Amusements.

ABBEY'S THEATRE—8:15—The Devil's Deputy.
ACADEMY OF MUSIC—8:15—Shenandoah.
AMERICAN THEATRE—8—In Old Kentucky.
ATLANTIC GARDEN, 50 to 54 Bowery—Evening—Concert and Vaudeville.
BIJOU THEATRE—8:15—Later On.
BROADWAY THEATRE—8—Dr. Syntax.
CASINO—8:15—The Little Trooper.
COLUMBUS THEATRE—8:15—On the Bowery.
DALY'S THEATRE—8—A Gaiety Girl.
EDEN MUSEE—11 to 11—World in Wax.
EMPIRE THEATRE—8:15—The Bauble Shop.
FIFTH AVENUE THEATRE—8:15—Humpty Dumpty Up to Date.
GARDEN THEATRE—8:15—Little Christopher Columbus.
HARLEM OPERA HOUSE—8:15—Rosedale.
HERALD SQUARE THEATRE—A Parisian Romance.
HOYT'S THEATRE—8:30—A Milk White Flag.
IRVING PLACE THEATRE—8:15—Mauerbluemchen.
KOSTER & BIAL'S—8—Vaudeville.
LYCEUM THEATRE—8:15—A Way to Win a Woman.
MADISON SQUARE GARDEN—2:30—8:30—Hagenbeck's Trained Animals.
PALMER'S THEATRE—8:15—Transgressor.
POLO GROUNDS—3:30—Football.
PROCTOR'S—10 a. m. to 10:30 p. m.—Vaudeville.
STANDARD THEATRE—8:30—The New Boy.
STAR THEATRE—8:15—The Merry Wives of Windsor.
14TH STREET THEATRE—8—The Irish Artist.

Index to Advertisements.

	Page.	Col.		Page.	Col.
Amusements	11	6	Hotels	8	4
Announcements	12	2	Instruction	8	1-3
Auc. Sale Real Estate	8	6	Lost and Found	8	3
Autumn Resorts	11	6	Marriages & Deaths	7	6
Board and Rooms	8	3	Miscellaneous	12	3-6
Business Notices	6	1	Miscellaneous	9	1
Dancing Academies	8	3	Ocean Steamers	11	5
Dividend Notices	11	4	Political Notice	7	6
Domes. Sits. Wanted	9	6-8	Real Estate	9	1
European Advts	5	6	Real Estate	8	5-6
Excursions	8	3	Railroads	10	5-6
Financial	11	3-4	School Agencies	8	3
Financial Elections	11	4	Special Notices	7	6
For Sale	9	1	Steamboats	10	6
Help Wanted	8	0-1	Summers	8	3
Help Wanted	9	2-3	Winter Resorts	11	5
Horses & Carriages	10	7	Work Wanted	9	4

Business Notices.

Roll Top Desks and Office Furniture.
Great Variety of Style and Price.
T. G. SELLEW
No. 111 Fulton-st., N. Y.

TRIBUNE TERMS TO MAIL SUBSCRIBERS.

	1 year.	6 mos.	3 mos.	1 mo.	Single copy.
Daily, 7 days a week	$10 00	$5 00	$2 50	$1 00	.....
Daily, without Sunday	8 00	4 00	2 00	90	3 cts.
Sunday Tribune	2 00	1 00	50	...	5 cts.
Weekly Tribune	1 00	...	...	...	3 cts.
Semi-Weekly Tribune	2 00	...	...	...	3 cts.
Tribune Monthly	2 00	...	...	...	25 cts.

Postage prepaid by The Tribune except as hereinafter stated.

CITY POSTAGE.—The law requires that a 1 cent postage stamp be affixed to every copy of the Daily, Sunday or Semi-Weekly Tribune mailed for local delivery in New-York City. This postage must be paid by subscriber. Readers are better served by buying their Tribune from a newsdealer.

FOREIGN POSTAGE.—To all foreign countries (except Canada and Mexico), 3 cents a copy on The Sunday Tribune; 2 cents a copy on Daily, Semi-Weekly and Weekly. This postage must be paid by subscriber.

REMITTANCES.—Remit by Postal Order, Express Order, Check, Draft, or Registered Letter. Cash or Postal Note, if sent in an unregistered letter, will be at the owner's risk.

OFFICES OF THE TRIBUNE.—Main office of The Tribune, 154 Nassau-st., New-York. Main uptown office, 1,242 Broadway. Address all correspondence simply "The Tribune," New-York.

European Branch, for advertisements only, 75, Fleet Street, E. C., London, England.

BRANCH OFFICES.

254 8th-ave., s. e. cor. 23d-st.
152 6th-ave., cor. 12th-st.
142 Columbus-ave., near West 66th-st.
106 West 42d-st., nea. 6th-ave.
20 West 14th-st., nea. 5th-ave.
257 West 42d-st., between 7th and 8th aves.
157 4th-ave., corner 14th-st.
1,823 3d-ave., between 35th and 36th sts.
1,838 3d-ave., between 76th and 77th sts.
1,026 3d-ave., near 61st-st.
150 East 47th-st., corner 3d-ave.

