The Sun.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1911.

Entered at the Post Office at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.

DAILY, Per Month	$0 50
DAILY, Per Year	6 00
SUNDAY, Per Year	2 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year	8 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month	70

Postage to foreign countries added.

All checks, money orders, &c., to be made payable to THE SUN.

Published by the Sun Printing and Publishing Association at 170 Nassau street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York. President of the Association, Edward P. Mitchell, 170 Nassau street; Treasurer of the Association, M. F. Laffan, 170 Nassau street; Secretary of the Association, D. W. Quinn, 170 Nassau street.

London office, Effingham House, 1 Arundel street, Strand. The daily and Sunday SUN are on sale in London at the American and Colonial Exchange, Carlton street, Regent street, and Daw's Steamship Agency, 17 Green street, Charing Cross Road.

Paris office, 6 Rue de la Michodière, off Rue du Quatre Septembre (near Place de l'Opéra). The daily and Sunday editions are on sale at Kiosque 12, near the Grand Hotel; Kiosque 77 Boulevard des Capucines, corner Place de l'Opéra, and Kiosque 19, Boulevard des Italiens, corner Rue Louis le Grand.

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.

Judicial Vacancies by Death.

Since Governor DIX was inaugurated three distinguished Judges have died whose places he will have to fill by temporary appointments to last until the end of the year: EDWARD B. WHITNEY, Justice of the Supreme Court in the First Judicial District, ABNER C. THOMAS, Surrogate of the county of New York, and WATSON M. ROGERS, Justice of the Supreme Court in the Fifth Judicial District. The Governor will do well if he is able to find equally capable men as their successors. They all possessed the high character which is an indispensable attribute of the judicial office in every community where lofty ideals prevail. Their professional attainments were ample, and there was an element of vigor in the methods of administration of every one of these three Judges which added largely to the effectiveness of his work.

It is too soon to talk about the successor to Judge WATSON M. ROGERS. The only names which we have heard mentioned as possible successors to Judge WHITNEY are FRANCIS K. PENDLETON, HENRY D. HOTCHKISS and R. BURNHAM MOFFAT—all competent men between whom it would be hard to choose. It has been said, we do not know how truly, that Mr. PENDLETON would prefer to be Surrogate.

The Budget for 1911.

One detail of the recent annual report of the State Comptroller should attract and retain public attention. Set forth in all the bareness of an official financial document is the summary of the recommendations of the several departments for appropriations for the year 1911. As this report is, in a sense, the last word of the outgoing Republican administration, it is significant to note that it preserves perfect consistency in requesting that the budget for the next year amount to $50,614,283.88, or, deduction being made for contributions to canal and sinking funds, to $44,752,376.88. These figures represent a gross gain over 1910, canal and sinking fund contributions included, of $7,638,833.02, and a net gain for ordinary appropriations of $5,695,209.44.

The progress of the State treasury toward poverty supplied one of the most useful issues in the last campaign. It was and it remains a serious indictment of the last State administration. To recall in detail this march of extravagance so soon after the discussions of the campaign may seem unnecessary, and yet the very publication of the document demonstrates that in one quarter at least, in the quarter responsible until January 1 for the conduct of State affairs, not even the records of the last election served as a warning or carried a message of menace.

Sixteen years ago, in 1895 to be exact, the cost of State administration was $22,709,445.27. Eight years later it had grown to $23,587,947.77, a modest appreciation of $878,502.50, or slightly more than $100,000 a year. How different is the situation shown in the next seven years, when the budget reached the enormous total of $42,975,450.86, or, deduction being made for canal and sinking fund charges, $39,057,197.44, a gain of $15,469,219.67, or slightly more than $2,000,000 a year, while the recommendations for the new year foreshadow a further increase which would make the total increase for the eight year period $21,164,429.41. This stands on all fours with the gain of $878,502.50 for the previous eight years, since it has not been in any way affected by the cost of canal or highway construction.

Accept the figures presented by Governor HUGHES's Comptroller for the budget of 1911 and they mark an appreciation of nearly 100 per cent. in the cost of State administration, a march from the $23,000,000 of 1903 to the $44,800,000 of 1911, to be exact. Nor does the statement for this year suggest the slightest decline in rate of increase; from 1907 to 1908 it was approximately $1,500,000, from 1908 to 1909 $4,800,000, from 1909 to 1910, $5,000,000. The increase foreshadowed by Comptroller WILLIAMS's report is $5,700,000.

Not less disquieting is the fact that in the face of all increase in the cost of that portion of the expenses of government which are discretionary in part, at least, there has been a similar advance in the expense flowing from canal construction, from bond issues, an increase which must continue for years to come. Last year this item amounted to $3,918,283.42; for the present year Comptroller WILLIAMS estimated it at $5,861,907, an increase of $2,130,056.94, which would bring the total increase for 1911 over 1910, accepting the figures of the report for this year, of almost $8,000,000.

