

Gc
975.2
A45w
1753402

REYNOLDS HISTORICAL
GENEALOGY COLLECTION

ALLEN COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 1833 02251 7780





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016

WHO WERE ✓

THE

Early Settlers of Maryland:

A PAPER READ BEFORE THE

"MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY."

AT

Its Meeting held Thursday Evening,
October 5, 1865.

—♦♦—
BY THE

REV. ETHAN ALLEN, D.D.

—♦♦—
BALTIMORE.

PRINTED AT THE OFFICE OF THE AM. QUAR. CHURCH REVIEW,
New Haven, Conn.

1866.

1753402

WHO WERE
THE
FIRST SETTLERS OF MARYLAND.

IF this question be answered in reference to individuals, we are shown that Kent Island, in the Chesapeake Bay, the first settlement in what is now the State of Maryland, was settled under the proprietorship of William Claiborne, a member of the Council and Secretary of State, of the Virginia Colony. But the names of the individual settlers under him during the first five years, have not come down to us.

The next settlement, four or five years later, was under the proprietorship of Cecelius Calvert, Baron of Baltimore. In his third "relation of Maryland," that of A. D., 1635, he has given us the names of his first Colonists, styled gentlemen, and the number of their servants. The gentlemen adventurers that embarked, were seventeen, namely: two of his Lordship's brothers; two Commissioners; a son of Sir Thomas Gerard; two sons of Lady Anne Wintour; a son of Sir Thomas Wiseman, and nine others, whose names, simply, are mentioned. These, with their servants, numbered about two hundred. Of these, George, one of the sons of lord Baltimore, remained in Virginia, and never came to Maryland; and two died on their passage, leaving only fourteen to have settled here. Of this fourteen, at the end of four years, nine had died, or removed. In a few years, four of these five died, and the last one returned to England. No one of all these left any descendants in the Province. The names of the servants, for the most part, are still found on the land records,—as are those of the subsequent emigrants,—and at the end of four years, some of these had become land-holders, and have the titles of "freemen" and

“gentlemen,” affixed to their names. Of this class, some of their descendants are among the most prominent families in the State.

In the further answer to our question, we may look at it in two aspects. First, what was their Nationality, and secondly, what was their Religion.

In reference to the first, it is generally stated in our newspapers, and in our school books, that it was settled by the Irish. This is a palpable error, and truth requires its correction. In this paper, it is not designed to go at large into an examination of this point. But it may be stated, in passing that the larger number, for thirty years, were from the Province of Virginia; so that it was early said, and frequently said by those of that Province, that one half of it was depopulated to settle Maryland. It is not indeed probable, that all of these settlers were natives of that Province; but from what foreign country those who were not, came, cannot here be shown, save generally, that they were of English birth.

The next larger number were natives of England, including Wales. Then came, in no inconsiderable numbers, natives of Scotland. Then, those of France, who were Huguenots. Then, from Germany, Holland, Bohemia, Spain, Italy, and last, if not least of all, from Ireland,—saving Irish servants. It was a mingled mass of Celtic, Gothic, Slavonic and even Hamitic origin. To examine this point at large, and in detail, however, is not our present purpose. Though interesting, in many points of view to do so, we have neither time nor space. It is a subject sufficient for a paper by itself. What has been stated, is enough to show the untruth to which we have referred, and should lead to the correction, at least of the school books of our country. They have too long already taught positive error on this point.

In reference to the second aspect mentioned,—it is generally, nay, almost universally held, that Maryland was settled, in early times, by and with Roman Catholics; using the name in its popular acceptation. In answer to this, the following statements will tell their own story, and that faithfully and truly.

We will look, first, at the early settlements of each of the ten Counties established under Lord Baltimore's administration of the Government, previous to 1688,—when, as a Romanist, his government ceased.

