

0341

72-3



S T A T E

OF THE

D E M A N D S

O F

FRANCIS REDEKER, Esq;

UPON THE

CROWN of GREAT-BRITAIN,

F O R

DEDUCTIONS made from his Accompts, on allegations of his having been over-paid on former Accompts settled, and paid by the Commissariate in Germany.

L O N D O N :

Printed in the YEAR MDCCLXVII.

S T A T E

OF THE

D E M A N D S

O F

FRANCIS REDEKER, Esq; &c.

IN the beginning of November, 1760, Prince Ferdinand of Brunswick communicated to Mr. Maffow, president of the chamber of Minden, his intention of making an expedition into Hesse, that he might take proper measures for providing forage for the support of the army; in consequence of which information, the president, whose orders were a sufficient authority, as he of himself formed a chamber, directed Mr. Redeker to go through every part of the provinces, and buy up every ration of forage he could find, and lay it all in the most convenient places for collecting it together; having particular regard, at the same time, to the convenience of transport, which he accordingly did.

In the mean time, his Serene Highness made requisitions to all the neighbouring provinces for an aid-delivery of forage, to be furnished to-

B

ward

[2]

ward the Upper Wefer, in order to fix the quotas of which, and make proper arrangements for delivering it, the deputies of the said provinces met the principal persons concerned in the supplies of the army, at Uflar, on the 23d of December following, when it was proposed by Mr. President Massow, in consequence of the measures taken by Mr. Redeker, pursuant to his directions; that Mr. Redecker should be desired to undertake that part of the said aid-delivery, which was required from the Prussian countries, amounting to 400,000 compleat rations; which proposal was agreed to by Gen. Peirson and Michael Hatton, Esqrs. directors-general of the British Commissariate, and payment promised him at the same rate, which other allied countries should receive for what they should supply on account of the aid-deliveries, without limiting any particular time for the execution of the said undertaking.

On these terms, Mr. Redeker undertook to deliver the said quantity, and entering upon the execution of his undertaking directly, in consequence of the preparations he had made for that purpose, he proceeded with that and other deliveries, which he was soon after directed by Col. Peirson and Mr. Hatton to make, so effectually, that he completed the following deliveries within the times set forth in the respective certificates granted for them.

Rations

[3]

Rations of
oats, hay, straw, amounting to
D. F. St.

Certified by Mr. Hulton, April 21, 1761. 290819— 429911— 355935— 43191:0: 8

Mr. Frazer, 24th July, 1761. 121490— 1071789— 73272— 54619:1: 2

Mr. Halfey, Sep: 28th, 1761. 213822— 267267— 173024— 28593:2: 19

626131— 1768967— 602231— 126403:4: 9

Upon which several certificates, warrants were given for payment by Col. Peirson, Intendant General, which was accordingly made without objection.

Shortly after this, commissioners of enquiry were sent over to Germany to examine the accompts of the supplies of the army, who took these, and some other accompts of Mr. Redeker's, though regularly settled and paid, to a revision; and as a security for the reimbursement of whatever sums they might think proper to deduct from them, put an immediate stop to all payment for other deliveries he had made; a great part of the king's magazine-keepers receipts, for which lay, at that very time, before the Commissariate for Certification.

Against such arbitrary and unjust proceedings, Mr. Redeker remonstrated in the strongest terms; but all his endeavours could procure him no redress, till the order was issued for bringing all

[4]

all unsettled demands on account of the war to be liquidated by Commissioners in London; in consequence of which, the receipts of his deliveries which had been thus stopped of payment, were given in at their office.

Instead of taking Mr. Redeker's said demands into consideration, the Commissioners communicated to him a charge laid against him by the Commissioners of enquiry aforesaid, purporting, "That, as Mr. Redeker had delivered all his forage, for which he had obtained certificates, warrants, and payments in Germany, without any order or authority, a deduction of 34548 ducats, 17 stivres, should be made from his demands before them for liquidation, to reimburse an overpayment made to him in Germany, for his former deliveries;"—and required his answer to this charge, before they would enter upon the said liquidation.

