

*The Chairman.*—Show the agency, and we will question the witness.

Question. [To witness.]—Have you at any time heard any one or more of the grantees say that he or they received any consideration for the use of his or their names as a grantee or grantees?

Answer. I have heard only one of the grantees express himself upon the subject of receiving any thing, and that was Mr. Travers, who told me he received a compensation as counsel. I had no interview upon that subject with any of the grantees. This was a voluntary declaration from Mr. Travers to myself. I never conferred with any of the other grantees upon that subject. All of them I do not know personally. But Mr. Travers and Mr. Browning are old acquaintances. My interviews were with those two gentlemen.

*By Mr. Blakistone.*—Q.—Did Mr. Travers state who he was counsel for?

Answer. No, he did not.

*By Mr. Gordon.*—Q.—Do you know who he was counsel for?

Answer. I do not. When he made the remark to me I took it for granted that it was for the grantees; but he did not state that.

*By Mr. Blakistone.*—Q.—Do I understand you to say that you never had any conversation with any of the other grantees upon that or any other subject?

Answer. I said that I had had conversation with two of the grantees, but with only one of them upon the subject of the compensation of the grantees.

Question. Upon what subject was your conversation with the other grantee? Upon a subject material to this case?

Answer. Upon the subject of the assignment.

*By the Chairman.*—Q.—Assignment of what?

Answer. Assignment of the grant.

*Mr. Alexander.*—Declarations after the assignment are not evidence. [To witness.]—At what time was this conversation between yourself and Mr. Travers? Before or after the assignment?

*Mr. Blakistone* said he thought the objection coming from the other side struck him as a little singular. This was not to be tried exactly according to the forms and technicalities of the law, but it was a general inquiry to find out what they had been challenged to prove, to show the connection between these parties, and that Brock & Co., though not seen in the affair, were the real parties interested, and if the Committee would allow them to bring this testimony before them, they would so connect it that the whole affair would be brought home and fastened upon these parties. But following the strict formalities in regard to testimony, much would be shut out that would so strongly circumstantial as to convince the Committee, as the whole community had been already convinced. He did not expect to get any one to come here and say—"Why I saw Mr. Brock pay so much money to the City Council, or to these gentlemen for the use of their names," or, that "Mr. Brock said so in my presence that this money is for your vote, or for the use of your name." But we do expect to prove, if the Committee will allow us, by action of circumstances so strong that they would hang a man, if murder were involved in this case, and bring this matter home, not only to the minds of the Committee, but to every unprejudiced and right minded member of the Legislature.

*Mr. Gordon.*—We want to give a fair opportunity to do what the gentleman desires, but at the same time we want to do it in a proper manner. We propose to give every opportunity to prove the facts charged, and if circumstances of such a character as will connect these parties with this transaction can be brought forward, of course that will be just as good evidence as any other. But hearsay, as we all know, is not evidence. We are not here to decide this case upon the common newspaper rumors or any thing of the kind, for if that were the case, we should not want the evidence of these witnesses at all.

*Mr. Blakistone.*—That is all true. I do not mean to confine this to rumors at all, but to show by this witness that a party in interest did repeat the fact,