

disorders on the day of election, shown in evidence, do not constitute such a general condition of tumult and riot as would prevent a free expression of the popular will at the ballot box. It is also apparent that the rejection of the vote in the precincts characterized by disorder, would have no effect on the result of the election.

It is also apparent, that if the city had been as free from disorder as on the day of the municipal election, and the Reform vote at the November election had reached 25,000, the result would have been the same. That their full vote was polled at the municipal election without any obstacle no one has ever questioned.

Your Committee will only briefly allude to the charges of fraudulent voting and stuffing of ballot-boxes by persons in the interest of the returned members. Clearly the election cannot be set aside because of fraudulent voting at this or that precinct. The rules of law require a contestant to prove a ballot to have been illegally received, upon which it will be rejected from the count, but its receipt can have no other or further consequence. The proof of the contestants is meagre in the extreme. There is almost no proof of the receipt by the judges of ballots from persons not legally entitled to vote.

In certain precincts in the three districts, discrepancies exist between the number of votes recorded on the clerks lists, and the number returned by the judges, this is, of course, of no weight as evidence, since no one can tell whether the excess consisted of Democratic or Reform votes. It is again urged that very many of the tickets in the ballot boxes were narrower than other tickets, and that very many more were found to have gotten in the ballot boxes unfolded. It is argued that these narrow tickets and unfolded tickets are necessarily fraudulent votes. Were they all Democratic tickets, and had it been shown by proof that the number of these tickets so found corresponded with the excess of the votes in the ballot box over the votes recorded by the clerks, the conjectural argument would have a certain plausibility, but the attempt thus to fix a suspicion on the conduct of the judges is futile, in view of the proof that these pudden tickets, as they are termed, were voted by many persons who testified to having voted them, and there is no correspondence whatever shown by the proofs presented to the Committee between the number of such tickets and the difference between the tickets in the ballot boxes and the names recorded on the clerks lists as having voted.

But if we could force ourselves to the conclusion that all of these narrow, tissue paper, or unfolded tickets must be re-