

VERY CUNNING FELLOW.

Blaine Climbed Out of a Window to Avoid Meeting Gen. Butler.

By the following from the New York

Blaine managers are promising everything—protection to dynamiters, encouragement and help to Cuban filibusters, appropriations to contractors, and jobs to old voters to speculators. "It's all Blaine really means to make the quietest honest administration we ever had perfectly safe to vote for him."

Mr. Blaine is ingenuous, but sophistry will hardly do duty for argument in this age and country.—*Rochester Union and American.*

THE MULLIGAN EPISTLES.

Blaine's Important Eloquence Omissions. [Washington special]

There is much comment here on the developments made to-day by the New York Times, which shows conclusively from records of the House of Representatives that four of the letters taken from Mulligan by Blaine were not read by the latter on the memorable June 5, 1876. After he had concluded his reading on that day Blaine solemnly declared to the House that he had read every one of the fifteen letters he had obtained from Mulligan. He also affirmed, in the presence of the House, that the letters he had read were dated, and corresponded precisely with Mulligan's memorandum which he held in his hand, and which he said he kept as protection to himself, as it showed the identity of the letters in every respect. The record shows that four letters, noted specifically and by date in Mulligan's memorandum, were not read, but in their stead Blaine substituted four letters of a different date which had not been in Mulligan's possession. This corroborates Mulligan, who has declared that Blaine did not read all the letters, and that some of them Blaine never would make public. At the time Blaine read the letters on the floor of the House he refused to let them pass into the hands of the official reporter, or to be copied by agents of the Associated Press. He furnished copies himself, and he denied all newspaper men access to the letters. In reading them to the House he did not observe the chronological order as they were arranged in the Mulligan memorandum, but studiously mixed up and disconnected the dates and subjects, and they were in this manner furnished by him to the Associated Press.

The Difference.

Grover Cleveland is a poor man, comparatively speaking. Although he has held several offices of high public trust he has never abused them to personal advantage. In his present capacity as Governor of New York, the opportunities for money making are practically unbounded, but no man has yet dared to whisper a suspicion that he has been a victim to temptation. Grover Cleveland's integrity is nowhere questioned.

James G. Blaine was also once a poor man, and comparatively poor when he became Speaker of the House of Representatives. He had also held several offices of public trust, and while opportunities for money making were never so favorable as they are to a Governor of the great State of New York, clothed with the supreme power of the veto, he has managed to accumulate several million dollars within a marvelously short time, and with apparently no expenditure of labor.

In his explanation of this remarkable difference, Mr. Blaine himself has given documentary evidence. Here is one of the selections:

AUGUSTA, Oct. 4, 1882.

MY DEAR MR. FISHER.—Find enclosed contracts of parties named in my letter of yesterday. The remaining contracts will be completed as rapidly as possible as circumstances will permit.

I inclose you part of the *Congressional Globe* of April 9, containing the point to which I referred at some length in my previous letter of to-day. You will find it of interest to read it over and see what a narrow escape your bill would have been at night in the session. Of course my plan did not make the bill pass, but the point was once raised. If the Arkansas man had not, however, happened to come to me at their wits' end and in despair, the bill would undoubtedly have been lost, or at least postponed for a year. I thought the point would interest both you and Caldwell, though occurring before either of you engaged in the enterprise.

I beg you to understand that I thoroughly appreciate the courtesy with which you have treated me in this regard, but your conduct to me in business matters has always been marked by an unbounded liberality. In past years, and, of course, I have naturally come to expect the same of you now. You urge me to make as much as I fairly can out of the arrangements into which we have entered. It is now my plain duty to make the best of what the point was once raised. If the Arkansas man had not, however, happened to come to me at their wits' end and in despair, the bill would undoubtedly have been lost, or at least postponed for a year. I thought the point would interest both you and Caldwell, though occurring before either of you engaged in the enterprise.

SARATOGA SPRINGS, N. Y., Aug. 6, 1884.

