platform here to-night. I am here to argue and call upon every man to forget past afflictions and to give an honest, earnest support to the election of Mr. Dowd for Mayor of the City of New-York. [Great applause.] And now for my reasons. I find the first in the letter of acceptance of Mr. Grace. Of Mr. Grace personally I have not a word to say save that he is a gentleman. I believe, of respectability, and a pure, upright man, and, so far as the simple duties of the office of Mayor are concerned, he is the peer of his competitor; but when, in accepting the nomination, he goes aside and says—I will use his own words—"If elected it shall be my aim to preserve the integrity of the common school system, so long established and regarded with pride by the American people." (I wish he had been a little more specific in identifying himself with them.) [Applause.] "In any appointments which I may have to make in connection with its management, I shall not fail to give full and proper recognition to the prevailing American sentiment in this regard." [Laughter.] I have looked at the records of the Board of Education in 1875, when a communication was presented by a portion of the American people resident in New-York. There are names signed to it by gentlemen of the highest respectability. They ask on what terms the parochial schools may be admitted to the benefits of the common school system; they say they are desirous of having it extended to the 30,000 children they speak for; that they represent more than fifty schools; that they have experienced teachers and large and commodious buildings, and they desire to find a common ground of action. They offer to pay their full share of the taxes that go to the support of public schools. To this are appended some twelve or fifteen respectable, worthy names, and their opinions are entitled to consideration.

But we differed with them. How did they want to carry on these schools? They would allow their teachers who had good training to teach during such hours as the Board of Education might designate, if they were allowed to give religious instruction for the rest of the day. Their idea was that secular and religious instruction should go hand in hand. That was all there was in it. The Board of Education referred the matter to a committee. They had one meeting, and adjourned and never met again. [Great laughter.] And I doubt if they ever will meet again [laughter] so long as the Board of Education is kept in its present condition. [Applause.] I recognize amongst the names of the gentlemen signing this petition a man for whom I have a personal respect; and when I had the privilege of having the appointment of the Board of Education, I desired to appoint him. I desired him to come to the office so that I might ask him a few questions. And having questioned him as to his intentions, he said: "Mr. Mayor, I will tell you frankly, I don't believe in the system of common schools; I don't believe in them. I believe that religious and secular instruction should go hand in hand." I honored that man, but I did not honor his principles; and we must take care to defeat the man who represents them. [Applause.]

This system of ours dates back a long, long time. It was organized in 1805, and continued in the condition in which it was then put into existence for forty years, a sort of charitable institution. There are those who remember the old Public School Society. It had the control of public schools, and exercised it for the benefit of children whose parents could not afford to provide for them. In 1842, by an act of the Legislature, the first system of public education was established, and until 1853 the Public School Society continued in connection with the Board of Education, but in that year they were merged into one body. From 1853 to 1869 the members of the Board of Education, or so-called Commissioners of Education, were elected by the people, sometimes from the wards, and afterward from the districts. In 1869 the elective board was abolished and the Board of State Commissioners arose.

Prior to that a bill was introduced at Albany, and it would have passed but for the earnest opposition of friends of non-sectarianism; it did pass to a second reading, and it was favorably reported upon by the senate. It provided that in every school having 200 or more children in attendance the supervisors of the town or county should pay to that school the same rate per capita as was paid for the children of the common schools. There was a tax levied at that time for each child attending school, $8 for each child. You will see the object of that bill. If it had passed they would never have wanted any change in the Board of Education. Parochial schools and the schools of other denominations would have been put on a par with our public school system. Fortunately, it was defeated. In 1873 another act was passed. Legislative boards ruled the schools, being fourteen in number, and twenty-one Commissioners were appointed, and under that law the present Board now exists. The Board of Education, in addition to having control of all the financial affairs, oversees the course of studies and has a general superintendence of the schools. In each ward are five trustees, who have the immediate charge of the schools located in that ward; they appoint teachers and supervise the affairs of the schools immediately under their charge. These trustees are appointed by the Board of Education, each being appointed for five years, one going out each year, and I appeal to every one familiar with our Board of Education to correct me if I do not state it exactly when I announce that in the appointment of trustees every nationality is represented. In every ward, I believe, there is a German trustee, and in every ward an Irishman—perhaps two. [Laughter.]

Now, if the complexion of this Board is changed; if Mr. Grace should adopt as the prevailing American idea of public schools that principle by the great German signed this petition, I very much fear that the parochial schools and our public schools would go hand in hand, and our system of public education would meet with a terrible disaster. [Great applause.] I have detained you longer than I intended to. When I received the notice I warned the gentlemen that I should not speak more than ten minutes. ["Go on, go on." I intended so to do, and must apologize for keeping you so long. [Applause and cries of "Go on, go on."] I cannot take my seat without urging upon every man here present the importance of this election. Success can be had. If you will only give your earnest endeavor to this one thing from now until Tuesday night we will rejoice on Wednesday morning to know that William Dowd is to be the Mayor of this city for the next two years, and with him our school system is safe. [Great cheers.]

