

two separate columns, the *total* of each of which is set down there as \$783,995 98, by which it would appear, to a cursory observer, that the two columns did exactly *balance*; whereas by *trying* the *addition* it will be found that the sum total of one column is, \$1,096,997 98. Instead of the sum there put down as *apparent* total, 783,995 98

Error in the addition (!!!) \$312 008 00

If all that was entered in the left hand column had formed *distinct* and *separate* items of assets, then the assets would not merely have been equal to the liabilities, but they would have very greatly, *over-balanced* these liabilities, set down as aforesaid at \$783,995 98

But in the column of liabilities there was an omission to put down, in the line of *capital stock*, the amount of *additional capital* that had been paid in 1832, which in the *answer* to the 1st Interrogatory, in the report before referred to, is stated to have been \$78,005, or as per the *March* statement, at least, \$77,965 00

Actual total liabilities, (September 1834) \$861,960 98

The September statement enumerates, *besides* the amount of assets with which the three *Trustees* therein named stand charged there, sundry other items amounting to about, \$578,607 98

And the amount with which the said *Trustees* are therein charged is set down at 518,390 00

Making in all, \$1,096,997 97

But if the amount "in the hands of the *Trustees*" is to be considered as *including the whole of the assets* of the bank in September 1834, (see answer to third interrogatory hereinbefore referred to,) then the *ASSETS* would appear to have been only, \$518,390 00

DEFICIENCY, in that case not accounted for, of \$343,570 98

Or, if it be contended that according to the September statement, the assets should be taken to be \$578,607 98, as the true amount that the *Trustees* should have been charged with, even then there would still appear to be a **DEFICIENCY**, not accounted for of about, \$283,353 00

According to the printed report before mentioned, the "Exhibit A. No. 2." purporting to be a "statement Susquehanna Bridge and Bank Company, Port Deposit, Monday, Sep. 1st 1834," represented the bank's condition to be such as is set forth in the following summary—viz: