

people Two dogs to be kept Tax free," and further recites that the tax of one shilling imposed in the original act on dogs over this allowance is not large enough to prevent the "multiplicity of useless or supernumerary dogs." The act provided that heads of families if living in the country may keep two dogs tax free (but those in towns only one), and that dogs above this number are to be taxed at five shillings each, as are all dogs owned by a single individual not a freeholder; and that a freeholder who is single may keep only one dog tax free. A very interesting exception, however, is to be noted as follows: "whereas it is represented that the keeping of Fox Hounds for destroying of Foxes is usefull and Necessary—therefore they should be Allowed to be kept Tax free, Provided the Owners will keep them either Coupled or kennelled and not suffer them to go loose and at Large—unless when the Owner or some other person by his permission is hunting with them." (pp. 241-242). Was this act passed primarily to protect the hen house or for the benefit and pleasure of the foxhunting delegates?

Only one act, which was classed by the Assembly as a private law, and as such had clerks' fees imposed upon it, was that relating to the name of John Beale Bordley, as already noted.

*Bills rejected at the November–December, 1766, session.* The conflict of interests as well as honest differences of opinion between the two houses are often best revealed by the fate of bills originating in one house and rejected in the other, or by amendments made to them in the house in which they did not originate. In the Maryland Assembly nearly all, but not all, legislation had its origin in the Lower House, so rejection or amendment nearly always first occurred in the upper chamber. The usual cause for disagreement between the houses on proposed legislation was the fear on the part of the Upper House that the Lord Proprietary's prerogative was being invaded, or because the Proprietary wished to prevent the extension of the powers of the county courts at the expense of the provincial courts at Annapolis, or because the Lower House resented any amendments by the Upper House to bills carrying money appropriations, or "money bills" as they were called.

*Bills not passed.* Although at the November–December, 1766, session, twenty-seven bills actually became laws, there were seventeen bills which originated in the Lower House that failed of enactment. Three of these sought to license and regulate innkeepers and the retail selling of liquors, and the licensing of hawkers and peddlers; two bills attempted unsuccessfully either to effect the death of, or to prevent the discontinuance of, laws expiring by time limitation; four new bills generally considered desirable, but with features objectionable to one of the houses; one meritorious bill but with a gesture having political significance; and one a bill affecting conflicting local interests; six bills involved changes in legal procedure. In nearly all these instances Lower House bills were either rejected outright in the Upper House, or so amended as to make them unacceptable to the lower chamber. These various rejected bills will now be briefly noted.

An unsuccessful attempt was made to repeal in its entirety the law enacted in 1765, with the misleading title, "an act for the benefit of the poor and encouragement of industry", but which was really an act providing for the payment of