









## *II Samuel Blunston-The Public Servant*

Read By I. C. Arnold, Esq.

(Notes by H. F. Eshleman)

Samuel Blunston's labors for Lancaster County begin at the very beginning of the county's existence.

In February 1729, he was appointed by the Council of Pennsylvania, with John Wright, Tobias Hendricks, Andrew Cornish, Thomas Edwards and John Musgrove, together with several prominent men of Chester County east of the Octoraro, together with surveyor, John Taylor, to run the line by which to divide Lancaster County from Chester County (3 Col. Rec. 345). In May of the same year the return of the division having been made out and presented he signed the document (Do. 356).

On the 8th of May, the same year, he was appointed one of the board of Justices of the Peace for the new county and with him were appointed the others who acted with him in fixing the dividing line, above named, except John Musgrove; and, in addition there were appointed Caleb Pierce, Thomas Reid and Samuel Jones. Robert Barber was appointed Sheriff, and Andrew Galbraith, Coroner (Do. 358). It may be mentioned in passing that Caleb Pierce lived on the Octoraro and his property was the terminus of one of the early important roads of the county; so also was John Musgrove's farm a point, in Sadsbury which determined the location of a road; and that road was adopted later as part of the dividing line between the newly erected township of Bart, carved out of old Sadsbury, about 1749.

Blunston was active in locating lines and surveys of Lancaster County and in September 1730 he was complained against by Captain Civility of the Conestoga Indians in a letter to the Governor (Vol. 1, Pa. Arch. 271). Civility says in the letter among other things: "Some time since I was at our county town of Lancaster, where I heard much talk that both the Dutch and English was agoing to settle on ye other side of Susquehanna. Likewise, Mr. Wright and Mr. Blunston hath surveyed a great deal of land and designs to dispose of itt to others, which giveth me and my brethren a great deal of trouble, itt being in our road to our hunting, lest our young men should break the chain of friendship which hath long been between us."

It is interesting, as a bit of evidence, upon the probable age and size of Lancaster Town at that time, to note that Civility refers to it as a town, then, September, 1730. It was the county seat; but he calls it a town. Marshe as we remember placed the date of the beginning of the town as 1728.

About a year later, Oct. 3, 1731, Samuel Blunston gives us a glimpse of the erection of the Court House (Do. 295). In a letter to Robert Charles, secretary to the Governor, Blunston says: "About a week ago, when several of the magistrates met at Lancaster to assist at raising ye Court House, Captain Civility came there and by an interpreter which he brought with him, laying down the enclosed string of wampum desired the following message might therewith be communicated to the Governor," etc. He then proceeded to complain of the settlement going across Susquehanna. His further complaint is that several Marylanders are settled on that side at Conejohela (which authorities fix as nearly opposite Washington Boro. He also says that they prevented the Indians from getting apples from their own trees, and in fact stole their apples.

It is perhaps in this letter alone that we have positive information of the exact time when the Court House was raised, that is, as I understand, the date when the upper joists and the rafters and roof were put on, as we remember it was built of brick. Here it is fixed as a week prior to Oct. 3, 1731, which would make it about the latter part of September.

Then too, it is quite surprising, I have no doubt, to know that the Indians had apple trees. Were they native trees or were they given them by the new comers? Were they wild or planted? Of course, the country having been settled for 20 years before this date, the Indians could have secured from the whites young apple trees. At any rate, from this we know that apples were growing here as early as 1730 at least.

Blunston was one of the men depended on by the governor of Pennsylvania to defend our rights against the Maryland encroachments. In a letter of Peter Chartier, dated Nov. 19, 1731, written from Paxtan, he informed Chartier that lands are to be laid out over Susquehanna to accommodate the Shawanna Indians and others who may wish to settle there; and, that they will be defended against encroachments and that all persons trespassing on the same will be dealt with and dispossessed. (Do. 299).

The following year he wrote the president of Council, a long letter explaining the history of the troubles on Susquehanna, with Maryland and others and particularly the Craesap troubles. He found it necessary to reprimand the Council of the Province for considering too lightly the Guerilla warfare which had been going on here on the border. He took them to task for trying to blame these border troubles on the Irish. (Do. 316).

In 1732 he was also elected as a member of the Assembly of Pennsylvania for Lancaster County. (Vol. 33; Votes of Assembly 183). He was placed on the committee to wait on the Governor and to receive his message and program of legislation and also to communicate the Assembly's plans to the governor. (Do. 184). The following Spring (1733) he was selected a member of a similar committee. (Do).

Keeping the peace on this border land on Susquehanna where he lived was a difficult matter, as there was a great element of lawlessness there. In fact those who will take the trouble to investigate some of the reasons set forth for the creation of our country will find that one reason was that in order to cope with the lawlessness of this section, and to put down robberies and horse thieving, a new county was necessary. In November, 1732, he and Wright, upon complaint made, issued warrants for the arrest of two of the sons of John Low for horse stealing and assaults on the owners of the animals. (1. Arch. 349).

Here again Blunston met with much apprehension of the Governor of Pennsylvania for some reason, who on learning of the arrest of the Lows, sent word to Blunston to be very cautious in his proceeding against the Lows. The governor feared war with Maryland, apparently, or at least complications in the boundary trouble. (See 1. Arch 353).

Blunston, however, informed the governor of the seriousness of the local situation in a long letter written by him and John Wright, dated at Hempfield, Oct. 30, 1732. (See 1. Arch 363). In the letter, Blunston goes back into the history of things on the Susquehanna and among other things says: "In the year 1729, when the governor was pleased to issue an order to divide this part of the Province from Chester county and erect the same into a distinct county and appointed magistrates to keep the peace.....and to secure the inhabitants of this part from thefts and abuses committed by idle and absolute persons who resorted

thither to keep out of the hands of justice. The southern boundary of the county were to be Octorara and the province of Maryland and including the inhabitants to lie open to the westward.....But the line was not run nor the exact boundary known. At that time there were no English inhabitants on the west side of Susquehanna in these parts." He then goes on to say that people of low morals and many from Maryland encroached over 20 miles north of the boundary line and carries on depredations continually and alienated our friendly Indians, burnt houses, killed horses, etc. He proceeds and says there was no reason for Lord Baltimore to be incensed, because these acts occurred a long distance north of his boundary. Blunston insisted that the peace must be kept here and the Indian must be properly treated and protected or more serious trouble will arise; and, he informs the governor that his apprehensions of unpleasantness with Lord Baltimore have no foundations at all.

Blunston's value in the Assembly now began to show itself. He was appointed on the committee in Assembly to revise the excise and flour act and to draw an act for the more easy collection of debts under ten pounds. (3 Votes of Assen. 188).

This committee drew a proposed law for raising of excise, but the matter did not proceed very far until the Assembly adjourned. Then when the the Assembly reconvened in August (the Assembly always adjourning so that the members might go home, from Philadelphia, and take in their hay and harvest, etc.) the matter was brought up again and on Aug. 8, the House, after considering it some time, voted not to act on the revising of the excise laws at that time (3 Votes 190). The governor, in a message, states that he "is very much surprised that the house is inclined to rise without making arrangements to revise the excise laws and make the revenues higher both because the revenue is needed and because debauchery is getting too common." (3 V. 195). The Assembly returned a tart reply to this and adjourned sine die. Thus it will be seen that Blunston was on a very important committee.

Before this 1732 Assembly came to an end, a constitutional question arose to wit that the eldest son of Penn, having lately died, Governor Gordon's commission was void. It was for that reason that the Assembly refused to enact laws; and for that reason the excise law was not proceeded with. (3 C. R. 508).

Samuel Blunston was appointed one of the committee to inform the Governor that in their view his commission was now void, since the death of the eldest proprietor. The other member of the committee was John Wright. These two committeemen stated that they came as friends to him to let him know that the house were unwilling to enter into controversy with him and asked him to withdraw his message to the House. The governor became suspicious of ill designs and he declined to give an answer, but in the afternoon summoned his council and acquainted them with the mysterious visit of Blunston and Wright, to him.

The governor and Council then resolved that Blunston and Wright might say to those who sent them that it was for the good and peace of the country he sent the message and that he desired more time to think over the matter. Then about nine o'clock that night two other members of the House appeared with a written message. The upshot of it was the House adjourned because they held they had no legal governor in being at that time.

