

L. H. J.  
Liber No. 50  
April 19

That the Duty on such Servants is required to be paid at the Time of Entry:

And that it was the Duty of those Officers to have refused to have Entered the Vessels Importing them, until the Duty was paid:

And consequently that their Conclusion, drawn from those Premises “for which those Officers ought to be answerable” cannot be wrong.

We can by no Means allow, that the Report of the Committee of the late Lower House, omits doing that Justice to the Naval Officers which is strictly their due; for though perhaps the Committee in that Report, might have more clearly expressed by what Means they came by their Knowledge of the Refusal of the Masters to pay the Duty on Convicts, and might have mentioned the N. B. placed at the Foot of the List of Entries, in which the Naval-Officer of Annapolis mentions his being in possession of Impost Bonds, on which the Duties, if due, might be Recovered, yet the nature of the Charge must still have been the same, viz. That they had omitted to collect the Duty on Convicts: And as the late Lower House, by their Address, gave it as their Opinion, that the Naval-Officers ought not to have taken Impost Bonds for that Duty, we must presume they were informed that such Bonds were taken, and very probably from the abovementioned N. B. and since there is no room to imagine they would have been of a different Opinion, upon receiving their Information from the Report of the Committee, it seems very clear, that every thing done, in consequence of the Report as it now stands, must have been done, if the Report in the most clear and express Manner, had mentioned the N. B. at the Foot of the List of Entries: Where then is the Foundation for your Excellency’s Insinuations, that Facts were not mentioned, and that some Transactions were noticed, when others appearing upon the Face of the same Evidence, were concealed, merely for the Sake of patching up a Charge against the Naval-Officers, in order to get their Office Bonds sued; that the Representations of the late Lower House were unjust, and our Complaints in Consequence of them unreasonable?” We are really concerned to find your Excellency, on such slight Pretences, charging the Representatives of a People, with Want of Firmness and Candour, and determining not to pay the least Regard to their Representations.

And now to conclude this Part of our Address; since it is clear to us that Convicts are liable to the Duty imposed on Servants for Seven Years or upwards, by the Act in Question; since it is the plain Construction of that Act, that the Duty on such Servants shall be paid by the Importer at the Time of his Entry; since all Duties are to be paid at the Time of Entry, unless it be otherwise directed by the particular Law imposing them; and since it is Clear, that Impost Bonds, except where the Law in any particular Case directs them to be Taken, are no more than an Indulgence in the Officer at his