standing that his son, Wm. M. Tweed, jr., should be appointed one of the Commissioners. At any rate this was done, and soon after the original Commissioners made their report. The amount awarded by these commissions for property taken was **$5,193,417**; and property was assessed on the east side of the projected park as far as Ninth-ave. When the report of the Commissioners came before Judge Barnard for his approval, he ordered certain assessments to be reduced, and he returned the report to the Commissioners for that purpose. Although this was clearly illegal, since it required the Commissioners to report, not according to their information and estimate, but at Barnard's dictation, the Commissioners reduced the amount, as shown by the tabular statement below, over $200,000, and again submitted it to the Court for approval. Meanwhile, the Ring frauds had been made public, and the old commissions were relieved, and on Jan. 1, 1872, new Commissioners were appointed, consisting of ex-Judge Josiah Sutherland, Wm. C. Traphagen, and Gen. Chas. K. Graham.

The awards made by the new Commissioners amount to **$5,573,828**, or $456,411 more than that awarded by their predecessors, while the full amount assessed on property-owners, adding in costs of the two commissions, collectors' fees, and other expenses, amounts to **$6,353,592**. Of this latter amount, $3,320,498 is assessed upon property lying between Eighth-ave. and the Hudson River and Forty-second and One-hundred-and-fifty-fifth-sts., while the remainder, $3,033,094, is put upon the city at large, to go into the general tax levy.

WHY THE PARK SHOULD BE ABANDONED.

It is claimed by many property-owners that the only persons who are benefited by this park are those living in its immediate vicinity, and, strictly speaking, with frontages west of Eleventh-ave. and between Seventy-second and One-hundred-and-thirtieth-sts. Central Park, the Grand Boulevard, Morningside, and Mount Morris Parks, all lie within a short distance of the proposed park, and persons owning property on the border of Central Park, and who have been assessed for the Riverside Park, declare that they are not benefited but absolutely injured by its establishment. In the range of the proposed park the average width of the whole island is only about two miles, and on either side of the Central Park there is left less than three-fourths of a mile for building purposes. It is stated also that the character of the land appropriated is such that if the subject of converting it into a park were out of the question, and it was proposed to level the bluff and grade it into streets and avenues at the expense of the land itself, the owners would gladly give it away in order to be free from the expenses which would accrue. It is further stated that the property taken for the park would not sell for one-half the awarded amount, and that the owners in testifying before the Commissioners as to its value had in view the prospective value which these lands would obtain from the creation of the park, and not its present or past worth, irrespective of the proposed improvement; and so their estimates of value are speculative and fictitious. As an illustration of this it is stated that lots that sold in 1867 for $1,000 and $1,200, have been valued by the Commissioners in their awards at amounts ranging from $3,500 to $5,000. The lots at Eighty-seventh-st. and the Public Drive, which sold a short time previous to the mapping out of Riverside Park by the first Commissioners for $1,200, are set down by the present Commissioners at amounts ranging from $3,780 to $4,305. Disinterested property-owners say that the property taken should be placed at the figures which ruled at the time the property was appropriated by the Park Commissioners, with interest added, inasmuch as the only additional value it has at the present time is what it obtains from the creation of the park itself. When the Riverside Park was first projected, the community was inordinately excited on the subject of parks. The city had been for years wanting places for recreation and pleasure, and the popular desire suddenly broke forth in various projects for converting the whole upper portion of the island into a pleasure-ground. But as time has passed, the sentiment of the people has grown more subdued and reasonable, and it is asserted that the great want for places of recreation is now amply supplied and that no more parks are needed. The condition of the city's finances is also referred to, and the present indebtedness of the city thought to be sufficient without augmenting it with further and unnecessary burdens.

WHY THE PARK SHOULD BE BUILT.

On the other hand it is urged that the park, if not a necessity, will be a great and valuable improvement, giving to all the property within the area assessed a vastly increased valuation. The late movement in real estate in the vicinity is said by some persons to be due less to the opening of the Boulevard, which diagonally crosses the area of assessment, than to the anticipated confirmation of the Riverside Park report and the opening of a new pleasure ground for driving. Others less enthusiastic say that the movement is altogether of a speculative character, occasioned by a recent heavy sale of lots on the Boulevard at Seventy-second and Seventy-third-sts. It is claimed, and reasonably, that Boulevard property should advance in prices in the ordinary progression of values, and keep pace with the steady rise in East Side property. Other well-informed dealers in real estate think that for purposes of investment the class of property mentioned could hold its own without any aid derived from the new pleasure ground, the expenses of which, coming in the shape of assessments, must be added to prices. The prevailing impression seems to be that although the Riverside Park will increase the value of property immediately adjoining, property a short distance away will not be affected by it; and that consequently the assessments for benefit should be levied only on those who own property in the vicinity. They are all agreed that prices have advanced on property situated in the immediate vicinity of the proposed Park over 300 per cent since 1867, when the land was condemned by the Central Park Commission, and that such enhancement in value is due principally to the action of the Commissioners at that time.

