

Q. Do you know Jim Manly?

A. Yes; I saw him drive by in a wagon, but he did not get out that I am aware of.

Q. Did you see any persons drive up either in hacks or omnibuses to the polls and vote?

A. I saw some in hacks, but none in omnibuses.

Q. Were they legal voters in the ward?

A. They were sick persons of the ward.

After the testimony had been concluded,

*Mr. Hagner* said—We desire to prove by certain members of the Reform committee, that the organization of the Reform party in Baltimore had only for its object the choice of municipal officers, and members of the House of Delegates for Baltimore city. That it was not intended to apply to State officers, in reference to which the members of that party were left free to exercise their party or personal preferences. That two-fifths at least of the Reform tickets had the name of Mr. Purnell for State Comptroller printed upon them; and that, if the election had been conducted with perfect fairness these gentlemen believe that Mr. Purnell would have received a large majority of the votes in the city of Baltimore—more than sufficient to elect him.

*Mr. Freaner*—The offer is overruled by a majority of the Committee, upon the ground that such testimony has already been produced.

*Mr. Schley* stated that the counsel for Messrs. Gaither and Purnell both desired to be heard before the Committee in open session.

To this proposition *Mr. Freaner* replied—I am authorised by a majority of the Committee to overrule the proposition for argument, upon the ground that the Committee have not time to hear any arguments upon the question, and upon the further ground, that they deem themselves, (without any disparagement whatever to the learned counsel, who represent the claimants,) able to decide upon the testimony as submitted.

The minority of the Committee dissented from these rulings of the Chairman.

Thereafter, the examination being concluded, the Committee adjourned.