

Lib. J. R. Maryland, We think it our Obligation to give you this In-
& U. S. formation that you may judge whether or no it is consistent
with your Law made for issuing and paying your Paper Cur-
rency. If the Collectors send us such Bills for that Account,
we know not how we can avoid them when they come into our
Hands, and if it is to be remedied, it must be done by your
Government only."

Your Committee also further find the following Bills, ap-
pearing by the Naval Officers Accounts to have been remitted
by them to the Trustees in London for which the said Trustees
have given no Credit viz'

By Philip Lee then Naval Officer of North Potowmack District	}	1739. John Boyd's Exchange	
		indorsed by Jn ^o Brown	£13..17..1
		John Domats ditto in-	
		dorsed by Robert Yeates	53..11..8
		1740 James Montier on Robert Brown	25..14..0
		1741 Randolph Johnson on John Buchanan	4..0..6
		Thomas Hungerford on John Buchanan	7..0..0
And by Thomas Lee his Executor in	}	1744: And by said Executors' Account then dated a Bal- ance due to the Province of	0..16..1¼
By the Deputy Naval Officer of Oxford	}	1744. Barker on Ash-	
		burner	40.. 8..0
		Foster on ditto	53..11..7
		Ackenleak on Catonack	37..12..4
		And in 1745: he charged a Bill William Pemberton on Richard Gildart	
		for	79..19..8
		And the Trustees give Credit for said Bill only	78..19..8
		Difference to the prejudice of the Province	1.. 0..0

But your Committee find that the Trustees have given
Credit to the Province in 1747: for Samuel Chamber-
laine's Bill on William Anderson for 140..6..4

Which said Bill we don't find charged in any of the Naval
Officer's Accounts and therefore think it probable the above