When the new Assembly was elected in October 1733, Blunston was defeated, or at least was not one of those elected for Lancaster County. But he was recommissioned a Justice of the Peace for this county. He

apparently had not incurred Gov. Gordon's enmity. (3 C. R. 531). Andrew Cornish was the only one dropped. (Do).

But Blunston was not rid of the difficulties growing out of the border troubles. Jan. 30, 1734 he sent a letter to Governor Penn, on the Craesap matter, as it was apparent to him that the fear Gov. Gordon held of offending Lord Baltimore, would forever prevent redress and protection being given to the people living on Lower Susquehanna. Therefore he wrote to the Proprietor himself.

This is a long letter. He being a Quaker, it appears he writes in a perfectly familiar vein to the Proprietor, and addresses him as "Esteemed Friend." He states that upon information that Craesap and several of his hands were to be at John Hendricks, the preceding day where Hendricks was at work squaring logs to build a house and to build a flat for his ferry; Wright and Smout and Sheriff Emerson and three or four others went over to proceed against them for forcible entry. He goes on to say that Craesap's wife, on horseback, was on watch to report what action was being taken, though her husband remained away hiding. That she rode off at full speed and reported the coming of the Lancaster County forces. However, eight were taken and committed to Lancaster Jail. That further orders were to lie in wait with a warrant to take Craesap when he appeared. But one of Emerson's men persuaded the workmen and the man with the warrant that the orders were to go after Craesap into Maryland and get him, and were to have fifty pounds reward. They proceeded and there was a battle and one man was shot in the leg and others had broken heads inflicted by "homly pestels."

He concludes by saying that on Craesap reporting the same to the Maryland governor there will be trouble between the Provinces. He then begs to have advice at the next Court, "for we seem to be much at loss how to proceed against those we have taken, as well as what to think of the madness of the others."

This letter, when its text is examined verbatim, gives us a very good notion of the attainments and style of Blunston in literary matters. Considering the lack of advantages and backwardness of means of schooling in this new country, the letter shows a fairly nice use of English. However that be, it shows us the rude and dangerous and tumultuous environments among which the first generation of our county settlers lived, on and near Susquehanna, and in this neighborhood generally.

Blunston was in danger of his life during these times as plainly appears in a deposition made by Michael Dooling in 1734 before one of our justices, in which he said, repeating a boast which Craesap had made to him, that Craesap declared he was to have fifty pounds for John Emerson's head and also fifty pounds for Samuel Blunston's head. (1 Arch. 413).

Blunston was, apparently, a very useful man in this section, though he was elected only once to the Assembly, that is in 1732, and was then defeated several times before being re-elected. In Indian affairs he was a valuable man to the Province. The governor wrote him that the governor of Virginia reported a heinous murder committed there which was charged upon our Ganawese or Conoy Indians, and that the evidence of it was that these Indians brought home from the south several scalps. The Governor demanded that they are guilty; they must be punished and that Blunston and Wright, upon the pretext of some business among them, must go and enquire their number and who their chief men are and whether they have lately been south. They are also to inquire about the scalps, etc. The governor concludes by saying: "I depend

much on your prudence in managing this matter with all possible privacy." (1 Arch. 436).

\* This was on Aug. 10, 1784, and three days later Samuel Blunston makes answer to the same. He says that last winter a party of twelve Conoys went toward the head of Roanoke near a town of their enemies; but that most of them were killed. He promised that he would investigate. He thought that those who were killed had done mischief. He then relates that a party of the Six Nation warriors came to Conoy town about a month earlier and that five or six of them came to his house in the name of the rest and told him they were going to war. They wanted a paper to take with them through Virginia to show the inhabitants that their intentions toward the English were peaceful. He says he advised them to call on the governor who alone had the power to grant such passports. But they said they were far out of the way and insisted on something from him. So considering that if I denied them a paper they would go without, I chose to write to Edmund Cartlidge a few lines to this effect, "that 40 of the Six Nations' Indians intending to go to the southward desired certificate from me to show the white people that their intention was not to do them any harm but to pass peaceably along and that they need not be afraid of them." He then says that he desired Cartlidge to let them know they must suffer no violence to be used toward any one and that they must not forcibly take anything. He also arranged that Cartlidge should give them a certificate of peaceable intention to be carried by one of their number going ahead, so that the inhabitants might not be frightened when the forty came on. He then adds that if he acted amiss in this, he is sorry, for he intended it for the best. (1. Arch. 437).

