tions from any Director to a watchman being employed by a contractor?

Answer. No, sir; because I have had to employ no watchman.

By Mr. Ford.—Question. Did you understand the order as forbidding all persons employed by contractors coming upon the premises?

Answer. I did so understand the order.

By Mr. Hurst.—Question. After the order was given, did you not see persons at work on Sunday in the shop of Mr. Duvall?

Answer. I cannot say.

By Mr. Jarrett.—Question. Have you ever expressed any apprehensions from fire because of the condition of Mr. Duvall's shop.

Answer. I believe I have.

Mr. Gambrill, recalled by Complainant.

By Mr. Gill.—Question. Did you know of any work being done on Sunday while you were acting as watchman?

Answer. I do not know of any.

Michael Conner, sworn by Complainant.

Examined by Mr. Gill.—Question. You were the foreman of Mr. Duvall in the manufacturing department?

Answer. Yes, sir, from the 28th February, 1860. I had no knowledge of any order being given, except that no prisoners should be worked on Sundays, and no fires be permitted in the dry houses on that day.

The Committee then adjourned until to-morrow, Wed-

nesday morning, at 10 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, July 3d, 1861.

The Committee met pursuant to adjournment. Present, Messrs. Sangston and Ford.

Mr. Murdock, recalled by Complainant.

Examined by Mr. Gill.—Question. If the rules and regulations of the Penitentiary, as laid down in the Code and printed orders, had been followed on the day when the shop of Mr. Duvall was fired, would not such fire have been prevented in your opinion?

Answer. I understand that under such rules an officer should have had the supervision of the prisoners, and if this had been so, it would be impossible, in my judgment, for the fire to have occurred. It would be difficult among so large a number of convicts to have at all times an officer with each convict. When the rules and regulations were