The Sun.

SUNDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1895.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication wish to have rejected articles returned, they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

LOCAL NEWS.—The City and Suburban News Bureau of the UNITED PRESS and NEW YORK ASSOCIATED PRESS is at 21 to 29 Ann street. All information and documents for public use instantly disseminated to the press of the whole country.

The Corinto Spoils.

Fifteen persons have shared the £15,000 extorted by Great Britain from Nicaragua, the highest amount being the £4,500 paid to Pro-Consul HATCH. The gross amount was what the little republic agreed to pay when Admiral STEPHENSON seized its port of Corinto in April last.

But in the British ultimatum of two months earlier, Lord KIMBERLEY had said that Great Britain must have from Nicaragua not only £15,000 "on account of their action in arresting, imprisoning, and expelling those British subjects," but also "an agreement to the constitution of a commission to assess the losses sustained by them in their property or goods in the reserve, owing to the action of the Nicaraguan authorities, such commission to be composed of a British representative, a Nicaraguan representative, and a jurist, not a citizen of any American State, to be selected by agreement between the Nicaraguan Government and the Government of her Majesty, and, failing such agreement, by the President of the Swiss republic." The question now is, what has become of this agreement?

The language seems to show that Great Britain originally demanded the £15,000 as a round sum of "smart money" for what she chose to regard as Nicaragua's misconduct. That was to be paid to her, and then individual damages were to be paid additionally, as assessed by a joint commission. But now we find individuals paid out of the £15,000.

Are we to suppose that these fifteen separate payments are only for expulsions or imprisonments, and that specific property losses are to be paid besides? Or has JOHN BULL unexpectedly contented himself with his round sum of £15,000, which has been such a windfall for Mr. HATCH and the other sharers in it? Or, finally, is he holding his right to a commission as a whip over Nicaragua? At all events, there are no public signs of steps taken to appoint such a commission.

The Canals and the Farmers.

That the great terminal cities of New York and Buffalo, the regions adjoining those cities, and the counties along the routes of the canals will be benefited by the improvements proposed for these waterways is admitted. But sometimes farmers are heard to say that they derive no benefit from the canals, and are yet to be taxed more than ever in order that nine millions may be laid out on deepening them and lengthening and otherwise improving the locks. The grain of the West comes here in competition with their own, they say, gets transportation without tolls, and thus injures New York farmers instead of helping them.

But unless the State canals are improved, there will be a great outcry for a ship canal, to be built by Congress across the State, and with that the competition of the West with local grain would be far greater. There is even such a demand now. And, after all, how much grain do farmers now raise in this State for sale? The difference in the cost of land and the average productivity of soil will always make the West the great grain-producing region, and that would be the case even with no canal at all. But with no canal the farmers would not only still find it more profitable to raise hay and vegetables for sale, in view of the competition of the West, but they would pay more for articles brought to them by rail, because there would be no water competition to reduce and regulate freights.

Senator WINDOM, in a report on this subject, once used these words regarding the important competitive influence exerted by the Erie Canal:

"You would doubtless be surprised, Mr. President, if I told you that the 'little ditch' which runs through your State holds in check and regulates nearly every leading railroad east of the Mississippi River, and that it exerts a marked influence on the cost of transportation over all the country, extending from the interior of the Gulf States to the St. Lawrence River, and from the great plains of the eastern foot hills of the Rocky Mountains to the Atlantic Ocean. And yet such is the fact."

Still more directly applicable to the people of the State of New York is the remark of Mr. BLANCHARD, of the Erie Railway, that "there is not a town that is not affected more or less by the canals in this whole State, from the extreme northeast to the extreme southwest corner of it, by the canal policy and the canal rates of freight." The State, too, holds the control of this canal, so that there is all the more reason for putting it in a proper shape for continuing its competition in freight.

The question may be raised whether the amount of benefit in decreased rate of transportation which the farmers receive, will make up for the increase in taxes laid upon them by the improvements now proposed. As to that, it has been shown that more than four-fifths of the sum will be paid by the counties, including New York, that receive direct benefits from the canals. In addition, the other counties, not bordering on the canal route, share indirectly in the benefits, because the increase of valuations correspondingly reduces the State tax in the border counties. Mr. ALDRIDGE, the Superintendent of Public Works, has said that "in the item of school tax alone many of these counties receive back, in the distribution of school moneys, much more than they contribute, which excess comes from the great centres of business and values like New York." A careful calculation shows that "the counties touched by canal transportation paid last year 87 per cent. of all of the State taxes." Again, while forty-three counties gave a majority for the Canal Improvement amendment to the Constitution, only seventeen gave majorities against it, and in only two did those majorities reach 1,000 votes.