He surely shows a fine spirit, an intense desire to act within the law and a high degree of patriotism. Edmund Cartlidge, at this time, lived in the southland. Blunston's letter is dated at Hempfield, the same as the former one.

The charge of murder against our Conoy Indians made a considerable stir in the Province. Blunston and three other justices wrote a letter to the Governor dated Lancaster, Feb. 8, 1735, stating that they had orders from Attorney General Jos. Growdon, to send depositions on this matter, and the outrages on the Susquehanna. They replied, saying that John Hendricks has gone to Virginia, and that a witness living at Donegal is also absent now. They also stated that the Indians who committed the outrages were not subjects but only allies and that in such case the custom was to apply to the Indian nation for justice as such persons cannot be tried and punished by us. (1 Arch. 439).

In the Fall of 1736, Blunston was sent by the Swiss (called Germans) to the Council of Pennsylvania, over which James Logan now presided, at Philadelphia, to intercede for them, the said "Dutch People or Germans" who with others had gone from this side over Susquehanna to settle. Their grievance was that certain agents of Maryland had prevailed on them to acknowledge the authority of Maryland over that section of country. They acknowledged their mistake and they asked him (Blunston) to state for them that they had a fixed resolution of returning to their obedience to Pennsylvania, and of acknowledging its just jurisdiction where they had settled; that they were truly sensible; that they of right belonged to Pennsylvania. The Council considered this a matter of great importance, and while Blunston was in Philadelphia they sent for him to give a particular account of it, so that the Board might better judge of it. He then related the matter in a statement covering two pages, in the Colonial Records. (4 C. R. 56, etc.) He said that the Spring of that year many people coming from the west side of

the River where they had settled had come by the ferry near his premises, to his house, and were very apprehensive for the welfare of their people over there for they had been led into the wrong belief that they belonged to Maryland. That he told them they must act openly and above board, etc., and they were very penitent, etc. He pleaded their cause very well, indeed, for at the conclusion of his statement before the Council, they asked him to withdraw and then they agreed that because of their ignorance in the matter and the sincere acknowledgment of their error, they would be forgiven and be given all needed protection by the Province; but that they must all act as a unit and acknowledge their allegiance to this Province.

These affairs now brought on real trouble with Maryland. The President James Logan desired Samuel Blunston to write out the particulars of the trouble growing out of conflicting jurisdictions on Susquehanna and he did so. This account written up by Blunston was laid before Councils at its meeting of Sept. 8, 1736, and it may be found in 4 Colonial Records p. 63. Maryland sent an armed force to take possession (in the name of Maryland) of the region west of Susquehanna, fully 20 miles north of the present Maryland line. The Lancaster forces met them. Blunston narrates the same with graphic fullness. He also laid before the Council the petitions of the people who were in that region praying for relief and protection, etc.

Blunston and the three other justices in that region about Sept. 10, 1736, sent several papers and documents and reports to Council upon the aggressions of Maryland and upon the hardships upon the people living in the region of turmoil. (See 4, C. R. 66). At the same time he sent his separate letter to the Council, upon the "affairs on Susquehanna" and it was received and in response to it a letter was drafted and sent by the Council to the justices of that part of our county. (See 4 C. R. 70).