(1st.) The first, in chronological order of settlement, was *Kent County*, embracing, at its beginning, Kent Island only. This was in 1628 or 9. It is the Island, as so well known, in the Chesapeake Bay, opposite to the City of Annapolis. The settlers here were then a part of the Virginia Colony, and all of them were Church of England men,—as were all in that Colony,—no others being then allowed to reside there, by the regulations of the English Government. The Rev. Richard James, and other Church of England Ministers from Jamestown, ministered in this settlement; all this we are shown from Virginia records and English documents. This settlement was a Protestant settlement.

(2d.) The next, in order of time, was *St. Mary's County*, under Lord Baltimore, who, by the way, as so well known, was an Englishman, as his long line of ancestry also had been. His title, indeed, was that of an Irish Baron, though he himself never resided in Ireland. In 1634, he sent over his first Colonists, all Englishmen; consisting, as before mentioned, of seventeen gentlemen and their servants, who seated themselves on St. George's, the River emptying into the Potomac, and not very distant therefrom, in a town which they named St. Mary's.

Who this Colony was made up of, may be seen from the letters of Father White, who came over with the first emigrants. His statement is this; “if you except sea-sickness, no one [on board the vessels coming over] was attacked with any disease, till the Festival of the Nativity of our Lord [Christmas]. That the day might be more joyfully celebrated, the wine flowed freely, and some who drank immoderately, about thirty in number, were seized the next day with the fever, and twelve of them not long after died, and among them, two Catholics, Nicholas Fairfax and James Barefoot, which caused great regret with us all.” These were two of the seventeen gentlemen before

mentioned. This may show us, that a very large proportion of the Colonists certainly were not Romanists. Among them, however, were two Jesuit Priests, who at once secured a chapel for their services in St. Mary's Town.

How soon the Protestants had a Church, is not stated. But in our very earliest documents, we find mention of Trinity Church, on Trinity Creek, six miles south of St. Mary's. Soon after, we have mention of St. George's Church, four or five miles West of St. Mary's ; and in 1642, we have an account of a Protestant Church in St. Clement's hundred, on St. Paul's Creek, some twenty or thirty miles up the Potomac. There were now, thus, three Protestant Churches, but no second Romanist Chapel had been yet established ; and Protestant Churches still stand on, or near the ground, where these three were.

Three years after this, that is, in 1645, occurred here what is known as Ingle's Rebellion, (not Claiborn's, as it is so often called,) he acting, as it is stated, under the authority of Parliament, which was then in the ascendant in England. In a letter written by the Maryland Assembly to Lord Baltimore, touching the matter, they state that *almost all the Romanists were driven out of St. Mary's at that time.* The government, consequently, fell into the hands of the Protestants, and St. Mary's itself was then Protestant. But in about two years, Governor Calvert, by the aid of Virginia soldiers, recovered his government. What portion of the banished Romanists returned, has not been ascertained.

(3d.) In 1648, Lord Baltimore appointed Colonel William Stone, of Virginia, a Protestant, his Lieut. Governor in Maryland, on condition of his bringing into the Province five hundred Colonists ; and with this condition it was accepted. Now then we have a third settlement, known as *Ann Arundel County*. It was on the Western shore of the Chesapeake Bay, North of St. Mary's, and opposite to Kent Island. It included all the territory on the Bay, North of the Patuxent River. In the next year, 1649, and soon after, the five hundred Colonists engaged to be brought in by Col. Stone, arrived. Some were from

England, but the rest came in from Virginia, and settled on the Bay Shore, and its tributaries, from the Patuxent to the North of the Severn River. These were all Protestants, for, as we have seen, no others had been permitted to reside in Virginia. Of this number, about one hundred were of the Puritan stamp, and settled immediately on the Severn. The rest were adherents of the Church of England.

In 1650, there arrived from England another small Colony. This was under the command of Robert Brooke, Esq. For this Colony, Lord Baltimore created a County on the South and South West side of the Patuxent, reaching from the Chesapeake Bay upwards, along its borders some fifty miles or more, which he named Charles. This County lay between St. Mary's on the South and Ann Arundel on the North. To Mr. Brooke, Lord Baltimore, as the document has it, gave the license and advowson of all the Churches in his County, which might be built. With him, came in the Rev. William Wilkinson, a Church of England Minister. This, too, was a Protestant Colony,—Mr. Bozman thinks it was Puritan; but it was of the "High Church" stamp. In one of the hundreds which this County included, there had been previously settled a few Romanist families.

