

be restored to his practice as an attorney, affirming that he had never acted through the affair "Contrary to the known and Common practice of this Province in Such like matters." His application opportunely following closely upon the conclusion of peace with France, he was restored and admitted to practice as an attorney as formerly.<sup>26</sup>

This was not, however, the end of *l'affaire* Cranford. On the very day that Cranford was restored to practice the "Committee of Agrievances" of the House of Delegates, Cranford being a member of the House, represented it a "great agrievance" that "Severall Attorneys by orders of Councill without being Legally convicted of any crime have been dismissed from their practice as attorneys much to the dissatisfaction of the court and country where they practice." Characterizing the opinion of George Plater, William Dent and Robert Goldsborough, as "the King's Councill att Law," as justifying the Council's orders "to the Generall dissatisfaction of the Inhabitants of this province, the Government never pretending to any such power before from the first seating of the province," it desired that the House move the governor that the opinion be publicly burned by the sheriff of Anne Arundel County. The House thereupon ordered the counsel taken into custody and brought before the House where they were examined on their opinion. The House also unsuccessfully demanded of the clerk of the Council copies of the severall proceedings of the Council relating to Cranford; the governor, however, did make available a copy of the opinion. Counsel were then again called before the House and, appearing to justify their opinion, were ordered to produce their authorities in support thereof. When the authorities were produced, the House conceived them as against the opinion.<sup>27</sup>

The House thereupon sent an address to the Governor and Council forwarding its resolution that it was "a very dangerous opinion giving liberty to the depriving and forejudging his Majesty's Subjects of their freehold and livelyhood upon bare suggestions without any presentment of their peers and to the Exasperating your Excellency against his Majestys Justices of this Province for protecting people in their Rights according to their oaths to the great vexation of his Majestys Subjects and dishonor of his Majesty." The address, however, offered as settlement terms payment of ten shillings each by the counsel to the "sergeant at arms" of the House, the burning of the opinion and the receiving of Cranford into the governor's favor. To this the Governor and Council replied that if the House could make it out that counsel had in any particular infringed or broken the law, the governor "would in no ways protect or shelter them, but leave them open to Justice." As to laying a fine, this was a thing of dangerous consequence without a known law. As to Cranford, he was already restored to his practice. Finally, if the House did not believe it within the King's prerogative to suspend attorneys in the province, it could lay the case before the Committee for Trade and Foreign Plantations "from whom they need not fear any other than a Just and Legall determination, both in this and all other matters of a like nature." The House regretted that it had not received a more satisfactory answer upon "so great an infringement upon our rights and Liberties" but would proceed no further than to leave its vote upon its journal "to assert that Right and Liberty which before this time was never Questioned from the very first seating and Inhabiting of this Province."<sup>28</sup>

The controversy was climaxed by a stiff and bitter message from the Governor

26. 23 *id.* 275, 380, 394-95.

27. 22 *id.* 87-93. See also the comments of Kilty on 15 Ed. II, c.1 and 4 Hen. IV, c.18. *Report on English Statutes* 215, 225.

28. 22 *MA* 93-94, 106-07.