

¹⁶⁶ Treasury, 64: 90, p. 55.

¹⁶⁷ Besides the specific figures given in the text there are also in the Archives several accounts of the tobacco imposts which do not agree much more closely than the others with the stated sum of £1266. I have, however, in spite of all discrepancies, considered it best to use the lists already compiled for the amount of tobacco exported, because they are for the most part official figures, regularly added from Lady Day to Lady Day, while it is often extremely uncertain how long a time the collector's figures include.

perquisites of his office, such as fees and a small tonnage duty,¹⁶⁸ consequently the position was one not to be despised by any needy officer of the king.¹⁶⁹ The governor, moreover, was not dependent on the legislature year by year, for although the other expenses of the government were met by detailed annual appropriations,¹⁷⁰ the salary of the governor was definitely fixed from the beginning of the royal period by a permanent grant of the shilling per hogshead for his support.¹⁷¹ In case of a dispute with his legislature the governor of Maryland could afford to be less subservient than the governors of New York or Massachusetts, who were dependent on annual salary grants.

The total revenue that accrued to the royal government and to the proprietor from the export duties on tobacco in Maryland must have been about £3165 per annum. It was natural that the English authorities should demand regular accounts of their share of this revenue. Such accounts were frequently sent home, but there was often complaint that they were too general, that the vouchers for payment were not included, or that they were unsatisfactory for other

¹⁶⁸ The tonnage duty was imposed in September, 1694, for the benefit of Governor Nicholson during his term of office. This act was unlimited in its duration, and must have been in operation at least until 1700, when John Povey estimated that this duty had amounted that year to £186. 16s. (Treasury, 64: 89, p. 48).

¹⁶⁹ That the payment of the governor's salary was fairly regular the frequent accounts in the Archives imply, although a certain proportion of it was probably lost through insufficient securities for bonds or bad bills of exchange (Archives, vol. xx, pp. 247, 295-296; vol. xxiii, p. 124; vol. xxv, pp. 54, 55).

¹⁷⁰ H. L. Osgood bears witness to the care with which appropriations were made in Maryland. "In the English provinces, with the exception of New York, the proprietors and their officials were dependent from the first on their legislatures for appropriations. . . . After the middle of the century, the appropriation acts in Maryland became very detailed and specific. . . . As expenditures increased, the list of items became larger and the acts contained an ever growing accumulation of details. Under this system,—and it was one which came to exist in many of the provinces,—though the treasurers were appointed by the proprietor or his governor, and though they paid out money exclusively on the governor's warrant, the discretion of the executive in the matter of expenditures was effectively limited" (American Colonies in the Seventeenth Century, vol. ii, pp. 370-372).

¹⁷¹ Archives, vol. xiii, p. 437; vol. xxvi, p. 312.

reasons.¹⁷² The effort to keep track of the tobacco revenue and of provincial expenditure was one phase of the general attempt of the English government to control more closely the administration of the colonies.

One other branch of the revenue accruing to the government from tobacco either in England or in the colony still remains for discussion: the penny a pound on all tobacco exported to other plantations. This duty, with others, was levied by the English government in the act of 1672 "For the encouragement of the Greenland and Eastland Trades, and for the better securing the Plantation Trade,"¹⁷³ and its purpose was not so much to obtain revenue as to "prevent exportation of goods from Colony to Colony and so to foreign countries in Europe, evading the English customs."¹⁷⁴ By this act a collector was to be appointed in each province to enforce the payment of these duties from all persons exporting certain goods elsewhere than to England, Wales, and Berwick-on-Tweed. The amount of tobacco exported from Maryland to other colonies was, as has been stated above,¹⁷⁵ about 320 hogsheads per annum, or about 128,000 pounds. A duty of a penny a pound on this amount would therefore come to about £533.¹⁷⁶ Of this the British government at first received one fourth, one half went to the collector, and the remaining fourth to the surveyor of the

¹⁷² Archives, vol. xx, p. 476; Treasury, 64: 89, p. 17; Treasury Papers, lvii, 44.

¹⁷³ 25 Charles II, c. 7.

¹⁷⁴ Cal. St. P. Col. 1689-1692, 2306.

¹⁷⁵ See page 36.

¹⁷⁶ An actual account of the penny a pound in Maryland for the year 1678 has been preserved. In this year Christopher Rousby collected £347. 13s. 2d. from the duty on tobacco sent to other plantations. As this was an early account, and made for Patuxent District only, it tends to confirm the average amount of £533 collected annually during the period of royal government (Audit Office, Accounts Various, 589, The State of the Acco^{ts} of his Ma^{ties} Customs in the American Plantacons Stated wth the Acco^{ts} of his Ma^{ties} Customs in England &c. for the Yeare ending at Michas: 1678). In June, 1692, the Commissioners of the Customs stated to the Lords of the Treasury that if the duty of a penny a pound were well collected it would bring in £300 or £400 above the cost of collection (Cal. St. P. Col. 1689-1692, 2306).

customs in Maryland. In 1694¹⁷⁷ it was decided that the money from this duty in Virginia and Maryland should be paid to the College of William and Mary in Virginia, and in the following year the salary of the collector for the collection of the penny a pound was lowered to twenty per cent, with one third of all forfeitures. The duty of comptroller or surveyor of this account was assumed by the rector of the college, in order that its revenue might be increased. After this time most of the revenue from the penny-a-pound duty in Maryland was paid to the college, but it never provided a very substantial source of income.

This brings to a close the discussion of the most important staple produced in Maryland. It has been shown that tobacco was almost the only product grown for profit, and that the inhabitants were exclusively occupied in its production. While the royal governors were in Maryland the amount grown for export averaged about 25,320 hogsheads annually. The price of tobacco in England was low and the province was far from prosperous. Toward the end of the period of royal government, however, on account either of the prospect of peace, or of the annual fleets, or perhaps because the market was not glutted by a surplus amount, the price in the colony rose from one and three fourths pence per pound in 1710 to two and one fourth pence in 1711,—a fact which argued hopefully for the colonists. Almost all the tobacco raised in Maryland was apparently shipped directly to England, and the large revenue, nearly £100,000, annually received from colonial tobacco by the duties on its import gave rise to the greatest care in the protection of the industry and eventually in 1713 to the law easing the conditions of import into England. The slight rise in price, combined with this improvement in the arrangements made for collecting the

¹⁷⁷ The first proposal to pay the duty to the college was not accepted by the Commissioners of the Customs. They proposed that the collector should receive a regular salary from the proceeds of the duty, and that the tobacco, in which it was usually paid, should be sold in England. The balance, if there was any, might go to the college (*Cal. St. P. Col.* 1689-1692, 2306). For arrangement reached in 1694 and 1695 see *Archives*, vol. xx, pp. 123, 341.

duties on tobacco in England, while not altering conditions during the twenty-five years of royal government, certainly would seem to foreshadow prosperity for the future.

It was thus in line with England's general colonial policy that Maryland should devote herself exclusively to the production of tobacco, and should neglect to exploit her natural resources of fur and fish or to raise food-stuffs for exportation. There was, however, one important respect in which this attitude of the government was qualified, to wit, in regard to naval stores, to the production of which the English statesmen at the end of the century were more than willing to give definite encouragement. Indeed, from the beginnings of English colonization it had been considered desirable that the colonies should furnish naval stores in order that the English navy might not be dependent for its existence on imports from foreign and possibly hostile countries. At first in the southern colonies the production of such stores was encouraged even at the expense of tobacco as being more directly profitable to England. Maryland promoters from the beginning reported that the soil of the province was suitable for the growth of hemp and flax, and that pitch and tar could be easily obtained from the neighboring woods.¹⁷⁸ Undoubtedly the production of such commodities should be encouraged by the home and colonial governments. In 1664, when the price of tobacco had fallen very low and the colonists were greatly in debt, the English government directed that hemp, pitch, and tar be brought into the kingdom customs free for five years, for the purpose, as the Lords Committee of Trade of the Privy Council put it, of encouraging "the planters to apply themselves to the planting of other commodities which may be of more benefit than tobacco."¹⁷⁹ In Maryland the colonial

¹⁷⁸ A Relation of Maryland, p. 27. A Relation of the Colony of Lord Baron of Baltimore in Maryland near Virginia, in Force Tracts, vol. iv, no. 12, p. 7. The Relation of the Successful Beginnings of Lord Baltimore's Plantation in Maryland, in Shea, Early Southern Tracts, 1865, p. 22.

¹⁷⁹ E. L. Lord, Industrial Experiments in the British Colonies of North America, in Johns Hopkins University Studies, extra volume xvii, p. 5.

legislature supported the effort to grow hemp and flax by the passage of a number of laws, in 1671, 1683, and 1688.¹⁸⁰ Unfortunately this legislation had but little effect, and the amount of hemp and flax raised in the province during the proprietary period was inconsiderable.

By the end of the century the point of view of England concerning tobacco had radically changed, but the question of securing naval stores for her fleet continued to be a vital consideration. She was at war with France, and the trade for naval stores with the Baltic was in a most unsatisfactory condition.¹⁸¹ All the colonies, whatever their chief occupation, must be encouraged to produce naval stores also. The commission sent to America by the Board of Trade in 1698 confined its attention to the investigation of the conditions for the production of such stores in the northern colonies,¹⁸² and at first no emphasis was laid on producing them in Maryland. The importance assigned to the whole question in England, however, did influence the resident royal officials in Maryland to emphasize strongly in their letters to the home government the suitability of that province for the production of naval stores as well as of tobacco. Edward Randolph sent a memorial to William Blathwayt, the auditor general of plantation revenues in England, offering to survey the woods in the plantations, and stating that there was much oak timber for ship-building in New England, New York, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia, as well as possibilities for producing resin, hemp, flax, and saltpetre.¹⁸³ The Assembly of Maryland stated several times that if due notice were given the province was capable of furnishing in large quantities masts of all kinds, yards, bowsprits, tar, knees, pipe staves, and barrel staves.¹⁸⁴ In 1695 an address to the same effect was sent to England, and Nicholson added

¹⁸⁰ Archives, vol. ii, p. 300; vol. vii, p. 325; vol. xiii, p. 222.

¹⁸¹ See Lord, p. 56 ff., for discussion of the question of the need of England for naval stores from the colonies.

¹⁸² Lord, p. 9 ff.

¹⁸³ Treasury Papers, xvi, 20. Randolph also presented to the Board of Trade a paper on naval stores (C. O. 323: 2, 4).

¹⁸⁴ Archives, vol. xix, pp. 80, 541.

in a letter to the Duke of Shrewsbury that it was a pity that "either his Majesty, or the people of England, that want them, should have so little Benefit from Such vast quantities as these Countreys affoord."¹⁸⁵ In 1704 a proposal was made to Governor Seymour by one Andrew Tonnard, a shipwright from Deptford, that sawyers should be sent for from England and shipyards be erected in Maryland to build fourth-rate ships for the navy, and so utilize the vast stores of timber in the province.¹⁸⁶ As hemp for cordage and pitch and tar could also be easily obtained in Maryland, it would be a most suitable place for the erection of such a yard. Nothing ever came of this elaborate proposal, although Governor Seymour recognized the advantages of the province for the production of naval stores. The lower Eastern Shore was, he declared, most suitable for making tar and pitch.¹⁸⁷ He thought that many of the inhabitants had old fields worn out with tobacco which might prove good for hemp. "Masts, Yards, and Bowsprits will at present, while the ffreight of Tobacco goes so high (tho' enough to be had here) be only Supplyd from New England etc the usuall places where the Shippes go to ffetch them. Many people are Aiming at Rozin, Pitch, Tarr, and Turpentine, and believe will send home some Pitch this Shipping, But tho' we have in many places great Quantitys of Pines that will afford all these, yet for want of Skill in the Tapping, Drawing off, and otherwise Burning the Tarr kilns, it is Complained of to be too hott for the Ropes, which might be easily Corrected by art."¹⁸⁸

¹⁸⁵ C. O. 5: 719, 18, Bundle 3, 1695.

¹⁸⁶ C. O. 5: 715, 79, Bundle 1704, F. 3.

¹⁸⁷ C. O. 5: 716, H. 14.

¹⁸⁸ C. O. 5: 716, H. 22. Gerard Slys, however, who offered to supply England with naval stores from Maryland, differed from Governor Seymour in his conception of the kinds of stores most easily furnished by Maryland: "Virginia and Maryland can Supply their Majesties with Pitch, Tar, and deal Plank but New England much better because of the Infinite number of Pine trees that Country affords, tho' masts and bolesprits Virginia and Maryland can supply with better then New England the Land being richer the trees are much bigger and taller and the rivers more convenient to

The province, then, was suited for the production of naval stores, and in spite of possible difficulties in securing skilled labor,¹⁸⁹ the governors thought that all that was really needed was systematic encouragement from England. This would best be given if the colonists could be assured of a steady demand in the home country for colonial naval stores¹⁹⁰ and if they could be taught by Englishmen the methods of preparing the commodities for the home market.¹⁹¹ When the attention of the English government was called to the situation, it was willing to protect the production of naval stores provided this would not interfere with tobacco raising. "Tho' the Encouragement of the Production of Naval Stores in the Plantations being of the highest Importance to England, yet it is not fitting to be encouraged in those Places which are proper for the Production of Tobacco, and therefore you will take care therein; but that the Production of Naval Stores may be in such parts of your Governmt as are only proper for them."¹⁹² Several efforts were made to give such systematic encouragement,¹⁹³ and the law concerning naval stores in the colonies¹⁹⁴ was of course sent to Maryland, where Governor Seymour expressed his hope that it would be favorably received by the people and would result in an increase of production in that colony.¹⁹⁵ The province itself had already made laws encouraging the growing of hemp and flax for naval stores, and after considerable

take them in, and for the rest of the Species the land will produce the best of Hemp and theres Oak enough, and if the charge of bringing it for England be thought too great, if men of War be order'd to be built there that charge will be saved and they may be built for half the charge that they are built for in England; and if incouragement be given Trades-men nor labourers will not be wanting" (Letter from Gerard Slye to Mr. Povey at Whitehall, March 20, 1693/4, in C. O. 323: 1, 82).

¹⁸⁹ Archives, vol. xix, p. 541.

¹⁹⁰ Treasury Papers, xvi, 20.

¹⁹¹ C. O. 5: 719, 18; C. O. 5: 716, H. 22.

¹⁹² C. O. 5: 726, p. 429, Letter from the Board of Trade to Governor Seymour, March 26, 1707; C. O. 5: 716, H. 14.

¹⁹³ C. O. 5: 713, 117, 117 (i); C. O. 5: 1260, 76; C. O. 5: 715, Bundle 1705, G. 31. See also quoted comments of colonial governors.

¹⁹⁴ 3 & 4 Anne, c. 9.

¹⁹⁵ C. O. 5: 716, H. 14, H. 22.

effort,¹⁹⁶ in 1706 a new act was passed in response to the appeals of the government at home and of the royal officials in the colony.¹⁹⁷ The colonial law made it obligatory for any creditor to accept good hemp and flax at fixed rates in payment of one fourth part of any debt.

But in spite of the planters' assertions, they needed more than government support to enable them to send large quantities of naval stores to the home country. Whatever may have been the reasons—and probably the principal one was simply the preoccupation of the colony with tobacco-raising—the production of naval stores in Maryland was more or less of a failure. During the whole period of royal government no hemp or flax was exported to England, and the preparation of large timber for the navy was almost equally unsuccessful.¹⁹⁸ Only the smaller kinds of wooden products, principally pipe and barrel staves, were exported in any appreciable quantities, and that not until after the beginning of the century. In 1715 Maryland and Virginia together exported about 3610 hundred pipe staves and 1115 hundred barrel staves to England. In the same year 189 last (12 barrels) of tar and pitch were sent over from the two colonies, but Maryland's proportion is uncertain. Even after the passage of the English bounty law of 1705 the exportation of any variety of naval stores increased but slowly.¹⁹⁹

The value of these exports was also, of course, small. In 1694 Gerard Slye of Maryland was willing to contract for tar delivered in the province at £5. 4s. per last, and for pitch at £4. 16s. per ton,²⁰⁰ but since the two provinces together never exported more than 189 last in any one year between

¹⁹⁶ Archives, vol. xix, p. 149.

¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, vol. xxvi, p. 632.

¹⁹⁸ It has been possible to obtain a complete account of the naval stores exported from Maryland and Virginia between 1697 and 1715 from the Custom House Accounts, Ledgers of Imports and Exports, vols. i-xvii, and C. O. 390: 8, 6. These accounts are printed in full in Appendix I to this study.

¹⁹⁹ See Appendix I.

²⁰⁰ C. O. 323: 1, 82 (i).

1689 and 1715, the value to Maryland of the pitch and tar trade was very small. Pipe and barrel staves were really the only profitable ventures in timber exportation. As pipe staves brought about 15s. per hundred in the colony,²⁰¹ the profit must have been considerable.

The conclusions of this chapter on the staple products of Maryland may be broadly stated. The colonial authorities never succeeded in inducing the inhabitants to turn their attention to exporting furs or fish or food-stuffs, and the royal governors at the end of the century not only acquiesced in the natural line of economic development in the colony, but did everything in their power to foster the growth of tobacco. This was to an even greater extent the aim of the English government, which the colonial governors represented, but on account of the necessities of the English fleet the home authorities were forced to make one exception to their policy in the encouragement of the production of naval stores in Maryland as well as in the other colonies,—an effort that proved to be futile. The staple commodity of Maryland was, and continued to be, tobacco, and with a few minor exceptions it was tobacco only that was produced in sufficiently large quantities to be exported to England or to the English colonies.

²⁰¹ Custom House Accounts, Ledgers of Imports and Exports, vols. i-xvii.

CHAPTER II

IMPORTS

We have seen that the staple product of the colony of Maryland was tobacco, and that almost all of that part of the crop which was exported had to be sent directly to England. It is clear, therefore, that most of the commodities imported must have come from England, and must have been obtained either as purchases made by the planters from the profits of their sales in England or as ventures sent over by English merchants, to be sold in the colony for a return cargo of tobacco. From the records this is found to be the case. For example, traders to Virginia and Maryland in 1689 asserted that those provinces depended on them wholly for clothing and other necessities from England.¹

This natural tendency received systematic encouragement in the home country. English statesmen, who had at first been more interested in the colonies as sources of supply for raw materials,² were now realizing their value as outlets for home manufactures.³ By the end of the century the planters of Virginia and Maryland were pointedly and repeatedly enjoined to import not only their luxuries but practically all their necessities from the home country. The inducement afforded by the natural course of trade and the added exhortations of the authorities amply secured the desired result. But while English manufactures constituted by far the largest and most important class of imports into Mary-

¹ Cal. St. P. Col. 1689-1692, 579. The Virginia Council stated in 1708 that that colony traded mostly with Great Britain for manufactured goods from the home country (C. O. 5: 1316, O. 25).

² Beer, *Origins*, p. 73.

³ Harleian MSS. 1238, f. 2, British Museum. See also Quarry's statement to Lord Godolphin in 1706 that the tobacco colonies were a market for English manufactures (C. O. 5: 3, 112).

land, they were not the only imports from British sources, the trade being further swelled by the importation of continental and Asiatic goods which, in accordance with the provisions of the Navigation Acts, had for the most part to be shipped to the colonies by way of England as an *entrepôt*.

An idea of the great amount and variety of these goods sent to Virginia and Maryland during the period of royal government may be gained from the sample list of English exports to those colonies, taken from the Custom House Accounts for 1699,⁴ and printed in Appendix II of this monograph. Evidently the British manufacturers supplied most of the necessities of colonial life, ranging from shovels, soft soap, and candles to great quantities of woollen cloths of qualities good, bad, and indifferent. The importation of home products was by no means confined to stern necessities; it included chariots, window-glass, stitched gloves, stays, looking-glasses, and perukes. Learning was supposed to be at a low ebb in Maryland at the end of the seventeenth century, yet almost every fleet brought boxes of books, maps, and pictures. In 1699 there were even two printing presses and letters (presumably type) and some mathematical instruments. From the continent and from the far east came groceries and spices, all kinds of linens, some of very handsome quality with elaborate eastern names, silks, wines, drugs, some paper fans, and toys made perhaps in Germany. It must indeed have been true, as the colonists said, that Virginia and Maryland depended almost wholly on England for their clothing as well as for many other necessities of life.⁵ Colonial manufactures could not have been of much importance when such large quantities of woollen and linen goods, of coarse as well as fine quality, and of leather, hats, and wrought iron were annually imported.

Such lists as these from the English Custom House indicate that the colonists had passed beyond the early stages of their

⁴ Custom House Accounts, Ledgers of Imports and Exports, vol. iii.

⁵ Cal. St. P. Col. 1689-1692, 579.

economic life. They imported only small quantities of food-stuffs from England. They no longer wanted only such articles as were needed to maintain life in the wilderness, the coarser sorts of clothing, arms and ammunition, and different kinds of agricultural implements. These commodities continued in demand of course, presumably for the use of the smaller planters, servants on the great estates, and frontier settlers, but in addition planters in the older settlements were demanding a greater variety of products, including the luxuries as well as the necessities of life. The large market for such things as East Indian fabrics presupposes a certain degree of comfort and some pretensions to the amenities of social intercourse.

With the increased demand for greater variety, foreign articles of all kinds and descriptions, expensive and cheap, useful and ornamental, were widely distributed throughout the province. The more costly imports must have been procured from England or purchased from incoming vessels by wealthy planters from different parts of the provinces, and stored by them on their plantations for future use. A colonist of good family and estate in almost any section of the province would leave at his death, besides his house, live stock, and negroes, large quantities of imported furniture, linen, and so on.⁶ For example, the inventory of the estate of Madam Henrietta Maria Lloyd of Talbot County on the Eastern Shore,⁷ made in the year 1697, shows that she died possessed of a stock of furniture, bedding, linen, woollen goods, and personal clothing which would not be scorned by any woman of the present day living far from a large city. Many ells of English canvas, crocas, dowlas, ozenbrig, and kersey were inventoried, with enough pins, needles, thimbles, tape, buttons, and so on, to equip a modern dressmaking establishment. Many varieties of farm utensils and carpen-

⁶ Collection of Inventories and Accounts at Land Commissioner's Office in Annapolis, Maryland.

⁷ Inventories and Accounts, vol. 15, f. 198, ff.

ters' tools, servants' clothing, coarse woollen goods,⁸ shoes, hats, and so forth, had been imported by her and formed considerable assets of the estate. In the house itself were no less than fifteen beds or mattresses (whether bedsteads or not is not stated), most of them with hangings and furnishings, eight looking-glasses, and numerous chairs, chests of drawers, and carpets. Madam Lloyd had accumulated a stock of foreign linen amounting to twelve table-cloths of varying qualities, eight dozen and three napkins, twenty-six pairs of sheets, and ten pairs of pillow-cases.⁹ Her own personal clothing was evidently handsome and adequate to most occasions: she rejoiced in the possession of eleven gowns and petticoats, some of them of silk and satin, one mantle, three coats, three pairs of stays, nine pairs of shoes, five pairs of silk stockings, and four headdresses, besides many smaller articles of clothing and a pearl necklace, not, however, of great value. Her complete outfit was worth £86. 15s. 6d., no mean sum for a woman of her day exiled in the colonies. Madam Lloyd was clearly a great lady, and the presence in the colony of other ladies and gentlemen of similar rank explains the necessity for a variety and a wide distribution of British and foreign manufactures. This and similar inventories of estates also support the declaration of Hugh Jones, quoted in Chapter I, that some planters had gained great estates by tobacco growing. The larger ones at least were evidently not so poor as they believed themselves to be.

⁸ Most of the coarse woollen goods must have been foreign in origin, because it was evidently carefully stated when such was not the case, as in the following two items in the account: "1¼ [yd.] of this Countrey Cloth 1s. 8d. 2 petty Coates 2 Waste coates and 2 pr of Draw^{rs} of this Countrey Cloth £1. os. od." (Inventories and Accounts, 15, f. 198).

That other articles mentioned in these inventories were largely of foreign origin seems indicated by the fact that they are nearly all mentioned in the Custom House Accounts of British and foreign manufactures imported to Virginia and Maryland, for a sample list of which see Appendix II. Of most of these articles, moreover, there is no record whatever of local manufacture.

⁹ Or "pillowberes" as they seem to have been called at that time.

It was not only the wealthiest classes that patronized the English merchants; less important families as well made almost exclusive use of foreign products. More modest estates were those of Major Robert King of Somerset County and Mr. John Hewitt, minister of Stepney parish, but their possessions also included for the most part articles which must have been imported. Major King left an estate valued at £629, consisting largely of imported furniture, household goods, and various kinds of hardware.¹⁰ Mr. Hewitt left behind him a library worth £12; some broadcloth, serge, dowlas, holland, and other materials; five feather beds, three silver spoons, one silver cup, one pair of silver buckles, three pewter porringers, fourteen pewter spoons, and a pair of fringed gloves.¹¹ Probably all these articles came from England.

Even the inventories of poor men's estates contained such things as ozenbrigs,¹² iron pots, and brass kettles,¹³ which were probably of foreign manufacture. It is quite clear, then, that the British and foreign manufactures brought into Maryland were varied in character and extent, ranging all the way from expensive luxuries to the commonest necessities of life, and that they were widely distributed throughout the province.

The amount and value of the goods thus imported varied considerably from year to year.¹⁴ The total for Virginia and Maryland in 1699 was £205,078. os. 2½d.,¹⁵ but this was unusually large, the average being about £135,000.¹⁶ Of this amount Maryland probably received about one third, the equivalent of her share of the exports of the two colonies.

¹⁰ Inventories and Accounts, 19, f. 62.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 16, f. 219.

¹² *Ibid.*, f. 60.

¹³ *Ibid.*, f. 162.

¹⁴ The imports seem to bear no immediate relation to the exports. That is, a small tobacco crop sent to England one year did not necessarily mean a proportionately meagre supply of manufactures imported the following year.

¹⁵ Add. MSS. 29903, f. 1, British Museum.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, *passim*, ff. 1-17. The average is computed for the years from 1699 to 1715.

On the whole, it is no wonder that the English government was anxious that this trade should be preserved.

It is true that the value of the raw materials exported from Virginia and Maryland—most notably, of course, tobacco—generally exceeded the value of the English and continental imports.¹⁷ The following list of imports and exports from 1699 to 1715 will show this clearly. As the list is from an English source, the words 'imports' and 'exports' used in the list are to be reversed when applied to the colonies. The figures show an excess of imports into England, that is, of exports from America.

THE IMPORTS AND EXPORTS COMPARED WITH THE EXCESS FOR EACH COUNTRY

For Virginia and Maryland

Year	Imports £.	Exports £.	Excess of Imports £.	Excess of Exports £.
1699	198,115	205,078	—	6,962
1700	317,302	173,481	143,821	—
1701	235,738	199,683	36,055	—
1702	274,782	72,391	202,391	—
1703	144,928	196,713	—	51,785
1704	264,112	60,458	203,654	—
1705	116,768	174,322	—	57,553
1706	149,152	58,015	91,136	—
1707	207,625	237,901	—	30,275
1708	213,493	79,061	134,432	—
1709	261,668	80,268	181,400	—
1710	188,429	127,639	60,790	—
1711	273,181	91,435	181,645	—
1712	297,941	134,583	163,357	—
1713	206,263	76,304	129,959	—
1714	280,470	128,873	151,597	—
1715	174,756	199,274	—	24,518 ¹⁸

The principal export of the two colonies, however, paid heavy customs duties to the government, and much of it also was reexported to the Continent in manufactured form. So

¹⁷ Sloane MSS. 2902, f. 171, British Museum, Report of the Lords of Trade and Plantations on the State of Trade in England.

¹⁸ Add. MSS. 29903, ff. 1-17, British Museum. These figures have been compared with the Custom House Accounts, Ledgers of Imports and Exports, and with one or two unimportant exceptions have been found to correspond exactly.

even the mercantilist writers thought that the trade was enriching the kingdom, and laid no emphasis on the fact that the actual balance was against England.¹⁹

In Maryland there was not so much satisfaction manifested at the state of the trade. The amount of tobacco exported to England varied largely from year to year. The English merchants naturally were loath to import into Maryland and Virginia large quantities of British and foreign manufactures which in the event of a bad harvest might be left on their hands.²⁰ As there was no foreign competition, the merchants had the colonists completely at their mercy, and even in average years the supply of goods imported seems to have been barely adequate to meet the needs of the inhabitants. At times it certainly fell far below the average requisite amount. In the bad years complaints were frequent from both colonies that they were entirely dependent on these English imports, that the quantity they were receiving did not suffice to supply their needs, and that the dearth of manufactures was causing great distress in the country. In 1704, for instance, a scarcity of goods was reported.²¹ The next year it was asserted in Virginia that, "the quantity of Goods and especially of Cloathing imported of late, not being sufficient for supplying the Country, Many of the Inhabitants, . . . have this last year, planted a considerable quantity of Cotton."²² Governor Jennings of Virginia said in 1714 that the planters were "in the most want of Cloaths and the fewest Goods in the Country that I ever knew,"²³ and Governor Seymour of Maryland stated the whole case quite clearly to the Board of Trade, representing to them what he considered to be the pitiful condition of the planters.

¹⁹ J. Gee, *The Trade and Navigation of Great Britain Considered*, 6th ed., p. 20. In spite of the trade balance in their favor, Virginia and Maryland received very little actual coin from England, the difference probably being made up in the form of bills of exchange drawn on London to pay for slaves and goods bought from other colonies.

²⁰ Bruce, vol. ii, p. 336.

²¹ C. O. 5: 1314, 21.

²² C. O. 5: 1315, N. 8.

²³ C. O. 5: 1315, N. 89.

The people, said Seymour, "being in debt to the Merchants Consignees in England, they Send them little or no goods at all, most of the Shippes coming from London, upon freight, in their Ballast with their provisions only for the Voyage, So that many people here are almost starke naked, which has occasioned Some to turne their hands to manufacture of Linnen and Woollen, and if your Lordships in your Wisdom do not find out Some Expedient to have the Necessity of the Country relieved, by obliging the Merchants to Send Supplis, it may be of ill Consequence to the Revenue arising on tobacco, which will be in greate measure layd aside by Such who find they can have nothing for it."²⁴ One paper on the state of trade in Virginia and Maryland in 1714 even went so far as to assert, with considerable exaggeration, that the importation of English manufactures to those colonies had fallen off one half in recent years.²⁵ Clearly the colonies themselves were far from satisfied with the condition of their trade with the home country, and their supply of foreign goods, although perhaps large enough to please the authorities at home, did not suffice to meet colonial demands.

The colonial governors did not confine themselves to pleading the pitiful condition of the inhabitants. They went on to show that in their opinion this inadequate supply of goods would drive the colonists to manufacturing on their own account. Governor Nicholson warned the Lords of Trade in 1695 that if ships did not come from England "to fetch the Tobaccos, and bring a good quantitie of linnen and woollen, working Tools, and other necessarys, it may put the people upon cloathing themselves," but he said that if enough ships came with suitable cargo, "the planters will mind nothing but planting, and leave of other projects."²⁶

²⁴ C. O. 5: 716, H. 41. The same reference is to be found in Archives, vol. xxv, p. 266. See also C. O. 5: 716, H. 22, H. 74.

²⁵ C. O. 5: 1316, O. 160.

²⁶ C. O. 5: 724, p. 198. Nicholson makes a somewhat similar statement in a letter to the secretary of state (C. O. 5: 719, 18, Bundle 3). Cf. also Sir Thomas Lawrence's memorial to the Lords of Trade, 1695 (C. O. 5: 713, 115).

The Virginians blamed the low price of tobacco for the lack of clothing, a lack which had "put them upon making diverse Manufactures themselves."²⁷ If the colonists were not clothed by English manufactures, they would learn to clothe themselves, and the demand for those English manufactures would soon cease entirely. That, at least, was the argument of the colonial governors.

