U. H. J. A Message from the Lower House by M<sup>r</sup> Bozman and M<sup>r</sup> Hawkins

By the Lower House of Assembly November 3<sup>d</sup> 1724 May it please your Honours

In Answer to your Honours Message this evening by Col<sup>o</sup> Ward We desire you will please to read the Bill and take notice of the Words of the Proviso which extend further than the parts of the Bill your Honours mention in your Message and Provide that the Act shall not in any ways affect the Publick or County Levy or 40 p Poll due to the Clergy which plainly shews that all the Inhabitants were intended to be Affected by that Law or that Proviso was Useless And if you please to compare this Bill with the part of Tobacco Law relating to the same you will there find it was the Sense of the Legislature that by the like Words in the Enacting part all persons were affected as by the Proviso therein more fully appears which words if your Honours approve them better may be added to this Bill

But upon the whole the vote having been put with us whether to recede from the rates proposed in the Bill it was carried in the Negative and therefore we cannot recede from it

Signed p Order M. Jenifer Cl Lo. Ho.

Adjourned till morning.

Wednesday November 4th 1724

Present as yesterday.

Read yesterdays Message by M<sup>r</sup> Bozman and M<sup>r</sup> Hawkins and the following Answer prepared thereto viz.

By the Upper House of Assembly Nov<sup>r</sup> 4<sup>th</sup> 1724. Gentlemen.

In Answer to your Message of Yesterday by Mr Bozman & Mr Hawkins we Assure you that we have many times read and considered both the Bill and the Proviso and the more we read the more We admire that you shou'd contend for such a forc'd and improper construction of them As for your Argument drawn from the proviso in the Bill we think it carrys as little Weight as those you have Used to maintain your sence of the Clause in the Bill for if none but merchants were mentioned in the Bill that Proviso would be necessary because