

Ohio rail road company, ch. 123, of 1826 was passed, I believe, with but two alterations, the addition of its two last sections, precisely as it had been framed by John V. L. McMahon, the counsel of Charles Carroll of Carrollton,

Philip E. Thomas,	George Hoffman,
William Patterson,	William Stewart,
Isaac McKim,	William Lorman,
Robert Oliver,	George Warner,
Charles Ridgely, of Hampton,	Benjamin C. Howard,
Thomas Tennant,	Solomon Etting,
Alexander Brown,	W. W. Taylor,
John McKim, Jr.,	Alexander Fridge,
Talbot Jones,	James L. Hawkins,
James Wilson,	John B. Morris,
Thomas Ellicott,	Alexander McDonald, and
	Solomon Birkhead, who

were a committee of its projectors.

I advocated the passage of that act with much zeal, but under the belief that its work could not, in any wise, conflict with the canal. To both works I then felt truly friendly, and I would not have done any act, nor have I since, knowingly, that would injure either, to gratify the friends of the other. For the success of both, and the welfare of each, I have since unceasingly exerted my faculties, and devoted much of my time, and commonly, without receiving any compensation from the rail road company for my services, as counsel, or otherwise; and never receiving any compensation, for such services, from the canal company.

At December session, 1827, I was not returned a delegate; my support of the act, ch. 260, of 1826, known as the Hoop-pole Law; but which simply enacted that trespasses committed on the freehold, *with intent to steal*, should be deemed and be punished as felonies, and my being unfriendly to the election of Andrew Jackson as President of the United States, had defeated my election, and I was not afterwards a candidate for re-election. But the president and directors of the Baltimore and Ohio Rail Road company then wishing to obtain a subscription of 500,000 dollars from the State to its capital stock, as was authorized by ch. 104, of 1827, applied to Wm. Gwynn and myself to become their counsel, as we did, to solicit that aid, and this employment brought me to Annapolis. To the circumstance that it was well understood by the friends of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal company, who desired for it a similar subscription, that I was decidedly friendly to their work, I ascribed the fact of my being selected on this occasion, as one of the counsel of the Baltimore and Ohio Rail Road company. The internal improvement act, ch. 180, of 1825, was framed upon the principle that the large sections of the State were alike entitled to appropriate care and improvement; that if the credit of the whole was to be used, for the purpose of improving one Shore, the other was alike entitled to use that credit for kindred, or more appropriate improvements. On this just