Letters like these evidently lessened the satisfaction of English statesmen with the condition of the trade with the tobacco colonies at the end of the century. That the colonists might take to manufacturing and therefore compete with English goods was a most disconcerting suggestion. What a calamity it would be should Virginia and Maryland no longer provide an annual market for home and foreign products! The Commissioners of the Customs moved the disallowance of the Act for Ports in Maryland, on the ground that it would encourage manufacturing and prevent the due cultivation of tobacco.²⁸ The Board of Trade told the Maryland authorities that all manufactured articles ought to be sent from England.²⁹ It asked them where the people now got those manufactures with which the home country had formerly supplied them.³⁰ It promised to try to induce the merchants to send over enough to supply the colony at a reasonable rate.³¹ When Governor Seymour complained that the importations were not large enough to answer the needs of his province, he was told that the merchants had been informed of his complaint and that the matter would doubtless be remedied, a statement repeated in 1708.³² As a matter of fact these hopes for an adequate supply were not realized during the period of royal control in Maryland. Nevertheless, according to the English point of view, English imports must be protected even at the cost of colonial

²⁷ Egerton MSS. 921, f. 9, British Museum, *The State of the Virginia Trade*, by Arthur Bayley, 1708.

²⁸ C. O. 5: 1316, O. 44.

²⁹ C. O. 5: 727, p. 112.

³⁰ Archives, vol. xx, p. 500; C. O. 5: 726, p. 437.

³¹ Archives, vol. xxiii, p. 350.

³² C. O. 5: 726, p. 472; C. O. 5: 727, p. 112.

interests. The merchants were to be urged to supply the demand, but even if they refused to do so the colonists were not to be allowed to manufacture for themselves, lest ultimately the market for English goods should be lost.

What meantime was the attitude in Maryland toward colonial manufactures? Had the colonial officials always consistently supported the British government in the attempt to forbid the development of colonial industry to meet colonial needs, or had their point of view changed with the arrival of the royal governors? How much inclined, also, had the province ever been to develop any real manufacturing on its own account? It may be said in answer to the first of these questions that while the proprietary government was in control in Maryland there was certainly no official discouragement of manufacturing on the part of the representatives of the proprietor, and little attention was paid to the opposition of England. Indeed, as in Virginia,³³ the colonial government was not averse to direct encouragement of home production. As early as 1662 an ordinance prohibiting the exportation of untanned leather was issued by the governor and Council for the encouragement of tanners,³⁴ and a statute to the same effect was passed in 1681.³⁵ In 1682 Maryland and Virginia both passed laws encouraging the making of linen and woollen cloth.³⁶ The Maryland act was renewed in 1688 at the instance of the Upper House of Assembly.³⁷ This house also asked for a grand committee to debate the question of promoting husbandry, the sowing of hemp and flax, the encouraging of the making of linen and woollen, and the encouraging of tradesmen to inhabit towns and carry on manufactures.³⁸ The policy of the colonial authorities during the proprietary period must therefore have been directly

³³ Bruce, vol. ii, pp. 457-458.

³⁴ Archives, vol. iii, p. 457.

³⁵ Ibid., vol. vii, p. 206.

³⁶ Ibid., p. 324; Hening, vol. ii, p. 503.

³⁷ Archives, vol. xiii, p. 220.

³⁸ Ibid., p. 169.

opposed to that of the home government. They considered that certain forms of industry would be distinctly beneficial to the colony, and did what they could to foster their development.

Enough has already been said to show that when the royal governors came to Maryland the policy of the executive fell into line with that of England. The governors told the inhabitants of the English objections to colonial manufacturing, informed the home government of the exact progress of different industries from year to year, and aroused the fears of merchants and manufacturers that colonial goods might at no far distant date compete with their own importations.³⁹ Apparently the Maryland Assembly followed the royal policy with reluctance, for at least one definite attempt to pass an act encouraging the planting of cotton, flax, and hemp was checked by the governor.⁴⁰ On the whole, however, the attitude of the executive forced the colonial government to support the home authorities, and prevented any legislation encouraging Maryland industries.

The second question with respect to the colonial attitude toward domestic manufactures remains to be answered. How far was Maryland at this time naturally inclined to develop home industries? Did the discouraging prohibitions of the British government and of the colonial authorities under its control really crush any incipient manufactures which might have increased the prosperity of the colony? Contemporary testimony all goes to show that Maryland had practically no incipient industries which, even if not interfered with, could have reached any considerable propor-

³⁹ See Seymour's letter to England quoted above. Other letters from the different governors express similar fears.

⁴⁰ C. O. 5: 713, 115; C. O. 5: 1314, M. 62. Virginia had passed two sets of acts for the encouragement of manufactures, one establishing a premium on hemp, flax, or manufactured articles, and the other making these commodities legal tender for debt. The premium law was not in force between 1684 and 1693, nor after 1699, and the debt act during only part of this period (Hening, vol. ii, pp. 503, 506; vol. iii, pp. 16, 30, 50, 121). See also on the Virginia policy C. O. 5: 713, 115, and Colonel Jennings's statement that Virginia encouraged manufactures (C. O. 5: 1316, O. 7).

tions. In fact, both Virginia and Maryland were agricultural communities, primarily interested in the cultivation of their one staple, and they turned to any form of manufacture only with the greatest reluctance. Governor Nicholson's statement in 1695 that the planters cared nothing for manufacturing when the English ships brought in suitable cargoes has already been quoted.⁴¹ He expressed a similar opinion to the secretary of state, that if no goods came the planters might clothe themselves, for "Necessity hath no law, and is the Mother of Invention."⁴² The same paper on the state of the tobacco trade which commented on the ill effects of manufacturing said that the people of Maryland and Virginia took it up "out of Meere Necessity."⁴³ Governor Spotswood of Virginia was sure also that the colonists there manufactured more from necessity than from inclination.⁴⁴ A representation of the Virginia Council in 1713 complained of the pitiful state of the people, and said that some of them had already stopped raising tobacco and "betake themselves to Manufactures of Cotton, flax and hemp, which they would never have thought of, had tobacco but yielded them a living price."⁴⁵ Clearly the tobacco colonies would manufacture for themselves only when literally driven to it. They had discovered long before this that their economy was unfavorable to the development of any kind of manufacturing interests on a large scale,⁴⁶ and that at almost all times, in

⁴¹ See page 65.

⁴² C. O. 5: 719, 18.

⁴³ C. O. 5: 716, H. 75; C. O. 5: 1316, O. 25.

⁴⁴ C. O. 5: 1316, O. 88.

⁴⁵ C. O. 5: 1316, O. 153.

⁴⁶ "In this province [Maryland], as well as in that of Virginia, the planters live mostly in separate situations and not in towns, for the convenience of the great number of rivers, and of creeks and in-lets of the great Bays of Chesapeak and Delawar, whereby they so easily convey their tobacco to the ships: so that in neither of those colonies are there as yet any towns of considerable bulk or importance. For the greater planters have generally storehouses within themselves, for all kinds of necessities brought from Great Britain, not only for their own consumption, but likewise for supplying the lesser planters and their servants, etc.— And, whilst that kind of œconomy continues, there can be no prospect of towns becoming considerable in either province; which is so far a benefit

spite of temporary scarcities of British and foreign goods, it was on the whole to their own "economic advantage to produce tobacco, to sell it in England, and out of its proceeds to buy English manufactures."⁴⁷

Naturally this does not mean that there was no manufacturing of any kind in the colony.⁴⁸ Thrifty housekeepers made coarse cloth to clothe their families, occasionally a venturesome inhabitant attempted to produce primitive articles of home manufacture for sale, and one or two small industries were developed in connection with the tobacco trade. Coopers and carpenters flourished in Maryland and Virginia where there was most need for their trades,⁴⁹ but the absence in the records of any mention of other kinds of artificers makes it probable that they were few in number.

Aside from carpentry, the most considerable activity of the inhabitants was that of spinning and weaving small amounts of wool, flax, or cotton for clothing, especially in the years when English imports were scarce. Such activity naturally developed on the individual plantations and not in any centre. The purely domestic form which this industry took is best shown by different reports from the colonies. Colonel Nott of Virginia wrote home that "Many of the Inhabitants, and more particularly in the Countys where they plant Aronoco tobacco, have this last year, planted a considerable quantity of Cotton, which they have manufactured with their wooll, for cloathing their familys, and others have sowed Flax, and made Linnen."⁵⁰ The Council of Mary-

to their mother country, as without towns, wherein home manufactures and handicrafts are generally first propagated, they must continue to be supplied from Britain with cloathing, furniture, tools, delicacies, etc." (A. Anderson, *An Historical and Chronological Deduction of the Origin of Commerce*, Dublin, 1790, vol. ii, p. 467).

⁴⁷ G. L. Beer, "The Commercial Policy of England toward the American Colonies," in *Columbia University Studies*, vol. iii, no. 2, p. 70.

⁴⁸ An answer to queries of the Board of Trade stated that only about one sixtieth of the inhabitants of Maryland did not plant tobacco (*Archives*, vol. xix, p. 540).

⁴⁹ See laws on coopers and gage of tobacco hogsheads in Maryland Assembly Records.

⁵⁰ C. O. 5: 1315, N. 8.

land told the Board of Trade in 1697 that the colony had no general supply of woollen manufactures except from England, although necessity had taught some of the inhabitants to use the native wool of the province for coarse stockings and clothing for servants and slaves.⁵¹ Governor Seymour reported that "Pinching Want has put some few on making of a little Linnen and Woollen but not sufficient to Supply their owne familys."⁵² In 1713 the Council of Maryland petitioned the Board of Trade for relief from poverty, and affirmed that "had not many people Applied themselves to Spinning the little wooll their Small flocks of Sheep afford, and likewise some Small Quantitys of Flax, they would have Suffered very much for want of Necessary Cloathing, which too many, not So carefull, and Industrious have wofully Experienced."⁵³

Even this domestic form of manufacture, though it caused the English officials such needless apprehension, was confined almost entirely to the Eastern Shore. Hugh Jones wrote to England in 1698 that "We have little or no woollen or Linnen manufactures . . . (Except what is done in Somerset County over the Bay) because we are yearly Supplied from England wth necessaries."⁵⁴ Governor Nicholson stated that "Somerset County in this province (into which, about 10 or 11 year past came 6 or 700 of ye Scotch-Irish from Ireland) doth allredy well nigh cloath ymselves, and others: and ye next County learns of ym."⁵⁵ Thus it was practically only in the places farthest removed from the British sources of supply that cloth-making developed to any marked extent, and even there it was of such small proportions and so purely domestic that the English Wool Act of 1699⁵⁶ had no effect upon it.

⁵¹ Archives, vol. xix, p. 540.

⁵² C. O. 5: 716, H. 74.

⁵³ C. O. 5: 717, I. 75.

⁵⁴ Royal Society, Letter Book, I, i, 183.

⁵⁵ C. O. 5: 714, 25 (iii); C. O. 5: 716, H. 74; Archives, vol. xix, p. 542.

⁵⁶ 10 William III, c. 16.

The only other industry which was large enough to find a place in the records of the period was that of tanning leather and making shoes. The exportation of untanned leather was prohibited by ordinance in 1662 and by statute in 1681, 1692, and 1712.⁵⁷ An attempt was made in 1695 to improve the quality of leather tanned in the province, but apparently nothing was accomplished.⁵⁸ Aside from these laws, statements with regard to the making of shoes are rare. In the session of 1695 the Lower House of Assembly thought it advisable that tanners be obliged to make shoes of a certain amount of durability.⁵⁹ Governor Seymour at one time remarked, "As to Manufactures here they are inconsiderable Shoes being the Chiefest, and those not to be had but at farr dearer rates then from Great Brittainne."⁶⁰ Tanning and shoemaking and the manufacture of linens and woollens were the only industries considered worthy of mention by Governor Andros of Virginia.⁶¹ Since these are the only references on the subject during the period of royal government in Maryland, it is evident that the inhabitants preferred on the whole to import their shoes as well as other manufactured articles from England.

As early as 1720 Governor Hart of Maryland reported that there was a great quantity of iron ore in the province but that it was not worked for want of skilled labor.⁶² The development of the iron mines at the head of Chesapeake Bay was begun about ten years after this date.⁶³ The industry was exploited by a company of English merchants who sent over managers and set up a forge at Principio. This company seems to have made little money at first, although mention is made in a letter of sixteen tons of pig

⁵⁷ Archives, vol. iii, p. 457; vol. vii, p. 206; vol. xiii, p. 496. The act of 1692 expired in 1695, and there was no further legislation on the subject until 1712 (*ibid.*, vol. xxix, p. 191).

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, vol. xix, p. 183.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

⁶⁰ C. O. 5: 716, H. 74.

⁶¹ C. O. 5: 1309, 24.

⁶² C. O. 5: 717, I. 106.

⁶³ Papers Relating to America, Carew Papers, 1725-1775, in Add. MSS. 29600, British Museum.

iron shipped on one vessel; in 1736 the company evidently feared competition from some new mines on the Patapsco which had already secured a good reputation for their iron. The detailed history of this industry belongs to a later time.

During the period of royal government, moreover, there is not a single record of the export from Maryland of articles of native manufacture.⁶⁴ It is clear that in this period the colony developed no industries either for home use or for export that could cause any immediate anxiety even to the most zealous royal governor.

Before passing to the discussion of minor imports it seems necessary to mention another problem to which the trade in British imports gave rise. Although the occasional scarcity of British manufactures and of European goods and the consequent suffering of the people did not tempt the inhabitants to manufacture for themselves, they gave rise to an acrimonious controversy with Pennsylvania over the subject of European goods which increased the already strained relations with that colony. The Maryland government thought that it was bound to keep all imported foreign commodities in the province. Consequently every precaution was taken to prevent the reexportation of European goods. The principal offenders against this policy were the merchants of Pennsylvania, who imported considerable amounts of foreign goods through Maryland and so lessened the quantity of such articles remaining to be sold in the latter colony.⁶⁵ The bill passed by the Maryland Assembly in 1695 imposing a duty of ten per cent on all European goods exported from the province was particularly meant to affect the Pennsylvania traders, as Virginians seem to have been exempted from the law.⁶⁶ William Penn, who naturally resented this

⁶⁴ This statement is based on the Ledgers of Imports and Exports from the Custom House Accounts. The only possible exception to the general statement is the record of the export of a few hats from Virginia or Maryland to England. These may have been, but more probably were not, of native manufacture.

⁶⁵ C. O. 5: 1257, 6 (xi).

⁶⁶ Archives, vol. xix, pp. 238, 487.

discrimination against his colony, protested to the Board of Trade that the duty was imposed even on goods consigned through to Pennsylvania, his merchants thus being denied the "freedom of the Kings highways."⁶⁷ The merchants complained even more bitterly to Governor Nicholson because articles consigned to them had been held in Maryland to pay the duty.⁶⁸ The Maryland Assembly, evidently acting upon the theory that the law was intended to apply to just such cases, refused to allow the goods to pass.⁶⁹ Upon this decision a Pennsylvanian wrote to William Penn: "Its not strange if Maryland endeavours the Subverting yo^r Govern^t since they Soe Publicly show their disaffection to the Place by laying an Imposition of 10 p ct upon all European Commodities imported through their Country Though a Pennard thereof be not exposed to Sale in their Province nor a Penny benifit rec'd from them."⁷⁰ Penn wrote again to the Board of Trade urging that Governor Nicholson should be instructed not to execute the law in Maryland, and implying that he knew it was about to be repealed by the English government.⁷¹ Apparently the law was not repealed, however, and the Maryland Assembly in 1698 manifested its intention of continuing it in force.⁷² Contrary to expectations this measure did not prevent the reexportation of European goods to neighboring provinces, but it did secure to Maryland a small revenue from the duty. Sometimes as much as £400 or £500 was collected on one consignment, and these consignments continued to go for the most part to Pennsylvania.⁷³

⁶⁷ C. O. 323: 2, 50.

⁶⁸ C. O. 5: 1257, 6 (x).

⁶⁹ Archives, vol. xix, p. 487.

⁷⁰ C. O. 5: 1257, 4.

⁷¹ "And I begg, that since the law of 10 p ct, is returned to ye Att. Gen^l after reported injurious to Trade, by w^{ch} means, the fleet proceeding in few days, we may be lyable to ye great oppression in Maryland, It would please the Lords to Intimate to Gov^r Nicolson that he forbear yt practice upon us, because the law will not have the Kings approbation here" (C. O. 5: 1257, 3).

⁷² Archives, vol. xxii, p. 41; C. O. 5: 741, p. 497.

⁷³ An Additional Account Taken from the Originalls from the year 1695 to 1698, in C. O. 5: 749. Accounts of the duty on re-exported European goods occur more frequently in the lists from Cecil County, which would indicate that it was to Pennsylvania that the bulk of the export was made.

It may have been because the law was not accomplishing its main purpose of stopping the trade that a new act concerning reexported goods was passed in 1706.⁷⁴ The exportation of European goods was entirely prohibited, although articles consigned directly to Pennsylvania as well as those consigned to Virginia could be sent through the province without paying duty. Possibly the representations of Penn and of his merchants had had their effect on the Board of Trade and Maryland had been directed to change her law, although no such instruction from England has been preserved.⁷⁵ This measure was probably directed more against the traders of New England than against those of Pennsylvania.⁷⁶ Their course of trading Governor Seymour described as very prejudicial to his colony. "And our diligent Neighbours the New England men, against which this Law is Leveled, for ffish Rum and Wooden Ware take the Oppourtunity of purchasing Considerable Quantitys of our Tobacco, and leave the same Ready against the Outport Vessells come in, (being the only Trade that Supply us with Goods, now, the London Shippes generally coming Empty) to purchase whole Shippes loadings, which they immediately Export to New England, to the great Disappointment, and Dissatisfaction, of our Gaping Planters; The merchants being willing to Deale where they can purchase their full Cargoe rather than Stragglng Hogsheads."⁷⁷ Although this may have been true, the

⁷⁴ Archives, vol. xxvi, p. 631.

⁷⁵ At this time the Privy Council could and frequently did disallow laws passed by the Maryland legislature, as, for example, the laws for the establishment of the church, which were rejected no less than three times (Privy Council Register, 76, pp. 253, 254; 77, p. 306; 78, p. 136). The Board of Trade, therefore, could have brought pressure to bear on the colony for a change in any law of which it did not approve.

⁷⁶ Archives, vol. xxvi, pp. 572, 573. At this time the committee on grievances in the Lower House of Assembly considered it a grievance that the Pennsylvania traders still exported from Maryland "most of the European goods imported here." The House itself, however, considered this no grievance, so the state of affairs was probably much exaggerated. The law would cover all goods reexported to Pennsylvania unless actually consigned from England to that province.

⁷⁷ C. O. 5: 716, H. 22.

Assembly soon found that the embargo did not so much serve to keep goods in the country as to hamper the trade with England, and the following year the law was repealed.⁷⁸ This ended all legislative attempts to prohibit the exportation of British and foreign products from Maryland.

Many merchants and sea-captains trading in the province found it profitable to import white servants, for whom there was a continuous demand. In earlier days prospective colonists themselves imported servants, basing their claims to land on the number brought over at their own expense, but this practice had ceased. The transportation of white servants had become a regular business between planter and merchant,⁷⁹ and large numbers were annually imported from England and Ireland. A discussion of the total number of these white servants in the colony, their proportion to the freemen and to the negroes, their economic status, and so forth, does not come within the limits of this paper. In order, however, to find out the extent of Maryland's import trade, it is desirable to ascertain if possible the number of servants annually imported into the colony and the consequent importance of this branch of the trade with England.

It is well known that from the first settlement of Maryland white servant labor played a very important part in its development. An abundance of cheap labor was absolutely necessary to cultivate tobacco. This was true throughout the seventeenth century, and, in spite of the fact that negroes were beginning to be imported to some extent from Africa,⁸⁰ white servant labor was still the primary economic factor of plantation life during the period of royal government. It is clear, therefore, that the importation of servants was an

⁷⁸ Archives, vol. xxvii, pp. 39, 156. The governor and the Council stated that "the Act of Assembly against the Exportation of European Goods is Experienced since the short Time it has been in force, to be a great discouragement to the Trade of Import, which is Diverted thereby from this Province & carried directly to other Ports. Whereas this Country would be the Port of Trade for such Vessels therefore advise it be repealed."

⁷⁹ E. I. McCormac, "White Servitude in Maryland," in Johns Hopkins University Studies, vol. xxii, pp. 124-133.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 145.

essential feature of the English trade to the tobacco colonies. They were brought over in various ways, either signing an indenture before leaving England, or being transported by ship-captains without any indenture, to be sold to pay for their passage upon reaching the colony. It is well known that the trade was a prosperous one, but it has proved almost impossible to get an accurate account of its extent for more than one or two years between 1689 and 1715. In 1698 Governor Nicholson told the Board of Trade that the number of servants imported that year was about five or six hundred, and again he put the number at between six and seven hundred.⁸¹ A compilation of scattered figures in various revenue lists from 1696 to 1698 gives the figures for white servants imported into the province as follows: 1696, 625; 1697, 353; and 1698, 703.⁸² It is possible that the figures for 1697 are incomplete, in which case Nicholson's estimate would not be far wrong. In 1708 there are supposed to have been three thousand and three servants in Maryland.⁸³ If they came in under a four-year indenture, this would mean an annual importation of about seven hundred and fifty; if the agreement was for five years, the number would be nearer six hundred. Probably it varied during the period of royal government somewhere between these two figures. Every white servant brought into the country sold at a price ranging between £15 and £20,⁸⁴ which paid the cost of passage and must also have given a considerable commission to the importer. A sufficient number of servants was annually sold in Maryland to make the trade comparatively profitable, and many of the English ships, especially those from the outports, landed white servants in the province.

Although the constant importation of white servants of all kinds was extremely valuable to the tobacco planters,

⁸¹ Archives, vol. xxiii, p. 498; C. O. 5: 714, 47, B. 35.

⁸² These figures are compiled from the Naval Office Lists for 1698 (C. O. 5: 749), and from some general revenue accounts in Maryland to be found principally in the same volume.

⁸³ Archives, vol. xxv, p. 258.

⁸⁴ McCormac, p. 154.

some slight attempt was made to regulate their quality and even to restrict their number in the larger interests of the colony itself. The presence of English convicts in Maryland was regarded as a distinct menace to colonial welfare, and as early as 1676 a law was passed forbidding their importation as servants.⁸⁵ This law, although renewed in 1692,⁸⁶ seems to have been ineffective, largely because it was against the policy of the home government. In the latter part of the eighteenth century Maryland certainly received large numbers of convict laborers.⁸⁷ In 1699 the Protestant government in the colony viewed with disfavor the importation of Irish Catholic servants as a danger to the new Establishment, and a law was passed laying a heavy duty on all such servants, "to prevent too great a number of Irish Papists in the colony."⁸⁸ This law, twice renewed under Governor Seymour,⁸⁹ an especially vigorous supporter of the Establishment and opponent of Roman Catholicism, lessened the number of Irish servants in the province, but did not entirely prevent their importation.⁹⁰ A duty was also levied in 1696 on all white servants imported; but its object was not to prohibit the trade, but to secure a revenue for the province.⁹¹ On the whole, the efforts to regulate the character of servants imported were but sporadic and not very effective. The number of laborers received was apparently not seriously affected by any adverse legislation during the twenty-five years of royal government, and remained pretty constant throughout the period. White men and women servants, therefore, formed a continuous if a minor import from the home country to the colony.

⁸⁵ Archives, vol. ii, p. 540.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, vol. xiii, p. 539.

⁸⁷ McCormac, chapter viii.

⁸⁸ Archives, vol. xxii, p. 497.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, vol. xxiv, p. 416; vol. xxvi, p. 289; vol. xxvii, p. 371.

⁹⁰ McCormac, p. 142. In 1708 Governor Seymour stated to the Board of Trade that few white servants were imported from England and that most of these were women, while several men as well as women came from Ireland (C. O. 5: 716, H. 74).

⁹¹ Archives, vol. xix, p. 167.

The most important product of foreign countries brought into Maryland was the negro. Negroes were imported in increasing numbers to supply the demand for laborers in the tobacco fields. By the time of the first royal governors they were beginning to form a considerable factor in labor conditions in the colony, although they were comparatively few in number until the early part of the eighteenth century.⁹² Most of the negroes at this time seem to have been brought directly from the Guinea coast, although a few came from the West Indies or the neighboring colonies.⁹³ The amount and value of this annual importation must be considered. In the spring of 1698 Governor Nicholson reported that there were expected in the colony that summer between four and five hundred negroes;⁹⁴ in August he gave the number for the year as four hundred and seventy odd, three hundred and ninety-six of them being from Guinea.⁹⁵ Between 1699 and 1707 the annual number imported was somewhat smaller, as the following list will indicate:—

⁹² J. R. Brackett, *The Negro in Maryland*, in Johns Hopkins University Studies, extra volume vi, p. 38.

⁹³ Governor Seymour wrote at one time to the Board of Trade that before 1698 the Maryland planters were supplied with negroes from Barbadoes and other of the queen's plantations, such as Jamaica and New England, in small lots of six, seven, eight, nine, ten in a sloop; and that whole shiploads from Africa were seldom received. Since that date trade had improved and, from the context of his letter, was presumably largely conducted by London ships directly with the African coast (C. O. 5: 716, H. 91). In another letter he says that there was in Maryland "a considerably Quantity of Negroes from Gambo and the Gold Coast besides the Country Natives grown up" (C. O. 5: 716, H. 74).

⁹⁴ C. O. 5: 714, 47, B. 35.

⁹⁵ Archives, vol. xxiii, p. 498. It is recorded elsewhere that in 1698 one man brought into Annapolis 423 negroes (C. O. 5: 749, Account of the Country Duty arising on the Western Shore in Maryland in 1697 and 1698. See also Archives, vol. xxii, p. 160), and that 40 or 50 negroes were imported into Patuxent (Archives, vol. xxii, p. 160). These figures would make Nicholson's account for the year an understatement of the actual numbers.

	Date	Name of Ship	Port of Departure	Number
May	2, 1699	Hopewell Jacob	London	86
July	20, 1699	African Galley	"	76
August	9, 1699	Fairfax	"	190
July	20, 1700	John Hopewell ⁹⁶	"	320
October	7, 1701	Betty Galley	"	64
July	4, 1702	Endeavour	"	49
July	4, 1702	Hunter Galley	"	152
Sept.	4, 1702	Providence	"	136
July	13, 1703	Pinck Mary	Barbadoes	55
June	11, 1704	Dolphin	London	200
July	2, 1705	Brigantine Dorset	"	131
July	9, 1705	Olive Tree	"	150
August	11, 1705	Brigantine Adventure	"	90
August	11, 1705	Sloop Swallow	Barbadoes	71
July	—, 1706	Olive Tree	London	163
August	4, 1707	Young Margaret	"	265
August	11, 1707	Brigantine Adventure	"	92 ⁹⁷

In 1708 the number had again increased, amounting to six hundred and forty-eight negroes imported in six invoices, presumably from Africa, in London ships.⁹⁸

These are the only exact figures obtainable of the importation of negroes. The whole number found in Maryland during the period increased considerably, a fact which must be partly due to an increase in the number annually imported. There were in Maryland in 1704, 4475 negroes, in 1708, 4657, in 1710, 7945, in 1712, 8408,⁹⁹ and by 1720 as many as 25,000.¹⁰⁰ From these statements it may be ascertained in general that the annual importation was comparatively stationary between 1699 and 1708; that for some reason the number increased between 1708 and 1710; and that a far greater increase took place after 1712, undoubtedly the effect of the Treaty of Utrecht and the Asiento in 1713.

The trade was decidedly profitable. The demand for

⁹⁶ The master of the John Hopewell was Captain Munday, of whom Governor Blakiston made mention in a letter, "I haveing an acc^t of his bringing in 300 Negroes" (C. O. 5: 715, 8, D. 35).

⁹⁷ C. O. 5: 716, H. 92. From a list sent over in Governor Seymour's letter of 1708.

⁹⁸ C. O. 5: 716, H. 93. Again from a list given in Seymour's letter.

⁹⁹ Archives, vol. xxv, pp. 256-259. The president of the Council in 1710 reported a great increase in the number of negroes in Maryland (C. O. 5: 717, I. 46).

¹⁰⁰ C. O. 5: 717, I. 106.

cheap labor became greater as more land was settled, and slaves always commanded a good price. There is a record in 1695 of two negroes from Barbadoes who were worth respectively 7600 and 10,000 pounds of tobacco, or about £31 and £41 sterling.¹⁰¹ A male negro in 1708 brought about £30 and a female £25 or £26,¹⁰² which were the prices asked in Virginia at the time.¹⁰³ A skipper who imported a cargo of two or three hundred negroes was sure of a good round profit from his venture, even after allowing for the cost of the passage from the African coast.

Maryland imported almost nothing else of appreciable value from foreign countries.¹⁰⁴ A single exception must be made of wines brought from Madeira and the Azores. Although a considerable part of the colonial supply of wines and spirits undoubtedly came from England,¹⁰⁵ there was a direct trade with these islands large enough at least to deserve mention. Hugh Jones in his letter home in 1698 wrote that "we have wine brought us from Madera and Phiol and rum from Barbadoes bear Mault and Wines from England."¹⁰⁶ The author of the *Narrative of a Voyage to Maryland* on his way home from the colony fell in with a sloop in distress: "shee was come from Fiall butt was of New England Called the providence of Boston and Bound for Mariland Loaden with wine, shee had bin out nine weekes from Fyall."¹⁰⁷

¹⁰¹ Archives, vol. xx, p. 227.

¹⁰² C. O. 5: 716, H. 91.

¹⁰³ Bruce, vol. ii, p. 90.

¹⁰⁴ There are one or two references to a trade with Lisbon. This trade, however, was one from which the colonial vessels brought back no foreign commodities, but received actual coin in exchange for the corn which they exported in small quantities (C. O. 5: 717, I. 106). In 1697 a letter from the Commissioners of the Customs in England to the governor of Maryland warned him that a certain Captain Rodgers had lately sailed from a Scottish port with a cargo of linen and other commodities for Maryland (Archives, vol. xxiii, p. 328). This was only a single case, however, and had no real significance in the economy of the province.

¹⁰⁵ The revenue accounts (C. O. 5: 749) give the duties on large amounts of rum, spirits, wine, and beer, but it is clear from the context that most of these liquors came from England or the English plantations.

¹⁰⁶ Royal Society, Letter Book, I, i, 183.

¹⁰⁷ Sloane MSS. 2291, British Museum.

Governor Seymour informed the Board of Trade in 1708 that wine, rum, sugar, molasses, and salt came from the Azores, the West Indies, Latitudes, and Providence, but that a small quantity sufficed the colony.¹⁰⁸ Governor Hart at the end of his administration wrote that Maryland traded with no foreign "plantation" except with Madeira for wine.¹⁰⁹ These casual references, which are all that can be found on the subject, indicate that there was some direct importation of various kinds of spirits from the islands, but imply that it was small in extent. Importation from other places would for the most part have been contrary to the provisions of the Navigation Acts.

Maryland imported some goods from the other English colonies. The nature of the trade can be ascertained from the records, but it is impossible to give the amount of each separate commodity or even a rough estimate of the total. From the island colonies, and perhaps even directly from the Campeachy coast,¹¹⁰ the province at this time was certainly receiving some rum, sugar, molasses, dye woods, indigo, and a little ginger and cacao.¹¹¹ The last four articles on the list seem often to have been reexported to England.¹¹² Vessels from New England, too, often imported rum, sugar, and molasses which they had secured through the West Indian trade.¹¹³ In addition to this, New England and New York merchants brought in some food-stuffs,—beef, pork, peas, flour, biscuits, malt, butter, and cheese,¹¹⁴ also fish and woodenware, although the importation of the last-named article fell off at the end of the century.¹¹⁵ The fact that

¹⁰⁸ C. O. 5: 716, H. 74.

¹⁰⁹ C. O. 5: 717, I. 106.

¹¹⁰ The trade was in all probability not directly with this coast, but through Jamaica.

¹¹¹ C. O. 5: 1309, 24; C. O. 5: 716, H. 74; C. O. 5: 1316, O. 25; C. O. 5: 717, I. 106.

¹¹² Custom House Accounts, Ledgers of Imports and Exports, vols. i-xvi, Imports from Virginia and Maryland.

¹¹³ C. O. 5: 1264, p. 90; C. O. 5: 1316, O. 25.

¹¹⁴ Add. MSS. 28089, f. 16, British Museum; C. O. 5: 1309, 24. See also earlier references.

¹¹⁵ Archives, vol. xix, pp. 511, 516, 540, 542, 543, 580, 583; C. O. 5: 716, H. 22.

toward the close of the century Pennsylvania was sending to Maryland, usually by land, some rum, beer, and sugar, considerable quantities of flour and bread, and a number of horses, was regarded by the people of the colony as a grievance, because the exchange was often made in money or European goods which they were loath to lose.¹¹⁶ After 1704 the importation from Pennsylvania of bread, beer, flour, malt, wheat, grain, horses, and tobacco was prohibited by law.¹¹⁷ On the whole, in spite of the limited importation from Pennsylvania before 1704, Maryland during this period was self-supporting and received little in the way of food-stuffs from any of the other colonies. Such commodities as were imported—and small colonial vessels were somewhat frequently to be found in the ports of the province—consisted very largely of rum, sugar, and molasses, and to a much smaller extent of fish and woodenware.

The results reached in this chapter may be summarized. By far the largest class of imports were the native manufactures sent from England and European goods reexported from the home country to Maryland in English ships. Not only was it natural that a colony exporting raw materials solely to England should thus receive in return British manufactured goods, but the exchange was also consistently

¹¹⁶ C. O. 5: 1309, 24; C. O. 5: 1257, 4; C. O. 5: 740, p. 335.

¹¹⁷ Archives, vol. xxvi, p. 314; vol. xxvii, pp. 172, 574; vol. xxix, pp. 238, 310, 328; vol. xxx, p. 226. In 1709 the law was repealed temporarily in order to relieve a scarcity with Pennsylvania food-stuffs, but this lasted for only one year (Archives, vol. xxvii, p. 482). Governor Seymour commented at some length on the reasons for the law of 1704. "The Designe of this Act was to prevent the mischief our neighbouring provinces use ag^t us in drawing away all our Moneys which they have a long time Practic'd to the great Detriment of this poore Country who have most industriously pursued the making of tobacco and neglected even necessary Tillage So that while Tobacco bore a price in England wee had money in England worth the reaching Contrivance of our Neighbours to gripe at which they have so effectually done that this province trusting to their Manufacture of tobacco have overdrawne themselves in England and the pensilvanians who have traded upon a Certainty got many of this province into their Debts—The Generall prohibition I Confess is not so regular and it had been better to have laid a large duty but this province stands on the Levell with other her Maj^{ty}s Governments in America" (C. O. 5: 715, G. 25, 1705 bundle).

avored by British statesmen as furnishing a market for their own products. Nevertheless, although the amount was large and was widely distributed throughout the province, the colony generally exported more than it received in return, and in some years the imports from England were not large enough to satisfy the real needs of the people. Under these circumstances the officials feared lest the colonists might begin to manufacture for themselves, but this did not prove to be the case, the colony developing no forms of manufacture that could rival those of the mother country. Great Britain also supplied Maryland with white labor, the trade in indentured servants forming a considerable feature of the importations. The chief commodities received from foreign countries were negroes from Africa, who were brought over in annually increasing numbers, and island wines, which were a steady but always a minor feature of colonial trade. From the other British possessions were received practically only West Indian products, rum, sugar, and molasses, and very small quantities of food-stuffs. Taken all in all, the British imports were so varied in kind and so extensive in amount that they well nigh precluded the necessity of drawing upon other sources.

CHAPTER III

TRADE ROUTES AND ILLICIT TRADE

The production of tobacco, which was one of the enumerated commodities, and which had therefore to be sent directly to England or to English colonies,¹ was largely responsible for the fact that Maryland trade was almost exclusively with England. A rough estimate of the total number of ships concerned in this trade may be made for the years 1689 to 1701,² as follows:—

Year ³	Number	Year	Number
1689	10-14 ⁴	1696	60
1690	49-52	1697	79
1691	15-16	1698	73
1692	81-89	1699	98
1693	56-59	1700	48
1694	44-47	1701	52
1695	71		

¹ As early as October 24, 1621, Virginia was forbidden to send tobacco elsewhere than to England (Acts of the Privy Council, Col. vol. i, p. 48). A royal proclamation of September, 1624, strongly implied that the colonists were to bring their entire product to England (Rymer, vol. xvii, p. 621), though the statement was not expressly made until the substance of the proclamation was repeated in March, 1625 (ibid., vol. xvii, p. 668). Mr. Osgood says with regard to the earlier proclamation that "though this proclamation lapsed with the death of James I, its principles were adhered to, and in later orders express reference was made to its contents as embodying valued ideas and precedents" (vol. iii, p. 197). The Navigation Act of 1660, by placing tobacco on the list of enumerated commodities, made its export to foreign countries definitely illegal. How far this prohibition was effective in Maryland will be seen later.

² This estimate is made up from figures obtained from C. O. 5: 749, passim, and from a list of ships entering Maryland, to be found in the Archives, vol. viii, p. 236.

³ From 1689 to 1691 the figures are based on a computation from both C. O. 5: 749, for Pocomoke District and Archives, vol. viii, p. 236, for Patuxent District. In 1692 the Archives list runs only to September, so is manifestly incomplete.

⁴ In making up these figures the port from which the ship sails, in every case where it is given, is taken in preference to that for which it is bound. Where two figures are given for a year it indicates that the place of ownership of several ships is not stated,

Evidently the number of vessels participating in this trade varied considerably from year to year. The largest number in any one year was ninety-eight, and the average number, made up from the years when the lists are more nearly complete, 1692 to 1699, was seventy-two.⁵

No pretense at a complete record of Maryland shipping can be made for the later years, but some information on the subject can be compiled from one or two scattered accounts of fleets leaving Virginia and from the more or less vague remarks of different men in the two provinces. Governor Nicholson wrote to the Board of Trade in July, 1702, that a fleet of one hundred and fifty sail was just about to go through the Capes, leaving few or no ships in Virginia and not many in Maryland.⁶ Virginia has preserved lists of two fleets leaving the colony in 1703, with a total of one hundred and seventy-eight vessels ready to sail, eleven more being delayed for a few weeks,⁷ and a list of 1704 of one hundred and twenty-six vessels.⁸ A paper written on the state of the tobacco trade in 1708 makes the statement that the trade employed annually two or three hundred ships.⁹ If Maryland's exports were about thirty-six per cent of the total for the two provinces, her share of the combined fleet annually

although the probability is that they were from English ports. If they are counted, the larger figure is correct for each year.

⁵ The years 1700 and 1701 are incomplete, as no account can be found for Potomac District. This would explain the discrepancy between these figures and those of earlier years. The record quoted in Chapter I, page 35, also gives the number of English and plantation ships leaving Maryland between 1690 and 1701. This account is no more accurate than that of exported tobacco, but it may be compared with the figures for English vessels given above and for plantation ships on pages 110-113.

Period	English	Plantation
1690-Feb. 1691/92	14	9
1692-one half 1693	14	15
1693-1694	52	30
1694-1696	96	36
1696-1698	91	14
1698-1700	112	7
1700-one half 1701	68	5

C. O. 390: 6, p. 145.

⁶ C. O. 5: 1312, 40.

⁷ C. O. 5: 1313, 35, 36.

⁸ C. O. 5: 1314, 22 (ii), 22 (v), L. 38.

⁹ Egerton MSS. 921, f. 10, British Museum.

concerned in the tobacco trade could not have been much over one third, or considerably fewer than one hundred ships, a fact which will bear out the more exact estimate of the Maryland fleets by themselves, made from 1689 to 1701. Nevertheless, the list of ships clearing from English ports for Maryland for the years from 1714 to 1716 inclusive must manifestly be incomplete unless the trade had seriously retrograded, which was not the case. Only thirty ships were so recorded in 1714, thirty-four in 1715, and forty-four in 1716.¹⁰ But as soon after this as 1720 Governor Hart estimated that about one hundred sail of ships came annually from Great Britain into the colony.¹¹ On the whole, the total number of vessels trading yearly between Great Britain and Maryland during the twenty-five years of royal government could never have exceeded one hundred, and probably averaged, according to the figures presented above, from seventy to seventy-five.¹²

London was evidently the chief center for the tobacco trade in England, as it was from there that the largest number of ships came. It is certain¹³ that there were in the plantation between 1689 and 1701 at least the following ships from the chief English seaport:—

Year	Number	Year	Number
1689 ¹⁴	1	1696	23
1690	19	1697	54
1691	7	1698	36
1692	39	1699	57
1693	32	1700	31
1694	14	1701	34
1695	41		

¹⁰ C. O. 390: 8, An Account of Ships cleared from English ports.

¹¹ C. O. 5: 717, I. 106.

¹² The constant complaint from the colony of lack of adequate shipping to carry away the annual crops would seem to indicate that these figures did not materially increase throughout the whole period of royal government. Governor Hart, even as late as 1720, may still have been expressing himself in round numbers, well outside the actual facts of the case.

¹³ In reckoning the ports from which ships sailed the larger figures given in the earlier list cannot be used, as there is no way of telling from what port in England a vessel sailed, although its English ownership in general may be almost certain.

¹⁴ These figures are compiled from the volume already used to ascertain the total number of ships in the colony, C. O. 5: 749.

The average number of vessels sailing from London to Maryland annually, therefore, is found to be thirty-seven.¹⁵ Their tonnage ran from fifty to three hundred and sixty tons, the average being one hundred and seventy tons. These ships were usually described as "square-sterns" or "ships" as distinguished from brigantines, ketches, or sloops.

The outports concerned in the tobacco trade were chiefly the seaport towns in the west or southwest of England,¹⁶—Liverpool, Chester, Bristol, Barnstaple, Bideford, Plymouth, Dartmouth, Lyme, Weymouth, and Exeter, although Whitehaven also sent several vessels nearly every year to Maryland, and scattering ships came not infrequently from Workington, Newcastle, Stockton, Scarborough, Hull, Colchester, and Deal.¹⁷ Whitehaven, Liverpool, Bristol, Bideford, and Plymouth were the most important towns. The total number of outport ships coming into the colony annually between 1689 and 1701 averaged as high as thirty-three,¹⁸ the number varying, however, considerably from year to year.

Year	Number	Year	Number
1689	9	1696	38
1690	30	1697	24
1691	8	1698	37
1692	39	1699	42
1693	24	1700	17
1694	30	1701	18 ¹⁹
1695	30		

Almost 'as many vessels, therefore, came to Maryland from the outports as from London, but they were almost all smaller in size, the largest being not over two hundred and fifty tons, and the average not over eighty. It will be shown that several of these ships were built and owned in the colony.

¹⁵ As in the earlier list, the average is made up from the years 1692-1699, in order to obtain what is probably a more accurate result.

¹⁶ C. O. 5: 716, H. 74.

¹⁷ C. O. 390: 8; C. O. 5: 749. Governor Nicholson remarked in one of his letters home that "North and West Country Vessels" came to Maryland (C. O. 5: 719, Bundle 4, no. 12).

¹⁸ This average is also made for the years from 1692 to 1699 inclusive.

¹⁹ C. O. 5: 749.

Every year, then, while the royal governors were in Maryland, an average of seventy ships arrived from England to receive their lading of 25,000 hogsheads of tobacco. For the most part these ships obtained cargoes from the Western Shore districts, Annapolis, Patuxent, and Potomac, as comparatively little tobacco was sent home from the Eastern Shore.²⁰ The tobacco exported was not always loaded directly on the larger ships, except when the plantation shipping the staple lay near where the vessels had anchored. Sloops were usually sent to the various private landing places²¹ up and down the creeks and rivers to load and bring back each planter's crop. This was convenient for the planters, but hard on the ship-captains, and it gave great opportunities for fraud in evasion of duties or misrepresentation of the grade of tobacco shipped.²²

In 1683 an attempt was made to improve and systematize the conditions of lading tobacco by the enactment of a colonial statute creating a certain number of towns to which all tobacco must be brought for shipment.²³ The effects of this law were entirely lost, however, by a decision made by Lord Baltimore in 1688 that tobacco did not have to be brought into the towns to be sold.²⁴ Later the home government and English officials in the colony endeavored to have the

²⁰ That the Eastern Shore was not so largely concerned in tobacco trade as the Western the exact lists of the export from each district, given in Chapter I, footnotes 108-112 inclusive, will indicate. The amount of tobacco and the number of ships given in these lists for Pocomoke are much smaller than for either of the Western Shore districts. In addition there is the statement of Sir Thomas Lawrence in 1695 that because few ships went to the Eastern Shore the colonists there had almost stopped growing tobacco, and were turning to manufacturing instead (C. O. 5: 713, 115).

²¹ Archives, vol. xxiii, p. 28. In 1705 Seymour wrote to the secretary of state that all the planters opposed the establishment of ports "for the Sake of clandestinely unshipping the Goods brought from England, and Shipping their tobacco at their owne Dores, which makes it impossible for all the Officers in the World to know what is shipt or unshipt" (C. O. 5: 721, no. 3).

²² C. O. 5: 1314, M. 7, Reasons alleged in a representation of merchants trading to Virginia, who asked for fixed ports in the tobacco colonies.

²³ Archives, vol. vii, p. 609.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, vol. viii, p. 61.

law reenacted.²⁵ In 1705 an elaborate scheme to prevent abuses in the tobacco trade was presented to the Board of Trade in England.²⁶ It recommended the selection by Act of Parliament, or by the governor in virtue of his royal prerogative, of five landing places or ports in Maryland from which tobacco must be shipped by the twentieth of April annually, in order that the lading of the fleet might be hastened and regulated.²⁷ This scheme was not carried out, but repeated representations from England at last induced the Maryland Assembly to pass another bill (1706) appointing certain towns where tobacco could be loaded on board ships, and public landing places from which it could conveniently be sent to the towns.²⁸ This law, too, was a dead letter, and it was repealed in England a few years later²⁹ because it was feared that the creation of towns would encourage manufactures.³⁰ Apparently no new towns were erected while the law was in operation,³¹ and the old desultory method of lading still prevailed. Ship-masters got their cargo how and where they could, for the most part continuing to ship it on sloops from the planters' private wharves along the bay or in the rivers.

²⁵ Privy Council Register, 74, p. 429, June 30, 1692; C. O. 5: 1262, 48, August 4, 1703; C. O. 5: 726, pp. 341, 343, 369.

²⁶ C. O. 5: 715, G. 11, G. 12, Bundle 1705.

²⁷ Governor Seymour and the other advocates of this plan endorsed it not only as a remedy for the difficulty in lading, but because it would tend to prevent illegal trade (C. O. 5: 715, G. 12, Bundle 1705; C. O. 5: 1314, M. 7, M. 10; C. O. 5: 1261, 139; Sloane MSS. 2902, f. 244, British Museum).

²⁸ Archives, vol. xxvi, p. 636. Supplement in vol. xxvii, p. 159.

²⁹ Privy Council Register, 82, p. 491, December 15, 1709; C. O. 5: 717, I. 2; C. O. 5: 727, p. 161. Apparently this repeal was not unpleasing to the ship-captains themselves. One of them petitioned the Maryland Council before the law was repealed that he might be allowed to trade in Chester River, where there was no town set up, as his trade suffered by the prohibition (Archives, vol. xxv, p. 234).

³⁰ C. O. 5: 1316, O. 44, O. 45, O. 50.

³¹ In December, 1708, the following comment was made by Governor Seymour: "The ports in this province may perhaps be worthy of the name of Townes but the other Townes will only Serve for Rowling-places to receive tobacco's in order to be water borne" (C. O. 5: 716, H. 100).

With the fleets fully laden and ready for the homeward passage, difficulties had still to be met. During almost the whole period of royal government in Maryland the voyage between England and the colony was fraught not only with the dangers of the deep, but with the almost greater peril of capture by the enemy as well. It was a long, hard voyage at best, and in time of war an unprotected ship was liable to be captured either off the coast of England or when it reached the West Indian or continental colonies. French privateers were especially fond of waiting off the English coast to capture homeward-bound ships laden with colonial commodities. The author of the *Narrative of a Voyage to Maryland* has described the precautions which his vessel, returning with only two other ships, took to avoid capture. When they got near the coast, "the Commanders mett aboard of the great ship to consult what they had best doe whether they should make directly for the Chops of the Channell or whether they should saile North about by Ireland and Scotland and att last itt was Concluded that wee should goe north aboutt by reason they did beleive that a great many French privatteere might be in the Channell picking upp the Scatterrers of the Virginia Fleete."³² On account of this danger it was the policy of the English government to permit vessels outward bound to the colonies to sail only in fleets or under the protection of an English man-of-war, and governors of the colonies were enjoined to take similar precautions with those bound for home.

In 1689-1690 a general embargo was laid in England on ships bound to Virginia or Maryland, but a fleet of thirty-four already made up was allowed to sail.³³ At the same time orders were sent to Virginia that the colonial government should prevent the sailing of single ships either from there or from Maryland.³⁴ Governors Copley and Nicholson were both carefully instructed that no ships should leave

³² Sloane MSS. 2291, British Museum.

³³ Privy Council Register, 73, pp. 356, 357.

³⁴ Cal. St. P. Col. 1689-1692, 787.

Maryland except in fleets or with convoys,³⁵ and due precautions continued to be taken in England³⁶ to the same effect. A suspension of the orders for convoys naturally took place during the short interval of peace from 1697 to 1702,³⁷ but they were renewed again when the war of the Spanish succession broke out and were in force until 1713.³⁸

This system of fleets and convoys for the colonies had been established even before the period of the French wars, and it made the trade so much safer that London merchants frequently petitioned the Privy Council for a convoy.³⁹ On the other hand, the delay incurred in waiting for the fleet often injured the ship's cargo and so lowered the profits on its sale. Traders who owned fairly large or well-armed ships were, therefore, sometimes willing to incur the risk of having them sail alone, and would petition that their vessels might not be held up by any embargo.⁴⁰ This practice evidently started a regular system of permits, and a large number of vessels were annually allowed to sail from England alone and to return from the colonies whenever they were ready, regardless of the fleet.

³⁵ Archives, vol. viii, p. 380; vol. xxiii, p. 547.

³⁶ Privy Council Register, 75, p. 18.

³⁷ Archives, vol. xxiii, p. 350.

³⁸ C. O. 5: 726, p. 146; C. O. 5: 1313, 30.

³⁹ C. O. 5: 1309, 6; C. O. 5: 1313, 34, 4 (ii), 6 (i); Privy Council Register, 78, p. 319. Examples could be multiplied.

⁴⁰ The Privy Council Register between 1689 and 1713 is full of petitions for ships to sail without convoy, requests which in almost every case were granted. See also Privy Council Papers, Unbound packets of petitions, etc., 1702, Bundle 2. Other specific requests may be found in C. O. 5: 1315, N. 4; C. O. 5: 716, H. 1. The instruction to Thomas Tench, 1702/3, that no ships except those with licenses be permitted to come alone from Maryland seems to imply a regular license system (C. O. 5: 726, p. 46). Four years later Governor Seymour was directed to allow all ships that could not get ready for a certain convoy to load and sail when they could (C. O. 5: 716, H. 37). In one of the volumes in the Colonial Office Papers there are entries between December, 1706, and April, 1710, of one hundred and forty-two ships bound to Virginia or Maryland which are directed by the secretary of state not to be held in the colonies (C. O. 5: 210). The Petition Entry Book contains, between 1710 and 1712, twenty-nine petitions from ships which wanted to go to the tobacco colonies without a convoy. The tonnage, numbers of men, and guns are carefully stated in each petition. These last requests are all referred to the Admiralty for settlement (State Papers Domestic, Petition Entry Book, vol. xi).

In Maryland the colonial government felt free to regulate independently the sailing of ships from the colony, the Council or Assembly not infrequently deciding to allow a ship left behind by the fleet to sail alone or with other vessels in a similar predicament.⁴¹ Ships were not allowed, however, to go alone when a fleet was in the colonies.⁴² Under ordinary circumstances the colonial government made careful arrangements to have the Maryland ships sail under convoy with the Virginia fleet.⁴³ It was customary for the commodore of the fleet to send word up the bay that he was ready to sail for home. His letter would then be published in the counties or personal warning would be sent to the captains of ships in Maryland. Usually this was sufficient notice,⁴⁴ and ships would thereupon be ordered by the government to collect at the mouths of the Patuxent and the Potomac preparatory to joining the Virginia fleet. The collectors or naval officers were supposed to take bond from each vessel before it sailed that it would first stop at Point Comfort, where the fleet with its convoy gathered.⁴⁵ Sometimes Maryland had difficulty in learning when the fleet was to sail,⁴⁶ but usually the system worked smoothly. With few exceptions it may be said that the colonial government cooperated with the Privy Council in attempting to carry out its regulations, and the danger from pirates, if not from the French, made the ordinary ship-captain only too glad to accept a convoy even in time of peace.⁴⁷

It was some time, however, before the arrival of these

⁴¹ Archives, vol. xiii, p. 255; vol. xix, pp. 94, 382, 548; vol. xx, pp. 139, 306, 582; vol. xxv, pp. 118, 189, 190, 225.

⁴² *Ibid.*, vol. xx, p. 396.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, vol. xx, pp. 19, 79, 146, 147, 429, 513, 570; vol. xxiv, p. 141; vol. xxv, pp. 149, 202.

⁴⁴ In one case the sailing of the whole fleet from Virginia was delayed a month because the Maryland vessels had been hindered in loading their tobacco by a very severe winter (*ibid.*, vol. xxiii, pp. 9-11).

⁴⁵ There is a reference in the Archives to one instance where the ships in Maryland were ordered to join convoys in New York instead of in Virginia (vol. xxvi, p. 61).

⁴⁶ C. O. 5: 716, H. 14, H. 76.

⁴⁷ Archives, vol. xxv, p. 118.

fleets could be so regulated as to please both merchant and planter. It has already been explained in what way the time of arrival in the colonies and the number of fleets which came each year were thought to affect the price of tobacco. These two considerations were of importance to the English government as well, both on account of the necessary convoy, and because of its desire for the success of the fleet and its cargo. If there were but one fleet a year, it would of course be unnecessary to send more than one convoy.⁴⁸ If the ships arrived in the autumn, the importations from England, consisting so largely of woollens, could be sold before the winter set in.⁴⁹ If the ships left the colonies in the spring, they would avoid the rotting of the ships' hulls by the worm and sickness among the sailors on account of the heat.⁵⁰ Various opinions were expressed on these questions,⁵¹ but Quarry's arguments⁵² settled the matter in the minds of the Board of Trade and the Privy Council.⁵³ "With regard to the Generall Security and Advantage of that Trade, and to the present occasions which your Majesty might otherwise have for your Shipping, One Convoy a Year, may Suffice to Carry on this Trade dureing the Warr, which Convoy as is Generally Agreed by all the Traders, may be appointed to Sail about the Midle of August or not later than the beginning of September, So as to Arrive in the Rivers of Virginia in December, that they may have time to unload and Distribute the Manufactures and other Goods from England to the Planters, As also to Load the Tobacco within the severall Rivers of Virginia and Maryland, and to Return from thence in the Month of May following by

⁴⁸ C. O. 5: 1315, N. 64; C. O. 5: 726, p. 428; Privy Council Register, 81, pp. 304, 305, Copy of a Representation of the Board of Trade and an Order in Council thereupon; Acts of the Privy Council, Col. vol. ii, p. 514.

⁴⁹ C. O. 5: 1308, 6; C. O. 5: 1313, 18 (i).

⁵⁰ C. O. 5: 1313, 4, 4 (i), 4 (iii), 5 (i), 7 (i), 10, 16 (i); C. O. 5: 3, February 2, 1705/6.

⁵¹ Compare C. O. 5: 1315, N. 20, N. 21, N. 23, N. 26; C. O. 5: 3, 121.

⁵² C. O. 5: 3, February 2, 1705/6; C. O. 5: 1315, N. 33.

⁵³ C. O. 5: 3, 121; C. O. 5: 1315, N. 64; C. O. 5: 726, p. 428; Acts of the Privy Council, Col. vol. ii, p. 514.

which means the Convoy and Fleet will avoid the Badd Seasons in the Country and the Worm, which in the Hott Months is so prejudiciall to them, and may arrive in England Soon enough to goe out again with the next Convoy at the same Season, which method We humbly conceive may best furnish the Planters with those European Commoditys which they stand in need of, and hinder them from applying their Labour to any other Product or Manufacture then that of Tobacco."⁵⁴ Whether the fleet came to Maryland precisely once a year after 1706 is not certain, but at least the English government did what it could to regulate and to protect Maryland's great trade route and the vessels engaged in it. The probability is that after 1706, and indeed even before that date, large fleets did come annually to Maryland, and that the trade was carried on, with comparatively few carefully licensed exceptions, only through a regular system of fleets and convoys which minimized the dangers of the voyage.

The tobacco of Maryland, on reaching England, came into the hands of wholesale merchants in the various coast towns. Of these the London merchants were by far the most influential. They owned most of the ships engaged in the trade,⁵⁵ and they bought the greater part of the annual crop. The fixing of freight rates and the price of tobacco was therefore largely under their control. They also exerted what influence they possessed over the governmental policy toward the trade, and they negotiated for foreign tobacco markets. All outpost merchants were forced to submit to their arrangements with regard to fleets, prices, and markets.

The most conspicuous among these London merchants were men whose names appear again and again in the records of the period. Micajah Perry, perhaps the most influential of all, was a large shipowner and tobacco importer and was at one time agent for Virginia. Peter Paggen, another

⁵⁴ Acts of the Privy Council, Col. vol. ii, p. 514.

⁵⁵ C. O. 5: 749.

prominent merchant, was also for a short time agent for Maryland. Through him the arms that the colony needed for its militia were purchased. In some cases several members of one family were concerned in the trade with Virginia and Maryland. The captain of a ship was often the brother or perhaps the cousin of her owner. The Brownes, of whom Peregrine was especially prominent, the Braines, the Yoakleys, and the Mundays were examples of such families. Henry Munday at one time had to enter into a heavy bond in Maryland because he was suspected of having had some connection with pirates, and when he returned to England, some members of this prominent group of merchants offered security for him.⁵⁶ These men were all closely connected in the tobacco trade, and conducted their business with a conspicuous solidarity of interest. In the absence of effective competition from the outports the planters were entirely at their mercy. The exorbitant freight charges which they fixed were partly responsible for the frequency with which the planters fell into debt to the merchants in England and for the general state of poverty in the two provinces.⁵⁷ The planters must also have been often cheated by unscrupulous ship-captains, for the Maryland Assembly in 1705 passed a law obliging all masters of ships to publish their rates before loading any tobacco, and imposing on them a severe penalty for making any subsequent change.⁵⁸

The influence of the London merchants was no less decisive in determining the method by which all tobacco destined for the foreign market should be packed and shipped to England. By far the greater part of the commodity was

⁵⁶ These merchants asked that Munday's bond in Maryland be discharged, and they offered to produce security for him in England if it should be demanded (C. O. 5: 710, Bundle 7, 1699-1702, 15, 16).

⁵⁷ Add. MSS. 22265, f. 102, British Museum. There are a number of records testifying that the freight charges were exorbitant (Archives, vol. xix, p. 516; vol. xxvii, p. 465; C. O. 5: 715, 1705 bundle, G. 12). Only once is the statement made that freight was low in the colonies, and this was because the annual crop was small, whereas an unusually large number of ships had entered the bay (C. O. 5: 1309, 74).

⁵⁸ Archives, vol. xxvi, p. 345.

packed and shipped in casks, more or less carefully marked and graded, but a certain amount was frequently sent over in bulk, especially through the outports.⁵⁹ The London merchants protested vigorously against the practice of shipping in bulk, because it facilitated smuggling and depreciated the price.⁶⁰ Governor Copley was ordered by the king to have a law passed in Maryland prohibiting the exportation of tobacco in bulk,⁶¹ but the Assembly refused to follow his bidding.⁶² The merchants then asked for legislation in England.⁶³ Nicholson, the second royal governor in Maryland, heard of this proposal and represented to the secretary of state the colonial side of the case. He said that "a total prohibition of it may very much lessen the quantity by discouraging the North and West Country vessels from coming for it, and bringing their Country Commoditys. . . . And if the Officers and seamen be not allowed to bulk tobacco, I suppose that it will be difficult to have them come to these parts, for it is a very slavish voyage."⁶⁴ As the Assembly, moved by this or other considerations, still refused to act, Parliament finally settled the question in 1699 by prohibiting the importation of tobacco in bulk into England.⁶⁵ Legally, then, the all-powerful merchant class had secured what it wanted, although Robert Quarry complained as late as 1703 that tobacco was still shipped in bulk.⁶⁶

Moreover, the packed tobacco did not escape being made the subject of controversy between the merchants in London and the planters in Maryland. In 1692 a local statute fixed the size of tobacco hogsheads at forty-four inches in length by thirty-one in the head,⁶⁷ but in 1694⁶⁸ and again in 1699,

⁵⁹ C. O. 5: 719, 18, Bundle 3.

⁶⁰ Treasury Papers, xvii, 71.

⁶¹ Cal. St. P. Col. 1689-1692, 2300; Archives, vol. viii, p. 335.

⁶² Archives, vol. xix, p. 90.

⁶³ Privy Council Register, 75, p. 84.

⁶⁴ C. O. 5: 719, 18, Bundle 3.

⁶⁵ 10 William III, c. 10.

⁶⁶ C. O. 5: 1262, 48.

⁶⁷ Archives, vol. xiii, p. 552.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, vol. xix, p. 104.

1700, and 1704⁶⁹ their gauge was declared to be forty-eight by thirty-two inches, a size slightly larger than that of the Virginia hogshead.⁷⁰ The ship-captains objected to the large size of these casks and systematically cut and, in the language of the colonial records, squeezed them to make them fit into the holds of their ships. This was a great grievance to the planters, for the quality of the tobacco was often injured in the squeezing process. In self-defense they passed a law in 1707 to accompany the latest measure regulating the size of casks. By this bill masters were prohibited under a very severe penalty from "Cropping, Cutting or Defacing Tobacco" taken on board ship.⁷¹ The London merchants strongly urged the home government to repeal these two laws, mainly on the ground that the increase in the size of the hogshead, taken in connection with the prohibition of squeezing, reduced the capacity of the ships.⁷² They also insisted that the penalty on the planters for exceeding the size of a hogshead, which was comparatively light,⁷³ and that on the ship-master for squeezing his lading, which was far heavier, should be made the same. The obnoxious laws were immediately repealed by the Privy Council,⁷⁴ and Governor Seymour was enjoined to have the Assembly pass a new measure making the size of Maryland casks conformable with those of Virginia and equalizing the penalties imposed upon ship-captains and planters.⁷⁵ The governor, however, was unable "to Winn their compliance to any the least of her Maj^{ty}s Just and reasonable commands."⁷⁶ Instead of passing a law, the members of the legislature petitioned the queen that they be allowed to retain the larger sized hogshead on

⁶⁹ Archives, vol. xxii, p. 560; vol. xxiv, p. 106; vol. xxvi, p. 331.

⁷⁰ The Virginia hogshead was 48 x 30 inches (Hening, vol. iii, pp. 435-437). The size which the English merchants wished to see adopted in Maryland was 46 x 28 inches (C. O. 5: 716, H. 67).

⁷¹ Archives, vol. xxvii, p. 157.

⁷² C. O. 5: 716, H. 49, H. 67.

⁷³ The penalty on the planter was six shillings, whereas that on the ship-captain was three pounds.

⁷⁴ Acts of the Privy Council, Col. vol. ii, p. 547.

⁷⁵ Archives, vol. xxv, p. 246; C. O. 5: 727, pp. 39-45.

⁷⁶ C. O. 5: 716, H. 97.

the plea that their tobacco could not be packed as tightly as that of Virginia without suffering deterioration.⁷⁷ The Board of Trade considered the petition but remained firm in its support of the London merchants,⁷⁸ and the provincial legislature was finally compelled to yield.⁷⁹ Edward Lloyd said that this compliance was "Gained with great difficulty, many of the Delegates, persisting in their opinion, that our Bright oranoca Tobacco required larger Casque, than the Tobacco usually made in Virginia."⁸⁰

The London merchants also attempted to interfere in the control and development of the tobacco trade on the English side of the water. Again and again they brought before Parliament and the Board of Trade long representations on the condition of the tobacco trade in England and on the Continent.⁸¹ While it is impossible to determine exactly the extent of their influence in shaping governmental policy, there was certainly in some important instances a striking similarity between their petitions and the course subsequently followed. For example, they complained of defects in the administration of the customs acts which increased the burden already imposed upon the trade by the high rate of duties in England.⁸² In 1713, after numerous efforts on

⁷⁷ Archives, vol. xxvii, pp. 279-281, 465; C. O. 5: 716, H. 97.

