

because the town commissioners had not been given the necessary legislative authority to execute a lease, although authority had been given them to make town regulations and to recover claims (p. 186). An attempt had been made at the October–November, 1763, session to obtain this authority and thus validate the lease, but because of a dispute between the two houses, no validating act had then been secured. The Upper House had insisted upon the appointment of market employees (clerks) by the county justices, and the Lower House that they be “elected and chosen” in a way not disclosed by the record, but doubtless by the town commissioners. The Lower House had also refused to accept an Upper House amendment adding the phrase “saving to his Most Sacred Majesty and to the Lord Proprietary and all other bodies politick and corporate their several respective rights”, because of the fear of the lower chamber that this might give some preferential claim to the Proprietary to fines or forfeitures imposed under the act, which it was felt should go to the public and not to him (*Arch. Md.* LVIII; xxxii-xxxiii). Public demand for the establishment and proper regulation of the market had, after two years delay and inconvenience, doubtless forced from the Lower House a reluctant acceptance of these Upper House amendments, for there was no discussion of them at this session and they are to be found incorporated in the act as passed by the Assembly (pp. 305-309). At the November–December session a petition was presented from the inhabitants of Baltimore Town requesting legislation that would validate this lease and enable the town commissioners to make rules for the management of the market; and the Lower House appointed a committee which recommended that the relief asked for be granted (p. 186). An act which confirmed the lease as previously executed was passed, and provided rules and regulations for the management of the market, one of these being that no slaughtering be permitted in the market-house, and another that no horse be allowed to enter it. It should be recalled that at the March–April, 1762, session a similar act had been passed for the establishment of a market in Chestertown with regulations for its management.

*Linen manufacture.* An act of no little interest to students of Maryland industries but with a somewhat misleading title was passed by the Assembly at this session. It was really an attempt to encourage linen manufacture in Maryland. Its title was “an act for the benefit of the poor and the encouragement of industry”, and it provided for the payment of bounties or prizes to those who made the best linen from flax or hemp grown in the Province. Its purpose was to encourage the raising of hemp and flax “as the making of linnen Cloth of Flax and Hemp of the growth of this Province would be of great Advantage to the Inhabitants thereof”. Introduced in the Lower House on November 20, the house by the close vote of 23 to 22 decided that the linen must be made in the county where the bounty was paid (p. 165). It passed the bill and sent it to the Upper House, where an amendment was added providing that not only must it be sworn to before two justices that the flax or hemp be the growth of the Province, but that the linen made of it “be manufactured by White Persons within this Province” (pp. 54, 170-171). This was doubtless to encourage the manufacture of linen by small planters and