

Bills were protested, and the same Sum has been by him since remitted for Reimbursement of the said Bills. Lib. J. R.  
& U. S.

Also by the Deputy Naval Officer of Pocomoke	}	1750. Samuel Chamberlaine's Bills, but dont say on whom, transmitted to the Trustees, for which there is no Credit by them for	31..7..6	p. 304
--	---	--	----------	--------

But they credit the Province next Year his Bill on William Anderson, not charged in his Naval Officer's Accounts for 27..0..0

Also the Naval Officer of Patuxent District in his Accounts 1755, charges the Province as follows:

To John Knight's Exchange on Johnson and Company	53.. 6..3
And Edward Barnes on Spencer for	34..12..5
	£87..18..8

Credit the Province by 15 <sup>d</sup> per Hogshead on 995 Hogsheads of Tobacco	62.. 3.. 9
And charge the Ballance to next Account	25..14..11
	£87..18.. 8

Which Ballance of £25 14s 11d he transfers to the Debet of his next Year's Account against the Province but it does not appear that the above two Bills, amounting to £87 18s 8d were ever credited by the Trustees; yet by their Account of the next Year they credited the Province by John Hanbury on said Naval Officer's Account £62 3s 9d: from which we apprehend the said Bills were not paid; and the said Naval Officer has ordered M<sup>r</sup> Hanbury to pay the nett Sum due only on the Tobacco, by the preceding Account exported; by which the said Ballance of £25 14s 11d carried to next Account again the Province should have been again credited, and not being so, is still due to the Province 25..14..11

And for Ballance of his Account 1756, he charges his Order on William Perkins in Favour of Messieurs Hunt and Hanbury remitted 319..18..4

And for Ballance of his Account 1757, his Exchange on M <sup>r</sup> William Perkins to be remitted to the Trustees by the first Ship	286.. 1..3
	£631..14..6

But your Committee don't find that the Trustees have credited the Province with the said Sums of £319..18..4: and 286..1..3: by which your Committee is induced to believe that