So zealous was Blunston in defending the rights of Pennsylvania against Maryland's contentions that the Governor of Maryland placed a reward of one hundred pounds for his capture, and fifty pounds for the capture of John Wright. So it is stated in a deposition found in 4 Colonial Records pp. 104 and 105. This deposition was given about the end of September, 1736. On the 29th of December of the same year, Samuel Blunston despatched a letter to the president of the Council at Philadelphia, informing the government that Charles Higginbotham, who formerly lived in the disputed region, had given up residence there and moved into Maryland and was rewarded by that government by being made a captain in the militia for his activities in fighting for Maryland on the Susquehanna. (4 C. R. 147). About a week later, on Jan. 3, 1737, Blunston sent another letter to the Council by a night express from Susquehanna, acquainting them with the fact that Higginbotham was now operating with his militia and infesting the neighborhood, and falling by surprise upon unprotected citizens and that he was becoming a terror to the place. (4. C. R. 149). A week later, on Jan. 9th, another letter arrived from Blunston reporting further violence on the Susquehanna. In this letter he states that Higginbotham declares his intention to oust every person on the west side of Susquehanna who does not recognize Maryland authority. He is breaking into the houses of the Germans and carrying them away prisoners; that he kills their cattle; that the wives and children are fleeing to this side for protection; and, that the whole west side will be deserted unless a force is sent there. (Do. 150). Thus we see that in the unfortunate step taken by these "Germans" in going over Susquehanna and settling without getting authority and protection from Pennsylvania, and in depending on

squatters' rights. Blunston was of immense help in righting the thing.

On January 25, 1737, Blunston was recommissioned a Justice of the Peace, for Lancaster County. This fact that he held the office of Justice naturally kept him in touch with public affairs and thus it is not surprising that March 1, we find him sending another letter to the Council of Pennsylvania, on Craesap's warfare. See his appointment in 4 C. R. 152 and the letter just referred to in same p. 155. The president of the Council of Pennsylvania called his body together to consider the affairs in Blunston's letters. In this letter Blunston shows that Higginbotham had a garrison of 30 men; that the Lancaster forces were mutinous and several had to be discharged and the deputy refused to stay in that station across Susquehanna; that Maryland was trying to buy out some of the "dutch people's improvements" there; that Maryland was trying to get them to be neutral and then would not molest them; that many were compelled to leave their houses there and winter coming on, their families were in need of food; that many felt they must acknowledge Maryland or perish; that it is very expensive to keep the sheriff's deputies together; that Maryland had offered large rewards for several magistrates of Lancaster County and other inhabitants living on the east side.

Blunston in another letter states that Joshua Minshall had been taken from his bed and carried off by these Marylanders, and that they had and held him in a guard-house, too strong to attack with success. (Do. 156).

In the spring, Blunston composed a letter and gave it to a number of "those Germans from the west side of Susquehanna who had lately suffered so deeply by the outrages of the Maryland Gang, in those parts and had come hither to represent their great distress." The complaint those people made, as the letter related, was that they were not allowed to plough their ground that their horses were taken away and several young men, and they held them demanding that they give security that they will do no more work there and they carried some poor people to Annapolis; and that the Maryland forces were increasing and ours were diminishing. (4 C. R. 188). Four days later Blunston sends another letter to Council saying that dispossession is about to proceed and the people are in terror. (4 C. R. 190). These letters are found in Vol 1 of the Archives, pp. 530 and 532. They show Blunston's deep concern over the conditions with which he had to concern himself. They are a credit to him and surely show the apathy and fear which the proprietors felt, of offending a neighboring government.

The following year, 1738, Blunston wrote again to Council concerning the encounters between the young Indians who had imbibed rum too freely and the white inhabitants. In his letter of March 8, this year, found in 1 Arch. 547, he relates how several young Indians stabbed two men who remonstrated with them about hurling missiles through the window of Samuel Bethel's house. He states that the old men of the Indians declare that they cannot control the young foolish ones who do such things and that they desire that the case be reported to the Provincial government for attention.

About the same time we find him taking depositions of witnesses on the Maryland troubles which continued unabated. This subject engrossed him continually. (1 Arch. 555).

November 22, 1738, Blunston was re-commissioned Justice of the Peace by the Province, which was surely a testimony that he was a valuable person in that office. (4 C. R. 313).

During the Fall of the next year he tried a famous Lancaster County counterfeiting case (3 V. 345) and a certain sum in cash was awarded

or paid to him for the same. This counterfeiter was John Wilson; and he counterfeited some of Pennsylvania's paper money. The record states that 5 pounds cash was paid to Blunston for discovering and prosecuting the same. It is difficult for us at this date to understand how a judge could receive pay for being a prosecutor.

