

listed correspond closely to those entered in the 1765 report (*Arch. Md.* LIX, lxii-lxiii, 146-147). Arms and ammunition included muskets, carbines, pistols, broadswords, swords, bayonets, daggers, halberds, cutlasses, sword-slings, buff-slings, belts, holsters, cartouche boxes, gun flints, trumpets, drums, and drumsticks. There were fourteen barrels and seventy-two half barrels of gunpowder, as well as bar lead and musket balls in the Powder House. The fifteen cannon on the Half Moon Battery were reported to be in better condition than in 1765, as were the arms in the Council Chamber, but those in the cellar of the Council Chamber would, unless removed, be ruined by rust, the present and late armorers having very much neglected them. The Powder House was in such a ruinous condition that unless soon repaired, it would fall down. The report was signed by Edward Ford, the Clerk of the committee (pp. 363-365). Although the name of the armorer is not mentioned in the journal of the Lower House, there is no doubt that the "late armorer" was Henry Walls, who had been appointed in 1748 at a salary of £35 a year, but, owing to the impasse resulting from the failure of the two houses to agree on a Journal of Accounts, had received no pay at all in the 1756-1766 period (*Arch. Md.* LVIII, lxix-lxx). The testamentary records show that Henry Walls had died in 1767, apparently insolvent, as Charles Carroll, doubtless as creditor, administered upon his estate. It is of interest that at the 1668 session a petition to the Assembly, the nature of which is not disclosed by the record, was presented on June 7th by Elizabeth Walls, who was probably the late armorer's widow. This was referred by the Upper House to the Lower House, where, after a second reading, it was rejected (pp. 290, 348, 349). Nor does the record disclose who had been appointed armorer following the death of Henry Walls.

THE CRIMINAL LAWS AND CRIME

In his opening speech to the 1768 Assembly Governor Sharpe had called attention to the fact that a careful review of the criminal laws in force in Maryland was required, as it was often uncertain whether or not a law was actually in force, resulting in "A Tenderness towards Convicted Persons, they may not seem to deserve." He urged that "some Criterion be Established so plain and explicit for determining what Criminal Laws are in force here, that all Doubts, on this Head, may in future be prevented" (p. 282). This confusion was unquestionably due in part to changes in Maryland criminal statutes and in part to the fact that English criminal laws were applicable in the Province unless they had been specifically superseded by Maryland acts, in many cases a question of no little uncertainty. There was no action taken at this session upon the recommendation of the Governor that the Assembly review the criminal law of the Province. During the session Sharpe brought to the attention of the Assembly two outbreaks of crime.

On May 28, 1768, and again on June 6th, Governor Sharpe sent messages to both houses in regard to recent outrages which had occurred on both the Eastern and Western Shores. In his first message he said that the details of this "horrid Piece of Villainy" would be found in an advertisement which had appeared in the *Maryland Gazette* of which he enclosed a copy, together with