In 1654 there occurred, near where Annapolis now stands, the celebrated battle, between the St. Mary's County men, under Gov. Stone, and the Providence men, as the residents of Ann Arundel County were then called. Of this battle, Capt. Heamans published a statement. In the year following, Mr. John Hammond, a friend of Lord Baltimore, published an answer, now before us. In that answer, we have these words,—“but those *few* papists that were in Maryland,—for indeed they were but few.” Mr. Hammond had resided in Maryland, and spoke of what he knew. Nor was he at all partial to the men of Ann Arundel. This was only twenty years after the landing at St. Mary's.

(4th.) After this battle, and during the year 1654, the lower part of Ann Arundel, and Mr. Brooke's Charles County, were

combined into one County, which was called *Calvert*. This constituted the fourth County. This arrangement, however, did not change the character of the population embraced in it; it was well nigh all Protestant.

(5th.) The fifth County established, was *Charles County*, now so known. This was in 1658. It is on the Potomac River, and North West of St. Mary's, from which it is separated by the Wicomico River. It was created thus, out of the north western part of St. Mary's County, and its population, consequently, was a mingled one of Roman Catholics and Protestants, just as it was before being made a separate County.

(6th.) The sixth County was created in 1659. This was named *Baltimore*, and embraced the northern part of Ann Arundel County, extending from *below* the Patapsco River, to the northern limits of the province. What part of this County had been settled, was, as was all Arundel, Protestant. The additions to its population were from England, and of the Church of England.

Thus much for the five Counties on the Western shore of the Bay, to 1659, and no new one was added, for near forty years. Three were entirely Protestant, and the other two, only in part Roman Catholic.

About this time, there came in some Quaker preachers from England, and numbers of the Puritan part of the settlers in Ann Arundel, and in Calvert, East of the Patuxent, went over to that denomination.

Turning now again to the Eastern shore of the Chesapeake, we have already seen that the first settlement on Maryland territory, was made on that shore, and became Kent County, and that it was Protestant.

(7th.) In 1660, or in 1661, a new County was constituted, out of the southern part of Kent County, extending South to the Choptank River. And, as was the population of Kent, so consequently was this, Protestant. Its early population had been much added to by emigrants from Ann Arundel County,

and also from England, who likewise were either Puritans or Church of England men,—Protestants of course.

(8th.) Five years after this, in 1666, a third County was created, and named *Somerset*, extending from Accomac County in Virginia, northward, and from the Atlantic shore on the East, to the Chesapeake Bay and Nanticoke River on the West. The early settlers of this County were all from Accomac County, and, as the Virginians were, excepting three or four Quakers, were of the Church of England. We have a full account of them from Virginia Records. Shortly after the County was constituted, it had a large accession of emigrants from Scotland. These were Presbyterians, who erected a number of their churches; and here, says Webster's History of Presbyterianism, was the first organized Presbytery, and here was the cradle of that denomination in the United States. It was thus an entirely Protestant County.

(9th.) In 1669, *Dorchester County*, on the Bay, north west of Somerset, and South of Talbot, having Choptank River on the North, was created. The population, like that of Somerset, was Protestant. Some of it, indeed, was Puritan.

(10.) Five years after that, in 1664, *Cecil County* was created, it having before been the northern parts of Kent, and Ann Arundel Counties. It extended from Delaware, on the East, to the Bay and Susquehannah River on the West, and North to the limits of the Province. Above the Bohemia River, the population was Lutheran. Before the settlement at St. Mary's, the Swedes had made a settlement on the Delaware. Soon after the Dutch came on, and in the progress of thirty years, the population had extended across to the Bay. Subsequently, there came in from New York, the Hermans, and settled a little below Bohemia River. They, too, were Lutherans. Cecil thus was a County of Protestants. Thus, on the Eastern shore of the Bay, every one of the five Counties were settled by Protestants, and no one, even in part, by the Romanists.

