MR. BLAINE ON THE TARIFF.

HEARD BY THOUSANDS IN PITTSBURG.

HOW THE MULTITUDE GREETED HIM—PROTECTION—THE SOUTHERN LABOR QUESTION.

[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.]

PITTSBURG, Oct. 20.—The 20,000 people who assembled in Exposition Park this afternoon to hear Mr. Blaine, General Beaver and others speak were treated to two pleasing incidents, one of which was thoroughly unexpected. The first was the introduction of Mr. Blaine to the assemblage by Curlstopher L. Magee, the Western Pennsylvania representative of that wing of the Republican party which on several occasions has shown its unfriendliness to Mr. Blaine. Mr. Magee simply said:

I take pleasure in introducing the man who is first in the hearts of all Republicans.

All were impressed with Mr. Magee's earnestness and a scene of wild enthusiasm followed. The great crowd was so demonstrative that it was fully five minutes before Mr. Blaine could begin his speech. The unexpected incident was Mr. Blaine's flattering reference to General Master Workman, T. V. Powderly, of the Knights of Labor. Pittsburg is truly a working community, and any mention of the great labor leader's name was sure to provoke enthusiasm. Mr. Blaine described Mr. Powderly as a man of wonderful intellect, who in the capital of the late Confederacy had the hardihood to oppose an obnoxious color prejudice. He called for three cheers for Mr. Powderly, which were given with a will. He then spoke on the subjects of finance and the color line.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A crisis in the tariff system of the United States is rapidly approaching. For a long series of years, ever since the close of the war, we have had a vast debt to be paid. However large the National revenue, its surplus could always be profitably applied to the liquidation of our National obligations. We have discharged that debt so rapidly that there remains now but little more than $200,000,000 of it that can be paid within this century, and all of that falls due within four years from this date; its maturity, thus rapidly approaching, may be said to be even now impending, so that the matter is one that must be taken into consideration at once, because the remaining $700,000,000 or $800,000,000 go over to the twentieth century. When Secretary Sherman, the most accomplished and able Secretary of the Treasury since Alexander Hamilton—(cheers)—performed the marvelous feat of funding a large proportion of the public debt in United States four per cents, his success was acknowledged on both sides of the Atlantic, as unparalleled in financial administration. But, under the wise administration of the Federal Government by the Republican party, the credit of the Nation has increased so rapidly that the United States bonds which were at par but seven years ago now command nearly $130, and the holders will not relinquish them to the Treasury at less than that rate. It may therefore be assumed as a certainty that their payment is postponed until the next century, and they fall outside of the present exigencies as they fall outside of the present power of the Legislature of this Nation. (Applause.

When, therefore, you shall have diminished the total volume of the obligations of the country to the amount of the $200,000,000 now almost due, whatever you going to do with the surplus which will accumulate, unless you change the tariff? What disposition are you going to make of the large amount which each year you have been accustomed to apply to the payment of the National debt? The free-trader replies, "Get rid of your surplus by striking down this protective tariff, and the duty on manufactures will reduce the number of other articles on the free list and reduce your revenues in that way." The protectionist answers, "Let us so reduce your revenue, that, with a wise discrimination, the American laborer, in his daily earnings, may be protected by the National law and keep that in his own pocket." (Cheers.) This is the question that impends for your decision, and after patient consideration of the probable consequences to result from that decision, I venture the assertion that there has not been, since the National election of 1860, a financial crisis so urgent and pressing as that which will be upon the American people within the next two years.

THE MAGNITUDE OF THE PROBLEM.

Dean Swift told the ministers of Queen Anne that they could double the duty and halve the revenue, or they could halve the duty and double the revenue. We may, therefore, increase the revenue while decreasing the duties or we may decrease the revenue while increasing the duties. The main question therefore is whether you will exclude from the tariff the protective idea, or whether you will reduce the rates upon articles from the duties on which you gain no protection, and thus so wisely discriminate that, with a new tariff adapted to $100,000,000 less revenue you will still gain all the protection needed. I say to you, gentlemen, that at only two periods in our history, namely the beginning of the Federal government and the outbreak of the Civil War, has the financial ability of the American statesmen been confronted by a problem of the magnitude of the one to which I have invited your attention. Never, therefore, was there a time when men who believe in protection to American industries were more imperatively called upon to gird up their loins for a great battle on that question. It is impending within two years and will be settled favorably or adversely in that time. I cannot now go into details on the tariff as to the manner in which it should be regulated, but I can say this, that unless it is so adjusted as to continue the doctrine of protection, you gentlemen will see hard times in this country. And that is what I came here to say. For advancing these same views since leaving home and in the city of Philadelphia, I have been complimented by the notice of *The London Times*, which tells me, from across the water, that the views which I hold have been negatived by the people of the United States, and that we are travelling toward free-trade and away from protection, from the dark days of our own policy toward the enlightened policy of Manchester. (Hearty cheers.) In the same paper in which I read the cablegram I have just quoted, in the same column and immediately following among this morning's dispatches, comes another from London which says that the poor have risen in a riot against the Lord Mayor having a splendid dinner while the workmen of London are starving in their hovels. (Hear, hear and applause.) I give you those two telegrams together as forming a better argument than any I could make on the question, and I send back a greeting to *The London Times* that I stand, this moment, before contrasted thousands of your American workingmen who have good wages and happy homes, with prosperity behind and before them. (Tremendous cheering.)