Nothing more appears concerning the activities of Mr. Blunston for nearly two years. But in 1741 he was elected to the Assembly again. (3 V. 444). In the Assembly his worth was recognized for he was put on the committee of grievances. (3 V. 445). This committee was in those days the principal committee of the Assembly, because its purpose was to receive the applications from the entire province for new laws to cure all and every grievance which the people thought ought to be remedied. The main work of the Assembly consisted of passing laws for the ease of the people and to remedy their needs and grievances. Another evidence of the confidence placed in him was the fact that he was put on the committee to audit the public accounts of the Province, particularly of the loan office — the main office issuing the paper money of the province. (Do.) He was also on the committee to report on the state of the province and its needs in the way of legislation, etc. This committee had also to do with the situation of affairs between the people and the proprietor. The appointment on all of these three important committees is the strongest kind of evidence of the place he occupied in the counsels of the province. He had province-wide reputation.

On the 8th of January, 1742. Blunston was named on the committee of the Assembly to draft an answer to the Governor's message. (3 V. 453). The answer drawn by this committee, which was approved by the House is found in Vol. 4 of C. R. p. 511, and among other things it is stated that the Governor's message on the filthy conditions under which the poor Germans must cross the ocean pleases the Assembly; but that his attitude on the lax condition of execution of the laws is not well taken and they consider him remiss in his duty of executing the laws. The answer also states that the freemen of the Province do not consider they owe the governor any thanks for such acts as he has performed; it also accuses him of trying to deprive the people of their religious liberties; also of governing too extravagantly, so that the province is not able now to build a hospital to take care of contagious diseases. It justifies the act of the Assembly in cutting off certain revenues so that the extravagance of the governor may be curbed. The answer also severely complains against the Governor threatening to eject those persons from land which they have not settled for.

Another comprehensive report on the conditions in Pennsylvania made by a committee of which Blunston was a member is found p. 514 of volume four of the Colonial Records. It covers nine pages and is very illuminating. In this report the committee again accuse the governor of infringing upon the liberties of the people; they accuse him of appointing officers without power to do so; they say the governor published certain acts in the Mercury to influence the elections, in which articles he takes the Assembly to task; they say he ignores the Assembly; that he takes authority to arraign the Assembly without any law or right to do so; that his view that this government is under the King, and that the Assembly cannot exercise any authority over magistrates, etc., is without foundation in our constitution; that his published proclamations that the Assembly have no right to exercise any acts of government is unfounded; that the government is divided into the "legislative, executive and federative departments, and that legislation, their province or part in government is one of the highest acts of government; that the legislature is the only power or branch with the right to create

offices and pay the officers therein. And in similar manner this committee go on defining the limits of the different departments of the government. The Assembly made the report its own act and transmitted it to the governor.

That Blunston was on so important a committee, elucidating so important and constitutional a matter, shows that he was able and influential.

He was again on the committee to draft legislation. One of the acts under his care was a bill to be passed into a law to enable the collection of small debts in an easy and cheap way. (3 V. 458). He was again placed on a committee to answer the governor's message. This was in May, 1742. (See 3 V. 465 and 4 C. R. 549). This resulted in drafting another long message from the Assembly to the Governor, in which the governor is again accused to being a usurper of the people's rights, of which the Assembly were the guardians; it asserted the right of an Assembly to sit upon its own adjournments, and that the governor has no right to complain of their adjournments and re-convening at their pleasure; that they have the right to pass laws to curb the governor's power; they take issue with the governor in his contention that he has the right at the behest of England to demand a law to be passed to prevent the crowds of foreigners coming to this Province, and say that subject is a matter for them to solve; they define the limits of England's rights here; they treat as a joke the threat of the governor that our privileges are in danger owing to the Assembly's conduct; they upbraid the governor for wanting to raise more taxes; and, in the governor contending that he is as much a friend of our liberties as the Assembly are, they say that his actions speak louder than words. Other services of Blunston on committee may be found in 3 Votes of Assembly 396.

