

over in the *Ruth*, on account of Leach's contempt of the December 9 decree, and three days later the writ was issued. The Commissioners of Kent County were ordered to seize and take possession of goods shipped in the *Ruth* or their produce wherever they might be found. They were to appraise them and then turn them over to Peighen to satisfy the decree and to repay his costs. And they were to return a certificate to Chancery without delay (*ibid.*, p. 202). How the matters were disposed of is not known now.

JOHN QUIGLEY AND THE BUILDING OF THE STATE HOUSE

In the spring of 1674 the Assembly passed an act to build a state house and a prison at St. Mary's City (*Archives*, II, pp. 404-407), and gave the contract to John Quigley, innholder and attorney of the Provincial Court, usually called Captain Quigley. His bid was 330,000 pounds of tobacco and he gave bond for 50,000 pounds to have the buildings completed on time (*ibid.*, pp. 383, 386). He went to work and almost immediately he ran into difficulties. By February 1674/5 he was asking the Assembly for his pay, next crop (*ibid.*, p. 455), although he was not supposed to get his money until after the work was completed. The Province was only forty years old, but Quigley found near at hand at least three good bricklayers, and he made contracts with them. John Roberts agreed to work on the brick building called the State House for one month for three shillings a day. At the end of the month Roberts asked £3/12 and, when Quigley refused to pay it, Roberts sued. When the case came up, Quigley disposed of it in short order, for he showed the Court a discharge from Roberts from all demands for money from the beginning of the world to the present, and the Court declared Roberts's claim false and gave Quigley 690 pounds of tobacco for his costs. Within a few days, however, Roberts went to work for Quigley again, with no definite wages provided, and this time he worked until the last day of September. Two other bricklayers also worked for Quigley on the State House from July 4, 1675, and all three of them worked on until the last day of September. When Quigley refused to pay Roberts what Roberts thought he reasonably deserved, the bricklayer sued again, this time for 10,000 pounds of tobacco. This time the jury and the Court granted the plaintiff Roberts 2400 pounds as damages and 1389 pounds more for costs (*post*, pp. 229, 230). Thomas Walker, who worked for the same time and the same wage agreement, was given the same verdict, save that he got 1362 pounds for costs, instead of 1389 (*ibid.*, 207). Thomas Paine, the third artisan, got the same contract, worked the same time and got the same treatment, also sued for the same sum, 10,000 pounds of tobacco. He too got a jury verdict, but the Court ordered a writ of enquiry of damages because it did not appear just how much he had been damaged. When the writ was returned, on April 13, 1676, the jury said he should have 4200 pounds damages and 1921 pounds costs (*ibid.*, 95-96, 228-229). When Quigley did at last finish the work, it was so poorly done that repairs and overhauling were needed very soon, but that is another story (*Archives*, VII, 229, 230, 294, 300; XIII, 223; XX, 35).