DEAR SIR:—Yours of the 2d inst. at hand. In

reply, I desire to inform you that I have read your letter carefully and noted the points which you propose and the question which you propose and asked you to do in the State in which you reside are anxious about and answered. First, that I voted against Tilden and Hendricks in 1876. This is untrue. Myself and those associated with me did our very best to elect Messrs. Tilden and Hendricks, and what occurred afterwards cannot be laid to my position of party in the summer of 1876. At present stands in this way. The laboring class, on whom we relied mainly for support are now pronounced against Gov. Cleveland, and that will be difficult for us to convince them that the election of the opposition will not be improved by the election of the opposition.

We will do what can be done to convince these people, and hope and expect to be comparatively successful. Let me add that these associations that are made against myself and the organization of which I am a member originated with and are the emanations of the same. Those who are prejudiced and dislike of our organization are such that they are at all these times misrepresenting us, in order to create false impressions in other parts of the country. Tammany Hall would not support Cleveland and Hendricks, Mr. Kelly was written to concerning his action in 1876 and asked pointedly whether he and his partisans of Tammany Hall intended to give their support to the Democratic nomination in 1884. The following is his reply, published in the local paper this morning:

JOHN KELLY Defines His Position. [Enfield (Ala.) Dispatch]

A controversy having arisen among local politicians as to whether John Kelly voted for Tilden and Hendricks in 1876, and the charge being made and denied that Tammany Hall would not support Cleveland and Hendricks, Mr. Kelly was written to concerning his action in 1876 and asked pointedly whether he and his partisans of Tammany Hall intended to give their support to the Democratic nomination in 1884. The following is his reply, published in the local paper this morning:

JOHN KELLY Defines His Position. [Enfield (Ala.) Dispatch]

A controversy having arisen among local politicians as to whether John Kelly voted for Tilden and Hendricks in 1876, and the charge being made and denied that Tammany Hall would not support Cleveland and Hendricks, Mr. Kelly was written to concerning his action in 1876 and asked pointedly whether he and his partisans of Tammany Hall intended to give their support to the Democratic nomination in 1884. The following is his reply, published in the local paper this morning:

JOHN KELLY Defines His Position. [Enfield (Ala.) Dispatch]

A controversy having arisen among local politicians as to whether John Kelly voted for Tilden and Hendricks in 1876, and the charge being made and denied that Tammany Hall would not support Cleveland and Hendricks, Mr. Kelly was written to concerning his action in 1876 and asked pointedly whether he and his partisans of Tammany Hall intended to give their support to the Democratic nomination in 1884. The following is his reply, published in the local paper this morning:

JOHN KELLY Defines His Position. [Enfield (Ala.) Dispatch]

A controversy having arisen among local politicians as to whether John Kelly voted for Tilden and Hendricks in 1876, and the charge being made and denied that Tammany Hall would not support Cleveland and Hendricks, Mr. Kelly was written to concerning his action in 1876 and asked pointedly whether he and his partisans of Tammany Hall intended to give their support to the Democratic nomination in 1884. The following is his reply, published in the local paper this morning:

JOHN KELLY Defines His Position. [Enfield (Ala.) Dispatch]

A controversy having arisen among local politicians as to whether John Kelly voted for Tilden and Hendricks in 1876, and the charge being made and denied that Tammany Hall would not support Cleveland and Hendricks, Mr. Kelly was written to concerning his action in 1876 and asked pointedly whether he and his partisans of Tammany Hall intended to give their support to the Democratic nomination in 1884. The following is his reply, published in the local paper this morning:

JOHN KELLY Defines His Position. [Enfield (Ala.) Dispatch]

A controversy having arisen among local politicians as to whether John Kelly voted for Tilden and Hendricks in 1876, and the charge being made and denied that Tammany Hall would not support Cleveland and Hendricks, Mr. Kelly was written to concerning his action in 1876 and asked pointedly whether he and his partisans of Tammany Hall intended to give their support to the Democratic nomination in 1884. The following is his reply, published in the local paper this morning:

