

between the people and the Proprietary as represented respectively by these two houses, which helped to prepare the minds of the former for revolution. But fortunately there have been preserved copies of three of these rejected Supply bills, and these together with the journals of the two houses and the correspondence of Governor Sharpe relating to them, bring out clearly the matters in controversy. In the case of the majority of other bills rejected at the 1762 and 1763 sessions, however, no copies have been preserved, and the journals of the two houses throw little or no direct light upon their contents. As most of them arose in the Lower House, and after passage there were promptly rejected by the upper chamber, it is safe to assume that nearly all were looked upon by the latter body as encroachments upon the Proprietary's prerogative. In a few instances, where before final rejection they were returned by the Upper House with amendments which the Lower House refused to assent to, the journals of the houses thus reveal what was the cause of their rejection. Some of these bills were recognized to be meritorious as far as their general purposes were concerned, and would have been promptly passed by both houses had not the question of the prerogative entered. The disposition of license fees and fines was often the point at issue, the Lower House bills providing that these should be used for some specified public purpose or for the general support of the Provincial government, while the Upper House claimed them for the personal use of the Proprietary. Bills that seem to have failed, or upon which action had been deferred, for this, and possibly other reasons, were: (1) An act to ease the Land Tax (pp. 154, 38); (2) an act for the advancement of justice (pp. 104, 138, 143); (3) an act to make it penal to forge or counterfeit Bills of Credit of Virginia, Pennsylvania, New York, East or West Jerseys, or the three lower counties of Delaware, called Newcastle, Kent, and Sussex (pp. 107, 126); (4) an act for the preservation of the breed of fish in the river Susquehanna (pp. 107, 145, 155, 32).

The rejection of another group of bills originating in the Lower House and turned down in the Upper seems to have been in part due to the fact that they would have extended the jurisdiction of the county courts at the expense of the provincial courts in Annapolis, a decentralization of judicial power which the Proprietary government opposed, as its influence was better assured in the courts at Annapolis, the seat of government. Such bills were probably: (1) An act for the advancement of justice (pp. 104, 138, 143); (2) an act for the trial of all matters of fact in the several counties (pp. 105, 137, 149); and (3) an act for issuing writs of replevin out of the county courts (pp. 135, 33, 34). Copies of these bills have not been preserved. In a quite different group, however, was the proposal to defer payment of allowances to the members of the Upper and Lower Houses of the Assembly (p. 392), which from its title suggests self-abnegation on the part of the Lower House, but was one really directed at the members of the Upper House, who also received pay as members of the Council and as holders of various other public offices. This had for years been a matter of controversy between the two houses and need not be again discussed here (*Arch. Md.* LVI; xxlii).