

persons were prevented from voting at the 1st ward polls. He answers: "Witness cannot say; but this much witness can say, that he does not believe there were enough persons prevented from voting at the polls to change the complexion of the result on the Hill." This seems plain enough; but the witness is re-examined in chief upon the following very regular interrogatory on page 14: Q. "Do I understand correctly that, in answer to one of the questions propounded by Mr. Krafft, you stated that the number of persons who were prevented from voting at the polls were not sufficient to change the result of the vote; you meant to say, the number of persons only *whom you saw attempt to vote*, and who were prevented by violence, threats or intimidation were not sufficient to change the result?" *Answer.* "That is what I meant to say."

This, taken from the testimony of the first witness called, is a fair specimen of a great part of the interrogatories.

The testimony consists, too, in great part, of matters of mere hearsay, of vague rumors and statements derived from others, couched in language quite inconsistent with the illiterate manner of some of the witnesses. For these reasons, we believe that every word of this evidence should have been ruled out by the committee.

Mr. Purnell declined to waive his objections to the evidence by cross-examining these witnesses, and the only opportunity afforded the committee of forming an opinion as to the intelligence and honesty of the greater part of them consisted in hearing them speak half a dozen words in reply to two standing interrogatories.

In this manner, *one* witness was examined from the 1st, 2d, 3d, 4th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 11th, 12th, 17th, 19th and 20th wards in the city of Baltimore respectively; no witness from the 16th; *two* from the 5th, 10th, 14th and 15th wards, respectively; *three* from the 9th and 13th wards, and *four* from the 18th ward—making *thirty* witnesses in all out of the 112 whose testimony is printed in the book. It is proper to remind the House, that *the only evidence in the book which they, under their oaths, can consider at all in the determination of this case, is that of the 30 witnesses referred to above*, and that, for the purposes of this case, the rest of the book can no more be considered, than if it were not in existence. To regard any testimony *not taken in this investigation*, would be an outrageous violation of every principle of justice. It is equally clear that even if the remonstrances sent from Baltimore referred at all to the case of Mr. Purnell, (as they do not,) being mere assertions, not under oath, and not read