

of any Servants, but Convicts to serve for Seven Years, the Expression of Servants imported as aforesaid, must necessarily be understood to refer to the Convict Servants therein mentioned; yet that House in their Address to me upon that Occasion, seem very fond of considering all the Importations mentioned in the Report, as Servants for Seven Years, in Contradistinction to Convicts, tho' the Report gives no Colour for understanding them in that Manner; and at the same Time seem so averse to having any Thing to say to Convicts, tho' that Report treats of nothing else, as to presume, contrary to the Report upon which that Address is founded, and with which that House had concurred, that they (the Officers) had Entered them under the Title of Convicts, tho' they were simple Servants for Seven Years.

L. H. J.
Liber No. 49
Dec. 16

Without taking up any more of your Time upon this Remark, I am afraid, Gentlemen, that House will appear from these Papers, not to have paid all that Regard to Truth and Candour, which, as Representatives of the People, it were to be wished they had; for it seems too evident, that the Report and Address cannot be both true, and indeed that the Conduct of that House was not consistent with itself.

And now, give me Leave to ask, What Reason could I have from a View of these Papers, so dark in themselves, so contradictory to each other, either to believe those Representations Just, or your Complaints Reasonable Unless you suppose that I am implicitly to gratify every Desire, and comply with every earnest Request, of such as may at any Time be Elected by the People, however unreasonable in themselves, or founded upon Facts contradictory, or destitute of Proof. And here, before I quit this Subject, I must take the Liberty to ask one more plain Question; and as the Answer to it may tend to our better understanding each other, by removing some Obscurities, which seem to me still to rest upon that Address of the former Lower House I shall hope you will favour me with a full and direct one: The Question is this; Do you insist upon the Naval-Officers Collecting, under the Act of Assembly made in 1754, for his Majesty's Service, the Duty of Twenty Shillings Currency p Head upon Convicts, Transported by Virtue of the Statute, or do you Not?

That the Merits of this Dispute may be the better understood, I must have Recourse to that Address of the last Lower House, containing the Charge against the Naval-Officers, which may be thus divided: p. 222

“The Duty on such Servants is required to be paid at the Time of Entry.”

“It was the Duty of those Officers to have refused to have Entered such Vessels, until the said Duty was paid down.”

“And not to have taken any Impost-Bonds, which is an Indulgence unknown to the Law.”