

Richard Lee, Esq; from the Upper House, delivers to Mr. Speaker, the following Message, viz.

By the UPPER HOUSE of ASSEMBLY, 26th November, 1763.

GENTLEMEN,

WE did not mean to give you any Offence by the Message you have been pleased to chuse for the Subject of your Animadversions, nor can we, on the strictest Review, discover in it any just Provocation for all that Asperity of Language, and Acrimony of Resentment, of which it seems to have been the unfortunate Occasion.

The Practice of retaining Bills sent to this House, is founded upon numerous Precedents, as these were upon Reason. When a Measure is proposed, are we to be compelled, at all Events, either to give an Assent, or Dissent to it, when we have not sufficient Time to deliberate and determine upon the Propriety or Impropriety of it? Is it not reasonable to make a Reference to a future Session, that there may be a competent Interval for Consideration, when the Intricacy and Importance of the Subject, or the extensive Influence of a Determination, may require it?

But the Bill, it seems, is, in your Opinion, as simple and plain, as the Object of it is useful and necessary.

Although it shou'd appear by your Votes and Proceedings, that a very great Majority, or even every Member of your House may be of that Opinion, must it therefore be a Matter of such absolute Certainty, as to exclude all possibility of any real Diversity of Sentiment among other People? If not, why shou'd our Hesitation provoke so great Resentment.

You are pleased to observe, that you did not, in your Message of the 22d Instant, desire us to come to any Determination upon the Bill, but that it might be returned to you with such Propositions for Amendments as we might think Expedient; but surely, if you will stop one Moment to Consider, you can't fail to discover, that we could not make any Propositions for Amendments till we had first determined what was proper to be rejected, and what fit to be adopted, or in other Words, till we could come to a full and comprehensive Determination upon the Plan of the Bill, and every Part of the Execution of it; To do this we told you, we had not Time, especially as several of our Members were, by Sickness, rendered unable to attend the Business of the House.

You Expressly said in one of your Messages, that the Bill was plain and simple, and we inferred it to be your Opinion that it was perfect too, because we presumed, that you would not otherwise have offered it for our Concurrence, as, without such an Opinion, it would have been a strange Piece of Conduct to desire it might have the Force of a Law; perhaps you imagined that we meant this Passage of our Message as a Citation from yours, and that we had foisted in *perfect* where it was not to be found, but a review of our Message will evince your Mistake, and acquit us of Misrepresentation; unless we misrepresent you by expressing ourselves in such a Manner, as implies an Opinion that you do your Duty.

We are persuaded that our Conduct in retaining the Bill, is strictly defensible upon the Authority of the most reasonable Precedents, and though it is not without some Concern, that we observe the querulous Disposition it has excited, yet we must take the Liberty at the same Time to intimate, that the Privilege we have asserted (which you hardly attempt to impugn by your last Message, though you signify some Dislike of it) we shall at all Times for the future exercise, when we shall think it expedient, without being deterred by the Apprehension of injurious Imputations, and groundless Reproaches.

Our Right being settled, the Indignity offered in proposing that a Copy of the Bill be delivered by our Clerk to yours for its Publication, will appear to be no more than uncovering and obviating your Pretence, and vindicating and preserving our Right.

Signed per Order,

J. Ross, Cl. Up. Ho.

John Ridout, Esq; from the Upper House delivers to Mr. Speaker the following Message, viz.

By the UPPER HOUSE of ASSEMBLY, 26th November, 1763.

GENTLEMEN,

HAVING for Reasons already communicated to you, and which we apprehend will sufficiently justify that Part of our Conduct, rejected the Bill you had thought fit to frame, for paying the Militia, and some other Public Claimants, common Justice to such Claimants made us recommend it to you, to replace in the Journal their several Accounts, or Allowances, in order that they may not be in a worse State than other Public Creditors; for had the Two Houses agreed to pass the Journal, and thereupon a Levy Bill in the usual Form had been Enacted into a Law, such Militia, and other Creditors, instead of having a Preference, would otherwise have had ample Reason to complain of the greatest Partiality and Injustice. If you are for your Parts of Opinion that it would be mispending Time at present to make such Additions to the Journal as we recommended, we do not blame you for declining it, nor would we advise you to make them at any future Session, unless you shall, at the same Time, resolve to make Mr. Ross the usual Allowance for his Services as Clerk of the Council, since it is the determined Resolution of this House, never to pass any Journal without it. The Omission of a single Claim so just as this, established on the most reasonable Grounds, and constantly allowed, ever since the Revolution at least, and we believe