

clothe, and pay them, it was expected that it would be reimbursed for this by Parliament (pp. 199-200). General Amherst, in his letter dated from New York, February 21, 1760, wrote in the same strain as he did in his previous letter of March 28, 1759 (pp. 149-150), and urged that the assemblies of the southern colonies furnish as large a number of men as they are able, without specifying the exact number expected from each, to act in cooperation with the regular forces wherever they are most needed by the Commander-in-Chief (p. 200-202). It is of interest that Sharpe, in his reports to the Lord Proprietary and to Secretary Cecilius Calvert, pointed out that these circular letters of Pitt, sent in identical form to the governors of several colonies, lacked the effectiveness that more direct and personal letters would have. He also wrote that a direct censure by Pitt of the Lower House, and a letter from that minister to him expressing extreme disapproval of its conduct, might well change the attitude of that body (*Arch. Md.* IX, pp. 325, 397).

The Lower House replied to this speech of the Governor in an address dated March 4, 1760, congratulating him on the many successes of his Majesty's Arms and promising immediate action which would demonstrate its loyalty by its prompt response to the requests contained in the letters of Pitt and Amherst. It also said that it would give due regard to the legal opinion of Charles Pratt, the Crown's Attorney-General, on the unconstitutionality of the two Supply bills previously sent to the Upper House, but added that it was presumed that this opinion was given by Pratt, not as representing the Crown, but "only as a private Counsel to the Lord Proprietary", and that it is greatly to be regretted that the opinion was not accompanied with the statement of the case upon which it was founded. The address concluded with the assertion that the bill which it is about to frame "will be consistent with the Liberties and Privileges of British Subjects, and justifiable upon the Principles of our Constitution" (pp. 230-231).

Following the usual preliminary resolves in the Lower House as to the scope of the proposed Service, or Assessment, bill and a vote of the house that the "money required be raised by an assessment on all estates, offices and employments", the Lower House appointed a committee to draw up such a bill. This bill was soon afterwards introduced and after a few changes in committee of the whole, it was passed and sent to the Upper House, where, as was anticipated, it was promptly rejected. This was the sixth successive time that a similar Service bill failed of passage. The various legislative moves in the two houses as regards this bill are narrated in more detail elsewhere in this introduction and need not be repeated here (pp. xlvii-xlviii).

A Naturalization bill for the relief of alien land holders was introduced in the Upper House at this session, passed on April 1, 1760, and sent to the Lower House. Here it was amended to exclude Roman Catholics from its benefits. The Upper House refused to agree to this discrimination and the bill failed of passage. Its course in the two houses and its subsequent fate are discussed later in this introduction (pp. lxiii-lxvi).

Under the provisions of the £40,000 Supply act for his Majesty's Service passed in 1756 imposing various taxes and duties, if the sinking fund estab-