

was under consideration, except when a motion was made in the Lower House that an alteration be made in the oath to be taken by Papists and non-jurors provided in the bill, almost all the Proprietary delegates voted to do away with these restrictive oaths (pp. 111-112). It is also to be noted that the 1762 Supply bill, like its predecessors, imposed a double land tax on all Roman Catholics (pp. 553, 559, 561). There is also good reason to believe that a bill, no copy of which has been preserved, with the innocuous title "an act for the security of the public records and papers", passed by the Lower House at the 1762 session, but allowed to die in the Upper House, was an anti-Catholic measure (pp. 154, 38), because at the 1763 session the title of a bill openly directed against Catholic clerks in public offices, recited that its purpose was "for the better securing of the public records" (pp. 320, 362, 374, 389-390).

The injustices suffered by alien, or unnaturalized landholders, especially if they were Roman Catholics, have already been discussed by the editor in a preceding volume of the *Archives*. It will be recalled that at the March-April, 1761, session, the Upper House had thought to ameliorate the plight of Catholic landholders by passing a naturalization bill to quiet the titles of alien landholders, Protestant and Catholic, by granting naturalization to those who took the prescribed oaths of abjuration and the declaration of fidelity to the Protestant Hanoverian line. But the bill was amended in the Lower House to apply only to Protestant landholders. The Upper House refused to accept this amendment, and the bill failed of passage (*Arch. Md.* LVI; lxiii-lxvi). At the 1763 session a bill was passed in the Lower House "for the security of purchasers and others being Protestant claiming by or from Aliens". The title indicates that it discriminated against Catholics, but as no copy of it is now known to exist, the extent of this discrimination can only be guessed at. It was rejected by the Upper House which did not state its reasons for so doing (pp. 304, 305, 354, 248, 259, 375).

Another Lower House bill, probably sponsored by Colonel Edward Tilghman, "to oblige persons who officiate as clerks or writers in the public offices to take the oaths to the government, and for the better securing of the public records", was apparently aimed at Roman Catholics serving as clerks in these offices. The laws of both Maryland and Great Britain forbade Catholics from holding public office, but this bill was obviously aimed to get rid of suspected Catholics in clerical positions, as no conscientious Catholic would be willing to take oaths which denied the spiritual authority of the Pope and belief in the transubstantiation of the sacrament. Again without assigning any reason for so doing, the Upper House promptly rejected this bill (pp. 320, 362, 374, 389-390). Another anti-Catholic bill, also sponsored by Colonel Tilghman, met the same fate in the Upper House as did his bill directed against clerks in public offices suspected of Catholicism. This was the Lower House bill, passed November 19, 1763, "for preventing the importation of German and French papists and popish priests and Jesuits into this Province by way of Pennsylvania or . . . Delaware". This bill was also rejected by the Upper House without explanation, although there may have been other features of the bill directed at the prerogative of the Proprietary, which played a part in its rejection (pp. 321, 370, 382, 389).