ADDRESS OF THE REV. DR. TYNG.

The Rev. Dr. Stephen H. Tyng, jr., was next introduced, amid long and continued applause. After the enthusiasm of the audience had vented itself in a measure, Dr. Tyng said:

MR. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: This is the second meeting of a political or semi-political nature that I have attended this week. The first meeting was a meeting to be regarded with sadness and grief, as that is to be regarded with gladness and joy. Last evening I went to Tammany Hall, in order that I might better understand the grounds taken there for supporting the Democratic candidate for Mayor of New-York City. I wanted to hear the other side of the case, that I might be able to squarely meet the issue raised by the gentleman who presided at that meeting. I remember the story of an old Presbyterian minister of Philadelphia, who, before beginning a sermon on a very abstruse subject, said: "I call the attention of this audience to a subject of great difficulty of comprehension. I will try to make it plain to you, but it will take some time and it will require close attention on your part, as I am not sure that I entirely understand it myself." Now, I did not want to come here before you in the condition of that minister. I wanted to be sure that I understood the question clearly myself, and that is why I went to Tammany Hall, so that I might understand the issue from every standpoint.

Now, I want to meet this question without any of the prejudice of my profession. I would have liked to be introduced here to-night without any prefixes or suffixes, but simply as a man who has the interests of the people and of the city at heart—from a secular standpoint, let me say—as one who wants the people to understand the greatness, the importance of the question which they are to decide next Tuesday at the polls. This is not a question of religious intolerance or proscription, John Kelly to the contrary notwithstanding. [Hisses.] No hisses, please, against a man in his virtuosity. I do not advise a man to vote against a candidate simply because he is a Roman Catholic, while I am a Protestant. I do not believe in punishing a man merely because his religious belief is different from my own. In that I agree with the speakers at Tammany Hall last night. But when a man's religion makes him subordinate to a sect that is hostile of civil power, and that is continually plotting to obtain control in the Government, then I feel that it is necessary to defeat the man in order to restrain the sect—the power behind the throne. A man who owes a student oath upon his religious profession. We must set our face against religious intolerance, but in no sense at the same time we must not allow those who are intolerant to obtain the rule over us. If John Kelly stands toward his religious body as it is claimed, it is impossible for him to be tolerant. In an association in which the infallibility of a man or set of men, either now or in the ages gone, is claimed, there cannot be any such thing as tolerance. Pope Pius IX. declared that the Roman Church should have power over the schools, over the education of Roman Catholic children, and this doctrine was changed to be infallible by the Church which promulgated it. Now, if John Kelly be true to his Church he must be true to this doctrine. He cannot be false to it. Nor can any true Roman Catholic. If we want liberality of sentiment in the control of our schools, then we cannot look to the man whom Kelly represents. The Roman Catholic Church makes its rulings and decrees them to be infallible. Then its members must be loyal to these declarations if they believe in them, and they must believe in them to be loyal to their church.

The intolerance of the Roman Church has been referred to. Let me give two recent instances of this in our own country. One case was thus published December 24, 1879: "Versailles, Ind., Dec. 23—The trial of the Rev. Father Demmelmeier, of the Morris (Roman) Catholic Church, for assault and battery, in severely whipping two boys, his pupils (sons of Henry Rochrand and Henry Schenck), for attending as participators the funeral of a Protestant boy, ended in a judgment against him—one count, $3 and costs; another for $15, and costs, which amounted to over $300. The case excited great interest, and so much bitter feeling was engendered that the venue was changed three times. An appeal is said to have been taken."

And here is a specimen of what looks rather like intolerance regarding the school question itself: "Louisville, Ky., January 3, 1879—Bishop Jeckiosky, of this diocese, has issued a decree prescribing that, as soon as possible, parochial schools be established everywhere: 'Now it is our will and command, that where there is a Catholic school in the parish, parents and guardians in such places shall send their children or wards who are under nine years of age, to such Catholic school; and we hereby direct that this obligation be enforced, under the pain of refusal of absolution in the sacrament and penance.' This decree took effect on the 1st of January, 1880. The effect caused much commotion in Louisville, as about 7,000 Catholic children attend the public schools."

Now, whether John Kelly or the Roman Catholic Church be tolerant is not the great question, or whether secular or sectarian education is the best, still is not the question. We are not now, as educators, comparing the excellencies of the systems, though it is not out of place to say a word concerning that. Some, perhaps, have thought that the education given by Rome in our Republic would borrow inspiration from our purer atmosphere and some bing of the spirit of our public schools in fitting the children intellectually and morally for the duties that await them. But the contrary appears to be the case, and the dissatisfaction of the more intellectual Roman Catholics with their schools, colleges and female seminaries is an old story.

