

with Secretary Lawrence, finally procured Blakiston's reappointment in October, 1713. Though offered his former salary, he now chose to accept only £ 100 a year.⁵⁶ Yet despite this unexampled generosity he was again dismissed in August, 1721. The occasion for this ill considered act had been the restoration of Baltimore's government in 1715; for the Lower House now assumed that, as residents of a proprietary province, they required no agent with the king.⁵⁷ They were soon to learn better.

Down to this time the Agency had been urged upon the delegates by the Governor and Upper House and had been accepted by them, always with some reluctance, as an expense of doubtful wisdom. After 1725 these roles were reversed. The Governor and Council, as His Lordship's representatives, were determined to prevent appointment of an officer who would serve chiefly as a bearer of popular appeals against the proprietor to the king. And the delegates now desired an Agent for just this purpose.⁵⁸

Unable to move the Upper House, they twice employed and paid an Agent without any act of Assembly. To bring before His Majesty their numerous complaints of 1739 they appointed the Pennsylvania Agent, Ferdinando John Paris, raised money by subscription, and paid him £ 100 per annum for five or six years.⁵⁹ In December, 1766, during a quarrel over the Clerk of the Council's salary, they appointed Charles Garth, the South Carolina Agent, and paid him with funds raised by a subscription and a lottery.⁶⁰ As the Lower House were, however, very high in their demands, it was hard for an Agent to satisfy them with such things as might be had.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, XXVII, 506-11; XXIX, 6, 13, 213, 458.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, XXXIV, 171, 175.

⁵⁸ The Lower House considered proposals for appointing and supporting an Agent in Nov., 1725; July, 1729; May, 1730; Aug., 1731; June, 1739; Oct., 1742; May, 1744; Aug., 1745; June, 1746; June, 1752; May, 1758; May, 1761; Dec., 1765; Nov., 1766; June, 1768; Dec., 1769; and Nov., 1771. Meantime Charles, Lord Baltimore, after April, 1742, instructed his Governors not to allow the appointment of anyone but himself as Agent. His successor, Frederick (1751-71), limited the choice to himself or his "beloved uncle," Cecilius Calvert (*Ibid.*, XLII, 650; VI, 401; Portfolio No. 2, folder 4, Md. Hall of Records). On some of the motives which induced the Upper House to oppose the appointing of an Agent see Daniel Dulany to Cecilius Calvert, Sept. 10, 1764 (*Calvert Papers*, II, 233). On the political aspects of the Agent controversy see Mereness, *op. cit.*, 465-74, and Barker, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

⁵⁹ *Archives*, XL, 528; XLII, 198; XLIV, 58-59, 331-32.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, XXXII, 180-85; LXI, 63 *et seq.*; LXII, 92. See also Horatio Sharpe's letters to Hugh Hamersley and to Lord Baltimore, Dec., 1766 and thereafter (*Ibid.*, XIV, 356, *et seq.*).