

NEW YORK HERALD

BROADWAY AND ANN STREET.

JAMES GORDON BENNETT, PROPRIETOR.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.—On and after January 1, 1875, the daily and weekly editions of the New York Herald will be sent free of postage.

THE DAILY HERALD, published every day in the year. Four cents per copy. Twelve dollars per year, or one dollar per month, free of postage, to subscribers.

All business or news letters and telegraphic despatches must be addressed New York Herald.

Letters and packages should be properly sealed.

Rejected communications will not be returned.

LONDON OFFICE OF THE NEW YORK HERALD—NO. 46 FLEET STREET.

PARIS OFFICE—RUE SCRIBE. Subscriptions and advertisements will be received and forwarded on the same terms as in New York.

VOLUME XL.....NO. 193

AMUSEMENTS TO-NIGHT.

- OLYMPIC THEATRE. No. 24 Broadway.—Variety, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.
FIFTH AVENUE THEATRE. Twenty-ninth street and Broadway.—THE BIG BO. 8:30 A. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.
CENTRAL PARK GARDEN. THEODORE THOMAS' CONCERT, at 8 P. M.
METROPOLITAN THEATRE. No. 285 Broadway.—Variety, at 8 P. M.
WALLACK'S THEATRE. Broadway.—THE GOSFORDS, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.
BROOKLYN PARK THEATRE. VARIETY, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.
ROBINSON HALL. West Sixteenth street.—English Opera.—GROFLE-GRIOFFA, at 8 P. M.
WOODS MUSEUM. Broadway, corner of Truitt street.—LITTLE EXHIBITION, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.
GILMORE'S SUMMER GARDEN. 45th Street, between Broadway and Avenue C.—GRAND PUPPET CONCERT, at 8 P. M.; closes at 11 P. M. Ladies and children's admission at 5 P. M.
CONWAY'S BROOKLYN THEATRE. MAD'S FAITH, at 8 P. M. Miss Minnie Palmer.
METROPOLITAN MUSEUM OF ART. West Fourth street.—Open from 10 A. M. to 5 P. M.
PARK THEATRE. Broadway.—EMERSON'S LECTURE MINSTRELS, at 8 P. M.

TRIPLE SHEET.

NEW YORK, TUESDAY, JUNE 15, 1875.

From our reports this morning the probabilities are that the weather to-day will be warm and clear or partly cloudy.

Persons going out of town for the summer can have the daily and Sunday Herald mailed to them, free of postage, for \$1 per month.

WALL STREET YESTERDAY.—Stocks were unsettled but showed an advancing tendency. Gold sold at 110 1/2 a 110 3/4. Foreign exchange was firm. Money easy at 1 1/2 and 2 per cent in call.

THE UPPER HOUSE of the Prussian Diet has adjourned after withdrawing State grants to the Roman Catholic clergy. The policy of Bismarck has had another triumph in this urgent measure against the Church.

FROST IN JUNE is rare, even in these uncertain latitudes; but yesterday ice was formed on lakes in New York and Pennsylvania, and the crops were injured by the unseasonable phenomenon.

DEAD OIL as a DISINFECTANT.—The experiment of disinfecting the Harlem flats with dead oil is considered a failure. The river Rhine washes the dirty town of Cologne, but Coleridge, with good reason, asked:—"What power divine shall henceforth wash the river Rhine?" So with our own realm of small and disease.—Even if the dead oil could disinfect the flats, what agent shall be used to disinfect the oil?

CHAOTIC WATER has done almost as much to build up the prosperity of New York as any other element of its success. No city, perhaps, of equal population has a fuller and purer water supply than this. Yet the demand is so enormous that it requires the constant attention of the civil engineers of the department to give an adequate supply. Some of the recent difficulties of obtaining water in the lower part of the city are detailed to-day in a special report to the Herald, and show how a great calamity was averted.

THE PRIME FRONT soon to come off between Allen and Rooke, two noted pugilists, ought to be prevented by the authorities, but will not be. West Virginia has become the favorite field for these discreditable encounters, and Pittsburg, Pa., is obtaining an unenviable reputation as the headquarters of the rowdies and their friends. The reputation of that city is at stake, and it ought to be in the power of its authorities to prevent this contemplated act of brutality in the immediate neighborhood. Prize fighting has ceased to be a manly art and has become a blackguardly business, which only thieves and worse than thieves have any desire to encourage.