Nor does the contemplation of the revenue of the State as presented in the report of the last Comptroller inspire hope or confidence. The revenue of the State for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1910, was $37,905,876.73, the appropriations $42,975,450.86. The estimated revenue for this year is $37,649,500, and the total of appropriations asked by the various departments $50,614,283.88. Last year the excess of appropriations over revenue was $5,069,574.13. The excess this year of the estimates embodied in Mr. WILLIAMS's report of appropriations over revenues is almost exactly $13,000,000. It is only necessary to add that the surplus remaining in the State treasury to-day is less than $7,000,000 to complete the statement of the case.

One of two courses lies open to Governor DIX and the Democratic majority in the Legislature. They must reduce to $37,649,500 the cost of State administration, which would mean cutting more than $5,000,000 from last year's budget and $13,000,000 from the estimates presented in the former Comptroller's final report, or they must promptly proceed to levy again that direct tax once so triumphantly abolished by Republicans.

Bulgaria's Price of Independence.

The failure of the negotiations between Bulgaria and Turkey for a new commercial treaty, which have been closely followed by Europe, is causing considerable apprehension to those Powers that had been hoping for a period of relief from Balkan broils. It carries the prospects of a bitter economic warfare between these two States, a hostility in which Bulgaria, on account of the present political unrest in the country, can ill afford to engage.

Bulgaria is paying for the independence secured in 1908 by the severance of the slight ties that bound her to the Ottoman Empire, a price which seems to have been calculated upon more by foreigners than by the Bulgarians themselves. As an integral even though nominal part of the empire Bulgaria had certain privileges of export that she fully exercised. Turkey was her best customer; of the $22,000,000 in exports more than $7,000,000 went to that country. A provisional treaty was entered into at the time of the establishment of new governments in the two countries; but now, after long continued negotiations, Turkey has refused to renew the old agreement, declaring that concessions demanded for certain of her exports were not granted. In other words, she puts the Kingdom of Bulgaria in this respect, as in all others, upon the same basis as a foreign country.

Bulgaria is thus compelled either to accede to Turkey's terms or to seek new markets for her live stock and cereals, her principal products. In her trade with Austria-Hungary her imports, according to the latest reports, were treble her exports. England sold her three times as much as she bought. Belgium bought twice as much as she sold; in fact, next to Turkey was her best customer. But the question is, can Bulgaria, even with her cheap labor and inexpensive farming methods, compete in the open markets of the world? She now comes more directly than ever before into competition with the grain fields and ranches of this country, Canada and Australia.

A very large percentage of the Bulgars are engaged in agricultural pursuits. They have already begun to show a decided reaction from the enthusiasm aroused at the time of the declaration of independence. The pomp with which FERDINAND has surrounded himself since he took the kingship is growing distasteful to these simple, frugal people. They have not reaped the benefits of the country's elevation in rank that they had expected, and the army is pressing heavily upon their finances and resources. The recent investigation in the Parliament gave the people the impression that Bulgarian politicians lost an opportunity for the military invasion of Macedonia two years ago that the country will not likely have soon again. It proved, too, that Bulgarian hopes for Macedonian territory are as active to-day as ever. The strife over this unfortunate land is alone a most serious cause for friction without the additional irritation of a tariff war. The conditions are such as to test to the utmost FERDINAND'S boasted devotion to the interests of peace and his well known political resourcefulness.

San Francisco's Triumph.

The palm for the best speech in the debate in the House upon the Panama Canal Exposition should be awarded to the Hon. WILLIAM A. RODENBERG of Illinois, who led the forlorn hope for New Orleans. Few in number were the advocates of the Crescent City, but her case was presented with such engaging knowledge of the subject, such moderation and grace of statement, with so much tact, and natural as distinguished from pumped up eloquence, that if Mr. RODENBERG'S colleagues had not already made up their minds he might have carried the day. The vacation argument was on the tip of every speaker's tongue, and Mr. RODENBERG was very happy in his use of it:

"If it be true that the public is no longer interested in expositions, then let us try the experiment of making the exposition simply an incident of a visit to the Panama Canal itself, the thing to be celebrated, and whose completion every American citizen believes in celebrating. You cannot do that by locating the exposition at San Francisco, but you can do it if you locate the exposition at New Orleans. Let us give the people an opportunity to visit the canal itself, on which the Government will have expended when completed over $400,000,000. The average American citizen who is in the habit of taking a vacation cannot afford to spend more than $100 during the time that he absents himself from his regular employment. If he were given his choice of spending this money for a trip to San Francisco, with the monotony of four or five days confinement in a stuffy sleeper, or spending it for a trip to the historic city of New Orleans, and from there to Panama, with an ocean voyage of six or seven days, giving him, perhaps for the first time, an opportunity to see an alien people, and above all enabling him to personally inspect this wonderful feat of engineering, which has been so thoroughly exploited in all the magazines and newspapers of the country, my judgment is that ninety-nine out of every hundred would decide in favor of the Southern trip."