Statistics published by the Executive Canal Committee show that in only one of those seventeen counties would the amount paid for canal improvement exceed that which it received for the schools above the amount paid by it into the school fund of the State. Or, taking the seventeen counties together, they "will have to pay $64,858.80 each year for seventeen years for the proposed improvement. They will receive from New York, Kings, Erie, Albany, Westchester, and Monroe counties, each year, for school purposes, $297,982.61 more than they pay to the State in school taxes." Those six great canal and terminal counties will thus give them four and a half times as much for their schools as they have to pay for the canal improvement. And those same six counties which shoulder the burden of taxation for the farming counties, themselves paid last year alone into the State school fund $1,815,099 more than they received from that fund. This sum, for a single year, was one-half greater than what will have to be raised annually for seventeen years to improve the canals under the pending plan.

Thus it will be seen that on the principle of the interest of the whole being also the interest of each part of the State, the present plan should commend itself even to the rural counties. The great terminal cities are able to bear their enormous proportion of the State taxes because their business prospers. A policy which would decrease their prosperity, or fail to allow its increase, is palpably unwise, even from the point of true self-interest in the parts of the State distant from the canal route. Indeed, the share of the individual farmer in the tax is so small as hardly to justify his vote against the project, in view of the question of State pride involved. The document just referred to remarks that "an amount equal to the cost of a dozen eggs or a pound of butter is about all that the ordinary farmer is taxed annually for the canals; a half dozen eggs or a half pound of butter contributed yearly for seventeen years is about the amount of taxation that each farmer in the State must bear to pay for the proposed improvement." And even that is scarcely a burden, since, unless the advocates of canal improvement are all wrong in their calculations, the farmer will be reimbursed many times for his outlay by the lower rates which the canals will establish for all freight.

The Riots in Constantinople.

Although the telegrams from Constantinople are somewhat conflicting, it is evident that on Monday and Tuesday the city was in the hands of a mob, of which the Softas, or Mohammedan theological students, were the ringleaders, and which the police, if not abettors, made no vigorous effort to control. The situation during those two days presented an almost perfect analogue to the anarchic state of things which prevailed in the Ottoman capital at the close of May, 1876, and which culminated in the murder of the Sultan ABDUL AZIZ. If anything were needed to convince the Christian powers that a commission composed exclusively of Turks would be unwilling or unable to protect the Armenians in Anatolia, the proof is furnished by the inability of ABDUL HAMID to shield them from massacre in Stamboul itself.

From a confused mass of testimony emanating from different sources it is possible to extract the following facts: On Monday a certain number of Armenian citizens, availing themselves of the privilege which they enjoy in common with all the Sultan's subjects, proceeded to the gate of the palace, which immemorial usage has made the supreme place of appeal, for the purpose of presenting a petition for the redress of grievance. It is alleged that they carried arms concealed upon their persons, but, if so, the precaution, as the event proved, was not unreasonable. What is certain is that they were prevented from exercising the right of petition by a mob of Moslem fanatics, and that the police, who should have given them protection, sided, in point of fact, with their assailants. All accounts agree that it was not until the police were ordered to fire upon them, that the Armenians employed their weapons in self-defence. The result was what would be expected by those who know how insignificant a fraction the Armenians form of the total population of Constantinople. As easily might a lamb resist a wolf. In the space of a few minutes most of the petitioners were either killed or wounded, and of the latter, we are told by an eyewitness, some were beaten to death with bludgeons after their arrest. Having tasted blood, the rioters undertook the indiscriminate slaughter of the Armenians throughout the city, thousands of whom were driven to seek refuge in the patriarchate and in Christian churches. Of these fugitives a large proportion were women and children. It is hard to imagine of what crime these panic-stricken seekers of an asylum were accused, but on Tuesday the police threatened to set fire to the patriarchate unless the refugees were surrendered. Thus far the threat has not been executed, but it appears that upward of a thousand Armenians have been imprisoned on the vague charge of having instigated the trouble. Meanwhile the Softas are not so utterly swept away by religious zeal as not to give evidence of a frugal mind by looting the Armenian shops and warehouses.

It is incredible that attempts should be made by some English newspapers to belittle the grim significance of this proof of the Sultan's want of power to safeguard his Armenian subjects even in the streets of his capital. It is admitted by the apologists of Turkish savagery that the Armenians had the right of petition, but they should have known, it is said, how grossly inexpedient it was to exercise it at this conjuncture. Granting that the inexpediency was but too well shown by the result, shall we pronounce men deserving of death for a mistake of judgment? It is still less easy to hear with patience the far-fetched theory that the petitioners were well aware that their lives would be imperilled, and deliberately resolved to risk them in order to compel the attention of the Christian world, by a shocking example of the Sultan's impotence, to the absolute necessity of placing Christians on the commission to be charged with the maintenance of order in Armenia. The exhibition of an heroic willingness to suffer martyrdom was not needed to point out to the Christian powers their duty, or to indicate the only measures by which it can be discharged. Lord SALISBURY, at all events, by his memorable speech in the House of Lords, expressed the resolve of Englishmen that the protection, which the Berlin Congress pledged Europe to give to the Armenians, shall no longer be deferred.