Dr. Brownson, when in Sandler's "Sixth Reader," used in Roman Catholic schools, is pronounced "the most original and philosophic thinker that America has produced," in his *Review* for January, 1862, gravely said: "Great dissatisfaction has been expressed, and in quarters entitled to respect, with our colleges and female academies;" and he asked "Whence comes it that so many of us prefer the public schools of the country to schools conducted by Roman Catholics? What is the explanation of these facts? How are they to be accounted for?" In answering this question he said of the Roman schools: "They practically fail to recognize human progress, and thus fail to recognize the continuous and successive evolution of the idea of life and of humanity. They who are educated in our schools seem misplaced and mistimed in the world, as if born for a world that has ceased to exist. They come out lagging in the rear of contemporary ideas, contemporary habits of mind, contemporary intelligence and tendencies, and large numbers of them sink into obscurity, and do nothing for their religion or their country. Comparatively few of them take a stand, as scholars or as men, on a level with the graduates of non-Catholic colleges; and those who do take the stand, in most cases, do it by throwing aside nearly all the ideas they learned from their alma mater, and adopting the ideas and principles, the modes of thought and action, which they find in the general civilization of the country in which they live. The cause of the failure of what we term Catholic education is not (judgment) is the fact that we educate, not for the present or future, but for the past, which can never be restored. It aims to restore a past age and order of things, which it is neither possible nor desirable to restore, for it could be restored only, if at all, by a second childhood."

The view thus expressed by Dr. Brownson of Roman education in America, corresponds with that of the Cavour Society for the instruction of the Roman youth, as calculated to give them "anti-patriotic and anti-National tendencies, false notions of Italian history, childish superstition and very little real knowledge."

However, we are not now discussing systems, nor the right of the Roman Catholics to conduct parochial schools. We do not wish to limit their usefulness in any way wherein they are useful. We have no controversy with the priests or with the Controller of the City of New-York. We as Tammany only as the chosen platform for this crusade against the public schools of New-York. This movement against the schools is only a part of that delightful cooing of "change" that we have been hearing so much about. However, I do not regard this as a democratic issue, but a Tammany issue, forced upon the Democratic party. Good Democrats will oppose it, as good Republicans will fight against it. If any man wants to wear a collar about his neck, with another man's name inscribed upon it, in God's name let him do it. But no man in this world shall stand as against for me. I have a responsibility of my own, and I shall exercise it as I feel it bearing down upon me. If the members of Tammany Hall, or if members of the Democratic party, want to be led along with a little dog-string all right. [Applause.]

But what is the great issue before us? Let me tell you: It is the maintenance of the time-honored system of our common school education. From 1824 to date the Roman Catholic Church has been unceasing in its efforts to undermine our common school system. It never yet at any time has succeeded. [A voice—"And it shall not succeed."] No, it shall not succeed! It must never succeed. We must stand by our system as its defenders, and we must fight as we would fight in defence of our National flag. We are here now to rebuke any who would strike against our common school system. As early as 1822, efforts were made by the Romish Church to interfere with our schools, and in 1831 the school system received its first open attack. A Roman Catholic orphan asylum came in 1835, claiming a proratal of the common school fund for the maintenance of its schools. The Methodists then came forward with a petition to the same effect, believing in John Wesley's maxim of fighting fire with fire. This destroyed the movement at that time. In 1840 the Roman Catholics reopened this question, and then, for the first time, it was made an issue in politics. That year a great meeting was held under the direction of Archbishop Hughes, and it was then resolved that the present system of common schools was a gross violation of civil and religious liberty. In 1841 Archbishop Hughes held a number of meetings and commanded the people to vote against the school system, but his meetings and commands availed little. They were sadly unsuccessful, and the common school system is alive and flourishing to-day.

We are here to-night to meet an attempt to renew the old conflict, to fight against a policy of "change." I here assert, without fear of contradiction from man or from history, that since 1824 the Roman Catholics have been aggressors against the public school system. I also assert that the plan for the maintenance of that system has never altered since 1824. The use of the schools for political machination begun by Archbishop Hughes has never been renounced, and the Roman Catholics are now using a part of the Democratic party to accomplish their designs against the schools. If Mr. Grace is elected Mayor, our common school system will be set back a generation. With the appointment of Roman Catholic School Commissioners he would put our system into the control of the head of the Romish Church. O, it is very pleasant, Mr. Kelly, to have the lion and the lamb lie down together, but how about the result as affecting the lamb? This thing of putting our schools on a par with Roman Catholic parochial schools is like asking us in the nineteenth century to put on the pantalettes of the thirteenth.

But we must avert this danger, and I appeal to you, men of New-York, to support Mr. Dowd for the Mayoralty. He is our champion to resist this new aggression upon the public school system, which up to this day has been the bulwark of this generation. I call upon you, I implore you, to defend this system, left to you as your heritage. Shall this system be an exotic here where it was born? Shall it be uprooted here only to flourish abroad, in countries which learned it from us? We shall not part with the heritage left to us and to our children. If you are interested in obtaining an office, do not vote to obtain it at such a cost. It will be dear to you in the end. Let every man approach the ballot-box on Tuesday with a responsibility he has never felt before. Let the ballot-box be regarded as an altar upon which we shall swear fidelity to that cause which is dearest to us, which is the great preserver of our liberties, the great conserver of our political prosperity. Let us vote in the fear of God and for the good of man. [Applause.]