In consequence of this information, which added the loss of so much time, and the expences of such a journey, to the inconveniencies he had already suffered from the delay of paying his just demands, Mr. Redeker was obliged to come to London, in the year 1765, when he laid before the Commissioners the several authorities herein before set forth, by which he refuted that charge beyond a possibility of contradiction.

The

[5]

The Commissioners, however, instead of candidly doing Mr. Redecker that justice, by the total retraction of these deductions, to which he had thus incontestibly proved himself entitled, made the following report upon his affairs, to the Lords of the Treasury, on the 29th of November 1765.

"We have taken into consideration an account presented by Mr. Wright, on behalf of Mr. Redecker counsellor of the chamber of war at Minden, amounting to two hundred twenty-nine thousand, two hundred and twenty-nine guilders, and three and three-fourths stivres, Holland's currency; and we have also taken into consideration, a report dated October 18, 1764, made by the Commissioners of Enquiry on the said counsellor Redecker's accounts, which had been settled in Germany, stating a deduction of 34548 ducats, 17 stivres, as a sum appearing to them to have been improperly paid to the said counsellor Redecker on the former settlements of his accompts with the British Commissariate, together with Mr. Redecker's answer to the said report, both which are hereto annexed; and we have also conferred with Major Gen. Peirson, and Mr. Hatton, on the subject of Mr. Redecker's engagements with the British Commissariate.

"On the whole of this enquiry and examination, we find, that in consequence of a meeting
B 3 " held

[6]

" held at Uslar, by the principal persons con-
 " cerned for supplying his Majesty's combined
 " army in Germany with provisions and forage,
 " on the 23d December 1760, for the purpose
 " of calling on the allied countries to make an
 " aid-delivery of forage, and for settling several
 " arrangements to effectuate this delivery, it was
 " proposed by Mr. President Massow, of the
 " chamber of Minden, and agreed to by Major
 " Gen. Pierson and Mr. Hatton, " That the said
 " Mr. Massow should desire the said Mr. Re-
 " deker to undertake that part of the aid-deli-
 " very, which was required from the Prussian
 " countries, and which was to be paid for at the
 " same rate which other allied countries should
 " receive for what they should supply in the
 " name of an aid-delivery.

" That 400,000 compleat rations was the
 " quota for the Prussian countries, which Mr.
 " Redeker was to furnish under this engage-
 " ment.

" That no precise time was limited for com-
 " pleting it.

" That the general purport of the orders and
 " directions given to Mr. Redeker was, to col-
 " lect this quantity of forage in depots in the Pruf-
 " sian countries, and to hold them in readiness at
 " the disposition of the British Commissariate.

" It

[7]

" It appears also, that about March 1761,
 " Major Gen. Pierson required Mr. Redeker
 " to deliver a quantity of oats; and that soon af-
 " ter he, Mr. Redeker, received such general
 " and unlimited orders from Mr. Hatton, as
 " will serve him for an authority, to cover any
 " deliveries of forage he might think proper to
 " make during the remainder of the year 1761,
 " and the beginning of 1762."

" This deduction of facts, which never came
 " to the knowledge of the Commissioners of En-
 " quiry in Germany, overturns the principle on
 " which they have made various deductions from
 " the settled accounts of Mr. Redeker, for
 " want of proper authorities from the British
 " Commissariate; but as the report discloses very
 " material facts, relative to Mr. Redeker's con-
 " duct, in performing the part assigned him in
 " this aid-delivery, as also his mode of making
 " and collecting the same, and of the quantity of
 " forage delivered by him on this account, it
 " becomes necessary for us to state in what
 " manner Mr. Redeker executed his engage-
 " ments with the British Commissariate, and
 " what in our opinion ought to be the just con-
 " sequence of his conduct on that occasion.

" It appears to us, to be sufficiently proved,
 " that counsellor Redeker had begun, with-
 " out any order from the British Commissariate,
 " to make a delivery into the magazine of Lem-
 " forde, three weeks before his friend Mr. Mas-
 "

B 4

" sow

“ fow had suggested, at the meeting at Uflar,
“ the propriety of employing him as an under-
“ taker for the Prussian aid-delivery, or offered
“ to endeavour to persuade him, Mr. Redeker,
“ to accept this Employment.

