greater part of the flock; fo that no general court could oblige them to produce their books, nor call them to an account even for the groffest mismanagement. At the request, therefore, of the petitioners, it was moved, that the Company should be ordered to give in a list of their proprietors, diftinguishing how many shares each perfon poffeffed of the flock, that it might appear in how few hands the bulk of it lay: but this being ftrongly opposed, from a perfuafion that a compliance with it would expose the fecrets of the Company, and that it was a matter of mere curiofity and of no importance to the public, who held the flock; and the petitioners apprehending, that debating these points would too much retard the principal bufinefs, this motion was withdrawn; and also another motion made to oblige the Company, to lodge their original books: by which last step, all the evidence that could be brought against them, was limited to those who either were or had been their fervants; no others having been at the Bay except the people of the difcovery-lhips, who had no means of judging how affairs were administered there.

IN Nº. II the Company give a lift of nine veffels, which they pretend they had fitted out upon the difcovery of a north-weft paffage; but by their instructions already cited, it appears that there were only five fent upon that expedition, two with Knight, two with Napper, and one with Scroggs. Of the four others here mentioned, two were the Prosperous-floop under Henry Kelfey, and the Succefs John Hancock; the first failed from York-fort, June 19th, and the other from Churchill, July 2d, 1719, and both return-ed the 10th of August. These had no instructions about the passage; their business was only to try to