A DELUSION OF FREE TRADE.

We are constantly encountering in this discussion the argument of the free-trader that we should increase our foreign trade; that the United States is deteriorating because we do not enlarge the area or increase the volume of foreign trade. To begin with, my friends, there is a great deal of delusion about our foreign trade. I live down on the extreme borders of the United States, in the State of Maine, although I am now near the very spot on which I was born. (Cheers.) If a merchant living on the border of Maine sends a cargo of goods across the New-Brunswick line five miles and sells it, that is foreign trade. If he should ship it around Cape Horn, away up to Washington Territory on Puget Sound, eighteen thousand miles away from home, that is domestic trade. (Laughter.) England's foreign trade is made up largely of her trade to the colonies which she herself governs, and I believe—though, as I do not absolutely know the facts, I refrain from making the statement as absolute—that what she sells to the channel islands of Guernsey and Jersey, between her coast and that of France and under her flag is classed as foreign trade by way of making a showing of prosperous business. But we have something else to look at. The free-traders beyond the water continually talk about our increasing our foreign trade. What they want is to get a share of our domestic trade. The foreign trade of this country last year, all that went out and all that came in, exports and imports, amounted to only 2[illegible] tons of merchandise, representing about $1,400,000,000 in value. The local freight carried on the railroad between Philadelphia and Pittsburg—not counting a ton of that which came from beyond the boundaries of the State, but the actual traffic within State limits handled on that great artery of trade by your State was 2,500,000 tons. (Cheers.) so that, even on a single line of railway within the limits of one State, the aggregate of merchandise taken up and delivered was practically equal in tonnage to the whole of our foreign trade, export and import. I have never yet been able to ascertain with positive accuracy what the enormous domestic trade of the United States amounts to. Some good statisticians have estimated it as being last year from $25,000,000,000 to $30,000,000,000. This total would represent all the exchanges which took place within our thirty-eight States and nine Territories. On the other hand, our total foreign trade of last year, exports and imports, is estimated at $1,400,000,000. I repeat that it is that domestic trade of ours which all the Nations of Europe want to get a share of. I can gracefully say to your Free-traders: "You need not bother yourselves in expending so much perspiration and natural gas in making steel and iron; we will send it over to you; and we will undersell you a little if you will give us a chance (laughter), and if you will just let us make that exchange we will transfer our steel to you, and probably we will transfer a good deal of our misery with it." (Applause.) Far be it from me to exult over the misfortunes or the reverses of human beings. I wish that the colonies of England were prosperous. I wish there was not a man in England in want of bread, but there are many there in rags and hungry, and I do not know of any obligation upon me, if I have a voice in legislation, to try to help them by putting the laboring people of this country in their condition. (Great enthusiasm.)

LABOR AND WAGES IN THE SOUTH.

There is another question upon which I wish to speak to you. It is one which, in my judgment, in this conflict, there has been too much disposition to avoid; one astonishing strong arguments have been met by the cry of "The Bloody Shirt." Several weeks ago I called the attention of the laboring men of Maine, whom I was addressing, to the fact that formidable competitors were rising up against them in the South, where there are 1,800,000 able-bodied laborers with dark skins. These latter were originally employed almost exclusively in raising cotton, tobacco, sugar and rice or in a wholly agricultural employment. They are now, and have been for ten years, entering into many of the mechanical industries. In Birmingham, Ala., in Chattanooga, Tenn., and in various parts of Virginia, they are making pig iron, and they are doing it at wages of from 60 to 70 cents a day. The product of their labor has thus far been so small that the important fact I am now stating has attracted comparatively no attention. But if the quantity which they manufacture attains large proportions, it will necessarily compete in the markets of the country with the iron made in Pennsylvania and Ohio, and they themselves will compete with men here who are paid $1 50 a day. What response is to be made to that by our workingmen who receive the better wages? The answer will be that this, that either that great body of workmen in the South must have justice done them and be fairly compensated for what they earn in the sweat of their faces, or else the wages of every Northern laboring man must be injuriously affected. This statement, when made by me, was met with rebuke in Harrison, but when that great organization of the Knights of Labor met in Richmond, Va., the other day under their chief, Mr. Powderly—whom I take to be a man of extraordinary ability and perception (Prolonged cheers)—the first thing they ran against was the absolute unwillingness on the part of the dominant white race of the South to allow the colored laborers of that region to have any benefit from Knights of Labor organizations or from any other organizations that could protect them in their right to be paid the wages which they earned. By a strange coincidence I received this very morning a letter from the South on that subject. My correspondent gives me an appalling picture of the South, and in one portion of his letter said: "But after all, we are ahead of you in the North in respect to labor, for in a great many parts of the South we have established the eight-hour rule for the colored men—eight hours in the forenoon and eight hours in the afternoon." (Universal and continued merriment.)

