

again at length and in detail. The Upper House said that honor required the payment of this salary, and added that "A Private Gentleman, who should refuse to allow an old Servant a Claim founded as M<sup>r</sup> Ross', would have very little Reason to expect the World should applaud him for his Prudence". It was indeed ludicrous, the upper chamber said, to call the matter of the salary a "struggle for liberty". Reference was then made to the demand of the Lower House for a support for a Provincial Agent in London to be appointed by it. The Upper House declared, that as the chance was desperate for the passage at this session of a Journal of Accounts, it was now willing, however, to pass the separate Lower House bill, which it had previously rejected, carrying an appropriation for the expenses of the late war. The message closed with the denial that the Clerk of the Council should be paid out of such funds set aside by law "for support of government" as the tobacco export duty, which would be contrary not only to usage but to the laws of the Province. He should be paid, as clerks before him have been, by the Journal of Accounts (pp. 97-110). The Assembly adjourned without further mention of the Journal. It may be added, however, that a Journal of Accounts was passed in the year 1766 after a lapse of ten years.

#### PROVINCIAL AGENT IN GREAT BRITAIN

It was inevitable that the question of provision for the appointment and support of a Provincial Agent in Great Britain to represent the people of Maryland before the Crown would come up again at the November-December, 1765, session, as it had at every session for so many years. The agitation about the Stamp Act and the actual employment of a special agent, Charles Garth, to represent Maryland in London in presenting remonstrances to King and Parliament asking repeal of this act, added strength to the popular demand that there be resident in London a Provincial Agent to represent the people before the Crown in matters involving disputes between them and the Lord Proprietary, or, as the Lower House expressed it, to resist the pretensions of the Lord Proprietary. These demands for a support for an Agent have been discussed in the introductions to the preceding volumes of the *Archives* dealing with Assembly affairs, and most recently in Volume LVIII (pp. xlvi-xlviiii).

On November 7, 1765, on the motion of Edward Tilghman, the Lower House ordered a committee of three, consisting of Tilghman, Murdock, and Lloyd to prepare a bill for the support of a Provincial Agent (p. 142). A bill imposing an export duty of fourpence on every hogshead of tobacco which left the Province, to be used for the support of such an agent, was brought in and passed on December 13, and sent to the Upper House (pp. 222, 232). Here it was rejected and returned with a message to the lower chamber (pp. 90-93, 235). As the demand for a representative in London was universal among all classes, and as Governor Sharpe and the Upper House were obliged to oppose it because of direct orders from the Proprietary, the upper chamber in objecting to it was forced to weave a web of legalistic sophistries in defense of its position. In its message it declared that the "members of the Upper House . . . [are] a distinct Order . . . each [house] has a Power to