SPEECH OF THE REV. DR. NEWMAN.

The Rev. Dr. John P. Newman was introduced as the next speaker. He was received with tumultuous applause. Dr. Tyng having referred to the Methodists of this city as appealing for a share of the public funds for their schools on an occasion many years ago, Dr. Newman, before beginning his speech proper, turned to Dr. Tyng and said good-humoredly:

If the Methodists did so err in the past I am proud and happy to say to my friend, Dr. Tyng, that they have returned to the path from which they strayed; they have returned to the true fold, and long ago refused to accept a dollar of the public moneys for their schools or for sectarian purposes; and I call upon him, standing so high as he does among his coreligionists, and wielding the influence he does with them, to raise his voice and to earnestly counsel all Episcopalians to refuse to accept, as do Methodists to-day, one cent from the public treasury for school or other sectarian purposes. [Loud applause.] Now having squared with Dr. Tyng, I'll proceed. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I have a deep interest in this matter. I am a native of this city. I received my early education in the public schools when the rattan and the grammar went hand in hand. [Laughter.] I am glad the rattan and grammar did go hand in hand in those days, for together they helped me to rise in the world. [Applause.] I am here, therefore, to speak a word for our public schools—the glory of our grand Republic. [Loud applause.] I am not here to make a crusade against any religion or against any sectarian religionists; I am not here as a sectarian, nor as a Methodist, but as a patriot and a citizen. [Applause.] We desire no quarrel with the Roman Catholics; we desire to live in peace and harmony with them. I am prepared to protect them in their rights [loud applause], for the Constitution guarantees to all men in the land the right to follow any religion he may choose. Here the Hindoo, the Mahometan or the Roman Catholic is as free to worship his God in his own way as the Methodist. It is none of your or of my business how any man worships, but it is our business to see to it that no religion should work harm to the body politic. [Tremendous applause.]

Whenever any religionist does allow his religion to work harm to the body politic he is false to his God and false to his country. [Loud applause.] But what do we see? A most diabolic, devilish attempt on the part of certain sectarians to place the public schools in the hands of one religion, whose ministers for years and years have had but one fiendish scheme close to their hearts. [Loud applause.] What reason have we to suppose Mr. Grace would have a sectarian policy? What reason? Bless me, Mr. Grace is a Roman Catholic. If he be a good Roman Catholic he must be subject to the decrees of the Pope which come through the Bishops to the priests, and through him, as consequence, to the good Roman Catholic. Well, what is the situation?

The Sovereign Pontiff takes bold ground and declares education not subject to the Roman Catholic Church is godless. If Mr. Grace is not a good Catholic and professes to be, he certainly is not fit to be Mayor of New-York City. [Applause.] He says in his letter—and was ever one drawn with greater skill, with the hand of a Talleyrand so plainly visible, and, indeed, for that matter, with the hand of a Jesuit so plainly visible?—that he will maintain the public schools in their integrity, but he does not say another thing, namely, that he will not favor an appropriation for Roman Catholic schools. [Applause.] It should be distinctly understood and constantly borne in mind that the Sovereign Pontiff says he is supreme in civil as well as in religious matters. The Encyclical Letter of 1874 says to all the Roman Catholic Church has the right to interfere in the education of youth and in the selection of teachers; and further, that the public schools should be under the control of that church, and, again, that the public schools should not be separated from the church. On March 5, 1879, Pope Leo, in a letter to the Cardinal Prefect, said that if he possessed the liberty he claims he would close all Protestant schools. He would like to do this in New-York, as he is anxious to do it in Rome. [Applause.] But instead, New-York shall be "re-Dowd" for the next two years. [Laughter and applause.] We must have a man about whom there is no question as to where he was born [applause], about whom there is no question as to his character for honor and purity in all things. [Applause.]

I am reminded that Cardinal Antonelli said that he would rather see children grow up in ignorance than to see them educated in such as the public schools of Massachusetts. What is the voice of the Roman Catholic press of this city on this subject? *The Freeman's Journal—Freeman's Journal?* [Laughter]—says: "Let the public school system go where it came from—the devil." It is not going to the devil. [Loud applause.] It didn't come from the devil. [Renewed applause.] But somebody else will go to the devil. [Laughter.] Father Hecker—poor Father Hecker—in his work on "The Catholic Church in Relation to the Republic," page 16, says: "It is no part of the State to educate children." We have fallen on serious times, but we have not inaugurated it; we are not the aggressors. General Grant gave the keynote of this whole business when he said that if another war should cause this country it would be ignorance and bigotry on one side and education and tolerance on the other.