Now, gentlemen, I do not hold you to the slightest belief on my part that the Republicans have any prospect of carrying a Southern State. The white men have the political power of that country in their grip. At first they said that they would not let a negro come to Congress as soon as they got the power to stop him. Well, the negroes stepped aside. Then they said they would not let a carpet-bagger come to Congress. Well, the carpet-bagger stopped. (Laughter.) Now they say they will not let any native white man come to the front if the colored men vote for him. (Laughter.) That closes up the avenues pretty tightly. That would speedily settle the question. They have eighty-five representatives in Congress from the seven States that were in rebellion. With the exception of, I believe, one in Virginia from a white constituency, and one in Tennessee, they take in the whole of them, although in several of those States, three at least, the colored race are in a majority.

NEGRO SUFFRAGE NOT FORCED ON THE SOUTH.

Let me correct another thing, even if I be repeating what I have said elsewhere. I refer to it because I regard it as of prime importance to correct a popular misconception on the part of a vast number of young men whom I have had the pleasure of meeting in Pennsylvania. I am not imputing ignorance to them, but merely mean that they have been born and have grown up since the events to which I am going to allude took place. You often hear from Democrats in Allegheny County, perhaps as elsewhere, that the Republicans were served just right because they put negro suffrage on the South and that it has returned to plague them. Well, I deny it. I deny—and I want to make that denial as intelligible and as forcible as I can—I deny that the Republican party in its system of reconstruction started out with the idea of forcing the South to take negro suffrage. I had a small part in that legislation. What we did was this—we said to the South:

"There is the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution. That amendment is of inestimable advantage. That amendment makes citizenship of the United States national. It conserves and preserves the National credit. It conserves and reserves the pension of the soldier. It prevents the men whose hands have been made bloody on fields of battle against Union men from taking part in the Government until Congress by a two-thirds majority shall release them from that disability. Agree to this amendment and come in; but you will find in that amendment this provision—I am giving you the popular meaning, not taking the exact language of the law: "If you exclude the negro from voting, he must be excluded from the basis of representation; but if you will give him the right to vote, he shall at once put in the basis of representation." That was a perfectly fair and square proposition. A representative is based upon a constituency; and if they did not allow the colored men to be included within the constituency, then those men ought not to be reckoned within the basis of representation to increase the number of representatives among their enemies. But if they do not will do the one, we will do the other. You enfranchise the colored man and we will increase your representation."

Tennessee alone of all the Southern States accepted that condition and came in at once, and the other ten rejected it in their Legislatures successfully, promptly, absolutely, by overwhelming majorities not one-tenth of the votes in any Legislature being in favor of it. What was the United States to do? I go over this because I have seen in one metropolitan journal what purported to be a correction of a statement which I had made, as though I had made a mistake and had omitted an essential part. When those States rejected the Fourteenth Amendment, what was the Government of the United States to do? That form of reconstruction had failed. It was dead. Was the United States Congress to sit down with their fingers in their mouths and say:

"Gentlemen, our soldiers, our gallant commanders" (like your candidate for Governor in Pennsylvania (cheers)—have whipped yours off the field of battle. We stood up to the fight until the last rebel soldier had surrendered, and now is the Congress of the United States to acknowledge itself absolutely unable to reconstruct those States on the basis of loyalty? If you will not come in on the basis of the Fourteenth Amendment, which gives you your time and your judgment to determine when the negro shall come to the suffrage, and shall increase your representation when you do bring him to the suffrage; if you reject that, shall we let you in, as you demand to be let in without condition, without qualifications, to come in as our masters? No."

Under the lead of that great commoner of Pennsylvania, Thaddeus Stevens, (cheers)—honor to his memory peace to his ashes—we said: "If you will not reconstruct those States we will empower the enfranchised men to join with the few loyal white men, and we will have reconstruction by the vote of the colored votes if the white men do not enforce it." (Applause.)

Then we passed the Fifteenth Amendment, which gave suffrage to every man in the United States who was duly naturalized, or was born on our soil. I want now to make this qualification. I do not stand here to justify the plan of reconstruction thereby by the Fourteenth Amendment, leaving to the South the right to determine when the negro should come to suffrage. I think that in the Providence of God, through the stiff-necked and rebellious conduct of the Southern men, who would not accept reconstruction on those terms dictated, we were driven to a better judgment and that partly through their obstinate and unreasonable spirit and through the inspiration of God's justice, by which the Republican party was influenced, we were driven to enfranchise the colored man and do justice to him. (Cheers.) But I want clearly to keep your minds on the fact that we did not force negro suffrage on the South until they themselves had made it the indispensable measure of reconstruction. We have lived to see negro suffrage in the South absolutely destroyed. Where he is in a majority of five to one no negro can elect a sheriff or a constable. In the majority of twenty-eight Representatives in Congress and the same number of Presidential electors of the United States, takes them by force, by fraud, by violence, and counts them in the Democratic column. (Cries of "That's so," and applause.)

