

tapany. In short order the remainder of the province was brought under submission and government by a Protestant Association was established. ⁴ The causes of the Maryland revolution of 1689 have been the subject of much scholarly debate but it would appear that foremost among the causes for discontent were the unreasonable exercise of the proprietor's veto power; the uncertain status of many of the provincial laws; the illegal raising of taxes and imposition of fines by the proprietor; the exaction of excessive fees by proprietary officers; the corruption, or at least maladministration, of the judicial system; the favoritism towards Catholics as evidenced through land grants, office holding and special legal protection; the seizure of goods under false pretenses; and the exaction of sterling instead of tobacco for the payment of rents. ⁵

With control of the colony secured, representatives of the Protestant Association petitioned that their religion, rights and liberties be safeguarded under a Protestant government—in effect that the crown accept Maryland as a royal province. The Committee for Trade and Plantations in London, consistent with its general attitude toward the chartered colonies, welcomed the opportunity to bring Maryland into closer dependence on the crown and sought to maintain the status quo in the province while obtaining legal advice in the matter. ⁶ In June 1690, Chief Justice Holt of King's Bench, in what has been termed a "shuffling and ignoble" opinion, advised that "it being a case of necessity", the King, by his commission, might constitute a governor for the province whose authority would be legal, although he would be responsible to Lord Baltimore for the profits. ⁷ Although hearings were held before the Lords of Trade on charges against Lord Baltimore and the Attorney General was directed to proceed by *scire facias* against the Maryland charter in August 1690, such proceeding was never carried forward and after an opinion had been received from the Attorney General of the same tenor as that rendered by Holt, C. J., the Privy Council in January 1690/91 directed that a royal commission for Lionel Copley as governor be drawn up. However, this commission did not pass the Great Seal until June 27, 1691 and for various reasons Copley's departure from England was delayed; he did not meet with his Council in Maryland until April 1692. ⁸ Lord Baltimore still retained proprietary rights to the soil and certain fiscal rights; this led Copley to remark, after a few months in the province, that there never would be peace and quiet until the proprietary interest was redeemed by the crown. ⁹ Whether Lord Baltimore would have retained his charter rights if royal hostility to the chartered colonies had not been aided by

4. Steiner, *op. cit. supra*, 298–99, 304–09; 3 Osgood, *op. cit. supra*, 495–500; 8 *MA* 115–18, 225–28; 20 *id.* 142–145. For some discussion of the leaders of the revolt see Kammen, *op. cit. supra*, 319–30.

5. The first extended discussion of the causes of the revolution of 1689 appeared in Sparks, *Causes of the Maryland Revolution of 1689*, JHUS, 14th Ser., XI–XII (1896); it was critical of the earlier views of McMahon and hostile to the proprietary. Steiner in his monograph (*supra note 2*) takes a more favorable view of Charles Calvert and a hard look at some of the leaders of the revolt. The most recent extended discussion of the causes is by Kammen (*supra note 1*). Some contemporary justifications for the revolt appear in *The Declaration of the Reasons and Motives for the Present Appearing in Arms of their Majesties Protestant Subjects in the Province of Maryland* (1689), in *Narratives of the Insurrections, 1675–1690* (Original Narratives of Early American History, ed. C. M. Andrews, 1915) 305–14; 8 *MA* 101–07, 215–20. For a narrative stressing the maladministration of justice and the corruption of the legal system see "Maryland's Grievances Why They Have Taken Up Arms" (ed. McAnear), 8 *J. So. Hist.* 392 (1942). See also Wroth, *The First Sixty Years of the Church of England in Maryland, 1632–1692*, 11 *MHM* 1, 29–34 (1916).

6. Steiner, *op. cit. supra*, 309–10; *CSP, Col.*, 1689–92, Nos. 315, 405–06.

7. Steiner, *op. cit. supra*, 336–37; *CSP, Col.*, 1689–92, No. 923; 8 *MA* 185–86.

8. Steiner, *op. cit. supra*, 312, 322, 337–45; *CSP, Col.*, 1689–92, Nos. 693, 1026, 1098; 8 *MA* 200–04, 207, 211–12, 214–15, 229–31, 232–33, 240–41, 263–70.

9. *CSP, Col.*, 1689–92, No. 2472; 8 *MA* 234–36.