Let us see what the horoscope of the Roman Church tells us in regard to this Republic. She once had the control of Spain, and what is the educational condition of that country? Out of her millions out 3,000,000 can write their name. She has control of France, beautiful France. What was the condition under the Empire? Out of 36,000,000 one-half could not read or write. Out of 142,000 criminals 100,000 could not write. Italy, that land of beautiful skies, has been under the dominion of the Roman Church for 1,000 years, and what is the condition of Rome? Statistics show that out of 100 Roman men only thirty-two can write, and out of 100 women only sixteen can write. The same is true of Austria, which at the breaking of the Concordat was under the heel of the Pope.

Citizens, this is an hour of grave responsibility. Never before has Rome raised her head so high in our midst. She has thrown down the gauntlet, and, trusting in the God of our fathers, we will take it up. [Tremendous and prolonged applause.] Will there be intimidation? No, fellow Democrats [laughter] and fellow Republicans, there will be no intimidation to us. The power that put down a stupendous rebellion cannot be intimidated. [Loud applause.] I am now going to tell what kind of intimidation there will be, and though I am about to make a startling statement I can produce affidavits to prove what I am going to state, and there are men here present who can verify what I shall disclose.

Not long ago, when a venerable man was Mayor of this city, a certain Roman Catholic prelate, who was personally acquainted with the Mayor, called at his office, and going up to the old man, held out in his hand a list of names, saying: "Will you appoint from among these gentlemen the men to fill the vacancies in the Board of Education?" The Mayor answered: "I will see." Again the prelate asked: "Will you choose the candidates from this list?" and the Mayor answered: "I will take it into consideration." Finally, growing angry beyond bounds, the prelate asked a third time: "Will you choose them from this list?" The aged man, jumping to his feet, actually screamed "No!" [Uproarious applause, during which the audience rose and cheered for several minutes, and when at last a lull came, somebody shouted: "Three cheers for William F. Havemeyer." They were given with a "tiger."]

When the prelate saw that he was baffled he stepped up to the aged Chief Magistrate, and with his clenched fist shaking in the face of the venerable man exclaimed: "You will hear from me for this." "I don't care if I do," replied the Mayor, "I will not appoint one of them." [Loud applause.] That will be the kind of intimidation. [Applause.] Citizens, in God's name; in the name of that greatest of American patriots—Abraham Lincoln [loud applause]—in the name of that other patriot who died a martyr [loud applause]; in the name of the great soldier whose voice is with us [applause]; in the name of the childhood of this city; in the name of the womanhood and the manhood; in the name of the perpetuity of this grand Republic, let us go to the polls on Tuesday and put William Dowd into the Mayor's chair. [Prolonged applause.]

LAWSON N. FULLER'S REMARKS.

Lawson N. Fuller was discovered in the room, and called to the platform amid hearty applause. Mr. Fuller said in part:

The ministers tell us much of "saving grace," but I do not think that Mr. Grace will save the public schools. [Applause.] I have been for twenty years in the service of the public schools of New-York City, and am in a position to know and say that the election of William R. Grace would be an indorsement of that class of men of our city who are opposed to the public schools of the city. [Applause.] William Dowd has been connected with the public schools and knows all about them. He believes in them. We are a great Republic educated in the public schools. People come here from all parts of the earth, and lose their foreign identity, and all are Americans. I am opposed to sectarian education; I would not trust the public schools to any sect, nor any divine, however pure or patriotic, for no divine or clergyman is fit to have sole control of them. [Applause.] There are some Catholics in the Board of Education who are noble and pure, but not all Catholics are friends of the public schools, and that is where the danger comes in. The public press see it, and the danger of electing a Catholic Board, or a Catholic Mayor who would appoint such a board, for he must obey orders. It is the duty of the clergy, of all denominations, of all parents, to cast a vote for William Dowd, for the public schools must be preserved at all hazards. I have as high an opinion of Joon Kelly as any man. I believe he is strictly honest, but when he grows politically drunk, he is as dangerous as any drunkard. Is it not enough that he controls $30,000,000 every year, but he must control all the heads of departments, and he a law unto himself? We are going in the direction of William M. Tweed altogether too fast, and it is time to halt. Every citizen, foreign or native-born, must reflect and weigh carefully what leads us to. Stop now, and declare on Tuesday next that William Dowd shall be the next Mayor of New-York. [Hearty applause.]

ADDRESS TO THE VOTERS OF NEW-YORK.

Voters of New-York: Do not forget that, independent of National issues, the welfare of our city is at stake in the coming election. It is a fundamental principle of our Republic, that the Church and State shall be separate; that men of every religious belief shall be alike in their powers and privileges; that no sect shall monopolize those powers.

It is now proposed that the entire and absolute control of our City Government shall be delivered to one sect to the exclusion of all others. Through many years and at vast expense we have developed a system of public schools of which we are justly proud. From them we expect our children that education by which alone they can be qualified for the duties of life and the exercise of a free government. It is essential to the perpetuity of this system that the schools should be kept non-sectarian, surrendered to one or divided among twenty sects they would no longer be the people's schools, and their ruin would be accomplished. It is proposed at the coming election to place these schools under the absolute control of one sect, which has for centuries held, and still holds, as an indispensable dogma, that all education should be sectarian.

