

Were you, or were you not, employed as counsel to solicit the General Assembly of Maryland, in the year 1836, to authorise a subscription of \$3,000,000 to the capital stock of the Baltimore and Ohio Rail Road Company, and a loan or subscription of \$3,000,000, to the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Company? And if your answer be in the affirmative, then state by whom, and when you were so employed—what compensation was stipulated to be paid to you on behalf of each of said companies—in what form said stipulation was made—and whether such compensation was to enure exclusively to your own use and benefit; and without any person or persons whatsoever participating therein: and further, state whether you have, or have not, applied for, received and so used a compensation stipulated as aforesaid to be paid to you, on behalf of said canal company—and its sum; and finally whether you have not applied—and to whom, when, and where, for the payment of a compensation stipulated as aforesaid to be paid to you on behalf of the Baltimore and Ohio Rail Road Company—its sum—the result of said application—and generally, what was said by the persons present respectively when you made such application.

Were you, or were you not, informed that James Wm. McCulloh had agreed to compensate, in the event of success, Messrs. Robert W. Kent and Philemon Chew, severally, for remaining at Annapolis in the month of March, 1836, to solicit members of the General Assembly to authorise a subscription of \$3,000,000 to the capital stock of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Company, and a like subscription to the capital stock of the Baltimore and Ohio Rail Road Company—and were you, or were you not, acquainted with the reasons which influenced said McCulloh to seek their co-operation—and if your answer be in the affirmative, then state those reasons.

Did or did not any counsellor propose in your hearing, to any member of the General Assembly, at December session, 1835, to unite the plan of a Real Estate Bank of ten millions of dollars to be borrowed on State stock to the provisions of a bill that had authorised a subscription on the part of the State of Maryland of \$3,000,000 to the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Company—and other less subscriptions to minor works, as an easy and effectual means of accomplishing the known wishes of such member of the General Assembly to have said subscriptions authorised? And if your answer be in the affirmative—name such counsellor and said member of the General Assembly—and state generally, what conversation passed at said interview.

Did or did not, any member of the General Assembly, at December session 1835, propose to you to advise the blending of the plan of a Real Estate Bank of ten millions of dollars to be borrowed on State stock, to the provisions of a bill that should authorise a subscription of three millions of dollars by the State, to the capital stock of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Company, and an equal subscription to that of the Baltimore and Ohio Rail