New-York Daily Tribune.

FOUNDED BY HORACE GREELEY.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1894.

TWELVE PAGES.

THE NEWS THIS MORNING.

Foreign.—The Japanese Parliament has been summoned to meet in extra session to discuss the war; two more British cruisers have been ordered to Chinese waters. ==== The Belgian Liberals have lost thirty-one seats in the Chamber of Deputies. ==== There were again conflicting stories as to the Czar's condition. ==== The Ameer of Afghanistan is critically ill.

Domestic.—Judge Jenkins dismissed the petition for the removal of Receiver Oakes, of the Northern Pacific Railway. ==== Senator Hill spoke at Kingston, N. Y. ==== There was a fall of snow in New-York and the New-England States. ==== Clarence Robinson confessed at Cleveland that he and his wife murdered Montgomery Gibbs, the Buffalo lawyer. ==== The Princeton football team defeated University of Virginia by a score of 12 to 0, at Baltimore.

City and Suburban.—The People's party candidate for Recorder withdrew and advocated the election of John W. Goff. ==== A woman at Elizabeth, N. J., while insane, burned herself and three children to death. ==== The Municipal Consolidation Inquiry Commission issued an address to the people favoring the "Greater New-York." ==== Winners at Morris Park: Jack of Spades, Lustre, Magian, Declare, Sir Walter and Lucania. ==== Prices for stocks weak and lower; gold shipments begun; foreign exchange strong.

The Weather.—Forecast for to-day: Warmer, clear and windy. Temperature yesterday: Lowest, 40 degrees; highest, 52; average, 43¾.

Mayor Schieren seems to have a just appreciation of the importance of what The Tribune has printed regarding the Memorial Arch in Brooklyn, and we welcome his assurance that he will do everything in his power to annul the evil and bring the perpetrators of it to justice. Only a small part of the truth respecting this job has yet been told. The rest has been carefully and skilfully covered up. It can be ascertained either by the examination of witnesses in court or before a legislative committee. Which of these processes will be adopted is as yet an open question. But there can be no question as to the importance of action that will uncover this evil, punish its authors and make the repetition of it impossible. If the work of the Brooklyn Ring in other directions is probed, there is little doubt that much other crooked work will be discovered.

Mr. Edward W. Chamberlain, the nominee of the People's party for the office of Recorder, has done a praiseworthy thing in declining to accept the nomination and urging the members of his party to vote for Mr. Goff. Mr. Chamberlain is extremely severe in his condemnation of Recorder Smyth, and says it would be a deplorable calamity for the city if he should be re-elected. He shows sound judgment and sagacity when he says that in the pending contest men should put aside personal interests and political prejudices and join hands in an honest effort for the common welfare. This sensible advice applies as well to the contest for the Mayoralty as to that for the Recordership. It is to be hoped that the People's party contains other men as clear-headed as Mr. Chamberlain. Such a party has, in truth, no excuse for being, so far as the local contest is concerned.

Delaware County, a Republican stronghold, is one of the counties which suffered violence in the Democratic gerrymander of the Congressional districts of the State. Its natural grouping is with the Hudson River counties, with which it had long been affiliated. But in carving out as many Democratic districts as possible the authors of the gerrymander determined to group Republican counties together wherever it could be done, without regard to local interests or excesses in population. So Delaware was lumped in with Chenango, Broome, Tioga and Tompkins. This Congressional district (the XXVIth) is, of course, overwhelmingly Republican, and Representative Ray, a lawyer of Norwich, is certain of re-election. The several counties too will give a good account of themselves in electing Assemblymen. Delaware County has the unfortunate distinction of having furnished Isaac H. Maynard to the State, and there was evidence in last year's election that he had some slight hold there in spite of his disgraceful record. Delaware ought to atone for this by rolling up a stunning majority against Hill.

The desperate case of Tammany Hall is shown by the attempts to bring about illegal registration, notwithstanding that last year a considerable number of Tammany workers were punished for frauds of this sort. Those engaged in this work now will discover sooner or later that a keen watch is being kept on them. If detected, as they surely will be, they will be handled without mercy. A census of the lodging-houses made by Superintendent Byrnes is one of the means taken to prevent the carrying out of iniquitous schemes, and Mr. Alfred R. Conkling, who has done remarkably good work in detecting election frauds heretofore, is now busy on the same lines. If the rascals persist in their attempts, they will be sure to get into trouble. False registration can be detected, and under the new Election Inspectors law Tammany cannot have its own way at the polls.

WHAT IT WOULD MEAN.

