

Concerning the Quibbles and Objections of One JOHN WORGAN.

THOSE who understand in what Manner the Excise Duties are charged and collected, I expect will blame me for taking any farther Notice of the *crazy* Objections of One *John Worgan*; yet for their sake who do not know that *Speculative Gauging*, and Gauging as it is practised in the Excise, ever were, and are ever like to be, two different things, (and who are the only People Mr *Worgan* has had any Chance to impose upon,) I shall here repeat what I published in the *General Evening Post* last February. But it may be observed, that before this, Mr *Worgan* took it into that Head of his, to publish Tables for measuring Timber, at the end of which he has an Appendix, full of the most palpable Lies and Slanders that the most unnatural Inveteracy and Malice could invent, against the Memory of the late Mr *Hoppus*; when at the same time, all who knew Mr *Hoppus*, must acknowledge he died in full Possession of the Character of a judicious Surveyor, and an honest Man, and I with Mr *Worgan* may live to deserve the like. Upon this Behaviour of Mr *Worgan's*, I thought it my Duty to refuse Mr *Hoppus's* Character, and to give the World a fair and impartial Account of the Merits of Mr *Worgan's* Tables, upon which he grew very loud and *scurrilous*, and nothing could serve his Turn, but to be revenged upon me he must needs turn Gauger; for his *Pride* and *Ignorance* could not bear a Rebuke; tho' to his great Mortification, he has since found, that the judicious Part of the World has concurred with me in Opinion, that his Tables are good for nothing, and can never be sold, but for Waste Paper. — But to come to the Business of the Royal Gauger.

To the GAUGERS employed in his Majesty's Royal Revenue of the EXCISE and Others.

Mr *Worgan*, and Comp. having for above a Fortnight declined returning any Answer to my Reply, to his Three Remarks upon the Royal Gauger, concluding, I suppose, that the Publick would by this Time have forgot what I had said upon that Head, and that therefore their groundless Assertions might stand a better Chance to gain some Credit; for this Reason I have re-printed my Reply, that those who are acquainted with the Excise, and think it worth while to compare what Mr *Worgan's* anonymous Friends have supplied him with against it, may readily be convinced, how little such rambling Stuff deserves the Title of an Answer to it. If these Gentlemen (I do not include Mr *Worgan*, because every one that's acquainted with him must agree with me, that he is a crazy wrong headed Wretch, and knows nothing of the Matter) I say, if these Gentlemen could have proved, that the Revenue of the Excise, was not ascertained, charged, and collected, agreeable to what I have laid down, there can be no room to doubt but they would gladly have done it; their suggesting it without Proof goes for nothing, and they are hereby called upon to do it, if they can; which if they decline, I submit it to the Publick, what Opinion ought to be entertained of their Morals or Capacity. If the Method of Gauging, by which the Excise Duties now are ascertained, charged, and collected, and by which they have been so for many Years last past, is not the proper Method to be taught in a Treatise wrote (as the Title Page declares) upon the Subject of Gauging, as it is actually practised in the Excise, I must confess I do not know what it is. These Gentlemen want Capacity, or Inclination, to apprehend, that speculative Gauging, and Gauging as it is practised in the Excise, ever were, and are ever like to be, two very different Things? But now it plainly appears, by their Answer, that their principal Aim and Business is only to throw Dirt and misrepresent, the better to impose upon such as are ignorant of the Method of ascertaining and collecting the Revenue.

A Reply to the Remarks on the ROYAL GAUGER, signed JOHN WORGAN, (for Self and Company.)

HAVING lately published a Treatise under the following Title, the ROYAL GAUGER; or Gauging made easy, as it is actually practised by the Officers of his Majesty's Revenue of Excise; there has appeared in this Paper of the 5th and 8th of January, some *scurrilous* Remarks and Misrepresentations of some Parts of it; which should have given me no Concern, but for the Sake of those who have not seen my Book, and therefore may be liable to be imposed upon by the Air of *Infallibility* so conspicuous in the Remarker. Those who understand what Gauging is, as it is practised in the Excise, I am satisfied are not to be bolli'd into a Belief that the Quibbles and Conjectures of speculative and undisciplined Gaugers are to stand in Competition with the Injunctions of the Commissioners. What a strange Idea of the Excise must they have, who imagine the Gaugers are at Liberty to regard the five Varieties of Casks? But to come to the Remarks. —

I. I am condemned, without Mercy, for saying (page 102) that the Contents of an Hyperbolic Spheroid is in Proportion to a CYLINDER, as 5 to 12*, which the *perblind* Remarker

* I assert that $\frac{5}{12}$ in Practice is near enough the Truth; tho' it is evident, that as the Transverse Axis and Intercepted Diameter differ, so will the Solidity of the Circumscribing Cylinder also differ in Proportion.