

presented at this session which were not then acted upon but did receive favorable action at later sessions. One of these was from the inhabitants of Baltimore Town asking relief from a miry marsh (Harrison's Marsh) which was a serious nuisance to the town (pp. 6, 28, 55, 62). At the session held later in 1766 legislation was secured which resulted in the filling in of the marsh and making the reclaimed land an addition to the town (pp. xc-xci). The other petition was from the merchants of Baltimore, upon which no action was taken at this session nor at the session held later in the year, but which did result in the passage in 1768 of a law for the inspection of flour and various other commodities sold in Baltimore or shipped from it (pp. xxxix, lii, 445-453).

The Journal of Accounts providing for payment of the Provincial debt, which had been accumulating for ten years, came up again at this session but action upon it was not taken until the November-December Assembly (pp. 11, 12, 26, 55, 58). It is discussed fully in a later section of this Introduction (pp. lxiii-lxvi). A resolve of the Lower House at this session which came to have the effect of a standing rule, was that "for the future this House will not take into Consideration any Petition from Inhabitants of any County or Parish relative to the imposing any kind of Taxes or erecting any publick Buildings or other matter any way respecting the general interest", unless the petition be advertised at all churches, chapels and at the Court house of the county for at least two months before presentation (pp. 63-64).

*Stamp Act echoes.* On May 21, 1766, Edward Tilghman moved, and it was so ordered, that the Lower House take under consideration "the Noble, generous, and Spirited Conduct of the friends of Liberty in Great Britain in Support of the Interests of America", but after discussion, consideration of the question was postponed until the next session, when it was expected that the house would have further information for its guidance (pp. 46, 60). The journals of the next session reveal that the Lower House wished to express its appreciation and gratitude to Pitt and Camden and other "Friends of Liberty" in the Parliament of Great Britain for their help in bringing about the repeal of the Stamp Act (pp. lviii-lix). At this session the perennial bill for the support of a provincial agent in Great Britain was again passed by the Lower House and rejected by the upper chamber (pp. 52, 12, 58). Another bill in controversy between the two houses, that for licensing hawkers and peddlers, already mentioned in a preceding paragraph, was passed in the Lower House by a vote of 27 to 10, but was rejected in this house after the upper chamber had amended it in several particulars, one amendment providing that the license money should be used as the Assembly might direct, instead of being used for the public schools as the Lower House wished (pp. 25, 32, 8, 53).

Another echo of the Stamp Act excitement is to be found in the action of the Lower House on May 20, 1766, when a letter addressed to Murdock, Tilghman, and Ringgold, the Maryland representatives at the Stamp Act Congress held in New York in October, 1765, from James Otis of Massachusetts, asking their help in having "an Allowance made to the Clerk of the late Congress at New York by this Province", was referred to the General Assembly, but the house resolved that it would make no further allowances than those already