

Henry Fox, Secretary of State, urged the Assembly to renew the embargo, and the act of June 1755 which had expired, was reenacted to be in force for the limited period from March 1 to May 10, 1757 (*Arch. Md.*, l, 590-591, 663). Under date of February 23, 1757, Sharpe acknowledged receipt of a letter from the Lords of Trade and Plantations, dated October 9, 1756, directing him to restrict the export of provisions to British possessions to ships which had given ample bond. Sharpe wrote that exports by this act of the Assembly were now limited to British ports, and to the two neutral Portuguese ports of Lisbon and Madeira, but that he now would extend the prohibition to both these latter ports as well (*Arch. Md.*, vi, 529-530).

The Lower House seems to have been very loath to reenact embargo legislation which so greatly curtailed the trade of the Province, especially the export of grain. As land had become worn out by long continued tobacco culture, grain had been found to be a profitable substitute crop, and much of it found its way to the West Indies and to Portugal and its possessions. At the April-May, 1757, session, however, upon the urgent request of the Governor and of the Lords of Trade and Plantations, an embargo act more stringent than the former act limiting exports to British ports alone, was passed by the Assembly on May 7, just before the close of the session. This act was limited in its operation to a period of less than two months (pp. 41, 111, 143-145). On the same day, however, an offensive resolution was introduced in the Lower House, but failed of passage by the close vote of 15 to 16, unjustly reflecting upon the good faith of the Governor in not communicating earlier certain information about the embargo supposed to have been in his possession. This resolution also asked the Governor by what powers the embargo was laid upon some vessels in the Province and not upon others, and by what indulgence a certain sloop had recently been allowed to sail from Baltimore Town (p. 109). This query was the result of a petition, May 7, 1757, of a certain Joseph Ensor, a Baltimore merchant, who had complained to the Lower House that his schooner Anson, ready to sail to the Barbados with provisions, had been held up for nearly two months, while another vessel similarly loaded had been permitted to depart (pp. 107-108). Sharpe wrote to Loudoun on June 4, 1757, that as the embargo had not been considered applicable to vessels loaded after May 8 in Virginia and in some other colonies, he had released Maryland vessels sailing after May 6 under transport (*Arch. Md.*, ix, 18-19). When the Assembly next met in September, 1757, an act of Parliament had recently been passed prohibiting the export of grain from all the American colonies except under severe restrictions, so that further extensions of the Maryland Embargo Act became unnecessary. It will be noted that complaint was made later that in certain cases where cargoes of produce under bond were shipped from Maryland to British ports and captured by enemy ships en route, that the bondsmen had been unjustly sued by Stephen Bordley, the naval officer at Annapolis and Attorney-General of Maryland (*Arch. Md.*, ix, 128-129).

Under date of December 14, 1757, the Lower House and the Upper House joined in a petition to the King and to the Lords of Trade and Plantations requesting that the severity of the acts of Parliament be relaxed. An address