

The individual whose name stands in the first line under "assets" was the cashier of the Bank at Port Deposit. Whether Co., was intended as an abbreviation to denote cashier, and whether "New York" was, or was not, misprint for 'new account' can only be ascertained by reference to the original manuscript. The individual next named was cashier in the office at Baltimore.

It will be remarked that bills *discounted* and bills *receivable* form separate items in the statement.

Why the sum of \$3401 19, was deducted from the amount of cash that ought to have been on hand is not explained, and we are equally in the dark as to what description of "cash" was meant by the words "*Port Deposit,*" "*Office,*" and "*Sundries*"

Although the statement A. (see printed Document herewith) presents on the face of it an exact balance of <i>apparent</i> liabilities and assets, yet it does <i>not include</i> , what ought by no means to have been omitted, in its column of liabilities on the 8th of March 1834, the <i>capital</i> originally paid in amounting to	\$315,683 22
Against which there was to be <i>deducted</i> however the	
cost of the <i>Bridge &amp;c.</i> , say,	218,978 11
And the cost of B. and R. R. Turnpike stock,	3,619 60
	<hr/> 222,597 71 <hr/>

Which would have shown a DEFICIENCY on the 8th

March 1834, not accounted for in the exhibit, of \$93,085 51

How is that *deficit* to be accounted for? Will the *second part* of *Exhibit A.* clear up the difficulty? It is believed that that statement, instead of mending the matter, presents it in a still worse point of view.

But before introducing here the "exhibit A. No. 2," it is proper to observe that the *answer* of the President of the Bank, to the *third general interrogatory* propounded by the committee on the currency, states that "the *books, papers and ASSETS* were, in the year 1834, *placed in the hands of TRUSTEES* appointed under an order of the CHANCELLOR," and that, so late as the 20th day of February 1838, they "*still remain in their hands.*"

In the exhibit of September 1834, we find the Trustees named therein, and a certain amount standing there against their names as *Trustees.*

Hence it would seem to follow that whatever "Books, Papers and Assets," the bank could in any way be entitled to, were by a *judicial order* placed in the hands of those *Trustees*, there to remain for the benefit of *all the creditors* of the insolvent institution.

And that whatever is exhibited as ASSETS on the 1st of September 1834, was *already included* in the amount therein stated against the names of the aforesaid Trustees, and if so, no part thereof ought to have been counted *twice!*

Exhibit A. No. 2, in the printed Report before referred to, is in