

indirect means, to deprive the purchaser of his property rights in his servant. The Lower House subsequently sought to accomplish the same end by providing for the sale out of the province of servants committed to jail as persons of ill repute, and for whom no one would give security, with the ultimate aim, apparently, of having many convict servants so adjudged, committed and disposed of. This measure was opposed by the Upper House and failed of adoption.

Efforts made to enact laws for improving the quality of tobacco failed through differences between the two houses of Assembly, though all admitted the urgent need of a remedy for the existing conditions. Governor Calvert, who had sought to secure concert of action with Virginia (where legislation upon the subject also failed), wrote to the Governor of that colony in July, 1726, after the adjournment of the Assembly which had been convened specially to deal with the subject, that there had been nothing done; though all agreed as to the necessity, there were diversities of opinion as to the means, and none would yield to the opinion of others (*Archives*, XXV, 458).

In the renewed debates about the fees allowed to public officers, the Lower House proposed to reduce them to one-half the existing rates; and over the allowances claimed by the members of the Upper House, and formerly made to them, for their services as members of the Council out of Assembly time, the dispute was bitter, the tone of the Lower House being especially truculent. And the bitterness extended to the debates relating to the disposition of servants committed to jail as persons of ill repute. The Upper House consisted of the Council appointed by the Proprietary, and its members were characterized by the Lower House as instruments of the prerogative, while its own members, it was pointed out, were the representatives of the people and defenders of their liberties.

The antagonism that was fomented between the two houses may be reasonably imputed to the influence of Thomas Bordley, a man of overbearing temper, who after holding several minor public offices, including that of clerk of the Provincial Court, was made a member of the Council. Shortly after the session of Assembly in August, 1721, the Governor dismissed him from the Council for giving what the Governor deemed pernicious advice, deliberately designed, if followed, to cause dissension between himself and the people of the province. This dismissal deprived Bordley of his seat in the Upper House. In the ensuing year, 1722, he was elected as a delegate to the Lower House, where he at once became a dominating factor. He was a member of