It seems to be a rational idea that visitors to a Panama Canal exposition would like to view the great waterway connecting the Atlantic and Pacific oceans and constituting a triumph of American engineering, the supreme wonder of an age of marvellous things, but "the average American citizen who is in the habit of taking a vacation" seeks amusement more than information. The following appeal by the Hon. JOSEPH RUSSELL KNOWLAND of California will strike more "responsive chords," we fancy:

"Think of the things that men off on a vacation may see on the way to California and in California. They can visit the Garden of the Gods; they can go over the Great Divide by Marshall Pass and the Grand Cañon of the Arkansas, and they may see the Great Salt Lake and its surroundings, including Salt Lake City and the beautiful Wasatch Mountains. They can see the Sierra Nevada Mountains; they can take in, if they choose, the Yellowstone National Park, the beautiful Cascade Mountains, the Dalles and Cascades of the Columbia River and the Puget Sound country. Without leaving their seats in the train they may in passing get many grand and inspiring views of those grandest of mountains, Rainier, Hood and Shasta, at the very feet of which the train passes. They may view that wonder of nature the Grand Cañon of the Colorado, more than one mile deep. Once in California, there are the Yosemite Valley, the big trees, the everblooming flowers, the delicious fruits, and everything to bring delight to the senses and comfort to mind and body. To see these things when no exposition is in progress men make long journeys from all over the world. What will they do in 1915? A very large percentage of the population of this country will go and see these wonders for themselves."

The "average American" would not "take in" these wonders, for his purse has a bottom and the cost of living in San Francisco would be a heavy tax upon it, but the opportunity as presented in Mr. KNOWLAND'S florid style might tempt him to "take in" the exposition. The Hon. JULIUS KAHN of California was a poor second in sounding the praises of his State. His was a penny whistle tune:

"The cool breezes from the Pacific are invigorating and exhilarating. Our luscious fruits, our fragrant flowers and our great natural wonders make glad the heart and delight the eye."

But the House was ready to vote, and San Francisco, with its imposing fund of $17,500,000 and the ingenuous assurance that not a dollar would be asked of the Federal Government, was an easy winner. It seemed to be a foregone conclusion. The San Francisco boomers had done their work well. It was almost with an apologetic air that the case of modest New Orleans was presented to the House. The cocksureness of the champions of San Francisco presaged decisive triumph. And yet there was an awkwardness, a constraint, in the manner of her propagandists in the House. Most of them did not argue the case with candor and valor, as Mr. RODENBERG did in the case of New Orleans. Their principal reason for favoring San Francisco seemed to be that it should be rewarded for recovering so handsomely from the fire and earthquake that levelled and devastated it. Experience tells us that expositions go where the dollars are most abundant.

Representative MACON of Arkansas shines in general debate as he does in the elucidation of intricate geographical and astronomical problems. His vocabulary for ordinary use is filled with mild and soothing words and phrases. His contributions to the *Congressional Record* on Saturday included:

"Little atom."
"Wilful, deliberate liar."
"Dirty little pilferer of words."
"Contemptible little ass."
"Falsifier of facts."

Mr. MACON'S friends frequently have urged him not to put such restraint on his tongue, but his modesty prevents him from going to the full extent of his powers. His self-effacement merits applause, but an inquisitive nation would like to hear him on a subject that really aroused his enthusiasm.

Praise of the Health Department's Doctors.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—SIR: In THE SUN of February 3 there is an extract from a letter sent to Health Commissioner Lederle in which a satisfied citizen praises the work of the Health Department in handling a case of contagious disease.

Please permit me to acknowledge my own indebtedness to the same department for excellent and efficient treatment of a dangerous disease. During the first part of November our little girl contracted a severe attack of diphtheria. Antitoxin failed to arrest membranous development and it became necessary late at night to insert a tube in her throat.

Within an hour a Health Department physician was found and had performed the delicate operation. Seven days later the tube was removed by another physician from the Health Department. Undoubtedly their promptness and skill saved the child's life. From the first visit of the examining doctors to the final duties of the fumigating corps we received careful attention and kindly sympathetic treatment from all individuals representing the Health Department. I might add too that although five other families live in the same house none of their children was infected. S. SQUIBB.

BROOKLYN, February 4.

The French Version of Carlyle.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—SIR: Last October THE SUN published a specimen of the French translation of Carlyle's "French Revolution," by Regnault, Barot and Roche. Here is another from the chapter entitled "Avignon"

"Jourdan the Headsman fled hither from that Châtelet Inquest, from that Insurrection of Women, and began dealing in madder; but the scene was rife in other than dye-stuffs, so Jourdan shut his madder-shop."

"Jourdan, ce chef qui a échappé à cette enquête du châtelet et à cette insurrection des femmes, commençait à devenir plus enragé, mais la scène changea de face, aussi Jourdan mit un frein à sa férocité."

