

mittee for the purpose of showing illegal votes received, or legal votes rejected, in the elections held in said counties and city respectively on the 1st Wednesday of October last, for Delegates to the General Assembly of Maryland—provided that in taking and receiving said testimony the said committee shall restrict the said petitioners to the specific cases of legal votes rejected, and illegal votes received, alleged in their respective memorials; and provided further, that said subpoenas shall be returnable to some day to be named by the committee on elections.—Provided that the said committee in the examination of testimony in the said contested elections, shall have or receive no other evidence than such as come proper and competent in the courts of law of this State; and provided further, that no witness shall be required to answer any question which may tend to criminate him, or the answer to which he cannot make without, in his judgment, accusing himself—and that the said committee inquire whether there has been any fraud or corruption practised at said election, by bribery or otherwise, if any be alleged in the memorials before the said committee, or to the committee since the reference of said memorials.”

This order was adopted on Saturday the 2d of February, and on Monday the 4th of February, the Chairman of the committee had an interview with Mr. Welch, and desired to be furnished with a list of such witnesses as he intended to summon, that the same might be laid before the committee without delay. Mr. Welch replied, he had concluded not to prosecute the matter any further, and that he did not desire any witnesses to be summoned. Remarking at the same time, that he was now old, being more than three score years of age; that the prosecution of his claim to a seat would be attended with excitement and trouble, and much expense to the State; and as the house had already decided that Puckett was not entitled to vote, it could but result in a tie, and that therefore, in consideration of these circumstances he should not prosecute the matter any further. This conversation was held in the Library, in the presence of Mr. Causin, a member of the committee; after the house adjourned on the same day, the chairman had another interview with Mr. Welch, in front of the State House. Mr. Welch presented to the chairman a letter addressed to Mr. Spencer, as a member of the committee, and requested him to read it, which he accordingly did, and found that the letter requested Mr. Spencer to inform the committee, that he (Welch) declined to prosecute his claim to a seat in the house, assigning the same reasons detailed in the above conversation. He stated to the chairman at the same time, that he had always been averse to claiming a seat, and had only done so, to gratify his political friends. On the next day, just after the house was organised, the door keeper informed the chairman, that Mr. Welch wished to speak with him, at the bar of the house; he accordingly went to see Mr. Welch, who said that his friends would not consent to his withdrawing his memorial. This was all he said, he did not request any meeting of the committee, or wit-