

Pursuant to the above Order we have called before us the within named Abraham Child who declares that the within named John Raymonds deceased did give the lands within mentioned to the within named Susannah his wife and her heirs forever, at the time of making his last Will and ordered his Will to be so drawn but the said Child through Ignorance omitted to express the intent of the said Testator in the words the said Child being the person that writ the said Raymonds will.

Signed for us John Beale Esq. Comr.

On Reading of which It's ordered Remains Contradictory that leave be given for bringing in of the Bill.

John Hall Esq. from the Upper house delivers (Mr. Speaker the following) Which being read was ordered to be entered (13th)

By the U^{pp}r House of Assembly July 25th 1716.

Gent^ls.
In answer to your Message this Morning by Capt. Mariants and five other Members of your house, we acquaint you that we do agree the act of striking of writs should be repealed for the reasons in your Message given. But as to the Supplementary bill proposed we are of opinion should this house agree thereto It would not only be repugnant to the laws of Great Britain but be an Invasion on the Subjects Common Birth right of making use of such writs.

Signed for us W. Bladen Esq. U^{pp}r Ho.

It is therefore ordered that the Committee of Law prepare and bring in a bill Repealing the said act against striking of writs, and the house took into Consideration that part of the said Message relating to the Supplementary bill to the act relieving the Inhabitants of this Province from some grievances in the prosecution of suits at Law and ordered that a Message be prepared, which being read was entered as follows.

By the Lower House of Assembly July 26th 1716.
May it please your Hon^{rs}.

On reading the latter part of your Message of the 25th instant by the Hon^{ble} John Hall Esq. about the Supplementary bill to the act relieving the Inhabitants of this Province from some grievances in the prosecution of suits at Law, we are of opinion that since the Legislature of this Province has thought it fit the advantage of the Inhabitants by that act to restrain any Plaintiff from suing their debtors being Inhabitants in the Provincial Court where the debt and demands does not exceed 5000^l 50^s or 20^l that there is as much reason by the Supplementary bill proposed to restrain the defend^{ts} from removing such Suits by Habeas Corpus to the Provincial in order to gratify their litigious tempers and weary out the Plaintiff with great charges and long attendances who is obliged to bring his action in the County Court,