

those Places greatly exceeds that of all their private Estates, a Stranger might perhaps the more easily Account for their differing so much from us in Opinion.

It is true the Upper House sent down some of our Laws while we were Preparing our last Address, but we did not think that any Reason for altering it, since several and the most material of them are still kept back, and if they should think proper to send them down before this reaches your Excellency, our Complaints are not the less Just for their detaining them a Month last Session, and almost a Fortnight now, and by that means only, running the Country to the Expence of the Assembly's Sitting near Six Weeks.

Your Excellency has indeed been more explicit in declaring your Sentiments and particularly pressing (as you are pleased to say) the Bill for Arms and Ammunition than any others; but can any one think you are in Earnest, when you must be convinced from the Assurances we have given, that upon the return of the other necessary Laws with their usual Duration, you may immediately have that for *Six Pence* per Hoghead; and if that be so essentially necessary as you are pleased to alledge, why must it be lost for none other reason than denying us those Laws no less necessary for the Welfare of the People and Administration of Justice?

The great Misapprehensions in our last Address, come out, it seems, to no more than a small mistake in point of Time, and the Omission of a single Exception that happened 17 Years ago in the Duration of some of the Laws. As to the first, granting it to be really so, (for we shall enter into no Dispute about it) does it alter the nature of the thing? or is it a Fact more or less true because said to happen at a different Time from what it really did? And as to the second, altho' at that distance of Time the Exception you mention might have escaped the notice of Persons more accurate than we pretend to be, yet we were not ignorant of it, but casually omitted inserting it in our Address; but how that can affect the principal matter so as to make it better or worse, we must acknowledge to be beyond our Apprehension, for we can never presume that your Excellency will say, that this single Exception constitutes the usual Duration, as the Upper House did once of the *Three Pence* per Hoghead Act.

We cannot agree that the Charge in our Message of the *9th* of *June* 1739, of the 2500 *l.* being unaccounted for was groundless, since from all that the Gentlemen of the Upper House have yet been able to do towards making out the regular Application of that Money, we still remain as much unsatisfied as to a great part of it, as we were of the whole at the Time of that Message.