

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

First, That notwithstanding all the Affe-
rations 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 Adhe-
rents, and consequently in a Manner to counte-
nance, 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 con-
tended, 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 main-
tained by the Upper House, in the Margin of that Part of the
Case, I shall only add here," &c.