There are, no doubt, many voters in this city and State who, having been from force of habit, heredity or association accustomed to act with the Democratic party, find it difficult to bring themselves to take a different course this year, notwithstanding the demonstrated unfitness of that party for power and the obvious fact that a vote for the Democratic ticket this year is a vote to continue in this city the most corrupt and dishonest rule that ever cursed a community. And yet they try to consider themselves good citizens and honest men because they do not personally profit by the system of organized crime, but in private disapprove and deprecate it. We ask these men to consider for a moment the effect of their action in voting this year for the Democratic candidates for State and municipal offices and the Legislature. Let us leave out of the discussion the Congressional tickets and consider simply the local and State issues involved in this election. We say issues, but there is really and practically only one, and that is whether the Tammany control of this city, with all that it is known to imply, shall be continued and perpetuated.

In State and city matters no National issue, whether of tariff, currency or finance, is involved. It is simply and only a question of good government and honest administration; bluntly stated, a question of the rule of honest men or of thieves; of common decency or of disgraceful disorder. The exposures which have been made already by the Lexow Committee have defined it with such startling distinctness that no man can plead ignorance, no man can upon any decent pretext evade it. Every citizen who deposits a ballot does it with his eyes wide open; every one who neglects to vote is guilty of cowardice of which he should be ashamed, or of indifference which ought to disqualify him for future exercise of the franchise. Does this statement seem harsh? We believe it will receive the indorsement of ninety-nine out of every hundred citizens who pretend to care for the government under which they live or who take any interest in the welfare of the community of which they are a part. Whoever votes for David B. Hill for Governor votes not merely to reward with high office the originator and abettor of a most outrageous crime against a free people, but to put a veto upon all legislation in behalf of municipal reform in this rogue-ridden city. Whoever votes for a Democratic Assemblyman votes against the passage of any law that shall interfere with the purposes of the men under whose control this city has become a stench in the nostrils of the country. Whoever votes for the Tammany candidate for Mayor votes to continue the domination here in all departments of the robber gang who have for years plundered the taxpayer, protected crime, consorted with criminals of every grade and terrorized all good citizens.

That is the exact size of it. That is what the election of a Democratic Governor, a Democratic Assembly or a Democratic Mayor would mean. No more nor less. The defeat of all these need not disturb any Democrat who believes, or thinks he believes, in any principle which the party has ever enunciated or any policy which the party ever openly approved. For, however much the party may have profited by the policy of violence, fraud and corruption pursued by Tammany Hall, it never dared openly avow its sympathy with or approval of it. No Democrat sacrifices principle or departs from his party allegiance by voting this year against the candidates for Governor, Assemblymen and Mayor who stand for the continuance of Tammany rule and for nothing else. Indeed, there are thousands of honest Democrats all over the State who, realizing the situation and the freedom of action it affords, will joyfully embrace the opportunity to purify their own party and administer a crushing rebuke to the scoundrels who have so long used the party name to aggrandize themselves in the establishment of a stupendous system of organized robbery. The election of a Republican Governor, Assembly and Mayor means the initiation of radical and sweeping Reform in all municipal departments. It means a revolution of the police system, the expulsion of the tax-eater, the blackmailer, the thief and the thug from positions where they can terrorize peaceable citizens, protect criminals and encourage crime. It means a thorough cleansing of the police courts, and the removal of the ignorant shysters and jumbler-rinsers who have disgraced the bench and polluted the fountains of law and justice. It means, in short, the cleaning of the Augean Stables, the filth of which has been upturned during the last few months and now lies reeking in the sunlight.

What would Republican defeat and Democratic success mean? Why, only this, that there are enough voters in the city and State who are careless and indifferent about it to turn the scale in favor of the scoundrels whose livelihood depends upon the perpetuation of the existing conditions. And then, when the latter, after all the exposures of their crimes, receive the popular indorsement, and with vicious leer inquire, "What are you going to do about it?" what kind of a town will this be to live in? Think of it, voters.

ABOUT CHANGING THE TARIFF.

Pretty soon we shall hear from Democrats that ex-Speaker Reed is in favor of keeping the present tariff unchanged. The same Democrats, on no better ground, reckoned him in favor of free coinage of silver. It would be well for them to go slow. A man who has brains does not utter all he thinks or knows in one speech.

It is Mr. Reed's idea that the present tariff cannot be repealed by Republicans until the country gets rid of the President who refused to sign it. That may be a mistake. One certain thing is that Mr. Reed himself and Republicans in Congress will try it whenever they get a chance. If they can get a straight vote only two months hence on the question whether the absurdities and robberies, the blunders and infamies of the present tariff shall be continued any longer, and whether the woollen duties and the income tax shall take effect next January, they will have Democrats for the motion who did not dare to vote against the tariff last August. There are States to be heard from on the subject which will speak quite distinctly. Louisiana will probably be heard, and likewise New-York, New-Jersey and Massachusetts. The Democrats may rest assured that Mr. Reed will not be at all slow to pitch the Democratic tariff into the waste-basket if he gets a chance, and the voters will show whether they mean he shall have a chance.