“ That Mr. Redeker promised a gratifica-
“ tion to the magazine keeper at Lemforde, to
“ induce him to accept his forage, before any
“ order came, and assured him of President
“ Maffow's grateful acknowledgments.

“ That Mr. Redeker was then acting as a
“ Commissary, to superintend the navigation of
“ the river Weser, and was paid in that capa-
“ city by Great Britain.

“ That Mr. Redeker, instead of collecting
“ the 400,000 compleat rations, the quota of
“ the Prussian aid-delivery into depots in a Pruf-
“ sian country, and giving notice thereof to the
“ British Commissariate, bought up in the Ha-
“ noverian country large quantities of forage,
“ and delivered the same into the king's maga-
“ zines, for which he obtained the magazine
“ keepers acquittances.

“ That he carried on a very improper corre-
“ spondence with the three magazine keepers,
“ Wienecke, Lehman, and Shimmelphening,
“ who had the custody of the king's magazines
“ at Lemforde, Lubecke, and Werther, &c.
“ particularly, that he directed one of them to
“ receive

“ receive the forage at whatever places his sub-
“ deliverers should lay it down, and give them
“ acquittances, in his, Redeker's name, as if
“ received into the king's magazine.

“ That he wrote to magazine keeper Leh-
“ mann at Lubecke, to report to the Commiffa-
“ riate *generally*, the quantity of forage in his
“ magazine, and to suppress naming the sever-
“ ral depots in which it was laid up.

“ That there is sufficient evidence to prove,
“ that this correspondence with these magazine
“ keepers was highly improper and unfair, and
“ that he gained the end he wanted by it.

“ That though his deliveries, taken from the
“ receipts of these magazine keepers appear fair,
“ and a real delivery into these magazines, yet
“ in reality this delivery extended thro' a very
“ large tract of country, distributed in an infi-
“ nite number of different places, as it best suit-
“ ed his own conveniency, and that of his sub-
“ deliverers, and remote from the inspection
“ and care of those, who, by the receipts, had
“ charged themselves with the custody of it.

“ It also appears, that some bought receipts
“ were introduced into this delivery; for the
“ further particulars of which, and for a more
“ minute detail of Mr. Redeker's correspon-
“ dence and conduct, and the mode of this de-
“ livery, we refer to the report made by the
“ com-

[10]

“ commissioners of Enquiry, and his letters annexed to that report.

“ We further observe, that it is sufficiently proved, by the report of Mr. Inspector Rofs, in May 1761, and further confirmed by the journal of Mr. Cuthbert, then Commissary of control, who made an inspection into the state of the deliveries made in that country the latter end of the same year; that the hay and straw, delivered by Mr. Redeker, was of a very inferior and bad quality, which is also more particularly set forth in the above-mentioned report.”

“ We are most clearly of opinion, that Mr. Redeker, in that part of his delivery, to which this evidence of his correspondence, mode of the delivery, and quality of a part of it applies, which is the same that was acquitted to him by the receipts of these three above-mentioned magazine keepers, has been to the prejudice of the just rights of this country largely overpaid, and that the deductions proposed by the Commissioners of Enquiry, on the whole of his delivery, on the grounds of his having made it without contract or authority, are at least proper to be made on that part of the delivery, in which it is evident, he has acted so shamefully, in violation of the spirit and meaning of his engagements, and the common rules of justice, and that the price of $10\frac{1}{2}$ stivres per each compleat ration, is rather a larger compensation

[11]

“ pension than he is entitled to, for that part of the delivery made under the circumstances above-mentioned, that rate being higher than the ordonance the Hanoverian regency allowed to their own subjects for deliveries made in the same period, and on the same account, with the charge of a partial transport included.