ASSESSMENTS REVOKED.

Reporters of THE TRIBUNE have been engaged for the past week in making transcripts from the books containing the awards and assessments, which have been open for examination for the past fortnight at the Bureau of Public Works, and the names of the persons principally interested are furnished, with the respective amounts of the awards and assessments. It was found impossible to give the full lists of awards and assessments, for more than 200 property-holders received awards, and over 1,300 are assessed to pay them. However, the most notable and heavy awards and assessments are given below. An examination of the list, as far as published, reveals some strange features and facts.

The area of "property assessed for benefit" includes all the area covered by the first Commissioners, and on the east side extends one street beyond, namely, to the Eighth-ave. Yet the following persons and companies who own property contiguous to the proposed park, and within the area named by the Commissioners, are not assessed for such property any amount whatever, whereas, under the first assessment, they were assessed the amounts set opposite their several names. These are understood to be the assessments where reduction was ordered by Judge Barnard, and they seem to have been wholly remitted:

Heid, Rev. R. R. Estate of W. P. Furniss	$101,800	Geo. J. Forrest	$5,450
	27,200	Augustus Whiting	5,150
Estate of G. D. Post	19,400	John Howland	3,700
Cortlandt Palmer	8,250	Geo. H. Peck	3,700
Wm. H. Paine	7,400	Eli White	2,775
John Paine	7,400	Estate of Rob. Laten	2,250
R. A. Witthaus	6,250	Joseph Cudipp	2,250
Wm. Browning	6,000	Total	$217,208

THE PRESENT ASSESSMENTS.

The amounts of the awards and assessments in the cases of all property-owners have been either increased or diminished from the amounts named by the first Commission, although the aggregate amount is greater than that first named. The reasons which induced these changes may perhaps be adequate, but this fact is noticeable that, in cases where large appropriations of any one person's property have been made, his awards have been increased, while his assessments for property bordering on the park have been greatly reduced. On the other hand, persons who own large tracts of land within the area of assessment, and who had little or no property appropriated for the park, have had their assessments greatly increased. The following cases are cited in illustration:

Wm. B. Astor's first assessment, was $30,753; his present assessment is $47,457. A. Carrigan's assessment is increased over 33 per cent; his present assessment is $110,965. Neither of the two named persons received any awards. The same facts are true with respect to the Society of the New-York Hospital, which is assessed the large amount of $124,422.

On the other hand, Patrick Callaghan, who owns large tracts of land bordering on the park, and who owned large amounts which were appropriated, has had the assessment reduced and awards increased. The estate of Wm. P. Furniss has been reduced $25,000 in assessments, and awards proportionately increased. The facts applicable to Callaghan and Furniss are true with respect to William H. Paine, Fernando Wood, Cortlandt Palmer, and others.

In some cases, also, great disproportion exists in the amounts assessed upon lots contiguous to each other, and the disproportion is so great as to baffle all speculation as to the reason which induced such varying assessments. As, for example, on the block numbered 29 on the map in the office of the Commissioners, lots Nos. 48 and 49, adjoining, are located in Eleventh-ave., between Seventy-seventh and Seventy-eighth-sts. The first lot, owned by V. M. Hooker, is assessed $8,150; while the other (No. 49), owned by Carl Schultz, is assessed only $74. One man owned only two lots, fronting on Ninety-ninth-st. The new road, or Riverside-ave., absorbed one of them and left the other subject to assessment. For the one taken he was awarded $226, as being its full value. On the other he was assessed $298, or only $26 less than its value, estimating by the award for the other.

It is a curious coincidence, also, that in cases where persons owned *largely* of property appropriated, and very *largely* of property bordering the entire length of the park, in no solitary instance do the assessments equal the awards. A glance at the table below will assist the reader in understanding the full force of this statement. The table of assessments, also, shows that persons residing in Fifty-third-st., on the border of the Central Park, are assessed more heavily for the proposed park than they were for the laying out of the former.

TABLE OF AWARDS.