The massacre of Armenians in Constantinople, by disclosing the weakness of the Sultan's authority and the consequent worthlessness of his promises, cannot fail to hasten the deliverance of the Christian populations in the Ottoman Empire.

A New Saddle for Bicycles.

With saddles wholly of leather and saddles part leather and part metal, with saddles that are flexible and others almost perfectly rigid, with saddles that tilt and those that don't, and with saddles nicely padded and adjustable, women are still dissatisfied with this feature of the bicycle's construction. If the seat is too hard, they complain of the vibration; and if too soft, the rider may be uncomfortably supported. A saddle too wide impedes free action of the legs, and one that slopes too abruptly is always hard to ride on.

The pommel is high; it interferes with the dress and chafes the body; and if this part is tilted downward, one slides forward on to the narrow shank of leather, and the comfort of wheeling is destroyed. Stout women condemn the narrowness of most saddles, while many of less weight object to a seat of more than ordinary width. Out of fully a score of saddles that are satisfactory to men, not one is pronounced good by the mass of women; not one, they say, is adaptable by any possibility to woman's structure. In short, while the saddles of to-day suit wheelmen, they positively do not suit wheelwomen, and hence they must be condemned.

Let us consider the essentials of a perfect bicycle saddle for either male or female. First, one that shall maintain the body in an easy and proper position. Secondly, one that shall afford the rider a firm, yet elastic, seat. Thirdly, one that shall allow pedalling without needless friction. The cycling sisterhood do not demand a saddle with upholstered arms in which to recline at will, but one conforming to their bodily requirements, and from which the machine may be propelled with facility and comfort.

Since the pneumatic tire has become so universally popular, why not have a pneumatic bicycle saddle, capable of hard or soft inflation, according to the rider's weight, shape, and fancy? We have yet to hear of such an experiment being made. In these days of reform will not some one of our fair riders with masculine ingenuity and human sense of personal comfort, invent a reformed bicycle saddle? We shall hail the advent of so important a factor to our sisters seeking health and pleasure on the wheel.

The Third Term in Massachusetts.

There was one Democrat in the Massachusetts Democratic Convention, who was not afraid to face the consecrated breezes which blow from Buzzard's Bay, and roar in every Custom House and Post Office in the State. The Massachusetts platform commended "the present Administration for its dignified, energetic, and patriotic management of our foreign affairs." The compliment seems palpably ironical, but was presumably sincere, the young gentlemen who now direct the fortunes and misfortunes of the Democratic party of Massachusetts being about as patriotic as their ancestors were in the war of 1812. The platform also commended the Administration "for the economies and reforms effected in the various branches of the Federal service, and for the many improvements in the civil service, particularly the recent orders affecting the consular service." Doubtless Mr. JOSIAH QUINCY, sometime Assistant Secretary of State, was responsible for this last bit of poppycock.

When the platform had been read, Mr. JEREMIAH T. O'SULLIVAN of Lawrence got the floor and offered a resolution declaring that the Democratic party of Massachusetts "is opposed to any violation of the tradition and precedents of this country, such as would be involved in the nomination of any man for a third term in the Presidency, believing such an action antagonistic to the fundamental idea of a free republic." In support of his resolution, Mr. O'SULLIVAN spoke as follows:

"I do not offer this in any expectation that, under the very benevolent despotism in which this Convention has assembled, it will be accepted, although I entertain a fond hope that this gathering of delegates might cast loose for a moment from the cut and dried programme which had been provided for it, and the delicate manipulation of its machinery by the State Central Committee and the Democrats of Boston long enough to divorce their admiration for GROVER CLEVELAND, and also their adherence to party long enough to see that his nomination would bring defeat.

"No man can be greater than GEORGE WASHINGTON or the other leaders who refused a third term, and I appeal to the friends of Mr. CLEVELAND, in whose admiration I yield to no man, to spare placing him in such a position; and I speak this with no disrespect to him, the greatest President since the war."

Mr. O'SULLIVAN, it will be seen, is a thoroughgoing admirer of Mr. CLEVELAND, but his admiration is not so hyperbolic as to make him forget that he is a Democrat and an American, or to make him wish to put aside the precedent beneficently set by WASHINGTON and followed for nearly a hundred years. The "beneficent despotism" wished to stand well with the powers that be. Mr. O'SULLIVAN'S resolution was instantly strangled by sending it to the Committee on Resolutions; and then the platform was adopted. Nobody seems to have dared to support Mr. O'SULLIVAN. The breezes from Buzzard's Bay blew too strongly. Will Mr. O'SULLIVAN be disciplined for his bold act? Are the Massachusetts Democratic bosses in favor of a third term for their patron?

The Maha-Bodhi Society.