⁷⁸ C. O. 5: 727, pp. 245-250.

⁷⁹ Archives, vol. xxix, pp. 5, 39, 40, 74.

⁸⁰ C. O. 5: 717, I. 59. In 1715 the Maryland Assembly made another attempt to increase the size of the casks. The small gauge having been found to "tend to the ruin of" honest traders, it was increased by law to 48 x 32 inches. A discussion of the results of this attempt would take us outside of our period, but it is safe to say that the will of the moneyed classes was what finally decided the controversy (Archives, vol. xxx, p. 348).

⁸¹ The references for these representations of the merchants may be found below in the detailed discussion of their influence on English and continental trade in tobacco.

⁸² A copy of a proposed draught of an act regulating the tobacco trade. (No date.) This draught embodies all kinds of regulations for the importation of tobacco; administration of the customs; regulations for manufacturing tobacco; suggestions that it be sold only in London, etc. (Harleian MSS. 1238, f. 37, British Museum). A presentment from the Commissioners of the Customs to the Lords of the Treasury. A statement that part of the duties on tobacco and sugar was being lost to the king on account of the lax admin-

their part, new regulations were adopted.⁸³ The time allowed for payment of duties was extended, greater allowances for waste and shrinkage were made, the temporary hardships of certain vessels laden with tobacco then in the Thames were relieved, and the drawbacks on reexport were regulated.

Of the tobacco imported into England less than one third was consumed there, the remainder being reexported.⁸⁴ By the end of the seventeenth century large markets for plantation tobacco had been opened in Holland, France, the Baltic countries, Spain, Ireland, and other parts of Europe.⁸⁵ England exported to Spain, for example, in 1699, 2,122,657 pounds of tobacco; the following year, 2,558,298 pounds; and from 1712 to 1714, 1,839,483 pounds.⁸⁶ The exports to Holland and the Baltic were even larger than this, in both leaf and manufactured tobacco. In all this trade to the Continent the London merchants, naturally, were most prominently concerned. They followed every fluctuation in the sale of colonial tobacco in foreign countries. In 1697 and 1698 they petitioned for advantages in the tobacco trade with Russia,⁸⁷ and a year or two later the Board of Trade reported to the House of Commons that the English minister at the Hague had treated with the czar for this purpose.⁸⁸

Shortly after this, certain English merchants, evidently not in the powerful London group, attempted to get a monopoly on manufacturing plantation and Russian tobacco in Russia.⁸⁹ The Board of Trade, reporting on a petition pre-

istration of the custom house and that no due care was being taken of the bonds. It recommends in detail various ways in which this state of affairs may be remedied (Treasury Papers, xxix, 25). Proposals concerning building of Towns in Virginia. Proposals concerning the Custome of Tobacco (Egerton MSS. 2395, ff. 666, 667, British Museum. No date).

⁸³ C. O. 5: 1316, O. 159; 13 Anne, c. 8.

⁸⁴ C. O. 5: 1315, N. 19.

⁸⁵ House of Lords MSS., June 5, 1714; Egerton MSS. 921, f. 9 ff., British Museum; C. O. 5: 1315, N. 19.

⁸⁶ C. O. 390: 8.

⁸⁷ C. O. 5: 1309, 25, 43.

⁸⁸ Sloane MSS. 2902, f. 5, British Museum.

⁸⁹ C. O. 5: 1314, M. 18, M. 19, M. 20. A petition of the Virginia merchants against the "contractors with the Czar of Muscovy," as they called the other group.

sented to the Privy Council by the London merchants, recommended that this attempted monopoly be stopped as injurious to English trade and "against the interest and usage of the kingdom." The Privy Council thereupon ordered the proper steps to be taken to prevent its continuance.⁹⁰ Further efforts were also made by the merchants to keep open to all the trade with Russia in plantation tobacco.⁹¹

The trade with Russia was but one example of the way in which the men most interested kept track of continental conditions. From the beginning of the eighteenth century the merchants realized that the exportation of tobacco to the Continent was seriously decreasing, principally because of the war which cut off many markets from English merchants. The trade with France was almost entirely monopolized by the Dutch, who had begun to grow and to manufacture large quantities to supply the French market.⁹² The growing of tobacco in different parts of Germany and also in Hungary was largely increased during these years, and the demand for plantation tobacco was thereby lessened.⁹³ The exportations to Spain were seriously diminished,⁹⁴ and the troubles in the northern countries injured the trade to the Baltic.⁹⁵ Many remedies were suggested to improve this condition of affairs, both by the London merchants and by others interested in the tobacco trade. Robert Quarry, the surveyor of the customs for the middle colonies, suggested that a careful inspection be made of the conditions under which tobacco was grown and manufactured in Holland, in order to counteract the Dutch schemes to monopolize the trade.⁹⁶ The London merchants and tobacco manufacturers,

⁹⁰ Acts of the Privy Council, Col. vol. ii, p. 487; C. O. 5: 1314, M. 47.

⁹¹ C. O. 5: 1315, N. 7.

⁹² C. O. 5: 1315, N. 19, N. 29, 82 (ii-v inc.), 87; C. O. 5: 716, H. 75; C. O. 5: 3, February 2, 1705/6; Treasury Papers, cx, 33.

⁹³ C. O. 5: 1315, N. 19; House of Lords MSS., June 5, 1714.

⁹⁴ C. O. 5: 1315, N. 29; C. O. 5: 716, H. 75; C. O. 5: 3, February 2, 1705/6.

⁹⁵ C. O. 5: 716, H. 75; C. O. 5: 1315, N. 29, 82 (vii), 87; C. O. 5: 3, February 2, 1705/6; Egerton MSS. 921, f. 9, British Museum.

⁹⁶ C. O. 5: 3, 112.

in elaborate papers presented to the government, asked among other things that definite encouragement be given to the manufacturers of tobacco in England, that the royal navy be allowed to use only tobacco manufactured there, and that the English envoys at the courts of Spain, Russia, Sweden, and other places be instructed to gain favorable conditions for the importation of the plantation product.⁹⁷ As the loss of the French market was perhaps the greatest blow of all, the suggestion was made several times from about 1706 that, notwithstanding the war, tobacco be carried to France in neutral ships.⁹⁸ The Privy Council, on the advice of the Board of Trade, adopted this remedy.⁹⁹ In fact, the policy of the government in these matters generally followed the wishes of the London merchants.¹⁰⁰

We know, furthermore, that this same group of men attempted to give advice on political affairs in Maryland. In at least two cases they recommended to the Board of Trade and the Privy Council a proper person for the office of governor. They actually stated that they had chosen one man because he would serve their trade interests, or, as they expressed it, because he was a man "of integrity, ability, and well-versed in the trade and constitution of that province."¹⁰¹ Doubtless there were other cases in which they recommended officials for both Maryland and Virginia, but there is no evidence that their recommendations were accepted. Their advice with regard to the government of the colonies was probably considered less valuable than that on the economic situation.

Many of the richer planters shipped their tobacco directly to certain firms in England and received in exchange their

⁹⁷ C. O. 5: 1315, N. 32, 82 (i), 87; C. O. 5: 3, 121; Egerton MSS. 921, f. 10, British Museum.

⁹⁸ C. O. 5: 1315, N. 32; C. O. 5: 3, 112, 153; Add. MSS. 10453, ff. 347, 348, British Museum.

⁹⁹ C. O. 5: 3, 121; Acts of the Privy Council, Col. vol. ii, p. 536.

¹⁰⁰ Another case in point is a law of 1707 decreeing that only plantation tobacco be sold in the royal navy (6 Anne, c. 50).

¹⁰¹ C. O. 5: 727, p. 312; C. O. 5: 717, l. 56; Privy Council Register, 79, p. 264; Privy Council Papers, Unbound packets, Bundle 1702, 2. Neither one of the two men recommended in these references was made governor of Maryland.

own consignments of European goods.¹⁰² When a full order of goods was not wanted, they often drew bills of exchange payable by their merchants in England. They were apt to overdraw their accounts and to fall into debt to the firms with which they traded.¹⁰³

The poorer planters did not raise enough tobacco to pay for the expense of shipping it to England. The English merchants had to buy it while it was still in the colony, and to pay for it with goods sent to Maryland at their own risk. Under these circumstances they did not try to sell their imported cargoes at once, because they might have to sell at a loss. The profit of the Virginia voyage, after making allowance for the wages and victualling of the sailors and for the dangers of loss at sea or capture by the enemy, was not large enough to risk any additional losses. Instead, therefore, of attempting to sell immediately the English traders usually employed factors or merchants in the colony to whom their cargoes were consigned, to be disposed of gradually at profitable prices. These factors represented the interests of their employers in disposing of their ventures of European goods, in receiving and shipping tobacco paid in return, and in looking after the payment of all money or bills due the merchants.¹⁰⁴ The depots for the sale of European goods kept by the factors or by other merchants representing English interests took the form of regular stores, which must have been a feature of Maryland as well as of Virginia life at the close of the century.¹⁰⁵ Their significance was shown when, with the object of further exploiting the towns, it was made the law during Seymour's administration that stores kept by merchants and factors trading in the province had

¹⁰² Add. MSS. 22265, f. 102, British Museum. For a detailed discussion of conditions of exchange in Virginia see Bruce, vol. ii, ch. xvi. The situation in Maryland was similar to that in Virginia, but material bearing directly on the system of exchange in the former colony is hard to find.

¹⁰³ C. O. 5: 717, I. 46; C. O. 5: 716, H. 45.

¹⁰⁴ Archives, vol. xxiii, p. 72; vol. xxv, p. 74; vol. xx, p. 550.

¹⁰⁵ For a discussion of the stores in Virginia see Bruce, vol. ii, pp. 381-385. The material available for the history of the local store in Maryland is very scanty.

to be in the towns marked out by the Assembly.¹⁰⁶ That inhabitants of the country also kept stores is indicated by a complaint made about the same time that merchants residing in the country were not subject to this law.¹⁰⁷ The poor planters probably fell in debt to these storekeepers in the colony as frequently as their richer neighbors to the English merchants. "These Gentlemen," said Quarry to the Board of Trade, "take care to Supply the poorer Sort with Provisions—goods and necessarys, and are Sure to keep them allways in Debt, and consequently dependant on them."¹⁰⁸

When goods were brought over in this latter way to be sold in stores, it was part of the colonial idea of fair trade that such goods should not be bought up wholesale by the "Covetous & active presort of people," who would sell them again to the inhabitants at a higher price.¹⁰⁹ It was the old fear that Englishmen had had from the time of Edward III that the "middlemen gained at the expense of the public; and it seemed to follow that if middlemen did not gain, the public would be put to less expense."¹¹⁰ Edward III prevented English merchants from buying or forestalling wine in Gascony before it was imported into England.¹¹¹ In the reign of Edward VI a general law was passed against buying up corn, wine, fish, and so forth.¹¹² The colonists in Maryland, as in the other colonies, were but following their inherited ideas of fair trade when they tried to prevent the forestalling and regrating of European goods imported into the province. The practice was forbidden by law as essentially unfair to the ordinary planter who expected to pur-

¹⁰⁶ Archives, vol. xxvii, pp. 247, 248.

¹⁰⁷ C. O. 5: 716, H. 94.

¹⁰⁸ C. O. 5: 1314, M. 62. In 1710 Edward Lloyd complained that the country merchants had advanced 200 per cent on the price of their commodities and were refusing to take tobacco in payment (C. O. 5: 717, I. 46).

¹⁰⁹ Archives, vol. vii, p. 253.

¹¹⁰ W. Cunningham, *The Growth of English Industry and Commerce during the Early and Middle Ages*, 4th ed., p. 319.

¹¹¹ 27 Edward III, Stat. I, c. 5-7.

¹¹² 5 and 6 Edward VI, c. 14.

chase directly from the factor.¹¹³ On the other hand, a too rigid enforcement of this law would have been very hard on the merchants who wished to dispose of their cargo quickly, so forestalling and regrating were often practised in the colony.¹¹⁴

The general prevalence of the system of direct exchange of the Maryland staple for the goods wanted from England almost obviated the necessity for money as a medium of exchange. It was only in the local trade that the need of a money exchange was actually felt, and it has been shown that for this purpose there was some coin in Maryland brought in through the West Indian trade. Laws were enacted from time to time to fix the value of foreign coins and so regulate local trading.¹¹⁵ These tentative efforts ended in 1708 with the law passed to conform to the English proclamation making the value of foreign coins uniform in all the colonies.¹¹⁶ Such coin was used solely for what Hugh Jones in his letter called "pocket expenses,"¹¹⁷ and all trading on a large scale was done in terms of tobacco or by bills of exchange.

Bills of exchange were drawn in Maryland by planters or by ship-captains on tobacco merchants. "This instrument was only used when the party who gave it had a balance to his credit in the hands of some merchant, the drawee being generally a person of this calling who resided in England, New England, Barbadoes, or in one of the other English colonies."¹¹⁸ For instance, the English government more

¹¹³ Laws against forestalling and regrating were often passed in the colony (Archives, vol. i, pp. 161, 294, 351; vol. ii, p. 131; vol. vii, p. 253; vol. xiii, pp. 526, 544; vol. xxii, p. 558; vol. xxiv, p. 104; vol. xxvi, p. 323). The act of 1704 was disapproved by the attorney-general in England as defective in construction and as unreasonable because no exceptions were allowed (C. O. 5: 716, H. 48).

¹¹⁴ At one time, for instance, Edward Randolph reported a ship-master to the Council for having broken his cargo to trade contrary to this law, but because of the damage which would result to the colony if he were protested he was allowed to continue trading (Archives, vol. xxv, p. 129).

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, vol. ii, p. 286; vol. xiii, pp. 142, 493.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, vol. xxvii, p. 350.

¹¹⁷ Royal Society, Letter Books, I, i, 183.

¹¹⁸ Bruce, vol. ii, p. 516.

than once requested Maryland to share the expenses incurred in defending New York in the Indian wars. At least once this sum was paid to New York in bills of exchange drawn on English merchants by masters of ships who had given them to the colony in payment for duties. The province sent these bills to New York, and from there they finally went to England to be cashed.¹¹⁹ In the circuitous travels of these bills and the long time that elapsed before they were presented for redemption the balance to the credit of the drawer was often overdrawn and the bills were protested.¹²⁰ In Virginia as well as in Maryland it was found necessary to impose a heavy penalty on the drawer of a bill which came back protested. In the latter colony from 1682 damages of twenty per cent of the value of the bill were exacted besides its payment and the cost of the suit.¹²¹ In 1708 the damages were lessened on the representation of the Assembly that they were so high that merchants were tempted to protest bills even when they had the money with which to discharge them.¹²² The merchants, as in so many other cases, objected to this change in the law, and the Privy Council repealed it.¹²³ In 1715, therefore, the damage on protested

¹¹⁹ Archives, vol. xx, pp. 16, 48, 49, 71. In another case Peter Paggen, the agent for Maryland, told the Privy Council that he had received bills by order of the Convention of Maryland drawn in the same way by masters of ships on their correspondents in England in discharge of the duty of two shillings per hogshead on tobacco (*ibid.*, vol. viii, p. 281).

¹²⁰ For example, bills of exchange for over £300 sent to New York by Governor Copley early in the period of royal government were returned to Maryland as protested in England (Archives, vol. xx, pp. 220, 221). The Maryland Council repudiated this whole transaction (*ibid.*, p. 235).

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, vol. vii, p. 323; vol. xiii, p. 449; vol. xxii, p. 464; vol. xxvi, p. 356.

¹²² *Ibid.*, vol. xxvii, p. 364.

¹²³ C. O. 5: 717, I. 3. This action of the Privy Council was due to the representations of the Board of Trade. "By this Law, the Persons who take Bills of Exchange will not get common Interest, for their Money, in case the Bills be protested, for it often happens that it is 18 Months or Two Years from the time of drawing such Bills before they can be returned, and the payment Demanded, These are Hardships which the Merchants here complain of" (C. O. 5: 727, p. 141). It would appear, therefore, in this particular case at least, that the recommendation of the Board of Trade was based directly on the complaint of the London merchant.

bills of exchange was again raised to twenty per cent.¹²⁴ In spite of all difficulties, however, most large payments in both public and private transactions were made by bills of exchange.

Regarding the trade routes of the colony elsewhere than to England but little need be said. When negroes began to be imported into Maryland and Virginia in large numbers, the English ships primarily concerned in the tobacco trade sometimes varied their voyages to increase the profits. They sailed first to the Guinea coast, where they bought negroes to exchange in Virginia or Maryland for cargoes of tobacco.¹²⁵ Governor Seymour wrote in 1708 that before 1698 few negroes had been brought directly from Africa, most of them being imported in small lots from the island colonies. Since then, however, the trade had "run high," but it was being carried on exclusively by separate traders, the Royal African Company not having supplied one negro to the province during the decade. It was his opinion that if separate traders were to be excluded the supply would so decrease that the colony would suffer greatly.¹²⁶ To show the extent of this trade he enclosed two lists, one for all importations of negroes between 1698 and 1707 and the other for 1708.¹²⁷ All but two of the ships named in these lists were from London, showing the general line of trade; the other two imported negroes from Barbadoes. Governor Seymour also stated that there was no Maryland shipping employed in this trade,¹²⁸ which was, therefore, practically confined to English vessels not connected with the Royal African Company.

This trade, although in a way bringing into Maryland an

¹²⁴ Archives, vol. xxx, p. 243.

¹²⁵ Privy Council Register, 76, May, 1697, to December, 1699. This volume of the Register contains numerous permissions given to English ships to sail to Guinea.

¹²⁶ C. O. 5: 716, H. 91.

¹²⁷ C. O. 5: 716, H. 92, H. 93; Archives, vol. xxv, p. 257.

¹²⁸ In 1693 Richard Hill, master of the *Hope* of Maryland, was forbidden to make the voyage to Guinea on account of the monopoly of the Royal African Company (Archives, vol. xx, p. 117).

import from a foreign country, was entirely in the hands of English shipping. As negroes were almost the only important foreign commodity, there was naturally no reason for the presence of any really foreign shipping in the colonial ports. Edward Randolph wrote in 1698 to the Board of Trade that there were many Scottish merchants in Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Maryland, but his zeal for the observance of the Acts of Trade conveys a somewhat exaggerated impression of the extent of this trade, at least in Maryland.¹²⁹ Between 1689 and 1699 there are eleven definite records of vessels bound for or from Scotland directly. About twenty-five ships in addition during those years were supposed to have been concerned in the same trade.¹³⁰ In 1707 trade with Scotland was legalized, but there are no records to indicate that this route ever became very popular.

In 1703 the Maryland Council reported that the colony had no trade at all with the French settlements in America,¹³¹ and a little later Governor Seymour stated that there was no one in Maryland who dared take advantage of the queen's permission to open up trade with the Spanish colonies.¹³² The small amount of corn sent to Lisbon was probably carried in plantation ships, no Portuguese vessels coming into Maryland.¹³³ The trade with Madeira and the Azores was also conducted for the most part in ships owned and built in the plantations, although occasionally an English vessel stopped at the islands on the way to Maryland.¹³⁴ The trade to foreign countries, on the whole, was extremely small, em-

¹²⁹ C. O. 5: 1258, 26 (ii).

¹³⁰ See Chapter III, pages 118, 119, for a detailed statement of the ships in this trade.

¹³¹ Archives, vol. xxv, p. 163.

¹³² C. O. 5: 209, p. 13, February 23, 1703/4. A copy of the circular letter from the secretary of state giving permission for this trade; C. O. 5: 716, H. 14; C. O. 5: 3, 23, 23 (i).

¹³³ C. O. 5: 717, I. 63, I. 106.

¹³⁴ The Naval Office Lists (C. O. 5: 749) show several instances of plantation-owned ships trading to the islands, and at least two cases where the ships were owned in England. See also C. O. 5: 716, H. 74, and Sloane MSS. 2291, British Museum. In the latter reference mention is made of a New England ship bound from Fyall to Maryland.

playing practically no foreign shipping and but few plantation vessels.

The colonial authorities often commented in general terms on Maryland's trade with the other English colonies. In 1697 they said that there was little traffic of this sort and that the little done was in small craft belonging either to the province or to New England.¹³⁵ Again, in 1708 Governor Seymour wrote that the trade of Maryland-built ships was confined to the West Indies and the Azores.¹³⁶ A record of the Virginia Council of October, 1708, shows that Virginia was trading in that year to a small extent with Barbadoes, New England, New York, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Bermuda, in ships belonging to the colonies named.¹³⁷ The conditions in the two colonies were much the same. It is evident that Barbadoes and New England were the most important trading centers and that the carrying for all inter-colonial traffic was largely done by outsiders. From the Naval Office Records, moreover, a list of vessels concerned in the intercolonial trade may actually be compiled. As printed below, this list will show the number of ships found in Maryland, the colonies where they were owned, and the ports from which they had sailed and to which they were bound. A dash is used where these ports are not known.¹³⁸

¹³⁵ Archives, vol. xix, p. 540.

¹³⁶ C. O. 5: 716, H. 74.

¹³⁷ C. O. 5: 1316, O. 25. The Council, however, said: "There's very little Trade carried on by the Inhabitants of this Colony to any of her Majestys plantations."

¹³⁸ It has already been explained that the lists are not accurate, but general conclusions may certainly be drawn from calculations based on them. Moreover, there is no indication of any increase in the amount of the plantation trade between 1700 and 1715, so the years to 1700 covered by the Naval Office Lists may fairly be taken as indicative of the amount of plantation shipping for the whole period of royal government.

Ownership	From	To	Number
In 1690, 26 ships			
New England	New England	New England	5
New England	Barbadoes	Barbadoes	1
New England	New England	Barbadoes	2
New England	New England	Jamaica	1
Maryland	Maryland	7
Maryland	Maryland	Virginia	2
Maryland	Barbadoes	England	1
Barbadoes	Barbadoes	Barbadoes	3
New York	New York	New York	2
Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania	1
Virginia	Virginia	Virginia	1
In 1691, 19 ships			
New England	New England	New England	3
New England	3
New England	New England	England	1
New England	New England	Barbadoes	1
New England	Barbadoes	Barbadoes	1
Maryland	Maryland	4
Maryland	Barbadoes	Barbadoes	2
Barbadoes	Barbadoes	Barbadoes	1
Barbadoes	Barbadoes	England	2
Virginia	Virginia	Virginia	1
In 1692, 21 ships			
New England	1
New England	New England	New England	4
New England	Barbadoes	England	1
New England	New England	England	2
New England	New England	Barbadoes	2
Maryland	1
Barbadoes	Barbadoes	Barbadoes	1
New York	1
New York	New York	New York	2
New York	New York	Jamaica	1
Virginia	Virginia	Virginia	5
In 1693, 44 ships			
New England	2
New England	New England	New England	10
New England	New England	Barbadoes	1
New England	Barbadoes	England	1
New England	New England	England	2
New England	Virginia	New England	1
Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania	London	1
Maryland	7
Maryland	Maryland	Barbadoes	1
Maryland	Maryland	New England	1
New York	2
New York	New York	New York	7
New York	New York	Jamaica	1
Virginia	1
Virginia	Virginia	Virginia	6

Ownership	From	To	Number
In 1694, 32 ships			
New England	New England	New England	9
New England	New England	Barbadoes	1
New England	Barbadoes	New England	1
New England	New England	—	1
New England	New England	England	1
Maryland	Maryland	Virginia	2
Maryland	Maryland	Pennsylvania	1
Maryland	Barbadoes	—	1
Maryland	Maryland	New England	1
Maryland	Pennsylvania	Barbadoes	1
Maryland	New Providence	Madeira	1
New York	—	—	1
New York	New York	Barbadoes	1
New York	New York	New York	2
New York	Barbadoes	England	1
Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania	3
Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania	England	1
Virginia	—	—	2
Virginia	New York	Virginia	1
In 1695, 24 ships			
New England	New England	New England	4
Maryland	—	—	2
Maryland	Madeira	Madeira	1
Maryland	Maryland	Barbadoes	3
Maryland	Maryland	—	1
Maryland	Barbadoes	Pennsylvania	1
Maryland	Maryland	Pennsylvania	1
New York	—	—	1
New York	New York	New York	2
Pennsylvania	—	—	1
Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania	—	1
Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania	2
Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania	New England	1
Pennsylvania	New York	New York	1
Virginia	—	—	2
In 1696, 42 ships			
New England	Barbadoes	Virginia	1
New England	New England	New England	3
Maryland	—	—	6
Maryland	Maryland	Maryland	1
Maryland	Barbadoes	Barbadoes	2
Maryland	Maryland	Barbadoes	3
Maryland	Maryland	Virginia	1
New York	New York	New York	5
New York	New York	Liverpool	1
New York	New York	Maryland	1
Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania	1
Pennsylvania	Maryland	Pennsylvania	2
Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania	Virginia	1
Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania	—	1
Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania	Maryland	1
Pennsylvania	Maryland	—	1

Ownership	From	To	Number
Virginia	—	Virginia	3
Virginia	Virginia	Pennsylvania	1
Virginia	Virginia	Virginia	1
Virginia	Virginia	Barbadoes	1
Carolinas	Carolinas	Carolinas	1
Carolinas	New England	Maryland	1
Bermuda	Bermuda	Providence	1
Plantation	—	—	2

In 1697, 56 ships

New England	New England	New England	5
New England	New England	—	7
New England	New England	England	1
New England	England	England	1
New England	Delaware Bay	S. Carolina	1
New England	Virginia	—	1
New England	Maryland	—	1
Maryland	—	—	9
Maryland	Maryland	—	2
Maryland	—	Virginia	2
Maryland	Fyall	—	1
Maryland	Barbadoes	—	3
Maryland	Barbadoes	Barbadoes	1
Maryland	Virginia	Maryland	1
New York	—	—	2
New York	New York	New York	2
New York	—	New York	1
New York	New York	Virginia	1
New York	New York	Maryland	1
New York	New York	London	1
Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania	—	2
Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania	2
Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania	London	1
Pennsylvania	Virginia	New England	1
Virginia	Virginia	—	1
Virginia	Virginia	New England	1
Carolinas	Carolinas	—	1
Carolinas	Carolinas	London	1
Bermuda	Bermuda	Barbadoes	1
Barbadoes	Barbadoes	Virginia	1

In 1698, 10 ships

New England	—	—	2
New England	Maryland	Maryland	1
Maryland	—	—	4
New York	—	—	1
Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania	1
Virginia	—	—	1

In 1699, 24 ships

New England	New England	New England	3
Maryland	New Providence	New Providence	1
Maryland	Barbadoes	Carolinas	1
Maryland	Madeira	Maryland	1

Ownership	From	To	Number
Maryland	Carolinas	Maryland	1
Maryland	New Providence	Madeira	1
Maryland	Maryland	Madeira	1
New York	New York	New York	2
New York	New York	Maryland	1
Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania	3
Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania	—	2
Pennsylvania	Virginia	—	1
Pennsylvania	Barbadoes	Carolinas	1
West Jersey	West Jersey	West Jersey	1
Virginia	Carolinas	Virginia	1
Carolinas	Carolinas	Bermuda	1
Bermuda	Bermuda	Bermuda	1
Jamaica	Maryland	England	1

In 1700, 15 ships

New England	New England	New England	1
New England	Port Lewis	Port Lewis	1
Maryland	Maryland	Barbadoes	1
Maryland	Barbadoes	Maryland	1
Maryland	—	Port Lewis	1
Maryland	Barbadoes	Madeira	1
Maryland	Barbadoes	Barbadoes	1
Maryland	Carolinas	Pennsylvania	1
New York	New York	New York	3
New York	New York	England	1
Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania	2
Plantation	Carolinas	—	1

In 1701, 15 ships

New England	New England	New England	2
New England	New England	England	2
Maryland	Barbadoes	Barbadoes	1
Maryland	Barbadoes	Maryland	1
Maryland	Nevis	Barbadoes	1
Maryland	—	New Providence ...	1
New York	New York	New York	3
Carolinas	Carolinas	Carolinas	1
Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania	2
Bermuda	Barbadoes	Barbadoes ¹³⁹	1

The general estimates of the colonial authorities were evidently nearly correct. More boats came into Maryland from New England than from any other place. Next to these the largest part of the trade was actually done by Maryland vessels, as the Council stated. The chief line of trade in either New England or Maryland vessels was that to Barbadoes. Nearly all other voyages were made along the coast.

¹³⁹ C. O. 5: 749, *passim*.

The size of the boats concerned in the plantation trade was small, most of them being sloops of from ten to twenty tons, with a few brigantines of larger tonnage. The trade routes were neither varied nor important and were not to be compared with the great route to England.

It is usually thought that Marylanders owned few or no vessels of their own, but this impression is inaccurate. Between 1689 and 1701, for instance, there were definitely named in the Naval Office Lists at least eighty boats from Maryland, three of them registering over one hundred tons and the largest two hundred.¹⁴⁰ In 1697 the sheriffs of the colony were directed to return lists of all shipping built, building, or owned in their respective counties, and of all seafaring men living there. The investigation gave the following results: In Anne Arundel County there were 4 brigantines, 2 built in England and 2 in the colony; 4 ships, 3 built apparently in England and 1 in the colony; 8 sloops, apparently all built in the county; 11 shallops, belonging in the county; 3 commanders; and 7 apprentices. In Calvert County there were 8 sloops, 4 shallops, and no seafaring men; in Prince George's County, 1 brigantine, 3 sloops, and 3 seafaring men. In Baltimore County there were 3 shallops, but no vessel was built in the county. In Charles County there were 3 sloops, 5 shallops, and 5 seafaring men, but no seafaring boats were built there. In St. Mary's County were found 4 ships, 1 owned in England; 6 sloops; 4 shallops; and 10 seafaring men. In Somerset County the lists show 4 ships, 12 sloops, 12 shallops, and 2 seafaring men; in Cecil County, 1 brigantine, 1 sloop, 6 shallops, and no seafaring men; in Dorchester County, 3 brigantines, 6 sloops, 3 shallops, and no seafaring men. In Kent County there were 4 ships, 1 owned in England; 1 brigantine; 5 sloops; 1 shallop; and 35 seafaring men. In Talbot County there were 6 pinks, 2 brigantines, 5 ships, 19 sloops, 7 shallops, and

¹⁴⁰ C. O. 5: 749. In making up this estimate a vessel which made more than one trip is counted only once.

6 seafaring men.¹⁴¹ There was, therefore, a total number of 161 ships, sloops, and shallops, built or building in Maryland at the end of the century. In Talbot County the tonnage was given. Two ships, the sheriff of that county said, registered four hundred tons and three were rated at three hundred. These figures are in a measure borne out by Governor Seymour's statement that good ships were built in Maryland. He even named one of four hundred tons, and said that several were large enough to be concerned in the English trade.¹⁴² Most of them, undoubtedly, were small. Governor Hart estimated in 1720 that there were only four small brigantines and twenty seagoing sloops owned in the province.¹⁴³ The sheriffs' figures, however, make it evident that a good many small vessels were owned and, in most cases, built in Maryland. The Eastern Shore counties were more concerned in ship-building and in the coast trade than those of the Western Shore because they exported comparatively little tobacco to England. The representatives of the colony were more than eager that this infant industry should be supported and encouraged by the province. Throughout the whole period of royal government there were enacted various laws remitting, for the encouragement of inhabitants building ships in the province, the duties on imports brought in on native ships.¹⁴⁴ No elabo-

¹⁴¹ Archives, vol. xxv, pp. 595-601; C. O. 5: 714, 47 (xi), B. 40. The shallops included in this list were probably not counted in the Naval Office figures, as they never went out of the colony. If that is true, the sheriff's figures do not vary greatly from those made from the Naval Office Records. Omitting the shallops, the county reports made up a total of 110 ships and sloops built or owned in Maryland.

¹⁴² C. O. 5: 716, H. 74. Governor Seymour said, however, that not so many ships were being built at the time when he was writing (1708). "The Countrey are naturally inclined to building Vessells and the Natives take it upon them Very readily but the loss of their Small Craft by the ffrench in trading to the West Indies together with their Low circumstances not having wherewithall to procure Sailes Rigging and Ironworke has not only discouragd but Totally Disabled them from the Attempt."

¹⁴³ C. O. 5: 717, I. 106.

