

same shall be Rejected or Not, It was carried in the Affirma- L. H. J.  
tive.

John Hall Esq<sup>r</sup> from the Upper House delivers M<sup>r</sup> Speaker the Bill relating to Servants that Cannot give Security for their good Behaviour, with the following Message Viz:

By the Upper House of Assembly

Octo<sup>r</sup> the 29<sup>th</sup> 1725

Gentlemen.

In your Message of the 28<sup>th</sup> Instant by M<sup>r</sup> Harrison and M<sup>r</sup> Johnson, Relating to the Disposall of Servants for want of Security for their good behaviour You tell us you hope we will not Insist on any thing that looks like depriving you of preventative Justice, which plainly Implies a Surmise, that we are going about to do it. We are very well assured that [in] our former Message Relating to this Bill, we have not used any Expression that Can be a just foundation for such a suspicion, and are very Sorry to find our selves often treated with such unjust Reflections in your Messages Rather as Enemies to our Country and Subverters of Justice then as an Upper House of Assembly. May we not differ with you in Opinion about some things debated between the two Houses, without being Suspected of having Intentions to deprive you of Justice, or Invade your priviledges? We desire you will be pleas'd to Consider that such Measures instead of Cultivating a good Understanding between us, directly tends to a Breach of it, and therefore we hope you will forbear such treatment for the future. It seems Strange to us why you should give Your Selves the Trouble of Composing so long a Message Consisting of Repeated Assertions of the Necessity of preserving the Publick Peace, and that Servants are not Exempted by the Act for payment of Criminall Servants fees, from being bound to their good behaviour, things not any where deny'd in our former Message, for we have as great Regard to the preservation of the Publick peace as You, and we have only Referred to that Law as a Sufficient Provision for the payment of Criminall Servants fees, without Injuring the Property of their Masters by the Exposing them to Sale, according to the unreasonable Directions of the Bill now in Debate, and we now take Leave to observe to you that altho the Act before Mentioned does not Exempt Servants acquitted of Crimes from being obliged to give Security for their good behaviour, yet as it directs they shall be Return'd to their Masters without any Condition expressed Obliging them to give such Security we may from thence Reasonably Inferred an Intention in the Law of Excusing them unless in Extraor-