The Grand Concatenated Order of Hoo-Hoos pales its ineffectual fire before the Golcondan splendor of the Mahá-Bodhi Society. The names of the offices of the Hoo-Hoos may be more impressive; in the names of its officeholders the Mahá-Bodhi is incomparably more majestic. The Patron is LOZANG THUB-DAN GYA-TCHO, Grand Lama of Thibet, the most eminent person on the earth. H. SUMANGALA of Pradhána Nayaka, Mahá Thero, Ceylon, is the President. It costs him 100,000 rupees a year to print his visiting cards. Among the Vice-Presidents are The THATHANABAING of Mandalay, own second cousin of the BILLIE-BEDAMM of Benares, Lord Abbot Unsiyo Vajo, Tokio; VELIGAMA SRI SUMANGALA, High Priest, and SRI DHARMARAMA, likewise High Priest, but not so high. That accomplished sage and astral philosopher, Col. HENRY STEELE OLCOTT, is Honorary Director, and Babu NANDU KISHORE LALL, M. A. B. L., is Honorary Legal Adviser. Imposing names these, and the object of the society is still more imposing.

This society was founded at Colombo, Ceylon, on May 31, 1891, "to make known to all nations the sublime teachings of the BUDDHA, SAKYA MUNI, and to rescue, restore, and reëstablish as the religious centre of this holy movement Budda-Ghayá, where Prince SIDDARTHA attained supreme wisdom." There stood the Bodhi Tree, under which he used to sit. There was, and is, the Temple. To quote from the prospectus:

"At this thrice sacred spot it is proposed to reëstablish a monastery for the residence of Bhikkhus of Tibet, Ceylon, China, Japan, Burma, Siam, Cambodia, Chittagong, Nepal, Corea, and Arakan."

It is also proposed to found at Budda-Ghayá an international Buddhist college, since "the time is now ripe to sow the seeds of BUDDHA'S teachings in Indian and American soil." The Sanscrit journalist, Sir EDWIN ARNOLD, seems to be the parent of the restoration idea. The Mahá-Bodhi Society estimates the amount necessary to carry out its building projects at 200,000 rupees. Persons desiring to help the Bhikkus of Chittagong and elsewhere, are invited to send their contributions to Mr. H. DHARMPALA, General Secretary, 2 Creek Row, Calcutta.

Membership in the Mahá-Bodhi Society, which recognizes no "distinction of caste, creed, or sex," is active, honorary, or corresponding. The active members work for the "propagation of Árya, Dharma, and all meritorious works;" the corresponding members are distinguished and learned persons, who are willing to send the society interesting information; the honorary members are persons famous, as Col. OLCOTT is, "for knowledge of Buddhism or services to humanity." It costs five rupees to become a member, and the annual dues are two rupees, and you get a doubtless ornate diploma. For the benefit of the poor there is the group called Sympathizers, who pay eight annas or more. Among the representatives of the society are eminent Buddhists like Prof. RHYS DAVIDS; the Sanscrit journalist, Sir EDWIN ARNOLD; H. R. H. Prince CHANDRAHAT CHUDADHAR of Bangkok; TAN TEK SOON of Singapore, MOUNG BAW THAW of Mandalay, MOUNG PO KIN, K. S. M., of Thayetmyo, and Pandit ANANT BAPU SASTRI JOSHI, Bombay. The New York representative is Mr. CHARLES T. STRAUSS of 466 Broadway.

The society's organ, the *Journal of the Mahá-Bodhi Society*, has on its cover a picture of the Budda-Ghayá Temple and a Sanscrit motto. If we may judge from the September number, the value of the exchange editor is properly appreciated in Calcutta, most of the contents of this number being contributed by him. It might be more interesting to print accounts of the progress of Buddhism in the United States and Europe. Why doesn't Mr. PHILANGI DASA, the representative of the society in California, tell us what are the prospects of Buddhism on the Pacific coast? Why doesn't Prof. LEON D'ROSNY, the Paris representative, report the fortunes of Buddhism on the Boulevards? Herr FRIEDRICH ZIMMERMANN of Stuttgart, and Dr. ARTHUR PFUNGST of Frankfort-on-the-Main, and Dr. HARTMANN of Holland might say how it fares in Germany and Austria. And Mr. CHARLES T. STRAUSS of Broadway: one of the objects of the Mahá-Bodhi Society being the propagation of Buddhism in this country, any New Yorker who feels a stirring at his heart and purse strings prompting him to send five rupees to Calcutta, ought to know beforehand how Buddhism is thriving here. Is New York becoming Buddhist as a result of the labors of Mr. CHARLES T. STRAUSS? Imperial New York, like imperial Rome, is big enough to contain and welcome all religions, but we don't seem to hear much of New York Buddhism. Is the town too busy to be contemplative, or is Mr. STRAUSS averse to propagandism?

The Chicago representative, Mrs. HOWARD, would seem to have an easy task. Chicago needs religion, and, though all attempts to Christianize her have failed, it may be possible to Buddhize her. The Mahá-Bodhi Society ought to get a goodly number of names in Chicago. Remembering the proud days of the Infanta's visit, illustrious citizens like the Hon. WASH. HESING, the Hon. FERDINANDO PECK, and the Hon. HARLON N. HIGINBOTHAM will be glad to stand again under the umbrella of great personages; and if LOZANG THUB-DAN GYA-TCHO and the THATHANABAING of Mandalay are not great, where shall greatness be found? We have pleasure in pointing the Mahá-Bodhi Society to Chicago as a promising field of labor.

