

that Mr. Williams mentioned that Dr. Rush had, either verbally or in some informal manner, disposed of certain articles or effects, and, according to my recollection, Mr. Williams said—I cannot give his precise words—but the impression made upon me by what he said was that he would ask the Library Company, or the Directors, I forget which, to assent to and confirm the disposition made by Dr. Rush of these articles. There was no discussion upon the subject, and certainly there was no dissent expressed by any member of the Board. It seemed to me to be prospective. He did not ask as of that time.

Q. The defendant has stated on page 11 of his answer, “I have been met with dictation and resistance, direct and indirect, and a constant struggle to obtain the control of his estate.” Do you know of any such dictation and resistance, and struggle to obtain such control?

A. I do not. I may add that I do not know of any formal request made by Mr. Williams to the Directors to confirm Dr. Rush’s verbal bequests further than as I have stated.

Cross-examination declined.

HENRY CRAMOND.

Sworn and subscribed before me,

RICHARD S. HUNTER, *Examiner*.

FREDERICK FRALEY, sworn.

Q. It is averred in the Bill, on page 17, that at a special meeting of the shareholders held on the 29th June, 1869, the defendant verbally mentioned his determination to place the Library on the Broad Street lot. That after the meeting, being strongly urged by the Committee to change that site for another equally good, and in a more central location, he, in order to relieve himself from the pressure thus put upon him, assigned among other reasons for his determination, that a loss to the estate would ensue if the lot was not used for that purpose; and that in answer to this it was at once arranged that any such loss would be met by voluntary contributions in relief of the estate; and that thereupon the