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.—To read of an era of good feeling in American politics is refreshing at this time, when the bitterness of partisan animosities is so great, and certainly the "Memoirs of John Quincy Adams" furnish a remarkable contrast to the existing condition of the United States. Presidential rivalries, the third term question, the disorganized society of the South, Sherman's book, which has been thrown like a firebrand into military circles, the Indians, all disturb the nation, but when we turn to these "Memoirs of John Quincy Adams" we find tranquility and more speculation as to the future than care for the present. The review elsewhere carefully analyzes a portion of the sixth volume of Mr. Adams' "Memoirs," and presents with force and picturesqueness all the salient points of that interesting work.

Political Parties and "The Independent Voter."

The meeting of John Cochrane's Liberal Republican State Committee at Albany, last week, and the resolution it adopted to hold a State convention, have given a fresh impulse to the recent gush and nonsense about "the independent voter" in certain journals which slipped their party cables after the great Greeley defeat in 1872, and have since been drifting about in search of a new political anchorage. These papers have failed, as yet, to comprehend the relations of independent journalism to politics. They have not emancipated themselves from the old notion that a public journal needs a special political constituency. They are acting like recently hatched chickens that wish to get back into the protecting shell. For a year or two they kept insisting that the democratic party, with which they had acted in the Greeley campaign, should disband and give place to a new organization, of which they would be the natural organs and through which they could re-establish the party relations which they had been forced into renouncing by the defeat of a movement which they intended and expected to lead. They did not profess independent journalism with deliberate forethought, from a conviction that journals are more useful when free from party trammels, but because their abortive attempt to form a new party had shattered their connection with the republicans, and the sentiments in which they had educated their readers did not permit them to join the democrats. None of the journals to which we allude suffered any diminution of prosperity by their disconnection from political parties, and we have looked upon this hankering for "the despots of Egypt" with regret and wonder. One of the most prominent of them went back, several months ago, into the republican party, and the others are still uneasy, blindly groping for some shred of a party which they may be thought to represent. The liberal republican organization, which they pioneered, having become virtually defunct, they now assume to be the organs of "the independent voter."

The independent voter may be left to take care of himself without a special wet nurse. If he pinned his political faith on any of these new nondescript organs he would be as service as when he followed them as organs of the republican party. Independence in politics consists in owning one's own judgment. It is as subject to be guided by an organ as to accept the dictation of a party. The really independent voter is a man who "steers by his own compass," and it is ridiculous for any newspaper to assume to be his organ. It is still more ridiculous to attempt to form the independent voters into a party. Parties cannot exist without organization and discipline; they cannot exist without some surrender of private judgment to the majority of the organization. The independent voter is a citizen who refuses to be bound by party ties, and it is sheer absurdity for any journal to treat him as if he belonged to a pocket party and needed an organ. The recent foolish gush about "the independent voter" is the last dregs of the unsuccessful movement to supplant the democratic party by a new political organization. Nobody who is a competent judge of present tendencies has any doubt that the Presidential contest of 1876 will be waged between the old democratic party and the republican party, which has been so long in power. Every attempt to form a successful third party has utterly broken down. The liberal republican party is a thin ghost hovering over a political grave ready to vanish at the first crowing of the cock. The farmers' movement in the West, which at one time seemed to portend a political revolution, has lost its aggressive vigor. It will hardly make a ripple in the elections of the present year, and next year it will be utterly lost in the great Presidential maelstrom. The republican party is too much weakened to afford another split, and the democratic party is too confident to court or encourage any separate movement. We are on the eve of a square, old-fashioned contest between the two great parties, in which the independent voter will be found on one side or the other. His independence will be manifested in changing his party relations if he dislikes the candidate or the platform of the party with which he has been accustomed to act. Practically, this is the only choice that will be left him, and it is mere thoughtless chatter to talk of the next Presidential election as if it were to be anything different from a struggle between the two existing parties, or as if the independent voter would have any influence in either of the national conventions by which the issues of that contest will be shaped. The sooner the hermaphrodite organs, which would like to be independent if they knew how, dismiss such nonsense from their columns the less they will confuse their readers.