There is one man prominent in municipal affairs who, to the extent of his power, rules with the absolutism of a dictator. A majority of the people of New-York are opposed to his rule, as they have shown at more than one election. Long ago they came to regard that this dictatorship invariably is the worst characteristic, and gives power and place to the worst elements of our metropolitan life. But these opponents of one-man power are divided in their views upon National issues and intend to voice at the coming election for different Presidential electors, and there is danger that because of this division upon National issues, our city will be delivered to the bondage-yoke of the dictator. We appeal to you not to permit this. Let each man vote for the Presidential candidate of his choice, but let each man vote for the municipal candidates who will best secure good government for the city.

Democratic fellow-citizens, remember that the success of Tammany Hall at this election would be the most fatal disaster that could befall the Democratic party, because it would deliver that party bound hand and foot to the control of the men against whom the wisest and most patriotic Democrats have so often and so earnestly contended. Do not abandon now the principles which you have held in the municipal contests of past years as we have maintained.

We can best guard against these evils by electing William Dowd our Mayor. We cannot do it by not voting. He is false to his duty as an American who fails to reflect and decide and vote. We should elect Mr. Dowd, not because he is a Republican, but because he is an old, tried and honored New-York merchant, whose political belief is of no consequence compared with the important principles which will be maintained in municipal affairs by his election. Do not fail to vote, and to vote for him, if you desire free political parties, free Democratic government, free and non-sectarian public schools.

NAVAL INTELLIGENCE.

WASHINGTON, Oct. 29.—Captain Robert T. R. Lewis, commanding the United States frigate Shenandoah, at Rio de Janeiro, September 19, reports to the Navy Department that James Grady, Brooklyn, was saved from drowning by William Moore, seaman.

Leave of absence has been granted to Master Charles W. Deering, United States Navy, for six months from November 20; to Passed Assistant Engineer William W. Horton, for one month from November 5. The leave of absence of Barmaster D. Mansfield has been extended thirty days.

Rear Admiral Bryson, commanding the United States Naval force on the South Atlantic station, writes to the Navy Department under date of Rio de Janeiro, October 4, as follows: "I have the honor to inform the Department that if the health of Rio de Janeiro continues as at present, I purpose remaining here until the latter part of this month. On my way south I will devote some days to an endeavor to pick up, locate and plot the Madgres Rock, if the existence of which, however, there seems to be considerable doubt; then to St. Catherine's for the purpose of landing and exercising the crew and to do some necessary work on the outside planking of the ship; after which I shall proceed at slow leisure. The Marion is at the latter port, where she will await my return; and late advices from her inform me that all were in excellent health. The general health on the Shenandoah continues good."

GROCERY TRADE FAILURES.

TROY, N. Y., Oct. 29.—Jesse B. Anthony, wholesale coffee and spice dealer at No. 363 River-st., principal in the firm of J. B. Pettis & Co., manufacturers of Masonic regalia, at No. 326 River-st., a director of the Union National Bank, and president of the Troy Steam Heating Company, made a general assignment to-day. His liabilities are over $100,000. Mr. Anthony's failure is the result of C. Risley & Co.'s suspension in New-York, leaving indorsed for them. He is Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of Masons of New-York State.

BUFFALO, N. Y., Oct. 29.—George W. Hayward & Co., who retail coffee and dried fruit dealers, have made an assignment to Philo D. Beard. The liabilities are $100,000, and there are preferred creditors to the amount of $23,729. The immediate cause of the failure was the suspension of C. Risley & Co., of New-York.

AN AGREEMENT RATIFIED.

MOBILE, Ala., Oct. 29.—At the annual meeting of the Mobile Cotton Exchange yesterday the agreement made in New-York on the 14th inst. between the creditors of Mobile and the Commissioners of the city was unanimously ratified.

A DEMOCRATIC PARADE IN BROOKLYN.

The public efforts of the Democratic managers in the present campaign in Kings County ended last evening with a parade in some of the principal streets of Brooklyn. The rainy weather interfered somewhat with the success of the affair on account of the constitutional aversion to waterproofs on the part of the average Democratic torch bearer. But enough boys and men were in line to make a fair showing of strength, though far from as good as that made in the Tilden campaign in 1876. About 10,000 men appeared in line, and it was midnight before the head of the column reached the reviewing stand. The column was under command of General John B. Woodward.

TRUMAN SMITH TO MR. BARNUM

PLAIN TALK.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: Will you permit me, through your columns, to address some plain words to one of my successors in the United States Senate from Connecticut?

TRUMAN SMITH.

Stamford, Conn., Oct. 20, 1880.

MR. SMITH'S LETTER.