The following are among the largest of the awards made, but the list is by no means complete. To various "unknown owners" $252,591 are awarded; and the aggregate amount foots up a million more than the sum of the awards included below:

Anderson, John	$72,548	Hills, Henry	$15,308
Bernett, Sophia	28,345	Jacobs, Aaron	44,470
Blodgett, Abby C. Mrs.	49,748	Martin, John S.	23,508
Browning, William	31,395	Orphan Asylum Society	99,960
Byrd, George I.	16,776	Palmer, Courtlandt	59,943
Callaghan, Patrick	131,302	Pell, George W., jr.	16,956
Cushman, Michael H. and Daniel	30,162	Pell, George W. (Trustee)	19,634
Clark, Cyrus	185,518	Post, George D., estate of	998,537
Clowes, Joseph W.	15,003	Potter, Orlando B.	81,045
Coates, Howard W.	174,713	Roberts, William R.	114,743
Cowdry, Samuel F.	15,644	Salisbury, Edward E. and Henry White, trustees of Mrs. Abby Salisbury	32,551
Eaton, Robert, estate of	70,077	Schieffer, Margaret H., Mrs.	111,261
Eidlitz, Marc, with Jos. Tausig	22,742	Smith, Nathaniel	27,495
Falkenau, Morris	11,539	Sutphen, John S.	61,569
Forrest, George J.	31,893	Tausig, Joseph	11,518
Furniss, William P.	505,745	Vanderpool, Jacob	45,652
Godwin, Joseph	15,854	Weyman, John, with W. W. Wale, W. W. Stacey, and Charles S. Weyman	77,254
Godwin, Joseph H., with George H. Peck	19,535	Waltbeck, Wm. A.	52,007
Grant, Oliver D. Forrest, estate of	74,144	Whiting, Augustus	56,729
Gray, Jno. A. C., with W. Blodgett and John Bigelow	58,437	Whitlock, William, jr.	197,925
Hendricks, Montague M., executor Francis Hendricks	22,910	Wood, Fernando	62,952
Higgins, Alvin	11,870		
Higgins, Alvin, with H. P. Perkins, and estate of James P. Perkins	58,880		

TABLE OF ASSESSMENTS.

The following table is by no means a full list of the persons assessed to pay half the awards, or $3,320,493. The books of the Commissioners include over 1,300 names. Of this large number of assessments, only the largest are given:

Appleby, Chas. E.	$1,779	Menzies, H.	$1,309
Appleby, R. & J. C.	12,608	Mott, Winnifred	4,695
Astor, Wm. B.	47,457	Mott, Valentine, and estate of	86,921
Blodgett, Mrs. A. B.	12,147	Munson, James	5,153
Boges, Jas., heirs of	43,550	Ninth-ave. R. R. Co.	421
Carrigan, A.	110,965	Orphan Asylum of New-York	48,720
Callaghan, Patrick	53,126	Orphan Asylum, Leaske & Watts's	18,492
Central Park and E. R. R. Co.	1,052	Paine, John R., with Lewis J. White	14,500
Chambers, H. D. W.	5,109	Paine, John	24,365
Clark, Cyrus	49,528	Phalen, James	12,526
Clowes, Joseph W.	7,950	Post, Geo. D., estate of	159,522
Cushman, M. H. & D.	19,948	Roche, Walter	1,666
Curtis, C. E.	27,404	Salisbury, Mrs. Abby	10,104
Eighth-ave. R. R. Co.	336	Schieffelin, Mrs. R. L.	25,449
Forrest, Geo. J.	19,505	Spaulding, George	10,539
Furniss, Wm. P., estate of	179,366	Stewart, J. D. & J.	5,656
Grant, O. D. F.	22,456	Stryker, Garrett H.	8,500
Disturr, V. W.	17,796	Sutphen, John S.	16,720
Hegeman, P. A. & F. H.	7,024	Talman, John H., estate of	18,157
Hendricks, F., est. of.	1,589	Ward, Lebbeus B.	4,621
Hospital of New-York	124,482	Weyman, Wm., heirs and estate of	41,172
Harson, Jacob, heirs of	62,878	White, Eli	13,064
Higgins, A. & E. S.	3,560	Whiting, A.	34,149
Higgins, M. A.	18,743	Whitlock, jr., W.	22,300
Higgins & Perkins	8,100	Wilks, H. H.	9,916
Jacobs, J.	12,739	Wood, Fernando	58,912
Johnson, Bradish	1,831		
Johnson, Eilen A.	492		
Knickerbocker Life Ins. Co.	621		
Martin, Wm. A.	13,962		

VIEWS OF A COMMISSIONER.

A TRIBUNE reporter called, yesterday, upon Wm. C. Traphagen, one of the Commissioners, to obtain his explanation in regard to the large amounts awarded and assessed. He said:

When the new Commissioners first met they determined to cut down the awards largely, believing that the amounts were from 33 to 50 per cent more than they should be, and accordingly it was notified to the persons whose property had been appropriated, that it was the intention of the Commissioners to reduce their several amounts. The Commissioners were therefore beset by these persons, who came fortified with documents and affidavits to show that the property was more valuable than the old Commissioners had esteemed it, and, in consideration of their statements, we were compelled to place those values upon their property which appear on the books. We felt and feel satisfied that some of the property taken by the Central Park Commissioners, and included in the proposed park, is unadapted to the purpose and never should have been appropriated; as, for instance, the water lots at Seventy-second-st. and Twelfth-ave., and in other localities, *some of which are six feet below low water mark*, and apparently of little value, yet the owners and others came before us and swore that the property was worth from $3,000 to $6,000 per lot. We were compelled to award over $30,000 for the sunken lots at Seventy-second-st. and Twelfth-ave. We cannot curtail nor abridge the area of territory appropriated by the Central Park Commissioners for the proposed park, but are compelled to accept the property as mapped out by them, and award the amounts which property-owners testify the land is worth. Some persons have urged that the value of the property should be estimated according to sales made in 1867; but the majority of property-owners say that we should award them according to the present valuation. The Commissioners have received an intimation from Judge Barnard that they have no right to assess or appropriate the property of the Hudson River Railroad, and although this opinion is not a decision of the Court, yet it seems to be generally accepted as the correct interpretation of the statute.

It was urged by persons owning property fronting on the Hudson River that the park would be of no advantage to them, as their land is only adapted for warehouses and stores, and that consequently they should not be assessed for benefit. Judge Sutherland and myself coincided in this view, and consequently many persons who were previously assessed have had their amounts greatly reduced or stricken out altogether. We shall, on Tuesday, afford an opportunity to those persons dissatisfied with the amount of their assessments to state their reasons for objection. We shall be glad to hear all who may feel dissatisfied therewith, and shall take their views into deliberate consideration. I personally am satisfied that property in the vicinity of the park is continually appreciating, and believe that the park, if completed, will make all the property in its vicinity more valuable.

VIEWS OF THE CLERK OF THE COMMISSIONERS.

A reporter also called upon Geo. H. Purser, Clerk of the Commissioners. He said:

"The value of all property taken for public uses must be fixed as existing at or about the time the report is presented for confirmation, and the Commissioners of Awards and Assessments must therefore accept the evidence of sales at that time. In 1869 an attempt was made to pass a bill stating that on taking land for improvements this principle should be changed, and the Commissioners should allow only the actual value of the property before the improvement was contemplated; but the bill failed.

As soon as it became known that the Central Park Commissioners had appropriated certain property to constitute the Riverside Park, property in that vicinity advanced in value, and has continued to advance to the present time, and every month that the confirmation of the Commissioners' report is delayed the cost to property-owners and the city increases. In regard to the matter of the Hudson River Railroad, the law of equity and justice is plain and simple. If corporations and municipal authorities are at liberty to take the property of railroad companies, or assess them for local improvements, the stability of no railroad in the country is assured; but they will be liable to be broken up and interfered with at any time by persons whose prejudices or animosities happen to be directed against them. It is better to have the produce and provisions of the West come pouring undisturbed into our lap than to jeopardize the interests of this great city merely to add a narrow strip of land to our pleasure grounds. There are good and sufficient reasons, also, why certain property with river privileges should be exempt from assessment, and I am preparing a statement to show why over $300,000 has been revoked by the present Commissioners. The statement will be finished in a week or ten days, and presented to the public in explanation of the action of the Commissioners.

THE RETAIL TOBACCO DEALERS' TAX.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: Under the heading of "Taxing the Poor," in your paper of the 8th inst., you publish an article which, in my judgment, does great injustice alike to Government and the tobacco trade. I regret that you should have done this, for I have been a reader of THE TRIBUNE for many years, and I am sure I should be unwilling to believe THE TRIBUNE would knowingly publish an article which does not fairly state facts.

New-York, June 10, 1872. H. W. H.

[Whatever the legislators meant who passed the Tax law in question, they certainly succeeded in making it potentially a frightful engine of oppression. It is to be hoped that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue will find some other interpretation of the law than what its words signify to people of ordinary comprehension, but it is no "injustice" to point out the obvious consequences of a natural interpretation. A wholesale tobacco dealer, probably quite as well informed as H. W. H., since he has made the subject a matter of investigation and correspondence, has expressed himself to us as greatly shocked at the outrage apparently contemplated.—*Ed.*]

THE LADIES' UNION RELIEF ASSOCIATION.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: The Ladies' Union Relief Association of this city, notwithstanding the failure of the State Legislature to make them the accustomed appropriation, are still doing their good work. Yesterday, a delegation of 25 ladies, laden with ice-cream, strawberries, and other delicacies, paid a visit to Ward's Island to the sick and disabled soldiers, dependent on the State for mere sustenance, and without those little delicacies which sick men so much crave. Of the many charitable institutions in this city, no other has for its object the alleviation of the distress of soldiers or soldiers' widows and orphans. This Association has whole families and numbers of sick soldiers who are partly dependent on it for support. The ladies who compose this Association are not able, without other assistance, to help all the deserving. It is their intention to petition the city authorities for an appropriation from the funds laid aside for charitable purposes; and with this and what they collect, they will be able to do much good, being acquainted with all the facts, and have had years of experience in the distribution of this charity. A SOLDIERS' FRIEND.