“ On applying therefore this rule to the settled accounts of Mr. Redeker, revised and re-examined by the Commissioners of Enquiry in Germany, and in consideration of the mode of delivery, and his improper correspondence with the three magazine keepers, as above set forth in their report, we are of opinion, that the sum of 79096 guilders, $14\frac{3}{4}$ stivres, Holland's currency, has been over-paid him on his liquidated accounts; which sum we have carried to the debit of the claimant—and having applied the same rule to that part of his accompt liquidated by us, to which it is properly applicable, from the same evidence, and the same circumstances, and having rejected eight articles of charge.—We are of opinion, that the sum of eighty-four thousand two hundred and two guilders, and seven and one-fourth stivers, is justly due to the said counsellor Redeker, as the ballance of this accompt, which sum of eighty-four thousand two hundred and two guilders, seven and one-fourth stivers, Holland's regency, we do report, ought to be paid to the said counsellor Redeker, in full of all his
“ de-

[12]

“ demands against the crown of Great Bri-
“ tain.

“ P. S. We think it necessary to apprize their
“ lordships, that in the course of the examination
“ of Mr. Redeker's accompt, the claimant and
“ his agents have frequently called upon us to
“ produce his original correspondence with the
“ magazine keeper Lehman, as brought forward
“ in the accusation of the Commissioners of En-
“ quiry, which we have not been able to com-
“ ply with. The annexed minute and extracts
“ of a correspondence with the Commissioners
“ of Enquiry has convinced us of the existence
“ of those letters at that time, which were packed
“ up in Germany, in a chest with other papers,
“ and a specification made out of the contents
“ of that chest, which now appear to be con-
“ formable thereto, except the letters in questi-
“ on. Mr. Redeker's original letters to the other
“ two magazine keepers, Wienecke and Shim-
“ melphening, as quoted and referred to by the
“ Commissioners of Enquiry, are existing.”

It would be difficult to reconcile this report to any of the common principles of human action, did not a single circumstance lead to a solution of the mystery. Mr. Cuthbert, one of the Commissioners, who made and signed this report, had been of the Commission of Enquiry in Germany, and had taken a circuit through the country, to inspect the state of the king's
ma-

[13]

magazines: unwilling, therefore, totally to give up the credit of that Commission, though he could not support any of the deductions made by it, on the principles they had been made upon; and desirous to shew the importance of his own observations, in that circuit, of which he had kept a journal, he thought it necessary to make the deductions here reported, upon the foundation of the great discoveries made by the Commissioners of Enquiry, and those entered in his journal aforesaid.

But sufficient as these reasons may have appeared to him, and his authority to the other Commissioners, for depriving a man of his property and character, Mr. Redeker does not apprehend himself any way obliged to pay the same deference to them.

As this report is founded on some facts, said to have been disclosed in the report of the Commissioners of Enquiry, it will be proper to examine the nature and proofs of these very material facts, in order to form a just judgment of the superstructure of which they are the foundation.

The first of these very material discoveries is,
“ That Mr. Redeker had begun without any
“ order from the Commissariate, &c.”

The account here given of these transactions, and which had been made known to the Commissioners, before they made this report, as ap-
pears

[14]

pears by the paragraph immediately preceding this, though they have thought it proper for their purpose to suppress some part of it, has sufficiently explained the affair here discovered.

Without entering into the merits of discovering that which was publicly known, and never attempted to be concealed, all that can be necessary to be said, in refutation of the conclusion drawn from this sage discovery, is, that whether Mr. Redeker had the *authority* of the Commissariate for beginning his deliveries before the meeting at Ular or not, he certainly had their *accord* to them there, which equally entitled him to payment for them, not only by the principles of justice, but also by the express rules given for the direction of the Commissioners. And of this the Commissioners themselves were well convinced, as appears by the very paragraph next preceding this, in their report.

The design, therefore, of publishing this discovery is not to impeach the authority, upon which Mr. Redeker had made his deliveries; but to insinuate a suspicion of some fraudulent understanding between him and Mr. Massow, as a foundation for their farther attacks upon the former: an insinuation which is also sufficiently refuted by the above account, and so inconsistent with the characters of these gentlemen, as to be beneath a further answer from them.

In

[15]

In the same manner, the circumstances of the affair might have explained the subject of the next discovery; "That Mr. Redeker had promised a gratification to the magazine keeper at Lempforde, &c."