There is a story which illustrates the point of a story very pertinent to the case. I heard it, not long ago in New-York. A Southerner said to a Northern man: "Let us play a game of billiards for the next Presidential election, two years hence—101 points." Just the number of electors that the Democrats claimed they went down to New-Orleans to settle the election two years in advance. The Southerner took up a cue—"I go on the assumption that you all know the game—and said, "Well, I will count off 13 points in this game; those are mine without playing for them." (Great merriment.) He added "You will see there that I have to get only six, while you have to get 101." (Renewed laughter and applause.) I confess, gentlemen, that I am utterly at a loss to denounce the fraud and the wrong which is so well illustrated by that story. The Southern elections are worse on the point of political moral than is the gambler who imposes the loaded dice upon and plays against him with loaded dice. (Cheers.) It is not Republicanism, it is not Democracy, it is not Heaven's justice, it is not man's fair play. What we demand in this country is that we shall not play a stake for the Presidency against men who are cooking up the loaded dice at us. (Cheers.) You say we cannot do anything. We ought to be able to do something. We ought to be able to make as solid a North as they have made a solid South. (Immense enthusiasm.) And in order to make that solid North, let old Pennsylvania do her duty. (Cheers.) Yes she will. It is not sufficient that you send back to us twenty representatives out of twenty-eight you now have. Increase your number. Nor is it sufficient that you merely elect them. It is not enough that you place the distinguished gentleman near me in your Gubernatorial chair. Place him there with such a mighty vote as will give emphasis as a point to the expression of Pennsylvania's wish. Give him such a vote that we shall not have to wait until the second day for the election returns to find how the State has gone. Put him in there by such a vote that all know by a flash of the wire before 9 o'clock on the evening of election that James A. Beaver is Governor of Pennsylvania. (Tremendous cheers.)

To-day's street demonstration was a creditable affair for an "off year," and the fact that active preparations for it had begun only two days ago. Mr. Blaine, General Beaver, ex-Chairman Jones, of the Republican National Committee and C. L. Magee occupied an open carriage drawn by four gray horses, which was preceded, flanked and followed by the Young Men's Tariff Club. In addition a guard of seven police lieutenants surrounded the carriage. The entire route was lined by the resident population to which was added at least 75,000 strangers, for whose transportation to the city it is estimated that one hundred trains, averaging ten cars each, were required. As may be imagined, the cheering was continuous and Mr. Blaine found it necessary to doff his hat, or wave his handkerchief every few minutes. The Carnegie Guards, of Braddock, who marched in the parade, had their colors draped in memory of their employer, Thomas M. Carnegie, who is dead at Cresson. He had been appointed a member of the Manufacturers and Business Men's Committee to receive Mr. Blaine.

From a postoffice window Mr. Blaine's two sons, James G., jr., and Emmons, viewed the parade. Beside them sat young Jim's Democratic brother-in-law, Colonel Richard Nevins, jr., the Government architect at this point, and his wife. Emmons Blaine arrived from Chicago this morning. James and his wife have been the guests of Colonel Nevins. J. Ewing, of Washington, Penn., who recently celebrated his ninetieth birthday, came to this city this morning to see his distinguished nephew. Mr. Blaine was at breakfast when his uncle arrived, and the latter waited at the dining-room door. When Mr. Blaine emerged there was a mutual recognition and Mr. Blaine fairly lifted his uncle off his feet. An aged colored man who stood near by seemed immensely pleased when Mr. Blaine advanced to him and extending his hand said:

"You are Henry Bolden. I have not seen you since I attended college, but I remember you well."

Bolden is a servant in the Ewing household. A general reception in the hotel corridor followed at which a colored man, who was accompanied by his wife and child, walked up to Mr. Blaine and said:

"Mr. Blaine, I want to shake hands with you and so does my wife and won't you please shake hands with our little Jimmie. He's named after you, and here's his picture which I want to present to you."

The photograph was accepted, and the little family departed happy. A well-known gentleman then stepped up and said: "I am happy to shake hands with our next President."

"You make a mistake," smilingly responded Mr. Blaine.

"I am sure," insisted the gentleman, "that our next President now stands before me."

A pleasing incident followed the reception. Mr. Blaine's carriage had been driven to the front entrance of the Monongahela House and he had taken his seat. General Beaver was slightly delayed, and when he made his appearance, leaning on his crutch, Mr. Blaine leaped from the carriage to the sidewalk and assisted the General to a seat. The action was loudly applauded. General Beaver lost a leg in the war.

To-night Mr. Blaine was the guest of Chairman Jones, at whose house in Allegheny City a private reception was held.

THE ELECTION OF MR. EDMUNDS.