Is not this a delicious rendering of "shut his madder-shop"? Many have wondered that Mark Twain's favorite book was Carlyle's "French Revolution." Perhaps the great American humorist read it in the French version.

BROOKLYN, February 4. THOMAS FLINT.

In Memory of a Loyal Scotch Terrier.

From the London Chronicle.

The loyalest of dogs was probably the little Scotch terrier to which Edinburgh some years ago erected a statue. For over eight years Greyfriars Bobby, as he came to be called, slept nightly on his master's grave in Greyfriars. He spent an hour or two a day in the curator's house, but night always found him again on the grave, however cold or stormy the weather. Locked doors failed to keep him in. There was always the window. And it was not till eight years had passed that Edinburgh learned of him, and then it was over the prosaic question of finding the man who ought to pay the dog license. That tiny statue on the street corner outside the graveyard is worth looking at even to the man who does not know the story.

AS IT IS AT ALBANY.

ALBANY, Feb. 4.—After three weeks sojourn in the City of Hills, watching hourly, daily and nightly the contest for election as United States Senator, the situation to-night recalls the remark of the late Frederick S. Gibbs, Republican national committeeman for New York State, a few hours before his death several years ago.

"My boy," he whispered to a friend, with the old quizzical smile on his wan face, "if I had my career to begin again I should become a humbug and join the Citizens Union; they get something."

After three weeks balloting there is no choice of a Senator to succeed Chauncey M. Depew on March 4. At the joint caucus of the Democratic legislators at 10 o'clock in the evening of January 16 William F. Sheehan, formerly Speaker of the Assembly and Lieutenant-Governor of the State, and subsequently the Democratic national committeeman for the State, received 91 votes of the 101 necessary to elect. His nomination was then made unanimous and he became by that act the candidate of the Democratic party of the State. His election was prevented by the refusal of the following Senators and Assemblymen to attend the caucus:

SENATORS.

Franklin D. Roosevelt of the Twenty-sixth district, comprising the counties of Dutchess, Putnam and Columbia.

Loren H. White of the Thirty-first district, comprising the counties of Schenectady, Montgomery and Schoharie.

George B. Burd of the Fiftieth district, embracing a part of Erie county.

John Godfrey Saxe of the Seventeenth district, Manhattan.

James F. Duhamel of the Eighth district, Brooklyn.

ASSEMBLYMEN.

J. K. Evans of Sullivan county.
William M. Martin of Saratoga county.
Randall N. Saunders of Columbia county.
Charles W. Cosad of Seneca county.
N. L. Drummond of Cayuga county.
Minor McDaniels of Tompkins county.
Clayton L. Wheeler of Delaware county.
Lewis W. Day of Jefferson county.
R. A. Brace of Montgomery county.
John B. Trombly of Clinton county.
Otis S. Beach of Tioga county.
John C. Myers of Schenectady county.
Edmund R. Terry of Kings county.
Harold J. Friedman of New York county.
Chester A. Miller of Otsego county.
Judson Bridenbecker of Herkimer couty.
Henry A. Hollmann of Nassau county.
Sydney W. Fry of the Twelfth district of Kings.
Edmund O'Connor of the Ninth district of Kings.

Senator Duhamel and Assemblyman O'Connor were nominated by the Independence League and therefore not expected to attend a caucus of Democrats. Yet they essayed to enter the caucus, but were prevented by a close personal friend of William R. Hearst. Assemblyman Cosad was nominated by an independent Democratic convention. At 7 o'clock of the same evening all but Duhamel, O'Connor and Fry assembled at the Hotel Hampton after conferring with Thomas Mott Osborne at the Hotel Ten Eyck; they decided to bolt the joint caucus, and issued the following statement:

The undersigned Senators and Assemblymen having at heart the welfare of the Democratic party in both the State and nation, and believing as representatives of the people of the State of New York that the people should know the manner in which they cast their ballots for the office of United States Senator, refused to enter the party caucus (as distinguished from a conference) this evening, feeling that if they entered the caucus their votes would be smothered and the credit of securing a majority for any one candidate would go to those who are not the elected representatives of the people, and also in order to avoid the suspicion that any coercion might have been practised in the securing of a majority for any one candidate; also feeling that in taking this course they were fulfilling the express wishes of Governor Dix, who stated to-day: "I want every member of the Legislature to vote according to his conscience and express the wishes of his constituents. This he must do untrammelled by coercion from any quarter."

We reiterate our loyalty to the true principles of the Democratic party.

Although Assemblyman Fry bolted the joint caucus he did not attend the Hampton Hotel conference, but issued a long statement in which he said he considered the caucus method unfair, and that as the sentiment of his constituents was overwhelmingly in favor of Edward M. Shepard he intended to carry out their mandate.