As for Mr. Cleveland, it will rest with him to say once more whether he thinks the bill of "perfidy and dishonor" ought to be the law of the land. He was weak enough in August to surrender his own convictions of right to the demands of those who urged that the bill was absolutely necessary to Democratic success. If he finds that the bill has proved a gallows for his party he will be free to decide that it shall come down. Possibly he will not have sufficient sense. But if other Northern States vote as Maine has voted, Democrats who have any sense whatever will perceive that their own chance of future success is to get rid of this tariff before the next Presidential election. The belief of Mr. Reed that the Democrats and Mr. Cleveland will continue to do the most foolish thing they can has a great deal to justify it. The leaders of that party and its conventions are all threatening further legislation of the same sort; more reduction and removal of duties; more destruction of American industries for the benefit of foreigners. The argument of Mr. Reed is that Republican victories will have a strong tendency to stop further agitation in that direction.

He reasons that the Democrats, however foolish they may be, will not dare in the face of public condemnation to renew tariff agitation for Free-Trade ends, and it is to be hoped that he is right. But a little bill of two lines repealing the tariff act of August, 1894, and restoring the law then in force, would not cost one day's delay, if the men who were opposed to it when it passed should get pluck enough to vote according to their convictions. It could never have passed the House if Democrats opposed to it had dared to call their souls their own. The House passed it without correcting a single one of its blunders, because it was certain that, if returned to the Senate at all, it would not then pass that body. The repeal of it would offer to industries and business such incalculable blessings that the mere proposal would encourage trade everywhere, except in foreign countries. It is safe for our Democratic friends to reckon that Mr. Reed will not be found in the future, any more than he has been in the past, legislating for the benefit of Germany and Great Britain against the United States.

TO-MORROWS DUTY.

To-morrow will be the second day of registration in New-York and Brooklyn. We give warning of it a day in advance, in order that our voting readers may make arrangements to-day which will enable them to devote time on Wednesday to this great political duty. While there are two subsequent days when names can be registered, procrastination is to be avoided in so important a matter. We urge every good citizen, whose name is not already on the roll, to ascertain to-day where his place of registry is, and to attend to the matter on the following day. If business arrangements are necessary on the part of clerks and others employed with regular hours of work, let them be made to-day.

Every citizen in these two great towns has a duty of more than ordinary importance to perform this year. He has not only a vote to cast against blundering and unprincipled tariff legislation at Washington, and another one against Hillism and Maynardism in this State, but also good-government ballots in municipal affairs and for constitutional revision. The Lexow investigation has disclosed the most scandalous and abhorrent system of police blackmail and municipal prostitution which has ever existed anywhere on earth. It is the duty of every honest man to vote against the horrors and wickedness of Tammany rule in this town. It is also the privilege of every friend of reformed government to rescue from defeat the new Constitution, which is imperilled by the opposition of gamblers.

Every good citizen must vote this year. Neglect to register is little short of a crime. Prepare to-day to register to-morrow.

NATURAL ALLIES.

Senator Hill's partisans are overhauling the newspaper files of 1892 and publishing extracts from his speeches in advocacy of the election of President Cleveland. "Turn about is fair play," they are muttering under their breath. "The Senator sprang to the rescue of his rival. "Now let the President be magnanimous in his "turn. Let him break silence and show him-"self to be a Democrat." It might be added, with much force, that the President could properly say something handsome about Senator Hill, since they have occupied common ground in opposition to the Gorman tariff. The Senator voted against it, and the President deliberately refused to sign it. They are each on record against it as an un-Democratic, treasonable measure, embodying outrageous discriminations and violations of principles.

President Cleveland has condemned the Gorman bill as a measure containing provisions "not in line with honest tariff reform," and "inconsistencies and crudities which ought not "to appear in tariff laws or in laws of any "kind." He has taken his place "with the rank "and file of the Democratic party, who believe "in tariff reform and well know what it is, who "refuse to accept the results embodied in this "bill as the close of the war, who are not "blinded to the fact that the livery of Democratic tariff reform has been stolen and worn "in the service of Republican Protection, and "who have marked the places where the deadly "blight of treason has blasted the counsels of the "brave in their hour of might." He has repudiated the work of his party during the last year as "perfidy and dishonor."

Senator Hill in like manner has declared: "The Tariff bill as it passed the Senate has "been discredited by the Democracy of the country. Senators must be blind to the signs of "the times, if they cannot see that it does not "have the approval of the Democratic masses." He has described his party as substituting "new-fangled Populistic principles for the good old principles of true Democracy," as heading a Solid South raid upon the industries and resources of the Empire State, and as adopting "every ism of the hour." "If political success "of my party," he has said, "is only to be purchased by such methods and such sacrifices, I "prefer defeat and the preservation of my self-"respect."

