

which complied with the commands of the King as embodied in Egremont's letter of December 12, 1761 (pp. 5-7). He also called attention to the fact that because Egremont "had not in explicit Terms, censured the Proceedings of either the Upper or the Lower House but only in general Words reprehended the Province for not having granted Supplies they [the Lower House] did not conceive the Censure expressed in Your Ldp's Letter as applicable to themselves" (*Arch. Md.* XIV; 47-48). Egremont, writing in reply, July 10, 1762, said that his censure "was intended for any Part of the Legislature of Maryland that had failed shewing a due Obedience to His Majesty's Command", as the Lower House had done in offering a Supply bill which it had known the Governor and Upper House had good reasons to reject. He declared that the King was well satisfied with Sharpe's zeal in his service, but wished the Governor to make known the King's sentiments on the conduct of the Assembly "that They may not deceive Themselves by supposing that their Behaviour is not seen in its true Light" (*Arch. Md.* XIV; 63-64).

In a lengthy reply to Sharpe's letters on Maryland affairs, Cecilius Calvert as representing the Lord Proprietary, writing under date of March 1, 1763, discussed with bitterness the obstinate course of the Lower House in the matter of the Assessment bill, and warmly approved Sharpe's actions in connection with it. He also thanked the Governor for bringing out in his messages that the dispute was not between the Proprietary and the people, as the Lower House sought to have the public believe, but was between the two houses, or rather between the people themselves who were divided in their own opinions, as the journals of the Lower House showed. He also declared that the Proprietary would cheerfully assent to paying taxes on his occupied lands on the same basis as occupied land owned by individuals was taxed. It is of interest that in this same letter Calvert told of rumors of a plan of the English ministry to secure the passage by Parliament of an act to tax the American colonies for the support of a military establishment, for which the several colonies themselves had failed to make sufficient appropriations. Nor had any other colonies been more obdurate in this respect than had Maryland. Although the plan of taxation outlined in the paragraph of Calvert's letter as quoted below was not the one adopted by Parliament, there was substituted for it the notorious Stamp Act that helped to lead to the Revolution: "I am by Authority inform'd, that Scheme is forming for Establishing 10000 men to be British Americans standing Force there, and paid by the Colonies, 'tis said to be Levyed by Poll Tax through out the Colonies; the Parliament has Voted the force, and the Eyes of the Crown and Parliament are on them from that purpose; if by Poll Tax, will require knowledge of the number of inhabitants in each Province; therefore I should be obliged to you to know as to numbers in Maryland" (*Arch. Md.* XXXI; 529-531).

PROVINCIAL AGENT IN GREAT BRITAIN

As was to be expected the matter of the appointment of a Provincial Agent at London to represent the people of Maryland before the King and the Ministry, came up again at both the 1762 and 1763 sessions. In a message to