ment of Col. Earle by interrogating him as to the truth of the statement made by him as to the interview in the Senate Chamber. Col. Earle further testified that at a subsequent meeting of the Committee on Finance, Colonel Woolford appeared to enlighten the Committee as to the merits of the bill that had been the subject of conversation between Col. Woolford and himself. The Committee immediately laid aside the work upon which they were engaged, and out of deference to Col. Woolford's position as Comptroller, took up the bill which brought Col. Woolford before them.

He at once began an explanation of the bill, and Col. Earle swears that, before proceeding far, Col. Woolford's "manner excited my suspicion; I thought there was something wrong, and I said to him very quickly and in a sharp manner, 'Col. Woolford, was that man ever in the army?' His reply was, 'No, Col. Earle, he never was in the army. but he is very good or first-rate Democrat;' I will not be positive which expression he used, meaning at all events a first-rate Democrat; he added, 'we cannot do without his services in some part of Somerset county,' which he named; I then said to him, 'There is an end of it sir;' at this Col. Woolford left the room, as you may suppose there was tremendous indignation in the Committee; I think I expressed my indignation very strongly myself, and I am sure the present Governor did also. As to the nature of the bill in which Col. Woolford was thus interested, Col. Earle swears that "it was certainly a pension bill and nothing else; its provisions were of a simple ordinary pension bill, I am sure I did not make a mistake as to the character of the bill." This testimony as to the nature of this bill taken with the testimony of Mr. Charles M. Jump, that the party named in the bill was the same as the party named in the petition for pension, which had enlisted such interest on the part of Col. Woolford, must demonstrate conclusively that Noah Webster who received an appropriation in consequence of having been illegally drafted, and the petitioner for pension, were too separate and distinct persons.

L. S. Claggett was sworn, and said that he was a member of the Senate of 1872, and a member of the Finance Committee of that Body, and remembered the circumstances attending the appearance of Col. Woolford before the Committee on Finance, to advocate the claim of a man in Somerset county for a pension. Mr. Claggett further says that he "would not have remembered the bill had it not been for the unfortunate occurrence that took place on that occasion, and the predicament in which Col. Woolford placed himself, and the surprised expressed by the Committee at his conduct in