President Cleveland and Senator Hill stand together on the same ground in opposition to and in condemnation of the recent policies of the Democratic party. With entire consistency the President can take his stand with Senator Hill. Having attacked the Gorman tariff and refused to accept responsibility for the bill by signing it, he can line up with good grace behind the Senator who voted against it. They can stand side by side on the skirmish line of the next Presidential election.

With the Gorman tariff as the central issue of the November elections Senator Hill, by the force of his example and by his own uncompromising hostility to the measure, virtually says to every Democrat: "Vote against it as "I did, as a Populist measure aimed directly "against the State of New-York." The President, standing by the Senator's side, cannot defend the measure which he has himself denounced more bitterly than any Republican leader has done. He cannot ask his party to do what he declined to do himself, namely, to express approval of the Gorman tariff by their votes. He can only advise Democrats to stay away from the polls altogether, if like himself they lack the courage required for vetoing the bill outright at the ballot-box in November.

Republicans certainly will welcome the President's intervention in the State canvass, and especially as a letter-writer. He has supplied them in the Wilson and Catchings letters with their most effective weapons against the Democracy, and doubtless will be equally useful if he now joins his natural ally, Senator Hill, on the skirmish line of 1896.

COLONEL FELLOWS TO THE RESCUE.

It is evident that a systematic fight is to be made against the work of the Constitutional Convention by the Democrats. The reforms provided for in the proposed amendments and the safeguards against the misuse of legislative power threaten to deprive the State machine of some of its dearest privileges. Therefore frantic efforts are being made to stir up the opposition of various interests by misrepresenting the character of some of the amendments, and all kinds of silly arguments are being put in circulation.

Immediately after the convention adjourned the Democrats tried to rally the pool-sellers and gamblers against the amendment prohibiting all kinds of gambling. But this was not a great success. A few bookmakers went into the fight, but the great body of the citizens did not seem to feel that their liberties would be greatly endangered by the stopping of a demoralizing traffic. The better class of horse-breeders were apathetic and inclined to believe that they might have something to live for, even if pool-selling did cease. Then it became necessary to take some other course. So the supporters of the gamblers have enlisted Colonel John R. Fellows in their cause. How earnest and austere an upholder of the laws against gambling Colonel Fellows is, how unbending is his conviction that it is his duty to make this a Puritanic town, everybody familiar with his record as District-Attorney is well aware. With activity even greater than that usually displayed by him in dealing with crimes committed, he rushes forward to stop the lawbreaking which he fears may be. The amendment would, says Colonel Fellows, "result in practically de-"stroying the business of the large exchanges "in the city of New-York." He declares that dealing in margins for speculative purposes would be gambling in the meaning of the Constitution, and gives this solemn notice: "I "should feel it my duty as District-Attorney to "present all such cases to the Grand Jury."

It was hardly to be expected that with the destruction of their business staring them in the face the brokers would rest quietly. Every stock, produce, cotton, coffee, metal or other broker, and all whose business was in any way connected with the exchanges, ought certainly to have risen in arms to defend their interests. But, strangely enough, they remain tranquil. The officers of the exchanges laugh at Colonel Fellows and his views of duty. In the first place, the courts have declared that their business is not gambling, and the amendment will not affect it. Even if it were gambling, it would stand before the law in just the same position that it does to-day. Gambling, except under certain restrictions on racetracks under the Ives Pool law, is now prohibited. If Colonel Fellows thinks trading on margins is gambling, it is manifestly his duty to proceed at once to stop the business of the Stock Exchange. He will have no more reason for doing it if the proposed Constitution is adopted. In his anxiety about his future duties he appears to have forgotten some of his present ones. On calling them again to mind he will, of course, make up for the neglect.

EPISCOPAL BROAD CHURCHMEN.

During the last few weeks an acrimonious controversy has been going on in "The Churchman" over a charge recently made by an Episcopal clergyman that the Philadelphia Episcopal Divinity School is unsound in its teachings about the Bible. It appears that some of the professors of the institution have discussed in their classes the authorship of certain books of the Bible, which tradition considered settled, and have generally shown more or less sympathy with the conservative conclusions of modern Biblical critics. In the universities of Oxford, Cambridge and Edinburgh such a circumstance, if true, would excite no comment whatever. Professors Driver and Sanday, for instance, are not in the slightest danger of ecclesiastical or academic discipline, though some of their conclusions concerning the Bible are radically opposed to the traditional views held generally by Protestants. Even the Rev. Mr. Gore, of Oxford, thoroughgoing High Churchman though he is, has avowed his sympathy with some aspects of modern Biblical criticism. But it is very different in this country, where the so-called higher criticism of the Bible has made much less progress than it has in England. In the Episcopal Church especially, the newer methods of studying the Bible introduced by modern critics have found little recognition. And until this controversy over the Philadelphia Divinity School was started, it was not known that any conclusions of the higher criticism were taught in its institutions of learning.