At midnight January 15 Thomas Mott Osborne, William Church Osborn, Governor Dix's legal adviser, and Governor Dix had a conference at the Executive Mansion. On leaving Mr. Osborne made this public declaration: "If Shepard was not elected up to to-night he is elected now." At 2 o'clock the following afternoon, January 16, after further consultation with Mr. Osborne and his legal adviser, William Church Osborn, Governor Dix issued the following statement:

The position I took immediately after election I believed then and believe now to be in strict accord both with the Constitution and with the fundamental Democratic principles. The position was that the Legislature shall elect the United States Senator. The statute declares that the "Legislature shall openly, by a viva voce vote of each member present, name one person for Senator in Congress."

I want every member of the Legislature to vote according to his conscience and express the wish of his constituents. This he must do untrammelled by coercion from any quarter.

Since the Senators and Assemblymen named in the foregoing list refused to attend the joint caucus for the nomination of a United States Senator they have become known here as insurgents, although they are frequently spoken of as obstructionists on the ground that they have continued to prevent the election of Mr. Sheehan, the unanimous choice of the caucus. On January 4 all of the insurgents or obstructionists attended the Democratic caucuses for the election of a President pro tem. of the Senate and a Speaker of the Assembly. By so doing, by thus recognizing the will of the majority which selected respectively Senator Robert F. Wagner, Tammany, Sixteenth district, and Assemblyman Daniel D. Frisbie of Schoharie, all of the insurgents or obstructionists were appointed to chairmanships and posts on the respective Senate and Assembly committees. They accepted these offices. They had recognized their obligations to the majority. The insurgents appointed to Senate chairmanships were Senator Roosevelt, Forest, Fish and Game; Senator White, Internal Affairs; Senator Saxe, Revision, and Senator Burd, Public Printing; and in the Assembly, Evans was made chairman of Internal Affairs, Martin chairman of Affairs of Villages, Trombly chairman of Penal Institutions, and Terry chairman of Committee on Claims. The following insurgent Assemblymen also were appointed to committees and are now serving: Saunders, Drummond, McDaniels, Wheeler, Day, Fry, Brace, Beach, Meyers, Friedman, Miller, Bridenbecker and Hollmann.

These Senate and Assembly committees were announced soon before the joint caucus for the election of a United States Senator convened on January 16. Within forty-eight hours after their announcement Senator Frank M. Loomis of Buffalo and Assemblymen Chanler and Hoyt of Dutchess and Shortt of Richmond, who had voted in the joint caucus for Mr. Sheehan, announced that they believed they had fulfilled their joint caucus obligations and went over to the insurgent camp, where they have remained. Senator Loomis is chairman of the Committee on Printed and Engrossed Bills and is a prominent member of the Committee on Canals. Assemblyman Chanler is chairman of the Committee on Codes, Assemblyman Shortt is chairman of the Committee on General Laws. Mr. Hoyt has no chairmanship.

After three weeks balloting Mr. Sheehan has lost but four votes, those of Messrs. Loomis, Chanler, Hoyt and Shortt. The remaining 87 voters have voted day after day for Sheehan, and day by day their loyalty to Sheehan has become more emphatic. They have become aroused to a certain extent because of the opposition of the insurgents or obstructionists to the overwhelming will of the majority. The opposition of twenty-seven Democratic insurgent votes day by day has remained antagonistic to Mr. Sheehan. The insurgents give all sorts of explanations for their attitude. Some whisper under their breath that they are opposed to Sheehan because he is a Roman Catholic. When this statement is met by the fact that President Taft appointed Edward Douglass White, a Roman Catholic, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, they do not answer. There has been a ton of A. P. A. literature circulated here against Sheehan. Other insurgents tell you that they are opposed to Sheehan because he has been a corporation lawyer connected with Wall Street interests, while others declare that Mr. Sheehan has been altogether too active in practical organization politics.

Not one of these insurgents, even by a whisper, has questioned Mr. Sheehan's integrity or his possession of the mental attainments necessary for the high post of a United States Senator. Other insurgents tell you that they did not enter the joint caucus because they would not be coerced, but when you ask them if they were coerced into voting for Senator Wagner for President pro tem. and for Assemblyman Frisbie for Speaker their only reply is a smile. Other insurgents tell you that they will not be dominated by a one man power, meaning Charles F. Murphy. When they are reminded that Edward M. Shepard, the chief candidate of the minority, was Richard Croker's candidate for Mayor of New York city in 1901 they do not answer. When they are reminded that not one of them, not a single Senator or Assemblyman in the insurgent camp, was nominated for his present place except by caucus or convention usage, that in all cases the majority ruled to their own benefit, they grin. When they are informed that with the whole history of the Democratic and Republican parties no United States Senator, President, Governor, State officer, Mayor or any other elective officer of the State has been nominated except by the methods used here to nominate Mr. Sheehan they give no heed to the information. When it is called to their attention that Governor Dix and all of the present State officers were nominated by the majority at Rochester, and that delegates who favored other candidates bowed to the will of the majority, there is still no satisfactory response. All this has created here somewhat of a mystery. What is the real reason for the attitude of this cabal? What master mind is behind the insurgent band? A Hudson River press bureau has announced publicly that a month before the joint caucus was held for the election of a United States Senator the will of the majority as expressed in the caucus would be opposed.