JOHN KELLY Defines His Position. [Enfield (Ala.) Dispatch]

A controversy having arisen among local politicians as to whether John Kelly voted for Tilden and Hendricks in 1876, and the charge being made and denied that Tammany Hall would not support Cleveland and Hendricks, Mr. Kelly was written to concerning his action in 1876 and asked pointedly whether he and his partisans of Tammany Hall intended to give their support to the Democratic nomination in 1884. The following is his reply, published in the local paper this morning:

JOHN KELLY Defines His Position. [Enfield (Ala.) Dispatch]

A controversy having arisen among local politicians as to whether John Kelly voted for Tilden and Hendricks in 1876, and the charge being made and denied that Tammany Hall would not support Cleveland and Hendricks, Mr. Kelly was written to concerning his action in 1876 and asked pointedly whether he and his partisans of Tammany Hall intended to give their support to the Democratic nomination in 1884. The following is his reply, published in the local paper this morning:

JOHN KELLY Defines His Position. [Enfield (Ala.) Dispatch]

A controversy having arisen among local politicians as to whether John Kelly voted for Tilden and Hendricks in 1876, and the charge being made and denied that Tammany Hall would not support Cleveland and Hendricks, Mr. Kelly was written to concerning his action in 1876 and asked pointedly whether he and his partisans of Tammany Hall intended to give their support to the Democratic nomination in 1884. The following is his reply, published in the local paper this morning:

JOHN KELLY Defines His Position. [Enfield (Ala.) Dispatch]

A controversy having arisen among local politicians as to whether John Kelly voted for Tilden and Hendricks in 1876, and the charge being made and denied that Tammany Hall would not support Cleveland and Hendricks, Mr. Kelly was written to concerning his action in 1876 and asked pointedly whether he and his partisans of Tammany Hall intended to give their support to the Democratic nomination in 1884. The following is his reply, published in the local paper this morning:

JOHN KELLY Defines His Position. [Enfield (Ala.) Dispatch]

A controversy having arisen among local politicians as to whether John Kelly voted for Tilden and Hendricks in 1876, and the charge being made and denied that Tammany Hall would not support Cleveland and Hendricks, Mr. Kelly was written to concerning his action in 1876 and asked pointedly whether he and his partisans of Tammany Hall intended to give their support to the Democratic nomination in 1884. The following is his reply, published in the local paper this morning:

JOHN KELLY Defines His Position. [Enfield (Ala.) Dispatch]

A controversy having arisen among local politicians as to whether John Kelly voted for Tilden and Hendricks in 1876, and the charge being made and denied that Tammany Hall would not support Cleveland and Hendricks, Mr. Kelly was written to concerning his action in 1876 and asked pointedly whether he and his partisans of Tammany Hall intended to give their support to the Democratic nomination in 1884. The following is his reply, published in the local paper this morning:

JOHN KELLY Defines His Position. [Enfield (Ala.) Dispatch]

A controversy having arisen among local politicians as to whether John Kelly voted for Tilden and Hendricks in 1876, and the charge being made and denied that Tammany Hall would not support Cleveland and Hendricks, Mr. Kelly was written to concerning his action in 1876 and asked pointedly whether he and his partisans of Tammany Hall intended to give their support to the Democratic nomination in 1884. The following is his reply, published in the local paper this morning:

JOHN KELLY Defines His Position. [Enfield (Ala.) Dispatch]

A controversy having arisen among local politicians as to whether John Kelly voted for Tilden and Hendricks in 1876, and the charge being made and denied that Tammany Hall would not support Cleveland and Hendricks, Mr. Kelly was written to concerning his action in 1876 and asked pointedly whether he and his partisans of Tammany Hall intended to give their support to the Democratic nomination in 1884. The following is his reply, published in the local paper this morning:

JOHN KELLY Defines His Position. [Enfield (Ala.) Dispatch]

A controversy having arisen among local politicians as to whether John Kelly voted for Tilden and Hendricks in 1876, and the charge being made and denied that Tammany Hall would not support Cleveland and Hendricks, Mr. Kelly was written to concerning his action in 1876 and asked pointedly whether he and his partisans of Tammany Hall intended to give their support to the Democratic nomination in 1884. The following is his reply, published in the local paper this morning:

JOHN KELLY Defines His Position. [Enfield (Ala.) Dispatch]

A controversy having arisen among local politicians as to whether John Kelly voted for Tilden and Hendricks in 1876, and the charge being made and denied that Tammany Hall would not support Cleveland and Hendricks, Mr. Kelly was written to concerning his action in 1876 and asked pointedly whether he and his partisans of Tammany Hall intended to give their support to the Democratic nomination in 1884. The following is his reply, published in the local paper this morning:

JOHN KELLY Defines His Position. [Enfield (Ala.) Dispatch]

A controversy having arisen among local politicians as to whether John Kelly voted for Tilden and Hendricks in 1876, and the charge being made and denied that Tammany Hall would not support Cleveland and Hendricks, Mr. Kelly was written to concerning his action in 1876 and asked pointedly whether he and his partisans of Tammany Hall intended to give their support to the Democratic nomination in 1884. The following is his reply, published in the local paper this morning:

JOHN KELLY Defines His Position. [Enfield (Ala.) Dispatch]

A controversy having arisen among local politicians as to whether John Kelly voted for Tilden and Hendricks in 1876, and the charge being made and denied that Tammany Hall would not support Cleveland and Hendricks, Mr. Kelly was written to concerning his action in 1876 and asked pointedly whether he and his partisans of Tammany Hall intended to give their support to the Democratic nomination in 1884. The following is his reply, published in the local paper this morning:

JOHN KELLY Defines His Position. [Enfield (Ala.) Dispatch]

A controversy having arisen among local politicians as to whether John Kelly voted for Tilden and Hendricks in 1876, and the charge being made and denied that Tammany Hall would not support Cleveland and Hendricks, Mr. Kelly was written to concerning his action in 1876 and asked pointedly whether he and his partisans of Tammany Hall intended to give their support to the Democratic nomination in 1884. The following is his reply, published in the local paper this morning:

JOHN KELLY Defines His Position. [Enfield (Ala.) Dispatch]

A controversy having arisen among local politicians as to whether John Kelly voted for Tilden and Hendricks in 1876, and the charge being made and denied that Tammany Hall would not support Cleveland and Hendricks, Mr. Kelly was written to concerning his action in 1876 and asked pointedly whether he and his partisans of Tammany Hall intended to give their support to the Democratic nomination in 1884. The following is his reply, published in the local paper this morning:

JOHN KELLY Defines His Position. [Enfield (Ala.) Dispatch]

A controversy having arisen among local politicians as to whether John Kelly voted for Tilden and Hendricks in 1876, and the charge being made and denied that Tammany Hall would not support Cleveland and Hendricks, Mr. Kelly was written to concerning his action in 1876 and asked pointedly whether he and his partisans of Tammany Hall intended to give their support to the Democratic nomination in 1884. The following is his reply, published in the local paper this morning:

JOHN KELLY Defines His Position. [Enfield (Ala.) Dispatch]

A controversy having arisen among local politicians as to whether John Kelly voted for Tilden and Hendricks in 1876, and the charge being made and denied that Tammany Hall would not support Cleveland and Hendricks, Mr. Kelly was written to concerning his action in 1876 and asked pointedly whether he and his partisans of Tammany Hall intended to give their support to the Democratic nomination in 1884. The following is his reply, published in the local paper this morning:

JOHN KELLY Defines His Position. [Enfield (Ala.) Dispatch]

A controversy having arisen among local politicians as to whether John Kelly voted for Tilden and Hendricks in 1876, and the charge being made and denied that Tammany Hall would not support Cleveland and Hendricks, Mr. Kelly was written to concerning his action in 1876 and asked pointedly whether he and his partisans of Tammany Hall intended to give their support to the Democratic nomination in 1884. The following is his reply, published in the local paper this morning:

JOHN KELLY Defines His Position. [Enfield (Ala.) Dispatch]

A controversy having arisen among local politicians as to whether John Kelly voted for Tilden and Hendricks in 1876, and the charge being made and denied that Tammany Hall would not support Cleveland and Hendricks, Mr. Kelly was written to concerning his action in 1876 and asked pointedly whether he and his partisans of Tammany Hall intended to give their support to the Democratic nomination in 1884. The following is his reply, published in the local paper this morning:

JOHN KELLY Defines His Position. [Enfield (Ala.) Dispatch]

A controversy having arisen among local politicians as to whether John Kelly voted for Tilden and Hendricks in 1876, and the charge being made and denied that Tammany Hall would not support Cleveland and Hendricks, Mr. Kelly was written to concerning his action in 1876 and asked pointedly whether he and his partisans of Tammany Hall intended to give their support to the Democratic nomination in 1884. The following is his reply, published in the local paper this morning:

JOHN KELLY Defines His Position. [Enfield (Ala.) Dispatch]

A controversy having arisen among local politicians as to whether John Kelly voted for Tilden and Hendricks in 1876, and the charge being made and denied that Tammany Hall would not support Cleveland and Hendricks, Mr. Kelly was written to concerning his action in 1876 and asked pointedly whether he and his partisans of Tammany Hall intended to give their support to the Democratic nomination in 1884. The following is his reply, published in the local paper this morning:

JOHN KELLY Defines His Position. [Enfield (Ala.) Dispatch]

A controversy having arisen among local politicians as to whether John Kelly voted for Tilden and Hendricks in 1876, and the charge being made and denied that Tammany Hall would not support Cleveland and Hendricks, Mr. Kelly was written to concerning his action in 1876 and asked pointedly whether he and his partisans of Tammany Hall intended to give their support to the Democratic nomination in 1884. The following is his reply, published in the local paper this morning:

JOHN KELLY Defines His Position. [Enfield (Ala.) Dispatch]

A controversy having arisen among local politicians as to whether John Kelly voted for Tilden and Hendricks in 1876, and the charge being made and denied that Tammany Hall would not support Cleveland and Hendricks, Mr. Kelly was written to concerning his action in 1876 and asked pointedly whether he and his partisans of Tammany Hall intended to give their support to the Democratic nomination in 1884. The following is his reply, published in the local paper this morning:

JOHN KELLY Defines His Position. [Enfield (Ala.) Dispatch]

A controversy having arisen among local politicians as to whether John Kelly voted for Tilden and Hendricks in 1876, and the charge being made and denied that Tammany Hall would not support Cleveland and Hendricks, Mr. Kelly was written to concerning his action in 1876 and asked pointedly whether he and his partisans of Tammany Hall intended to give their support to the Democratic nomination in 1884. The following is his reply, published in the local paper this morning:

JOHN KELLY Defines His Position. [Enfield (Ala.) Dispatch]

A controversy having arisen among local politicians as to whether John Kelly voted for Tilden and Hendricks in 1876, and the charge being made and denied that Tammany Hall would not support Cleveland and Hendricks, Mr. Kelly was written to concerning his action in 1876 and asked pointedly whether he and his partisans of Tammany Hall intended to give their support to the Democratic nomination in 1884. The following is his reply, published in the local paper this morning:

JOHN KELLY Defines His Position. [Enfield (Ala.) Dispatch]

A controversy having arisen among local politicians as to whether John Kelly voted for Tilden and Hendricks in 1876, and the charge being made and denied that Tammany Hall would not support Cleveland and Hendricks, Mr. Kelly was written to concerning his action in 1876 and asked pointedly whether he and his partisans of Tammany Hall intended to give their support to the Democratic nomination in 1884. The following is his reply, published in the local paper this morning: