

prerogative of the Proprietary; (3) that the imposition of an additional duty on English indentured servants would impede the settlement of the Province; (4) that an additional restrictive duty on convicts would bring the Province into conflict with the English government. The Lower House replied that these objections to the bill were unwarranted. It declared that the addition to the paper currency issue was too small to have any effect, that the sinking fund requirements of certain existing issues would in a short time more than neutralize this issue, and that the additional duties on imported servants and convicts were too small to have the consequences alleged.

Of the other provisions of the bill we are ignorant, as it is not printed in the *Votes and Proceedings* of the March session, but it was probably similar to the bill passed by the Lower House at its next session in July, which was also destined to be rejected by the Upper House. In the July bill, in addition to the items objected to by the Upper House in the March bill, we find wheel carriages taxed and import duties imposed on spirits, wines, sugar, and molasses, additions which the Upper House does not appear to have questioned.

The crux of the controversy was the question of licence fees from ordinaries; these, under the bill, were to be applied to the sinking fund to secure the bills of credit or currency to be issued to defray the military expenditures. There can be no question that the other objections to the bill would have been easily settled, as they seemed to have been forgotten in the acrimonious dispute about the ordinary licences which now developed between the two houses, as disclosed by the numerous messages on the subject which passed between them, and to which reference has already been made.

It is difficult to apportion the blame of the failure of the Assembly, at this and the next session, to agree upon a plan to raise funds for military operations on the frontier. The Lower House was stubborn in its determination to continue to use the licence fees from ordinaries for this purpose, and as a matter of principle refused to eliminate this item from its bill. The Upper House, acting under orders from the Proprietary to the Governor, refused to accept it. The responsibility for its rejection while apparently upon the shoulders of the Governor and Council, should really be placed upon Frederick, the Lord Proprietary and non-resident landlord, whose only interest in Maryland was as a source of revenue for his private purse. That both the disputants should be so blind to the danger that threatened the Province at this crisis seems extraordinary, for in less than four months General Braddock was to march through the Province against the French and to meet a humiliating defeat, exposing the people of Maryland to grave peril. That the eyes of the Lower House were closed to the great danger, is shown by its declaration that Maryland was less concerned with