

and the people over these licenses had now been going on for nearly three-quarters of a century. It is to be noted that in the following year, 1766, Frederick, on the advice of Daniel Dulany, was finally obliged on legal grounds to relinquish his claims to the license fees. (C) Another instruction, also dated January 16, 1765, notified Sharpe of the Proprietary's formal assent to various laws, sixty-six in number, which had been passed, and approved by the Governor, at the March-April, 1762, and October-November, 1763, sessions (pp. 360-361). It will be noted that since the 1762 session nearly three years had elapsed, and that the acts then passed had been in force during all this period, although the formal assent of the Proprietary was required to put the final legal stamp of approval upon them. (D) A fourth instruction, of the same date as the above three, directed Sharpe to appoint James Hollyday to the place on the Council made vacant by the death of Philip Key (pp. 361-362). It is to be noted that Hollyday refused the appointment, preferring to remain in the Lower House. (E) The fifth instruction, dated February 14, 1765, directed Sharpe to appoint Colonel Henry Hooper, Speaker of the Lower House, to the place on the Council made vacant by the death of Stephen Bordley; and to appoint Charles Goldsborough, a member of the Council, to the office of Commissary-General or judge of the Probate Court, which had also been made vacant by Bordley's death. Frederick also formally confirmed all church benefices, provincial preferments and offices which had been filled by his uncle, Cecilius Calvert, during the former's absence from England (pp. 362-363).

III. *Letter of Cecilius Calvert.* This letter of Cecilius Calvert to his nephew, Frederick, Lord Baltimore, dated London, March 28th, 1764, which is printed in the Appendix (pp. 363-366), is written in such a jerky style and with so many abbreviations, as to suggest that it is a rough abstract rather than the letter actually sent to the Lord Proprietary. The writer heaps contempt upon the "sophistical upstart" who wrote the "Queries"; lauds Sharpe and the Upper House; denies that the Upper House refused to pass a law providing for the support of a Provincial Agent in Great Britain, saying that it was willing to make provision for such an Agent, if both houses made the appointment and had joint authority over the expenditure of the monies appropriated. The letter is incomplete, breaking off in the middle of a sentence.

IV. *Pamphlet and newspaper controversy.* Maryland politics were injected into a wordy war of newspaper writers and pamphleteers in the 1763-1765 period. In the London *Public Ledger* for November 17, 1763, an anonymous writer, hostile to the Proprietary government of Maryland, inserted a series of sixteen "Queries", so framed as to show: that the Upper House of the Assembly, composed as it was of the members of the Council, was the mere creature of the Proprietary, and like the Governor was entirely subservient to his will; that the most lucrative Provincial offices, civil and judicial, were held by its members; that the entire judiciary, including the Chancellor, who was the Governor, was under proprietary control; and that it was this Proprietary influence which had blocked the appointment of an Agent in England to represent the people of Maryland before the Crown in their disputes with