It is not likely, however, that the accused professors will be put on trial for their alleged false teaching; for the charges made against them are exceedingly vague. The incident, however, is worthy of note, because it appears to have grown out of the issue raised by Bishop Seymour, a little more than a year ago, when he accused certain men in the Episcopal Church of trickery, evasion and deceit in remaining in the Church while denying its doctrines. Bishop Seymour has come to be the acknowledged leader of the extreme High Churchmen, and his arraignment, which was directed against the Broad Church party, has been constantly reiterated by those who sympathize with his views. This last week, for instance, a correspondent of "The Living Church" has declared that many of the prominent clergy of the Episcopal Church are accused of "evasion, trickery, deliberate dishonesty and betrayal of trusts"; and he calls upon them to answer the accusation. In last week's "Churchman," also, Bishop George D. Gillespie, of Michigan, spoke of a party in the Church—meaning, of course, the Broad Church party—that "unblushingly holds "and openly teaches what only dishonesty or "untruthfulness can attach to the creeds. Some "of these ministers of this Church," adds the Bishop, "are in high places, and to-day the "Schools of the Prophets are arraigned, with "no small show of evidence, for their false "teaching." Having thus drawn up his individual indictment against those of his ministerial brethren whom he regards as dishonest and untruthful, he proceeds to call upon the House of Bishops, which is to hold a meeting in this city to-morrow, to "speak out boldly, and "say what is the attitude of the Church toward "these men." If they fail to make a declaration on the subject, it is the opinion of the Bishop that they will lose their prestige and cease to be true leaders of the Church.

To these serious charges made by responsible men in the Church the Broad Churchmen have thus far made no answer. In fact, their studied silence has now been made one of the counts in the indictments against them. So strongly do some of the High Churchmen feel on the subject that it would not be surprising if they finally took steps to force the trial of the issue they have raised.

THAT WASN'T THE WORST OF IT.

Not a thousand miles from this city resides a plain homespun gentleman, father of three grown-up sons. His father before him was a life-long Democrat, and none of the family ever shied a regular Democratic nomination or bolted a regular ticket. The death of his father not long ago left him in possession of a handsome property, and this circumstance, in connection with his own and his family's record of unwavering fidelity to the party, led his Democratic neighbors to consider him an available candidate for office. One day not long ago, while calling on a Republican neighbor, between whose family and his own had long existed relations of cordial friendship, he casually remarked with a knowing sort of look:

"Did you know, George, that the Democrats had been at me to get me to run for Congress?"

"No, I had not heard of it," said the other. "What did you tell them?"

"Oh, I knew what they was after. They know I'd got some money and thought I'd be fool enough to blow it in."

"Well," said George, thoughtfully, "to tell you the truth, I don't really think this is a good year for you to run, if you have any notion of being elected."

"Yes, I know that's so," said the life-long Democrat; "but that isn't the worst of it. The fact is me and my three boys are all going to vote the Republican ticket this year."

Governor Flower's silence rivals that of Richard Croker and Grover Cleveland. He might at least take his fellow-citizens into his confidence far enough to let them know whether he still thinks that the tariff question was settled for twenty years by the passage of the Gorman "thing of incongruities." And so far as we have observed, Mr. Flower has not expressed his feelings on the failure of the State Convention of his party to adopt his suggestion of a declaration that the tariff should not be touched for that period. Is he keeping up a-thinking on that subject, too?

The smokeless chimneys of every factory and forge forced into idleness by the Bill of Sale will serve as exclamation points to punctuate the people's angry November declaration of distrust and contempt against Democratic treachery and dishonor.

David B. Hill makes upon his winning rival a personal attack that is petty and contemptible, even for a "peanut" politician. He says that "the proscriptive sentiments of New-Hampshire which surrounded Mr. Morton" during his residence in that State "may have influenced his convictions upon certain public questions." The complete self-stultification of which Hill is guilty in this matter is made evident when it is remembered that New-Hampshire was, at the time referred to, one of the strongest Democratic States in the Union. It voted overwhelmingly for Jackson in 1832, for Van Buren in 1836 and 1840, for Polk in 1844, for Cass in 1848, and for Pierce in 1852. Whatever "proscriptive sentiments" prevailed were therefore those of Hill's own party. The smirched candidate had better take up some other kind of mud to throw.

The plank in the Massachusetts Democratic platform booming Civil Service Reform has caused Josiah Quincy to laugh so violently that the symmetry of his countenance is grotesquely disordered.

