

tax the colonies, and it seems likely that a duty on manufactured goods may have then been under consideration as a possible source of revenue. The Lower House, in its reply, dated December 6th, said that as his Excellency was aware, there was nothing that deserved the name of manufactory in Maryland, the inhabitants "from the first to the lowest Rank, are generally clothed in British Manufactures", although several families "make some of the coarse Cloathing"; and that there was a "small Bounty lately paid by the County Court on a few Pieces of Linen." It added that more cannot be imported than can be paid for by our own exports, and that the burden on Tobacco is such and the profit to the planter so small, that together with the increase of the price of imports and the decline in their quality, it will soon be necessary for the inhabitants to clothe themselves (p. 213).

*Bounties on linen.* The reference in the Lower House message to the bounties paid on linen was to the act of 1765. An unsuccessful attempt was made to repeal this law, which had obviously soon become an unpopular one, under which bounties were offered for linen manufactured in private homes. This act had been passed at the November–December, 1765, session with the misleading title, "An Act for the Benefit of the Poor and Encouragement of Industry" (*Arch. Md. LIX*; xxxii-xxxiii, 267-269). A bill to repeal the act, introduced with the approval of the Lower House by William Allen of Worcester County, failed of passage in this house (pp. 142, 179). Immediately thereafter Allen brought in another bill repealing the act as far as it applied to Dorchester, Somerset, Calvert and Worcester Counties, which was promptly passed and sent to the Upper House where it was as promptly rejected (pp. 179, 180, 110). The Upper chamber may have felt that the attempt to encourage linen manufacture had not been given a sufficient trial. Originally passed in 1765 with a time limitation of five years, the law was not extended, when in 1770 it expired.

*Trustees in London.* Among the last addresses of the Assembly to the Governor was a joint address of both houses, and sent with it was a joint address to the Lord Proprietary, requesting him to appoint and supervise trustees in London, who should receive and invest the dividends from the Bank of England stock belonging to the Province, and also to exercise certain other trusts in England under the law just passed for the payment of the public debt, and for emitting bills of credit for this purpose (pp. 218-219). When the Upper House had first suggested to the lower chamber that the two houses should jointly, out of respect to the Lord Proprietary, ask him to undertake these supervisory duties, the Lower House felt that such a formal request was unnecessary, as the Proprietary had exercised this supervision under the former paper currency, or bills of credit, act, and that the new act merely implied a continuance of this trust; but it expressed a willingness to join in the request if the Upper House would prepare the address (p. 215). The last message of the session was that of Governor Sharpe to the two houses, proroguing the Assembly.

*Legislation.* Fifteen of the twenty-seven acts passed at the November–December, 1766, session, were new laws, the remainder being either continu-