New-York, June 12, 1872.

Most of the malcontent Democratic and Free Trade organs cite as the chief proof of the infamous pack ing of the Cincinnati Convention by the Greeley men, that a gentleman not residing in the State, in point of fact a well-known and brilliant newspaper correspondent, who lives in Pennsylvania and is on duty in Washington, cast the entire vote of Delaware every time solid for Greeley. Without inquiring into the accuracy of their description, it may be worth while simply to observe that he happened to cast the vote first and steadily for Mr. Adams. Perhaps that gives the transaction a different color in their eyes.

POLITICAL OUTLOOK.

DRIFT OF POLITICAL DISCUSSION.

UNFORTUNATE SITUATION OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY IN PENNSYLVANIA.

From The Boston Advertiser (Adm.).

The situation of the Republican party in Pennsylvania is more unfortunate and perilous than in any other State of the Union. A ring of selfish and worthless plunderers appears to rule it at will. The nomination of Gen. Hartranft for Governor by the last State Convention was accomplished in the face of the protests of all the more honorable leaders of the party, in contempt of the better sentiment of the people, and in defiance of the conditions of success. It was the work of the Geary faction, and the administration of Gov. Geary has been prolific of disreputable and demoralizing influences. The Republicans who care something for the honor and good name of the party, as an organization to advance patriotic and beneficent public interests, went home from the Convention with a sorrow akin to that which weighed down the sincere men in the Cincinnati Convention after the nomination of Greeley. They look upon the candidacy of Hartranft as a disgrace to the party, and utterly refuse to conspire, by advocating his election, to bring shame upon the State. The prestige and prospects of this party are blighted by this act.

WHAT THE FOLLOWERS OF GRANT ARE COMPELLED TO BELIEVE.

From The Springfield Republican.

Another article has been added to the already "lengthy" creed of the Grant party. The faithful are required henceforth to believe and profess that Mr. Sumner is not only a malignant and "brutal" slanderer, but a willful liar. This new dogma has been proclaimed with all due formalities both in the Senate chamber and in the official organs. Matt. Carpenter, acting as a sort of apostolic legate to the silent political pontiff at the White House, declares that there is not a word of truth in what Mr. Sumner has said and printed about his conversation with the late Secretary Stanton. Other loyal Senators loudly assent, the Grant press chime in, and the thing is done. Mr. Sumner's character is blasted. The orthodox everywhere—here in Massachusetts as well as anywhere else—are required to spit upon his name as that of a man guilty of the most deliberate and aggravated falsehood ever uttered within the walls of the Senate. It will come hard on a good many of our Massachusetts Republicans who know Charles Sumner, and know how incapable he is of such an infamy. But the edict has gone forth. To doubt or hesitate,—much more to dissent—would be to bring their own "soundness" into suspicion.

WHY THE WORLD HAS BECOME SUCH A ZEALOUS REFORMER.

From The Detroit Union.

The New-York World is hammering away lustily at the "Brooklyn Ring." It claims that somebody or other, who owns some stock in *The Brooklyn Eagle*, is connected with said Ring, and proves, very conclusively to itself, that because this is thus, Greeley should not be indorsed by the Baltimore Convention. In this *The World* is having its own way, no one else, Democrat or Republican, paying the slightest attention to it. The fact is the frauds of which it complains were long ago exposed in THE N. Y. TRIBUNE as well as *The Brooklyn Eagle* itself, and the avowed object of *The World* being to destroy the influence of *The Eagle*, because it supports Greeley, its eleventh hour complaints of course fall flat on the community.

DEMOCRATIC VIEWS ON THE GENERAL ISSUES.

THE WISEST COURSE FOR BALTIMORE.

From The Missouri Republican.

The masses of the Democracy desire to vote for Horace Greeley, and it is strongly urged that the Baltimore Convention give him the benefit of a Democratic renomination. This proposition is the natural result of the violent but feeble effort being made for a third ticket. We think, however, that the wisest thing for the Baltimore Convention to do is not to nominate a third ticket, nor even to adopt the Cincinnati ticket, but to submit the whole subject to the judgment and patriotism of the Democratic masses. There is a marvelous coherency of sentiment and clearness of intent among these masses on the subject; they know exactly what to do, and they will do it just as promptly and effectively without instructions from their National Convention as they would under them. Besides, any number of individual Democrats may do a thing which an official National Democratic Convention could not consistently do; the latter could not properly travel out of its way to nominate a Republican ticket, but the former could, with perfect propriety, vote for such a ticket.

THE PROMINENT DEMOCRATS ALL FOR GREELEY.

From The Louisville Courier-Journal.