HE ACCEPTS IN A BRIEF SPEECH BEFORE THE LEGISLATURE.

[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.]

MONTPELIER, Vt., Oct. 20.—The vote for United States Senator was declared before a joint assembly of both Houses of the Legislature at noon to-day. The vote was: Whole number cast, 264; necessary for a choice, 133. George F. Edmunds had 229, W. H. Bingham 29 and W. G. Veazy 8. Mr. Edmunds was declared elected for six years from March 4, 1887. Mr. Edmunds was present, and after appropriately expressing his gratitude spoke as follows:

"I know from experience how impossible it is for any man to live up to his own ideal of what he should be and do either as a citizen or as a representative of citizens in any character of trust; and so, I feel more deeply the kindness of the people of my native State and yours, as their representatives, in overlooking the many faults that in the many years of my service I must have committed, and again choosing me with an expression of confidence so nearly unanimous. But I think it right to say, as a citizen of this old state of ours, that what the people have done and what you have done is far more than any personal honor to your confidence in me. It is, I think, and as I understand it the old Green Mountain courage, and honesty and purity of the people who in spite of combinations and calumnies understood their own business in their own way, and chose to do it; (applause) and so in this sense I cannot take these honors to myself. They are the honors that belong to a self-respecting, self-understanding and intelligent people. They are the honors that belong to states, without regard to size of territory or accumulations of wealth, as still equals in the great sisterhood that makes our Nation, and that, constituted as our State is, of a homogeneous people, of an intelligent people, of an upright and Christian people, are to be, so long as there is any hope for free government in the world, a guide and beacon for the future. I accept, too, with more than an ordinary sense of solicitude, the responsibility for the future. As you know, I must from experience have seen how heavy the work is how great the responsibilities, how difficult and sometimes sudden the emergencies are that call upon your representatives and the representatives of other States to take action in respect to affairs that affect the welfare of all. And I have seen, too, how rapidly, even in a body where the term of office is for six years, the representatives of States appear and disappear. In the time during which our State has honored me and my colleague who I am sorry not to see here, this moment, every senator except ourselves has been more than once chosen, and the faces that were few at first have disappeared from the scene of political action as the represen atives of their States, and now men continually come and continually go, while Mr. Merrill and myself seem, through your kind favor, to stand there something like the Camel's Hump and Mansfield and see the world go by."

MADAME MODJESKA'S SEASON.

Madame Modjeska is hard at work this week, rehearsing every day at the Union Square Theatre in preparation for the opening of her prolonged season there next Monday. She has selected "As You Like It" for her opening production, and "Les Choumes," for which great preparations have been made, will follow shortly. In the cast of "As You Like It" will be Maurice Barrymore, Charles Vandenhoff, Jan Robertson, William Haworth, Hamilton Bell, and Miss Clara Ellison.

MR. TILDEN'S WILL PROBATED.

THE SUPREME COURT TO CONSTRUE IT.

THE SUMMONS IN AN ACTION BY GEORGE H. TILDEN SERVED—NOT A FORMAL CONTEST.

As was foreshadowed in yesterday's TRIBUNE, the will of Samuel J. Tilden was admitted to probate by Surrogate Coffin, of Westchester County, at White Plains, yesterday morning without the faintest indication of objection on the part of any of the heirs. The proceedings passed off as quietly as though every one was perfectly satisfied with the distribution of the estate. None of the heirs or legatees was present, but Delos McCurdy and John Yard, of the law firm of Vanderpoel, Green & Cuming, were on hand to guard their interests. Mr. McCurdy was the legal adviser of Henry A. Tilden, father of Colonel Samuel J., George H., Susie, and Ruby Tilden and Mrs. Caroline B. Whittlesey; has acted as attorney for Samuel J Tilden in many important legal matters and is therefore thoroughly acquainted with the somewhat complicated financial affairs of the Tilden family. The executors were represented by James C. Carter, who drew the will, and Lewis Cass Ledyard. William A. Whittlesey, the husband of Mrs. Caroline B. Whittlesey, to whom Mr. Tilden left 100 shares of the stock of the Cleveland and Pittsburg Railroad and $50,000 in trust, and Charles F. MacLean, one of the relatives who was not mentioned in the will, were present avowedly as spectators.

When Edward H. Dixon, of Hastings-on-the-Hudson, and Dr. Charles E. Simmons and Leighton Williams, of this city, who witnessed the signing of the will, had acknowledged their signatures on the document, John Bigelow, Andrew H. Green and George W. Smith qualified as executors and trustees and letters testamentary were issued to them. They gave no bonds.

The proceedings were brief and when they were over the administrators received an idea of how disagreeable the duties imposed upon them were to be made by an intimation in the shape of a summons informing them George H. Tilden, one of the nephews, who was induced to become a partner in the debt-laden firm of Tilden & Co. upon the understanding that his uncle in his will would provide the means for wiping out the obligations assumed, would request the Supreme Court of New-York State to decide as to the validity of the clause of the will creating the Tilden Trust and delegating to the executors authority to designate the legatees. The summons will be followed by a complaint and the attorneys for the executors will have twenty days to file an answer, after which the case will be placed on the Supreme Court calendar for argument.