Governor Dix closed his statement on the afternoon of January 16 by saying: "I want every member of the Legislature to vote according to his conscience and express the wishes of his constituents. This he must do untrammelled by coercion from any quarter."

Governor Dix from the hour of his election in November last had taken an intelligible stand regarding the Senatorship. He refused to express a preference for any of the candidates, on the ground that such a course would be an unwarrantable and unconstitutional interference with the Legislature, and added that in recent years there had been altogether too much Executive interference.

Thomas Mott Osborne and his friends were greatly elated when Governor Dix issued his statement at 2 o'clock on the afternoon of January 16. That statement was the inspiration of the declarations issued later the same day by the insurgents. Governor Dix's statement has been the hourly, daily and nightly argument used by Mr. Osborne and his friends for their continued opposition to Mr. Sheehan. The vast majority of the Democrats on the ground in all this trouble, including some of the Governor's warmest friends and admirers, have declared over and over again that the Governor departed from his impartial attitude when he issued his statement, for the reason that no matter how affirmative or negative it might have been it was nevertheless a departure from his previous stand and gave Mr. Osborne and his insurgent friends the very opportunity which they had been seeking, the opportunity to oppose the will of the Democratic majority. Furthermore, Governor Dix's friends in the Democratic organization and many out of it have declared that the Governor, immediately after the joint caucus with its overwhelming majority for Sheehan, should have issued a public statement, in which he could very properly have taken the ground that he had kept his hands off the election of a United States Senator, but that now that the majority had expressed its will the minority had no other course, according to Democratic and Republican usage for a century, but to accept the will of the majority, and that any other course on the part of the minority would be subversive of the true principles of Democracy and disastrous to the cause of representative government as expressed by Thomas Jefferson: "Let us then with courage and confidence pursue our own federal and republican principles, our attachment to united and representative government, and the absolute acquiesence in the decisions of the majority, the vital principle of republics."

It has been the daily comment since of those familiar with the situation that Governor Dix made two vital mistakes, first in issuing that statement, which was quickly seized upon by Mr. Osborne and his insurgent friends, and secondly, when the Governor remained quiescent after the majority, the overwhelming majority, had made Mr. Sheehan the unanimous choice of the Democratic party of the State for a United States Senator. From that hour, according to dispassionate opinion, Governor Dix sowed the seeds for discord, for obstruction to all constructive legislation, and gave the opportunity by which ill advised and prejudiced Democrats may be permitted to occupy a position which puts a premium upon political perfidy. There is hardly a dissenting voice to the opinion that the Governor, by his attitude on January 16 in issuing that statement, and later by neglecting to announce that the minority should accept the will of the majority, has prolonged to this hour this most unhappy struggle.

Several of Governor Dix's advisers have told him as well as others that the election of Mr. Sheehan would have an ill effect upon the immediate future of the Democratic party in the State and nation. The answer of the Democratic leaders to such counsel is that it is not for several officeholders who have benefited by the work of the Democratic State organization in nominating and electing Governor Dix to say what will be the effect of Mr. Sheehan's election, in view of the fact that a Democratic joint caucus had made Mr. Sheehan the unanimous candidate of the party and that 91 Democrats of the 114 Democratic legislators had decided that Mr. Sheehan was the best man for United States Senator. It is not for several officeholders to oppose the will of the Democratic party of the State. They, like all others in the minority, should have abided by the will of the majority, remembering always that the voters of the State in next fall's election and next year's election are quite competent to express their approval or disapproval of Mr. Sheehan's selection. Such is the view insisted on here at Albany.

When the polls closed on last election night, and at sunrise when it was generally known throughout the State that the Democratic party had won this great victory, there was happiness in the ranks of that party. The Democrats had "entered into a land where it was always afternoon." They hadn't had the Legislature in nearly twenty years. They had been thumped and buffeted from pillar to post, and the organization up State had become a mere shell. Suddenly all this was changed. Now it is all changed again, and on every side are heard gloomy forebodings, dire forecasts for the future, dismal prophecies, all because an insignificant minority has been permitted practically to usurp the functions of a majority and to prevent the will of the Democratic party of the State from being carried out.