To the Hon. WILLIAM H. BARNUM, Chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

SIR: You represented in the House of Representatives of the XLth, XLIst, XLIId and XLIIId Congresses the IVth Congressional District of Connecticut, as the undersigned did a part of it (to-wit, Litchfield County, then our VIth District,), in the XXVIth and XXVIIth, and the whole or it in the XXIXth and XXXth. You represented our ancient Commonwealth (once called the land of steady habits) in the United States Senate for the XLIVth and XLVth Congresses, being what remained of the last Senatorial term of the lamented O. S. Ferry, as the undersigned did in the XXXIst, XXXIId and XXXIIId Congresses. During the period of your service your compensation was at least three-fold more than was that of the undersigned and such men as Henry Clay, John C. Calhoun and Daniel Webster, with whom he had the honor to be associated. The pay of members at that era was $8 per day and mileage, which in the case of the undersigned was at the long session from $2,500 to $2,750, and at the short session less than $900, including mileage in both cases, being a compensation of from $1,700 to $1,850 per annum, or from $3,400 to $3,650 per Congress; but your compensation during the whole of your service at Washington was $5,000 per annum, or $10,000 per Congress, beside mileage.

The undersigned now charges: *First*, that you were paid most abundantly for your services, on the hypothesis that you were as much in your seat and as attentive to your duties, as good faithful members ever are; that the people of the United States had an absolute right to your attendance (sickness excepted); and that you had no more moral right, if you did not choose to attend, to apply for and take the compensation attached to your office than to break into the Treasury and carry off the amount *et al. aerosis*. *Second*, he charges that you, while a member of the House, were guilty of an absenteeism far more atrocious than has been committed by any other member since the organization of the Government. He doubts whether the aggregate of any five bad cases in any one Congress would equal yours.

The truth is, that before you became a member you had established yourself in the iron business on a large scale, and had been in a high degree successful. About that time, or perhaps before, the country ran mad on the subject of railroad building, and the demand for iron became enormous and the profits of the business correspondingly so. Hence you could not afford to occupy your seat in Congress, and you did not to a very large extent. The undersigned must make one exception to this dark picture, and that is, if any question as to protection had arisen or was likely to arise, you took care to be on hand.

The undersigned has not the slightest doubt but that you made more than $100,000 per Congress out of your iron business, and probably that amount annually. And what did you do with your immense earnings, including what you got out of the Treasury which you did not earn? It is believed by a vast number of our best people that you, solely, are responsible for the introduction of political venality into Western Connecticut. You are reported to have a wonderful aptitude for that sort of effort. Were you for that reason selected for the chairmanship of the Democratic National Committee? In that capacity you have put into activity all the engines of detraction and abuse which the evil one could invent to besmirch the best and purest men of the country.

SIR, the undersigned is indignant at your conduct. He had the honor to represent as Washington the district which you have done so much to demoralize. When he was elected venality was unknown in the district; and the same thing was true when the late Senator O. S. Ferry, the late John H. Hubbard, and also the Hon. O. S. Seymour and the Hon. George C. Woodruff, both Democrats, were elected to the House. Sin on your advent it became frightfully prevalent. The undersigned has sometimes thought himself guilty of a serious dereliction of duty in not arraigning you for the enormities, as the fear of public opinion, but advanced age and other considerations have prevented. He tells you to your face that were he to go to Washington and get the statistics of your absenteeism in connection with your baseless requisitions on the Treasury and give them to the public, they would cover you all over with infamy.

Stamford, Conn., Oct. 20, 1880. TRUMAN SMITH.

P. S.—Having finished the foregoing, the undersigned submitted it to a discreet friend, who advised him to ascertain whether you drew your salary pay in full, saying that possibly you did not. He accordingly wrote to the honorable secretary of the Treasury, and has just received the following reply:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, Oct. 23, 1880.

Hon. TRUMAN SMITH, Stamford, Conn.:

SIR: In reply to your communication of the 20th inst., relative to the amount of compensation received by the Hon. William H. Barnum as member of the House of Representatives for the XLth, XLIst, XLIId and XLIIId Congresses, and as United States Senator for the XLIVth and XLVth Congresses, I have the honor to state that the records of this Department show the following sums to have been paid to Mr. Barnum in full for compensation and mileage:

XLth Congress...	$10,410 00	XLIIId Congress...	$12,404 45
XLIst Congress...	10,200 00	XLIVth Congress...	10,200 00
XLIId Congress...	15,000 00	XLVth Congress...	10,200 00

The amount paid during the XLIIId Congress includes the retroactive increased compensation under the Act of March 3, 1873, which was subsequently returned to the Treasury. The amount for the XLIIId Congress includes the increased compensation allowed by the same act from the beginning of that Congress to the date of its repeal, January 20, 1874.

JOHN SHERMAN, Secretary.

The foregoing is rich in its developments, and calls for comment. But this he withholds for the present. Rest assured, sir, if God spares my life, this matter will not rest here. T. S.

Oct. 26.

CLOSE OF A BAPTIST CONFERENCE.