We understood from the first that Mr. Pendleton indorsed, as we ourselves do, the nomination of Mr. Greeley. The same of Mr. Hendricks was given out before the final begira of delegates from Cincinnati. Indeed, we know of scarcely a prominent Democrat who seriously considers any other possibility. After all is said against Mr. Greeley that can be said against him, this remains to be said in favor of our accepting him, that elected by us, and cut loose from his old Radical associations, he will make as liberal a President as we need and desire. We think he is available as a strong nominee. He took hold of the popular heart at once. In the South we are a unit for Greeley. We are tired of swinging on to the coat-tail of men like Voorhees, who lead us into trouble. We cannot stand four years more of military rule. If we are consigned to it the Northern Democracy will be responsible. *The New York World* is at this critical moment the worst enemy the Southern people have, because it is urging a course which is sure to reelect Grant. The people of the South feel this keenly, and they will remember it. In a word, it is not that Horace Greeley is the man of our choice, but that all roads which lead from Greeley go to Grant, that settles us on the side of the Liberal ticket as against the Radicals.

MR. GREELEY THE ONLY MAN WHO CAN BE ELECTED.

From The Richmond Dispatch.

If Greeley cannot be elected, no Democrat can, no Liberal Republican can. No other candidate could possibly be selected who would have any chance of success. To say that Greeley cannot be elected, and then to claim that any Democrat could be, is to insult the intelligence of the reader. A man who is so blind or foolish as to believe such an assertion is a fit subject for a lunatic asylum. So whether Greeley can be elected or not, it will be the best plan to indorse him. We may elect him. There is a chance for success, his bitterest enemies will admit. For our part, we believe that he will be triumphantly elected. But let his chance for success be what it may, it is better than that of any Democrat. He will lead an army that will go into battle expecting a victory and buoyant with the prospect. A Democrat would lead a forlorn hope. His defeat would be assured before the firing of the first gun.

THE VOTERS CANNOT BE HUMBUGGED BY A THIRD TICKET.

From The Elmira Gazette.

The Democracy are in no humor to be trifled with, and cannot be humbugged into the belief that a straight nomination at Baltimore means anything else than the election of Grant. Leaders who assume that they can control the masses and lead them to the support of a dummy ticket will find themselves without followers if they undertake that game. This is a movement in which the voters have constituted themselves leaders. They accepted the platform and candidates of the Cincinnati Convention readily and heartily. Neither argument nor appeals by leaders were necessary to convince them that the true path to success lay in that direction. We believe the Baltimore Convention will have the good sense to indorse the work so well accomplished at Cincinnati.

COMBINATION THE ONLY SAFETY.

From The Hartford Times.

Democrats desire to preserve constitutional government. Under Grant and the party that supports him, it is in rapid progress of destruction. A thousand times Democrats have warned the people against the steady and rapid strides of the military power that is usurping civil Government. With scholarly force and eloquence, Senator Sumner, in his late great speech, has presented the same view. To defeat Grant is to save the Government and the rights of the States. To elect him is to weaken both, and plant the seeds of destruction at the core. To avoid this calamity a combination of the opponents of Grant must be effected. Without this combination, the opportunity is lost.

THE EMBODIMENT OF POPULAR ASPIRATION.

From The Paterson Guardian.

The nation sorely needs the restoration of political harmony and fraternal feeling between the North and the South, and every day that long-felt want becomes more imperative. It cannot be satisfied by the reelection of Grant, nor by the nomination of a Democratic candidate for the Presidency who has no reasonable chance of success at the polls. It can only be supplied by the union of patriotic citizens representing all parts of the country, all existing political parties, and all phases of opinion on questions of political economy, in support of Greeley and Brown, who have been made by the force of events the embodiment of the popular aspiration for constitutional government, honest administration and peace.

A SOUND DEMOCRATIC TICKET SURE OF SUCCESS.

From The Detroit Free Press.

The entire Democratic vote can be concentrated upon a proper nomination in Baltimore. If that nomination is of a character to disperse or distract our party, the nominee of the Republicans at Philadelphia will be elected. If it is of a character to satisfy our party and have the confidence of the Republican "reformers," it will be elected. It must be, to succeed, conservative, not ultra—soundly Democratic in principles, and faithful in its acceptance of the situation as accomplished and settled by the war, as well as committed against violent or sudden changes that would distract or imperil the commercial and financial interests of the country. If these can be combined in one man by the Baltimore Convention, the Democratic party is as sure of success as that the sun will rise on election day.

THE DEMOCRATIC MASSES FOR GREELEY.

From The Selma (Ala.) Times.

