

E
695
S84
copy 2



Class E695

Book 'S84

PRESENTED BY

copy 2

WAS NEW YORK'S VOTE STOLEN?

BY WILLIAM GORHAM RICE AND FRANCIS LYNDE STETSON

I

CAN the electoral vote of New York State be stolen? Did such a theft occur in 1884? Was the will of the people then criminally perverted and did Democracy come into power at Cleveland's first election with a fraudulent title to the Presidency?

These questions arise for the reason that doubt of the honesty of the declared result of the Presidential vote of New York in 1884 has been announced recently by a writer of considerable reputation. Even if not supported by evidence, a suspicion of this kind put forth by responsible authority is not unlikely to have some weight when in the future the story of our own times comes to be written. Especially may this occur if the allegation remains uncontroverted and secures without challenge a place in the record of the present. A statement expressing such a doubt seems, therefore, to deserve consideration at this time and to warrant reply from representatives of those who had close association with the first election of Mr. Cleveland and direct knowledge of the events of that campaign.

It is true that immediately after that election a few bitter partisans of minor consequence and some subordinate officeholders, who through undisturbed occupation for twenty-four years had come to look upon government place as a private perquisite, indulged in a recreation perhaps fairly to be characterized as "swearing at the Court." Some newspaper writers, too, whose election predictions had gone wrong, and other men who had made wagers and lost, apparently found mitigation of their disappointment in claiming that there were frauds in the count. Where these

frauds were they did not attempt to specify, but consoled themselves with vague and undefined accusations. After a little time, however, virtually all these accusers admitted fair defeat and the trustworthiness of the returns showing Cleveland's election was accepted by unprejudiced and carefully informed men throughout the country. In the State of New York where the issue particularly arose and where all the facts were best known there was a universal conclusion that a truthful result had been declared.

Though generally conversant with all that has been written about Mr. Cleveland, I had never seen this charge of dishonesty as to the declared vote of New York supported by name until the publication of an article entitled "Election Superstitions and Fallacies" by Edward Stanwood, in the *Atlantic Monthly* for October, 1912. Mr. Stanwood is a well-known writer whose reputation as a publicist has been largely established by his *History of the Presidency*. He is also the author of a *Tariff History of the United States*, written from the protectionist point of view, it is true, but esteemed upon the whole accurate even by those who are adverse to the protectionist theory. Mr. Stanwood presented something more than vague and unsubstantial accusation and, accordingly, on October 8th, I wrote him:

DEAR SIR.—In the article "Election Superstitions and Fallacies" . . . you say, "there is a strong probability at least that he (Blaine) did actually have a plurality of the votes honestly cast in that State (New York)." Will you kindly refer me to the evidence which has led you to this conclusion?

I was well acquainted with the election procedure in the State of New York at that time, and I have never seen evidence to make me doubt the absolute accuracy of the count (of 1884), and until your statement I had not supposed that such count was questioned by any well-informed man.

Yours very truly,

WILLIAM GORHAM RICE.

Mr. Stanwood, on October 11th, replied:

MY DEAR SIR.—I am unable to present any definite information to justify my statement that the vote of New York was fraudulently counted for Mr. Cleveland in 1884. In the nature of things such information, properly to be termed evidence, is impossible. But I am surprised that you should think that the count was not "questioned by any well-informed man." for it was most emphatically questioned by many. To my certain knowledge it was questioned by Mr. Blaine himself, but he was well aware that there was no way in which it could be investigated, and he would not have sanctioned an investigation if there had been a way to make it.

You probably do not know that I was, all my life, intimately connected

with Mr. Blaine, as a cousin of his wife, as a fellow-townsmen, as secretary of the Republican State Committee of Maine when he was the chairman, and in many other ways, and that I wrote his biography for a volume in the American Statesman series. I venture to append the remarks I made in that volume on the result of the election (page 291):

"New York was counted for Cleveland, but there were then, and are now, few Republicans cognizant of the facts who doubt that a plurality of votes was actually cast for Mr. Blaine. It was openly charged at the time, and commonly believed by Republicans, although Democrats warmly denied it, that in many precincts of New York City the votes for Butler were counted for Cleveland. The conviction, a few years later, of the unscrupulous boss of a town near New York, on a charge of falsifying election returns, confirmed in their opinion those who held the view that Blaine was really elected."

That, of course, is neither evidence nor an approach to evidence; but it does at least—so I think—justify the sentence from my article which you quote. The facts that the counting was in the hands of Mr. Blaine's opponents; that the opportunity to falsify the result existed; that such falsification had been practised on other occasions; and that there were many men in charge of the counting who were not above making false returns; all these things combine to suggest at least that when a national election could be carried by a reversal of 575 votes, the suspicion is not unreasonable.

Yours truly,

EDWARD STANWOOD.

Before Mr. Stanwood's and other similar accusations are taken up in detail and the process is considered by which the result of the election in question was ascertained in New York State, the situation there will be better comprehended by recalling some incidents of the Presidential campaign in 1884 which I have elsewhere related.

It was Grover Cleveland's courage and rectitude as shown in his public acts as Mayor and Governor that led to his first nomination for President. He drew to his support progressive-minded men from all parts of the country, many of whom previously had had no identification with, or even had been actively in antagonism to, the Democratic party. Opposed to him was James G. Blaine, who had long been conspicuous in public affairs, who had been Speaker of the House of Representatives, and who had secured the nomination after many years of aspiration and of devoted effort on the part of ardent admirers. At the close of his nationwide speaking tour, just before Election Day, Mr. Blaine had passed through New York City. He was there long enough, however, to receive a clerical delegation whose spokesman, addressing him as the opponent of "Run, Romanism, and Rebellion," had met with neither immediate rebuke nor contradiction.

As Assistant Secretary to Governor Cleveland I had direct knowledge of his campaign, and it so happened that I was particularly associated with the events of and immediately following Election Day. That day generally ends the Presidential campaign, but it was not so when the first extended control of national affairs by the Republican party ceased. In 1884, after a campaign perhaps unequaled in party heat from beginning to end—and in which the last week had been particularly exciting because of the incident referred to above—when the polls had closed interest suddenly intensified, and flamed up and centered upon the vital question of which candidate had carried New York State. The election there, it clearly appeared, was close, phenomenally close. A few hundred votes either way would determine it. To which side would the balance go? If in the one direction, Democracy after its long exclusion from power would be triumphant in the nation. If in the other, Republicanism would remain dominant. At once remembrance of the Tilden-Hayes controversy became vivid. Again the country was confronted with the dangers of a disputed title to the Presidency. Again the possibility even of civil war was in men's minds.

Mr. Cleveland, after casting his vote in Buffalo early on Election Day, had returned to the Executive Mansion at Albany. In the evening with a few intimate friends gathered about him he received the returns there. Congratulatory telegrams began to pour in soon after the polls closed, but while these despatches and friendly newspaper bulletins were claiming New York State for him by many thousands, few satisfactory detailed figures were received. There was no telegraph wire at the Executive Mansion, and even the telephone early went out of commission that night in a rain-storm which as the hours progressed became almost a deluge. Messengers were the only means of contact with the outside world. In this situation I went to the Albany *Argus* newspaper office and from the working press wire there began before long to get fairly exact, though fragmentary, returns. Assembling these in partial totals, I soon reached a conclusion which was at variance with the then general opinion that New York State had given a large majority for Mr. Cleveland. My conclusion was based upon percentages of comparative gain over other years as shown by the exact figures from scattered election districts both

in cities and in rural communities. While the drift seemed constantly and surely favorable to Mr. Cleveland, it was so slight that I was satisfied his majority would not be over 2,000. This rather startling conclusion I wrote out, with condensed figures sustaining it, and sent it by special messenger to the Governor's Secretary, Colonel Lamont, who was with Mr. Cleveland at the Executive Mansion. The situation immediately became the subject of careful consideration there by the four or five men who had been in particularly close touch with the contest in New York State, and soon after midnight we sent the following telegrams to two or more prominent Democrats in virtually every county of the State:

The only hope of our opponents is in a fraudulent count in the country districts. Call to your assistance to-day vigilant and courageous friends, and see that every vote cast is honestly counted. Telegraph me at once your estimate, and let me hear from you from time to time until actual figures are known.

DANIEL MANNING.

Mr. Manning was the Chairman of the Democratic State Committee, but he was not at the Executive Mansion, and his name was used without consultation with him. In fact, he knew nothing of the telegram until replies began to come in. Later telegrams to citizens of the highest standing urged them to go to the Clerk's office in their respective counties, to remain there until returns were filed, and then to obtain certified copies of such returns and to send these copies by special messenger to Albany. Gradually semi-official returns were collected at the Executive Chamber in Albany, and Mr. Cleveland's assured majority in the State was more accurately known there than anywhere else. The exact majority determined finally by the State Canvassing Board in the following December was 1,047.

When our Executive Chamber tabulation of detailed returns was finished, and Mr. Cleveland was satisfied that the totals told the truth, he sent this telegram, November 6th, to a friend:

I believe I have been elected President, and nothing but grossest fraud can keep me out of it, and that we will not permit.

But it was not until later in the week when the Manager of the Western Union Telegraph Company at Albany delivered into Mr. Cleveland's own hands a message received

over a special wire that the situation was relieved of doubt. That message was in these words:

GOVERNOR CLEVELAND,—I heartily congratulate you on your election. All concede that your administration as Governor has been wise and conservative, and in the larger field as President I feel that you will do still better, and that the vast business interests of the country will be entirely safe in your hands.

JAY GOULD.

Coming from the most conspicuous of his opponent's supporters—from one who was the head and center of the group of interests which had continued to claim that opponent's election, it satisfied Mr. Cleveland that the contest was over and the victory won.

How the call of the telegram of Election night was obeyed, and how implicitly the canvass of the vote deserves to be trusted, is told in pages following by Mr. Stetson, who largely organized and directed the special protective measures which were continued until the declaration of the vote of New York State. It was the prompt, intelligent, and devoted efforts of the group of men of which he was one that preserved inviolate and unsullied for the Democracy of the Union a victory in what may well be considered the most important election of recent years. Defeat in 1884 assuredly would have seriously weakened the vitality of historic Democracy as a party in the United States. Success in 1884 established that party anew, and as a sequence brought into effective relationship a body of younger men of high political ideals whose maturer association had no small influence in the Democratic success of 1912.

This preliminary part of the history of the Presidential count of 1884 in New York State, I believe, cannot be concluded better than with the words concerning the Stanwood letter spoken to me late in October, 1912, at Princeton, by Mrs. Cleveland: "You and I know," she said, "the Presidency would have possessed no interest for Mr. Cleveland had he felt there was the remotest taint upon his title."

WILLIAM GORHAM RICE.

II

The "group of men" referred to by Mr. Rice as watching the canvass in the City of New York was assembled under the authority of the following letter to me from the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the National Democratic Committee under date of Thursday, November 6th:

DEAR SIR,—In view of the fact that the Democratic electoral ticket in the State of New York has been chosen by a narrow majority, which may possibly be disputed by the Republicans, and sought to be reversed, I have the honor to request that you will take steps to organize a committee of the bar to guard the rights of the people before the boards of canvassers throughout the State, and thus secure an honest count. I venture to urge prompt action and to appeal to the patriotism of the bar, which has never yet failed to assert and protect the liberties of the people.

If you consent to act, kindly meet me at my room, No. 71, Fifth Avenue Hotel, at 8 P.M.

Yours very truly,

A. P. GORMAN,
C. E. C.

In response to an appeal on the basis of this letter fifty or more Democrats and Independents eminent at the bar of New York immediately offered their services, and during the next ten days devoted themselves to the supervision of the count throughout the State. Their energies did not relax until upon November 16th the New York *Tribune* conceded the election of Mr. Cleveland.

My own part was at the Hoffman House headquarters, where I was in charge, under the direction of William C. Whitney, having the continuous assistance and advice of Roscoe Conkling, and the occasional counsel of Carl Schurz and James C. Carter, all being in constant touch with the situation and informed as to all that was going on. They were all impressed, and so declared themselves, with the obvious fairness and frankness of the procedure and with the manifest determination of all that, whatever the consequences, this election should be decided according to the vote actually deposited in the boxes. That such was the result, and that Mr. Cleveland actually and honestly carried the State of New York by more than 1,000 plurality, I have not the slightest doubt, and I know that my opportunities for knowledge were better than those of Mr. Stanwood, and also better than those of Senator Hoar, or of any of the anonymous cynical Senators quoted by him in his *Autobiography* (Vol. I, p. 408), as follows:

I suppose it would hardly be denied now by persons acquainted with the details of the management of the Democratic Campaign, at any rate I have heard the fact admitted by several very distinguished Democratic members of the Senate of the United States, that the plurality of the vote of New York was really for Mr. Blaine, and that he was unjustly deprived of election by the fraud at Long Island City by which votes cast for the Butler Electoral Ticket were counted for Cleveland.

The pre-election campaign, of course, was under direction

of the National Committee, comprising several Democratic Senators, but neither these Senators nor any one else had authentic information, except from or through me and my associates, as to the details of the post-election canvass, and I deny absolutely and unreservedly that "the vote of New York was really for Mr. Blaine" and that he was unjustly deprived of election by fraud either "at Long Island City," the one locality specified by Senator Hoar, or "in many precincts in New York City," as charged by Mr. Stanwood, who candidly admits that at the time "Democrats warmly denied it."

Twenty years after by Senator Hoar and thirty years after by Mr. Stanwood is rather late for the reproduction of these unfounded charges, and it may be fortunate that there are yet remaining some who are able to demonstrate that they are unfounded. To this demonstration I shall now address myself.

For the purposes of convenient consideration the single specification of Senator Hoar and the several insinuations of Mr. Stanwood may be combined and classified as follows:

(1) That the counting was in the hands of Mr. Blaine's opponents.

(2) That Butler votes were counted for Cleveland (*a*) in many precincts of New York City, (*b*) in Long Island City.

(3) That an unscrupulous boss of a town near New York was convicted a few years later of falsifying election returns.

These are the three and the only three points on which either Mr. Stanwood or Senator Hoar rests his charge.

1. As to Mr. Stanwood's first point that "the counting was in the hands of Mr. Blaine's opponents":

This certainly was not so as to the country districts, nor was it so as to the New York City districts.

In every New York City district there were four election inspectors, of whom two were Republicans and two were Democrats. But of these Democrats most, if not all, were nominated by the Tammany organization, which had been bitterly opposed to the nomination of Cleveland and was referred to in General Bragg's famous declaration, "But most of all, we love him for the enemies that he has made." The Chief of the Bureau of Elections was John J. O'Brien, a partisan Republican. The Police Board was bi-partisan, under the control of a Tammany-Republican combination

which at that very time was in full operation ousting Joel W. Masen, a conservative Republican, so as to put in John McClave, more satisfactory to both machines. To any one acquainted with the local political situation in New York in the autumn of 1884 the suggestion that the election machinery was in the hands of "Mr. Blaine's opponents" (a phrase which is meaningless unless intended to mean Mr. Cleveland's friends) is utterly absurd.

The Cleveland managers were in great anxiety as to the purposes and the conduct of this Tammany-Republican combination, and its control of the election machinery in New York City, and, as presently will be seen, they took efficient measures to ascertain and to guarantee the accuracy of the official canvass, notwithstanding the anti-Cleveland control.

The country conditions were even more perilous to Mr. Cleveland; that is, upon the theory of Mr. Stanwood in his letter, that the counting was in the hands of the friends of Mr. Cleveland.

Of the sixty New York counties, forty-six were for Mr. Blaine, giving him 68,423 plurality over Mr. Cleveland. Besides New York, Kings, and Westchester, Mr. Cleveland carried eleven counties. In these eleven Cleveland rural counties were 397 election districts as against 1,766 districts in the forty-six rural counties for Mr. Blaine, who would have been elected by a change averaging less than one vote in each Blaine district. Naturally, in view of the memories of 1876, much alarm was felt by the Cleveland friends at Albany who sent out the call in Mr. Manning's name, "The only hope of our opponents is in a fraudulent count in the country districts," and at our New York headquarters, where we collected as splendid a body of young lawyers as ever assembled and sent them out two by two to watch the canvass in every doubtful county.

Similar precautions were taken by the Republicans, as printed in the *Tribune* of Monday, November 10th:

The Committee have made preparations to have the canvass closely watched in every county of the State. Careful inquiry will be made into the matter of votes cast for Butler or St. John electors being counted for Cleveland.

Never was a canvass watched more closely on both sides, nor one conducted more fairly than that of 1884 in all the counties of New York. This was recognized at the time by

both the State and the National Republican Committees. In the *Tribune* of November 8th the State Committee declared that it did not make any wholesale charges of fraud, but stated simply that "the canvass will be watched with care," and on the 9th the National Committee announced that

The Republicans are taking the most careful and thorough measures to ascertain errors, if any have been made, and frauds, if any have been committed, in the returns of the late election in the State of New York.

This supervision and these measures by both Republican Committees, fully awake and forewarned, never eventuated in any charge whatever. This certainly would not have been the case had there been even plausible grounds upon which to challenge the perfect accuracy of the official canvass. It was a lack of votes, not a theft of votes, that lost the State to Blaine. As Secretary W. E. Chandler said to me at the close of Cleveland's Inauguration Parade, "That's all very fine, but I wish that we had had one thousand more votes in New York."

Out of a like disappointment Mr. Blaine's kinsman, partisan, and biographer has permitted to emerge a cruel imputation upon the fairness of this election in the State of New York, unworthy of his own high character, and refuted upon even slight examination of the events and the contemporaneous records of 1884.

2. The charge that the Butler votes were counted for Cleveland (*a*) in many precincts of New York City and (*b*) in Long Island City:

(*a*) As to the New York City canvass as charged by Mr. Stanwood, the first suggestion of this kind was brought to me on Thursday, November 6th, by my old-time friend Talcott Williams, then connected with the *Press* of Philadelphia, from which city he had come over to New York, sincerely believing that such a transposition of Butler votes had been made to Cleveland to the detriment of Blaine, whom the *Press* was supporting with ardor. I told him that there was no reason to believe that there had been any such transposition, but that I would start an investigation, which I proceeded to do through a distinguished committee selected by me. The result of my action is reported in the *Tribune* of Saturday, November 8th:

Yesterday a self-appointed committee of Cleveland men, consisting of Aaron J. Vanderpoel, General F. C. Barlow, Albert Stickney, and Charles

P. Miller, insisted upon the opening of the election returns filed with the Bureau of Elections. Judge Barrett ordered the returns opened, under Sec. 1878 of the Election Law of 1882, ch. 410.

The envelopes were opened by the Republican Chief of Bureau, John J. O'Brien, in presence of the Republican Committee, John E. Brodsky, William H. Townley, and Colonel George Bliss. No one cognizant of New York personalities will suppose that any Republican points were overlooked by this committee. The disclosures were as stated in the *Tribune* of Sunday, November 9th:

Police returns were compared by Albert Stickney for Democrats and John E. Brodsky for Republicans, and showed Cleveland plurality 42,801 (the final figures were 43,064), or 425 less than last computation from police copies. President S. B. French and D. C. Wheeler (each a Republican Commissioner of Police) thought this difference might prove important, and went uptown to give information to Republican National Committee.

Thereupon the matter was referred to the official canvass to begin on Wednesday, November 12th. How little doubt was felt as to the sufficient supervision of the canvasses was indicated by the following editorial in the *Tribune* of November 10th:

The whole canvass must be conducted with the utmost openness and under the most rigid legal scrutiny, with resort to the proper courts whenever necessary. Then if the fair count gives Governor Cleveland a plurality of only a single vote, he will be inaugurated.

The actual conduct of the canvass under competent Republican counsel is shown by the following extracts from the *Tribune*, November 13th:

Actual canvass of the city vote began yesterday. Colonel George Bliss, Robert Sewell, Clarence A. Seward, and John E. Brodsky closely watched the return for the Republicans. Precautions have been taken to prevent any tampering with the returns or corrupting inspectors of election. Inspector Byrnes was present all day. He had a force of men in plain clothes. No suspicious actions were reported.

The particular point of transposition of Butler votes was brought up in the canvass on November 15th. And the following allusion, while remote and indirect, seems to be the only reference in the count proceedings to the alleged transposition. It was reported, in the *Tribune* of the 16th:

When the defective return of the Sixth Election District of the Seventh Assembly District was taken up, it was found that the inspectors instead of setting down the number of the *ballots* (395) cast for Presidential Electors had multiplied that (395) by 36, thus counting the *votes* for each

elector on the several tickets as *ballots*. By this method it was made to appear that there were

7,668	votes for	Blaine
6,300	“ “	Cleveland
180	“ “	Butler
72	“ “	St. John
36)14,220(395		

Thus, it may be reiterated, there was attributed to a district in which there were only 395 votes, the amazing and erroneous total of 14,220 votes!

This would have elected Blaine by a large majority. The following colloquy ensued:

John N. Lewis: That's what the Republicans have been claiming the election of Blaine on! (*Laughter.*)

Mr. Duffy (to Colonel Bliss): You get a little the best of us there.

Colonel Bliss: Yes, I insist upon it, that the Inspectors cannot alter the returns.

Thus the fiction was exploded with a loud guffaw from both sides; and it received no further consideration from either side during the progress of the canvass.

Upon November 16th the *Tribune* observed, editorially:

In this city an exaggerated idea of the number of defective ballots improperly rejected seems to have been adopted because of the occasional report of "thirty-six defective" when the inspectors really meant "one defective with thirty-six names on it." Elsewhere many still think Butler votes were counted for Cleveland, but, with the ballots destroyed, the canvass did not establish it.

Upon this record must disappear Mr. Stanwood's insinuations as to the New York City canvass of Butler votes as though for Cleveland.

(b) As to the Long Island City frauds imagined by Senator Hoar.

No evidence whatever is offered to support this particular charge, and there is no reason to suppose that the conditions in Long Island City are more open to suspicion than those in New York already indicated. But in any aspect the total vote was so small as to be negligible. Cleveland received 2,092; Blaine, 1,265; Butler, 99, and St. John, 27. Butler's vote here approximated five per cent. of Cleveland's vote, while in the State at large (excluding New York City) Butler's vote was less than four per cent. of Cleveland's vote. If we reject all of Cleveland's plurality of 727 over Blaine, Cleveland still would have been elected, though by a narrow

plurality. The canvass of the Long Island City vote was watched closely in behalf of the Republicans by the late Jesse Johnson, one of the most alert and capable of lawyers and most zealous of Republicans at the Brooklyn Bar, whose vigilant observation no wrong-doing could have escaped.

This sole specification of Senator Hoar, therefore, is of no consequence, and his suspicions generated by baseless and treacherous rumors are unworthy of his reputation for serious work, where partisan considerations were not controlling an otherwise interesting and able intellect.

3. The crowning absurdity is reached in Mr. Stanwood's conclusion that the conviction some years later of Boss McKane, for election frauds at Gravesend, affords ground for belief that previously similar frauds there in 1884 had carried the State for Cleveland.

Here, also, the vote was too small to affect the result. Cleveland received 667; Blaine, 295; and Butler, 1. Here again, if Cleveland's plurality (372) were disregarded, the final result would not be changed. The vote was canvassed under the vigilant attention of United States Attorney Tenney representing the Republicans.

The willingness of Boss McKane to commit any election fraud for Democrats may be recognized as fully as the fact of universal frauds by all parties in Adams County, Ohio, or as charged by Colonel Roosevelt upon the regular Republican organization in 1912, but we have high Republican authority for declaring that all such remote frauds are *aliunde*.

The whole case may be summed up by considering that in the very nature of things the wonder is that New York gave Cleveland a plurality so small rather than a large majority. New York naturally was a Democratic State. From 1867 to 1892, inclusive, a period of twenty-five years, the State went Republican only six times. In 1882 it had gone for Cleveland by 192,000, and in 1883 generally by about 16,000 Democratic. Therefore, it was strange that in New York City Cleveland's plurality of 43,064 in 1884 exceeded by less than 2,000 that of Hancock in 1880. The surprise was the size of the vote given not for Cleveland, but for Blaine. As was observed editorially in the *Tribune* of November 14th, "Right in this city, the very center of the Independent strength, Mr. Blaine received a vote several thousand larger than was ever before given to any Republican." This ex-

ceptional tribute to Mr. Blaine in New York City and New York State should have attracted the appreciation of Senator Hoar and Mr. Stanwood, and they should have been too manly to base their regrets that their candidate failed of election upon the suggestion not that votes intended for him were diverted, but that Butler votes against Blaine might not have been counted for Butler, there being concededly no evidence to support this suggestion. The New York result in 1884 was legally and accurately ascertained under the most careful scrutiny, and the method and result of the ascertainment reflected credit upon the State. The proper attitude with respect thereto was that of Mr. Blaine's constant supporter, the *Tribune*, and is not that of Mr. Stanwood or Senator Hoar.

In closing it may be interesting to observe how little of the actual conduct and condition of the election or of the canvass was known to the candidates themselves.

Upon November 13th I received from Colonel Lamont the following message:

DEAR STETSON,—We don't get any news from New York, and you can well imagine that we are all very anxious for news. Would it be possible for you to give us a telegram as each Assembly District is completed? We get all sorts of rumors through the day, and have to wait for actual news until we see the New York papers the next morning. If you can telegraph me anything in a general way of your impression as soon as you receive this it would be greatly appreciated. No one telegraphs us, and it has seemed to me that since you are on the ground no one can give us the news so quickly.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL S. LAMONT.

ALBANY, Nov. 13, 1884.

Upon November 16th, the Augusta correspondent of the *Boston Journal* disclosed a similar isolation on the part of Mr. Blaine:

I asked Mr. Blaine what he thought of the result of the count in New York, and he replied that he had no more means of knowing than an unborn child.

The conclusion of the whole matter is that New York's vote was not stolen in 1884; that none of the principals had reason to suppose that it was stolen; that at the time no responsible person or paper adhered to the charge that it was stolen; and that these facts are attested by evidence still in existence and readily accessible.

FRANCIS LYNDE STETSON.

WAS NEW YORK'S VOTE STOLEN?

BY

FRANCIS LYNDE STETSON
AND
WILLIAM GORHAM RICE

*[Subject headings for cataloguing this pamphlet:
"Presidential Elections," "Grover Cleveland," "James G. Blaine"]*

REPRINTED FROM THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW
FOR JANUARY, 1914

NEW YORK
THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING CO.

Copyright, 1913, by
The North American Review Publishing Co.

Gaylord Bros.
Makers
Syracuse, N. Y.
PAT. JAN. 21, 1908

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 013 785 865 4 •