CONSOLIDATION OF COURTS.

EX-JUDGE VAN HOESEN'S OPINION.

HE DISAGREES WITH THOSE WHO THINK THE SUPREME, SUPERIOR AND COMMON PLEAS COURTS SHOULD BE UNITED.

At the annual meeting of the Harlem Law Library held recently at No. 109 West One-hundred-and-twenty-fifth-st., ex-Judge George M. Van Hoesen delivered an address on "Proposed Constitutional Changes in the Superior City Courts." The Harlem Law Library was organized in March, 1891, for the convenience of lawyers living in Harlem and its vicinity. There are 135 members. The library has over 1,700 volumes, comprising all the New-York State and Federal reports and a well-selected collection of textbooks. Its officers are: Ezra A. Tuttle, president; Daniel P. Hays, treasurer; Wayland E. Benjamin, librarian, and George C. Lay, secretary. A feature of its annual meeting has been an address by a judge or jurist of reputation upon some topic of interest to lawyers. Among the speakers in former years have been Austin Abbott and Rastus S. Ransom.

Judge Van Hoesen said in part:

I saw in The New-York Tribune a production which emanated from that well-known American character, the interviewer, and consisted of interviews with various prominent gentlemen of this city upon the subject of changes that ought to be made in the organization of our courts by the coming Constitutional Convention; and occasionally as I have picked up "The Albany Law Journal" I have read in that periodical suggestions of all sorts, from all sorts of people, upon the subject of the changes that ought to be made in the Court of Appeals and in various other courts of the State. It seems to me that there are almost as many opinions as there are lawyers and judges, and this very wide diversity of views, this seemingly irreconcilable and hopelessly discordant expression of opinion in so many quarters of the State, make it reasonably certain that the time has not yet arrived when it is safe to make any change in the fundamental law. A change in the Constitution of the State ought to be made only when there is a public demand for it, and when by wide discussion and profound reflection and a close comparison of views there seems to be at least some consensus of opinion as to what the changes ought to be and why they should be made.

With respect to the judges of the Court of Appeals, as to whether the number of judges should be increased, as to whether it is proper to create divisional courts or to divide the business of the Court of Appeals among various coteries of judges, there seems to be a very wide difference of opinion. And so with respect to the organization of courts of the city of New-York. I know there are a great many lawyers in the city who entertain the opinion that the time has come when the Court of Common Pleas and the Superior Court should be merged or consolidated with the Supreme Court, and they speak rather oracularly when they say it is idle to have any more than one court of original jurisdiction—it ought not to be. Now, it is very easy to assume as a postulate a matter about which there may be wide differences of opinion. I don't concede the self-evident proposition that there should be only one court of original jurisdiction. I do concede that if one court of original jurisdiction could dispatch business better than several courts of coordinate jurisdiction then there ought to be one court. But let us inquire whether it is certain than one court of original jurisdiction is better than several courts of coordinate jurisdiction.

Now, the courts of the State of New-York are creatures of slow growth, saying nothing of the early origin of the Court of Common Pleas, and its great antiquity. But beginning with our Circuit Court: The Circuit Courts of the State of New-York had their origin in 1823. From 1821 up to 1847 these duties of Circuit Judge of course were performed by the Circuit Judges, eight in number. In the city of New-York, the Circuit Judges were unable to do as in other districts—perform the duties of Vice-Chancellor—and the office of Vice-Chancellor was created, and the office of Assistant Vice-Chancellor, and there were two Assistant Vice-Chancellors; and that was our condition at the time the Constitution of 1846 was adopted. But it became evident that the business had grown so much that the Circuit Judges could not perform the duties required of them, and the result was, when the Court of Chancery was abolished, the Supreme Court was established, the Supreme Court with four judges in every district, and eight districts in all.

THE SUPERIOR COURT FOUNDED.

But in the city of New-York, shortly after the Constitution of 1821 went into operation, it was discovered that the Circuit Judge alone, even with the aid of the Vice-Chancellor and the Assistant Vice-Chancellors, could not perform all the duties expected to be performed in this city, and accordingly, it was determined to create another court. In 1828 they created what was called the Superior Court of Common Pleas, consisting of three judges. There never has been in the State of New-York, and it is doubtful if there has been in the United States, a court of abler judges than the Superior Court at the time of its organization. It at once took possession of the business of the city of New-York. All the important commercial cases were brought to the Superior Court. The ablest men of the city went there because they preferred it to going before a Circuit judge.

Now, when the Constitution of 1846 went into operation four judges were elected to the Superior Court of this city, and they were all able men. And it was supposed that the placing of those four eminent men on the bench of the Supreme Court would tend, at least, to equalize business. The election of those four gentlemen to the Supreme Court utterly failed of its purpose, so far as that was concerned. The lawyers still crowded into the Superior Court, which was still the great commercial court of this city and county, and the demands upon which were such that the judicial force was increased, and three were added to its number. It was fortunate again in the character of the men placed upon the bench. The principal part of the court life of the chief members of the New-York bar was spent in the Superior Court. And that continued to be the case until, unfortunately, the political methods that prevailed in the city of New-York changed and after a while the giants of the bar chose another arena for their Titanic contests.

ORIGIN OF THE COMMON PLEAS.

So, in regard to the Court of Common Pleas. The Court of Common Pleas grew up, as we all know, from the Mayor's Court, as it was called originally, after which the Mayor's Court was held, sometimes by the Mayor, sometimes by the Recorder, sometimes with and sometimes without the presence of the Aldermen, and then finally the Mayor dropped out, and the Recorder dropped out, and first one judge was added, and then another, until they had three judges of the Court of Common Pleas.

Now, I want to ask, if there is any gentleman here who is old enough to know, I would like to ask him if he ever saw in the days when the Superior Court was the chief commercial court of this city and country, any bar, any clashing, any embarrassment in the fact that the Superior Court held functions and possessed powers that were coordinate with and concurrent with those of the Supreme Court? I appeal to you, gentlemen, here to-night, if you ever saw any embarrassment or any clashing between the Court of Common Pleas and the Superior Court, or felt that there was any difficulty in both courts subsisting in this city, side by side, possessing the powers and functions which they have to-day? Somebody says, well, there is occasionally a difference of opinion and conflict of decisions. How many? What if there are? How often does it occur that there is a difference of opinion between those courts? How many conflicts can any gentleman here cite between the Superior Court and the Supreme Court? or the Common Pleas and the Supreme Court? There are little questions of practice undoubtedly, but unimportant. Of what account are these questions of practice? Are they so serious as to require that the Constitution of the State should be changed and that these courts, or some of them, should be wiped out of existence? I say no.

Now, if the working force is not to be increased, if the amount of work is not to be made of a better quality, what reason can there be for making any change? As I say, there are no substantial differences in the practice, no substantial conflicts between them; they go on side by side, and have gone on harmoniously for years, and why should there be a change now, unless it may be to indulge a love of novelty which seems to commend itself to the minds of many men?

Now, practically, it seems to me, there is a great deal of difficulty in combining all the courts into one. It seems to me there would be difficulty all the time about calendars. If we had ten or twelve calendars all in our court. There would be difficulty in chamber business if we were all obliged to run pell-mell into one court, or one or two branches of the same court, for the dispatch of chamber business. There are difficulties in all things in getting them too large. There is a limit to the capacity of doing business. There is always a limit to the size of public offices and public employments.

But there is another consideration. I believe it to be of great importance to the members of the Bar that they should have different tribunals in which to bring their cases. I have heard members of the city of New-York who were men of standing were afraid to bring their cases in the Supreme Court. It has happened before now that men who had brought their cases in the Supreme Court, terrified by the presence of Barnard and Cardozo, were anxious to transfer them to other tribunals. And it is a fact which can be attested by the public records that some of the most important cases brought in the Supreme Court in those days were transferred to the Common Pleas, where, instead of being confronted by Barnard and Cardozo, the lawyers were confronted by Charles P. Daly and Joseph F. Daly and Hamilton W. Robinson and Charles H. Van Brunt and Richard L. Larremore. They felt safe there, and they did not feel safe in the court where they had originally brought their cases.

Now, these things may occur again. I don't know that they will, but it is nevertheless a safeguard and a protection to have your option of going into one court or another in troublous times, when it becomes important to select a tribunal with reference to securing justice for your client.

CHANGES SUGGESTED.

My choice would be to leave these courts exactly as they are. But if that be impossible, if there is a desire to change, I think a change ought to be made rather upon the lines of business. If I were going to make any changes, the change I would suggest would be something like this: I should give to the Supreme Court complete jurisdiction at law and in equity; that is, I would transfer to the Supreme Court all litigated business; give it all the jurisdiction which it can possibly desire in cases at law and in equity. Of course, I would give it control of the special proceedings that naturally belong to it. I would give it the power of issuing prerogative writs, mandamus and certiorari and the others, prohibition, just as they are now. And then I would create another court, which might be called the Court of the Domestic Relations. I would take the Court of Common Pleas and unite it with the Surrogate's Court. I would make that court a court having exclusive jurisdiction over the probate of wills and the administration of estates, and over the relation of guardian and ward, and over the care of lunatics and of husband and wife, including the custody of children and matters of divorce, providing it, of course, with a jury. I would make it control the business's accountings; in other words, I would make it a court in which all the accountings should be done. Wherever there is an accounting of a fiduciary character I would transfer it to that court. Not that I would interfere with the ordinary trustee, but I mean that wherever there was an executor or an assignee or a guardian or any duties of that kind, I would transfer that to a court by itself. Now, my idea in doing that very largely is this: That it occurs to me that the watching and supervision of the estates of infants and lunatics and decedents should be the constant business of men who do nothing else, and that it is extremely unsafe, extremely undesirable, to leave the settlement of executors' accounts and guardians' accounts to judges who are to-day holding a trial term in maybe a criminal court, and to-morrow called in to act as a Surrogate or a Master of Accounts. It seems to me that men devoting themselves entirely to the business of accountings are infinitely safer and better for the discharge of those duties than men who are occasionally trying a suit in equity and another trying a criminal case.

And then again, I would create another court. I would leave the Court of General Sessions as it is, but give it exclusive jurisdiction of criminal cases, and I would let it have its general term. Then it seems to me, there would be no conflict of jurisdiction. Each court would have its own work to do, each court could be limited to its own sphere, and, it seems to me, that men who are devoting themselves entirely to one branch of the profession would require a skill and proficiency in dispatching the business that cannot be expected of men who are passing their time partly in one case and partly in another.

With regard to the Court of Appeals, some say there ought not to be a divisional court. Some say the business is so complicated in the Court of Appeals, so unevenly divided, so peculiarly complicated, that it would be impossible to divide it, and that, therefore, a divisional court ought not to be created. Now, I would not have any permanent division of the court. But it occurs to me it would be an extremely good thing if the court could of itself, when its business required it, detail two or three judges to transact a particular line of business which happened to be pressing upon its hands.

Now, for instance, a court of that sort would be expansible. It would open, divide itself, three judges might, for instance, be appointed to clear off a particular part of the calendar depending upon the order of business; three other judges another part of the calendar, when they had accomplished that they go back to the court again, or whenever they are called back. And then, again, it is said that any arrangement of that kind would necessarily produce conflict of decision. That is not so. There is no necessity for any conflict of decision in a divisional court. Suppose a divisional court makes a decision, for instance, in an action for divorce, or a probate of a will, or what you please. If any decision is to conflict with the course of decisions, what could be done? Why, James date'y bring it to the notice of the full court and ask for a rearrangement, and if there is any incongruity or any conflict it can be corrected. That could be done in each individual case.

That brings me to the last thing I want to say, and that is this: Is there not some way in which the Bar can be saved buying their decisions which are going to be reversed? What on earth is the use of paying for decisions, and sometimes paying for them two or three times over when you know to a certainty, when matters prove that 19 per cent of them are going to be reversed? Is it not, if for the law it have been? Now, I know perfectly well it may be said it is very necessary to have the decisions of the Supreme Court, but are reversals of the Common Pleas and of the Superior Court, and it seems to me entirely unnecessary to pay for them. I say there ought to be some way devised, and I think it is for the profession to devise it, by which they may be relieved from the burden of buying these reports that are going to be reversed. It does not always follow that the Court of Appeals is always right and that the lower court is always wrong. Take our General Term of the Superior Court. Here are two excellent men, Judge Parker and Judge Bullett, who were both members of the Court of Appeals a little while ago, and when they get down to the General Term they are reversed like everybody else.

NATIONAL SOCIETY S. A. R.

THE ANNUAL CONGRESS TO BE HELD IN WASHINGTON TO-DAY.

Washington, April 29 (Special).—The annual congress of the patriotic National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution will be held in this city to-morrow. The delegates will be the guests of the large and thriving District of Columbia branch of the order in the social features of the occasion. Delegates are gathering from all parts of the country, some of them being already here from the Pacific Coast. The majority will arrive by the Monday morning trains. The congress will be composed of about a hundred representatives including a number of prominent public men.

This is the society whose local branch in California originated, in 1875, this whole movement for societies of this class. The Sons of the American Revolution admit none except lineal descendants of the men of 1776-83 to membership. There are no "collateral" descendants in any of the societies of the S. A. R., and the careful inspection of credentials and rigid requirements of admission have given such special value to membership that every one of the societies is growing year by year. A remarkable number of men of high position are members of the S. A. R., and in addition about three hundred officers of the Army and Navy.

In this congress the following States will be represented: Maine, New-Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New-York, New-Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, Arkansas, Kansas, Nebraska, Utah, Washington, Oregon, California, District of Columbia, Virginia, Kentucky, Louisiana, South Carolina and several others, comprising a membership of more than forty-five hundred. Several societies are in process of organization, and may possibly be represented.

The delegates from New-York State are Chauncey M. Depew, Robert B. Roosevelt, William P. Wadsworth, A. J. C. Fore, Edward P. Cue, General Ferdinand P. Earle, J. Warner Cutler and Henry Hall. The present officers of the National Society are: President-General, General Horace Porter, of New-York; vice-presidents, Chauncey M. Depew, General J. C. Breckinridge, U. S. A.; Judge Henry M. Shepard, of Chicago; Colonel Thomas M. Anderson, U. S. A., stationed on the Pacific Coast, and Henry C. Robbins, of Connecticut; secretary-general, Franklin Murphy, of Newark, N. J.; treasurer-general, Charles W. Haskins; registrar-general, A. Howard Clark, of the Smithsonian Institution; historian-general, Henry Hall; chaplain-general, Bishop Charles E. Cheney, of Chicago.

The Sons of the American Revolution have already distinguished themselves by much noteworthy public work, and have several new and interesting schemes on foot. They have secured from Congress the collection and indexing of the records of the American Revolution at Washington; established the annual celebration of June 14 as Flag Day, and promoted the construction of the great battle monument at Bennington and the statue of Stark in New-Hampshire. They are building a battle monument in Baltimore; have preserved as a permanent historical monument the headquarters of "Brother Jonathan" at Lebanon, Conn., and have marked the graves of soldiers of the Revolution in Massachusetts with bronze tablets. They took an exceedingly prominent part in the centennial of the cornerstone of the National Capitol at Washington, have secured the old Colonial City Hall in New-York from destruction, and held more than a hundred public celebrations of a patriotic character. The sentiment which brings the members together awakens their enthusiastic attachment, and promises to secure the doing of many things of a public character which have heretofore been left to the spasmodic efforts of individuals.

SON OF A WEALTHY MERCHANT HELD FOR THEFT

Charles Gaffney, thirty-three years old, son of Richard Gaffney, the wealthy retired leather merchant, of No. 127 West One-hundred-and-twenty-ninth-st., was committed in $1,000 bail by Police Justice Burke in the Yorkville Police Court yesterday morning on a charge of stealing a pocketbook and $85 cash and a number of railway passes, the property of William Hoey, the superintendent of the Adams Express Company, living at No. 162 West Seventy-fourth-st. Gaffney, who is an electrician, doing business at No. 938 Amsterdam-ave., went to the Hoey house on Saturday afternoon to look after some bells that he had lately repaired. The family was at luncheon, and Gaffney, getting permission of the servant, went upstairs to view his work. Shortly after he had gone Mrs. Hoey missed her husband's pocketbook, which she had placed in her bureau drawer a short time before.

She reported the case at the West Sixty-eighth-st. station, and Detectives Wawne and Walters were detailed to work it up. They arrested Gaffney at his home with his wife and baby at 6:30 p. m. He denied the allegations of Mrs. Hoey. When searched only about $8 was found on him. At the police station the prisoner was identified by Ellie Hawkinson, the cook for Mrs. Chaplin, at No. 423 West End-ave., as the man who on March 25 stole her pocketbook and $33 from her dress pocket in the kitchen closet at Mrs. Chaplin's, where he had been doing some work. She did not say how she knew he stole it, further than that she missed it after he had been there. Gaffney has several brothers who are well-known lawyers. His father bailed him out.

Practical Results—13 Years' Work.

EIGHTEEN MILLION ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY THOUSAND DOLLARS ALREADY PAID TO WIDOWS AND ORPHANS.

Forty Million Dollars already saved being policy holders by reduction of premiums. Eighty Thousand paying Members. Two Hundred and Sixty Million Dollars insurance in force. Three Million Six Hundred Thousand Cash Surplus—Reserve—Emergency Fund. More than Sixty Million Dollars new business for the year 1893. These are a few practical results already recorded to the credit of the

MUTUAL RESERVE FUND LIFE ASSOCIATION.
H. B. HARPER, President.
Home Office, 38 Park Row, N. Y.

Send for circulars and rates.

IF THE WOMEN HAD VOTED.

THEY WOULD HAVE BEEN CALLED UPON TO TELL THEIR EXPERIENCES.

WHAT MIGHT HAVE BEEN BROUGHT OUT BY THE LEXOW COMMITTEE—SAD TALES OF FEMININE DISTRESS.

If the word "male" had been struck out of the State Constitution prior to the election last November, the following might have been the report of a session of the Senate Committee engaged in investigating the Police Department:

The committee met as the County Court House with all of the members, Senators Lexow, Saxton, Robertson, Pound, Bradley, ex-Senator and "Uncle Dan" Bradley, present. Mr. Sutherland appeared as counsel for the committee, and ex-District-Attorney De Lancey Nicoll looked after the interests of the Police Department. The first witness called was Mrs. Silas B. Bluestocking, of Madison-ave.

Q.—Mr. Sutherland—Your name is Mrs. Silas B. Bluestocking? A.—I prefer to be called Mrs. Priscilla Alzada Bluestocking. I know of no reason why my identity, even my name, should be merged in that of my husband.

Q.—Well, Mrs. Bluestocking, you were a watcher at the polls on Election Day last November, were you not? A.—I was. I do not shrink from any public duty. I believe in women's complete equality with man, and I see no reason why a woman should not be a watcher as well as a man.

Mr. Sutherland, suavely—Certainly, certainly. But it is not necessary to discuss such things here. All we want is the facts. At what place were you a watcher? A.—At the First Election District of the 101st Assembly District.

Q.—Did you see any improper conduct on the part of the police? A.—Well I should say I did. It was disgraceful, sir, simply disgraceful. As I told my husband——

Mr. Sutherland—Never mind what you told your husband. Just state the facts as they occurred. A.—The witness—Well, anyway, I told him that if that was a sample of the way men held elections, it was high time the women should take charge.

ALL ABOUT HER MAUVE GLOVES.

Q.—Now, Mrs. Bluestocking, will you not tell us what you saw? A.—Certainly. I went to the polling-place at 6 o'clock in the morning, before daybreak. I remember it was dark because I couldn't tell before I got out of the carriage whether I had taken my mauve or my slate-colored gloves. I intended to take my mauve gloves because——

Mr. Sutherland—Well, you got to the polling-place. The witness—Because my mauve gloves were slightly soiled. You interrupted me, sir, in the middle of a sentence. That will not happen when women have control of the courts.

Mr. Sutherland (sotto voce)—Won't it? (Aloud) I beg your pardon. I only wanted to——

The witness (with hauteur)—I can tell the whole truth, sir, without being interrupted. The polling place was a vile den. It was in an old barber shop and there was a liquor store on each side of it. A perfectly disreputable place, such as no woman should be called upon to go to. I show in my credentials to the policeman there and started to go inside the guardrail. He put his arm out, right across my face, that big, burly policeman did, and he said: "Yer can't go in here, see. Yer haven't any business here anyway, but if yer'll stay outside the guardrail and not make a disturbance, I won't run yer in."

"How dare you, sir," said I. "I have a right inside that guardrail, and I am going there. Don't you dare to stop me." I walked right in before he could hit the way. Then he gave up to me and said, "I don't wanter have no trouble with ye, but you've got yer right out." I refused to go, sir, because I had a right there, sir, and I believe in standing up for my rights always, sir. Then that brute, actually took hold of my arm and pushed me outside the guardrail. It was an outrage, sir. When the women——

Mr. Sutherland—Was there anybody else in the place beside yourself and the policeman? A.—Yes. The inspectors of the election were there, but they pretended to ask the other way. There was a woman voter in at the place also, and she told me, "You haven't learned yet, dearie, darlin'. Yer should have sat down on yer thirty cents per day (three) to improve yer." She was a woman of the lowest character.

MRS. MCSWATT'S TRIBUNE TO FORCE.

Q.—Did you remain outside the guardrail after that? A.—I did until Mr. John Saxine Smith came with Inspector Williams, and made them give me my rights. But it was force, sir, mere physical force that kept me out. When the women——

Q.—Did you remain at the polling place all day? A.—I did, I believe.

Q.—Did you see any irregularities with the voting? A.—Hundreds of them. Some men voted two or three times, and some women did, too. That creature was spoke to me when the officer put me outside the guardrail voted twice. She didn't have been put up to it by——

Q.—Did you see her cast two ballots? A.—No. But I know she did.

Q.—How do you know? A.—Because I know she did. She was a——

Q.—Do you recall any other specific violations? A.—Oh, I cannot remember about any case. I just remember in general what occurred. As I told my husband——

Mr. Sutherland (resignedly)—Your witness.

Q.—(to Mr. Nicoll, exhibiting signs of fatigue)—How old are you? A.—(briskly and distinctly)—Fifty is.

Q.—Married? A.—Certainly, sir.

Q.—What is your husband's business? A.—He has retired from business.

Q.—When did he retire? A.—Ten years ago.

Q.—How do you have you been devoting your time to public affairs? A.—Eleven years. I did not see the light until late in life.

Q.—Your husband saw a light sooner than did? A.—My husband, sir, is too intelligent a man to wish to keep me from the broad field of the world into which women are justly entitled to enter.

Mr. Nicoll—Of course, after you saw a light and went into public life, your husband saw a light and retired from business, I understand. Are you a Republican? A.—I am.

Q.—Are you a Mugwump Republican or a Bliss Republican?

Mr. Sutherland—I object.

Mr. Lexow—The objection is sustained. The witness has testified that she is a Republican. That was perfectly proper, proper as showing possible bias. But no useful purpose can be subserved by taking factional differences in the party.

Mr. Nicoll—I was only asking questions to test the credibility of the witness.

The witness—Test my credibility. That is so to-said, sir. I will not answer any more of your questions. I will leave the witness stand this minute.

Mr. Lexow—You must not do that.

Mr. Nicoll—I apologize if I offended you. Now did you make any complaints about the wrongdoing you saw on Election Day? A.—Yes. I told my husband and Mrs.——

Q.—I mean to the authorities? A.—No.

Q.—Why not? A.—Well, I was ill for seven weeks after election and when I got well I thought it was too late.

Mr. Nicoll—That is all.

MISS FRAIDCAT WAS INTIMIDATED.

Mr. Sutherland—Will the chairman of this committee call as the next witness Miss Prudence Fraidcat.

Mr. Lexow—Is Miss Fraidcat present?

Mr. Sutherland—I wish to call the committee's attention to the fact that Miss Fraidcat has been regularly subpoenaed to appear as a witness and has refused to come. I desire to make an example of her. I ask that the sergeant-at-arms be sent to find her and to warn her that if she continues her refusal to appear she will be prosecuted before the bar of the Senate. I want no intimidation of witnesses to be practised here.

Mr. Lexow—The sergeant-at-arms is directed to find Miss Fraidcat and make this announcement to her.

Mr. Sutherland—Thank you. I will now call Mrs. Petit Charmer. Mrs. Charmer, you live in the silk—er—hat district, do you not? A.—I live in Central Park West.

Q.—Did you vote last November? A.—Yes, after a great deal of trouble.

Mr. Sutherland—State your experience.

The witness—Well, I didn't want to vote at all in the first place, but my husband and some of my friends told me I really ought to, so I registered. I went to the polling-place about noon on Election Day and I was almost scared to death. I told the clerk my name, and he said: "You've voted once."

"Oh," said I, "you are mistaken. I haven't really."

"Well, your name's checked and you can't vote," said the clerk.

"I knew that I had got into one of those horrid cheating things that they have in politics, and I didn't know what to do, so I burst right out crying. As soon as I got back to my house I wrote to my husband that he must come right uptown and protect me, because I was going to be arrested. Well, he came up, and he was awfully angry, and he said I should vote or he'd know the reason why. I tried to get him not to do anything, because I didn't want to vote after all that, but he insisted on getting a mandamus and going with me to the polling-place and making those cheating people receive my vote. But I'll never vote again, not even to please my husband. Oh, it was terrible!

Mr. Sutherland—You felt that a great indignity had been heaped upon you, of course?

The witness—I should say I did. And the worst of it all was that the woman who voted on my name, as I found out afterward, was a perfect fright.

SHE WANTED TO VOTE FOR SCHIEREN.

Miss Flossie Tintinabulator, a pretty, jaunty typewriter girl, was next called to the witness chair.

Q.—(By Mr. Sutherland)—Miss Tintinabulator, did you vote at the last general election? A.—I guess so.

Q.—Don't you know? A.—Not for sure. You see the policeman who helped me prepare my ballot sort of rattled me, but I think I voted.

Q.—Well, now tell the committee all about your experience at the polling place. A.—When I went into the place there was a policeman standing close to the rail.

Q.—Do you know his name? A.—Oh, no. I never was introduced to him, you know, but I remember he had blue eyes and a blond moustache. A homely little man with a squint eye handed me my ballots and told me to go inside a little place and fix up my vote. The policeman followed me into the booth. I was scared then, you know, and I thought he had a right to come in and help me.

"How're ye goin' to vote?" said he.

"I'm an Independent," said I. "I am going to vote for just whom I please, if my young man is a Democrat. I am going to vote for Mr. Bartlett because he has such a lovely name—they're my favorite pears. Then I'm going to vote for Mr. Schieren because——"

"Yer dead wrong," said the policeman. "Schieren ain't a candidate here. You want to vote the straight Tammany ticket."

"I know better," said I. "Mr. Schieren is a candidate, and he's a good man, who hasn't been in politics before." You know politics makes all of us corrupt after we've been in it a length of time.

"Look at your ballots," said the policeman, "and you'll see Schieren's name ain't down."

I looked and didn't find Mr. Schieren's name, and I told him that I knew Mr. Schieren was a candidate, because I had read about him in the papers, and he was trying to fool me because I hadn't ever voted before, and I said if I couldn't vote for Mr. Schieren I wouldn't vote for anybody; so there. Then the policeman chucked me under the chin—the audacity—and said: "Cheer up, little girl; I'll fix your ballot." And I told him if I couldn't vote for whom I wanted to, I didn't care what he did; and he said that was the proper spirit, and he took my ballots and he folded up one and put it in the box, and he said: "Now, you've voted right." That was my first experience with voting. I don't believe that it was the policeman who wouldn't let me vote for Mr. Schieren. I think it was that ugly little man with the squint eye who wouldn't give me the right ticket.

MRS. MCSWATT, TAMMANY LEADER.

Mr. Sutherland—I will now call Bridget A. McSwatt. Mrs. McSwatt, you are associate Tammany leader of the VIth Assembly District, are you not? A.—Oi am, sorr.

Q.—How did you come to be chosen associate leader of the district? A.—Well, when ther wimmin got their rights, Misther Croker decoided to distribute the buoiness mon who were associate leaders by business wimmin, so, mesiff, bein' a prominent business wimmin of the VIth, was appointed. And Misther Croker sez to me himself, sez he: "Don't be afraid av Johnny Simpson"—but that's another story.

Q.—You say Mr. Croker did all this? A.—Shure, O, begorry! but I bespoke; mesiff. Av coorse Misther Croker didn't do it; it was the voice av the people spokin' through Tammany Hall. Now yez hav' it right.

Q.—Was it the voice of the people which made the remark about Johnny Simpson? A.—Yez, a-foolin' me. Shure, I said nothin' about Johnny Simpson, at all, at all.

Q.—So you were selected as a business woman. What was your business? A.—I was in the laundhry bizness.

Q.—Where was your laundry? A.—At me home.

Q.—Oh, you took in washing. A.—I was engaged, sorr, in ther noble wurrk av preservin' cleanliness, which is next to godliness.

Mr. Sutherland—I see. And you are now engaged in washing political lines. You are president of the Bridget A. McSwatt Association, are you not? A.—I hov that annerr.

Q.—How many members has the association? A.—I shwing 1,500 votes.

Q.—What do you mean by "swinging" votes? A.—Shure, the members all voote for ther organization's candidates.

Q.—As associate Tammany leader of the VIth Assembly District, you have charge of the distribution of some of the patronage, do you not? A.—Yez, sorr.

Q.—I don't suppose you have ever tried to get any members of your association upon the police force, have you? A.—Indade not. They're all ladies, sorr.

Q.—Did you ever try to get any of their husbands upon the force? A.—Maybe I did, one or two.

Q.—How many applications have you made to Mr. Croker? A.—Half a dozen, parhaps.

MR. CROKER'S LADIES' PARLOR.

Q.—How many husbands of members of your association has Mr. Croker had put on the force at your request? A.—Shure, not more than tin.

Q.—Did he appoint ten men on six applications? A.—I must have made more than six applications.

Q.—How about brothers and sons and cousins and other relatives? A.—Not more than twinty.

Q.—And Mr. Croker did all this, did he? A.—Shure, now, I waz jokin' when I sez "Misther Croker." Av coorse, he didn't do it. It was ther Police Commissioners that did it, because they was all good min that I recommended.

Q.—Well, now, without "joking," how many times have you been to see Mr. Croker? A.—Wunst.

Q.—And did you have to wait in line? A.—Indade, yez. Now that wummin has ther rights, Misther Croker has a ladies' waiting-room, all by itself, where yez can go and wait lady-like as yez plaze.

Q.—Did you ever recommend anybody for the police force who was not a member of Tammany Hall? A.—I did not.

Q.—And you've only been to see Mr. Croker once? A.—Well, now, a little mather of a few times more or less don't make much difference.

"Uncle Dan" Bradley—Mrs. McSwatt, you appear to be pretty intelligent, quite as intelligent as Mr. Rokoko. I presume you also are acquainted with the meaning of the term "mental reservation."

Mrs. McSwatt—Shure, I think it means a timinint to rint in the upper story.

"Uncle Dan" Bradley—Dismiss!

As soon as the laughter had subsided the assemblyman-at-arms (retired) and reported that Miss Fraidcat had escaped to Newchoppy, where the women vote not, neither do they have to appear before investigating committees.

NEW RESORTS ON THE JERSEY COAST.

DARLINGTON AND LOCH ARBOUR ARE GROWING FAST—ATTRACTIONS OF KIRKBRIDE.

Elberon, N. J., April 29 (Special).—This section of the Atlantic coast is dotted with some of the prettiest seaside resorts on the entire shore front of the ocean, and more are coming, so that it will only be a short while before the whole stretch of seaboard will be strung with a continuous series of beautiful and restful beach resorts. Among those commanding attention and challenging admiration now is the little settlement whence this letter is dated. It is diminutively a village by the sea of imposing villas, homelike cottages and churches, of which there are two; no stores or other places of business, absolutely no nuisances, and only one hotel, The Elberon, of which J. V. Jordan is proprietor. The opening day of the hotel is announced for June 1. Many alterations and improvements have been made in this house since last season.

This is the summer home of the Pullmans, Drexels, Cortlises, Fahnestocks, and other solid families who sway the fashionable world. Spacious lawns handsomely inclosed in hedges of boxwood heather and other hardy shrubbery are quite evidences of the high cultivation that abounds, while broad, well-gravelled avenues are the rule and not the exception.

Henry Hilton, jr., has leased the Drexel cottage for the coming summer. D. Crawford Clark, of New-York, has rented one of L. B. Brown's cottages; Oliver Harriman, jr., of New-York, has taken another of Mr. Brown's cottages on the ocean front. Mrs. Dudley Field has leased the handsome Headbrook villa. S. M. Felton, of Cincinnati, who has leased for the season one of L. B. Brown's cottages in ocean-ave., contemplates an early departure with his family from their Western home. James T. Gleason, of New-York, has rented Dr. Thomas's property, and will bring his family down in the course of a month.

Immediately to the south of this place, about one mile distant, another new paradise by the sea has sprung into existence within a year and a half. It is known as Darlington, in compliment to its founder and owner, D. S. Darling, formerly of Detroit. Although only eighteen months old as a modern seaside resort, it is in fact the oldest summer ocean place on the New-Jersey coast, having been formerly well known as Deal Beach. The old Hathaway House, for over four decades conducted by members of the family bearing that name, has entertained the most distinguished people. To-day it makes way for the march of progress, and is being transformed into a hotel of mammoth proportions, supplied with every modern appliance, while yet retaining all of its outside and many of its inside evidences of antiquity and rural life. The hotel, under new management will be ready for the reception of guests about the middle of June.

