

Letter Bk. IV  
p. 14

[Sharpe to Baltimore.]

Annapolis the 8<sup>th</sup> of Decem<sup>r</sup> 1758.

My Ld

Together with a Copy of the Account that I transmitted to Your Ldp the 24<sup>th</sup> of last March I shall now send Your Ldp another of the Amount of the Duty of one Shilling a Hhd which the Naval Officers collected between the 29<sup>th</sup> of Sept<sup>r</sup> 1757 & the 29<sup>th</sup> of last Sept<sup>r</sup> & which they have now accounted for to Your Ldp's Agent. Your Ldp will likewise receive inclosed in this Letter sundry Bills of Exchange for £401. 9. 6. the said Sum being very near the Ballance due to Your Ldp as will appear by this Year's Account. When I sent the former to your Ldp the 24<sup>th</sup> of March last I supposed that the Nett Sum which the Agent had received from the Naval Officer of Potuxent was £243. 19. 3 & that he had received from the Naval Officer of Potowmack £329. 6. 7 but when Col<sup>o</sup> Lloyd came afterwards to Annapolis & Settled with me he gave me to understand that the former had paid him on Account of the One Shilling a Hhd no more than £224. 5. 5¼ & the Latter no more than £324. 18. which Difference I found was occasioned by your Ldps having given Leave for some of the Hhds of Tob<sup>o</sup> that were exported from those Districts that Year to be shipt Duty free in lieu of a like Quantity that had been lost at Sea in a preceeding Year, this being the Case & Colo Lloyd having therefore upon a Settlement paid me £23. 2. 4¼ less than I expected he would & than I gave Your Ldp Credit for I have now taken the Liberty to rectify that Error & altho Col<sup>o</sup> Lloyd has not yet settled with me for the Year that expired the 29<sup>th</sup> of last Sept<sup>r</sup> yet I hope there will be no Error this time as I have Copies of all the Naval Officers Accounts now before me, We have not received any Authentick Advices from the Westward since the 20<sup>th</sup> of last Month at which time General Forbes was on his march from the Post  
p. 15 at Loyalhannon to Fort Du Quesne with upwards of 3000 Men, but we are told by some People that are come hither from the Western Part of Frederick County that some of their Neighbours who had been at the Camp at Loyalhannon returned home the 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>d</sup> Ins<sup>t</sup> & reported that General Forbes had actually reached the Place where Fort Du Quesne stood but that the French had destroyed it before his Arrival & carried all the Artillery &c to a Fort which they had built about 20 miles lower down the River. Your Ldp will be pleased to observe that this is no more than a Report & that it is not yet confirmed by any Letters from the Army, Most People however seem inclined to believe it & indeed I am of Opinion that if the Enemy had attacked & defeated our