

Lower House to alter their Mode of Taxation, to which I answer——

First, That notwithstanding all the Affeversions which have been published to the contrary, it appears most clearly, from the Opinions of the Attorney General, laid before the Lower House, that he did not give them upon a View of the Bill and Messages between the two Houses, but upon a *Case stated*, because he expressly refers to such a *Case* *.

Now as the Opinions were sent down by the Governor to the Lower House, it follows that the *Case*, on which those Opinions were founded, must have been stated by the Proprietor's Adherents, and consequently in a Manner to countenance, as much as possible, the Claims of his Lordship.

It is well known, that very minute Differences, in two *Cases* relative to the same Matter, may produce Opinions totally repugnant, and yet both right. With little Reason then can it be alledged, that an Opinion thus procured ought to have any Weight in influencing the Lower House to depart one Tittle from what they had before asserted. If indeed the Government and the Lower House had concurred in stating a *Case*, and submitting all controverted Points to the Determination of the Attorney General, it might have been contended, with some Reason, that his Opinion ought to be decisive. But would any Man of

B 3

common

* *Attorney General's Opinion*: "Having given my Sense upon each of the Objections, so far as they have been taken up and maintained by the Upper House, in the Margin of this Part of the *Case*, I shall only add here," &c.