On this pretty piece of the ocean bluff there has already been erected about twenty of the finest and most imposing seaside dwellings to be found in the land. They are commodious, on good-sized plots of ground, nicely laid out, and built in the most substantial manner of rock-trimmed limestone, varying in color sufficiently to relieve the monotony of the view. Stables built of the same material are appurts of every villa, and are built with the same care to detail and solidity as characterizes the work on the villas. These handsome homes seem to find ready purchasers and easier leasees, notwithstanding the hard times.

Through all the streets water and gas mains have been laid, the sidewalks stone-curbed, and the roads thoroughly gravelled and rolled. The property upon which this new resort stands extends along the ocean on a high bluff, about half a mile in length, and directly on the ocean front, stretching up and down this distance, has been laid out in a beautiful park.

Adjoining this property is another portion of the original tract so long known as Deal Beach which, for the last ten years, has been known on the boat maps as Loch Arbour. Here also has been set up a model seaside resort, with all the acceptable restrictions, and the same conditions of exclusiveness belonging to the other two places. Numerous pretty cottages, an Episcopal chapel and one hotel, the Throckmorton, now constitute this community of summer residents. The hotel is a spacious modern structure, directly facing on the main road leading from Long Branch to Asbury Park, with the rear of the hotel affording a full view of the ocean.

Recently Dr. Samuel Johnson, a wealthy physician of Asbury Park, has acquired the sole ownership of all unsold lots, and has begun new the work of improvement that has been lagging for several years owing to some vexatious litigation with former part owners.

The north side of Deal Lake, which is the southerly boundary of this resort, is to have a stone abutment built around it which will greatly enhance the beauty and safety of the drive that skirts this pretty sheet of water.

Among the New-York business men having properties here who are preparing to open up house for the summer may be mentioned John N. Beach, William Creighton, J. E. Smith, H. S. Knight, J. E. Manley, William P. Aldrick, and N. H. Hudson.

Captain Lambert Edwards and Mrs. Richard Stout are both building handsome new cottages for occupancy the coming season.

TO OPEN THEIR NEW MEDICAL SCHOOL.

The formal opening of the new building for the New-York Post-Graduate Medical School and Hospital, Second-ave. and Twentieth-st., will be held to-morrow, from 2 until 6, and from 8 until 10 p. m. The medical school and hospital will be open for inspection during these hours, except from 8:30 to 9:30 o'clock, when exercises will be held in the reading-room. There will be a prayer by the Rev. Dr. Marvin R. Vincent, and addresses by the president, Dr. D. B. St. John Roosa; the Rev. Dr. William R. Huntington and St. Clair McKelway. There will be a short service in the babies' wards at 4 p. m. Tea will be served in the orthopedic ward.

There's no Danger

to be feared, even if you do use too much Pearline in the washing. If there's any danger of damage at all, it's when you use too little. In that case, you'll have to begin that dreadful rubbing—and carloads of Pearline couldn't do as much damage to your clothes as that will. Follow the directions on the package—that's the best way of all. But remember, too much won't hurt anything. It's only a waste of good Pearline.

Beware Peddlers and some unscrupulous grocers will tell you "this is as good as" or "the same as Pearline." IT'S FALSE—Pearline is never peddled; if your grocer sends you an imitation, be honest—send it back. 429 JAMES PYLE, New York.

GOOD NEWS FOR FAT FOLK.

THESE THINGS DO AND THOU SHALT GROW LEAN.

PRINCE BISMARCK'S PRIVATE PHYSICIAN REDUCES FLESH—ONE MUST EXERCISE AND DIET.

From The London Daily Telegraph.

Professor Schweninger is Prince Bismarck's private and private medical adviser, and although his reputation in his own country rests upon a widely different footing, this alone should entitle him to be heard with respect wherever he has a consolatory message to deliver to sick and suffering humanity. In late years he has devoted his attention to the O. annihilation of the ills to which well-fed flesh is heir, and has published his views in an article entitled "Obese and Cures." His treatment of obesity is the outcome of his views on its nature and origin. As to the causes that produce embonpoint, Professor Schweninger holds that they are legion; among the most frequent and efficacious, however, he enumerates mental indolence—leanness being a characteristic of the thinker; lack of physical exercise, a sedentary life, too much sleep, badly lighted and badly ventilated rooms, which promote corpulency by impeding the organic process of combustion; abuse of this aggravation are illnesses after meals, a sensation of pressure, short, quick breathing, later on a feeling of anxiety bordering on dread, pains in the region of the heart, which often extend to the throat, and the foreboding of some impending calamity. Furthermore, the sounds produced by the lungs grow weaker as fat accumulates, and the beating of the heart becomes less perceptible. The narrowing of the space needed by the organs of the chest impedes the movements of the heart and produces palpitation. That vital organ can no longer