are some of our objections to the bill we have rejected, and which, cannot in any way, be so effectually obviated as by assessing a certain fixed sum upon these several offices, graduated according to the nett income which they may be supposed to yield.

That each should be required to contribute according to his *nett* income seems to us a proposition so obviously just, that we can scarcely see the possibility of adopting any other standard that would operate impartially; and this can only be done either by the mode we have suggested, or by imposing on such *nett* income a certain per centum, leaving the amount to be raised by it indefinite; to the latter of these modes as well as to the bill we have rejected, there are obvious objections, considering it merely in the light of a revenue measure, which it is not necessary here to recapitulate. It may be sufficient to refer to past experience on the subject which will teach us how little in the way of revenue is to be expected from the plan proposed or any other by means of a per centum on the amount of receipts.

In 1823 the Legislature, by an act passed at December session in that year, required these same officers to pay into the State Treasury 25 per cent. upon the gross amount of receipts after deducting therefrom $1500, and guarded it by every necessary provision apparently calculated to secure its object; the law remained in force for three years and until repealed by the act of December session 1826, and yet during these three years, sufficient as we should suppose, to test the wisdom of the scheme, the whole amount paid by all these officers into the State Treasury for the entire three years amounted to but the sum of $6,779.98, less by upwards of $800 in the aggregate than we should *every year* receive under the plan which we have herein the honor to submit.

For the accuracy of the above statement we beg leave to refer to the Treasurer's Reports to the Legislature during the sessions of 1824, 1825 and 1826 found upon pages 29, 39 and 282 of the House Journal of those years respectively.

We therefore again, in conclusion, beg leave to repeat our conviction that an annual tax of a certain specific sum to be assessed upon these several officers, and graduated according to the value of each, is the only practicable plan of raising a revenue from such a source. It avoids all the objections to which every other scheme suggested is principally obnoxious, and whilst it takes in the same proportion from all, it is itself fixed and certain, dependent upon no contingencies, liable to no evasion, and avoiding the objection to which most of our revenue measures are necessarily subject, it enables us to calculate in advance upon the exact amount which it is certain, annually to yield. By comparing the several amounts we have suggested as a proper levy upon these several officers, (and which will be found in a schedule accompanying this,) with their nett revenues respectively, according to their reports to the Legislature, and varied only in some cases by other data before us, it will be found that the tax we propose to lay amounts to upwards of ten per cent. upon their several nett incomes; which, added to the two