The O'Brien Leads the Way.

And so the O'BRIEN Democracy, the Shamusites, have bravely plucked the honor of being the first to put into plain and unequivocal language the spirit of opposition to THEODORE ROOSEVELT and the Republican liquor plank, by passing in their County Convention on Thursday night a resolution demanding this:

"The sale of spirituous liquors, wines, ales, and beers to be permitted during such hours on the first day of the week as shall not be concurrent with the ordinary and recognized hours of public religious observance of that day, and under such restrictions as to the manner and exposure of such sale as shall preserve the order and quietude associated with the day; citizens engaged in the business of the sale of spirituous liquors, wines, ales, and beers to be protected in the right to pursue their vocations without molestation, exactions, persecutions, or extortions."

This contradiction of the Republican plank, which calls for the continuation of the Sunday law, is of the squareness necessary to divest the issue of the last element of haziness. It expresses the opinion which every one prepared to support the New York Democratic platform of this year must agree with, if not out of personal desire to buy liquor on Sundays, out of willingness to see the existing veto abolished and people empowered to gratify themselves.

Why should not men desiring to drink liquor on Sunday be possessed of the same freedom as those desiring to eat oysters?

We observe that non-partisanship, that grand, sweet fancy of the late reformers, is fading out like a retiring Comet's tail. The Hon. WILLIAM L. STRONG cast it from him on the first day of last January. WILLIAM R. GRACE, his special partner, repudiated it by letter soon afterward. And now the main army of reform is preparing to let the non-partisan cause go to pot, and take service in the ranks of the Republicans. We have heard the last of non-partisanship certainly until 2006, probably later.

The *World* characterizes all the leading paper makers of the country as common swindlers and as conspirators against the public welfare. These gentlemen might very reasonably decline to have any dealings with the *World*, and if they did they would be well within their rights.

What a fascinating game is the game of politics as played here! It is superior to poker, baseball, chess, craps, golf, euchre, bowling, football, dice, chuck-farthing, lawn tennis, fakiring, logic, or the gift enterprise business. It is often played by experts sharper than any that ever engaged in the shoving of the queer. There is more excitement in it than in moonshining among the mountains of Georgia.

There are some high old players at the game of politics in New York. Their betters can't be found anywhere.

The countenances of the crack players are apt to be tinged with melancholy when seen in public. They do their laughing behind doors.

Not in all those parts of the world that lie outside the United States are there such ingenious players at the game of politics as the American players.

The game in politics at which we are looking these days is one for which sharp wits are needed; but the national game that is to be played next year, that will be a game for the master players of the whole country, and it will be a stirring one, too.

IN THE ROCKY MOUNTAINS.

The Pleasures of Sport.

ST. MARY'S LAKE, Sept. 20.—We have had no great luck so far. We have killed only one grizzly and three or four mountain sheep, not to mention a few grouse, that we have eaten. But we had an adventure the other night all the same.

I was waked from a sound sleep by the sound of sh—sh, and a scratching on the tent. "We have got a skunk inside the tent, and don't you stir whatever happens," said my partner.

I lay still, and presently I was aware of a little creature crawling around me and over me, but doing nothing worse.

But it was hard to keep quiet with him feeling about your face, with his fur tickling a little now and then. But I lay motionless till he left me and went elsewhere.

Meanwhile the scratching on the tent was continued, so that our visitor seemed to take an interest in it, and then he left us as quietly as he came.

After he was gone we stopped up the place he had come in at, and went to sleep again.

Thus we got off better than a party who were out with Theodore Roosevelt a few years ago. There were six men sleeping together in a little hut. One of them, a green Scotchman, fired at a wee beastie he saw on the earth floor in the night, and wounded him. Result serious.

Are Men Less Given to Swearing?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* It seems to me that men don't swear so much as they did. I think you certainly hear less swearing in public places, in the streets, in cars, and so on. Am I right? OBSERVER.

SAVE THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY!

The Malign Forces Within the Party Which Are Working for Its Disintegration.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* It seems to me that pending the election for President of next year it is desirable to settle the question of the organization of the Democratic party and the obligation of Democrats to support it, or at least the necessity of their supporting it if they expect to obtain the political supremacy.

In several of the most important Democratic States there have been contests in the ranks of the party for the control of the State organizations and the nominating conventions. Established leaders have been strenuously opposed by Democrats desirous of other leadership, and differences concerning questions of Federal policy, touching the currency question more especially, have incited bitter controversies. Such disagreement is a healthy manifestation, to my thinking. It betokens earnestness of conviction and a lively interest in politics. It shows a hopeful vitality in the Democratic party. But when these disputes have been decided one way or the other by the organizations representative of the party, the decision must be accepted or the party will have no coherency. A party without discipline is disintegrated.

