

lished under the act did not reach £40,000 by the year 1760, any deficiency was then to be met by the imposition of an additional land tax. As there was a large deficiency and this meant an increased tax burden on all landowners, the Assembly sought to take measures to avoid imposition of the additional land tax by continuing for a further period of time the imposition of the various other taxes imposed under the act, in the hope of thus wiping out or decreasing the deficiency in the sinking fund. The Lower House appointed a committee to determine the amount in the sinking fund and the additional land tax which would be required to meet the deficiency (pp. 245-247). It then passed a bill extending the period for the continued imposition of the various other taxes and duties before the onerous land tax should be imposed, which the Upper House refused to approve. A second bill with this end in view was then passed by the Lower House, which, after it was amended in the upper chamber, the Lower House refused to pass (pp. 257, 263, 214-215, 262-263, 254-256, 309-313, 220, 221). These bills are discussed in detail elsewhere in this introduction (pp. lxii-lxiii). Relief from the additional land tax was extended to landholders at the next session.

Three other bills passed by the Lower House were so amended in the Upper House that when they were returned to the lower chamber they were promptly rejected, but as copies of the bills are not recorded in the proceedings, the merits of the objections cited against them cannot now be determined. One of these bills, entitled "An Act for Reducing the Interest upon Tobacco and Money", was objected to on the grounds that the fines to be paid for its violation under the Lower House bill were to be divided between the public schools and the informer; it was so amended in the Upper House as to provide that the fines should go to the Lord Proprietary, the bill being obviously considered by the Upper House as a slap at the prerogative of the Proprietary (pp. 306-307, 313-314, 218-219). Other bills passed by the Lower House and rejected in the upper chamber, were opposed because they were thought to weaken the Proprietary's prerogative or to lessen the authority of the provincial or county courts. Two such were bills "for the trial of all matters of fact in the several counties" (pp. 237-240), and "for the speedy recovery of small debts out of court before one justice" (p. 218).

Among the many petitions presented at this session were four which concern parochial or church affairs. The vestry of Port Tobacco Parish, Charles County, requested the passage of a bill which would validate the proceedings of an irregular vestry meeting held on Easter Monday in 1759 for the election of a new vestry (pp. 208, 210-211). From the preamble of the act which was passed it is revealed that "last Easter-Monday happening to be an excessive Rainy Day, it prevented a sufficient Number of the Vestrymen of the said Parish from meeting to proceed to the Election of Vestrymen and Churchwardens, by which Means the Parish aforesaid hath not been since fully Represented". The act validated any actions that might have been taken by the hold-over vestry, such as taxing bachelors, choosing tobacco warehouse inspectors, and the election of vestrymen and churchwardens (pp. 208, 323-325). Several of the inhabitants of Prince George's Parish, Frederick County, petitioned the