

appointed. To this petition the Court replied "that as the right Hon^{ble} the Lord Prop^{ty} of this Province is as much bound by his own Lawes as the meanest of his Ma^{ties} Subjects resideing here under the protection of his said Lordp^p, so itt is but just that his cause should be tryed before he be concluded." (*post*, p. 245). Therefore the Court advised the petitioner to employ one of the attorneys assigned him as counsel (and they were the top men at the Provincial bar), so that the Attorney General might be compelled to answer and that justice might be done quickly and effectively (*ibid.*). At the same time the elder Browne and Henry Bartholomew, also of Salem in New England, petitioned for the return of the land at Farley, and of most or all of the goods and chattels. The attorney to whom they went thought their case was just, but he himself refused to handle it for them. The petitioners suggested to the Governor that perhaps the coroner might have wanted to ingratiate himself by getting such a verdict from the jury. The later career of Charles James lends color to that hint. He became sheriff of Cecil County on January 2, 1676: in just five months he was impeached by the Lower House of Assembly for perjury. He had sworn falsely against a Cecil County commissioner, and had persuaded others to join him. He had forcibly taken from Edward Pynn, sub-sheriff of Cecil, a bag of writings of great value, and when protest was made, he had said that he, James, was now proprietor of Cecil County. Whereupon the Lower House asked the Proprietary to order that James should never again hold public office. At the trial the Upper House desired the Proprietary to call in James's commission as sheriff, and the Lower House, taking it for granted that his commission as coroner and deputy sheriff would also be invalidated, was satisfied with the result (*Archives II*, 490-491, 499). According to the 1676 verdict as delivered, the jurors said "upon their Oathes", but most of those to whom Bartholomew and the elder Browne talked, told them that they had never taken an oath at all. As to the land at Farley, the petitioners believed that, if the records were searched with care, James Browne's right to it would appear. The Proprietary had granted a resurvey for all his land, including Farley, and the return of the resurvey had been entered in the record. So they hoped that Farley would be returned to the widow and the fatherless (*post*, pp. 246-247).

Petitioners John Browne and Henry Bartholomew believed that Mr. Samuel Shrimpton of Boston had "very considerable concern" in the estate of James Brown. There was clear testimony under James's own hand that Shrimpton had due him more than 23,000 pounds of tobacco and also £191 sterling which he had turned over to Browne to buy goods for the voyage. There was also pewter ware and the like belonging to Shrimpton in the store at Farley. Since all of the books and papers about these accounts were withheld from them, presumably in the hands of Proprietary officers, the petitioners were destitute of relief and could do no more than petition for help. To all the matters in the petition, the Court replied that, since the Farley land had, by valid legal process, become vested in the Proprietary, they could not, on a mere suggestion, award land or goods to the claimants. There was a due course at law by which they could seek their rights against the Proprietary,