

finally decided at this time. This is less than half the number in the preceding sessions, and even more below the number in earlier sessions.

The clerk of the Court throughout these two years was John Blomfeild, who had served for several years in the past. Like the justices, he was a man of many offices, for, in addition to being clerk of the Court and of the Secretary's office, he was keeper of the lesser seal of the Province and clerk of the Council (*post*, p. 141). Whether he was again, as he had been, chief notary of the Province and so entitled to a third of the fees received in the notary's office (*Archives*, V, p. 50) is uncertain. He was to be notary during his Lordship's pleasure, and when, on July 21, 1670, he was discharged from his post as secretary of the Council, and ordered to surrender the lesser seal, his other offices were not mentioned (*ibid.*, p. 66). And yet, when he was once more sworn in, nothing is said of the notary's office.

As in earlier years, many men appeared before the Court as attorneys. Some were, almost certainly, attorneys in fact only, but when they came before the Court and were sworn in as its attorneys, there can be no doubt about it: those men were attorneys at law. Twenty-three different men appeared for clients or for themselves in this period, but some of them had but one or two cases. Only eight or ten had many cases, and only four or five can have been really busy at the law. Kenelm Cheseldyn, who was at the same time the attorney general of the Province, had almost a hundred and fifty clients, and was himself a party in thirteen more, not counting those in which he appeared as attorney general. Robert Carvile and Robert Ridgely each had more than a hundred cases, and both were parties in many others. Although the Attorney General appeared for private clients, and although the clerk of the Court had in other years likewise practiced before it, John Blomfeild, now clerk, did not do so. To be sure, when he was party to a suit, he appeared without counsel, as attorney did in most cases.

One item which the Court always took into consideration in setting the costs of a suit was the attorneys' fees, although they are sometimes not separately listed. In November 1676, the Court "Ordered that an Attorney of this Court be allowed in a bill of costs the Summe of four hundred pounds of tobacco (*post*, p. 316). This ruling was in accordance with an act of Assembly of February 1674/5 which set the fees for attorneys in the courts of the Province, and it was perhaps made necessary by the fact that the statute, though signed by Governor Charles Calvert, did not pass the great seal of the Province until February 26, 1679 (*Archives*, II, pp. 467, 470), when the Governor had become the Proprietary. There are, at this time, two suits involving the non-payment of attorney's fees, and, oddly enough, in both of them Robert Ridgely was the attorney who had not been paid. On December 13, 1674, he said, Thomas Carleton had retained him to prosecute, in the Provincial Court, a suit against John Cock of Baltimore County, and had promised that he "would well and truly Satisfie and pay unto him the said Robert So much as he should deserve for his labour travell skill Councell & advice in & about & concerning the prosecution of the suit (*post*, p. 58). He had prosecuted the suit, and he said that Carleton or his executor ought to pay him 400 pounds of tobacco as provided