Such, in this aspect of the matter, were the early settlers of Maryland, during the first thirty years. In the ten Counties, five being on each side of the Bay, only two, St. Mary's and Charles, on the Potomac, had any Roman Catholic population, and these were only in part such. And yet it is claimed now, and said constantly, that Maryland was settled with Roman Catholics!!—betraying an ignorance utterly without excuse.

To the statements now made, taken from more than thirty documents, we will refer to subsequent documents on record, either sustaining them, or showing the permanent continuance of the truth, of what might justly be inferred from them.

And first, we have Lord Baltimore's own statement, made twelve years after the last date mentioned. In 1676, complaint was laid before the Privy council, by the Bishop of London, about the want of support given to the Church of England Ministers in Maryland. Its population was now stated at 20,000. Lord Baltimore's answer was very soon laid before the Council, and is still in their archives. (2. Anderson's Colonial Church, 398.) In that answer he said, that Presbyterians, Independents and Quakers, constituted three-fourths of the population, that is, 15,000; and that the four Church of England Ministers, already in the Province, had a decent subsistence. Assuming the statement of the three-fourths to be correct, there was but 5,000 left of Church of England men and Romanists. If the Church of England Ministers, ministered to scattered congregations, of which there were many, counting in all eight hundred or a thousand to each Minister, we see at once how very few Roman Catholics there were then in the two counties in which they were found; and yet, such as we have seen, was Lord Baltimore's own statement. And we cannot deny that he was a competent witness.

Twelve years after this, that is, 1688, occurred in Maryland, what is known as the Protestant Revolution. At that time, the Roman Catholic Lord Baltimore's government ceased in the Province; and as Roman Catholic, ceased forever. For the *third time*, the government now fell into the hands of the

Protestants, and so ever after continued. But though the government was thus wrested from Lord Baltimore, his chartered estate was continued to him.

In a letter of Mrs. Barbara Smith, who had resided in Maryland, dated Dec. 1689, just subsequent to the Revolution, touching Calvert County, she tells us, that, "the men of estate, or men of note, *were themselves, as were most of the County, Protestants;*" and that "the County of Ann Arundel, accounted the most populous and richest of the whole Province, *had but one Papist family;*" thus coinciding with what is stated of these Counties forty years before. They had not lost anything, during that period, of their early Protestant character.

In 1692, the Church of England became the established Church of Maryland, by the Act of its General Assembly. In this Assembly, the Roman Catholics were excluded, and the only other opponents to the Act, as we shall see proof of presently, were the Quakers. The population of the Province was now, 25,000. By the passage of this Act, we are shown that the Church of England men were decidedly a majority over Lord Baltimore's Presbyterians, Independents and Quakers. Had it not been so how could the Act possibly have been passed?

Within two years after the passage of this Act, the several County authorities, as was therein provided, divided their Counties into thirty Parishes. We will give a condensed statement here of the reports on record of these parishes, constituted by these authorities, as returned to the Governor and Council, adding, only in a few cases, some items from ancient parochial records, which we have examined.

St. Mary's County, according to the returns made, was divided into two parishes, which had the three Churches mentioned in 1642, but only one Minister.

Kent County was divided into two parishes, and had two Churches, but had no Minister.

Ann Arundel County was divided into four parishes, but had only two Churches, and one Minister.

Calvert County was divided into four parishes, and had three Churches, and two Ministers.

Charles County was divided into three parishes, having but two Churches and one Minister.

Baltimore County was divided into three parishes, but had only two Churches, and no Minister.

Talbot County was divided into three parishes, having four or more Churches, and two Ministers.

Somerset County was divided into four parishes, but had only one Church, and one Minister.

Dorchester was divided into two parishes, and had one Church, but no Minister.

Cecil County was divided into two parishes, and had two Churches, yet but one Minister.

There were thus, in these thirty parishes at this time, twenty-two Churches, and nine Church of England Ministers.

