

monies raised under previous Supply bills, such as allowances for Indian scalps, funds accumulated in the Loan Office, and funds to be secured from ordinary licenses by the provisioning act of 1754 relating to these licenses, be appropriated for the support of these troops. The motion was lost by a vote of twenty-five to nineteen (pp. 121-122). Notwithstanding the defeat of this motion it was brought up again, in what would seem to be the same form, on April 19, when it was defeated by a smaller majority, twenty-four to twenty-two. It is to be noted that the change of one vote would have resulted in a tie, and as Speaker Hooper had strong Proprietary leanings, his vote in its favor would have passed the bill. It was a narrow escape for the Popular party. On this vote Gantt was recorded against it, while Ward and Wright, who a week before had voted against it, now voted for it. Simon Wilmer of Kent, who in the interval had appeared in the house and been sworn in as a delegate, voted for it, and thereafter seems to have consistently voted with the Proprietary group (pp. 146-147).

Two days later, April 16, in an attempt to get its hands on the licenses from ordinaries, the Lower House passed a bill designed to revive an act under which the licenses from ordinaries had been used for military purposes. The record does not disclose the terms of this bill, which probably provided that the monies from this source be used for the support of Provincial troops and for recruits for the King's regular regiments. At all events, it was evidently looked upon by the Upper House as another attempt to encroach upon the Proprietary's prerogative, and was promptly rejected when it reached that chamber (pp. 151, 35, 36, 37).

Under date of April 17, 1762, the Lower House sent a message to Governor Sharpe which dealt with the various questions in controversy, especially with the attitude of the Lower House on the subject of a Provincial Agent in London, the Supply bill, and Attorney-General Pratt's opinion on its constitutionality, and among other things declared that "we think it not very decent in Your Excellency to pervert the Meaning of Letters from his Majesty's ministers, by arbitrary and forced Constructions, merely for the Sake of throwing an Odium on our Proceedings", in order to make them appear to reflect upon the failure of the Lower House to pass a Supply bill, and not upon the upper chamber (pp. 138-143); this is of course a reference to Egremont's letter (pp. 5-7).

In an even longer message, one covering fourteen printed pages of this volume, in reply to the Lower House, the Governor gave a very full summary of the five years dispute between the two houses on the subject of the various Supply bills, with his objections and those of the military representatives of the Crown to the Lower House bills, on administrative, constitutional, and military grounds. The interested reader is referred to this message for an excellent presentation of the entire matter from the Proprietary point of view (pp. 157-170).

Immediately after the Assembly had been prorogued, Sharpe on April 25, 1762, wrote a letter to the Earl of Egremont justifying himself before the Crown in not having been able to bring about the passage of a Supply bill