Day after day many of the insurgents have received protests against their course from their constituents. They pay not the slightest heed to them. There isn't one of them big enough mentally to come out and acknowledge his mistake. They tell you that they are afraid to do so because some of the anti-regular newspapers will charge them with corruption. There isn't one of these insurgents who has fought this game man fashion. They have acted like children. Some of them tell you they are fighting for a principle, but they have no defined idea of what principle it is that opposed the usages by which representative government in the State has been maintained. Amid all the tension there has been now and then a flash of humor. When two years ago the Democratic State League was organized at Saratoga and Thomas Mott Osborne was made its chairman, William J. Conners of Buffalo was chairman of the Democratic State committee. He hailed the league with these comments: "They are a pack of sawdusters who only want to break into the Democratic party of the State." Now Mr. Conners has joined Mr. Osborne in his opposition to Mr. Sheehan. The League people officially announced that they were not for any man or against any man, and yet they started the machinery by which Conners was thrown out of his place as State chairman. In this act Charles F. Murphy, William F. Sheehan, Daniel F. Cohalan and other Democrats aided. Replying to Mr. Conners's statement at the time concerning the League, Mr. Murphy issued a counter statement in which he welcomed all Democratic support, declaring that there was room for all Democrats in the State, and the more Democrats the merrier. Representatives of the Democratic State League, fully aware that Mr. Conners, chairman of the Democratic State committee, was opposed to them, visited Charles F. Murphy at Tammany Hall in New York, and constantly received financial assistance for party matters from Mr. Murphy, and they received this assistance at the wigwam in Tammany Hall.

There has been too much humbug, it is daily declared here, and it is time that some of it was exposed. For instance, Mr. Shepard is credited with having written the Rochester State platform on which Governor Dix was nominated. Nothing of the kind. The draft of the platform was prepared by Daniel F. Cohalan of Tammany and was accepted by the subcommittee, and was presented in its complete form to the convention by Seymour Van Santvoord of Troy. Mr. Shepard's part in that platform was to write the plank on new nationalism and part of the labor plank. Then, too, Alton B. Parker, contrary to general opinion, did not write the draft of the platform resolutions submitted by the New York delegation to the full committee on platform in the Denver national convention of 1908. That draft was prepared by Mr. Cohalan and was merely handed in by Judge Parker.

This article, stating the situation here, is no brief for any Democrat, but it is intended to tell the truth ascertained on corroborative evidence in order to dispel recent Democratic political fictions. The situation here has frazzled the nerves and irritated the sensibilities of Democrats who have long submitted to misrepresentation in silence. The old idea of democracy in the State was that the up-State Democrats should always fight Tammany Hall, or the New York city Democrats. This doctrine was constantly promulgated by the late David B. Hill. For years before it was the custom of the up-State Democrats to join hands with the Brooklyn Democrats to keep Tammany in a subordinate position. The new idea as planned by the Democratic leaders, Charles F. Murphy, Daniel F. Cohalan, William F. Sheehan and their friends in the Democratic State League was to abolish this political sectionalism and to engage all Democrats in one united effort against the Republicans. There can be no gainsaying of this statement.

The political relations between Mr. Shepard, Mr. Osborne and Mr. Murphy have been exceedingly pleasant for two years and more. Governor Dix has joined in these friendly conferences. There has been a sincere desire to rehabilitate the shattered Democratic party in the State. Of course there has been a prejudice in the rural districts against Tammany. That prejudice has dated from the days of William M. Tweed and from the time when John Kelly bolted Lucius Robinson for reelection in 1879 and by running for Governor turned the State over to the Republicans. This prejudice was augmented by Tammany's attitude toward Samuel J. Tilden and Grover Cleveland. Tammany is suffering to this day from that prejudice. It may not be eradicated in years, but it is known that the Democratic State League was organized for no other purpose than to join hands with Tammany and all New York city organizations and all Democrats in the effort to upbuild the Democratic party in the State.

While Mr. Sheehan has been attacked here in all sorts of ways, his integrity, his democracy and his militant spirit have not been questioned for a single moment. His value to the Democracy of the country at Washington has been admitted in personal interviews and letters by some of the most conspicuous Democrats in the State, notably Francis Lynde Stetson and Smith M. Weed, and yet Mr. Stetson is strong for the election of Mr. Shepard, and Mr. Weed does not see his way clear publicly to announce his support of Mr. Sheehan, yet he declines to support Mr. Shepard. On the other hand, the Democratic leaders and Mr. Sheehan have expressed no criticism and have made no comment publicly or privately against Mr. Shepard or any of the Democrats voted for in the daily sessions. The fact that Mr. Sheehan when he is elected, as the Democratic party of the State insists he shall be elected, and goes to Washington, goes there absolutely unpledged to any interests whatever except the interests of the Democratic party, is known to all who really understand the actual situation here.