They betray their misconception of independent journalism by assuming that it requires, or will lead to, a different method of conducting political contests from that which has heretofore existed. The Herald has been an independent journal for more than forty years, and may claim to have some knowledge of the requisites of independence. These forty years have brought a pretty constant succession of fierce political struggles, generally between two parties, although there have been sometimes three or four, and we have never found independent journalism difficult by reason of the division of the community into hostile party camps. We have unflinchingly told to both parties the truths which it most behooved them to consider. We have fairly published the speeches and documents of both, enabling our readers to form an independent and impartial judgment. We have exposed the abuses and done justice to the sound measures of both; but we never contemplated anything so fantastic and chimerical as the abolition of political parties, knowing that the government of a free country cannot be conducted without them. We have always regarded it as a public evil for the party in power to be so strong as to have no immediate fear of its adversary, since the most efficient check on bad government is the mutual watchfulness of rival parties powerful enough tooust each other by appeals to the people. "The independent voter" is no recent invention of callow journalists; he has always existed; he has always made himself felt in great emergencies; he has not exer-

ted his power by acting outside of parties, but with parties. He has had the courage to boldly change his party relations in obedience to his sense of the public interest, instead of hovering, as he is now advised to do, on the outskirts of both parties and demanding consideration for a pretence of neutrality. The Herald has always been willing to see citizens take sufficient interest in public questions to enlist on one side or the other, and has never perceived the necessity of coddling a special class of independent voters when experience has demonstrated that there are always citizens enough who have sufficient patriotism to change sides whenever there are strong reasons for putting the government into new hands. Independent journalism does not seek to annihilate parties or to establish a balance-of-power party, of which it seeks to be the organ, but simply to guide the public judgment in reliance on that large body of honest voters who have so many times in our history ejected and reinstated political parties. Voters of this class have always been pretty well distributed through both political organizations, and their power is exerted, not by standing aloof from ordinary politics, but by frankly changing sides when the public interest is betrayed by the party in power. It is a sham independence, either in voters or journals, that dars not support what is right lest Mrs. Grundy should accuse them of inconsistency. It does not yet appear which political party will best deserve support in the next great contest, but it is evident enough that there will be only two parties to that contest, and that all citizens who contribute to the result will vote with one or the other. The independent voter will not stand aloof, but act with one of the parties, and the most solid proof he can give of independence is by openly voting with former adversaries if he thinks it for the public interest. It is the duty and province of independent journalism to assist citizens of both parties in forming a correct judgment.

The Yachting Season.

Those who sail down our beautiful bay will see here and there far off on the horizon beyond Coney Island, or near the Highlands, or beyond the sea that breaks on Sandy Hook, white canvas flashing in the sunlight like the wings of gulls. Or as the idle traveller upon the steamboats that run from the Battery to Staten Island gazes upon the sunset he may hear the rush of waters and see the shadow thrown upon the waves as a mighty yacht bends its masts to the breeze, and passes by like a sudden apparition of swiftness and grace. Or along the pleasant shores of that fair island, which even now with its forests looks to us as it did two hundred years ago to the Dutch merchant who had his bumble home upon the shores of Manhattan, the traveller may see yachts, exquisite in form and lightness, quietly riding at anchor like the albatross asleep upon the sea. Everywhere the Bay of New York seems dotted with yachts of all sizes and styles, from the tiny boat which a zephyr might capsize, to the majestic ship which seems to defy the storm, and to have her destined march upon the mountain wave, her home upon the deep.

With such a harbor, with cruising grounds so fine, and with natural advantages which no other American city rivals, it is not to be wondered at that New York leads the yachting interests of the country. Our clubs are numerous and were never so prosperous as now. The season this year has begun auspiciously. Yesterday another event of interest was added to the list—that of the Corinthian sloop race of the Seawanhaka Club, which was won brilliantly by the Addie Voorhis. The entries we print for the regatta of the New York Yacht Club, which is to be sailed tomorrow, indicate another contest of unusual interest. The opening of the yachting season has been attended with all the spirit and popularity the friends of this noble sport could desire, and there is every prospect that 1875 will become memorable in yachting annals. A good breeze is all our yacht clubs ask; that granted, they will supply all else that is required themselves.

