

adopted a series of resolves as to the scope of the bill, which were almost identical with those adopted at recent previous sessions, except that there was a sharp reduction in the number of men to be levied, and the amount to be raised was almost halved. The bounty money offered for enlistment was also lowered from £12 to £6, doubtless because the prospect of fighting was greatly lessened by the recent successes of the British arms on the Ohio and in Canada (pp. 233-234, 364-365). At the same time, by a vote of 19 to 13, the House deliberately destroyed all hope of the passage of any act to make effective its resolves by adopting a motion, of course unanimously opposed by members of the Proprietary party, that the required funds be raised by the already five times rejected method of an assessment on all estates and an income tax on those who enjoyed lucrative offices and employments (pp. 365-366). A committee headed by Edward Tilghman, with Matthew Tilghman, Carroll, Murdock, and Hanson as members, were directed to bring in a Supply bill for raising the necessary funds; and another committee headed by Michael Earle of Cecil, with Gassoway, and Hanson as members, was directed to bring in estimates of the amounts required to comply with the several resolves (p. 366). The latter committee reported, with detailed estimates, that these resolves called for an expenditure of £27,523—10—0, of which £4,373—10—0 was needed for enlisting, paying, and clothing two hundred men for six months; and £23,150 for repaying the advances made by Forbes, for the costs of winter quartering the soldiers in Annapolis and in Kent and Cecil counties in 1756 and 1757, for the expenses of the "volunteers" (militia) sent by the Governor to guard the frontiers, and for building a new road from Fort Frederick to Fort Cumberland (pp. 368-369). The house thereupon fixed the total amount to be raised under the proposed Supply or Assessment bill at £32,000 and the number of men at two hundred (p. 370). When the bill was introduced it was amended in the house by a vote of 23 to 10 to read that no import taxes to be imposed under it on goods should be construed to extend to those imported from Great Britain (p. 377). British goods were doubtless exempted because of the warning contained in the opinion of the King's Attorney-General Charles Pratt, that such levies would not be tolerated by the home government (pp. 203-204). Thus amended it was passed on October 11 by the small vote of 20 to 13, and sent to the Upper House (pp. 377-378). That only 33, out of a total membership of 58, are recorded as voting indicates that nearly half the members had returned to their homes. In the upper chamber it was immediately rejected after a first reading (p. 346). Thus for the seventh time the Assessment bill failed of passage. No messages passed between the two houses in regard to the causes for its rejection. No copy of this bill is known to exist, but it was unquestionably identical as to the methods of taxation employed with the Supply bill rejected at the last session and printed in full in the journal of the Lower House (pp. 263-306).

At the *April-May 1761 session* of the Assembly, which was the sixth and last sitting of the Assembly that had been elected in September, 1758, the Lower House went through exactly the same farcical proceedings that had been