

George Plater, Esq; from the Upper House, delivers Mr. Speaker the following Message :

By the Upper House of Assembly, May 19. 1740.

Gentlemen,

WE, who are desirous and careful of avoiding Mistakes and Misapprehensions, must always be pleased with having them rectified; But whether your last Message was useful and necessary to that Purpose, will perhaps appear from the few Observations we now make on it.

We shall, as you have done, wave the mention of many Facts, especially of such, as make but little or nothing to the Question between us, as whether the Law of 1734 was the only Law ending with a Session, and other Facts of the like Nature, where, as you say, there is so little probability of our Agreement.

That we may not be supposed to misrepresent you to those impartial Judges, to whom you appeal in the third Paragraph, we here insert what you say in your two Branches of that Appeal, the first runs thus, *viz.* " Whether your offering a Bill for raising *Six Pence* per Hoghead for Purchasing Arms and Ammunition, or any lesser Sum, as the present Existence of our Case may require, for one, two or three Years, with an Assurance of renewing it and enlarging or lessening the Sum if there should be Occasion, or our insisting on *Three Pence* only for Nine Years, or for Three and to the end of a Session, bespeaks the greatest Care for this Part of his Majesty's Dominions, or the most impartial Views towards the Safety of the Province at a Time of impending Danger?" The second Part is to this Purpose, *viz.* " And whether your readiness to raise a Supply for the encouragement of Freemen to enlist in his Majesty's Service abroad, or our entire refusal of it, unless at the same time we could obtain the before mentioned Bill for Arms, &c. with our beloved termination of Nine Years or a Session of Assembly, argues the greatest Zeal for the Success of the *British* Arms?" As to the first, we cannot on perusal of your Messages, discover the least mention before now of Three Years, or the assurance of renewing that Bill, which you are now pleased to give: We hope, *Gentlemen*, you did not imagine it possible to mislead your impartial Judges or ourselves, by this Assurance, into a false Opinion of your Care for this Part of his Majesty's Dominions; can you assert that such an Assurance can oblige any succeeding Assembly to renew that Act, or that such an Assurance is of the same Effect with an Act? If it can tye any future Lower House, what difference is there between binding them by an Act, and such an Assurance; and why should not an Act be now made for as great a length of Time, as any Revival on such an Assurance