

tempted, heretofore, to procure the passage of a law, to provide a pension for a man from Somerset county, who was no entitled thereto, is true or false, beg leave to respectfully present the following minority report:

And, although it has been the pleasure of your Honorable Body to adopt the report of the majority of the Committee, thereby rendering this report valueless and unnecessary in assisting your Honorable Body in making up its judgment upon the subject presented to you, that judgment having been already pronounced, the minority of your Committee feels an imperative duty, demanding that this paper should be presented. As has been already stated by the majority report already adopted, a number of gentlemen possessing a personal knowledge of the facts, underlying the subject under investigation, were summoned and examined by the Committee. With a singular facility, the majority have, in their report, almost completely ignored the testimony presented by the gentlemen having the most intimate knowledge of the facts of the case, and seem to have based their report upon the testimony offered by gentlemen, who, from their relations to the subject, could possess but comparatively little knowledge thereof.

Now, what are the facts in this case as presented by persons swearing positively and emphatically that their statements to the Committee were strictly and absolutely true, and who from their intimate connection with the subject are best qualified to testify as to the truth or falsity of the charge, that Col. Levin Woolford attempted to procure a pension for a man in Somerset county during the Legislature of 1872, not because he was entitled to a pension, but because he was a good Democrat and servicable to the party in his county. The majority report presents to the General Assembly, the opinion that the party for whom Col. Woolford is alleged to have attempted to procure a pension, was a man named Noah Webster, who was granted pecuniary relief by a subsequent Legislature. That this is an assumption by the Committee unfounded and unsupported by facts, and has no testimony whatever to rest upon, your Committee thinks will appear clear and undoubted, as the sworn testimony of the case under consideration is presented.

That the alleged pensioner was not the man, Noah Webster, appears from the testimony of Charles M. Jump, who being duly sworn, said: "He was a member of the Senate Committee on Pensions in 1872, and that during the Session 1872, Col. Woolford came to him with a petition, of a man residing in Somerset county for a pension. This petition was placed among many others in his file. In consequence