¹⁴⁴ Archives, vol. xiii, p. 387; vol. xix, pp. 229, 248, 257; vol. xx, p. 411; vol. xxvi, p. 349. Remission of tonnage duty for same reason (*ibid.*, vol. xix, p. 114).

rate merchant marine was developed in the colony even as a result of this legislation, but the art of ship-building was never entirely neglected.

The subject of trade routes and exchange cannot be considered complete without an investigation of the somewhat difficult question of illicit trading. It is of interest to find out whether enough illegal trade was carried on in Maryland to increase appreciably the total amount of her commerce, and whether the colony was in league with any of the pirates who are known to have traded in some of the other colonies in defiance of the law. Exact records of smuggling operations were naturally never made public by the smugglers, but the men who came into contact with the colony often recorded their impressions of the amount of illegal trading done there. It is on the authority of these opinions that answers to the foregoing queries must be based.

As the trade with England was the most important, the most serious form of illegal trade would naturally be that carried on in defiance of the English Navigation Acts. Vessels trading in the colony must be of English or colonial build, must import foreign articles only through England, and above all must carry tobacco, an enumerated commodity, directly home or to another English plantation. To enforce these regulations all vessels had to be registered in England, their registry had to be examined in the colony, and heavy bond had to be given there for the proper delivery of the tobacco. After 1672, if the bond was not given for delivery in England, all tobacco paid a duty of one penny on the pound, and even then it had to be shipped only to an English plantation. These were the laws which the English governors in Maryland, and especially the zealous English customs officials, complained were frequently broken. Edward Randolph told the Commissioners of the Customs, for instance, that it was the fraudulent practice of collectors to allow tobacco to be loaded on forged certificates, for

offering which there was no penalty in the colony,¹⁴⁵ to accept short entries for the payment of the penny a pound provided masters purchased the collectors' own crops for export,¹⁴⁶ and to permit goods to be imported directly from foreign countries.¹⁴⁷ He asserted, too, that bonds were given as security by men of insufficient estates in the colony, that they were often falsely discharged, as it was hard to get a colonial jury to prosecute a forfeited bond,¹⁴⁸ and that tobacco was often shipped aboard New England or other plantation vessels without paying duty or giving any bond at all.¹⁴⁹ Randolph's *bête noir* was the direct trade to Scotland. He accused Maryland of allowing Scottish-owned vessels to trade freely in the colony and to ship large cargoes of tobacco directly to their native country.¹⁵⁰ Others confirmed Randolph's testimony that tobacco was secretly shipped from the colony,¹⁵¹ and the Commissioners of the Customs formally reported that foreign goods came into Maryland often by way of Newfoundland.¹⁵²

While the Associators (1689-1691) were in control of Maryland, the general impression was that these varied forms of smuggling were frequently practiced. Clandestine trading in Maryland was easy, reported one ship-captain in 1691.¹⁵³ Before Governor Copley arrived in the following year, Governor Nicholson of Virginia complained that Maryland, being under a loose government, crippled the neighboring colony where trade was more strictly controlled.¹⁵⁴ Edward Randolph as usual discovered a most serious state of

¹⁴⁵ C. O. 323: 2, 6.

¹⁴⁶ C. O. 323: 3, 79.

¹⁴⁷ C. O. 323: 2, 6.

¹⁴⁸ C. O. 323: 2, 6.

¹⁴⁹ C. O. 323: 2, 6. See also C. O. 5: 1257, 26 (viii).

¹⁵⁰ C. O. 323: 2, 6; C. O. 5: 1308, 56; C. O. 5: 1258, 26 (iii).

¹⁵¹ C. O. 323: 6, I. 93. Robert Quarry claimed in 1699/1700 that a great deal of tobacco was shipped openly from the continental colonies to Barbadoes, where it was repacked and was then smuggled into England without paying the duty. This would be another way of avoiding full payment of the tobacco duties in the colonies and in England (C. O. 5: 1260, 90 (vi)).

¹⁵² Treasury Papers, lvi, 82; C. O. 323: 2, 144 (i).

¹⁵³ Cal. St. P. Col. 1689-1692, 1951.

¹⁵⁴ Cal. St. P. Col. 1689-1692, 2075.

affairs when he arrived in the colony in 1692. He wrote to Governor Copley immediately: "I know there is a great deal to doe in your parts, especially in the Eastern Country adjoining to Newcastle;"¹⁵⁵ and, again, to the Commissioners of the Customs: "In my last letter I told you of the number of vessels trading illegally."¹⁵⁶ He constantly reported ships which in one way or another were violating the Acts of Trade. A single list contains nine vessels, seven of them bound for Scotland.¹⁵⁷ Robert Quarry claimed that Maryland was infected by Pennsylvania's bad example.¹⁵⁸ Both of these men are known to have been over-officious in their zeal, and their reports are perhaps somewhat exaggerated. It is certain, however, that between 1691 and 1702 at least thirty-one vessels were definitely recorded as engaged in illegal trade, twenty-one before 1696.¹⁵⁹ Almost all of them were seized, and eleven can be positively identified as Scottish or as concerned in the direct trade with Scotland. There

¹⁵⁵ Archives, vol. viii, p. 317.

¹⁵⁶ Cal. St. P. Col. 1689-1692, 2446.

¹⁵⁷ C. O. 5: 1308, 56.

¹⁵⁸ C. O. 5: 1257, 29.

¹⁵⁹ The detailed list for each year is as follows:—

Year	Number	Reference
1691	1	Cal. St. P. Col. 1689-1692, 1951.
1692	6	Cal. St. P. Col. 1689-1692, 2295; Archives, vol. xiii, pp. 320, 327; C. O. 323: 2, 7. In 1692 Randolph asserted that there were in Somerset County thirty sail of Scottish, Irish, and New England ownership trading illegally. He said that about twenty vessels had sailed in the past eight months, but he made no specific charges except against the six already recorded (Cal. St. P. Col. 1689-1692, 2295).
1694	12	C. O. 5: 1308, 56; C. O. 323: 2, 7; Archives, vol. xx, pp. 64, 65. Eleven of these ships were almost certainly seized by Randolph.
1695	2	Archives, vol. xx, pp. 309, 322.
1696	4	Archives, vol. xx, pp. 366, 403, 463, 487.
1698	2	Archives, vol. xxii, p. 25; vol. xxiii, p. 380.
1699	3	C. O. 5: 714, 71 A, C. 36.
1702	1	C. O. 5: 745, p. 13. Randolph was the prosecutor against this ship.

are, besides, a number of other more or less specific reports that the illegal trade with Scotland was considerable,¹⁶⁰ but the province apparently made no attempt to communicate with the Scottish colony at Darien whose effect on colonial trade was feared in England.¹⁶¹

When the royal government was once firmly established after Governor Nicholson's arrival, smuggling evidently became less and less easy. The inhabitants complained of the strictness with which trade was regulated.¹⁶² Governor Blakiston announced that "This Place has formerly been a Nest of foul and illegal Traders."¹⁶³ Governor Seymour asserted in 1708 that very little illegal trade had been carried on since his arrival and that the few cases which had occurred had been severely punished.¹⁶⁴ In 1708 the Acts of Trade were extended to Scotland, and the question of trade

¹⁶⁰ In 1690 two ships from Virginia or Maryland were seized in Glasgow for unloading tobacco not entered in England (Privy Council Register, 74, p. 4). George Plater in 1694 stated to the Council that several vessels from Maryland had sailed directly to Scotland, whereupon he was ordered to put their bonds in suit (Archives, vol. xx, p. 65). Randolph accused Nehemiah Blakiston, collector of Potomac, of allowing eight vessels to clear for Scottish ports about the same time (C. O. 323: 2, 7). In 1695 the colony was notified of four vessels to arrive from Scotland (Archives, vol. xx, p. 340). Governor Nicholson informed the Board of Trade, March, 1696, that Gustavus Hambleton, a ship-master, was supposed to have taken three or four hundred hogsheads of tobacco to Aberdeen (C. O. 5: 714, 1). In 1696 four vessels came from Scotland with Scottish goods and two sailed thither from Maryland with tobacco (Archives, vol. xx, p. 546; vol. xxiii, pp. 11, 12). One such vessel was reported in 1698, and the Commissioners of the Customs notified the governor of the colony that ships were supposed to be building in Maryland for the Scottish trade (*ibid.*, vol. xxiii, pp. 328, 329). And finally, in 1699, three Scottish merchants were to be apprehended for trading in the colony (*ibid.*, vol. xxv, p. 73). None of these vessels apparently was seized or prosecuted in Maryland. Some of these cases are mentioned in the study by T. Keith, *Commercial Relations of England and Scotland, 1603-1707*, p. 125.

¹⁶¹ The Commissioners of the Customs sent a number of letters to Maryland officials forbidding any trade with the Scots at Darien, letters which were officially proclaimed in the colony. There is, however, no notice of any Maryland vessel having sailed for Darien, though Blakiston wrote that Pennsylvania was supposed to have fitted out some vessels for this trade (Archives, vol. xx, pp. 345-355; C. O. 5: 719, 3, Bundle 7).

¹⁶² Treasury Papers, I, 27, nos. 6, 8.

¹⁶³ C. O. 5: 719, 3, Bundle 7.

¹⁶⁴ C. O. 5: 716, H. 74.

contrary to their provisions apparently ceased to be of any great importance in Maryland under the royal governors.¹⁶⁵

All through this period smuggling, whether extensive or not, was a matter of great concern to the English authorities. At this time the colonial policy of the Board of Trade was well defined and energetically carried out. Every effort was made to ensure strict supervision of the commerce of Maryland. Proposals to prevent smuggling were frequently sent to the authorities in England by persons familiar with the tobacco trade, and were gratefully received and considered.¹⁶⁶ Every royal governor, along with his ordinary instructions from the Board of Trade, received on his entry into office a long and elaborate set of directions for the observance of the Acts of Trade.¹⁶⁷ Further information

¹⁶⁵ The Commissioners of the Customs presented a report to the House of Lords in 1695 on illegal trade in the proprietary colonies. The query was whether Carolina, Maryland, Pennsylvania, etc., were keeping the Acts of Trade. In the answer given, that "we are doubtful whether the Said plantacon Lawes are so well Executed . . . in Carolina, Pennsylvania, the Jerseyes and Road Islands as in the other Plantations," the name of Maryland is, significantly enough, omitted (Treasury Papers, xxxvi, 3).

The records are full of complaints that Pennsylvania was a hot-bed of smuggling (C. O. 5: 1257, 27, 28, 29; C. O. 5: 1260, 90 (vi); C. O. 5: 719, 4, Bundle 5; C. O. 5: 719, 18, Bundle 3; C. O. 5: 714, 1, 17, 17 (iii), 52, 52 (v), 52 (vi)). Maryland occasionally sent tobacco to Pennsylvania for direct shipment elsewhere than to England (C. O. 5: 713, 115; C. O. 5: 1314, M. 62; Archives, vol. xxiii, p. 87). In 1697 a certain Pennsylvanian, however, denied that this practice was ever allowed. "And as to running Tobaccoe to Pensilvania at the head of the Bay from Maryland is a Gen^l mistake the Inhabitants of Pensilvania forbidding it by a Perticular law of their making And to my knowledge instead of that there was the Last year about 100 hhds Tobaccoe Transported over Land from Pensilvania to Maryland Partly by a Permit of Col^l Ninkolsons being tobaccoe to be transported that way for England" (C. O. 5: 1257, 4). On the whole Maryland must have had little share in the illegal trade of the northern colony.

¹⁶⁶ Proposals Humbly offered to the Hon^{er}ble House of Commons, not dated (Harleian MSS. 1238, f. 1, British Museum). Mr. Randolph's account of the way illegal trade is encouraged in Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania, with ways of prevention (C. O. 323: 2, 6). Colonel Quarry to the Board of Trade. Among other things he considered proposals for the security of trade primarily in the plantations (C. O. 323: 5, 19).

¹⁶⁷ Instructions to Governor Nicholson (Archives, vol. xxiii, p. 311). Instructions to Governor Seymour (C. O. 5: 726, p. 222). Instructions to Governor Hart (C. O. 5: 727, p. 398).

concerning the Acts was also given him from time to time.¹⁶⁸ The Lords of the Council, the House of Lords, and especially the Board of Trade and the Commissioners of the Customs, as most concerned in colonial affairs, corresponded often with all the colonial governments on every phase of the question of illegal trade. They wanted to know in detail the extent of the smuggling in each province, and they urged the governors in circular letters to observe the Acts of Trade in their provinces, to force their customs officials to perform their duties, to support them while so doing, and to prevent illegal trade with Europe by way of Newfoundland.¹⁶⁹

The governors of Maryland supported the royal efforts to crush illegal trade. Governor Nicholson received from the lord high admiral of England a commission as vice-admiral with authority to erect an admiralty court in Maryland,¹⁷⁰ and he executed his office by naming and establishing during his administration full admiralty courts for the trial of offenses against the Acts of Trade.¹⁷¹ Although the

¹⁶⁸ Archives, vol. xx, p. 418; C. O. 5: 726, p. 284; C. O. 5: 727, p. 47.

¹⁶⁹ Queries of Board of Trade about the methods of preventing illegal trade in Maryland (Archives, vol. xx, p. 499; C. O. 5: 726, p. 436). Commissioners of the Customs to the governors of plantations, a paper enclosed in their report to the House of Lords (Treasury Papers, xxxvi, 3). Lords of the Council to Maryland, enclosing late act of Parliament regulating frauds (Archives, vol. xx, p. 418). Address of House of Lords to the king about the state of trade in the kingdoms with reference to the plantations (C. O. 323: 2, 46). Order in Council approving order for naval officers to give security and directing such order to be sent to the governors of plantations (C. O. 323: 2, 145). Copy of instructions to Governor Blakiston (C. O. 5: 725, pp. 253-289). Report of the Commissioners of the Customs to the Lords of the Treasury about trade in the plantations (Treasury Papers, lvi, 82).

¹⁷⁰ Archives, vol. xx, pp. 91, 100.

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 115, 161. Lionel Copley's commission also contained a clause authorizing him to exercise powers of vice-admiral and to erect a court of admiralty in Maryland (*ibid.*, vol. viii, p. 268). The legality of this authority was denied by Nicholson on the ground that the commission was not held directly from the lord high admiral (*ibid.*, vol. xx, p. 115). As a matter of fact Copley made no attempt to establish a permanent admiralty court, but continued the practice of appointing four judges to try any case of breach of the Acts of Trade, under a commission of Oyer and Terminer (*ibid.*, vol. xx, pp. 42, 64). Once he appointed a temporary admiralty court to try one ship (*ibid.*, vol. xx, pp. 72, 75). The detailed his-

governor was doubtful for a time whether all breaches of the Acts could be legally tried in a court of admiralty,¹⁷² the larger number of cases that arose during the period of royal government from this time were certainly so tried.¹⁷³ Nicholson was highly praised by the royal officials in the colonies for his zeal.¹⁷⁴ Governor Blakiston also showed commendable energy in apprehending at least three vessels through admiralty court process.¹⁷⁵ Seymour's chief activities as vice-admiral were concerned with the condemnation of French prizes,¹⁷⁶ but according to his testimony illegal trade in Maryland had almost entirely ceased, owing to the efforts of the customs officials.¹⁷⁷

These governors and their councils also exercised their zeal in attempts to make the bond and security system really effectual. All masters of ships had to give oath that their certificates or bonds taken in England were genuine and that their cargoes were correctly declared.¹⁷⁸ Collectors, surveyors, and naval officers had to return to the government lists of ships, bonds, certificates, and ladings from their districts

tory of the establishment of an admiralty court in Maryland belongs rather to the history of the administration than to a discussion of the amount of illegal trade in the colony.

¹⁷² Nicholson recommended the establishment of a court of exchequer in Maryland because he was not sure that all cases of illegal trading could be tried in the admiralty courts (C. O. 5: 719, 18, Bundle 3; C. O. 5: 714, 25, B. 4; Archives, vol. xxiii, p. 195). His difficulty was, however, set at rest by the attorney-general in England, who said that all such cases could be brought before the admiralty courts (Archives, vol. xxiii, pp. 195, 196).

¹⁷³ Several vessels were specifically tried in the admiralty courts either as prizes or for breach of the Acts of Trade (Archives, vol. xx, p. 113; vol. xxv, pp. 16, 165, 178; C. O. 5: 1309, 74 (iii); C. O. 5: 714, 69 (i), C. 31; C. O. 5: 721, 1, 1 (i), 1 (ii), 1 (iii); C. O. 5: 716, H. 14, H. 15). A few vessels, on the other hand, seem to have been tried by a special court or by a regular session of the provincial court (Archives, vol. xx, pp. 134, 155, 243-244, 366, 508; vol. xxiii, p. 3; C. O. 323: 2, 5 (ii)).

¹⁷⁴ C. O. 323: 2, 114; C. O. 5: 1257, 27; C. O. 5: 1258, 16.

¹⁷⁵ C. O. 5: 719, 2, 3, 6, Bundle 7; C. O. 5: 714, 69 (i), C. 31; C. O. 5: 715, 2, D. 16; C. O. 5: 725, p. 403.

¹⁷⁶ C. O. 5: 716, H. 14, H. 15.

¹⁷⁷ C. O. 5: 716, H. 74. The Board of Trade considered Seymour's attitude toward illegal trade commendable (C. O. 5: 727, p. 112).

¹⁷⁸ Archives, vol. xx, p. 502; vol. xxiii, pp. 4, 86.

in order that accurate accounts might be kept.¹⁷⁹ Collector Plater of Patuxent was even ordered to send to the American plantations to which tobacco was shipped from Maryland for their records of imports, in order to balance accounts at both ends.¹⁸⁰ Although the people were poor and it was a difficult task,¹⁸¹ the governors professed themselves careful, according to royal command,¹⁸² to receive only good security for navigation bonds entered in the colony.¹⁸³ In 1694 the attorney-general of Maryland was ordered in the interests of the crown to put in suit, after twelve months' interval, all navigation bonds for which no proper certificates had been returned.¹⁸⁴ Two years later a similar order was issued,¹⁸⁵ and a request for an extension of time for the return of certificates was refused.¹⁸⁶ The conveyancing of his property to another by the bondholder to avoid the payment of the bond was declared illegal.¹⁸⁷ Both Governor Nicholson and Governor Blakiston realized, however, that payment was often almost impossible, and recommended that in some instances executions of judgments against bondholders be remitted.¹⁸⁸ It is impossible to ascertain whether or not this recommendation was accepted.

¹⁷⁹ Archives, vol. xx, p. 585; vol. xxiii, p. 38; C. O. 5: 714, 17 (iv), A. 30.

¹⁸⁰ C. O. 5: 714, 17 (iv), A. 30. See also Archives, vol. xxiii, p. 38.

¹⁸¹ The Commissioners of the Customs once stated that it was well known that bonds taken in the plantations were from persons of insufficient means (Archives, vol. viii, p. 431).

¹⁸² The trade instructions of the governors insist on this point (Archives, vol. xxiii, pp. 91, 315; C. O. 5: 726, p. 247; C. O. 5: 727, p. 398).

¹⁸³ Archives, vol. xxiii, p. 86; C. O. 5: 714, 62, C. 4.

¹⁸⁴ Archives, vol. xx, pp. 40, 65.

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, vol. xx, p. 477. Two years later Edward Randolph wrote to the Board of Trade that Nicholson had put all forfeited navigation bonds in suit (C. O. 323: 2 (iii)).

¹⁸⁶ Archives, vol. xx, p. 508.

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, vol. xxiii, pp. 4, 121.

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 88; C. O. 5: 714, 62, C. 14. Governor Nicholson made his recommendation for mercy with reservations. "If his Maty be graciously pleased to grant ye humble peticon of ye Burgesses (and what they suggest therein, I must needs own to be true) yet I most humbly propose yt some of ym may be made examples especially some of those who have been illegal Traders within these 2 or 3 years" (C. O. 5: 714, 16). In 1697 Collectors Plater and Muschamp

Whether or not execution was always entered on judgments obtained, this energy on the part of the earlier royal governors did definitely result in the prosecution of a number of holders of navigation bonds for which certificates had not been obtained. Extant records dated 1697 show that sixty-four vessels bonded in the colony between 1679 and 1697 had duly returned their certificates.¹⁸⁹ One hundred and forty were reported for not producing the proper papers to discharge their bonds,¹⁹⁰ and elsewhere one hundred and thirty-one ships were said to be impleaded upon suit for the king.¹⁹¹ One hundred and twenty-five vessels of these two lists are duplicates, but the other names differ, making an unduplicated list of one hundred and forty-three vessels which had not discharged their bonds. A separate account for the same date (1697) of twenty-eight other ships already condemned swells the number of bonds prosecuted before 1698 to one hundred and seventy-one.¹⁹²

There are also available two accounts of cases on forfeited bonds presented before the provincial courts in 1697 and 1698.¹⁹³ Wherever these cases could be identified they

both said that even if executions were entered into for forfeited bonds the revenue of the king would be but little increased, as the people were very poor (C. O. 5: 741, p. 367).

¹⁸⁹ C. O. 5: 714, 17 (v), list of sixty ships on which certificates had been produced. This list with several exceptions may also be found in Treasury Papers, I, 27, in which account four new names are added.

¹⁹⁰ C. O. 5: 714, 17 (v).

¹⁹¹ The other list that was apparently sent home to the Treasury at the same time as the first one is on record in Treasury Papers, I, 27, no. 1.

¹⁹² C. O. 5: 714, 17 (v). It is significant that all these lists include bonds entered into in the colony throughout a period of eighteen years, a fact which must be taken into account when the numbers forfeited are considered. It is unfortunate that no records for the later years of royal government in Maryland are available on this point. General conclusions must be drawn from the material for the first decade, and Governor Seymour's statement that there was little or no illegal trade during his government should probably be accepted for this point as well as for other irregularities in trade.

¹⁹³ C. O. 5: 714, 25 (iv), B. 12, Abstract of causes continued from May Court, 1697, at His Majesty's suit on navigation bonds. This list is not complete, as it is simply a record of continued cases. C. O. 5: 714, 47 (x), B. 44, Docket of causes tried in the Provincial Court, April, 1698, upon navigation and other bonds passed to the king.

were found to be almost invariably on bonds reported as impleaded in the earlier accounts. The fact that out of the fifty-nine cases brought before the court in 1698 only four judgments for the king were obtained would serve to indicate that in the majority of cases the certificates were eventually produced, or that the provincial juries were unduly lenient. Governor Nicholson was inclined to the latter opinion,¹⁹⁴ but as far as the cases are analyzed there seem to have been perfectly legitimate reasons for the continuance or discharge of most of the trials.¹⁹⁵ At any rate, from the one cause or the other, judgments were comparatively rare. Only twenty-eight vessels were condemned in 1697, and on some of these the bonds were taken as early as thirteen years before. In the April court of 1698 four more condemnations were made out of fifty-nine prosecuted bonds.¹⁹⁶ Although judgments were rare and the revenue from those executed was evidently very small, the zeal of the royal governors was undoubtedly manifested in constant efforts to hold the customs officers and the ship masters up to the requirements of the Acts of Trade in the taking of oaths and securities.

In another way, moreover, the support which the colonial governors gave to the English authorities was no less noticeable. The Commissioners of the Customs, in response to a suggestion of the Virginia merchants in London, conceived

¹⁹⁴ C. O. 5: 713, 114.

¹⁹⁵ The following is a good example of what happened in the April Court, 1698. A bond of £2000 against Edloe of Maryland was discharged by the oath of Hammond, who deposed that he sent tobacco to England in the ship for whose captain Edloe had become security, and that he had had account of the sale thereof in London (C. O. 5: 714, 47 (x), B. 44).

¹⁹⁶ Even these judgments were apparently not executed. The securities brought writs of error and reversed the judgment because the bonds were destroyed in the interval between the first judgment and the attempted execution. This writ of error was sustained by Edward Northey, but he thought that judgment might be obtained for His Majesty again in equity in chancery court. It was decided that the case should be so pleaded, but the final decision is not given (Archives, vol. xxvii, p. 392; Acts of the Privy Council, Col. vol. ii, p. 625; Add. MSS. 8832, ff. 261-262, British Museum; Add. MSS. 36110, ff. 75-78, British Museum).

the idea of appointing a small vessel under a competent commander to cruise in Chesapeake Bay for the detection of illegal traders.¹⁹⁷ This plan, after being approved by the proper authorities,¹⁹⁸ resulted in an Order in Council that Governor Nicholson, going to Maryland in 1694, be instructed to hire a boat of forty tons burden to cruise off the coasts to examine ships trading in those parts.¹⁹⁹ A small vessel under the command of Thomas Meech was employed,²⁰⁰ but unfortunately for the success of the plan Meech was drowned within a year,²⁰¹ and another vessel despatched by the Lords of the Admiralty to Maryland was wrecked off the Carolina coast.²⁰² Still a third royal boat under the command of Captain Peter Coode was lost at sea,²⁰³ but in spite of these misfortunes the governors continued to urge the advantages of the system.²⁰⁴ It was so easy, said Governor Blakiston, for false traders to unload secretly in the little creeks and rivers of the province that a small boat was almost indispensable to follow them into out-of-the-way places.²⁰⁵ Blakiston even went so far as to hire at his own expense vessels which were apparently used in this service.²⁰⁶ It is clear that the royal governors could

¹⁹⁷ Treasury Papers, xxvii, 19.

¹⁹⁸ The report of the Commissioners of the Customs went to the Lords of the Treasury, was sent by them to the Lords of Trade, and finally came before the Privy Council (Treasury Papers, xxvii, 19; C. O. 5: 1308, 46; C. O. 323: 2, 6 (xii)).

¹⁹⁹ C. O. 323: 2, 6 (xii). The order of the Council was sent to Nicholson by the Lords of Trade and was accompanied by an elaborate set of instructions for the captain employed by the governor (C. O. 5: 1308, 59, 60; Treasury Papers, xxx, 16, 45; C. O. 5: 724, p. 180; Archives, vol. xx, pp. 240, 262, 263; vol. xxiii, p. 551).

²⁰⁰ Archives, vol. xx, p. 240; C. O. 5: 724, p. 199.

²⁰¹ Archives, vol. xx, p. 367; C. O. 5: 741, p. 76; C. O. 5: 714, 1, A. 1; C. O. 5: 725, p. 1.

²⁰² This vessel was sent from England by the Lords of the Admiralty, contrary to Randolph's advice that it be procured in the colony (Acts of the Privy Council, Col. vol. ii, p. 310; Archives, vol. xxiii, p. 208; C. O. 5: 714, 30, 31, 37).

²⁰³ C. O. 5: 726, p. 139; Archives, vol. xxiv, p. 19.

²⁰⁴ C. O. 5: 714, 1, A. 1, 25; C. O. 5: 715, 64, E. 47; C. O. 5: 716, H. 74; C. O. 5: 719, 18, Bundle 3; C. O. 5: 719, 2, Bundle 7. Robert Quarry also approved this plan (C. O. 323: 5, 19 (ii)).

²⁰⁵ C. O. 5: 719, 2, Bundle 7.

²⁰⁶ Treasury Papers, cii, 67.

not have been more zealous or more faithful. They stood side by side with the English customs authorities in their efforts to enforce the Acts of Trade and to prevent smuggling.

It would be interesting to find out whether the governors were supported by the provincial legislature, by the courts, and by the inhabitants. Unfortunately, however, little evidence is available on these points, and that comes from prejudiced sources, that is, from the governors themselves or the English customs authorities. Edward Randolph insisted that even Governor Copley himself in 1692 aided and abetted the acquittal of three ships which Randolph had seized,²⁰⁷ that local collectors were not always honest in their efforts to suppress illegal trade,²⁰⁸ and that local courts and juries were prejudiced against His Majesty's cases.²⁰⁹ In Governor Nicholson's time the Assembly did petition for a relaxation of the severe enforcement of the Navigation Acts in their province, thus showing no great love for the restrictions imposed.²¹⁰ The governor complained, too, that the Assembly would not ask for an English cruiser lest its presence in Maryland waters should prevent smuggling,²¹¹ and he accused the whole people of longing in years of peace for Lord Baltimore's loose government and their "Darling, illegal trade."²¹² These were, however, practically the only accusations made, even from prejudiced sources, and it is impossible to draw from them the conclusion that the legislature, the courts, or the colonists in general were inclined to connive at breaches of the Acts of Trade.

Evasions of colonial acts imposing customs duties are equally infrequent. The chief duties levied in the province were those upon exported tobacco. These must have been

²⁰⁷ Archives, vol. viii, p. 335; C. O. 323: 2, 7.

²⁰⁸ C. O. 323: 2, 6, 7.

²⁰⁹ C. O. 323: 2, 5 (ii). There is also on record a letter written to the attorney-general in England by the Board of Trade to find out what might be done in Maryland to attain juries which would not condemn ships for breaches of the Navigation Acts. Nicholson had asked the question of the Board of Trade (C. O. 5: 725, p. 19).

²¹⁰ Treasury Papers, I, 27.

²¹¹ C. O. 5: 714, 25, B. 4.

²¹² Archives, vol. xxiii, p. 491.

easily collected, because the strict surveillance exercised by the English customs officials in the enforcement of the Navigation Acts made it difficult for any tobacco to be sent out of the colony without official inspection. Besides the duties on the chief staple, levies were also made on furs, beef, pork, or European goods exported from the province, and on imported wines, liquors, and negroes, and there is strong reason to believe that their payment was usually enforced. In the collection of these duties the chief area of trouble was the Pennsylvania border, over which dutiable articles might easily be smuggled.²¹³ To avoid this possibility a riding surveyor was appointed in Cecil County at the head of the bay to prevent illicit trade with Pennsylvania.²¹⁴ Just after the appointment of this officer in 1697 Governor Nicholson asserted that there were good roads between the two provinces on which boats for illicit trade might easily be carted to and fro,²¹⁵ but in spite of his assertion the amount of smuggling was probably small. Enough seizures were made to show that the officers were fairly vigilant, but the insignificant size and value of their confiscations do not argue a flourishing illicit trade with the northern colony.²¹⁶

²¹³ Archives, vol. xx, p. 279; vol. xxiii, p. 87.

²¹⁴ Ibid., vol. xx, pp. 284, 388. For a time there were two riding surveyors, one in Cecil County and one in Williamstadt on the Eastern Shore (ibid., vol. xx, pp. 284, 388, 517). The office in Cecil County was continued at least until 1703 (ibid., vol. xxv, p. 161).

²¹⁵ Ibid., vol. xxiii, p. 87.

²¹⁶ A proclamation concerning the trade with Pennsylvania in 1695 would make it seem as if there were considerable cause for complaint. "And Forasmuch as (by severall Complaints & other advice received) it is made apparent that the Trade of this Province is much impared & Damnified by Sloops Shallops & Boates off & belonging to the province of Pensilvania Town of New castle & Territoryes thereunto belonging (they being distinct Governm^{ts} from this) which keep runing and Trading up and down wthin the severall Rivers and Creekes of this his Ma^{ty}s Province of Maryland, transporting their loading over land & taking in the same at the heads of Severall Rivers wthin this Province especially Bohemia & Elke Rivers, and not only so; but are frequently known to transport in Carts at the said places indifferent large Sloopes, Shallops, & Boates wthout making any report or Entrey thereof . . . and Forasmuch as it hath likewise been represented unto me in Councill, how that his Ma^{ty}s Duty for Importacon of Liquo^{rs} from those parts have been much defrauded by concealing & hiding severall Runlets

The records indicate only a few seizures in other parts of Maryland for breaches of the colonial acts and these were on a very small scale.²¹⁷ It is unlikely in view of the general activity of the royal government in cases of illegal trade that much smuggling even in violation of colonial acts went on undiscovered, and there are certainly no references to this kind of trade as frequent in the colony after 1697, the date of Governor Nicholson's statement. Legitimate trade in dutiable commodities other than tobacco was not large, and smuggling could not have increased its volume to any appreciable extent.