Although the suit is brought in the name of George H. Tilden, it is understood that all the natural heirs will support him and are just as much interested in the outcome as he is. The object in having but one complainant to represent all the interested persons is to avoid the too general application of the sweeping clause in the will depriving any heir who contests the validity of the document of his share. This is the last clause and reads:

Since I have made a disposition of my property according to my best judgment, and since as most of the devisees or legatees under it are females, it is impossible to foresee under what influences some one or more of them might possibly come; and since it is desirable to avert insanity or speculative litigation, I hereby declare it to be my will that in case any person who, if I died intestate, would be entitled to any share of my property or estate, shall under any pretence whatever institute, take, or share in any proceeding to oppose the probate of this my last will and testament, or to impeach or impair or to set aside or invalidate any of its provisions, or to contest the validity of the same, then the person or persons under this will is hereby revoked, and such person shall be excluded from any participation in and shall not have any portion of my property or estate, real or personal, and the portion to which such person might be entitled if I had died intestate, or might otherwise be entitled under the provisions of this instrument shall be devoted to charitable purposes as my said executors and trustees shall designate.

It will be claimed by the attorneys for the complainant that the mere act of requesting the Supreme Court to construe the will, and especially its thirty fifth clause, cannot be legally regarded as an effort to impeach, impair, set aside or invalidate any of its provisions. If, however the courts should decide otherwise it is said that the amount forfeited will be made up to the complainant by the other heirs interested. Even if this is not done, it is argued that he can well afford the loss since his wife is the heir-apparent to a considerable fortune, which will be at his disposal.

A gentleman whose sympathies are enlisted for the Tilden brothers, who is in their confidence and who, therefore, speaks knowingly, said yesterday:

I want to impress upon your mind that the act of requesting a court to decide as to the validity of a will is not a contest in the strictest sense of the word. A contest, as I understand it, is made when objection is made to the probate of a will on the ground of the incapacity of the testator, undue influence or kindred reasons. Such a case is tried in a probate court. If the probate has been granted and the heir may ask the Surrogate to revoke the probate if he thinks he can prove incapacity or undue influence. In the case of the Tilden will the Supreme Court is merely asked to construe the meaning of one or more clauses and decide as to the validity. The executors thereupon will simply ask such a request if they were in doubt as to any of the provisions.

In my mind there is no question that the courts will declare the clause invalid authorizing the executors to "obtain from the Legislature a charter for an institution to be called the Tilden Trust, with capacity to establish and maintain a free library and reading-room in the City of New-York, and to promote such scientific and educational objects" as they may more particularly designate. Then look at the alternative. In case such institution shall not be incorporated, or if for any cause or reason my said executors and trustees shall deem it inexpedient to convey said real, residue and remainder or any part thereof to the said institution, I authorize my said executors and trustees to apply the real, residue and remainder of my property, real and personal, or such portions thereof as they may not deem it expedient to apply to its use, to such charitable, educational and scientific purposes as in the judgment of my said executors and trustees will carry out the intent of the testator, residue and remainder of my property most widely and substantially beneficial to the interest of mankind." In other words, the executors receive the gift of an immense estate to distribute as they like and are not responsible to a living being for their actions, while, on the other hand, but one of the methods for carrying out the testator's wishes has been provided for in any way.

The Court of Appeals has decided several times within the past few years that a testator cannot legally delegate to any other person the power to dispose of his property by will. Each legatee must be specifically named and the executors must be directed in the will in what manner and for what purpose they may distribute the estate. Many of these decisions were made prior to the date that the will was written and signed. The attorneys in their argument in the case will collate a number of decisions bearing on this point.

Andrew H. Green, the only executor who returned to the City after the probate proceedings, refused to talk about the intended action of the heirs.

James C. Carter said that he understood that papers had been served giving notice of a suit to determine the validity of the residuary clause, but he would not discuss the points raised.

George H. Tilden was in the city until 6 o'clock last evening, when he started for Albany. He expressed himself as confident that the courts would decide in his favor. Colonel Samuel J. Tilden, Mr. W. A. Whittlesey and the Misses Susie and Ruby Tilden started for New-Lebanon at 3:40 p. m. Mrs. Whittlesey has been in New-Lebanon for the last three weeks consulting with her brothers and sisters and their attorneys regarding the proposed contest.

It is said on good authority that the creditors of Tilden & Co. were in favor of attempting to set aside the will on account of undue influence exercised over the testator by Andrew H. Green and others and that the exact manner in which the contest would be made was not agreed upon until Tuesday afternoon.

WEDDINGS.