CORTLAND, N. Y., Oct. 28.—The State Convention of Baptist pastors closed to-day. At yesterday's meeting the President, Dr. Edward Bright, of New-York City, reviewed the history of the Convention. He said the Cortland Baptist Church was the first church organized in the county. In 1803 there were eighty-six Baptist churches in the State, with a total membership of 5,000. To-day there are 875 churches, with 115,000 members. A great conference meeting was held in the afternoon, Drs. J. D. Hart and R. S. MacArthur, of New-York, and many others, participating. In the evening the Educational Committee reported on Madison and Rochester Universities, Hamilton and Rochester Theological Seminaries, Cook and Colgate Academies, and Vassar College, as follows: Students in Collegiate courses, 213; in Theological courses, 100; in Academic courses, 277; in Vassar College, 303; total, 923. Large additions to the apparatus and endowment funds, from private benefactors, were reported. The report was discussed at some length by President Strong, of Rochester University, and one Rev. Drs. Patterson, of Amsterdam, and Hoyt, of Brooklyn.

This morning the following officers were elected for the ensuing year: President, Edward Bright; vice-presidents, J. C. Overheiser and E. P. Gaffney; secretary, Samuel T. Hickman; directors, Daniel E. Corey, Wayland Hoyt, W. N. Sage, John Peddie, R. B. Hall, H. M. Simons, A. J. Fox, J. L. Seeley, R. G. Cornell, and J. H. Griffith.

The Rev. T. S. Barnes, of Rochester, delivered an address upon "The Widest Study of the Bible, in Reference to Doctrine, a Necessity." Dr. Hoyt, of Brooklyn, followed. The last sermon was on the afternoon, when sermons were delivered by the Rev. Drs. C. A. Bastwick, of Rochester, J. P. Thomas, of Corning, and C. H. Watson, of Oswego. Through all the sessions the congregations have been very large.

SMALL-POX FROM PHILADELPHIA.

Many children and adults were vaccinated yesterday by the health officers at High Bridge and at two other points in the city, where cases of small-pox have been reported. It has been learned that at least one of the three cases was brought from Philadelphia, where the disease has existed for some time. This case was that of James Ritchie, a laborer, who was in a boarding house at Wolf-st. and Lind-ave., High Bridge. He was one of a gang of fifty men who had recently come from Philadelphia to work on the extension of the Elevated Railroad. Two of them had brought the disease in a mild form, and there had been two new cases after their arrival, before the matter came to the knowledge of the Board of Health. All the men were vaccinated Thursday night. Professor Janeway is convinced that the two cases that have occurred down town have also come from Philadelphia. Ritchie is very ill in the Riverside Hospital.

TWO MEN BURIED ALIVE.

John Hadley and Albert Bray, workmen in the Sayreville clay-pits at Matawan, N. J., were buried alive by the caving in of the embankment of the pit in which they were working yesterday. The Clay-pit Company, although informed that such an accident might occur at any time, took no precautions to guard against it.

WILLIAM B. SPOONER.

BOSTON, Oct. 29.—William B. Spooner, for many years head of the firm of W. B. Spooner & Co., leather merchants of this city, but for the last eight years retired from business, died this morning, age seventy-four. He was active in the organization of the Massachusetts Total Abstinence Society, of which he was president at the time of his death. The total amount of his charities is said to reach $700,000. Notwithstanding these large gifts and the loss of $150,000 by the great fire of 1872, he leaves a large estate to his widow and relatives. He had filled various public offices with credit.

THE POLITICAL SITUATION SOUTH.

LETTER FROM SOLON ROBINSON—DESPERATION OF THE NEGROES—THE HOPES OF THE COUNTRY RESTING WITH NORTHERN REPUBLICAN VOTERS.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: In the course of a recent tour through several Southern States, I talked with intelligent negroes upon the subject of the Presidential election, and asked whether many would vote the Democratic ticket. The answer was, "not one in a thousand." Others said: 'We are going to vote, and going to have our vote counted or fight. We are tired of being cheated."

"But you will be, and dare not resent it; if you do you will be discharged from work and turned out of house and home."

"Then somebody else will be. I tell you we have made up our minds, if we are struck as we have been to strike back. Do you see that?"

"Yes, that is a match."

"And that is cotton, and there is a good deal of it lying round loose in Georgia."

And in my opinion, there is a good deal of this same feeling "lying round loose" among the negroes, who may be goaded to desperation by wicked bulldozers, and then—who can foresee the San Domingan horrors which would come from a general contact of cotton and matches!

There is a bitter feud in the "white man's party" in Georgia upon the gubernatorial question, which bids us take courage. Although of no benefit to the Republican party this year, it shows what may come "when rogues fall out." It indicates a breaking up of the Solid South.

In Florida I find local politics a little mixed. In Duval and Putnam Counties, most notably, the disgruntled Republicans have coalesced with Democrats upon independent tickets, the fruit of which will probably be the election of Bloxham, Democrat, for Govern