

L. H. J. and their earnest Requests to your Excellency, have not yet had the  
 Liber No. 50 desired Effect, and to fear their ill Success is to be attributed rather  
 April 19 to a total Disregard of the reasonable Complaints of the Representatives of the People, than to any other Cause.

If, by forming a Judgment, and coming to a final Determination, upon our Representations, your Excellency means, as it would seem from your Application of that Right to the Case in Hand, a Right of expounding the Laws of this Province; we must express our Opinion to the contrary; for we presume that final Determinations upon the Sense and Meaning of the Laws ought not to be made by any but those, who, agreeable to our Constitution are appointed, for that Purpose, the proper Judges in the Courts of Law: But since your Excellency has thought fit to lay before us your Reasons for not ordering the Bonds of the Naval-Officers of Port Annapolis and Patowmack, and the Bonds of the Commissioners of the Paper-Currency-Office, to be put in Suit, we shall consider them, and endeavour to shew, they are by no Means sufficient to acquit those Officers of Neglect of Duty, and consequently that we are right in our Application to your Excellency, to do Justice to the Country, by prosecuting them for that Neglect; and we must assure your Excellency, that tho' in your Opinion our Representations may, at any Time, injuriously affect the Life, Liberty or Property of any Individual in this Province, yet, as long as they appear just and reasonable to us, we shall think it our indispensable Duty to repeat our Applications for Redress.

p. 72 Your Excellency, after inserting an Extract of the Report of the late Lower House, and their Address in Consequence thereof, is pleased to say, "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, viz. that tho' the Report treats only of Convicts and Convicts to serve for Seven Years, yet that House, in their Address in Consequence of that Report, seem fond of considering all the Importations, mentioned in the Report, as Servants for Seven Years, in Contradistinction to Convicts." This is indeed a curious Discovery; you allow all Transported Convicts are by Statute to serve for Seven Years at least; Are they not then Servants for Seven Years and upwards? If they are, where is the Difference between the Report and the Address? Surely it can only be in Terms; for if the Report mentions only Convicts, and all Convicts are Servants for Seven Years and upwards, How is it possible that by the Address that House should seem fond of considering all the Importations mentioned in the Report, as Servants for Seven Years, in Contradistinction to Convicts, when they expressly refer to the Report, which treats only of Convicts?

Your Excellency remarking still on that Address, again says, "and at the same Time seems so averse to having any Thing to say to