Two years after, three more Churches had been built, and nine Ministers had come in, making the whole number of Ministers in the parishes, eighteen, and the number of their places of worship, twenty-five.

At this date, 1696 or 7, we have the Report of the Governor of Maryland, from items furnished him, on his requisition, by the Sheriffs of the Counties, made to the Bishop of London. It is found in the archives of Maryland, and in those of that Bishop. From this Report, we have condensed the following statement, using, far as possible, its own words.

Kent County had no Popish Priest, lay brother, nor Romish place of worship, and but three Papists. There were twenty-four Quakers, who had one meeting-house.

In St. Mary's County, there were two Priests, one lay brother, and four Chapels. But there were no Quakers, or Dissenters.

In Ann Arundel County, there was neither Priest nor lay brother. But the Quakers had two meeting-houses, two meetings in private houses, and two preachers.

In Calvert County, there was neither Priest nor lay brother, nor any of their Churches, or Chapels. But the Quakers had one meeting-house, and one meeting at a private house.

Charles County had three Romish Priests, one lay brother, and four Chapels, but had no Quaker meeting-house, and only two Quakers.

Baltimore County had neither teacher, nor place of worship, either of Roman Catholics or Quakers.

Talbot County had no Romish Priest, or lay brother, and but one Romish Chapel. It had, however, four Quaker meeting-houses. The number of preachers is not given, if there were any, at this time.

Somerset County had no Popish Priest, lay brothers, or any of their Chapels, and no Quakers. But it had three Dissenting [Presbyterian] places of worship.

Dorchester County had no Romish Priest, or dissenting Minister.

Cecil County made no returns. There was indeed none to make.

Prince George County, which had been constituted the previous year, made of the northern parts of Calvert and Charles Counties, lying between the Potomac and Patuxent Rivers, reported that there was in it, neither Papist, Priest, nor lay brother, nor Chapel, nor Quaker meeting house.

Thus we have, in the two Counties where they were found, in their beginning, five Romish Priests, two lay brothers, and eight Churches and Chapels, and none in any other County, except a Chapel in Talbot.

In four Counties, the Quakers had eight meeting-houses, and three meetings in private houses, and none in the other Counties. Only two preachers are returned by the Sheriffs.

In one County, the Presbyterians had three houses of worship, and we may add, from other documents, two Ministers. Two others, one in Talbot and one in Ann Arundel, were there in 1694, but, as it appears, they were now gone.

Thus we have, *in all*, Roman Catholic, Quakers, and Presbyterians, according to the returns made, nine religious teachers and ministers, and twenty places of worship, not of the

Church of England ; while that Church had eighteen Ministers, and twenty-five places of worship,—thus outnumbering all the other denominations.

And now we will quote from a document which carries us back to the beginning again. In July, 1700, a Committee of his majesty's Council to the Governor, was appointed to address the Privy Council in England, vindicating the Governor and Council from some aspersions cast upon the Government of Maryland, by some persons calling themselves *ancient planters*, in connection with the Act establishing the Church. And they say :—

“ We humbly assure your Lordships. that whatever titles persons may give themselves, of dissenting Protestants, there has *no sect of Religion* here, opposed the law, but the Papists and Quakers, and, as for their [the Papists] being ancient settlers, we acknowledge that *some*, though but *few* Papists, were at the *first* seating. But, so far were the Quakers from being the most ancient seaters, that when they first came in, [in 1659.] they were ordered to be whipped out, for disturbing the government, and they are now, so far from being any considerable part, that we are confident they will not make the twentieth part of the province.”

It is but fair, however, to state, that it is said the Quakers disowned these disturbers of the Government.

This is signed by John Addison, Thomas Brooke, Thomas Tasker, and John Hammond,—names well known in their descendants, and who came into the province before thirty years after the first landing at St. Mary's. They knew whereof they affirmed.