In the fall of 1742 he was again elected to Assembly (3 V. 497). He was placed on the committee to communicate with the governor the organization of the Assembly. (Do.). He was also again on the important committee to settle the accounts of the loan of the office. (Do.). He was again on the committee of grievances. (Do.). He was again placed on a committee to reform the laws on the subject of collection of debts. (Do. 398). The law originated by his committee was passed by the Assembly and is found in Vol. 4, Statutes at Large, p. 370. This law transferred from the Courts to the Justices of the Peace, actions for debts under five pounds, in order that action might be more speedy and less expensive to the defendant in costs. It is the foundation of a part of our Justice of the Peace jurisdiction of today.

He was placed on a committee to draft a law for the relief of the heirs of the unnaturalized foreigners, that is of the Swiss and Germans who came to Pennsylvania and whose heirs could not inherit lands of their parents by will or otherwise because they were not Englishmen. (3 Votes 500). An important naturalization law was the result of his committee's work. (3 Votes 501). He was also put on the committee to take up and examine the facts relating to the great election riot in Philadelphia in 1742, which the Assembly charged was the result of the Governor's attitude toward freemen's rights. This was a most serious event in early Pennsylvania and had a profound influence on later legislation, etc. (3 V. 501). It was an onslaught against the Quakers and several persons were wounded. The report of the Committee and the address to the governor growing from it may be found in Vol. 4 C. R. 620.

In the early part of 1743, Blunston was appointed on a committee to make answer to the governor's address to the Assembly. (3 V. 514 and 4 C. R. 628). In this answer the old bickerings were renewed.

These points of difference were on constitutional points, etc. Pennsylvania was in the throes of working out its government and of marking the proper domains of the departments of it.

He was also placed on a committee to draw a law to erect cattle pounds in the Province. (3 V. 514). He was likewise appointed on a pure food committee namely that for drawing an amendment to the flour act of the province and an act was drawn up and passed accordingly. (3 V. 520).

At this point I desire to notice that during these years Blunston was being assigned to many more important posts, committees, etc., than his neighbor, John Wright. Wright was somewhat older and his health was falling. When the Assembly met after harvest, Blunston was again put on the committee to answer the governor's message. (3 V. 523 and 4 C. R. 659). The next election in October he was not elected but on the death of Thos. Lindley, he was again chosen. (3 V. 539). He was again put on the committee to reply to the governor's message (3 V. 543) and the answer may be seen on 4 C. R. 659. In May, 1744, he was placed on the committee to take up the subject and make report to the governor on the murder of Armstrong in Lancaster County. (3 V. 546). He was placed on the committee to audit the public accounts (3 V. 547); and on the committee on incidental expenses of the Assembly. (3 V. 556). The same Fall he was placed on the committee to audit the accounts of the Trustees of Province Island. (3 V. 556). This seems to have been the end of his career in Assembly.

**RETURN TO → CIRCULATION DEPARTMENT**  
**202 Main Library**

LOAN PERIOD 1	2	3
<b>HOME USE</b>		
4	5	6

**ALL BOOKS MAY BE RECALLED AFTER 7 DAYS**

Renewals and Recharges may be made 4 days prior to the due date.

Books may be Renewed by calling 642-3405.

LIBRARY USE ONLY

**DUE AS STAMPED BELOW**

JUN 24 1988  
 CIRCULATION DEPT.

LIBRARY USE ONLY  
 JUN 24 1988  
 CIRCULATION DEPT.

AUTO DISC JUN 24 '88

RECEIVED BY

JUN 24 1988

CIRCULATION DEPT

DEC 07 1994

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY  
 BERKELEY, CA 94720

FORM NO. DD6,

RETURN TO the circulation desk of any  
University of California Library  
or to the  
NORTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY  
Bldg. 400, Richmond Field Station  
University of California  
Richmond, CA 94804-4698

---

ALL BOOKS MAY BE RECALLED AFTER 7 DAYS

- 2-month loans may be renewed by calling (510) 642-6753
- 1-year loans may be recharged by bringing books to NRLF
- Renewals and recharges may be made 4 days prior to due date.

---

DUE AS STAMPED BELOW

---

**AUG 28 1999**

---

**SEP 19 2003**

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

12,000 (11/95)

APR 20 1999  
LD21-35m-8,'72  
(Q4189810)476--A-32  
CIRCULATION DEPT.

General Library  
University of California  
Berkeley

GENERAL LIBRARY - U.C. BERKELEY



8000994920