It is still possible that Maryland colonists might have traded with the pirates who haunted colonial waters during these years. Their presence would have opened routes for a dangerous but profitable trade. The English government undoubtedly dreaded pirates in the waters of the province. They were a menace because they might capture vessels sailing to or from England, and because they could easily make alliances with the inhabitants for carrying on illegal trade. The authorities at home, therefore, continually warned the Maryland governors to be vigilant for the protection of the province and for the preservation of its trade

full of Brandy Rum & other Spirits, And wine wthin Caske pretended to be filled with Bisket and ffloore" (Archives, vol. xx, p. 279). There are a few specific instances of this trade (*ibid.*, vol. xxiii, pp. 151, 166, and probably 399; vol. xxv, p. 161), but the small number and value of the seizures show that it was not so dangerous as the proclamation makes it appear.

²¹⁷ Shallop seized for exporting skins (Archives, vol. xx, p. 284). Sloop which carried sixteen barrels of pork from Somerset (*ibid.*, vol. xx, p. 486). Shallop seized by deputy collector of Williamstadt (*ibid.*, vol. xxiii, p. 101). Twenty-two negroes brought into the province without entry (*ibid.*, vol. xxiv, p. 8). Thirty-five negroes imported without paying duty (*ibid.*, vol. xxvii, pp. 240, 241). Also a schedule of goods from one boat seized by the naval officers for Cecil County. This schedule indicates how petty the trade was. It includes 1 keg of rum, 9 gallons, $\frac{1}{2}$ barrel of beer, $\frac{1}{2}$ barrel of beer half out, 2 runlets of beer of 2 gallons each, $1\frac{1}{2}$ pints of spirits, $1\frac{1}{2}$ pints of sugared rum, 1 pint bottle of rum and syrup mixed, 13 pairs of gloves, 1 fishing line, 1 knife and fork, 3 small pieces of lead, 1 barrel of biscuit, 1 pot and pothooks, 1 fowling piece and ammunition, 1 small glass bottle, 2 chests and a small box, 1 large cake of gingerbread, 10 dollars, 5 casks containing upwards of eight hundredweight of sugar (*ibid.*, vol. xxiii, p. 71).

against the pirates,²¹⁸ and they kept the colony informed of any especially notorious pirate captains who might be approaching the coast.²¹⁹ The law for the trial of pirates in the plantations naturally included Maryland,²²⁰ and her governor received a definite commission to try all cases of piracy found in Maryland or Pennsylvania.²²¹ The royal governors themselves were no less concerned at the possible presence of pirates in their waters. They imparted their fears to the English government,²²² they rehearsed the precautions which they had taken or wanted to take to capture the pirates,²²³ and they frequently issued proclamations against well-known captains.²²⁴

As a matter of fact their precautions were hardly worth while. Only a few alleged pirates ever came to Maryland at all, and some of these were probably innocent. There were, however, many rumors of pirates in Pennsylvania and of an alliance between them and the Pennsylvanians which caused considerable anxiety to the governors of Maryland throughout the whole period of royal control.²²⁵ Finally, Nichol-

²¹⁸ Archives, vol. xxiii, p. 25; C. O. 5: 725, pp. 177, 382, 478; Archives, vol. xxv, p. 78.

²¹⁹ Archives, vol. xx, p. 496; vol. xxv, p. 73.

²²⁰ Draught of the bill for the trial of pirates (C. O. 323: 2, 105, 113, a duplicate copy). See also C. O. 5: 725, p. 490, and 11 William III, c. 7.

²²¹ Order in Council for commissions to be issued to the colonial governors for the trial of pirates (C. O. 323: 3, 68). Circular letter (C. O. 5: 726, p. 41). Blakiston's commission (C. O. 5: 726, pp. 22, 27, 37).

²²² C. O. 5: 719, 18, Bundle 3; Archives, vol. xx, p. 486; vol. xxiii, p. 85; C. O. 5: 714, 40 (i).

²²³ It was partly for this reason that the governors so anxiously requested a small frigate in Maryland waters (C. O. 5: 719, 18, Bundle 3; Archives, vol. xxiii, p. 85). In one case a Captain Darnell was commissioned to capture privateers in the Delaware (Archives, vol. xx, p. 532). Maryland vessels were ordered even in time of peace to sail together to avoid pirates (C. O. 5: 741, pp. 503, 504). The governors joined in recommending a reward to those persons discovering pirates (C. O. 5: 1260, 76).

²²⁴ C. O. 5: 714, 54 (ii), C. 21; Archives, vol. xxiii, p. 132; vol. xxv, pp. 97, 100.

²²⁵ Archives, vol. xx, p. 566; vol. xxiii, pp. 84, 159-163; vol. xxv, pp. 116, 554-570, 577-580; C. O. 5: 714, 25, 17 (iii), B. 4, B. 8; C. O. 5: 715, 47, E. 21, Bundle 1701; C. O. 5: 741, p. 428. In view of the presence of pirates in Pennsylvania the officers of Cecil County were enjoined by Governor Nicholson to be especially careful to watch for them (Archives, vol. xxiii, p. 153).

son, as the representative of English authority nearest at hand, actually sent an armed expedition into Pennsylvania to bring out a man named Day who was suspected of piracy. But Pennsylvania was justly furious at this invasion of her territory, and Governor Markham proved that Day had received a commission from him as a privateer against the French.²²⁶ Robert Quarry, who was a notorious exaggerator, warned Governor Blakiston during his administration that a sloop with ten pirates, escaped from New York, was about to enter Maryland waters.²²⁷ When the boat was captured, however, the number against whom anything could be proved dwindled to one man. He was tried and sent to England, and the sloop in which he had come to the colony was condemned.²²⁸ A cabin boy of Captain Kidd's was supposed to have taken passage for England in Maryland, but he had sailed before Blakiston could lay hands on him.²²⁹ Captain Munday, arriving in the province from trading off the Guinea coast with a tale of the piratical depredations from which he had suffered, was himself suspected of collusion with the pirates and was laid under a heavy bond.²³⁰ Real pirates must have frequented the mouth of the bay, for a number of ships trading to Maryland were captured by pirates and the London merchants even petitioned for a convoy to protect the fleet from their depredations,²³¹ but the governors themselves acknowledged that the enclosed character of the seacoast made it inconvenient

²²⁶ For a complete history of the case of the invasion of Pennsylvania to capture Day see C. O. 5: 1257, 6 (ii)-6 (ix). See also C. O. 5: 714, 17 (iii).

²²⁷ C. O. 5: 719, 5, Bundle 7; C. O. 5: 1258, 31.

²²⁸ C. O. 5: 719, 5, 6, 6 (i), 6 (ii), 8, Bundle 7; C. O. 5: 714, 70, 70 (i)-70 (vii); C. O. 5: 715, 1, D. 10, Bundle 1700; C. O. 5: 725, p. 402; Treasury Papers, cii, 67.

²²⁹ C. O. 5: 719, 7, Bundle 7.

²³⁰ C. O. 5: 715, Bundle 1700, 6, 8, 8 (ii)-8 (viii), 9, 10, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19. It appears that Munday's connection with the group of London merchants extricated him from having to answer this accusation. See page 96.

²³¹ C. O. 5: 715, 4, Bundle 1700; C. O. 5: 716, H. 41, H. 74; C. O. 323: 3, 28, 35.

for pirates to come actually into the province.²³² On the whole, the protected position of Maryland plus the vigilance of her governors made it impossible for the colony to become a pirate refuge, or for the inhabitants to carry on this form of illegal trade.

A review of the facts contained in this chapter makes apparent the following points: The great trade route of Maryland was that to England, employing at least seventy ships annually, the larger number from the English metropolis. Usually these vessels sailed, probably once a year after 1706, in regular fleets under the protection of a convoy, and in Maryland they separated to obtain their return cargo where and how they could. When the tobacco arrived in England, it came in one way or another into the hands of small groups of merchants. Those in London were so important that much of the conduct of the tobacco trade was under their control; and they certainly attempted, with what direct success it is impossible to say, to influence the government policy toward that trade. The measures undertaken by the government were often singularly in accord with appeals from those merchants. The tobacco was sold by the planter to the merchants, either in England, in which case the planter in Maryland could draw bills of exchange on the merchant for his shipment, or in Maryland, where the factors of the merchants bought the staple in exchange for imported European commodities. Finally, moreover, this route to and from England was occasionally lengthened by a voyage to the Guinea coast for negroes, such trips being made by private traders not under the control of the Royal African Company. Trade routes to foreign countries were insignificant in comparison with the route to England, but those to the other colonies were of some importance, though the vessels concerned and the bulk of traffic were small. The chief line of trade was to Barbadoes. The boats used in coastwise and West Indian commerce were owned for the

²³² C. O. 5: 715, 1, D. 10; C. O. 5: 717, I. 63; C. O. 5: 719, 9, Bundle 7.

most part in New England or in Maryland; as many as one hundred and fifty-two vessels were actually built or building in the colony at the end of the century.²³³ The conclusion has been reached that although there was undoubtedly a certain amount of illegal trading, the precise extent of which it is difficult to ascertain, still on the whole the English authorities were so zealous that breaches of the Navigation Acts, and apparently also of the several colonial acts, were comparatively rare. Absolutely no connection between the people of Maryland and any of the notorious pirates of the seventeenth century can be traced, and certainly, too, no pirates frequented the colony. Neither illegal trade nor piracy had any appreciable effect on the development or the direction of Maryland trade routes.

²³³ Not all these vessels were concerned in the intercolonial trade, a few being large enough to form part of the fleet engaged in the trade to England.

APPENDIX I

TIMBER EXPORTED FROM VIRGINIA AND MARYLAND
1697-1717

Period	Masts	Oars	Pipe staves and hhd.
Michaelmas 1696-			
Lady Day 1697			11 c. 1 q.
Lady Day 1697-			
Michaelmas 1697	1 small		986 c. 1 q.
Michaelmas 1697-			
Michaelmas 1698		1 q. 14 no.	352 c. 1 q. 2 no.
Michaelmas 1698-			
Christmas 1698			191 c.
Christmas 1698-	10 middle		708 c. 1 q. 16 no.
Christmas 1699	5 small		
1700	2 great 3 middle	2 c. 1 q. 6 no.	674 c. 1 q. 20 no.
1701			744 c. 0 q. 10 no.
1702			1898 c. 3 q. 19 no.
1703			1040 c. 2 q. 14 no.
1704		12	3288 c. 2 q. 14 no.
1706	2 small		1479 c. 2 q. 10 no.
1707			1976 c.
1708			1710 c. 0 q. 15 no.
1709		40	2472 c. 3 q. 11 no.
1710			1489 c. 0 q. 17 no.
1711	12 small		1559 c. 3 q. 2 no.
1713		0 c. 2 q. 20 no.	1622 c. 1 q. 20 no.
1714			2454 c. 3 q. 14 no.
1715	8 large 15 middle 4 small	12	3610 c. 0 q. 12 no.
1716	3 large 10 middle 1 small	4 c. 1 q.	4706 c. 3 q. 6 no.
1717	86 large 12 middle 17 small		5723 c. 2 q. 6 no.

APPENDIX I (cont.)

Period	Barrel staves	Hhd. headings	Oak knees
Michaelmas 1696-			
Lady Day 1697			
Lady Day 1697-			
Michaelmas 1697	5 c.	48 ps.	
Michaelmas 1697-			
Michaelmas 1698	5 c.		94
Michaelmas 1698-			
Christmas 1698			
Christmas 1698-	10 c. 0 q. 20 no.		
Christmas 1699			
1700	15 c.		
1701	317 c. 1 q. 20 no.		
1702	120 c. 0 q. 24 no.		
1703	29 c. 3 q. 24 no.	10 c. 2 q.	36
1704	127 c. 0 q. 20 no.		
1706	57 c.	5 c.	
1707	155 c. 2 q. 10 no.		
1708	149 c. 2 q. 10 no.	8 c.	
1709	269 c. 2 q. 20 no.	32 c.	Firkin staves 15 c.
1710	95 c.	22 c. (bbl. heading)	
1711	227 c. 0 q. 5 no.	10 c.	
1713	401 c. 3 q. 15 no.	1 c.	
1714	712 c. 1 q.	2 c.	
1715	1115 c. 1 q.	7 c. 2 q.	
1716	2748 c. 3 q. 14 no.	24 c.	
1717	2615 c. 3 q. 26 no.		

APPENDIX I (cont.)

Period	Walnut plank or boards	Other plank or boards, oak, cedar, etc.	Deals
Michaelmas 1696-			
Lady Day 1697			
Lady Day 1697-	Value of		
Michaelmas 1697	£33. 0. 0.		
Michaelmas 1697-			
Michaelmas 1698	215 ps.		
Michaelmas 1698-			
Christmas 1698		41	
Christmas 1698-	Value of	993 ps. and plank	
Christmas 1699	£31. 7. 6.	to the value of	
		£12. 5. 0.	
1700		261 ps. and plank	
		to the value of	
		£27. 5. 0.	
1701	£ 5. 0. 0.	26 ps.	
1702	£31. 0. 0.		
1703	109 ps.	2 loads	8
1704	10 ps. and		
	at value	13 ps.	0 c. 1 q. 4 no.
	£ 7. 10. 0.		
1706	£ 1. 0. 0.	9 ps.	19
1707	48 ps. and 120 ft.	17 ps.	
1708	£ 4. 6. 0.	24 ps.	
1709	£69. 19. 0.		
1710	102 ft.	103 ps.	
1711	24 small ps.	3 boards and	
		1590 ft.	
1713	21 ps.	£64. 10. 2.	
1714		£11. 6. 8.	
1715			25
1716		230 47/50 loads	
1717		160 11/50 loads	

APPENDIX I (cont.)

Period	Spars	Timber and wood of several sorts
Michaelmas 1696-		
Lady Day 1697		
Lady Day 1697-		
Michaelmas 1697		
Michaelmas 1697-		
Michaelmas 1698		
Michaelmas 1698-		
Christmas 1698		
Christmas 1698-		30 loads
Christmas 1699		
1700		4 loads 21 ft.
1701		2 loads
1702		
1703		
1704		
1706		
1707		11 c. wood
1708		
1709		
1710		4 loads 16 ft.
1711		
1713		
1714		Value of £14. 17. 4.
1715	0 c. 2 q. 17 no.	33 loads and wood to the value of £548. 4. 2.
1716		Value of £56. 0. 0.
1717	0 c. 1 q. 0 no.	32 23/50 loads and wood to the value of £248. 18. 1.

Custom House Accounts, Ledgers of Imports and Exports, vols. i-xvii, Inspector General's Accounts, vol. i; C. O. 390: 8. The Custom House Accounts are followed through 1714.

APPENDIX I (cont.)

PITCH AND TAR AND TURPENTINE EXPORTED FROM
MARYLAND AND VIRGINIA, 1697-1715

Period	Pitch and Tar	Turpentine
Michaelmas 1696-		
Lady Day 1697	None	
Lady Day 1697-		
Michaelmas 1697	4 last* 6 barrels	
Michaelmas 1697-		
Michaelmas 1698	3 last 1 barrel	
Michaelmas 1698-		
Christmas 1898	None.	
1699	1 last 8 barrels	
1700	5 last 10 barrels	
1701	None	
1702	4 last 3 barrels	
1703	2 last 2 barrels	
1704	31 last 5 barrels	
1705	9 last 4 barrels	
1706	49 last 5 barrels	
1707	31 last 8 barrels	
1708	8 last 8 barrels	
1709	15 last 7 barrels	
1710	3 last 2 barrels	9c.
1711	61 last 3 barrels	
1712	54 last 6 barrels	
1713	44 last 2 barrels	
1714	14 last 7 barrels	
1715	189 last 10 barrels	

Custom House Accounts, Ledger of Imports and Exports, vols. i-xvii; Inspector General's Account, vol. i; C. O. 390: 6.

* Twelve barrels were counted to the last.

APPENDIX II

CHRISTMAS 1698-CHRISTMAS 1699. ENGLISH MANU- FACTURED GOODS EXPORTED TO VIRGINIA AND MARYLAND

Article	Amount	Value L. s. d.
Allom	7 cwt. 0 q. 14 lbs.	
Apparel	19160 suits	
Apples	300 bushels	
Apothecary ware	72 cwt. 3 q. 0 lbs.	
Aqua vitæ	19 T. 2 hhd. 36 gal.	
Bacon	13 flitches	
Baggs money	117¼ doz.	
Beds sea	5	
Bellows	10¾ doz.	
Beef	1 runlet	
Breeches	4 pr.	
Bricks	26000	
Beans	1 bu.	
Beer	73¾ T. 1 hhd. 1 bbl.	
Books printed	110 cwt. 3 q. 13 lbs.	
Bodies	5630	
Brass wrought	310 cwt. 3 q. 23 lbs.	
Bridles	534 5/12 doz.	
Butter	164 firkins	
Buttons hair	138 groce	
Candles	380 doz. lbs.	
Capps plain monmouth	65¼ doz.	
Cards new wool	52 2/3 doz.	
“ old “	51 doz.	
“ playing	3 cwt. 3 q. 21 lbs.	
Chariots	2	
Cheese	441 cwt. 3 q. 10 lbs.	
Copper wrought	26 cwt. 1 q. 2 lbs.	
Cordage	306 cwt. 2 q. 0 lbs.	
Coals	20 chaldron	
Collers p. horses	82 2/3 doz.	
Cyder	7 T. 2½ hhds.	
Dimity	617 yds.	
Earthware	75676 ps.	
Flax	2 cwt. 3 q. 0 lbs.	
Fustian	3440 ps.	
Guirts for saddles	20 doz.	
Glass bottles, pint	308	
“ “ quart	25800	
“ pottles	956	
“ drinking	10591	
Glass for windows	147⅛ chests	
Gloves stitched	3¾ doz.	

APPENDIX II (cont.)

Gloves plain leather	1745 2/3 doz.
Grindlestones	71¾ chaldron
Gunpowder	284 cwt. 1 q. 18 lbs.
Haberdashery	527 cwt. 0 q. 21 lbs.
Hatts beaver	15 doz.
“ castor	582 2/3 doz.
“ felt	2059 5/12 doz.
“ straw	211 1/2 doz.
Hatbands cruel	3 doz.
Haircloth	24 ps.
Harness p. coaches	5 pr.
Holsters	93 pr.
Hopps	3 cwt. 1 q. 15 lbs.
Horns powder	1 doz.
Iron cast	37 cwt. 3 q. 14 lbs.
“ clockwork	3 cwt. 0 q.
“ wrought	3806 cwt. 1 q. 10 lbs.
“ nayles	3457 cwt. 1 q. 11 lbs.
Lace silver	2 lbs.
Lanthorn leaves	200
Lead and shott	12 F. 821 cwt. 1 q. 9 lbs.
Leather tanned	8 cwt. 2 q.
Leather wrought	110 c. 89 lbs.
Lime	9¾ chaldron
Linnen	3360¼ ps.
“ ticking	131 ps.
Malt	575 q. 7 bu.
Maps	1 q.
Oaker red	1 q. 14 lbs.
Oatmeal	½ bu.
Pease	24 bu.
Parchment	2½ rolls
Pictures	1 cwt.
Pewter	853 cwt. 1 q. 8 lbs.
Plate wrought	601 oz.
Saddles great	1144
“ small	4293
“ side	8
Skins sheep drest	20
“ calve	1 cwt. 2 q.
Shovells shodd	53 1/6 doz.
Silk thrown	703¼ lbs.
“ wrought	2956½ lbs.
Soap hard	104 cwt. 3 q. 21 lbs.
“ soft	10 bbls.
Starch	14 lbs.
Stays	18 pr.
Steel gad	2 q. 2 lbs.
Steel	63 cwt.
Tinn	5 cwt. 2 q. 7 lbs.
Thread brown	6 lbs.
Tobacco pipes	3984 gross
Watches	1
Wax sealing	9 lbs.

APPENDIX II (cont.)

Wool: Bays double	14 ps.	
" barnstaple	80½ ps.	
" minikin	323 2/3 ps.	
" single	37½ ps.	
Cloth long	23½ ps.	
" short	249¼ ps.	
" broad	18 ps.	
" Spanish	30 ps.	
" remnants	33851½ lbs.	
Cotton northern	63351 goads	
" Welsh plains	2646 goads	
Coverletts wool and hair	2273 ps.	
Devon doz. double	96 ps.	
" single	28 ps.	
Dozen double northern	49½ ps.	
" single	2 ps.	
Flannels	11981 yds.	
Frize	2666 yds.	
Kersies	3172½ ps.	
Linsey woolsey	108 lbs.	
Pennistons frized	130½ ps.	
" unfried	36 ps.	
Perpetuanas	72 ps.	
Ruggs Irish	2651	
Serges	25527 lbs.	
Stockings men's worsted	1327 doz.	
" " wool	2497 1/6 doz.	
" Irish	547 1/3 doz.	
" women's wors.	2½ doz.	
" " wool.	5 doz.	
" children's "	1220 10/12 doz.	
" " wors.	174 doz.	
" cloth	2 doz.	
Wastcoats wool	7	
Shaloon	20 lbs.	
Stuffs	34003½	
" w. hair	32 lbs.	
" w. silk	3912 lbs.	
Waistcoats worsted	2	
Tavestocks	83 ps.	
Goods at value		
Blankets	—	495. 2. 4.
Bone lace	—	78. 3. 6.
Brandy, English	—	2. 10. 0.
Bisketts	132 cwt. 3 q. 8 lbs.	89. 12. 0.
Cabinets	1	3. 0. 0.
Cartwheels	—	29. 1. 0.
Chairs	—	318. 10. 9.
Escrutore	—	12. 0. 0.
Files	6 doz.	1. 8. 0.
Garden seeds	—	3. 12. 0.
Handkerchiefs silk	1 doz.	1. 4. 0.
Joyner's wares	—	29. 11. 0.
Iron backs	2	2. 10. 0.

APPENDIX II (cont.)

Goods at value

Looking glasses	—	17. 10. 1.
Mathematical Instruments	—	9. 14. 0.
Mil stones	—	2. 8. 0.
Muslin	—	1. 14. 4.
Perukes	—	99. 19. 6.
Printing press and letters	2	102. 0. 0.
Pictures etc.	—	3. 0. 0.
Purbeck stone	6 load	15. 10. 0.
Ruggs	17	8. 9. 2.
Red paint	10 lbs.	3. 15. 0.
Tombstone	1	5. 0. 0.
Turnary ware	—	1863. 9. 3.
Thread hose	3 pr.	0. 6. 0.
Walnut plank	49	10. 0. 0.
Whipps	—	0. 10. 0.
Bellows for smiths	—	5. 5. 0.
Chests of drawers	—	59. 18. 8.
Clock cases	3	8. 10. 0.
Corks	—	21. 19. 6.
Household goods	—	72. 13. 8.
Millinary	—	1728. 11. 8.
Salt	72½ wey 15½ bu.	1342. 6. 8.
Spirits	—	153. 4. 0.
Stationary wares	—	253. 5. 0.
Tinware	—	601. 4. 2.
Upholstery	—	10115. 12. 6.
Harness for horses	—	13. 19. 0.
Paper	6 reams	2. 8. 0.
Scives	—	23. 0. 0.
Canes	—	4. 0. 0.
Callicoos	5 ps.	4. 0. 0.
Cotton ware	—	2. 6. 0.
Hoops	—	45. 8. 0.
Latten ware	—	24. 8. 6.
Lasts for shoes	—	3. 6. 0.
Netts and lines	—	5. 10. 0.
Spice	—	37. 12. 9.
Yarn wick	—	20. 14. 3.
Woollen coverletts	133	26. 12. 0.

CHRISTMAS 1698-CHRISTMAS 1699. EXPORT OF FOREIGN
GOODS FROM ENGLAND TO MARYLAND AND
VIRGINIA

Article	Amount	Value L. s. d.
Battery	158 cwt. 0 q. 13 lbs.	
Anchovies	20 bbls.	
Allom	10 lbs.	
Brimstone	14 lbs.	
Candles	790 lbs.	
Capers	786 lbs.	

APPENDIX II (cont.)

Capps Dutch	9½ doz.
Carpets Turkey	1
Cordage	14 cwt.
Drugs	1 cwt. 2 q. 3¾ lbs.
Fanns paper	1 doz.
Frize Irish	9883 yds.
Fustian	6 ps. and 58½ yds.
Groceries: Almonds	6 lbs.
Cinnamon	30¼ lbs.
Cloves	38¾ lbs.
Currants	42 cwt. 2 q. 23 lbs.
Figs	1 cwt. 0 q. 20 lbs.
Ginger	0 cwt. 3 q. 11 lbs.
Licoris	0 cwt. 0 q. 2 lbs.
Mace	12¾ lbs.
Nutmegs	138½ lbs.
Pepper	1689 lbs.
Prunes	15 cwt.
Raisins	198 cwt. 1 q. 5 lbs.
Rice	1 cwt. 0 q. 22 lbs.
Sugar brown	83 cwt. 3 q. 4 lbs.
Hats Irish	3 doz.
Incle wrought	8 7/12 doz.
" unwrought	7 lbs.
Indigo	33 lbs.
Iron frying pans	3 cwt. 3 q. 11 lbs.
" nails	1 cwt.
" stoves	5
" backs	6
" Spanish	40 cwt.
" Swedish	68 cwt.
" wrought	1 cwt.
Iron	1 T.
Linen: Linen barras	12 c. 1 q. 18 ells
Bengarols	2 lbs.
Blew linen	7 ps.
Callicoes	2476 17/20 ps.
Cambricks	41 ps.
Brown rolls	60 ells
Buckram	5 ps.
Canvas Hessens	20 c. 0 q. 6 ells
" Et. country	1 c. 1 q. 10 ells
" Normandy	5 c. 0 q. 11 ells
" packing	1 c. 1 q. 15 ells
" spruce	27 c. 0 q. 17 ells
" vittrey	476 c. 2 q. 20 ells
" working	1 q. 15 ells
Checks	685½ ps.
Cloth British	92 ps.
Siletia Damask napkins	177½ yds.
" diaper	2573 13/20 yds.
" tabling	276 yds.
Dowlas	748 ps.
East country broad	6 c. 2 q. 0 ells

APPENDIX II (cont.)

East Country narrow	11 c. 1 q. 15 ells
Flanders linen	1482½ ells
Germany broad	525 c. 2 q. 15 ells
" narrow	3914 c. 3 q. 14 ells
Harfords	45 c. 3 q. 9 ells
Hamborough	490 ells
Hamells	328 ells
Hinterlands	7 c. ells
Holland linen	22663 1/10 ells
" duck	13 c. 2 q. 24 ells
Irish linen	196 c. 3 q. 11 ells
Ghenting	28 ps. 581 ells
Kenting	10 ps.
Sletia lawns	1638 ps. and 34 yds.
Huckabuck	621 yds.
Lochrums	9 c. 2 q. 8 ells and 54½ ps.
Ozenbrigs	32874 1/3 ells
Poldavies	5 bolts
Polonia broad	0 c. 3 q. 20 ells
" narrow	4 c. 0 q. 12 ells
Russia	1 c. 2 q. 0 ells
Scotch twill	158 c. 0 q. 23 ells
" linen	163 c. 0 q. 23 ells and 57 ps.
" ticking	83 c. 0 q. 16 ells
Ticking Flanders	65½ ps.
" East country	172 yds.
" Hamborough	4 ps.
Ticks turnall	57 ps.
Lampblack	1 cwt. 3 q. 22 lbs.
Oil olive	7½ gal.
" linseed	85 gal.
" sweet	280 gal.
" trayne	45 gal.
Mittings wadmall	17½ doz.
Paper ordinary	219 reams
" copy	10 reams
" royal	4 reams
" demy	12 reams
Plate wrought	71 oz.
Potts iron	1654
" stone	344 cast
Quilts calico	9
Rozen	14 lbs.
Ruggs Irish	30 ps.
Salt Spanish	23 wey 32½ bu.
" French	33 wey 33 bu.
Silk Italian thrown	214 lbs.
" Turkey raw	½ lb.
" Dutch wrought	141 lbs. 13 oz.
" Bengal plain	16 ps.
" Bengal wrought	1 lb.
" Persian	3 ps.
Shruff	3 q. 10 lbs.
Smelts	40 lbs.

APPENDIX II (cont.)

Soap	277 cwt. 0 q. 17 lbs.
Stockings worst.	3 doz.
“ wadmall	10 doz.
Stones quern large	3 5/6 last
“ “ small	40 5/6 last 11 pr.
“ dog	2 1/3 last
“ mill	44
Steel long	11 cwt. 2 q.
Stuff Irish	23 yds.
“ Guinea	40 ps.
Thread Irish	72 cwt.
“ Bridges	5 1/2 doz. lbs.
“ Outnall	60 lbs.
“ whitened brown	113 doz. lbs.
Tarras	3 bbls.
Tobacco	210 lbs.
Toys	1 parcel
Tallow	8 cwt.
Twine	1 cwt.
Turpentine	8 lbs.
Taffeties	23 ps.
Wrought brass	2 q.
Wine Canary	16 pipes 1 hhd. 60 gals.
“ Florence	1 pipe 15 gal.
“ Port	12 pipes 1 hhd. 41 gal.
“ Rhenish	1 1/2 awm 34 gal.
“ Spanish	2 p. 2 hhd.
“ Sherry	3 p. 1 hhd. 6 gal.
Wood logwood	604 cwt.
“ redwood	4 cwt.
“ pipe staves	134 c. 20 no.
Whale bone	12 cwt. 0 q. 22 lbs.
Wool cotton	3 lbs.
Vinegar	31 1/2 gal.
Yarn cotton	56 lbs.
“ Floretta	16 lbs.
Goods at value	
Bugle great	715 lbs.
Chintz	64 ps.
Derribands large	5 ps.
Grocery	262 cwt. 2 q.
Mullmuls flowered	2 ps.
Muslin	266 1/4 ps. 12 yds.
Neckcloth flowered	36 ps.
“ plain	431 ps.
Nilleas	50 ps.
Nickanees	55 ps.
Romalls	684 5/6 ps.
Sallampores	22 ps.
Shirts	289
Soosays	12 ps.
Shallbafts	5 ps.
Spice	791 lbs.
Stuffs Guinea	120 ps.

APPENDIX II (cont.)

Goods at value	19½ ps.	
Tanjeebs	33	
Tepoys	1 cwt. 1 q. 11 lbs.	
Drugs	1 parcell	
Glassware	6 ps.	
Bafts	154 ells	
Borelaps	6 ps.	
Doreas	98 ps.	
Handkerchiefs	7 ps.	
Mohabut banees	24 ps.	
Mullmuls plain	15 ps.	
Putkeys	166 ells 115 yds.	
Striped linen	30 ps.	
Tapsells	2 ps.	
Stuffs Fanna	103¼ doz.	52. 12. 6.
Stockings Scotch		18. 0. 0.
Cravats Scotch		
Earthware	221 yds. 37 ps.	
Printed linen	29 gals.	
Spirits	22 lbs.	2. 10. 0.
Thread Scotch		45. 17. 0.
Trunks		
Linen	16 gal.	
Brandy	104 lbs.	
Coffee	18 ps.	
Crocus linen	2 doz.	
Diaper napkins fringed	1000	
Flints	20 ells	
Garlicks narrow	36 ps.	
Ginghams	60 gal.	
Mum	43 lbs.	
Chocolate	3 cwt.	
Earth red	85	
Fanns silk	6	
Linen aprons	2 ps.	
Bettlees	29 ps.	
Birampants	5 ps.	
Chuckleys	2 ps.	
Hunnims	60 ps.	
Nightrails	32 ps.	
Penniascoes	10 ps.	
Savagucees	3 lbs.	
Pimento	2 cases	
Sauces	3 ps.	
Silks Turkey wrought	23 ps.	
Taffeties	367	
Colored linen	1 ps.	
Stuffs India		222. 19. 9¾.
Thread		

Custom House Accounts, Ledgers of Imports and Exports, vol. iii.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

MANUSCRIPTS

- A. Public Record Office, London, England.
 - 1. Colonial Office Papers.
 - 2. State Papers, Domestic.
 - 3. Treasury Papers, 1689-1715.
 - 4. Treasury Accounts, Revenue Yearly, vols. i-iv.
 - 5. Audit Office, Accounts Various, 589.
 - 6. Declared Accounts of the Audit Office, 1688-1715.
 - 7. Declared Accounts of the Pipe Office, 1688-1715.
 - 8. Customs Accounts:
 - a. Ledgers of Imports and Exports, vols. i-xvi.
 - b. Inspector General's Accounts, vols. i-x.
 - 9. Privy Council Registers, 1688-1720.
- B. House of Lords, London.
 - 1. House of Lords MSS. Answer of Commissioners of Trade to an order relating to the Tobacco Trade, June 5, 1714.
- C. British Museum, London.
 - 1. Additional MSS. 8832, 10453, 28089, 22265, 29600, 29903, 36110.
 - 2. Egerton MSS. 921, 2395.
 - 3. Harleian MSS. 1238.
 - 4. Sloane MSS. 1815, 2717, 2902, 2291.
 - 5. Stowe MSS. 316, 324.
- D. Privy Council Office, London.
 - 1. Privy Council Papers, 1702, Bundles 1 and 2.
- E. Royal Society, London.
 - 1. Letter Books, I, i, 183.
- F. Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, London.
 - 1. A. MSS., vols. i-v.
 - 2. B. MSS., vol. i.
- G. Bodleian Library, Oxford.
 - 1. Tanner MSS. xxxi, 137-140.
- H. Pennsylvania Historical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
 - 1. State Papers, Colonial Series, Plantations General. Transcripts.
- I. Land Commissioner's Office, Annapolis, Maryland.
 - 1. Records of Textts Testaments Administrations etc., vols. x, xii, xiii.
 - 2. Inventories and Accounts, vols. xv, xvi, xix.

