

credit to any person for liquor sold him (pp. 402-407). Two local acts were passed; one (No. 13) prohibited any person from allowing sheep or geese from running at large in Frederick Town (p. 398); and the other (No. 14) abolished the tobacco inspection warehouse at Plum Point in Calvert County (p. 399). One private act (No. 15) authorized Susannah, the widow of Talbot Ristean of the town of Joppa in Baltimore County, as executrix, to sell certain lands to pay her husband's debts (pp. 399-401). The committee of the Lower House to which was referred the widow's petition to be allowed to sell houses and lots in Joppa for the payment of these debts, recommended that her request be granted as it was "in a Town unlikely to Flourish", a prophesy to be soon fulfilled (p. 306). The creditor who had obtained judgement against the widow for £767:18:0, was Sampson Levy, probably one of the earliest Jewish settlers in Baltimore County.

The agents appointed under the several Supply acts made a lengthy report to the Lower House on November 11, 1757. This report was a survey of the military expenditures made under the various supply acts and dealt with soldiers' pay, bounties, quartering of troops, provisions, messengers, arms, ammunition, scalp bounties, and sundry other items. To the student of military affairs of this period it is an interesting document. The legality of certain expenditures, such as the employment of women as cooks and nurses, was questioned by the committee of the Lower House which examined the accounts (pp. 213-214, 257-266).

SESSION OF FEBRUARY—MARCH, 1758.

The Assembly met at Annapolis, February 13, 1758, in what was called by the Lower House a "meeting", and by the Upper House a "convention" of the Assembly, for at this futile session no legislation of any kind was enacted. The previous session had been prorogued on September 15, 1757, to meet again on January 3, 1758 (p. 390), but by later proclamations it had been successively prorogued until January 17, January 24, and February 6 (*Arch. Md. xxxi*, 240), although it did not actually meet until a week after the last mentioned date. In his opening speech to both houses, Governor Sharpe told them that he had sent to the Earl of Loudoun their addresses of September 15 and December 16, together with a copy of the rejected Supply bill, and was now transmitting the Earl's reply, with the expectation that they would promptly comply with his very reasonable representations (p. 411). Loudoun's letter, dated at New York, December 30, 1757, declared that as to the military part of the bill "had it been passed into a Law of the Province, it would have been a direct Infringement of the King's undoubted Prerogative, and as such was very wisely rejected by the Upper House". This was of course a reference to the restriction which the Lower House sought to put upon the use of Maryland troops both as regards their disposition and their virtual control not by the Governor, but by agents to be appointed by the Assembly. He reminded them that the Provincial troops of the northeastern colonies had for three years been serving in New York, and that there had never been raised elsewhere the question as to the right of the commander-in-