The masses of the Democracy desire to vote for Horace Greeley, and it is strongly urged that the Baltimore Convention give him the benefit of a Democratic renomination. This proposition is the natural result of the violent but feeble effort being made for a third ticket; Mr. Voorhees's declamations against Greeley are actually irritating the masses of the party into a more ardent espousal of him, and they argue that if their leaders come so far short of understanding the situation as to attempt to make the Democratic party the auxiliary of Grant, they might as well insist on making it the pledged ally of Greeley. We think, however, that the wisest thing for the Baltimore Convention to do is not to nominate a third ticket, nor even to adopt the Cincinnati ticket, but to submit the whole subject to the judgment and patriotism of the Democratic masses.

CAMPAIGN FALSEHOODS.

From The Nashville Banner.

Some Grant Republican—an office-holder, of course—writes a letter from Nashville to *The New-York Times*, in which, among other reckless things, the writer says that, "In some portions of this State it is absolutely unsafe to be a Grant man," and further, that "All Republicans in Tennessee are for Grant." *The Times*, being a partisan journal, is very wild in its statements sometimes, but it seldom goes so far as to print campaign literature so utterly devoid of truth as is furnished by this Tennessee correspondent. We know of several ex-Confederate soldiers who are as pronounced Grant men as Ewell or Mosby, and we know numbers of Republicans who voted for Grant in 1868 who will vote for Greeley in 1872, if the Democratic managers do not drive him off the track. Tennessee will go largely for Greeley, though it is quite possible that Grant's vote may be increased in the State. There is no bad feeling here. On the contrary, the bearing of political opponents toward each other was never more tolerant and courteous.

MORE UNANIMITY THAN WAS AT FIRST INTENDED.

From The Journal of Commerce (Dem.)

So well settled was it that Gen. Grant was to be renominated, that the Brutuses who "would not have it so" refrained from any participation in the affair, and left the unanimity to be a little more perfect than perhaps the engineers of the ovation would have wished it to be. Some slight semblance of opposition would have carried with it also some show of free choice. The contest for the Vice-Presidency was one rather of professional than of public interest. If sticking to his party through thick and thin, from its origin till now, could entitle a man to the nomination, Senator Wilson was amply entitled; and, further, his name may be expected to make the ticket acceptable to the Trades Unionists, with whom he is well understood to sympathize.

THE ORGAN'S DISCORDANT TUNES.

From The Chicago Times.

We had occasion, at the time of Mr. Greeley's retirement from the editorship of THE NEW-YORK TRIBUNE, to censure *The Times*, of the same city, for insinuating that he would still be its editor *sub rosa*. *The Times* has probably already forgotten the direction which its meanness then took; for now it is telling us "that THE TRIBUNE has gone all to pieces since he ceased to write for it." But this is about the way in which the stories of papers of *The Times'* stamp generally "hang together."

A YOUNG MEN'S GREELEY CLUB IN SYRACUSE.

The following call appeared in *The Syracuse Standard* of Tuesday:

We, the undersigned electors of the City of Syracuse, declaring our faith and confidence in the principles of the Cincinnati Convention, and being convinced of the honest purposes of its nominees, hereby agree to organize ourselves into a political "Young Men's Greeley Club" for the purpose of uniting our strength and directing our energies toward the election of Greeley and Brown, and we hereby call a meeting for the purpose of organization, to be held at the City Hall, on Tuesday evening, June 13, at 7½ o'clock p. m.