PRINTED RECORDS

1. Acts of the Privy Council of England, Colonial Series. Edited by W. L. Grant and J. Munro. Vols. i-iv, vi. Hereford, 1908-1912.
2. Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies. 20 vols. London, 1860-1912.
3. Hening, W. W. The Statutes-at-Large, being a Collection of all the Laws of Virginia. 13 vols. Philadelphia and New York, 1819-1823.
4. Maryland Historical Society.
 - a. Archives of Maryland. Edited by W. H. Browne. 33 vols. Baltimore, 1883-1913.
 - b. Fund Publications. 37 vols. Baltimore, 1867-1901. No. 15: G. Alsop, Character of the Province of Maryland. 1880. Nos. 28, 34, 35: Calvert Papers. 1889, 1894, 1899.
5. Rymer, T. Foedera. First edition. 20 vols. London, 1704-1735.
6. Statutes of the Realm. Printed by command of His Majesty King George III. 11 vols. London, 1810-1828.

CONTEMPORARY ACCOUNTS OF THE COLONY

1. Alsop, G. A Character of the Province of Maryland. London, 1666. Reprints: Shea, Early Southern Tracts. New York, 1869; Maryland Historical Society, Fund Publication, no. 15. Baltimore, 1880; Narratives of Early Maryland, 1633-1684. Edited by C. C. Hall. New York, 1910.
2. An Account of the Colony of the Lord Baron of Baltimore (1633).
The Latin original of this account was transcribed, 1832, by Father William McSherry from the Archives of the Society of Jesus in Rome. It has been translated and printed in several places: Peter Force, Tracts and Other Papers relating principally to the Origin Settlement and Progress of the Colonies in North America from the discovery to 1776. 4 vols. Washington, 1836-1847. Vol. iv, no. 12; Maryland Historical Society, Fund Publication, no. 7; Narratives of Early Maryland, 1633-1684. A printed copy of another translation of this same document may be found among the Roman Catholic Archives in Westminster, under the title, A Declaration of the Lord Baltimore's Plantation in Maryland nigh upon Virginia: manifesting the Nature, Quality, Condition, and rich Utilities it containeth. Arch. Westmonasterium, xxvii, 8.
3. A Relation of Maryland. London, 1635. Reprints: J. Sabin, New York, 1865; Narratives of Early Maryland, 1633-1684.
4. A Relation of the Successful Beginnings of the Lord Baltimore's Plantation in Maryland. London, 1634. Reprinted by Shea, Early Southern Tracts, vol. i. Albany, 1865.
5. The Lord Baltimore's Case, Concerning the Province of Maryland, adjoining to Virginia in America. London, 1653. Reprinted in Maryland Historical Magazine, vol. iv, pp. 171-182.
6. Virginia and Maryland, or The Lord Baltimore's printed Case, uncaused and answered. London, 1655. Reprints: P. Force, Tracts, vol. ii, no. 9; Narratives of Early Maryland, 1633-1684.
7. Babylon's Fall in Maryland. Published by Leonard Strong. London, 1655. Reprints: Maryland Historical Magazine, vol. iii, pp. 228-240; Narratives of Early Maryland, 1633-1684.

8. A just and Clere Refutation of a false and scandalous Pamphlet, Entitled Babylon's Fall in Maryland, &c. By John Langford. London, 1655. Reprints: Maryland Historical Magazine, vol. iv, pp. 42-64; Narratives of Early Maryland, 1633-1684.
9. An Additional brief Narrative of a late Bloody Design against the Protestants in Anne Arundel County, and Severn, in Maryland in the Country of Virginia. By Roger Heaman. London, 1655.
10. Hammond vs. Heamans. By John Hammond. London, 1655.
11. Leah and Rachel, or, the Two Fruitfull Sisters Virginia and Maryland. By John Hammond. London, 1656. Reprints: P. Force, Tracts, vol. iii, no. 14; Narratives of Early Maryland, 1633-1684.

GENERAL SECONDARY WORKS

1. Anderson, A. An Historical and Chronological Deduction of the Origin of Commerce. 6 vols. Dublin, 1790.
2. Beer, G. L. The Origins of the British Colonial System, 1578-1660. New York, 1908.
3. ——. The Old Colonial System, 1660-1754. Part I. 2 vols. New York, 1912.
4. Bozman, J. L. History of Maryland (1633-1660). 2 vols. Baltimore, 1837.
5. Browne, W. H. Maryland, the History of a Palatinate. Boston, 1884.
6. Bruce, P. A. The Economic History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century. 2 vols. New York, 1896.
7. Child, Sir Josiah. A new discourse of trade. London, First edition, 1692. Fourth edition, 1740.
8. Cunningham, W. Growth of English Industry and Commerce during the Early and Middle Ages. Fifth edition, London, 1910.
9. ——. Growth of English Industry and Commerce in Modern Times. Fourth edition. 2 vols., London, 1907.
10. Gee, Joshua. The Trade and Navigation of Great Britain Considered. First edition, 1729. Sixth edition, Glasgow, 1755.
11. Hart, A. B., editor. The American Nation: A History. 26 vols. and index vol. New York, 1904-1908.
Vol. iv. Tyler, L. G. England in America. 1904.
Vol. v. Andrews, C. M. Colonial Self-Government. 1904.
Vol. vi. Greene, E. B. Provincial America. 1905.
12. Keith, T. The Commercial Relations of England and Scotland, 1603-1707. Girton College Studies, vol. i. Cambridge, 1910.
13. Kilty, W. The Landholder's Assistant and Land Office Guide for Maryland. Baltimore, 1808.
14. McMahon, J. V. L. Historical View of the Government of Maryland. Baltimore, 1831.
15. MacPherson, D. Annals of Commerce. London, 1805.
16. McSherry, J. History of Maryland; to the year 1848. Baltimore, 1849.
17. ——. History of Maryland. Edited and continued by Bartlett B. James. Baltimore, 1904.
18. Mereness, N. D. Maryland as a Proprietary Province. New York, 1901.

19. Neill, E. D. *Terra Mariae*. Philadelphia, 1867.
20. Osgood, H. L. *The American Colonies in the Seventeenth Century*. 3 vols. New York, 1904-1907.
21. Rogers, J. E. T. *A History of Agriculture and Prices in England*. 7 vols. in 8. Oxford, 1866-1902.
22. Scharf, J. T. *History of Maryland*. 3 vols. Baltimore, 1879.

MONOGRAPHS AND ARTICLES

1. Beer, G. L. *The Commercial Policy of England toward the American Colonies*. Columbia University Studies in History, Economics and Public Law. Vol. iii, no. 2. New York, 1893.
2. Brackett, J. R. *The Negro in Maryland*. Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science. Extra vol. vi. Baltimore, 1889.
3. Jacobstein, M. *The Tobacco Industry in the United States*. Columbia University Studies in History, Economics and Public Law. Vol. xxvi, no. 3. New York, 1907.
4. Lord, E. L. *Industrial Experiments in the British Colonies of North America*. Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science. Extra vol. xvii. Baltimore, 1898.
5. McCormac, E. I. *White Servitude in Maryland*. Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science. Vol. xxii, nos. 3, 4. Baltimore, 1904.
6. Sparks, F. E. *The Causes of the Revolution of 1689 in Maryland*. Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science. Vol. xiv, nos. 11, 12. Baltimore, 1896.
7. Steiner, B. C. *The Protestant Revolution in Maryland*. Annual Report of the American Historical Association, 1897, p. 279. Washington, 1898.
8. ——. *The Restoration of the Proprietary of Maryland*. Annual Report of the American Historical Association, 1899, p. 229. Washington, 1900.

INDEX.

- Acts of Parliament, 30 n., 43, 44, 45, 46, 50, 55, 56, 71, 90, 97, 104, 130. See also Acts of Trade.
- Acts of Trade, 30, 50, 59, 82, 85 n., 108, 116, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 125, 127, 128.
- Admiralty court in Maryland, 121 and n., 122 and n.
- Admiralty in England, 92 n., 121, 126.
- Africa, 76, 79 and n., 80, 81, 107, 131.
- Andros, Governor, 16 n., 72.
- Annapolis, 12, 13 n., 47.
- Annapolis District, 32 n., 33 n., 34 n., 79 n., 89.
- Anne Arundel County, 114.
- Appendices, I, 134-138; II, 139-146.
- Asiento, the, 80.
- Assembly of Maryland, 16, 23 and n., 24, 27, 29, 30 n., 53, 68, 73, 74, 76 and n., 90, 93, 96, 97, 98, 99 n., 104, 106, 127. See also Laws of Maryland.
- Associators in Maryland, 32 n., 117.
- Azores, the, 81, 82, 108, 109.
- Baltic countries, the, 53, 100, 101, 102.
- Baltimore, Lord, 11, 24, 39 n., 42, 47, 49, 53, 67, 89, 127.
- Baltimore County, 114.
- Barbadoes, 16, 17, 36 n., 79 n., 80, 81, 109, 110-113, 117 n.
- Beef and pork, 20, 128, 129 n.
- Berkeley, Governor, 22 n.
- Bermuda, 20 n., 109, 112, 113.
- Bibliography, 147-150.
- Bills of exchange, 64 n., 103, 105-107.
- Blakiston, Governor, 14, 29, 80 n., 119, 122, 123, 126, 131.
- Blakiston, Nehemiah, Collector of Potomac, 119 n.
- Blathwayt, William, 48, 53.
- Board of Trade, 14, 17 n., 18, 20 n., 27, 29, 30, 38, 39 n., 41, 43, 48, 53, 64, 66, 71, 74, 75, 77, 78 n., 79 n., 82, 86, 90, 94, 99, 100, 102, 104, 106 n., 108, 119 n., 120, 121, 123 n., 127 n.
- Bonds and securities, 116, 117, 122-125.
- Braines, family of merchants, 96.
- Browne, Peregrine, 96.
- Brownes, family of merchants, 96.
- Calvert County, 114.
- Campeachy coast, 82.
- Carolinas, 21 n., 38, 109, 112, 113, 120 n., 126.
- Cattle and hogs, 19-20, 25.
- Cecil County, 74 n., 114, 128, 129 n., 130 n.
- Cecil County District, 32 n., 33 n.
- Certificates. See Bonds and securities.
- Charles County, 27, 114.
- Chesapeake Bay, 9, 69 n., 72, 126.
- Coin. See Money currency.
- Collectors, 50, 51, 93, 116, 117, 119 n., 122, 123, 127.
- College of William and Mary, 51 and n.
- Colonial government. See Maryland; Laws of Maryland.
- Colonies, Spanish. See Spain.
- Commissioners of the Customs, 43, 50 n., 51 n., 66, 81 n., 99 n., 116, 117, 118, 119 n., 120 n., 121, 123 n., 125, 126 n.
- Committee of Accounts in England, 48.
- Convicts, English, 78.
- Convoys, 41, 91-95, 131. See also Fleets.
- Coode, Captain Peter, 126.
- Coopers and carpenters, 70.
- Copley, Governor, 91, 97, 106 n., 117, 118, 121 n., 127.
- Corbett, John, 48.
- Cotton, 43, 64, 68, 69, 70, 145.

- Council of Maryland, 11, 17 n., 27, 67, 70, 71, 90 n., 93, 105 n., 106 n., 108, 109 n., 113, 119 n.
- Council of Virginia. See Virginia.
- Customs duties, in England, 37, 40, 43-45, 46, 63, 117 n.; in Maryland, 12 and n., 13, 20, 47, 48, 49, 50, 73, 74, 78, 79 n., 106, 115, 116, 117, 127, 128, 129.
- Darien, 119.
- Day, a pirate, 131.
- Delaware Bay, 69 n., 112, 130 n.
- Dorchester County, 114.
- Eastern Shore, furs from, 14; apples from, 19; suitable for tar and pitch, 54; linen and woollen industry on, 71; little tobacco from, 89 and n., 115; ship-building on, 115.
- Edloe v. Hammond, 125 n.
- Embargo on ships, 91, 92.
- England, no fish exported to, 11; furs exported to, 13-14; sentiment against tobacco in, 21, 22 n., 42, 52, 53; Spanish tobacco excluded from, 22 and n.; tobacco growing forbidden in, 22; market monopolized by colonial tobacco, 22, 23, 27; bad tobacco shipped to, 25, 26 and n.; amount of tobacco exported to, 30-36; price of tobacco in, 37, 39, 40, 42; sale of tobacco in, 34-38, 102-103; duties on tobacco in, 40, 43-44, 99-100; revenue on tobacco in, 45-46; smuggling of tobacco repressed in, 46; export of naval stores to, 56, 57, 134-138; amount of British and foreign goods imported from, 58-60, 64-66, 71, 81, 139-146; small amounts of food-stuffs from, 60; value of goods from, 62-64; balance of trade against, 63-64; white servants from, 76-79; shipping from, 85-88; convoys and embargo in, 91-92; reexportation of tobacco from, 100-102; colonial ships in Maryland trading to, 110-113; Maryland vessels built or owned in, 114. See also Acts of Parliament; English government; Acts of Trade; Merchants, London; Trade, illicit.
- English government, regulation and protection of tobacco trade by, 21, 22, 24, 30, 41, 42, 43-45, 46, 49, 50, 51, 66, 85 n., 89-90, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102; settles rates of coins, 30; care for colonial revenues, 49, 50; regulation and protection of naval stores, 52, 53, 55; encourages imports to Maryland, 58, 63, 64, 66-67; attitude toward towns in Maryland, 66, 89, 90; discourages manufactures in Maryland, 66-67, 68; regulation of fleets and convoys, 91-92, 94-95; influence of London merchants on, 95, 97, 98, 99-102, 106; asks Maryland to share expense of Indian wars, 105-106; action against illicit trade, 120-121; attitude toward pirates, 120-130. See also Acts of Parliament; Acts of Trade.
- Exports from Maryland, fish, 11; furs, 11-14, 128, 129 n.; food-stuffs, 15-17, 18; fruit, 18-19; beef and pork, 20, 128, 129 n.; tobacco, 21, 31-36, 75; naval stores, 52, 53, 56-57, 134-138; iron, 72-73; hats, 73 n.; European goods, 73-75, 128. See also Tobacco.
- Factors, 38, 103.
- Fish, 10-11, 21, 82, 83.
- Flax. See Hemp.
- Fleets, time of arrival in colony, 31 n., 41 n., 94-95; size of English, 32 n., 33 n., 85-87, 91; dependence of planter on, 38; controversy over annual number of, 40, 41, 42, 94-95; London, 31 n., 75, 79 n., 80, 87-88, 107; outpost, 38, 88; vessels to Maryland sail in, 95. See also Convoys; Embargo.
- Food-stuffs, 15-18, 21, 60, 108, 129 n.
- Forestalling, 104-105.
- France, 42, 53, 91, 92, 93, 100, 101, 102, 108, 115 n.
- Fruit, 18-19.

- Fur trade, 10, 11-14, 21, 128, 129 n.
 Fyall, 81, 108 n., 112.
- Germany, 101.
 Guinea coast. See Africa.
- Hart, Governor, 18, 27, 72, 82, 87, 115.
 Hats, 73 n., 140, 143.
 Hemp, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 139.
 Hewitt, John, 62.
 Hill, Abraham, 25 n.
 Holland, 25, 100, 101.
 Hungary, 101.
- Imports, from English colonies, 15, 17-18, 19, 82-83; British manufactures, 58, 59-67, 129-142; reexported foreign goods, 59-64, 142-146; variety of British and foreign, 59-62; small quantities of English food-stuffs, 60; distribution of British and foreign, 60-62; value of British and foreign, 62-64; amount from England too small, 64-67; white servants, 76-78; negroes, 64 n., 76, 79-81; directly from foreign countries, 79-82.
- Indians, 11, 12, 14, 15, 19, 19 n.
 Ireland, 71, 76, 78, 91, 100, 118 n.
 Iron, 72-73, 140, 143.
- Jamaica, 79 n., 82 n., 110, 113.
 Jennings, Governor, 64, 68 n.
 Jones, Hugh, 10, 28, 61, 71, 81, 105.
- Kent County, 114.
 King, Major Robert, 12 n., 13 n., 62.
- Latitudes, 82.
 Lawrence, Sir Thomas, 41 n., 43, 89 n.
- Laws of Maryland, on fur trade, 11-12; on planting corn, 15; prohibiting importation of food-stuffs from Pennsylvania, 18, 83; protecting cattle, 19 n.; duty on exported food-stuffs, 20; on quality of tobacco, 23 and n., 26; two shillings duty on exported tobacco, 39 n., 47; three pence duty for governor, 47; three pence duty for province, 47; tonnage duty, 49 n.; on growing hemp and flax, 53, 55-56; against exportation of untanned leather, 67, 72; encouraging making of linen and woollen cloth, 67; on gage of tobacco hogsheads, 70, 97, 98, 99 n.; on European goods exported from Maryland, 73, 74, 75, 76; on establishment of Church, 75 n.; forbidding importation of convicts, 78; imposing duty on Irish Catholic servants, 78; imposing duty on imported white servants, 78; establishing towns, 89, 90; on publication of freight rates on tobacco, 96; against squeezing tobacco hogsheads, 98; on stores to be kept in towns, 103-104; against forestalling, 104-105; on value of foreign coins, 105; on protested bills of exchange, 106, 107; to encourage ship-building, 115.
- Leather, 67, 72, 140.
- Linen, 43, 65, 67, 70, 71, 72, 79 n., 140, 143-144.
- Liquors, 25, 81, 82, 128, 141, 145, 146.
- Lisbon, 17 n., 81 n., 108.
- Liverpool, 41 n., 88, 111.
- Lloyd, Edward, President of the Council in Maryland, 17 n., 27, 38, 39 n., 80 n., 99, 104 n.
- Lloyd, Madam Henrietta, 60, 61.
- London, 31 n., 75, 80, 87-88, 107, 110, 112.
- Lord High Admiral. See Admiralty in England.
- Lords Committee of Trade of the Privy Council, 52.
- Lords of the Admiralty. See Admiralty in England.
- Lords of the Council. See Privy Council.
- Lords of the Treasury. See Treasury.
- Lords of Trade, 65, 126 n.
- Lower House of Assembly in Maryland, 11, 12, 16, 24, 29, 40, 72, 75 n.

- Madeira, 17 n., 81, 82, 108, 111, 112, 113.
- Manufactures in Maryland, cotton, linen, and woollen goods, 43, 64, 65, 66, 69, 70-71, 72; discouraged by English government, 43, 66-67, 68; few colonial, 59, 68-73; royal governors fear, 65-66, 68; encouraged by colonial government, 67-68; leather goods, 67, 72; cooperage and carpentry, 70; iron, 72, 73; hats, 73 n.
- Markham, Governor, 131.
- Maryland, settlements, 9-10; fisheries, 10-11; fur trade, 11-14; food-stuffs, 15-18; fruit, 18-19; cattle and hogs, 19-20; tobacco, the staple of, 15, 18, 21, 23, 24, 25; quality and quantity of tobacco in, 23-26; poverty of colonists, 27-28, 39 and n., 65; tobacco medium of exchange in, 23, 28-30, 105; amount of tobacco exported from, 30-36; price of tobacco in, 36-42; effect of tobacco duties on, 40, 44-45; fleets in, 40-42, 94-95; revenue in England on tobacco from, 42-46; revenue from exported tobacco in, 47-51; salary of royal governor in, 47-49; naval stores in, 52-57, 134-138; British and foreign goods imported into, 58-60, 139-146; distribution of imports in, 60-62; value and amount of British imports in, 62-65; manufacturing in, 43, 65-73; attitude of colonial government toward manufacturing in, 67-68; amount of manufacturing in, 68-73; dispute with Pennsylvania, 73-76; importation of white servants into, 76-78; of negroes, 79-81, 107; imports from foreign countries directly, 81-82; from English colonies, 82-83; number of vessels trading from England to, 85-87; from London, 87-88; from outports, 88; methods of loading tobacco in, 89-90; convoys to, 91-95; influence of London merchants on tobacco trade in, 95-99; freight charges in, 37, 96; bulk tobacco in, 96-97; size of tobacco hogsheads in, 97-99; influence of London merchants on political affairs in, 102; methods of selling tobacco in, 102-104; forestalling in, 104-105; bills of exchange used in, 105-107; trade routes to foreign countries, 107-109; to English colonies, 109-114; shipping owned in, 109, 114-116; illicit trade in, 116-129; pirates in, 129-132. See also Laws of Maryland; Tobacco; Merchants, London; Trade, illicit; Pirates.
- Massachusetts, 16 n., 49.
- Meech, Thomas, 126.
- Merchants, English, 27, 28, 37, 38, 39, 41, 58, 62, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 72, 76, 94, 95, 100, 103, 104, 105, 106. See also Merchants, London.
- Merchants, London, sell tobacco for planters on commission, 37, 38, 65; favor annual fleet, 40, 41; influence tobacco trade in England, 44-45, 46, 95, 99; petition for convoys, 29, 131; names of families of, 95-96; influence on freight rates, 95, 96; influence on English government, 95, 106 and n.; determine methods of packing and shipping tobacco, 96, 97, 98, 99; influence on trade with Continent, 100, 101, 102; on political affairs in Maryland, 102; on illicit trade, 125.
- Money currency, 23, 28-30, 64 n., 81 n., 105.
- Munday, Captain Henry, 80 n., 96 and n., 131.
- Mundays, family of merchants, 96.
- Muschamp, Collector, 123 n.
- Narrative of a Voyage to Maryland, 11, 81, 91.
- Naval officers, 32 n., 93, 122.
- Naval stores, production encouraged by English government, 52, 53, 55; by colonial government, 52-53, 54, 55-56; colony suitable for, 52, 53-54; small amount exported, 56,

- 134-138; small value of, 56-57; production a failure in Maryland, 56.
- Navigation Acts. See Acts of Trade.
- Negroes, 24, 64 n., 76, 79-81, 107, 108, 128, 129 n.
- Nevis, 113.
- Newcastle, Delaware, 118, 128 n.
- New England, imports from, 15, 20, 75, 82; exports to, 16, 36 n., 75; naval stores in, 53, 54 and n.; traders in Maryland, 75; negroes from, 79 n.; ships trading in Maryland, 81, 108 n., 109, 110-113; concerned in illicit trade in Maryland, 117.
- Newfoundland, 17, 117, 121.
- New Providence, 111, 112, 113.
- New York, exports to, 17; imports from, 21 n., 82; governor of, 49 and n.; suitable for naval stores, 53; transaction with Maryland in bills of exchange, 106; ships trading in Maryland, 109, 110-113.
- Nicholson, Governor, 9, 25, 27, 36, 41 n., 49 n., 53, 65, 69, 71, 74, 77, 79, 86, 88 n., 91, 97, 117, 119, 120 n., 121 and n., 122, 123, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130.
- Nott, Colonel, 70.
- Orders in Council, 41, 126.
- Orinoco tobacco. See Tobacco.
- Outports in England, want poor tobacco, 25; buy tobacco in Maryland, 38; want several fleets annually, 41; concerned in trade with Maryland, 75, 88, 97; number of vessels from, 88; submissive to London merchants, 95.
- Paggen, Peter, 95, 106 n.
- Parliament, 99. See also Acts of Parliament.
- Patuxent District, 31 n., 32 n., 33 n., 34 n., 50, 79 n., 89, 123.
- Patuxent River, 9, 93.
- Penn, William, 73, 74, 75.
- Pennsylvania, imports from, 17-18, 21 n., 83; exports to, 17; prohibition of imports from, 18; coin in, 30; suitable for naval stores, 53; controversy over reexported European goods, 73-76; Scottish merchants in, 108; ships trading to Maryland, 109, 110-113; illicit trade, 118, 119 n., 120 n., 128 and n.; pirates in, 130, 131.
- Perry, Micajah, 95.
- Pirates, 93, 96, 116, 129-132.
- Plater, Collector George, 119 n., 123 and n.
- Pocomoke District, 13 n., 14 n., 17 and n., 20 n., 31 n., 32 n., 33 n., 34 n., 89 n.
- Port Lewes, 17 n., 113.
- Potomac District, 31 n., 32 n., 33 n., 34 n., 89, 119 n.
- Potomac River, 9, 93.
- Poverty in Maryland, 27-28, 39 and n., 65.
- Povey, John, 48, 49 n.
- Price of tobacco, 23, 35, 37-42, 66.
- Prince George's County, 114.
- Principio, 72.
- Privateers, French. See France.
- Privy Council, 24, 52, 75 n., 92, 93, 94, 98, 101, 102, 106, 121, 126 n.
- Prizes, French. See France.
- Proclamations, against exportation of food-stuffs, 15, 16; against exportation of flesh, 20; against English grown tobacco, 22 and n.; concerning rates of foreign coins, 30, 105; against exporting tobacco to foreign countries, 85 n.; concerning trade with Pennsylvania, 128; against pirates, 130.
- Proprietary period. See Baltimore, Lord.
- Proprietor. See Baltimore, Lord.
- Providence, 82, 112.
- Quary, Robert, 33 n., 40, 41, 58 n., 94, 97, 101, 104, 117 n., 118, 120 n., 131.
- Randolph, Edward, 15, 36 n., 53, 105 n., 108, 116, 117, 118 and n., 119 n., 120 n., 123 n., 126 n., 127.
- Regrating. See Forestalling.
- Revenue, to Maryland from fur trade, 12, 13; to England from tobacco, 42, 43, 45-46; to Maryland from tobacco, 47-51; to Maryland from reexported

European goods, 74; to Maryland from white servants, 78.
 Rhode Island, 21 n., 120 n.
 Rousby, Christopher, 50 n.
 Royal African Company, 107.
 Rum. See Liquors.
 Russia, 100, 101-102.

St. Mary's County, 114.

Salary of royal governor in Maryland, 47, 48.

Scotland, trade with, 81 n., 108, 117, 118 and n., 119 and n.

Secretary of State, 9, 54, 65 n., 69, 89 n., 92 n.

Securities. See Bonds and securities.

Servants, Irish Catholic. See Ireland.

Settlements, French. See France.

Seymour, Governor, 20, 27, 39 n., 43, 48, 54 and n., 55, 64, 65, 66, 71, 72, 75, 78, 79 n., 80 n., 82, 83 n., 89 n., 90 n., 92 n., 98, 103, 107, 108, 109, 115, 119, 122, 124 n.

Ships, number in English trade, 85-88; in intercolonial trade, 110-113; owned in Maryland, 109, 114-116.

Shoes, 72.

Shrewsbury, Duke of. See Secretary of State.

Slaves. See Negroes.

Slye, Gerard, 54 n., 56.

Smuggling. See Trade, illicit.

Somerset County, 9, 62, 71, 114, 118 n., 129 n.

South Carolina. See Carolinas.

Spain, 100, 101, 102, 108.

Spotswood, Governor, 69.

Stores in Maryland, 103, 104.

Stoughton, Governor, 17.

Surveyor, riding, 128.

Surveyors of the Customs, 50, 51, 101, 122, 128.

Sweden. See Baltic countries.

Talbot County, 60, 114, 115.

Thames River, 45, 100.

Tobacco, the staple of Maryland, 15, 18, 21, 24-25, 51, 57, 58, 69, 70; first grown in Virginia, 21, 22, 23; regulation and protection by English government, 21-22, 42-43, 45, 46, 49-50, 52, 55, 56, 85 and n., 97, 98, 99, 100,

101, 102, 116, 120-121; price in Virginia, 23, 38-39; regulation of quality and quantity in Maryland, 23-24, 25-26; packing of stalks, 25 and n., 26 and n.; amount grown in Maryland, 25; Orinoco, inferior variety, 25, 70, 99; quality of Maryland, 25-26; bad condition of trade, 27-28, 39, 61; use as medium of exchange, 23, 28-30, 105; amount exported to England, 30-36, 47; to English colonies, 36, 47; methods of selling, 37, 38, 102-104; price of, 35, 37-42, 66; effect of wars on trade, 39-40, 42; English duties on, 37, 40, 43-45, 46, 99, 100; effects of fleets on price of, 40-42, 94; revenue in England from, 42, 45-46; evasion of English duties on, 46; revenue in Maryland from, 47-51; colonial duties on, 47; salary of governor from duty on, 47-48; penny a pound on, 50-51; value of exported, 63; cheap labor essential to cultivation of, 76, 77, 78; London the center for trade in, 87-88; outports concerned in trade in, 38, 88; methods of loading, 89-90, 94; influence of London merchants on trade in, 95-102; freight rates on, 37, 54, 96; bulk, 97; size of hogsheads for, 97-99; trade with Continent in, 100-102; illicit trade in, 116, 117, 119 n., 120 n., 127-128.

Tonnard, Andrew, 54.

Towns in Maryland, 67, 89, 90, 103.

Trade, illicit, in England, 46; ways of evading Acts of Trade, 116; in New England ships, 117, 118 n.; constant before 1696, 117, 118, 127; with Scotland, 117-119; in Pennsylvania, 118, 119 n., 120 n.; little in Maryland after 1696, 119, 120 and n.; action of English government against, 120, 121; of colonial government against, 121-127; bonds and securities, 122-125; boat used

- for detection of, 126; attitude of inhabitants toward, 127; evasions of colonial acts, 127-129; with Pennsylvania, 128 and n.
- Trade routes, to England, 85-89; to Africa, 107; to foreign countries, 108; to other colonies, 109-114.
- Treasury, 25, 40, 50 n., 99 n., 120 n.
- Upper House of Assembly, 24, 29 n., 39 n., 67.
- Utrecht, Treaty of, 80.
- Virginia, 9, 21 n., 22, 24, 33, 36 and n., 40, 41, 46, 51, 58 and n., 59, 62, 63, 69, 70, 73 n., 94, 95, 96, 102, 103, 107, 109, 117, 119 n.; cattle imported into Maryland from, 19; tobacco first grown in, 21-23; sends tobacco only to England, 22, 85 n.; price of tobacco in, 23, 69; laws regulating tobacco in, 23 and n., 24, 26 n.; grows better tobacco than Maryland, 24, 25, 26; amount of tobacco exported from, 33-35; bill for ports in, 43; naval stores in, 53, 54 n., 56, 134-138; encourages manufactures, 67, 68 n.; scarcity of goods in, 64, 65, 66, 69-70; little manufacturing in, 69-70, 72; exports European goods free through Maryland, 73, 75; price of negroes in, 81; ships leaving, 86, 91, 92 n., 93; size of tobacco hogsheads in, 98 and n., 99; law on protested bills of exchange in, 106; Scottish merchants in, 108; trade routes with other colonies, 109; ships trading to Maryland, 110-113.
- Virginia Company. See Virginia.
- West Indies, 79, 82, 91, 105, 109, 115 n.
- West Jersey, 113.
- White servants, 24, 76-78.
- Wines. See Liquors.
- Wool, 43, 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 72, 141.
- Yoakleys, family of merchants, 96.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY STUDIES
IN
Historical and Political Science
Under the Direction of the
Departments of History, Political Economy
and Political Science

Thirty-third Series, 1915

The University Studies will continue to publish, as heretofore, the results of recent investigations in History, Political Economy and Political Science.

For the year 1915 the titles given below are now announced; other numbers will follow from time to time.

The Constitutional Doctrines of Justice Harlan.
By FLOYD BARZILIA CLARK.

