

When this message about amendments was read in the Lower House, it was "unanimously disagreed to" (p. 272). No favorable action was taken by the Delegates before the end of the session, in fact they did not even deign to reply to the suggestions made by the Upper House (pp. 290, 299).

On November 8, 1770, three days after the Assembly had reconvened, the members of the Upper House sent another message to the House of Delegates in regard to the same bill. While the Councillors thought the bill exceptionable in many respects, however, as the welfare of the colony depended upon the regulation of their staple of tobacco and the fees of officers, they proposed a conference with the Lower House for the purpose of discussing the provisions of the act in question (pp. 349-350, 378).

In their reply to this message on the following day the Delegates said that if the Upper House thought the bill exceptionable in many respects, then the Councillors should point out the amendments they have to propose in order that the Lower House could consider them. Then, if the Delegates decided that it was expedient, they would agree to a conference with the Upper House (pp. 351, 383-384).

The Councillors sent back a message the very next day. They claimed that there were several precedents for their suggesting a conference to discuss the bill. To point out all the amendments, or exceptions, they made to the bill would take much time, they added. However, the members of the Upper House then proceeded to state a few general propositions regarding the bill, including suggestions about the regulation of officers' and lawyers' fees, and the payment of fees in money or tobacco (pp. 352-353, 390).

The Lower House answered the Upper House on November 12 giving their opinion of the propositions submitted by the Councillors (pp. 356, 394-396). The members of the Upper House continuing the discussion on the following day protested against reductions in officers' fees (pp. 356-357, 397-398). In their reply of November 15 the Lower House maintained that they had no desire to reduce the fees of officers so low as not to be sufficient to support a particular office. The Delegates suggested that all provisions in the bill under discussion relating to officers' fees should be eliminated. Then with this understanding, a conference of the two Houses could be held for the purpose of coming to an agreement in regard to the other less contested provisions of the bill (pp. 359, 401-402). The Upper House, however, did not look with favor on this suggestion (pp. 360-361, 406).

The inter-house debate was continued by the Lower House on November 17. Going into great detail they pointed out instances where, they considered, excessive charges had been made under the provisions of the act in question (pp. 363, 411-415). In an equally lengthy reply, on November 20, the members of the Upper House claimed that they had always been willing to remedy defects in the provisions regarding the regulation of fees (pp. 366-369, 421).

As no agreement could be reached between the two legislative bodies before the end of the session on November 21, 1770, the Act of 1763 regarding the staple of tobacco and officers' fees failed of reenactment. On the closing day of the session the Lower House unanimously adopted resolutions which con-