Of the same date, 1700, we have a statement from the Rev. Dr. Bray, touching the then present state of things. He was the Bishop of London's Commissary in Maryland, and a man of high character. In a Memorial addressed to the House of Bishops in England, this year, after having been in Maryland, he writes thus :—“ The Papists in this province appear to me to be not above a twelfth part of the inhabitants, but their Priests are very numerous, whereof more have been sent in this last year, than was ever known. And though the Quakers

brag so much of their numbers and riches, yet they are not above a tenth part [of the population] in number." This was not indeed guess work; it was shown by the return of the County Sheriffs.

These testimonies, we doubt not, will be sufficient to show who, in respect to their Religion, were the early settlers in Maryland. They would be held so in any Court of Law, and more especially so, where, as in this case, there is no counter testimony.

1753402

But it may not be without interest to give some later testimony, to show how this matter continued, subsequent to 1700.

In 1715, The Lords Baltimore, having become Protestant, the Government of Maryland was restored to them by King George I., and continued to be Protestant, just as it had been since 1688. Henceforward, the Governors of the Province were appointed by them, just as they had been by the King, for the last twenty-five years.

During the administration of one of the Governors, that of Gov. Sharpe, there was quite a panic in the Province, in which the Roman Catholics were implicated. It was spread abroad that a general massacre of the Protestants had been plotted. To counteract this, the Governor ordered the County Sheriffs, in 1758, to make returns to him of all the Roman Catholics in their respective Counties, and these returns are on record still, in the archives at Annapolis. And we have the summing up of them, in a letter from Gov. Sharpe to Lord Baltimore, of Dec. 19, 1758, in these words:—"The people of that Religion, [the Roman Catholic,] do not, at present, make a thirteenth part of the inhabitants, [the population now was upwards of 200,000,] as I find by the returns of the Sheriffs and Constables, who have, in obedience to my order, made the most strict inquiry in their respective districts. And the rolls returned by the collectors of the land tax, show that they are not possessed of a twelfth part of the land, which is held under your Lordship, as proprietor of Maryland." We are shown, thus, that during the one hundred and twenty-four years of the existence of the Province, there had been no in-

crease of the proportion of Roman Catholics to the Protestants in Maryland. It was still Protestant, *not* Roman Catholic Maryland.

We have yet another series of papers in the Maryland archives, of no little interest, not as showing so much the comparative numbers of the Established Church with the other Denominations, which it nevertheless does to some extent show, but its comparative ability and liberality. Since 1695, three new Counties had been added to the eleven then mentioned; namely, Frederick, on the Western, and Queen Anne and Worcester Counties, on the Eastern shore.

In 1760, there was a great fire in Boston, Mass., which destroyed one hundred and seventy-four dwelling houses, and as many warehouses and shops and other buildings, which, with the furniture and goods burnt, made the estimated loss to be £100,000 sterling; \$433,000. The Governor of Massachusetts applied to the Governor of Maryland for aid, and Governor Sharpe issued his brief, now before us, to *every worshipping congregation* in the Province, with directions, that collections be taken up, and the amounts severally remitted to him. This was done, and the returns made give us the following facts:—

	£	s.	d.
St. Mary's County, from its 4 parishes, with 4 Clergymen, sent - (sterling),	146	13	0
“ “ “ 4 Romanist Clergymen, sent	31	13	0
Charles County, from its 4 parishes, having 4 Clergymen, sent, - - -	128	05	11
Charles County, from its 2 Romanist Clergymen,	45	19	3
Prince George Co., from its 3 parishes, having 3 Clergymen, sent - - -	196	16	9
Frederick Co., from its 2 parishes, having 2 Clergymen, sent - - -	56	1	6
“ “ the Presbyterians, sent - - -	9	3	7
“ “ the Dunkers, - - -	6	0	0
“ “ the Lutherans, - - -	4	16	0
Calvert Co., “ its 2 parishes, having 2 Clergymen, sent - - -	54	3	5
Ann Arundel Co., from its 5 parishes, having 4 Clergymen, sent - - -	127	9	5
“ “ “ the Quakers, sent - - -	92	5	0

