

to the rights and powers of the British House of Commons was so unbecoming to a body representing the people of Maryland that no attention would have been paid to it, "but for the Salutary Motive of Obviating those groundless pretensions". The Upper House doubted "the Reality of your Concern over our action in rejecting the bill for raising supplies for His Majesty's Service" because hopes of agreement between the two houses were thus shattered, as "there is not the Least Evidence from your Conduct of a Real Concern to raise Supplies for his Majesty's Service". The objections of the Upper House to the bill were then discussed. It declared that the principal objections to the bill were that it was based on taxes derived from a general assessment upon incomes from real and personal estates and from profits, salaries, and earnings. The Upper House asked why the lower chamber insisted upon adopting an untried and intricate system of taxation, when a familiar one to which the people were accustomed could be used. The assertion of the Lower House that the plan had been successfully employed elsewhere was untrue. The upper chamber declared that the system was "totally new . . . tho you are pleased to assert that plans of this sort have not only been thought practicable but found by long Experience Eligible in our Mother Country and most of the Neighboring Colonies. We must take the liberty to deny that there is to our knowledge or belief any such law Subsisting in either One or the other unless where the Constitution of Government may happen to be such as you would willingly reduce this to, and even in such a Constitution if such can be found, no such Bill as yours has Existed and been found by long Experience to be Eligible, the Invention is Entirely your Own, and however desirous you may pretend to be that we would only give the people of this Province an Opportunity of making an Experiment of it we must begg to be Excused". The Upper House also denied the assertion of the lower chamber that many of its objections to the first Supply or Assessment bill of 1758 had since been removed, as it still found most of the material objections, especially the constitutional ones, were retained in the present bill. After eight previous rejections why did the house think that a different fate awaited its ninth attempt? It had tried to make the people believe that the bill was really opposed by the Upper House because it taxed the estate of the Lord Proprietary and the great officers of the government, and it had sought to mislead the people by referring to the bill as "an equal assessment" upon all. In saying this the Lower House had no regard for truth or decency, for it knew that the objection of the Upper House was not to the principle of the bill taxing the Proprietary, but to its manner of doing this and the disproportionate quantum of taxes imposed upon him; and it also resented as untrue the statement that all its other objections were merely "thrown in as a barrier" to prevent the imposition of a tax upon the Proprietary. The Upper House did not understand or recognize as true the dictum of the Lower House that it was a "maxim in Politicks almost universally adopted that the Representatives [in the Assembly] are Justified by the Instructions of his Constituents". The Lower House had said that it did not have time now to look into some of the matters in dispute, but if it would consult its constituents, the journals of the Assembly, the law books,