

that they were of a narrow, bigoted, and turbulent spirit. They had two chief aims in view: one to thwart the will of the Proprietary, encroach on his rights, and discredit his officers as far as possible, and the other, to render the proprietary government odious in England, that, either by revocation of the charter or without it, the Province might be taken and governed by the Crown.

Their motives are apparent in their action on the supply-bills for the prosecution of the war. While professing a dutiful readiness to raise the necessary funds, and to draw up a bill for the purpose, they invariably inserted in these bills conditions which they knew the Governor and the Upper House could not possibly accept, and when the bill was rejected they put on the airs of loyal and patriotic subjects, ready to sacrifice themselves for the general good, but prevented by the selfishness of the Proprietary and his representatives.

The chief objections to these bills were, first, that they proposed to tax the Proprietary's reserved but unoccupied lands, which yielded him no revenue, at the same rate as occupied lands.

That a tax should be laid on non-residents, and a duty on imports from England.

That non-jurors, including the Catholics, should pay a double tax.

That the Lower House alone had the right to appoint the commissioners to carry out the law and to audit claims and accounts under it, while the collection of the taxes was thrown upon the Proprietary's agents.

The Lower House, indeed, had got into their heads (as had their predecessors of 1669) that they were a House of Commons, and they did not scruple to speak of the Upper House as a useless appendage to the government.

In 1759 the Proprietary laid a copy of the proposed bill before Attorney-General Pratt, asking his opinion on it, which was given at length. The most important points were:

That the right to nominate the commissioners belonged to neither House alone, but to both Houses conjointly.

That the tax on unoccupied lands was unreasonable and should be resisted.

That the tax on non-residents was illegal, and that Parliament would never allow duties to be laid on imports, as such duties might amount to a prohibition.

That the double tax on non-jurors was not only unjust, but "a breach of faith, and tended to subvert the very foundations of the Maryland institutions."

"As to the power of the Lower House," the Attorney-General remarks, "to examine claims and accounts, the Upper House are right in making a stand to this clause in the Bill, and should take care how they admit encroachments of this kind, when they are supported by arguments drawn from the exercise of like rights in the House of Commons here. The constitutions of the two assemblies differ fundamentally