The missionary in China is always in bad case in time of war or civil commotion, and his position now is less favorable than that of his predecessors three and a half centuries ago. They followed the return of Jenghis Khan's western wars of invasion, and during the continuance of his dynasty were pretty well treated and their work on the whole encouraged. Carpini and William of Rubruk, Franciscan friars, visited the country as early as 1250, and both have left records of it which are yet extant, describing the habits and social customs of the people. Fifty years later came Friar John, of Monte Corrino, also a Franciscan, and after much obscure propagandist labor among these interesting pagans obtained a following and was appointed by Pope Benedict XII, Archbishop of Cambaluc, known to later gazetteers as Peking. Afterward, as the faith spread, numbers of suffragan bishops and priests of his own order were sent out, and missions were established all over the country. They were favored and protected by the great Khans, who succeeded Jenghis, Kublai among them, lord of the pleasure dome of Xanadu, as well as many others; but with the downfall of the line of Jenghis the old national hostility to foreigners revived, the work of the missionaries was entirely blotted out, and only resumed after the accession of the Manchu Emperor two centuries later. This time it was the Jesuits and the Dominicans who came, and they have maintained a footing in the country with varying fortune and favor ever since, their power and influence being greatest in the early period of their occupancy there. The policy of the Government is to extend protection to all missionaries, whom it cordially despises nevertheless, but they are not always safe from local outbreaks of fanaticism. It was the advice of Li Hung Chang that they should be as inconspicuous as possible during the present troubles, and there is no doubt that it was sagacious counsel.

Reduced to its final essence, Mr. Hill's plea in abatement in behalf of the theft of the State Senate is that the crime ought to be forgiven on the ground that it happened more than two years ago, and was a rather small one at that.

Hill is said to have sent out the order to his subordinate officers that everything must be sacrificed for the sake of the Assembly. But it is noticeable that he is not sacrificing his Senatorship for that or any other purpose. It was reported the other day that he was going to resign. But he won't; or, if he does, he will have a string attached to his resignation.

The Republicans are on the high road to victory in city and State. Let them not make the woful blunder of thinking that the victory is already won.

PERSONAL.

Dr. Charles Eastman, the Indian, and his wife (Elaine Goodale) are living in St. Paul, and are well and prosperous.

The late Professor von Helmholtz, it is said, left material among his papers for a work on mathematical physics. It will be edited and published by Professor Arthur König.

It is expected that every citizen of Philadelphia will be awake on the 24th inst., that being the day on which the statue of General McClellan is to be unveiled.

Hans Zopke, the Royal Engineer of the Russian railway system, is now in this country examining the various American railway systems.

The late Professor Swing had a curious fad for collecting revolvers and bowie-knives, and had a large cabinet of those weapons in his study.

In an offhand chat the other day, George W. Cable spoke as follows about the North and the South: "Their characteristics are very different. The best word I can find for differentiation is economy in its very large sense. There is a difference in the whole economy of life, a difference not merely in the manner of life, or in the methods of life, but in the sentiments, in the verbal expressions of the emotions and passions. One reason, I suppose, why the New-Englander likes the typical Southerner so well is because companionship with him is a sort of recess, a relaxation. The Southerner has a recklessness, not only of life in the large, but in the minute and moment as well. He spends himself every hour and every day more freely than the New-Englander does. The New-Englander economizes himself at every turn. In the long run he has somewhat the advantage. I think he gets more out of life just as he gets more out of the use of money than the Southerner does, though I don't believe that many Southerners, or many New-Englanders either, would admit this without several shakes of the head. If I were to have the making of both the Southerner and the Eastern man over again I should not want to take any quality away from either which he now possesses; but I should like to add to the Southerner's dash the New-Englander's poise, and to the New-Englander's poise the Southerner's dash."

THE DRAMA.

PALMER'S THEATRE—MISS NETHERSOLE.

Miss Olga Nethersole, a young English actress, presented herself for the first time to an American audience at Palmer's Theatre last night. She chose to appear in a play by A. W. Gattie called "The Transgressor." Miss Nethersole gained the confidence and friendship of her audience at once, and earned the hearty greeting which she received. She has the quality of charm which is so invaluable on the stage, and the lack of which cannot be counterbalanced by any amount of industry or study. She gains sympathy by the simple force of personality. In the technicalities of her art she is accomplished, but not always finished and matured. The fulness and roundness of her power are not yet reached. She has youth, beauty, grace and self-command. Her voice is musical and her manner refined. With these qualities she will surely be admired and will make her way. Greater authority and command may come hereafter.

Through two acts last night Miss Nethersole had little to do but to be on the stage for a part of the time. Her talk was bright and happy and her face was gay and sunny. These things pleased so far as they went. They showed that the actress was at home on the stage and that it was likely to be agreeable at any time to see her there. They showed that she had elegance and repose, highly desirable qualities, essential indeed. But that was all. At the end of the third act she had a scene of a sort which it is common to designate as "strong." It was not sensible and it was not womanly. She could not enforce the conviction that such a woman as she had shown herself to be would do what she did. She did show that she could reach a fine emotional height, but the act of the woman whose part she played seemed incredible, and she did not make it seem anything else. This woman, a person of refinement and lofty moral sense, has been married to a man who has another wife still living. He has convinced his own conscience that he has a right to contract this second marriage, but he has not had the courage to tell her. He has deceived her and she finds him out. Then in an instant she forgives him, tells him that she can still be his wife in spirit—a spirit of no very etherial essence, it would seem—and in another instant says that she will defy society and rushes into his arms. It would take an actress of phenomenal powers indeed to carry over conviction of pure womanhood through such an episode.