Benjamin Franklin Cleveland, a cousin of President Cleveland, was married last evening, at the Waverly Congregational Church, on Jersey City Heights. The bride was Miss Emma Coe, a daughter of Isaac Coe, of Carlton-ave. The ceremony was performed in the presence of a large company of guests by the Rev. Dr. Sherwood, pastor of the church. The bridal party was preceded into the church by two guards, two ushers and seven groomsmen, all fellow officers of Mr. Cleveland in Zabriskie Post No. 35, G. A. R., of which he is chaplain. Full military dress was worn by each, and the bridegroom appeared in the uniform of a Brigadier-General of the Union Veteran Army of the United States. The maid of honor was Miss Jessie Summerville, and the bridesmaids were Miss Jennie Summerville, Miss Jennie Robertson, Miss Bella Robertson and Miss Henrietta Acorn. All wore short white dresses and carried bouquets of roses. The bride's costume was of white satin with long train. The tulle veil was held in place by a wreath of orange blossoms and lilies of the valley. Between two and three hundred guests attended the reception given afterward.

In St. Peter's Church, Morristown, N. J., Miss Annie Robbins was married yesterday to Washington Allston Flagg. There were eight bridesmaids, Miss Bessie Campbell, Miss Flagg, Miss Effie Haight, Miss Susie Day, Miss Hallie Hall, Miss Lizzie Miller, Miss Randolf and Miss Walker. The ushers were Ernest Flagg, Stuart Smith, Thomas Robins, Paul Revere Houston, A. Revere, T. Robbins, Frank and Arthur Scribner. The best man was Bond Emerson. The bride wore white satin trimmed with white tulle. The bridesmaids' dresses were of white cashmere trimmed with watered silk. They wore large picturesque white hats and carried bouquets of yellow chrysanthemums. Among those present were Mr. an Mrs. Irving Clark, Mr. and Mrs. George McCullough Miller, Miss Miller, Miss Emily Butler, Mr. and Mrs. Charles Haight, Mr. and Mrs. Henry Miller, Mr. and Mrs. Fairly Cox, Mrs. Stephen Whitney, Mr. and Mrs. Richard King, Reginald Fry, James Duane Irving, Stanford Newel, Mr. and Mrs. Theodore Roosevelt, Mr. and Mrs. Henry Day, Mr. and Mrs. John Inglis, Miss Kitty Winthrop, Philip L. Livingston and J. Masson Hoadley. There was a wedding breakfast at the house on the bride's parents.

At the country house of Benseliar W. Dayton, Miss Lizzie Van Derveer Dayton, sister of Mr. Dayton, was married yesterday afternoon to Henry Duncan Oliphant, son of General M. R. Oliphant, of Trenton. The Rev. Robert J. Kent, pastor of the Presbyterian Church, performed the ceremony. The bride wore a costume of white satin trimmed with old point and duchesse lace, cut square at the neck and with a court train. There were no bridesmaids. Colonel Thomas Chambers, of Trenton, was best man. The bridal procession entered the library headed by the ushers, Judge Alfred R. Dayton, Surgeon Boyd, U. S. N., Major A. Oliphant, James H. Dayton, Samuel Oliphant and Edward E. Dayton. Then came Colonel Chambers and the bridegroom followed by the bride on the arm of her eldest brother, Benseliar Dayton. Among those present were General D. Oliphant and Mrs. Oliphant, William de Leyster, formerly Minister to Holland, and Mrs. de Leyster, Henry S. Little, president New-Jersey Central railroad; Henry C. Kelsey, Attorney-General Stockton, General Robert Stockton, Bishop Scarborough, Judge R. W. Scudder, the Misses Scarborough, Judge Nixon and the Misses Nixon, Mr. and Mrs. Henry H. Longstreet, Mr. and Mrs. Charles G. Green, Mrs. Theodore Freilinghuysen, Howard Terhune and Stacy Conover.

BOSTON, Oct. 20 (Special).—The Arlington Street Church was filled to-day at the wedding of Miss Grace Fessenden and Sullivan A. Sargent. The ceremony was performed by the Rev. Brooke Herford. The bride was given away by her father. The ushers were William Sheafe, William L. Greene, George Sargent, Harcourt Emery, Henry Fessenden and Henry Deford. After the ceremony a reception was given at the home of the bride's parents, No. 17 Hereford-st.

Another wedding took place to-day at the Emmanuel Church on Newbury-st. This was the marriage of Miss Blanche Thompson, formerly a favorite member of the Boston Museum Company, to N. Sumner Myrick, a Boston lawyer. The ceremony was performed by the Rev. Leighton Parks. George A. Fraser appeared as best man and Miss Real stood by with the bride who was given away by Henry H. Real, of the firm of Real, Higgins & Henderson. The newly wedded couple are to live at No. 41 Mount Vernon-st.

A GOLDEN WEDDING.

