

only in behalf of one of them; and it is not so much as pretended, that it is applicable to more of them. This Plan of Defence therefore proves three Acts out of four totally unjustifiable. And what can this most pressing Necessity signify towards exculpating the fourth, when we resume our first position and deny it not only to have had a real, but a possible Existence? What Necessity was there for Passing the *Norfolk* and *Princess-Ann* Act, or the Act for the Frontier Parishes *without a suspending Clause*? What Necessity was there for the general Act, which affected the whole Clergy in 1755; by which several suffered, and one in particular was defrauded of about Twenty Pounds by the Collector, who received Tobacco from the People and paid off the Parson in Money, as the Act directed; and who was therefore in Col. *Bland's* mild, moderate, and decent Stile, *a Beast of Prey; a Harpy left to feed on the Vitals of the poor Parson without controul*. There was just as much Necessity for all this, as there was for stinting the price of Corn at Twelve shillings and Six pence a Barrel; which all the Year afterwards did not sell higher than at Ten Shillings. In Truth, the late Assembly, being fallible, as well as other Societies of Men, have frequently suffer'd themselves to be imposed upon by frightful Descriptions of approaching Scarcity; which may serve as a Warning to their Successors against too hasty credulity concerning Accounts of the Crop, at a Time when it cannot certainly be known how it will turn out.

Col. *Bland* seems displeas'd that the Clergy should complain of the particular Acts agreeable he says to the Ministers concern'd (how far they were so we shall see by and by) as well as of the general Acts. I will therefore let him know how these