

a popular measure with people of all classes, however, and when the bill came up at the 1760 session, it passed the Lower House by a vote of 34 to 1, nearly every member of the Proprietary party now voting in favor of it, its lone opponent being the die-hard Proprietary member, Dr. George Steuart of Annapolis (pp. 183, 184, 191, 157, 192, 241-242, 214). As is discussed elsewhere in this introduction, when the two houses attempted at the 1761 session to frame a joint letter of condolence to the new king George III upon the death of his predecessor George II, they could come to no agreement because the Lower House insisted upon the insertion of a paragraph begging the King that they "be permitted to raise a Support for an Agent, who may lay all their Grievances, which they suffer under the Government of the Lord Proprietary, properly before Your Majesty" (pp. 456-458). After the Upper House refused to agree to the insertion in the address to the King of any references to a provincial agent in Great Britain, the Lower House adopted a separate address including this request, but there is reason to believe that it was never presented to George III as is explained in another section (p. lxii). A bill for the support of an agent in Great Britain was also introduced in the Lower House at the 1761 session, but does not seem to have been pressed for passage, probably because it was hoped to effect this end by the inclusion in its address of condolence the request that the King might aid them in their efforts to maintain a provincial agent in London through whom their grievances might be laid before the Crown (pp. lxi, 473). An attempt also seems to have been made to insert in the 1761 Supply bill, an appropriation of £300 or £400 for the salary of an agent (*Arch. Md.* IX, 519).

#### MESSAGE OF CONDOLENCE TO THE KING.

The Governor on April 15, 1761, sent messages to each House asking them to join with him in an address of condolence to the King expressing their great loss in the death of the late sovereign and congratulations to the new King upon his accession to the throne (p. 443). The Upper House in its reply to the Governor, after extending its condolences to him and expressing its pleasure upon the accession of the new King, injected in it a dig at the lower chamber which was to stir the latter's ire, by declaring that we "shall most cheerfully give our Concurrence to any equitable bill" that would "promote the Service of our Sovereign" (pp. 406-407, 404).

An innocuous address of condolence and congratulation, apparently prepared by Dulany and Bordley of the Upper House, was presented for adoption to a joint committee of the two houses (p. 411), and was referred to the Lower House itself by its representatives on the committee. On April 22 this house voted 24 to 7, the Proprietary party voting solidly in the negative, to add a paragraph to the address declaring that the people of Maryland "destitute as we are of the proper Means of obtaining Access to the Throne", pray that they be permitted to appropriate money to maintain an agent in London to lay their grievances against the Proprietary before the King. The Lower House expressed its confidence that a full inquiry would disclose the true cause why this Province has "in so small a Degree exerted it's Force for the Service of