Mr. and Mrs. Isaac Bawden celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of their marriage last evening at their home, No. 344 West Twenty-seventh-st. The large parlors in which the reception was held were tastefully decorated and well filled with the members of the family, including the Rev. H. H. Bawden, of Champaign, Ill. There were four sons with their wives and four daughters with their husbands, accompanied by eighteen grandchildren. In addition to these was the Rev. W. H. Pogson and wife, of this city, Mr. Bawden, although feeble in body, owing to an attack of paralysis which afflicted him some fifteen months ago, was able to enjoy the entertainment.

DISCUSSING CHRISTIAN UNITY.

PLANS PROPOSED BY EPISCOPALIANS.

A DECLARATION BY THE BISHOPS—CHANGES IN THE PRAYER BOOK.

[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.]

CHICAGO, Oct. 20.—The Committee on the State of the Church made a report this morning on the subject of Christian Unity, and offered the following resolution:

Resolved, The House of Bishops concurring, that a commission consisting of five bishops, five clerical and five lay deputies, be appointed to open communication with the various bodies of Christians in this land with a view of ascertaining if a disposition exist among them to promote organic unity upon the basis of "the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship and in the breaking of bread and the prayers," and further, in the event this disposition does not exist, to inquire what benefits they think we can mutually impart to one another, and what advantages in their opinion would result in furtherance of the evangelization of the world, and that this commission be requested to make a report of its action to the General Convention of 1889.

A minority report signed by five of the forty-nine members of the committee was also presented by the Rev. Dr. Hopkins, of Central Pennsylvania. It agrees in the general principles of the majority report, but considers it undesirable to ask the other bodies what they are willing to give up until the Church has told them what it is willing to give up, and what it cannot give up. The report specifies these points:

First—We must insist on the faith of the undivided Church. The thirty-nine articles have no more authority than the decrees of the Council of Trent. Second—The apostolical succession is essential, but as hypothetical baptism is allowed, so may hypothetical ordination be allowed. This would meet the case of those ministers of other churches, who could not co scientiously acknowledge that their ordination is invalid. As for baptism, that is valid in all bodies, if administered with water in the name of the Trinity. The Holy Eucharist is valid if administered with the words of the institution. All other matters are merely insignificant details.

Both reports were referred to the proper committee, and will come before the House later. The minority report is supposed to embody the views of the High Church party on the Christian Unity question and it is unexpectedly liberal. The Committee on Constitutional Amendments reported that the proposed Book of Offices is of doubtful constitutionality and the report was placed on the calendar. It was decided to hold the next General Convention in the City of New-York.

Mr. Benet, of South Carolina, spoke for the much-abused negro, who is getting tired of being discussed. He referred to the race instinct, and he rebuked against any sort of assault upon the relations between the two races, and criticised Bishop Dudley for saying that intermarriage between the two races is a future possibility. The Rev. Dr. Nelson, of Virginia, spoke against a separate episcopate, or a separate church organization for the colored people. He was in favor of a special commission to oversee such work.

After recess an important message was received from the House of Bishops on the subject of Christian unity. It was a declaration to Christians of all denominations on the subject of Christian unity. It says in part:

This Church does not seek to absorb other communions, but rather co-operating with them on the basis of a common faith and order, to discontinue schism, to heal the wounds of the body of Christ, and to promote the charity which is the chief of Christian graces, and the visible manifestation of Christ to the world. But furthermore, we do hereby affirm that this Christian unity now so earnest desired can be restored only by the return of all Christian communions to the principles of unity exemplified by the undivided Catholic Church during the first ages of its existence.

The report of the Liturgical Committee on Revision as reported from the House of Bishops came up. The house resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole with Judge Sheffey in the chair. A note as to the ecclesiastical full moon and new tables for Easter Day were adopted. It was voted to allow a permissive use of the latter portion of the Benedicite, except on the four Sundays in Advent. A little flurry arose over the insertion of the word "again" in the clause of the creed, "He rose from the dead," but it was finally inserted. The permission to shorten the evening prayer on week days was granted. From these examples it will be seen how inconsiderable are the proposed changes.

WHAT PEOPLE THINK AND SAY.

A CITIZEN OF THE UNITED STATES.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: I came to this country in November, 1880, (under eighteen years of age). In October, 1882, I went back to Germany on a visit and returned to this country in May, 1883, and was naturalized in February, 1886. Different persons (the German military authorities, for instance), consider the time spent in this country not sufficient to secure citizenship. Am I not a legal citizen of the United States? C. SCH.

New-York, Oct. 15, 1886.

[The treaty of 1868, which regulates questions of nationality between this country and Germany, provides that citizens of Germany "who have become naturalized citizens of the United States of America and have resided uninterruptedly within the United States" shall be considered as citizens of the United States by the German Government. A strict construction of the word "uninterruptedly" might interfere with the recognition of your American citizenship by the German authorities; but there is no doubt of your citizenship, under the circumstances mentioned, under the laws of this country.—*Ed.*]

LEGAL TENDER OF RAILWAY FARES.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: On Saturday evening I offered a $5 note for my fare at the Rector Street Elevated Station. The ticket-seller positively refused to accept it, saying that he wanted the change he had on hand, as the man he relie