Concerning Governor Dix's appointments, the Governor and the Democratic leaders tell you unreservedly that the reappointment of Adjutant-General Verbeck and the appointments of William Church Osborn as the Governor's legal adviser and of Thomas Mott Osborne as Forest, Fish and Game Commissioner were made without the slightest suggestion of a protest on the part of any Democrat in the State. In fact the Democratic leaders, Charles F. Murphy and his friends, urged Governor Dix to appoint Mr. Osborne. Yet the Democratic leaders now tell you without the slightest hesitation that Mr. Osborne's conduct and the attitude of his insurgent friends is subversive of the honor and success of the Democratic party in the State. Now Mr. Osborne and his friends want to return to the old Hill idea and continue the antagonism of the up-State Democrats to the New York city Democrats, and the insurgents have publicly criticised Governor Dix's appointment of W. W. Farley of Binghamton to be State Excise Commissioner when Mr. Farley was indorsed by all the bankers and merchants of Broome county. Only a few days ago Senator Harvey D. Hinman, Republican, called on Governor Dix and informed the Governor that in appointing Farley he had made one of the best selections possible. If it is any guarantee of good character it may be further stated that Governor Hughes only a year ago appointed Farley manager of the Binghamton State Hospital.

Governor Dix now has daily interviews with Senator Roosevelt and other insurgents as well as with the Democratic leaders. The Governor recognizes the gravity of the situation, but believes that time will lessen the present acute feeling. The Governor has been informed by Norman E. Mack, chairman of the Democratic national committee, and by many others, that he can very properly say to Senator Roosevelt and his fellow insurgents that they were all nominated by the methods used here to nominate Mr. Sheehan, and were all elected on the same platform on which Governor Dix was elected, that as Democrats they should abide by party usage and accept the will of the majority and turn in to aid the Governor to bring about constructive legislation which would be of lasting benefit to the State. Day after day Governor Dix has gone over this line of argument with Senator Roosevelt and his colleagues. They remain obdurate.

There is a lurking suspicion that influential members of the Democratic State League are engaged in a movement which may culminate in something like the anti-snap organization of 1892. The Governor and his friends among the Democratic leaders hope to avert such a disaster to the Democratic party of the State, and feel that the delegation to the national convention next year should be united.

Several of the insurgents have told Governor Dix that they would like to vote for Mr. Sheehan, but are opposed to Mr. Murphy. The Democratic leaders, answering that statement, recall that Mr. Shepard and in fact all of the candidates for Governor at the Rochester convention sought the influence of Mr. Murphy to bring about their nomination for Governor, and that since election day Mr. Shepard's friends have sought Mr. Murphy's influence to bring about Mr. Shepard's nomination for United States Senator. It is a well known fact that Mr. Murphy has been very severely criticised for throwing his influence in favor of Mr. Sheehan, for many years the chief lieutenant of David B. Hill in his attacks on Tammany. Criticisms of Murphy for favoring Sheehan come from a majority of the Tammany district leaders. Several of the insurgents and their friends have called Governor Dix's attention to Governor Wilson's attitude in New Jersey, asserting that Governor Dix should "interfere" in their behalf. The Democratic leaders, on the other hand, have reminded Governor Dix that Governor Wilson did not "interfere," but only recognized the majority rule, that the primary in New Jersey had taken the place of the ancient caucus method of nominating United States Senators, and that Governor Wilson recognized the majority primary vote for Senator Martine. As a matter of absolute fact Senator Roosevelt and his insurgent brethren have no principle, logic, custom, or usage to support their attitude.

The Democrats of all States are watching this controversy. Its outcome will be the test of representative government. Whether expressed through primaries or through caucuses, the majority must rule. The majority has ruled since the foundation of government. The Democratic leaders look upon most of the insurgents as misguided. They feel that with the aid of Governor Dix and the counsel of unbiassed Democrats the will of the majority and the obligations of the minority to the majority in all cases will eventually be recognized.

Vienna's Suicide Record.

Vienna correspondence Pall Mall Gazette.

Austria's capital continues to maintain its unenviable notoriety for the number of suicides. The figures just published for last year are the highest ever recorded. Altogether no fewer than 567 persons took their own lives in Vienna, 405 men and 162 women. In addition to these there were 891 attempted suicides, of which 499 were by men and 392 by women. The total number of suicides and attempts averages almost exactly four a day for the year.

April and November showed the largest number of suicides, fifty-nine and fifty-eight respectively. September had the least, thirty-eight. The majority of the victims either found or sought death by hanging; next came shooting, drowning, poison, and throwing themselves out of windows. The oldest victim was a man of 90, and the youngest a boy of 12. Both threw themselves out of windows.

Love troubles were the motive for most of the suicides, and after these came family differences, mental disorders, sickness, poverty, and general weariness of life. In one-fourth of the cases the motive was unknown.

New Sword for British Officers.

From the Westminster Gazette.

The War Office is said to be contemplating the provision of a new sword for cavalry officers which is to resemble the weapon now carried by troopers. Instead of the slightly curved blade, intended for cutting as well as thrusting, they are to be given a light, straight bladed weapon, intended solely for thrusting.

System.

Knicker—Why have you got two filing cabinets?

Bocker—Each one keeps track of what is in the other one.