In the State of Kentucky the Democratic State Convention, made up of delegates elected to represent the differing desires and opinions of the Kentucky Democracy as to candidates and platform, put in nomination a candidate for Governor to whom the minority were opposed because of his views on the purely Federal question of the currency. His Democracy was unquestioned and unquestionable, and no objection was made to him, nor can any be made, so far as concerns the State issues raised by the Kentucky Democrats. He is a man of ability, of integrity, and unassailable character and reputation. Not one of his bitterest opponents even denies or doubts that he would make a competent and genuinely Democratic Governor. He obtained the nomination regularly, his friends winning it for him in a fair field and strictly in accordance with the long-established and equitable methods of the Democratic organization in Kentucky. The currency question, as to which his views differ with those of his Democratic opponents in the Convention, and with mine, cannot be settled for the Democracy by the Kentucky Convention. It must be settled by the National Convention of the party, in which all the States will be represented. The last national platforms of both the Democrats and the Republicans purposely and adroitly left that question open to disagreement in the parties. The State Conventions of both held since their adoption have interpreted their utterances as to the currency differently, according as the prevailing State sentiment was or is. There has been no square discussion between the parties as to it, and there is now no unanimity of opinion in either party regarding it. It did not enter into the last Federal canvass, in which for the Democrats the dominating and triumphant issue was the Force bill. Under such circumstances some of the unsuccessful opponents of the candidate in the Kentucky Convention are refusing to be bound by its decision simply because its candidate exercises his right to an individual opinion on that unsettled question.

In Maryland the opposition to the leadership of the Democracy by Senator Gorman, fostered and fomented by a President elected as a Democrat, sought to obtain control of the Convention, which this year nominated candidates for State offices. It did not succeed, and the candidates favored by Mr. Gorman and his friends were nominated. The candidate for Governor put up for support by the Democratic party is a gentleman of the highest character, against whom personally and as a stanch and consistent Democrat nothing can be alleged; yet, with the same malign influences at their back, a cry arises among those who sought unsuccessfully to abase Mr. Gorman from his party leadership, that this regularly nominated Democrat must be defeated! It is with them rule or ruin. They went into a Convention and were fairly outvoted by their fellow Democrats, but because they were in the minority they refuse obedience to the decision, and simply on the grounds of personal pique. Is there no Democratic organization in Maryland, no party tribunal for the settlement of such internal disputes, or shall every Democrat be left to go as he pleases and thus throw away his vote in the multitude of counsels?

In the State of New York the most powerful subsidiary Democratic organization is unquestionably Tammany Hall of this city. It is the regular city and county organization of the Democracy, and it marshals a host of Democratic votes absolutely essential to the dominance of the party in the State, if not in the Federal Government. Last year, at a time of general Democratic demoralization throughout the Union, it cast nearly 109,000 votes for the regularly nominated Democratic candidate for Mayor. They were the votes of Democrats whose loyalty to the party was proof against the allurements held out to them by the traitors from it who assisted in electing a Republican Mayor. When the faithful Democrats of that regular organization elected delegates to the State Convention, in accordance with the requirements of the long-established rules of the party, made for the necessary purpose of consolidating its strength, these deserters still stood aloof and elected delegates of their own in defiance of Democratic law and usage. Then, because the Convention allowed them a less representation than the regularly elected and indubitably Democratic delegates, they marched out of the body and refused to be bound by it. They went there determined to revolt if it did not agree with their minority wishes and intentions. Really, of course, they were not entitled to any representation whatever in a Democratic Convention. What they got they got by favor alone, and, in my opinion, it was mistaken generosity which granted them anything at all. They had no credentials justifying their admission. They are outlaws from the Democracy. They ought to have been politely but peremptorily shown the door, all of them.

Having rejected the squandered favor of the Democratic Convention, this faction are proceeding to declare further their independence of all Democratic organization. They have purloined the name of the Democracy, but they propose to use it for the injury of the Democracy. They are trying to vent their spite against the regular Democratic organization by combining with the Republicans for the defeat of the only Democratic ticket, the only ticket bearing the Democratic emblem, which will be nominated in this city. Their opposition to the ticket cannot be based on objections to the candidates, for those have not yet been selected by the Democratic County Convention. It has been decided upon in advance, and is solely directed against the organization of the Democratic party. They will oppose the Democratic candidates, whoever they may be, simply because they are the candidates of the Democracy as represented by its only regular organization in New York. Moreover, they are composed or are under the leadership of the men who are nearest to the occupant of the White House, and with whom his sympathies are warmest.

