from his marriage with the complainant, and does not know of any other business in which he is engaged except that connected with the cultivation of the farm.
To the seventh, that he does not know of Watkins ever contracting any debts in his wife's name for liquor, except once and perhaps oftener, for a pint of brandy which he supposes was to have been used in sickness, as Watkins at the time so told deponent.
He has frequently contracted debts in his wife's name with deponent for other articles.
The eighth interrogatory waived.
To the ninth interrogatory, that deponent knows of two grown horses and a colt, some cattle, but he doesn't know how many. There is also a negro man, a woman who deponent has understood is a slave for a term of years, and an old woman a slave for life the mother of the man. They have also some furniture and some farming utensils. Deponent always considered the farm on which Watkins lives as his wife's, being her dower in her first husband's estate. Watkins is in possession of all this property as far as deponent understands. Mrs Watkins is not living with him, he has heard, but understands that she is with her daughter Mrs Black, but whether on a visit or not he does not know. He thinks Mrs Watkins has no other property that above described. He thinks the farm has lessened in value and productiveness since the marriage of the complainant and defendant, and is still lessening. The income from the farm according to the manner of cultivating it as above described, is not sufficient for Mrs Watkins support. But if properly managed, it could be made a more productive farm and sufficiently so to support the family of the defendant.
~~William Bird~~ And thereupon A. Randall Esq Solicitor for the defendant exhibited his cross-

interrogatories filed and herewith returned which being put to the witness he answers and says:
To the first cross interrogatory, that at the time referred to Watkins told deponent that he had the disease and got it from this woman.
To the second cross interrogatory, that he does not know whether he had been drinking, but thinks Watkins was making light of it. He also remarked in a playful manner that there were several in the neighborhood who had been burnt in the same way by the woman, answers laughing and joking about it.
To the third cross-interrogatory, that deponent doesn't know what is termed drunk. It has not been long since he saw Watkins under the influence of liquor. The last time that it was perceptible was during the spring term of Anne Arundel Court.
To the fourth cross-interrogatory that he does not recollect whether he was sick then. He had the disentery some time during that year, but he does not remember at what time in the year. He knows that he was not sick during all the time referred to.
William Bird a witness of lawful age produced on the part of the complainant being duly sworn and examined to the special interrogatories filed and herewith returned, deposes and says.
To the first special interrogatory, that he knows the parties, he may have known them by name or sight for some years, but has only known them specially for about three years during which time he has been their family physician.
To the second cross special interrogatory, if the disease existed when Watkins applied to deponent for remedies, he had been guilty of infidelity, but when or from whom he contracted it, deponent did not ask him nor has he ever known.
In the year eighteen hundred and fifty one, in January, February and March, Watkins procured medicines from deponent