Alfred Wilkinson,		John Yorker, jr.,
C. H. Sedgwick,	George H. Wright,	George N. Hurst,
Moses Summers,	D. B. Keeler,	J. Page Munro,
G. W. Wisner,	E. D. Lewis,	William Summers,
T. S. Sanford,	M. Tobin,	D. K. McCarthy,
E. S. Covert,	C. T. Redfield,	S. W. Sweazy,
H. S. Burt,	Alex. Kinsley, jr.,	Wm. S. Moorhead,
E. W. Phillips,	E. G. Seymour,	Wm. Henry Hoyt,
Isaac D. Garfield,	F. W. Waggoner,	M. M. Pratt,
S. A. Daniels,	H. Starr,	Fred. Ganier,
R. E. Ellis,	John Walsh,	George H. Gilbert,
W. S. Carpenter,	Stanley Bagg,	E. W. Marsh,
C. A. Blodgett,	Tom D. Chapman,	A. G. Cook,
John A. Lombard,	W. M. Brown,	W. J. Denison,
S. E. Kingsley,	W. W. Gillespie,	Ira Wood,
John Ryan,	Henry Peat,	John C. Bennett,
D. Dunham,	Adam Robsing,	William Sulz,
A. B. Perry,	Chas. W. Barnes,	N. R. Clary,
E. Butler,	Anthony S. Webb,	N. Lehsen,
J. B. Stoup,	J. R. Connolly,	Thomas Ryan,
Geo. A. Ostrander,	Stiles M. Rust,	Jacob Werner,
Willis S. Barnum,	J. S. Collins,	Jean C. Cooney,
E. Dexter,	Cooney Mowery,	Paul Tonar,
Irving G. Vann,	B. Davis Noxon,	Theodore Dissel,
John F. Connolly,	Fred. Arnold,	T. Sullivan,
J. L. Hauchett,	O. J. Brown,	W. H. Wood,
E. A. Witmans,	John Moore,	A. L. Johnson,
H. H. Wheeler,	John Hurst,	W. A. Beach,
P. Corbett,	D. Pratt, jr.,	D. L. Moorhead,
George Doheny,	Charles E. Wright,	James H. Connolly,
C. F. W. Williston,	J. W. Yale,	E. W. Truston,
D. Bookstaver,	J. Glatz,	George H. Greenaway,
E. W. Longstreet,	Edward I. Ballard,	Thomas McCarthy,
Walter M. Dallman,	Michael Wanlan,	P. Phelan,
John Fitzgerald, jr.,	E. M. Dailey,	H. D. Patterson,
S. Gurney Lapham,	Will H. Reed,	W. C. Honey,
Thomas Emery,	John Chase,	D. Anthony Gillespie,
James L. Davis,	O. W. Titus,	C. H. Hart,
Jacob Galazer,	C. H. Kenyon,	Wm. H. Warner,
J. L. Toonson,	Ancil S. Prescott,	James J. McCabe,
N. R. Colton,	J. Emmet Wells,	W. E. Jones,
Harry Wagner,	J. L. Bennett,	S. Hutchins,
Matthias Button,	R. R. Wame,	James Weir,
J. H. Danziger,	Henry D. Brewster,	Henry J. Mowry,
George Barnes,	W. H. Gifford,	David F. McCarthy,
Wm. A. Street,	John O. B. Lynch,	Peter Smith,
James Barnes,	Watson Gill,	John Drehing,
Rudolph Hosp,	John Demsey,	S. D. Gibson,
A. W. Jaynes,	Jacob Gebhardt,	E. S. Butterfield,
Jacob F. Arkedit,	Stephen W. Burt,	Fred. J. Pelham,
John Ulmar,	John Malvihill,	Samuel Myers.

THE TENTH ASSEMBLY DISTRICT.

A VIRGINIAN INDORSES THE CINCINNATI NOMINEE.

The Xth Assembly District Greeley and Brown Club met at No. 385 Third-ave., Monday night, William T. Ashmun presiding, and was addressed by John U. Andrews of Virginia, who said, in the course of his address:

There was never a time when political affairs demanded the attention of our citizens more than at present. For four years back this country has been controlled and governed, as it were, by one man. We in the South have been waiting calmly and patiently for the good time promised when Gen. Grant was inaugurated. We were promised then, and had every reason to expect, that peace would be proclaimed, that the North and South would be reunited in the bonds of brotherhood, and that a feeling of confidence would be restored, but in all this we have been sadly disappointed. The people of the Southern States are stretching out their arms to you of the North and asking for peace. They are willing to do all they possibly can to extricate the country, North and South, from the many difficulties that the unhappy war produced. Having lost their all by that contest, and being trodden under foot by military despots, their lands in desolation and ruin, they come to you and ask to be forgiven and protected. Shall not white men be permitted to occupy a position equal to that of any other race on earth?

It may seem strange to you that I, having been born and raised in old Virginia and having always been a sound Democrat, should support the nominees and platform of the Cincinnati Convention, but I tell you that platform is the soundest Democratic platform that has been presented to the American people since the days of Jefferson [applause], and although from my boyhood I have been in antagonism with Horace Greeley, yet it was only upon one question—the institution of Slavery. That question has been settled; it is now a dead issue, and has been buried so deep in oblivion that the hand of resurrection can never reach it. [Applause.] Why should we quarrel then? Why waste time in discussing dead issues? This venerable sage who stands before the American people to-day with an untarnished and unblemished reputation, although he was in antagonism to the South for many years upon the slavery question, comes forward, in his goodness of heart and nobleness of soul, now that that has been settled, and extends to the Southern people the right hand of fellowship. We mean to support him with all our might and main, and I believe there will be a grand uprising of the American people from Maine to the Gulf and from the Atlantic to the Pacific, proclaiming that we will once again be a united and peaceful people.

Mr. O'Brien said that Horace Greeley had always been the protector of the rights of workingmen, and if they forgot him in the present contest they would be guilty of base ingratitude. Jules Harboug and Francis Schneider also made brief addresses.

A QUERY.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: What right have the little company of Free Traders who meet at Steinway Hall to dictate their movement by the use of Mr. Adams's name? Does anybody believe he would permit himself to be used simply to divide the Reform ranks and assist in electing Gen. Grant? And is it "just the thing" to use the name of a man who is too far away to prevent it, in such a blatant and contemptible manner?

New-York, June 7, 1872. E. R. E.

THE COURTS.

GEN. BUTLER AT NEW-ORLEANS.

THE