When Mr. Redeker had collected the forage, as directed by Mr. Massow, in consequence of the requisition of Prince Ferdinand, which was about the beginning of December, in order to prevail upon the magazine keeper to receive it, Mr. Redeker was obliged to promise him some gratification, as a discovery of his authority would have discovered the prince's design, which was necessary to be kept inscrutably secret: but when the necessity for that secrecy was at an end, these promises were thought no more of by him, nor the performance of them ever claimed by the magazine keeper. Instead, therefore, of these promises being criminal, as asserted here, they were really meritorious, and proved Mr. Redeker's capacity and zeal for the service.

"The following discovery, that Mr. Redeker then acted as a Commissary, &c." is certainly as important, as the sagacity that could discover what was known to the Commissaries when they employed him, and to every man in the army, must necessarily be great: but, till the same sagacity shall discover also how this employment interferes any way with that of delivering the forage; or what the crime, thus mysteriously insinuated, can be, the objection must

must be left to answer itself, as it certainly is beneath a serious answer.

Equally important is the next discovery, " that Mr. Redeker bought up large quantities of the forage he was to supply, as the Prussian aid-delivery, in the Hanoverian country, &c." In answer to this, it is sufficient to say, that instead of being limited to procure forage in any particular country, or collect it at any particular place, he was expressly directed to go through all the countries, and buy every ration of forage he could pick up, and then collect the whole in the most convenient places, not losing sight of the conveniency of transport at the same time, as the Commissioners had been sufficiently informed.

In answer to the following discovery, " That Mr. Redeker carried on a very improper correspondence with three magazine keepers, &c." It is sufficient to say, that the only correspondence he had with these, or any other magazine keepers, out of the common, public course of their business, or that could possibly have the least appearance of impropriety, was that explained before in the answer to the discovery made, of his having promised a reward to one of those magazine keepers. Before it was proper for him to disclose his authority for making these deliveries, he was under a necessity of writing to them in a style of request to receive

receive his forage, but never after, that reason ceased.

Asto his directing one of them to receive the forage, at whatever places his sub-deliveries should lay it down, and give them acquittances, as if received into the king's magazines, with out dwelling on the inconsistency of this discovery with the one immediately preceding, " that he delivered the forage into the king's magazines, and received the magazine keeper's receipt for the same:" it has been shewn, that he had authority for laying up his forage in whatever places he should think convenient, not losing sight of the conveniency of transport at the same time; and at those places, he had also authority to deliver his forage, by that clause in his agreement at Uslar, " that he should be paid at the same rate as the other allied countries," which rate *without transport*; that is to say, at the depots, and not at the magazines, was settled with the Hanoverian regency, and is the same which he has charged for these deliveries, made at his depots, according to their respective distances, in consequence of his being entitled to receive the same payment with the Hanoverian deliveries.

From the wording of the next discovery, " that Mr. Redeker had wrote to the magazine keeper Lehmann at Lubecke, &c." — it should appear to relate to that immediately preceding. Not to insist on the disingenuity of this obscurity, which could be designed only to mul-

multiply one charge into many appearances: it is a sufficient answer to this in particular, that Mr. Redeker absolutely denies having ever written such a letter, till that letter shall be produced.

When first Mr. Redeker received information of this heavy charge, he waited on the Commissioners, and desired, with the impatience of conscious innocence, to see it, on a supposition, that there must have been some error in the translation of the letter, as he knew the Commissioners did not understand the German language, in which his letters to these magazine keepers were all written, and could not suspect them of founding such a charge on a fictitious letter: but after many evasive excuses of having mislaid it, and assurance that it was entered in their books, in the manner stated by them, they were at last obliged to own, on his insisting resolutely upon his right to see it, that the letter had been lost in bringing from Germany! such proceeding, and the little credit to be given to such allegations, needs no remarks to set them in a proper light.

Equally disingenuous and insignificant is the following discovery, "that this correspondence was improper and unfair, and that he gained the end he wanted by it."—If the correspondence was really such, as had been so often insinuated, that it was both improper and unfair, was too obvious to require being mentioned; but

but till it is shewn that it was so, and that this end was also improper and unfair, this assertion is beneath an answer. Mr. Redeker's only end for corresponding with these magazine keepers, has been sufficiently explained; as the end proposed by the Commissioners, in thus subdividing this charge into so many parts, and urging it in so many different lights, requires no explanation, being obviously no other, but to make a charge really insignificant and groundless, if fairly stated, appear to be of weight by this repetition.