Can the Democratic party be kept together unless Democrats vote solidly against such treachery and for the maintenance of the authority of the representative organizations of the party? What right have the Democrats to call themselves a party unless they have common principles and a common policy, and how can they act to secure the adoption of those in the Government unless they are bound together in an organization to which they all submit? What is the use of holding party conventions unless the party abides by their decision? Is a man to be counted as a Democrat when he goes to a Convention of the party, and refuses to be governed by its decision simply because he is in the minority? If he leaves, he leaves not only the Convention, but the party also. He has cut himself off from the Democracy. He is no more a Democrat, and he should be treated by the party as a deserter and political apostate.

In Pennsylvania there was a bitter contest in the Republican party against the leadership of Senator Quay, but when the majority of the Republican State Convention decided in his favor, that was the end of it. The minority accepted their defeat. Mr. Platt having succeeded against violent Republican opposition in this State, his enemies in that party are doing the same. They bow to the inevitable, waiting for a better opportunity. That is good, sound party discipline, and it is creditable to the intelligence and sincerity of the Republican party. It is principles and not men with them, and so it must be in every party which expects to preserve the coherence necessary to success.

The Democratic party must get rid of the Mugwumpery injected into it by Cleveland or prepare for ignominious defeat next year, and for its steady disintegration. Alas! that the party bound together in a compact and irresistible organization by the statesmanship of Samuel J. Tilden, should have fallen a victim to the personal ambition and discordant and inimical principles of Clevelandism. But the cure of the evil is discovered so soon as the source of the poisonous influence is found out. From this time forth, in every Democratic organization and in the breast of every honest Democrat, let there be the determination to stand loyally and squarely by Democratic principles, and to abandon utterly submission to a personality or the defence or tolerance of any individual who fails to represent those principles, or to render allegiance and obedience to the authority and discipline of the Democratic organization. Save the Democratic party! It is not a mere question of carrying an election. It is a question of life or death for the party of Jefferson, Jackson, and Tilden. Away with the traitors in the camp who wear the uniform of the Democracy simply to betray it if they cannot rule it!

NEW YORK, Oct. 5. JEFFERSON.

ON MUNICIPAL REFORM.

Seth Low and the Public Debt.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* President Seth Low, according to a morning paper, made, in part, before the Chamber of Commerce last night, the following observations:

May I say a word further in regard to the general subject, as I happ n to be upon my feet? Our sister city of Brooklyn has given us an illustration of what may happen if we fail to unite all these forces together. It is a matter of history, although all members of the Chamber may not know it, that at the election for Mayor in the city of Brooklyn following my retirement from office the forces which had been united behind me were divided. The result was that, divided, they cast a majority vote of the city, but the enemy entered into possession of the offices by a plurality vote. It was eight years before another union could be brought about which led to victory, and during those eight years the debt of Brooklyn was increased from its lowest point as a result of the legislation passed for the collection of arrears during my years of $30,000,000 to $45,000,000. So that the debt of the city, looked at merely as a municipality, was increased about 50 per cent through that separation of the forces that ought to have kept united.

I submit, therefore, that merely on its business aspect this Chamber has a keen interest in the result of these movements to bring about a union. I conceive it to be the height of achievement to pluck the flower safety out of the jaws of danger, and there is no other body of men in this city except this Chamber, in my judgment, that can do it. I believe we can, by standing fast for a union, and second for a union such as has been indicated in my resolution, do work of a character that will command universal support.

If there is any meaning or point in these observations it must be in the fact that Mr. Low was a reform Mayor of Brooklyn; that when he retired the bad men in Brooklyn got possession of the offices, held them for eight years, increased the public debt during that time by $15,000,000, or, as he puts it, about 50 per cent., and he warns that august body, the Chamber of Commerce, unless the union of all elements in New York city opposed to Tammany Hall takes place here, an increase of the public debt of New York city may be looked for.

1. The reformers, so called, with Mr. Low among the chief of them, carried this city last fall; went into office on the first of January last, and have increased the debt of our city millions upon millions. Unless this statement is correct, literally correct, our Comptroller is a fraud and a humbug and a liar, and who dare pretend that he is either?

2. These reformers have increased the tax rate to a point, in the State and in the city, as high, if not higher, than it has been for the past twenty-five years, according to my recollection.

3. And the Comptroller points out, as I remember the figures, that the rate must be still higher for 1896, when, if the proposed estimates of the different departments are adopted, the aggregate of the tax levy in 1896 will exceed the present aggregate by several millions of dollars.

4. And a union of all the elements opposed to Tammany Hall must be brought about to the end that this increasing of the public debt of the city tax rate may continue, would seem to be the grand scheme of President Low, who was born with a golden spoon in his mouth, who has never been compelled to work an hour in his life, and who is pecuniarily able, by means of inheriting an immense fortune, to give away a million of dollars with the same nonchalance that he sips his morning coffee. Now don't misunderstand me; I have great admiration for President Low, and have expressed it in season and out of season. He is one of the foremost men of our city, but when he undertakes to cement a union against Tammany Hall by the argument that to fail in such a union is to increase the debt of the city he ought to know that he makes himself appear ridiculous to any reflecting men. I am not a Tammany Hall man; never was a member of Tammany Hall; I am, for me, a heavy taxpayer; my all is in the soil in New York city, except a country home; my taxes are oppressive; I have inherited fortune to fall back on, and I am an anxious looker-on as to what is transpiring in this city. From a careful observation of the workings of the city government and its expenditures I am of the belief it is the most extravagantly conducted government that has existed in this city since the days of Tweed. Since the first of January last the scramble has been solely to drive the ins out and to select from the outs a class of men answering to the well-known description of the beggar when placed on horseback.

