

The Lower House on April 5 appointed a committee of five headed by Walter Dulany to serve on a joint committee with Benedict Calvert of the Upper House to inspect and report upon the condition of the Loan Office (pp. 223, 296). The first report of this joint committee which was presented on October 14 was followed by another on November 24. These reports, showing as they did large debts to that office long overdue and unpaid, resulted in certain repercussions which will be discussed more fully under Loan Office affairs (pp. lx-lxiv, 271-276, 312-313, 406-407).

The Committee on Accounts also were charged with keeping an eye on the treasurers of the two shores, and on the naval officers who collected certain export duties. The Lower House on October 13 took cognizance of the fact that the treasurers "have omitted for some time to render acc^{ts} of the money by them received for the use of the public", and the Committee on Accounts was ordered to make a report when these accounts had last been filed (p. 309). In a report on the condition of the Loan Office, dated October 14, 1763, the committee declared that the two treasurers had made no reports for several years although the increase in the number of negro slaves imported during the last four years indicated that there must be considerable sums of public money due the Province by the two treasurers for duties on negroes, which had been deposited with them (pp. 312, 313). On October 25, 1763, this committee was directed, that at the time it reported to the Lower House as to when the treasurers had made their last reports, there be also included a report as to when the naval officers had done so (p. 333). On November 22, the committee reported that Charles Hammond, Treasurer of the Western Shore, and Colonel Edward Lloyd, Treasurer of the Eastern Shore, had recently rendered their accounts down to October, 1763 (p. 391). Nor does any report seem to have been made about the accounts of naval officers.

Under the act of May, 1756, appropriating £40,000 for His Majesty's Service, familiarly known as the £40,000 Supply bill, three agents, namely, William Murdock, James Dick, and Daniel Wolstenholme, had been appointed to carry out the terms of that law (*Arch. Md.* LII; 488). Supplementary supply acts passed at the September-October, 1756, the April-May, 1757, and the September-December, 1757, sessions, had also made these same men agents to put these several later acts into effect (*Arch. Md.* LII; 650-656: LV; 125, 402-408). At the October-November, 1763, session, the Lower House appointed a committee headed by Charles Grahame, to examine the accounts of the agents under the supply bills which do not seem to have been examined for several years. This committee reported on November 24, and its report showed various small sums still due to the agents and the names of a number of persons who have not yet paid monies due by them, but the report does not criticize the agents or suggest that they had not properly performed their duties (pp. 343, 399, 401).

When the Journal of Accounts was brought before the Assembly at the 1763 session it met with the same fate that it had met for the last seven years. Passed by the Lower House, it was promptly rejected in the upper chamber. At this session, however, the causes for its rejection were brought more into