And this is also the design of the amplified repetition of the several parts of this charge, which makes the next discovery, and has been already repeatedly refuted in every instance.

To the following discovery, "of bought receipts being introduced into Mr. Redeker's deliveries, &c;"—it is answered, that the fact is absolutely denied and disclaimed by Mr. Redeker; and the charge fully refuted by his letters to the magazine keepers, strictly forbidding them to accept of any regimental or bought receipts in his accompts; which letters are in the possession of the Commissioners, though Mr. Redeker could never prevail upon them to produce them before him, those which they refer to as annexed to the report of the Commissioners of Enquiry, having no particular relation to this affair, and being too general and vague to prove any thing. (The meaning of this

[20]

this reference to the Commissioners of Enquiry has been already shewn; and the propriety of it shall be more fully considered; as shall also that of alledging the journal of Mr. Cuthbert, when a Commissary of control in Germany, as a proof upon which to found a judgment made by him, in another character, in the next discovery.)

Equally candid and just, is the manner in which the authority of Mr. Rofs is alledged to prove, that the forage delivered by Mr. Redeker, was of an inferior and bad quality.

The words of Mr. Rofs are these: "Some of the hay is of inferior quality, if better could be had; (alluding to the exhausted state of the country) yet the whole is fresh and of a good colour: the oats are of a good colour, and not heated; and *all well lodged.*"

—The sophism of concluding thus, from the first part of an hypothetical proposition, is too gross to require any other refutation, than a bare recital of the part omitted.

Whether the report of Mr. Rofs or Mr. Cuthbert is most to be depended on, will appear from the following circumstances. Mr. Rofs inspected the depots of Mr. Redeker in May 1761; and upon his report to General Peirson, orders were given to transport his forage to Herford, and into the bishoprick of Paderborn, which was done without intermission, during the months of June, July, and part of August; about

[21]

about the middle of which this service was nearly compleated, to the great satisfaction of the troops, the commissariate, and the Commander in Chief, as will appear upon examination of the reports and magazine accompts; the last receipt for 25,000 rations of oats, bearing date the 20th of August 1761; whereas Mr. Cuthbert did not inspect that part of the country till October, when a very small part only of Mr. Redeker's deliveries remained to be made, and consequently he could see only very little of his forage.

That this little also was good, is sufficiently proved by this, that after all his deliveries were compleated, some British cavalry and trains made use of it, as their own magazine accompt, and the records of the control will testify.

What may have led Mr. Cuthbert to this opinion, was this: in the beginning of the war, the Hanoverian chancery had collected in several small depots, a quantity of forage which Mr. Hunter disapproved of, and left upon their hands. A considerable time after, Mr. Bailiffe Reincke bought this forage at a very low rate, and placed it in depots near those of Mr. Redeker, where it lay, as Mr. Cuthbert says, on fens and heaths, *under the covering of heaven*, which therefore must certainly have been the forage Mr. Cuthbert took for that of Mr. Redeker, as Mr. Rofs had expressly reported, that Mr. Redeker's forage *was all well lodged.*—

But is not this vindicating his veracity at the expence of his circumspection, and care to be rightly informed? And what credit can a report merit in any particular, in which so gross a mistake as this is detected?

Upon the credit of these discoveries, the Commissioners found their opinion, " That Mr. Redeker was largely overpaid on those parts of his deliveries, which were made into the three magazines, with the keepers of which he had held the correspondence so often mentioned, and therefore, that the deductions made by the Commissioners of Enquiry on all his accompts, *for want of authority*, should be continued on that part of them, in which he had acted so shamefully, &c. and that the price of 10½ stivres per comp. rations, is rather a larger compensation than he is entitled to, for that part of his deliveries made under the circumstances above-mentioned, &c."

As the foundation of this report has been totally over-turned, the report itself must fall of course: it may not, however, be improper to make a few observations upon the extraordinary nature of this report, in order to shew the exact conformity between it and the foregoing discoveries, in point of judgment, and regard to justice.

The aim of this report, is to establish, as far as possible, on any pretence, the deductions made

made by the Commissioners of Enquiry. As these deductions were made upon a supposition of want of authority; when that principle was over-turned, it was necessary to find some other, in order to save their credit from being over-turned with it. For this purpose, a parade is made of some very *material* facts, discovered by the said Commissioners of Enquiry, on which the same deductions are founded upon principles of justice, which, in the former case, were founded solely on want of authority, without any mention being made of justice; for this good reason, that in justice, Mr. Redeker was entitled to be paid for the deliveries made by him, even though he had wanted formal authority, because these deliveries had been received and made use of; the only instance in which such want of authority could have been urged against him, with any colour of justice, being to have refused receiving his deliveries.

With equal candour, the Commissioners for German Demands, make no mention of the want of authority in their deductions, but found them solely upon justice, by impeaching the character and conduct of Mr. Redeker, and to enlarge that foundation, repeat the same impeachment several times, and in several forms, to make them pass for impeachments of different facts; and for this equally good reason, that there is the clearest authority against them, Mr. Commissary Hatton, having in his letter of the 23d of July 1761, to Mr. Commissary Frazer, expressly

[24]

expressly fixed the price of the forage delivered by Mr. Redeker, into the three very magazines of Lubecke, Werther, and Lempforde, together with that of Bilefield, at nine stivers per ration for oats, $4\frac{1}{2}$ for hay, and $1\frac{1}{2}$ for straw, making together 15 stivres per compleat ration; which price was accordingly paid to him without any objection, at the time when the facts here pretended to be discovered, were, so far as they were true, fresh in every body's memory, because the reasons of these facts, as herein before set forth, were also known, and obviated every objection of that impropriety and unfairness, which are so often imputed to them in this report.—Whether the deductions, therefore, from this price, are better founded upon justice, than those of the Commissioners of Enquiry were, upon want of authority, is sufficiently evident.

As to “ the price of $10\frac{1}{2}$ stivres, fixed by the Commissioners, being higher than that allowed by the Hanoverian Regency, &c.”—Were the matter even as they would represent it, which it was not by any means, it could not affect Mr. Redeker, whose price was expressly fixed by proper authority.

The fact was this; the Hanoverian chancery, in order to fulfill their contracts with the Commissariate, issued a publication in their country, that they would receive forage from the peasants at about 10 stivres the compleat ration, and *pay for it directly*, for which forage they themselves
after-

[25]

wards received the price fixed by Mr. Hatton. Of this publication, the Commissioners of Enquiry happened some way to get a copy, and made use of it afterwards against every claimant who came before them.

The injustice of this proceeding is most glaring. This was a price on condition of immediate payment, without delay, risk, loss, or any other expence or trouble, than that of barely carrying it from the barns and farms of the peasants to the next depots of the chancery, which were always near them; (and this is the *partial carriage* here mentioned) whereas the deliveries made to the Commissariate, were attended with great trouble, great expences, great risk, great losses, and such very great delays of payment, as made that price, in those circumstances, much more profitable than the price fixed by Mr. Hatton could possibly be, under such disadvantages.—In a word, it is breaking through a fair and firm agreement, to deprive a man, not only of the fruits of his honest industry, but also of the money which he had necessarily advanced in the exertion of that industry; and that this is, in a most striking manner, the case of Mr. Redeker, he has proved by an affidavit, made before a magistrate in London, on his being informed of this price being fixed by the Commissioners; that upon the whole, he paid more for the forage himself, exclusive of expences, trouble, &c. as he shews by his Accompt.

To

To conclude, that the conduct of Mr. Redeker, in this and all his concerns with the army, was able, upright, and satisfactory to those who were proper and competent judges of it, is attested, and his character vindicated from every impeachment laid against him in the above report, in the fullest and most honourable manner, by General Peirson and Mr. Hatton, whose direct and express testimony of approbation under their hands, from a regard to justice, will not be put in ballance with dark insinuations, and varied repetitions of the same charge, proceeding evidently from a desire to raise an appearance of guilt, at any rate, in order to support the accusations of persons in one character, by their judgment in another, in which they thus acted both as judges and accusers: a situation that shews, in a light, sufficiently clear, the deference due to their judgment.

And that this approbation of Mr. Redeker's conduct was not unknown to the Commissioners of Enquiry, time enough to have rectified every misinformation, and saved them the trouble of searching for such discoveries, and consequently to have prevented the Commissioners for German Demands, from building such a superstructure upon those *material* discoveries, had not both wilfully shut their eyes to conviction; is proved by the following literal extract from a letter written by Mr. Hatton, whose testimony was incontestible proof, to the said Commissioners of Enquiry, from Bremen, June 22, 1762, in answer to their letter to him on this subject.

“ The

“ The army, on its retiring from Hesse, remained a long time on the Dymell; the great rains, badness of the roads, and overflowings of the Weser, prevented the transports of hay from about this place, and of course exhausted all the magazines which were within reach of the troops.

“ The Duke crossed the Weser with a large corps, about the beginning of November, and moved as many of the troops as far back as he could for the conveniency of forage.

“ His Serene Highness made requisitions to all neighbouring provinces, Hanover, Brunswick, Hildesheim, Sonderhausen, &c. and among others the Prussian territories; every province was desired to furnish forage towards the Upper Weser.

“ The deputies met at Uslar, at which time they asked Mr. President Massow, what quantity the chamber of Minden would furnish; he answered, more for size of the country, than any thing you have mentioned yet, notwithstanding the little provinces have been so much more foraged than yours.

“ Mr. Redeker, who was then at the headquarters, was ordered by the President, who of himself forms a chamber, to go through every part of the provinces, and pick up every ration he could get, to lay it in the most convenient

“ venient

[28]

“ venient places for assembling it together, and
 “ not to lose sight of the conveniency of tran-
 “ sport at the same time ; from thence arose the
 “ depots you enquire after.

“ We marched into Hesse soon after ; I was
 “ detached from the head-quarters to the corps
 “ which was besieging Cassel, where I staid till
 “ the siege was raised : from thence I went to
 “ Carlshaven, to form depots on the Dymell
 “ for the troops, which were left on that river,
 “ to make the cordon : what orders were given
 “ in my absence, relating to the depots of Mr.
 “ Redeker, I can't say ; but when I joined the
 “ Duke at Neuhaufs in the beginning of April
 “ 1761, I found most of the troops in the nei-
 “ bourhood of that place, and of Paderborn,
 “ supplied from them. Stückenbrock was the
 “ nearest depot from whence the forage was tran-
 “ sported to the above places, and all the troops
 “ in the above-mentioned quarters had no other
 “ supply.

“ I leave you, from these circumstances, to
 “ judge whether they were approved by me ;
 “ and if I mistake not much, they were so by
 “ Colonel Peirson, and he signified that satis-
 “ faction to Mr. Halsey, tho' with a trifling dif-
 “ ference as to the time of their being formed.

“ About a fortnight after my arrival at Nieu-
 “ haufs I was sent over to England, and did
 “ not return till about three weeks before the
 “ army

[29]

“ army took the field. When I came back, I
 “ found the head-quarters and its neighbour-
 “ bourhood still subsisting from the depots
 “ formed by Mr. Redeker, which is yet a stron-
 “ ger mark they were approved and of great
 “ use ; and though I cannot inform you of the
 “ particular orders which may have been given,
 “ you must be convinced, from what I have
 “ said, that the troops could not have done
 “ without them ; but could I have conceived
 “ that such particular informations would have
 “ been required, eighteen months after they
 “ were transacted and approved, I would have
 “ endeavoured to have got a secretary, who
 “ should have journalized every action, with the
 “ reasons why each thing was done.”

As all the charges, therefore, upon which
 these deductions are made from the accompts
 of Mr. Redeker, are proved to be totally desti-
 tute of foundation, he has an indisputable right
 to the payment of what is so unjustly with-held
 from him, amounting to G. 97883 2 $\frac{3}{4}$ St.



0357

