

possession of the polls, can be true. The Reform Party polled nearly 22,000 votes, but 3,000 less than their vote at the Mayoralty election, which was an unusually quiet election. To have polled such a vote—larger by 5,000 than the vote of the Republican Party at the last Presidential election—in face of the all-ged combination of police and ruffians, to exclude them from the polls, is simply impossible.

But this charge, that the polls were taken possession of by ruffians, with the connivance of the police, is disproved by the direct testimony of the witnesses examined on the part of the contestants in all of the districts, and in all parts of the city. So far from the fact being as alleged, the proof is uniform that the access to the window was kept open for all voters during the entire day.

For the views of your Committee on the charges against the Police Board, we refer to our report in the matter of the investigation of their conduct, herewith submitted.

It was sought by some witnesses to establish a connivance on the part of the police officers at a general condition of violence and disorder. In the few instances where specific neglect of duty by particular officers, was offered in evidence; the proof was weak in the extreme, and the charges in each case fully rebutted by counter testimony. But if every case had been fully and completely proven, the number is so small the cases themselves so clearly were individual wrongs, if any wrong were done; that it would be simply absurd to claim that any connivance of the police force at a general condition of disorder had been shown by the proof.

So far from this, the proof of the contestants shows active and strenuous effort on the part of the officers in every case where serious disorder existed, as in certain precincts of the 5th, 15th and 18th wards, where but for their efforts to suppress disorder, many lives would have been lost by collisions between excited bodies of white men and negroes.

Your Committee cannot avoid the conclusion that so much of the charge preferred as implicates the police authorities and officers in encouraging or conniving at the alleged condition of disorder is not only unsustained by proof, but is clearly shown by the testimony to be a cruel slander upon men faithfully seeking to perform an arduous duty under circumstances of difficulty.

Nor does the proof disclose the existence of any general disorder on the day of election. All of the witnesses agree that voting continued throughout the day, without interruption at all of the polling places. No witness pretends that the police ever lost or abandoned the control of the ac-