

similar tax imposed by Parliament a few years later resulted in an insurrection in the Province. Under the bill as originally introduced there was included a tax of five shillings on each marriage licence issued, but by a vote of 28 to 19 this provision was struck from the bill. The Lower House later substituted a tax on bachelors rated according to their wealth. The land tax was fixed at one shilling for every hundred acres, with a super-tax of one shilling in the case of Papists; these taxes were, of course, in addition to the regular quit-rents payable to the Lord Proprietary. It is to be noted that the Lower House backed down on its insistence to levy a tax on ordinaries, which had been the cause of a deadlock between the two houses in previous sessions, but included other explosives in the bill, which reached the Upper House on April 8th and was returned to the Lower House on April 15th with a message pointing to more than a dozen of its provisions which were objected to, and adding that there were still other items which it might later question.

In all, eighteen messages, usually acrimonious, passed between the two houses on the subject of this supply bill, and a conference had to be held before one was finally agreed upon and passed on May 14th. With all the steps in this dispute we cannot concern ourselves here. The Lower House insisted that the regular parliamentary practice should be followed and *all* the objections of the other house made at the outset, for otherwise it feared that after relinquishing with reluctance certain of its undoubted rights, demands to give up others might then be made. The Upper House resented this intimation that its action was a ruse to involve the other house in a succession of concessions by bringing up new objections as soon as one set had been disposed of, and on April 19th returned the bill with its negative. The Lower House then seems to have made certain trivial changes in the bill, the nature of which are not disclosed, and to have passed it again on April 23d and sent it back as a new bill, with a message repeating the reasons for so doing given in a former message, and indulging in a lengthy quibble as to the use of the word "some," instead of "all" as applied to the objections which the Upper House might see fit to bring forward against items obnoxious to that body. The Upper House promptly returned this second bill with a negative, saying that few of its objectionable features had been removed, although a new and equally objectionable one, vesting extraordinary powers in a committee to be created to fix the land tax, had been added, and reminded the Lower House that the Upper House had as much right to pass upon the various items of a supply bill as the Lower House had to propose one.

Further changes were made in the once more rejected bill by the Lower House, and it was passed on April 28th and again sent up as a new bill. The Upper House rejected this on the grounds that it was substantially the same