

these Lights ; and if material and applicable to the present Bill, Why should we not adhere to them ? Will the Length of Time, since the Lower House was acquainted with them, lessen their Force ? Or will not rather that Length of Time, and the repeated Disregard to them, render the obstinate Adherence of the Lower House to the same faulty Plan, the more inexcusable ? But you tell us, we might have observed that in the forming this Bill, the Foundations for *many* of those Objections were removed : Tho' we have bestowed our best Attention upon this Bill, we could not observe from it that the Foundations for *many* of those Objections were removed : We observe, indeed, that *some few*, and those only of the least Importance, are obviated ; but by much the greater Part, both in Number and Importance, still remain, and particularly all those Parts of the Bill calculated to introduce an unconstitutional Influence, remain untouched : Why were not these Parts of the Bill altered conformable to the Objections, that, by your affording one Proof of a real Concern for his Majesty's Service, we might have had an Opportunity of coming to an Agreement with you on that Occasion ? In a Word, *Gentlemen*, we shall adhere to our Objections, nor may you ever expect our Assent to any Bill, whatever may be the Occasion, to which they are applicable ; for " we are satisfied " that nothing is so likely to preserve the Tranquility of the Province, as the maintaining with a strict and " steady Hand, the necessary Powers and just Prerogatives of the Crown, and the preferring an uniform " and settled Principle of Government, to an occasional Departure from it for temporary Convenience ; " every Day's Experience convinces us, that it is in vain to negotiate away his Majesty's Prerogative, every " new Concession becoming the Foundation of some new Demand, and That, of some new Dispute."

Your " maxim in Politics, almost universally adopted, that the Representative is justified by the Instructions of his Constituent, in acting even against his own Judgment," we neither understand, nor see any present Use of : Would you insinuate that the Conduct of the Lower Houses, relative to his Majesty's Service, has been agreeable to the Instructions of your Constituents, and by thus excusing yourselves, leave them accountable for your extraordinary Conduct ? We know that the Inhabitants of this Province in general, are an honest well-meaning People, as Loyal Subjects as any in his Majesty's Dominions, and endued with a Spirit conducive to his Majesty's Service, to the utmost of their Abilities ; but we are sorry to say at the same Time, they are not exempt from Imposition, and whether the Conduct of former Lower Houses, and the other Branches of the Legislature, may not have been misrepresented to them by such as may have thought the People's seeming Concurrence a necessary Countenance to their own ambitious Schemes, we shall not at present determine ; but to us it seems extremely natural, that the People upon the breaking up of a long Session, without any Thing done for his Majesty's Service, tho' with a very heavy Charge to themselves, should enquire into the Occasion of these frequent Disappointments ; and it is as probable, they may be told of the just and equal Methods proposed by the Lower House to raise Supplies, the Title of the Bill, which is called an *Equal Assessment*, may be cited as an Authority to this Purpose, and if necessary to proceed further, the Substance thereof may be represented in such Manner as may best suit the then present Purpose, concluding, that in short the Bill is in itself highly just and reasonable, but that the Upper House will not pass it, for no other Reason than because it contains a Tax upon the Proprietary Estate, and the great Offices of the Government ; and as probably they may not see the Propriety of leaving these Objects untaxed, they no Doubt will conclude their Delegates are right in persisting that these shall come in as well as the Rest ; nor can it be a Matter of Surprize that the People imposed upon by such Arts as these, should, in some Instances, be induced to give such Instructions to their Delegates as you allude to ; however, that this is far from being generally the Case, is evident, from the constant and almost equal Opposition, the Proposal of this Plan has of late met with in the Lower House : But whatever Measures some Members of that House may have thought fit to take, to impose upon the Credulity of their Constituents, we could not have conceived you would have given us so flagrant a Proof of such Practices, as to assert this Matter to Ourselves ; and yet you are pleased to entertain Hopes that we might be more at large than heretofore with Respect to the Tax upon the Proprietary Estate, and the great Offices of the Government, which you take to have been our real Objections to the Supply Bill in 1758, to cover which, most of the others were only thrown in as a Barrier ; these are your Words : Why did not you, *Gentlemen*, inform us what Foundation you have for this indecent and untrue Suggestion ? What Authority have you for insinuating, that this House ever was under any Restraint with Regard to either of those Points ? Or, what Reason have you to hope we are now more at large in Respect to them than heretofore ? If you have no Foundation for this Behaviour, what Regard will any Thing you say deserve ? You tell us, you take the Tax upon the Proprietary Estate, and the Great Offices of the Government, to have been our real Objections to the Supply Bill in 1758, and ought to have shewn us where we made these Objections ; but if you cannot do this, what must the World think, not only of your Insinuations, but your express Allegations ? Your having Recourse to those Objections in 1758, will not serve your Purpose, for you will there find no Objections to either of those Particulars being *at all* taxed, as you would have it understood, but only to the Manner, and the Quantity, the