

a month before, in the absence of Mr. Purnell, and without notice to him; printed and shown to the witnesses, who, on an average, did not speak ten words in presence of the committee. The witnesses for the defence examined *as the law prescribes*, and rigidly cross-examined, were asked by counsel upon both sides as to those particular matters testified to by the witnesses for Mr. Jarrett. That they contradicted the contestant's witnesses in these particulars, only proved the existence of a difference between them which the committee was bound to reconcile or decide upon from the manner and appearance of the opposing witnesses.

A brief reference to the evidence of particular witnesses will illustrate the matter.

Thomas H. Martin testified in Baltimore to sundry matters set forth in the printed book. When called to testify in this investigation, his whole evidence consisted of a few words of assent, after which formality his whole *ex parte* statement was admitted against Mr. Purnell. He stated that he was a judge of election in the tenth ward; that all the judges were not present when the voting began; that he was present but a short time, during which Hinesley refused to allow the witness to take any of the tickets, or to allow Reformers to vote, but admitted Know-Nothing votes whenever offered; that no Reform challenger was permitted to stand at the window, and that upon remonstrating with Hinesley because he would not put a Reform ballot in the box, he was assaulted by him and compelled to leave the room.

Col. Samuel Houston, another judge at the same polls, swears that all the judges were in attendance when the voting began; that well known citizens were present as Reform challengers; that Martin and Hinesley were each taking Reform and American tickets with equal fairness, when the clerks declared that they could not record the names if two judges took tickets at the same time; that Martin, who was excited by drink, then insisted that he alone should take the ballots, but Hinesley insisted upon his equal right to do so for a while; and Martin accused him of dropping a Reform ticket on the floor, instead of placing it in the box. Col. Houston declares that search was made on the floor by himself and the Reform clerk for such ticket, and none such was found, and that the charge was untrue; that Martin offensively persisted in the statement, and finally received a blow from Hinesley, soon after which he left, stating that he would soon return. These two statements are presented to the committee, and they are to decide between them. Houston was properly examined and cross-examined according to law. Martin scarcely spoke half dozen words. Houston was proved to have lived