The play was altogether a rather tiresome affair. It discusses the question whether insanity should be a valid ground for divorce. This is a question rather for a medical, a religious or a sociological than for a dramatic work. So far as the play answers the question at all it answers it in the affirmative. But it does more than that. It implies that well-meaning persons may override the social and statute law on this subject, as at present constituted, and that they are justified in being a law to themselves. This, it will be seen, constitutes a criticism on the Book of Common Prayer. But it is more even than that. It is one thing to say that the words "until death" should be taken out of the marriage service, and it is quite another to say that, though they are there, any one is at liberty under certain circumstances to disregard the vow containing them which he has solemnly taken. The hero of the play talks a good deal about the wrong and injury that have been inflicted on him by the law which requires him to be faithful to a wife who has been insane for fifty years, but it does not occur to him that if he wanted to be free of any promise he should not have made it. The view that the law is wrong and therefore may be broken with comparatively little sin is the one which is supported by most of those characters in the play who are supposed to command respect. Those who take an opposite stand are shown to be persons of a rather stupid and narrow-minded sort. The possible exception to this rule is an honest country squire, who, however, is kept pretty well in the background.

There is a doctor who has written a book on "Mental Disease in Its Relation to Heredity," and he is the chief authority on the badness of the law. He happened to be in love with the charming daughter of the mad woman of the play, but she was mad only by accident. Miss Ida Conquest made this daughter one of the most agreeable persons in the play, and G. P. Nash did his best to render the presence of the doctor tolerable. Grant Stewart appeared as a young clergyman with lofty principles about seeing his duty and doing it, which did not prevent him, however, from listening to a conversation between persons who did not know he was present, or from making use of the information so obtained. Wilton Lackaye was the long suffering and defiant hero, and Mrs. D. P. Bowers and J. H. Barnes, both fine actors, had rather stupid parts. E. M. Holland played a character that the spectator would have been glad to like, but there was no sufficient opportunity of making his acquaintance.

"THE SCARLET LETTER."

Richard Mansfield's presentation of Hawthorne's "The Scarlet Letter" is a convincing protest against the complaint that theatre-goers care only for indiscriminate hilarity. Sometimes it seems indeed as if the public that supports the theatre would accept nothing but pageantry and buffoonery, but such a play as this could never succeed if there were not left among those from whom the audiences are drawn a decided element of intellectual appreciation. Mr. Mansfield offered a revival of Joseph Hatton's version of "The Scarlet Letter" at the Herald Square Theatre last night. It is scarcely necessary to say that the force and interest of this work as a drama are in no way proportionate to the importance of the original as literature. This is because almost all the action of the story, and practically all that which gives it power and keenness and life, is spiritual and not physical action. It is the story of a soul which is in its nature pure, though also in its nature weak, but which is blotted with one great sin. Arthur Dimmesdale has a conscience so acute that the memory of one act follows him, haunts him, crushes him under a burden of remorse. He has not the strength to throw off the burden by any deliberate act of explation. He strives to punish himself secretly, with efforts which he knows must be in their very nature futile. With groans of contrition he humiliates himself before himself, while he dares not humiliate himself before his fellow-men. The tortures of his soul are spread before the readers of his story with masterly force and effect; it is scarcely possible to show them on the stage. The presence of Chillingworth, the wronged husband, transformed into a malignant demon of revenge, does as much as can be done to supply the deficiency of dramatic material. Aside from his own obvious relation to the story, he in some sense personifies the remorse which is always confronting and attacking and destroying the sinful and helpless priest. He becomes to Dimmesdale an outward and visible sign of his inward antagonist.

Mr. Mansfield finds in Arthur Dimmesdale a character with which his spectators can be expected to have little sympathy. Pity is the best that can be hoped for. Even pity for suffering is likely to be stifled when the suffering is accompanied by moral cowardice. Admiration aroused by the performance must be all for the art of the actor in the denotement of the character, not at all for the character itself. Mr. Mansfield's own sympathies are not much moved by the part. He understands rather than feels its nature. He sets it forth with the results of the sincere and diligent study which he never omits, and with the technical and artistic skill which never fails him. To his habits and qualities as an actor the effect of the part is due, and to this the play owes its success. A character deserving and receiving more sympathy is Hester Prynne. Miss Beatrice Cameron in this part is not the realization of the idea of Hawthorne's reader, but she plays it with quiet and pathetic dignity and sweetness.

"LITTLE CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS."

The prosperous "1492" was