

Answer. No, sir; I stated the circumstances under which the demand was made, and his reply to it.

By Mr. *Alexander*. Question. You stated, at the commencement of your examination, that you thought it would be better to give a connected explanation in detail of the origin of your connection with this application to the City Council for this ordinance. Now, as a part of our cross-examination, we propose to furnish you that opportunity. Now make, if you please, such explanation as you think will place you and the subject in a right light before the Committee?

Answer. I have endeavored to make a pretty full statement as I have gone along.

Question. If that is sufficient we will ask no more?

Answer. I suppose it is unnecessary for me to say that there has been a great deal of misrepresentation in regard to this whole transaction. The press have charged from time to time that this grant was sold, that it was obtained by the original grantees for the purpose of sale; and that seems to have been considered by a great many persons to have been the truth. As I have before stated, we were called upon frequently by gentlemen of responsibility to purchase this grant, and we declined.

By Gov. *Pratt*. Question. Who were those parties?

Answer. Upon one occasion I was called upon by a Mr. Charles Hall, who represented himself as being from the State of Pennsylvania, who was very anxious to negotiate the purchase of this grant. He called several times at my house, and had interviews with me upon the subject; and finally he desired that I should be placed in communication with Mr. Simon Cameron, of Pennsylvania, and said that Mr. Cameron had sent word that he was anxious to see me. I went to see him, not upon that subject, but in obedience to the invitation of Mr. Cameron. I had an interview with Mr. Cameron, a part of the time in the presence of Mr. Hall. The object of Mr. Hall seemed to be, as far as it was disclosed then, to get the endorsement of Mr. Cameron as to his responsibility, and as to his power and ability to carry out and construct this railway. Mr. Cameron further stated that he himself would like to have a part in this matter, and said that anything that Mr. Hall would do would be endorsed by himself. Mr. Hall was the party who offered \$100,000 in stock, to be issued by the company, and \$50,000 in cash for the grant. As I said before, as it was not a merchantable article in the market, of course we rejected his offer. No amount of money could have purchased it.

Mr. *Blakistone*. We want the fullest latitude given here. But I hope the Committee will bear in mind that this is less admissable than some testimony that was rejected last night.

Gov. *Pratt*. This testimony is perfectly legal.

The *Chairman*. In what way does this testimony bear upon this subject?

Mr. *Alexander*. To show that there was a bona fide connection between this gentleman and some Philadelphia gentlemen, at the time he permitted his name to be used. It was generally understood that these grantees were to have a connection with those to whom they afterwards made an assignment. And after the grant was made, the assignment was made in good faith precisely as it was understood, these gentlemen not caring to keep to themselves for their benefit a work, an interest in which they might legitimately have claimed under the original arrangement. Mr. Travers states that he had been applied to by Mr. Wood to permit his name to be used in the grant, the capital for which was to come from Philadelphia, and Philadelphians were to be associated with the grantees in it. The precise terms of the interest the grantees were to have were not stated. After the ordinance was passed Mr. Travers was introduced to those Philadelphia gentlemen, whose names he did not know before, and an explanation took place between them in regard to the condition in which they would stand in regard to each other. And these grantees made an out and out