

ernor had ever pressed horses for public use without due satisfaction or had "ever by an Arbitrary and Military Power seiz'd mens Estates and Writings."³² On the same day Robert Tyler, one of the Prince Georges County justices, said to have some cognizance of the matter, was ordered to bring before the Council an inhabitant of the county who had frightened away a Piscattoway Indian by "some threatening discourses" and taken some property from him.³³

In May 1696 proclamation was made that any person willing to undertake the establishment of a bridewell or house of correction transmit their proposals in writing to the justices of the several county courts "to do therein, according to the Laws and Usual Customs of England in such case, and of this Countrey."³⁴ The *Liber* contains no indication that any proposal was made in Prince Georges County.

In October 1696 the Council proposed "that the Militia of the Province be new modelled as near as may be According to the manner of England and that every hundred be Obliged to fit a Proportionable number of men with Arms and Ammunition etc. to General Musters and Trainings and that such of his Majestys Council Justices of the Peace Militia Officers and Vestries as Inhabit in the several hundreds do meet at some set time and place therein to Consult and agree about the same and sending for Arms etc. . . ." It does not appear whether such meeting ever took place in Prince Georges County or whether the justices of the peace participated therein.³⁵

From time to time the commissioners recorded in the *Liber* various documents, some of which had been acknowledged before the court. These included bills of exchange drawn on London merchants, an obligation to pay money to orphans, an arbitration award, statements of births and deaths, a wife's acknowledgement of a conveyance of land by her husband, a deposition as to non-payment by the drawee of a "note", depositions as to land boundaries, deeds of gifts of cattle, powers of attorney, a settlement of accounts, and a memorandum of tender of monies and refusal thereof.³⁶

IX. JURISDICTION OVER COMPLAINTS BETWEEN MASTERS AND SERVANTS

As noted earlier, it was apparently common practice in the Provincial Court and county courts to hear and determine complaints of masters and servants by way of petition. However, in several instances, upon appeal or writ of error brought upon judgments rendered upon such petitions, "for want of due and formall proceedings according to the Strict Rule of Law" the judgments had been reversed. Accordingly, an act of March 1697/8 provided that it should be lawful for the Provincial Court and the several county courts to hear and determine any complaints between master and servants by way of petition and to give judgment and award execution upon such petitions. Upon any appeal or writ of error brought from any county court to the Provincial Court or from the Provincial Court to the Governor and Council, no such judgment was to be reversed for want of judicial process by reason of the fact that the matter was not tried by jury or of any matter of form either in the entry or giving of judgment, provided it appeared from the record that defendants were legally summoned and not condemned unheard. Lastly, the act provided that any matter of dispute arising between masters and

32. 23 *id.* 382-83.

33. 23 *id.* 383.

34. 20 *id.* 422.

35. 19 *id.* 451.

36. *Infra* 163, 571; 163, 163-64; 348, 519; 183; 5-6, 221; 260, 348, 376, 451-52, 553; 275, 290; 207-08; 7.