

The Bill, entituled, *An Act for enlarging the Jurisdiction of the County Courts*, being Read the Second Time, the Question was put, Whether the said Bill shall Pass, or not? *Resolved in the Negative.*

For the NEGATIVE,

Mr. Bond,  
—Abell,  
—Barnes,  
—Mills,  
—G. Wilson,  
—J. Gresham,  
—R. Gresham,  
—Harris,  
—Carroll,

Mr. Smith,  
—Jof. Hall,  
—Brome,  
—Mackall,  
—Courts,  
—Harrison,  
—W. Wilkinson,  
—King,  
—D. Wilson,

Mr. Dennis,  
—Leicompie,  
—Sullivan,  
—Colwill,  
—Pearce,  
—Hyland,  
—Sheredine,  
—Paca,  
—John Hall,

Mr. Buchanan,  
—Addison,  
—Gordon,  
—Bordley,  
—T. Wilkinson,  
—T. Hammond,  
—Hopper,  
—Purnell.

For the AFFIRMATIVE,

Mr. P. Hammond,  
—Worthington,  
—Hen. Hall,  
—Smallwood,

Mr. Stoughton,  
—N. Goldsborough,  
—Lloyd,  
—Thomas,

Mr. Hooper,  
—Ennalls,  
—George,  
—Wootton,

Mr. Sprigg,  
—Pemberton,  
—Sally,  
—Outson.

Daniel Dalany, Esq; and Col. Tasker, from the Upper House, deliver Mr. Speaker the Bill, entituled, *An Act for raising the Sum of Three Thousand Pounds Current Money, and Two Pence Sterling per Hogshead for his Majesty's Service, &c.* Indoried, "By the Upper House of Assembly, August 23. 1745. Read, and will not Pass.

"Signed per Order, J. Ross, Cl. Up. Ho."

And the following Message, viz.

By the Upper House of Assembly. August 23, 1745.

Gentlemen,

THE Reasons you are pleased to give, why you cannot agree with our Amendments are, *First*, Because "You conceive it to be the undoubted Right of the House of Delegates alone, to raise upon the People any Sum of Money or other Tax, &c." This we conceive to be a most extraordinary Claim, and such as no House of Commons ever made, but when a small Part of that House, by the most violent Means, usurped the whole Authority, as well Legislative as Executive; which is such a Precedent as, we hope, you will not think for your Purpose: Had you been pleased to have contented yourselves with asserting, that it was your undoubted Right to begin a Money-Bill in your House, we would at this Time, for the sake of Dispatch, have forbore to make any Observation on such an Assertion; but we hope you will not think we act besides our Duty in letting you know what Objections we have to any Money-Bill, so that you may (if they are reasonable) remove them, and make the Bill proper for its Passage here. *Secondly*, You say, "Some of the Amendments are unnecessary, and others tend to lessen the Advantage which may be made for the Garrison of Louisburg." As you do not particularize which of them, and why they are unnecessary, we cannot be satisfied barely by such a general Allegation, that they are so; and as to the other Part, if a Proposal of expediting our intended Supply of Provision, so as not to be prevented by the Frost, or remitting a Sum of Money immediately, without Loss of Time, or Expence of Commissions and Charges, can tend to lessen any Advantage for the Garrison of Louisburg, we must acknowledge ourselves mistaken in Judgment.

We did assert in our former Message on the Subject of this Bill, and now avowedly repeat, that the establishing a Fund for raising a Sum of Money for the Support of an Agent, is foreign to his Majesty's Service in general; and were we inclinable to enter into the Reasoning you have made use of on this Occasion, we might prove beyond any reasonable Contradiction, that the Agency designed by the Bill would be so far from preserving or procuring Ease and Tranquility to His Subjects, that it would be the Foundation of the greatest Disturbances in this Province: But it is sufficient for us to say, That in Parliamentary Language on the Subject of any Money-Bill, no Clause was ever looked on as relative to his Majesty's Service, or proper for such Bill, which did not either immediately grant Money to his Majesty, or to his Use; or was an Appendix to some other Bill which had before granted Money to his Majesty: And when any Instance can be produced contrary to this Observation, we shall own our Assertion to be as improper, as your's of "your House alone" having the Right to raise Money.

The same Arguments by which you urge this Agency to be for his Majesty's Service, may prove every Suit at Law between private Persons, for the Recovery of a Debt, to be also for his Majesty's Service; and it tends to the Quietness and Satisfaction of his Subjects, perhaps in a more eminent Manner than this Agency would do: And yet it must be granted a Man would not be thought to know what he said, if he should make his Majesty's Service any Ingredient or Circumstance in the Case; and indeed your Reasoning would by a little Deduction, make his Majesty's Service concerned in almost every Affair that happened in Society.

At the same Time that we filed this Blending or Tacking two different Matters in the same Bill an unparliamentary, unjust, and violent Proceeding, we gave you our Reasons for it, and could have supported them by the concurrent Opinions of some of the greatest Men in Parliament; but you save us this trouble by a tacit Admission; for you only deny it is Tacking, or if it is, "yet it is not so Tacking in an Unparliamentary Manner." How you can prove it is not Tacking, we are still at a Loss to know, for you have not, nor can shew one Reason to support your Negative; and we must do you the Justice to believe, you did not mean we should understand you to be so much in earnest in the Denial, as to abide by it, since you took Care to couple with it a Reserve, viz. "If it is, it is not a Tacking in an Unparliamentary Manner," and