Prices and Currency in Maryland, 1720-1765. By
CLARENCE P. GOULD.

The Helper and American Trade Unions. By JOHN
H. ASHWORTH.

Political Parties in Virginia on the Eve of Secession. By D. S. FREEMAN.

The Negro in the District of Columbia. By W. T.
LAPRADE.

The cost of subscription for the regular annual series, comprising about 600 pages, is \$3.00. Single numbers, or special monographs, at special prices. Complete contents of previous volumes given on pages II-V.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY STUDIES IN HISTORICAL AND POLITICAL SCIENCE

Edited by HERBERT B. ADAMS, 1882-1901

* Not sold separately.

FIRST SERIES.—1883.—\$4.00.

- I. An Introduction to American Institutional History. By E. A. FREEMAN. 25 cents.
- II. The Germanic Origin of New England Towns. By H. B. ADAMS. 50 cents.
- III. Local Government in Illinois. By ALBERT SHAW.—Local Government in Pennsylvanla. By E. R. L. GOULD. 30 cents.
- IV. Saxon Tithingmen in America. By H. B. ADAMS. 50 cents.
- V. Local Government in Michigan and the Northwest. By E. W. BEMIS. 25 cents.
- VI. Parish Institutions of Maryland. By EDWARD INGLE. 40 cents.
- VII. Old Maryland Manors. By JOHN HEMSLEY JOHNSON. 30 cents.
- VIII. Norman Constables in America. By H. B. ADAMS. 50 cents.
- IX-X. Village Communities of Cape Ann and Salem. By H. B. ADAMS. 50 cents.
- XI. The Genesis of a New England State. By A. JOHNSTON. 30 cents.
- *XII. Local Government and Schools in South Carolina. By B. J. RAMAGE.

SECOND SERIES.—1884.—\$4.00.

(Volume sold only with complete sets.)

- *I-II. Methods of Historical Study. By H. B. ADAMS.
- III. The Past and Present of Political Economy. By R. T. ELY. 35 cents.
- IV. Samuel Adams, the Man of the Town Meeting. By JAMES K. HOSMER. 35 cents.
- V-VI. Taxation in the United States. By HENRY CARTER ADAMS. 50 cents.
- VII. Institutional Beginnings in a Western State. By JESSE MACY. 25 cents.
- VIII-IX. Indian Money in New England, etc. By WILLIAM B. WEEDEN. 50 cents.
- *X. Town and County Government in the Colonies. By E. CHANNING.
- *XI. Rudimentary Society among Boys. By J. HEMSLEY JOHNSON.
- XII. Land Laws of Mining Districts. By C. H. SHINN. 50 cents.

THIRD SERIES.—1885.—\$4.00.

- I. Maryland's Influence upon Land Cessions to the U. S. By H. B. ADAMS. 75 cents.
- *II-III. Virginia Local Institutions. By E. INGLE. 75 cents.
- IV. Recent American Socialism. By RICHARD T. ELY. 50 cents.
- V-VI. Maryland Local Institutions. By LEWIS W. WILHELM. \$1.00.
- VIII. Influence of the Proprietors in Founding New Jersey. By A. SCOTT. 25 cents.
- IX-X. American Constitutions. By HORACE DAVIS. 50 cents.
- XI-XII. The City of Washington. By J. A. PORTER. 50 cents.

FOURTH SERIES.—1886.—\$3.50.

(Volume sold only with complete sets.)

- I. Dutch Village Communities on the Hudson River. By I. ELTING. 50 cents.
- II-III. Town Government in Rhode Island. By W. E. FOSTER.—The Narragansett Planters. By EDWARD CHANNING. 50 cents.
- *IV. Pennsylvania Boroughs. By WILLIAM P. HOLCOMB.
- V. Introduction to Constitutional History of the States. By J. F. JAMESON. 50 cents.
- *VI. The Puritan Colony at Annapolis, Maryland. By D. R. RANDALL.
- VII-VIII-IX. The Land Question in the United States. By S. SATO. \$1.00.
- X. Town and City Government of New Haven. By C. H. LEVERMORE. 50 cents.
- XI-XII. Land System of the New England Colonies. By M. EOLESTON. 50 cents.

FIFTH SERIES.—1887.—\$3.50.

- I-II. City Government of Philadelphia. By E. P. ALLINSON and B. PENROSE. 50 cents.
- III. City Government of Boston. By JAMES M. BUGBEE. 25 cents.
- *IV. City Government of St. Louis. By MARSHALL S. SNOW.
- V-VI. Local Government in Canada. By JOHN GEORGE BOURINOT. 50 cents.
- VII. Effect of the War of 1812 upon the American Union. By N. M. BUTLER. 25 cents.
- VIII. Notes on the Literature of Charities. By HERBERT B. ADAMS. 25 cents.
- IX. Predictions of Hamilton and De Tocqueville. By JAMES BRYCE. 25 cents.
- X. The Study of History in England and Scotland. By P. FREDERICQ. 25 cents.
- XI. Seminary Libraries and University Extension. By H. B. ADAMS. 25 cents.
- XII. European Schools of History and Politics. By A. D. WHITE. 25 cents.

SIXTH SERIES.—1888.—\$3.50.

The History of Co-operation in the United States.

SEVENTH SERIES.—1889.

(Volume sold only with complete set.)

- I. Arnold Toynbee. By F. C. MONTAGUE. 50 cents.
- II-III. Municipal Government in San Francisco. By BERNARD MOSES. 50 cents.
- IV. Municipal History of New Orleans. By WM. W. HOWE. 25 cents.
- *V-VI. English Culture in Virginia. By WILLIAM P. TRENT.
- VII-VIII-IX. The River Towns of Connecticut. By CHARLES M. ANDREWS. \$1.00.
- *X-XI-XII. Federal Government in Canada. By JOHN G. BOURINOT.

EIGHTH SERIES.—1890.

(Volume sold only with complete set.)

- I-II. The Beginnings of American Nationality. By A. W. SMALL. \$1.00.
- III. Local Government in Wisconsin. By D. B. SPENCER. 25 cents.
- *IV. Spanish Colonization in the Southwest. By F. W. BLACKMAR.
- V-VI. The Study of History in Germany and France. By P. FREDERICQ. \$1.00.
- VII-IX. Progress of the Colored People of Maryland. By J. R. BRACKETT. \$1.00.
- *X. The Study of History in Belgium and Holland. By P. FREDERICQ.
- XI-XII. Seminary Notes on Historical Literature. By H. B. ADAMS and others. 50 cents.

NINTH SERIES.—1891.

(Volume sold only with complete set.)

- *I-II. Government of the United States. By W. W. WILLOUGHBY and W. F. WILLOUGHBY.
- III-IV. University Education in Maryland. By B. C. STEINER. The Johns Hopkins University (1876-1891). By D. C. GILMAN. 50 cents.
- *V-VI. Municipal Unity in the Lombard Communes. By W. K. WILLIAMS.
- VII-VIII. Public Lands of the Roman Republic. By A. STEPHENSON. 75 cents.
- IX. Constitutional Development of Japan. By T. IYENAGA. 50 cents.
- *X. A History of Liberia. By J. H. T. MCPHERSON.
- XI-XII. The Indian Trade in Wisconsin. By F. J. TURNER. 50 cents.

TENTH SERIES.—1892.—\$3.50.

- I. The Bishop Hill Colony. By MICHAEL A. MIKKELSEN. 50 cents.
- II-III. Church and State in New England. By PAUL E. LAUER. 50 cents.
- IV. Church and State in Maryland. By GEORGE PETRIE. 50 cents.
- V-VI. Religious Development of North Carolina. By S. B. WEEKS. 50 cents.
- VII. Maryland's Attitude in the Struggle for Canada. By J. W. BLACK. 50 cents.
- VIII-IX. The Quakers in Pennsylvania. By A. C. APPLGARTH. 75 cents.
- X-XI. Columbus and his Discovery of America. By H. B. ADAMS and H. WOOD. 50 cents.
- XII. Causes of the American Revolution. By J. A. WOODBURN. 50 cents.

ELEVENTH SERIES.—1893.—\$3.50.

- I. The Social Condition of Labor. By E. R. L. GOULD. 50 cents.
- II. The World's Representative Assemblies of To-Day. By E. K. ALDEN. 50 cents.
- III-IV. The Negro in the District of Columbia. By EDWARD INGLE. \$1.00.
- V-VI. Church and State in North Carolina. By STEPHEN B. WEEKS. 50 cents.
- VII-VIII. The Condition of the Western Farmer, etc. By A. F. BENTLEY. \$1.00.
- IX-X. History of Slavery in Connecticut. By BERNARD C. STEINER. 75 cents.
- XI-XII. Local Government in the South. By E. W. BENNIS and others. \$1.00.

TWELFTH SERIES.—1894.—\$3.50.

- I-II. The Cincinnati Southern Railway. By J. H. HOLLANDER. \$1.00.
- III. Constitutional Beginnings of North Carolina. By J. S. BASSETT. 50 cents.
- IV. Struggle of Dissenters for Toleration in Virginia. By H. R. MCILWAINE. 50 cents.
- V-VI-VII. The Carolina Pirates and Colonial Commerce. By S. C. HUGHSON. \$1.00.
- VIII-IX. Representation and Suffrage in Massachusetts. By G. H. HAYNES. 50 cents.
- X. English Institutions and the American Indian. By J. A. JAMES. 25 cents.
- XI-XII. International Beginnings of the Congo Free State. By J. S. REEVES. 50 cents.

THIRTEENTH SERIES.—1895.—\$3.50.

- I-II. Government of the Colony of South Carolina. By E. L. WHITNEY. 75 cents.
- III-IV. Early Relations of Maryland and Virginia. By J. H. LATANÉ. 50 cents.
- V. The Rise of the Bicameral System in America. By T. F. MORAN. 50 cents.
- VI-VII. White Servitude in the Colony of Virginia. By J. C. BALLAUGH. 50 cents.
- VIII. The Genesis of California's First Constitution. By R. D. HUNT. 50 cents.
- IX. Benjamin Franklin as an Economist. By W. A. WETZEL. 50 cents.
- X. The Provisional Government of Maryland. By J. A. SILVER. 50 cents.
- XI-XII. Government and Religion of the Virginia Indians. By S. R. HENDREN. 50 cents.

FOURTEENTH SERIES.—1896.—\$3.50.

- I. Constitutional History of Hawaii. By HENRY E. CHAMBERS. 25 cents.
- II. City Government of Baltimore. By THADDEUS P. THOMAS. 25 cents.
- III. Colonial Origins of New England Senates. By F. L. RILEY. 50 cents.
- IV-V. Servitude in the Colony of North Carolina. By J. S. BASSETT. 50 cents.
- VI-VII. Representation in Virginia. By J. A. C. CHANDLER. 50 cents.
- VIII. History of Taxation in Connecticut (1636-1776). By F. R. JONES. 50 cents.
- IX-X. A Study of Slavery in New Jersey. By HENRY S. COOLEY. 50 cents.
- XI-XII. Causes of the Maryland Revolution of 1689. By F. E. SPARKS. 50 cents.

FIFTEENTH SERIES.—1897.—\$3.50.

- I-II. The Tobacco Industry in Virginia since 1860. By B. W. ARNOLD. 50 cents.
- III-V. Street Railway System of Philadelphia. By F. W. SPEIRS. 75 cents.
- VI. Daniel Raymond. By C. P. NEILL. 50 cents.
- VII-VIII. Economic History of B. & O. R. R. By M. REIZENSTEIN. 50 cents.
- IX. The South American Trade of Baltimore. By F. R. RUTTER. 50 cents.
- X-XI. State Tax Commissions in the United States. By J. W. CHAPMAN. 50 cents.
- XII. Tendencies in American Economic Thought. By S. SHERWOOD. 25 cents.

SIXTEENTH SERIES.—1898.—\$3.50.

- I-IV. The Neutrality of the American Lakes, etc. By J. M. CALLAHAN. \$1.25. Cloth, \$1.50.
- V. West Florida. By H. E. CHAMBERS. 25 cents.
- VI. Anti-Slavery Leaders of North Carolina. By J. S. BASSETT. 50 cents.
- VII-IX. Life and Administration of Sir Robert Eden. By B. C. STEINER. \$1.00.
- X-XI. The Transition of North Carolina from a Colony. By E. W. SIKES. 50 cents.
- XII. Jared Sparks and Alexis De Tocqueville. By H. B. ADAMS. 25 cents.

SEVENTEENTH SERIES.—1899.—\$3.50.

- I-II-III. History of State Banking in Maryland. By A. C. BRYAN. \$1.00.
IV-V. The Know-Nothing Party in Maryland. By L. F. SCHMECKEBIER. 75 cents.
VI. The Labadist Colony in Maryland. By B. B. JAMES. 50 cents.
VII-VIII. History of Slavery in North Carolina. By J. S. BASSETT. 75 cents.
IX-X-XI. Development of the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal. By G. W. WARD. 75 cents.
XII. Public Educational Work in Baltimore. By HERBERT B. ADAMS. 25 cents.

EIGHTEENTH SERIES.—1900.—\$3.50.

- I-IV. Studies in State Taxation. Edited by J. H. HOLLANDER. Paper, \$1.00; cloth, \$1.25.
V-VI. The Colonial Executive Prior to the Restoration. By P. L. KAYE. 50 cents.
VII. Constitution and Admission of Iowa into the Union. By J. A. JAMES. 30 cents.
VIII-IX. The Church and Popular Education. By H. B. ADAMS. 50 cents.
X-XII. Religious Freedom in Virginia: The Baptists. By W. T. THOM. 75 cents.

NINETEENTH SERIES.—1901.—\$3.50.

- I-III. America in the Pacific and the Far East. By J. M. CALLAHAN. 75 cents.
IV-V. State Activities in Relation to Labor. By W. F. VILLOUGHBY. 50 cents.
VI-VII. History of Suffrage in Virginia. By J. A. C. CHANDLER. 50 cents.
VIII-IX. The Maryland Constitution of 1864. By W. S. MYERS. 50 cents.
X. Life of Commissary James Blair. By D. E. MOTLEY. 25 cents.
XI-XII. Gov. Hicks of Maryland and the Civil War. By G. L. RADCLIFFE. 50 cents.

TWENTIETH SERIES.—1902.—\$3.50.

- I. Western Maryland in the Revolution. By B. C. STEINER. 30 cents.
II-III. State Banks since the National Bank Act. By G. B. BARNETT. 50 cents.
IV. Early History of Internal Improvements in Alabama. By W. E. MARTIN. 80 cents.
*V-VI. Trust Companies in the United States. By GEORGE CATOR.
VII-VIII. The Maryland Constitution of 1851. By J. W. HARRY. 50 cents.
IX-X. Political Activities of Philip Freneau. By S. E. FORMAN. 50 cents.
XI-XII. Continental Opinion on a Middle European Tariff Union. By G. M. FISK. 30 cts.

TWENTY-FIRST SERIES.—1903.—\$3.50.

- I-II. The Wabash Trade Route. By E. J. BENTON. 50 cents.
III-IV. Internal Improvements in North Carolina. By C. C. WEAVER. 50 cents.
V. History of Japanese Paper Currency. By M. TAKAKI. 30 cents.
VI-VII. Economics and Politics in Maryland, 1720-1750, and the Public Services of Daniel Dulany the Elder. By St. G. L. SIOUSSAT. 50 cents.
VIII-IX-X. Beginnings of Maryland, 1631-1639. By B. C. STEINER. 75 cents.
XI-XII. The English Statutes in Maryland. By St. G. L. SIOUSSAT. 50 cents.

TWENTY-SECOND SERIES.—1904.—\$3.50.

- I-II. A Trial Bibliography of American Trade-Union Publications. 50 cents.
III-IV. White Servitude in Maryland, 1634-1820. By E. I. MCCORMAC. 50 cents.
V. Switzerland at the Beginning of the Sixteenth Century. By J. M. VINCENT. 30 cents.
VI-VII-VIII. The History of Reconstruction in Virginia. By H. J. ECKENRODE. 50 cts.
IX-X. The Foreign Commerce of Japan since the Restoration. By Y. HATTORI. 50 cents.
XI-XII. Descriptions of Maryland. By B. C. STEINER. 50 cents.

TWENTY-THIRD SERIES.—1905.—\$3.50.

- I-II. Reconstruction in South Carolina. By J. P. HOLLIS. 50 cents.
III-IV. State Government in Maryland, 1777-1781. By D. W. BOND, JR. 50 cents.
V-VI. Colonial Administration under Lord Clarendon, 1660-1667. By P. L. KAYE. 50 cts.
VII-VIII. Justice in Colonial Virginia. By O. P. CHITWOOD. 50 cents.
IX-X. The Napoleonic Exiles in America, 1815-1819. By J. S. REEVES. 50 cents.
XI-XII. Municipal Problems in Mediaeval Switzerland. By J. M. VINCENT. 50 cents.

TWENTY-FOURTH SERIES.—1906.—\$3.50.

- I-II. Spanish-American Diplomatic Relations before 1898. By H. E. FLACK. 50 cents.
III-IV. The Finances of American Trade Unions. By A. M. SAKOLSKI. 75 cents.
V-VI. Diplomatic Negotiations of the United States with Russia. By J. C. HILD. 50 cts.
VII-VIII. State Rights and Parties in North Carolina, 1776-1831. By H. M. WAGSTAFF. 50c.
IX-X. National Labor Federations in the United States. By WILLIAM KIRK. 75 cents.
XI-XII. Maryland During the English Civil Wars. Part I. By B. C. STEINER. 50 cents.

TWENTY-FIFTH SERIES.—1907.—\$3.50.

- I. Internal Taxation in the Philippines. By JOHN S. HORD. 30 cents.
II-III. The Monroe Mission to France, 1794-1796. By B. W. BOND, JR. 50 cents.
IV-V. Maryland During the English Civil Wars, Part II. By BERNARD C. STEINER. 50c.
VI-VII. The State in Constitutional and International Law. By R. T. CRANE. 50 cents.
VIII-IX-X. Financial History of Maryland, 1789-1848. By HUGH S. HANNA. 75 cents.
XI-XII. Apprenticeship in American Trade Unions. By J. M. MOTLEY. 50 cents.

TWENTY-SIXTH SERIES.—1908.—\$3.50.

- I-III. British Committees, Commissions, and Councils of Trade and Plantations, 1622-1675. By C. M. ANDREWS. 75 cents.
IV-VI. Neutral Rights and Obligations in the Anglo-Boer War. By R. G. CAMPBELL. 75 cents.
VII-VIII. The Elizabethan Parish in its Ecclesiastical and Financial Aspects. By S. L. WARE. 50 cents.
IX-X. A Study of the Topography and Municipal History of Praeneste. By R. V. D. MAGOFFIN. 50 cents.
*XI-XII. Beneficiary Features of American Trade Unions. By J. B. KENNEDY.

TWENTY-SEVENTH SERIES.—1909.—\$3.50.

- I-II. The Self-Reconstruction of Maryland, 1864-1867. By W. S. MYERS. 50 cents.
III-IV-V. The Development of the English Law of Conspiracy. By J. W. BRYAN.
75 cents.
VI-VII. Legislative and Judicial History of the Fifteenth Amendment. By J. M. MATTHEWS. 75 cents; cloth \$1.
VIII-XII. England and the French Revolution, 1789-1797. By W. T. LAPRADE. \$1.

TWENTY-EIGHTH SERIES.—1910.—\$3.50.

(Complete in four numbers.)

- I. History of Reconstruction in Louisiana (Through 1868). By J. R. FICKLEN. \$1.00; cloth \$1.25.
II. The Trade Union Label. By E. R. SPEDDEN. 50 cents; cloth 75 cents.
III. The Doctrine of Non-Suability of the State in the United States. By K. SINGE-WALD. 50 cents; cloth 75 cents.
IV. David Ricardo: A Centenary Estimate. By J. H. HOLLANDER. \$1.00; cloth \$1.25.

TWENTY-NINTH SERIES.—1911.—\$3.50.

(Complete in three numbers.)

- I. Maryland Under the Commonwealth: A Chronicle of the years 1649-1658. By B. C. STEINER. \$1; cloth, \$1.25.
II. The Dutch Republic and the American Revolution. By FRIEDRICH EDLER. \$1.50; cloth \$1.75.
III. The Closed Shop in American Trade Unions. By F. T. STOCKTON. \$1.00; cloth \$1.25.

THIRTIETH SERIES.—1912.—\$3.50.

(Complete in three numbers.)

- I. Recent Administration in Virginia. By F. A. MAGRUBER. \$1.25; cloth, \$1.50.
II. The Standard Rate in American Trade Unions. By D. A. McCABE. \$1.25; cloth \$1.50.
III. Admission to American Trade Unions. By F. E. WOLFE. \$1.00; cloth \$1.25.

THIRTY-FIRST SERIES.—1913.—\$3.50.

(Complete in four numbers.)

- I. The Land System in Maryland, 1720-1765. By CLARENCE P. GOULD. 75 cents; cloth, \$1.00.
II. The Government of American Trade Unions. By T. W. GLOCKER. \$1.00; cloth, \$1.25.
III. The Free Negro in Virginia, 1619-1865. By J. H. RUSSELL. \$1.00; cloth, \$1.25.
IV. The Quinquennales: An Historical Study. By R. V. D. MAGOFFIN. 50 cents; cloth 75 cents.

THIRTY-SECOND SERIES.—1914.—\$3.50.

(Complete in three numbers.)

- I. Jurisdiction in American Building-Trades Unions. By N. R. WHITNEY. \$1.00; cloth, \$1.25.
II. Slavery in Missouri, 1804-1865. By H. A. TREXLER. \$1.25; cloth \$1.50.
III. Colonial Trade of Maryland. By M. S. MORRIS. \$1.00; cloth \$1.25.

The set of thirty-two series of Studies is offered, uniformly bound in cloth, for library use for \$112.00 net. The separate volumes may also be had bound in cloth at prices given.

NOTES SUPPLEMENTARY TO THE STUDIES IN HISTORY AND POLITICS.

PRICE OF THESE NOTES, TEN CENTS EACH, UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED.

- Municipal Government in England. By ALBERT SHAW.
Social Work in Australia and London. WILLIAM GREY.
Encouragement of Higher Education. Prof. H. B. ADAMS.
The Problem of City Government. Hon. SETH LOW.
The Libraries of Baltimore. By P. R. UHLER.
Work Among the Workingwomen of Baltimore. By H. B. ADAMS.
Charities: The Relation of the State, the City, and the Individual to Modern Philanthropic Work. By A. G. WARNER.
Law and History. By WALTER B. SCAIFE.
The Needs of Self-Supporting Women. By CLARA DE GRAFFENREID.
Early Presbyterianism in Maryland. By J. W. MCILVAIN.
The Educational Aspect of the U. S. National Museum. By O. T. MASON.
University Extension and the University of the Future. By RICHARD G. MOULTON.
The Philosophy of Education. By WILLIAM T. HARRIS.
Popular Election of U. S. Senators. By JOHN HAYNES.
A Memorial of Lucius S. Merriam. By J. H. HOLLANDER and others.
Is History Past Politics? By H. B. ADAMS.
Lay Sermons. By AMOS G. WARNER; with a biographical sketch by GEORGE E. HOWARD.
Price twenty-five cents.

Extra Volumes of Studies

IN

Historical and Political Science

Those marked with an asterisk (*) are out of print.

- *I. The Republic of New Haven. By CHARLES H. LEVERMORE. 342 pages.
- II. Philadelphia, 1681-1887. By EDWARD I. ALLISON, A.M., and BOIES PENROSE, A.B. 444 pages. Svo. Cloth. \$3.00.
- *III. Baltimore and the Nineteenth of April, 1861. By GEORGE WILLIAM BROWN. 176 pages.
- IV. Local Constitutional History of the United States. By GEORGE E. HOWARD, Ph.D.—Volume I—Development of the Township, Hundred and Shire. 542 pages. Svo. Cloth. \$3.00.
- VI. The Negro in Maryland. By JEFFREY R. BRACKETT, Ph.D. 270 pages. Svo. Cloth. \$2.00.
- VII. The Supreme Court of the United States. By W. W. WILLOUGHBY, Ph.D. 124 pages. Svo. Cloth. \$1.25.
- VIII. The Intercourse between the U. S. and Japan. By INAZO (OTA) NITOE, Ph.D. 198 pages. Svo. Cloth. \$1.25.
- *IX. State and Federal Government in Switzerland. By JOHN MARTIN VINCENT. 250 pages.
- X. Spanish Institutions of the Southwest. By FRANK W. BLACKMAR, Ph.D. 380 pages. Svo. Cloth. \$2.00.
- XI. An Introduction to the Study of the Constitution. By MORRIS M. COHN. 250 pages. Svo. Cloth. \$1.50.
- XII. The Old English Manor. By C. M. ANDREWS, Ph.D. 280 pages. Svo. Cloth, \$1.50.
- *XIII. America: Its Geographical History, 1492-1892. By WALTER B. SCAIFE. 176 pages.
- *XIV. Florentine Life During the Renaissance. By WALTER B. SCAIFE.
- *XV. The Southern Quakers and Slavery. By STEPHEN B. WEEKS, Ph.D. 414 pages. Svo. Cloth. \$2.00.
- XVI. Contemporary American Opinion of the French Revolution. By C. D. HAZEN, Ph.D. 325 pages. Svo. Cloth. \$2.00.
- *XVII. Industrial Experiments in the British Colonies of North America. By ELEANOR L. LORD. 164 pages. Svo. Cloth. \$1.25.
- XVIII. State Aid to Higher Education: A Series of Addresses at the Johns Hopkins University. 100 pages. Svo. Cloth. \$1.00.
- *XIX. Irrigation in Utah. By C. H. BROUGH. 228 pages.
- XX. Financial History of Baltimore. By J. H. HOLLANDER, Ph.D. 400 pages. Svo. Cloth. \$2.00.
- XXI. Cuba and International Relations. By J. M. CALLAHAN. 503 pages. Svo. Cloth. \$3.00.
- XXII. The American Workman. By E. LEVASSEUR (translation). 540 pages. Svo. Cloth. \$3.00.
- XXIII. Herbert B. Adams. A Memorial Volume. 232 pages. Svo. Cloth.
- XXIV. A History of Slavery in Virginia. By J. C. BALLAGH. 160 pages. Svo. Cloth. \$1.50.
- XXV. The Finances and Administration of Providence, 1636-1901. By HOWARD K. STOKES. 474 pages. Svo. Cloth. \$3.50.
- XXVI. The Adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment. By HORACE E. FLACK. 286 pages. Svo. Cloth. \$2.00.

NEW SERIES.

- I. The Revision and Amendment of State Constitutions. W. F. DODD. 368 pages. Svo. Cloth. \$2.00.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS OF BALTIMORE.

- American Journal of Insanity.** Quarterly. 8vo. Volume LXXI in progress. \$5 per volume. (Foreign postage fifty cents.)
- American Journal of Mathematics.** FRANK MORLEY, Editor. Quarterly. 4to. Volume XXXVI in progress. \$5 per volume. (Foreign postage fifty cents.)
- American Journal of Philology.** B. L. GILDERSLEEVE, Editor. Quarterly. 8vo. Volume XXXV in progress. \$3 per volume. (Foreign postage fifty cents.)
- Beiträge zur Assyriologie und semitischen Sprachwissenschaft.** PAUL HAUPT and FRIEDRICH DELITZSCH, Editors. Volume X in progress.
- Elliott Monographs in the Romance Languages and Literatures.** EDWARD C. ARMSTRONG, Editor. 8vo. \$3 per year.
- Hesperia.** HERMANN COLLITZ and JAMES W. BRIGHT, Editors.
- Johns Hopkins Hospital Bulletin.** Monthly. 4to. Volume XXV in progress. \$2 per year. (Foreign postage fifty cents.)
- Johns Hopkins Hospital Reports.** 4to. Volume XVII in progress. \$5 per volume. (Foreign postage fifty cents.)
- Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science.** 8vo. Volume XXXII in progress. \$3 per volume.
- Johns Hopkins University Circular,** including the President's Report, Annual Register, and Medical Department Catalogue. T. R. BALL, Editor. Monthly. 8vo. Volume XXXIII in progress. \$1 per year.
- Modern Language Notes.** E. C. ARMSTRONG, J. W. BRIGHT, B. J. VOS, and C. C. MARDEN (Managing Editor). Monthly. 4to. Volume XXIX in progress. \$2 per volume. (Foreign postage twenty-five cents.)
- Report of the Maryland Geological Survey.**
- Reprints of Economic Tracts.** J. H. HOLLANDER, Editor. Third Series in progress. \$2 net.
- Terrestrial Magnetism and Atmospheric Electricity.** L. A. BAUER, Editor. Quarterly. 8vo. Volume XIX in progress. \$3 per volume. (Foreign postage twenty-five cents.)
-

- PHOTOGRAPHIC REPRODUCTION OF THE KASHMIRIAN ATHARVA-VEDA.** M. Bloomfield, Editor. 3 vols. Folio. \$50.
- POEMA DE FERNAN GONÇALEZ.** Edited by C. Carroll Marden. 284 pp. \$2.50 net.
- THE TAIL OF RAUF COILYEAR.** Edited by William Hand Browne. 164 pp. \$1 net.
- A NEW CRITICAL EDITION OF THE HEBREW TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.** Paul Haupt, Editor. Prospectus on application.
- STUDIES IN HONOR OF PROFESSOR GILDERSLEEVE.** 527 pp. \$6 net.
- THE PHYSICAL PAPERS OF HENRY A. ROWLAND.** 716 pp. \$7.50 net.
- ECCLESIASTES: A New Metrical Translation.** By Paul Haupt. 50 pp. 50 cents net.
- THE BOOK OF NAHUM: A New Metrical Translation.** By Paul Haupt. 53 pp. 50 cents net.
- THE HAGUE PEACE CONFERENCES OF 1899 AND 1907.** By James Brown Scott. Vol. I, The Conferences, 887 pp.; Vol. II, Documents, 548 pp. \$5 net.
- DISTURBING ELEMENTS IN THE STUDY AND TEACHING OF POLITICAL ECONOMY.** By James Bonar. 156 pp. \$1.
- THE ECGLOGUES OF BAPTISTA MANTUANUS.** By Winfred P. Mustard. 156 pp. \$1.50.
- DIPLOMATIC NEGOTIATIONS OF AMERICAN NAVAL OFFICERS, 1778-1883.** By C. O. Paullin. 380 pp. \$2.
- FOUR PHASES OF AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT. Federalism—Democracy—Imperialism—Expansion.** By J. B. Moore. 218 pp. \$1.50.

A complete list of publications sent on request

THE HAGUE PEACE CONFERENCES OF 1899 and 1907

By HON. JAMES BROWN SCOTT

Solicitor for the Department of State and Technical Delegate to the
Second Conference.

Two Volumes. 8vo. Cloth. Price \$5.00.

VOL. I. THE CONFERENCES, 887 Pages.

VOL. II. DOCUMENTS, 548 Pages.

These two substantial volumes furnish the most complete account of the Conferences which has appeared in English, and will undoubtedly be accepted as the definitive account of the work of those two great gatherings. The fact that the author was the Technical Delegate of the United States to the Second Conference and played a conspicuous part in its deliberations, adds to the authoritative value of the treatise.

The Nation says:

"Little of significance has escaped our author. First, here are your original treaties and convention. Secondly, you get nearly 150 pages of condensed commentary on the two conferences. Lastly, you have an expanded account of 750 pages, authoritative and circumstantial."

Judge Simeon E. Baldwin, in the *American Political Science Review*, says:

"Professor Scott has thus not only given the general public a clear view of the formation of the achievements of the two most imposing international congresses ever held, but put the student of public law who desires to examine them more closely, in possession of the most important sources of original information."

The American Historical Review says:

"There has been great need of a volume in English which should analyze the work of the Second Hague Conference in a manner at once interesting to the general reader and satisfactory to students and teachers of international law. In the successful accomplishment of this task, Professor Scott deserves our heartiest thanks."

Orders should be addressed to

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS,

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

THE LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
Santa Barbara

THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DATE
STAMPED BELOW.

FAC NOV 9 1976

FAC X JUN 20 1977

JAN 9 1984

NOV 23 1983

Series 9482

AA 000 588 108 1



<http://stores.ebay.com/Ancestry-Found>

26

