

L. H. J. for the 91 Convicts to serve for Seven Years and upwards. And by
 Liber No. 49 the Account of Richard Lee, Esq; Naval Officer of Patowmack, it
 Dec. 16 likewise appears, That the Snow Trial, William M'Caghin Master,
 Entered in the said Port of Patowmack, 91 Convicts, and Cleared
 out thence without paying the Duty of Twenty Shillings Currency p
 Head on the same 91 Convicts. And it also appears by the same List
 of Entries in said Port of Annapolis, that during the Course of last
 Year's Importation, and since the 29th April, 1756, sundry Persons
 paid to the said Naval-Officer of Port Annapolis, the Duty of Twenty
 p. 220 Shillings p Head on Convicts, and Convicts to serve for Seven
 Years and upwards. And we submit it, whether the said Naval-
 Officers ought not to have Collected the Duty of Twenty Shillings
 Currency p Head on Convicts and Servants imported as aforesaid."

This Report, on the Day it was presented, was Read and Concurred
 with by that House; from whence one might have reasonably sup-
 posed that House was satisfied the Facts there set forth were true;
 and that every future Proceeding upon that Affair would, in Point
 of Fact, correspond with it.

Notwithstanding which, the next Step that House takes upon this
 Subject, within Six Days after, is an Address to me, referring to the
 Report thereto annex'd (which yours of the 10th seems design'd to
 enforce), amongst other Things in the following Words:

"It is truly discouraging to us to find—in others—(Officers) who
 can't plead Ignorance of the Laws, such an Omission of Duty as we
 could not suspect, and which your Excellency will observe by the
 Report, in regard to the Conduct of the Naval-Officers of Patowmack
 and Port Annapolis, who, notwithstanding they have received the
 Duty on Servants for Seven Years and upwards, from many Masters
 of Vessels, have nevertheless omitted to receive it from others, be-
 cause (as we presume) they have Entered them under the Title of
 Convicts, tho' the Duty on such Servants is required to be paid at
 the Time of Entry; and we conceive to have been the Duty of those
 Officers to have refused to have Entered such Vessels, until the Duty
 was paid down, and not to have taken any Impost-Bond for it;
 which, if they did, is an Indulgence unknown to the Law: And for
 which, as we apprehend, the Naval-Officers ought to be answerable."

Tho' several Remarks might be made, both on the Report and
 Address, I shall nevertheless, for Brevity Sake, content myself with
 one upon the Difference between them, as enough to shew that Exact-
 ness is not so inherent to the Representatives of the People, as to be
 Proof against any Reflection that may be disposed to make; for tho'
 that Report treats only of Convicts, and Convicts to serve for Seven
 Years (which seems to me to have been a needless Distinction, since
 all Transported Convicts are by Statute to serve for Seven Years at
 least) and says not one Word of Servants except at the Close of it,
 p. 221 and tho' it is clear, that since there is no prior Mention in that Report