

In 1742, there was considerable alarm as to the Indians. On July 26, and August 10, Governor Ogle wrote the Virginia Council as to the danger to Maryland (15 Va. Hist. Mag., pp. 385, 388) and on the same subject we find letters in the Pennsylvania Archives, as follows: Pa. Col. Recs. IV, 573 (July 7), p. 576 (July 10), p. 586 (July 19), Pa. Arch. Fourth Series I, pp. 793 (July 10) 796 (Aug. 16). In volume 28 of the Archives of Maryland, the Council Proceedings contain much upon these Indian troubles. Upon the Nanticokes' cemeteries on the Eastern Shore, David I. Bushnell made an important contribution, in the 71st Bulletin of the Bureau of American Ethnology, p. 24, and Dr. F. G. Speck's address delivered before the Eastern Shore Society of Baltimore City in 1922 and published separately is of great value.

A convoy to Maryland in 1742 is referred to in Charles M. Andrews' "Guide to Manuscript Materials, etc.," pp. 216, 217.

The great Indian treaty at Lancaster, Pennsylvania, in 1744, is discussed by H. Frank Eshleman's Lancaster County Indians at p. 340—a book full of information as to the Susquehannocks and the Nanticokes. The Pennsylvania Archives (Series I, vol. I, p. 645, and series 4, vol. I, pp. 840 to 850) contain information as to Indian affairs in that year. The Council Proceedings contained in volume 28 of the Archives also furnish valuable information upon this subject.

There was no session in 1743, as men waited for a reply from the Proprietary to their address and this reply did not come until quite late in the year. On May 1, 1744, the Assembly met and remained in session until June 4. New committees of from five to eight members were appointed, although this was not a new Assembly. Edward Lloyd was a new member of the Council and, in the Lower House, Henry Trippe was reëlected from Dorchester; John Paca took the place of Aquila Paca (who had died) from Baltimore; John Courts was chosen to the place left by Yeates's death in Charles; David Wilson became member from Somerset, in place of Martin, who had accepted the position of sheriff in the new County of Worcester; and that County was represented by its four members, Messrs. Henry, Purnell, Robins and Selby. There was some rather obscure doubt as to the legality of the issuance of the writs upon which these Delegates were elected and two divisions were taken upon the question on May 17. By a vote of 21 to 20, the House decided to take up the question and, by a vote of 25 to 16, to seat the new members. The anti-proprietary party voted in the negative (2 from St. Mary, 3 from Kent, 3 from Anne Arundel, 3 from Calvert, 3 from Prince George's and 1 each from Charles and Queen Anne's). The new County (the act forming which the appendix shows the Proprietary was on the point of vetoing) needed considerable legislation and