

Several petitions praying legislative action were either rejected, or their consideration postponed until the next session. A petition was presented at the 1762 session in the Upper House by "Reb^a Stokes of Baltimore County Widow praying a Town may be laid out on a Tract of Land called Harmer's Town upon Susquehanna", but was promptly rejected (p. 20). Rebecca Stokes was the widow of Robert Stokes who lived on the tract Harmer's Town patented under this name in 1658 at the mouth of the Susquehanna, where the city of Havre de Grace, founded in 1785, now stands. It is uncertain what connection, if any, there was between this petition and the petition which was presented at the 1763 session of the Assembly praying that a town, to be called Charlotte Town, be laid out in Baltimore County at the mouth of the Susquehanna River (p. 232). The petition for the establishment of Charlotte Town will be discussed later (p. xxxiv). Petitions from St. Peter's Parish, Talbot County, for authority to establish a chapel of ease (pp. 105, 155), and from Prince George's Parish, Prince George's County, apparently for similar authority, were presented, but were not acted upon (pp. 33, 149, 151). A petition of sundry inhabitants of George Town, Frederick County, and also one from sundry inhabitants of Talbot and Dorchester counties, the nature of which are not disclosed, were also referred to the next session (pp. 16, 105, 155). The character of the petition of the Mayor, Recorder, alderman, and common council of the city of Annapolis upon which action was also deferred is not revealed (p. 20, 105, 155). Another petition, of an undisclosed nature, from the inhabitants of Anne Arundel County was considered in the Lower House on April 20, 1762, and by a vote of twenty-nine to ten, action upon it was deferred until the next Assembly (p. 148). This was doubtless the petition for the establishment of a town at Elk Ridge Landing which was rejected in the Upper House at the 1763 session (p. xxxiii). The petition of Henry Ward of Cecil County was also deferred (pp. 116, 155). It is not quite clear why a petition presented by John Paca and others, executors of the estate of John Paca, Jr., of Baltimore County, requesting legislation granting them authority to sell certain lands, which had been presented at successive sessions since 1758, should have been again deferred (pp. 17, 105, 133, 427, 431). It may be added, however, that the requested legislation was enacted at the 1763 session. For some undisclosed reason no petitions were presented in the Assembly at the 1762 session for the relief of debtors languishing in prison, nor did petitions of this kind come before the 1763 session.

The 1762 Assembly, after a five weeks session, was prorogued on April 24, to meet again on September 13, 1762, but the sequel shows that after several postponements it was not brought together until October, 1763. The 1762 session was not an important one. The long-standing matters in controversy between the two houses were becoming a little shopworn, and although some of the messages display considerable apparent acrimony, one rather feels that much that was said was "for the record", and that both sides were becoming a little weary of the long continued war of words.