	£	s.	d.
Baltimore Co., from its 4 parishes, having 4 Clergymen, sent	142	14	9
“ “ the Quakers “	23	19	0
“ “ the Baptists “	7	0	0
“ “ the Romanists “	2	17	6
Cecil Co., from its 2 parishes, having 2 Clergymen, sent	53	9	4
“ “ the Presbyterians sent	25	11	0
Kent Co., “ its 2 parishes, having 2 Clergymen, sent	72	18	1
“ “ 3 Quaker meetings, sent	18	0	0
“ “ the Presbyterians, “	2	2	6
Queen Anne Co., from its 4 parishes, having 4 Clergymen, sent	120	18	8
“ “ “ the Presbyterians, sent	10	2	6
Talbot Co., from its 2 parishes, having 2 Clergymen, sent	232	19	7
Dorchester Co., from its 3 parishes, having 3 Clergymen, sent	123	16	2
Somerset Co., from its 3 parishes, having 3 Clergymen, sent	109	0	6
“ “ the Presbyterians, sent	43	3	1
Worcester Co., “ its 2 parishes, having 2 Clergymen, sent	61	17	0
“ “ the Presbyterians, sent	19	12	0

Thus from the 14 Counties,

The Church, from its 42 parishes, having 41 Ministers, sent	1,503	7	11
The Quakers sent	134	4	0
The Presbyterians, “	107	12	2
Six Romanist Priests—5 contributions, sent	76	0.	9
The Baptists sent	7	0	0
The Dunkers sent	6	0	0
The Lutherans sent	4	16	0
Making nearly \$9,000 in all, or	£1,839	0	10

The other denominations than the Church, sent £315 12 11 of this amount.

It will be seen that while, since 1700, the increase of Counties had been only three, that of the parishes had been twelve.

The next statement we give is from Mr. Eddis, dated April 2, 1772, then Surveyor of Customs, residing at Annapolis. Writing to a friend in England, he says, “their number [the Romanists] are at present very inconsiderable, and their influence of no weight in the concerns of the Province.”

More testimony, indeed, might be presented, concurring with what has now been brought forward. But this is deemed sufficient to sustain the fact, that Maryland never was "Catholic Maryland," notwithstanding the slang of our School Histories, and speeches of politicians. We have here, all these documents, running through a period of one hundred and thirty-five years,—documents which have never been impeached, never contradicted, all telling the same story.

As a fitting *appendix* to the foregoing, we conclude this paper with the following extract from the speech of Governor Hart, to the General Assembly of Maryland, in 1720, copied from its proceedings.

"Gentlemen:—The pretence of the Romanists that Maryland was granted as an asylum to them, from the rigor of the penal laws in England, is a position of theirs which has long amused the world. It was an imposition. For they cannot have a better right, than what the Charter admits them to, and, in my opinion, there is so far from a provision made therein that the government should be in their hands, in any degree, that there is not an exception made for the exercise of their Religion. 'It hath been affirmed, that Cecelius, Lord Baltimore, published a declaration, inviting all persons that believed on the name of Jesus Christ, to settle and inhabit this Province, promising them equal privileges. Yet I presume it will be admitted, that noble Lord could not give greater powers than he had.'

"For, after all the privileges mentioned in the Charter, toward the conclusion, there is this provision made, namely:—"provided always, that no interpretation be admitted thereof, by which God's holy and truly Christian Religion, or the allegiance due unto us, our heirs and successors, may in any wise suffer any prejudice or diminution.' The Charter was granted by King Charles the First, who was a Protestant, and certainly could not intend the proviso for any other Religion, than that of which he was a zealous professor. But to make this the more evident, it is expressly stipulated in the body of the Charter, that all churches, chapels, and oratories, be dedicated and consecrated according to the Ecclesiastical law of the kingdom of England. This so well explains itself, that it wants no comment. I am only surprised, from what latent cause the Papists derive any privileges here, beyond what the connivance of Government may indulge them in.

"In reply, the Lower House of Assembly said:—"We know of no legal right they [the Papists] have to any more than they enjoy,'" &c.

This, it may be remembered, was the publicly expressed and received view of those in the highest places of authority in Maryland, one hundred and twenty-five years ago.

F 857.0315

5614



