

It was omitted by Mr. *Ross*, and the Gentlemen of the Committee were easily led into the Mistake, by supposing it had happened in this, as well as in other Instances, that the Clerk had made out Proclamations for each County, as usual, and by being uninformed, that, by Order of the Governor, they had been printed by Mr. *Green*. The Charge ought to have been only 1818 lb , so that there is an Excess of 6630 lb of Tobacco. The Sum of 1818 arises as follows: *viz.*

Proclamation for Training the Militia, and keeping their Arms in Order, 2 Sides, Recorded, and 15 Times issued,	} 288
Proclamations, publishing certain Clauses of the 40,000 <i>l.</i> Law, concerning the Collection of Duties which were to take Place sooner than it was apprehended the Law could be Published, 3 Sides and a Quarter, Recorded, and issued 15 Times,	} 468
Recording the Clauses annexed to these Proclamations, 59 Sides,	531
Making out a Copy for the Printer,	531
	1818

But this Excess being deducted, still the Charge for Services done, exceeds the Salary, so that it is not material on the Question, whether the Salary ought to be allowed.

The Charge of 1762, April 20th, Fifty Copies of his Majesty's Declaration, with Proclamations of War sent to the several Counties, 714 Sides, 6426 lb of Tobacco, is right; but we confess that you might easily apprehend it to be wrong, upon the Supposition, that only one Proclamation, issued to each County, as is usual in other Cases. However, the Fact is, that the Proclamations issued to the Officers of the Militia, and of the Customs, which, in this Instance, were proper; and 50 Proclamations were actually issued, according to the Article of Charge.

If you are, since the Perusal of our Message, at a Loss why we took it to be agreed, that a Salary to the Clerk is the most convenient Satisfaction, and that the Salary of 9600 lb of Tobacco, or 60 *l.* per Annum, Currency, is a moderate Allowance, it is not in our Power to explain that Matter more fully. When you allowed the Clerk might merit *some* Salary for his Services, and did not propose or recommend *any other* Method of Recompence; and, though you would not undertake to ascertain that Salary, yet, as you did not object to it, except in respect of the Manner of the Payment, what other reasonable Inference could we make, what less offensive? Would it have better pleased you, to have given your Message, in this Particular, the Epithet *Evasive*?

If you thought it an useless Consideration, what Kind or Measure of Recompence the Clerk merited, why was his Account required? Was it required, because there was any Doubt whether it would be exhibited? Or, was it merely to satisfy an unprofitable Curiosity?

If the Stress we have laid upon the Account, has prompted, or provoked your Strictures, we have little Reason to repent of having taken that Step, since, in the full Discussion of the Subject of our Controversy, it will undeniably appear, to every sensible and impartial Man, that we are only contending for the Allowance of a Claim, which the Obligations of Justice, and a Regard to the Public Faith, have called upon us to support, and this we shall always firmly do, whether it may, or may not, entitle us to popular Applause, often, very often bestow'd upon those, who the least, and withheld from those, who the most deserve it. We have considered the Salary as a very moderate Allowance; and tho', by the Accumulation of many Years Arrears, you seem solicitous to present it to the Public View, as a Grievous Oppression; yet, in Fact, the annual Salary would not, at this Time, and much less in the future Increase of the People, amount to One Farthing Current Money, per Poll.

We have little Satisfaction from the Account you are pleased to annex, for other Reasons than the very obliging one of consulting our Ease; and we must be so plain as to tell you, that, if the Discovery of Truth, or the Establishment of Justice, were your real, as much as your declared View, you would not endeavour to give an Impression, by an Account founded on the most egregious Disregard of Facts, a Method of Deception the most likely to insnare the inattentive; and we can't but observe, that your stating the Account from Mr. *Ross's* Appointment to the Office of Clerk of the Council, and charging him for what he has received beyond your Ideas of a *Quantum meruit* to a Constitutional Officer, altho' all he received he had an indubitable Right to, under express and positive Laws, enacted by as prudent and able Legislators as yourselves, is but an indifferent Specimen of that Candour and Impartiality you profess, and not very consistent with that Respect you allow them to have been entitled to.

You have been so far from supporting your Deductions, that they have been clearly evinced to be against Facts, except in the Instance wherein a Mistake is admitted by us; and, if you were probably right in some of them, the Question between us is not influenced thereby, since, on the Account stated, for the View already explained, the Sum exceeds Mr. *Ross's* Claim for his Salary to the Amount of 12,343 $\frac{1}{2}$ lb of Tobacco; and therefore, if any Charges equal to, or even beyond the Excess, should be admitted to be improper, his Claim, which is only of his accustomed Salary for *all* Services, as well those that are, as those that are *not* included in the Account, would not be affected.

By restraining the general Expressions of the Message in 1756, sent hither with the Journal, you would endeavour to shew your Conduct to be consistent with the *ultimate* Sense of that House, but a short Examination will discover with how little Success.

When the Upper House observed, that Mr. *Ross's* Salary was omitted in the Journal, they expressed themselves, that "they were the *more* surprized at this Omission, as the Lower House " could