IRA SHAFER.

THE LIBERTY BELL QUESTION.

What Is the Matter?

TO THE EDITOR NEW YORK SUN—*Sir:* We, the undersigned members of the Columbian Liberty Bell Committee, have had our attention called to an article of a scurrilous nature in your paper, signed "G. Winfield Pierce," dated September 18. The writer reflects on the genuineness of the Columbian Bell, and upon the characters of the men and women who originated and promoted this project, giving their time and their labors without reward, to create a Bell worthy of the Columbian era, which it was intended to commemorate. This beautiful Bell, welcomed so warmly both at Chicago and at Atlanta, bears witness to our success, and challenges criticism as to quality and tone, even if the character of those who created it are not sufficient guaranty for its genuineness.

The writer, both on account of his deplorable ignorance and manifest malice, is beneath individual notice. We will therefore, hold you responsible for the appearance in your columns of such a false and libelous attack upon a committee composed of some of the most honorable as well as the most influential men and women throughout the country.

Will you nullify the injurious effect such an attack might have in the public mind while the Bell is at Atlanta, or shall we be compelled to seek legal redress?

This article caused great indignation among the D. A. Rs. at Atlanta, who sent it to Washington in order that some action looking to redress might be taken. It is a matter of astonishment to all who have read it, that so reputable a journal as the NEW YORK SUN would publish a statement so slanderous.

Signed, ANNE S. GREEN
Regent for Va of Colombia Liberty Bell
MINNIE F. BALLINGER
Regent for District of Columbia Col Lib Bell.
PATTY MILLER STOCKING,
Representing Historical Societies Columbian Liberty Bell Com. Washington D. C.
LILIAN PIKE,
Representative of Freemasons on Col. Lib. Bell Committee.

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 3, 1895.

The Changing of Names.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I can't agree with a paragraph in THE SUN criticising Polish and other Jews for changing their jawbreaking names, even though the names they assume "completely disguise their nationality and religion" and "can be productive only of ethnographic, genealogic, and theologic confusion." What harm is there in that? Having become Americans, their original nationality is of no consequence; and why should Jews more than other people be required to advertise their religion by their names?

These Jews and other foreigners who have changed their names to make them more easily pronounceable by English-speaking people show that they do not wish to be distinguished as foreigners by their very patronymics; and is not that disposition creditable to them as Americans by naturalization? They do not want their children growing up here as Americans purely, to be hauled down with such surnames as Skopowsky, Lotzowsky, Grodjinski, and Bolenofsky, foreign to our speech and forever indicating an alien origin. Besides, their new names are more convenient, easier to spell and to pronounce. In making the change, therefore, do they not show a laudable consideration for the public?

A large part of our most frequent English names have been brought over to us from other languages, and their original forms have undergone changes as great by a gradual process. Only a student of the subject can find in these "ethnographic and genealogic" significance, while as to the "theologic," there is none possibly discoverable.

I am glad of anything that indicates a desire among the foreigners coming out of citizenship to get rid of the marks distinguishing them from the rest of the people. AMERICAN.

NEW YORK, Oct. 5.

How about the prudence of allowing a cough to run on, rasping the pulmonary and bronchial organs, when that approved and speedy remedy, Dr. D. Jayne's Expectorant, can be obtained from any apothecary.—Adv.

WHAT IS GOING ON IN SOCIETY.

Newport and Lenox will suffer from a very decided dwindling of their population this week. The golf tournaments are over in both places, and the numbers who came to watch them will be leaving in crowds. The contests can hardly be said to have fulfilled all that was expected of them. In Newport a succession of unaccountable accidents occurred, in the withdrawal of Mr. Stoddard, the failure of Winthrop Rutherfurd, and the chances and changes of the game which kept many of the best players in the background. Young Sands won laurels for himself by his fast, good play and the boldness with which he took Stoddard's place, and did his level best to win. But his youth and inexperience were hardly a match for Dr. Charles MacDonald, a Scottish gentleman resident in Chicago, who learned the game in his own country, and has had years of practice as a golfer and athlete. Mr. Havemeyer's costly prize goes, therefore, to the St. Andrew's Club, and Dr. MacDonald will be decorated with the golden medal that accompanies it.

The tournament of course awakened the warmest interest among the Newporters, and the red coats of the players, with the flashing colors of the women's costumes, made the links a lively scene in the bright October sunshine. The result has been to call into being many new golf clubs in New York and its vicinity, some of which will be accessible at all seasons, and as golf had its origin in