The American Team in Ireland.

Our riflemen have been safely landed on the shores of Ireland. Deputations from the Corporation of Dublin and from the Irish Rifle Association met them before they touched land, and welcomed them in the name of the Irish people. That these were no empty forms of welcome was shown by the enthusiastic ovation tendered the representatives of America by the populace. The telegraphic accounts say that "the Americans were escorted to Queenstown, and upon their arrival met with an enthusiastic reception from the population." Americans at all times are sure of kindly and hospitable greeting in Ireland; but then it is evident that the Irish masses look upon the present occasion as of peculiar importance and significance. The gentlemen of the American team are not looked upon so much as opponents anxious to carry off laurels as the representatives of a nation bound by ties of blood with the Irish people. Hence the warmth of the welcome offered to the American riflemen—a welcome that even kings could not command. Whatever the result of the coming trial of skill the visit of the American team cannot fail to strengthen the bonds of friendship between the two countries. It will also have a tendency to remove many prejudices which can be very well dispensed with. Some of the experiences of the Americans will perhaps surprise them, but in a little while they will become accustomed to the ways of the people among whom they are thrown. Almost on setting foot on land they had the honor to be enlisted among the noble band of ticket-of-leave men. It being contrary to British law for people to carry arms in Ireland, the police authorities furnished the visitors immediately on their landing with licenses or tickets of leave to carry arms while they remain in Ireland. This graceful little attention on the part of the London authorities will save the Americans from the danger of being marched off to jail by some officious policeman. We may, therefore, breathe freely, as all danger of political complications are at an end, and there is no longer any fear of our British cousins mistaking the American team for a Fenian army bent on the conquest of the Green Isle.

The New Evidence in the Beecher Case.

The statements of Mr. Leys, published in the Herald yesterday, and of the carpet layers, published in the Herald and Sun, have excited much attention. It does not yet appear what action counsel will feel it their duty to take in relation to these unexpected developments; for although Mr. Beach called attention to them at the opening of the Court yesterday morning and intimated that he would make some motion after the recess, the subject was not brought up again during the day. The Brooklyn Eagle, which has steadily championed the cause of Mr. Beecher with remarkable zeal and ability, devoted last evening the longest editorial we recollect to have seen in its columns on any subject to an attempt to weaken the statement of Mr. Leys, the druggist who sold a deadly poison to Mr. Beecher in May, 1871. It points out discrepancies between the testimony of Mr. and Mrs. Moulton on the subject of poison and the statement of Mr. Leys; but among its inferences from these discrepancies it fails to draw one which strikes us as important. The discrepancies prove that the story of Mr. Leys was not invented to support the testimony of Mr. Moulton and his wife. Had it been fabricated for that purpose its inventor would have made it tally with their statements. Prussic acid is a liquid, and the poison spoken of by Mrs. Moulton was a powder. This is the main discrepancy; but there are several minor ones, and taken together, they preclude the hypothesis that the story of Mr. Leys is an invention intended to match with and corroborate the evidence on the subject of poison given in court. It wears the appearance of a fact stated precisely as it occurred, without any attempt to accommodate it to the exigencies of the case.

Besides this circumstantial confirmation of its genuineness there is another, more direct, which is furnished by the Eagle itself. It sent a reporter to Whitestone, where the druggist who sold the poison now resides, and Mr. Leys repeated his statement of the sale and exhibited the ledger in which it was charged with several other articles. The Herald, therefore, anticipated the Eagle by an interval of only ten hours in publishing the main features of the story.

We can perceive no warrant for the tone of complaint and invective in certain quarters at the publication of such facts. If these statements are true they ought not to be suppressed; if they are false it is in the interest of truth to put them forth, so that they can be met and exploded. As Hildreth, the historian, says, in his remarks on the old Seditious law, it is better that such things assume a definite printed shape; "especially if printed in newspapers and pamphlets they can hardly fail to come to the speedy notice of the party concerned, whereas spoken slanders circulate privately behind a man's back and may do irretrievable injury before their existence is known; and even when it is known, the fleeting and changing shape of all merely oral declarations may often occasion great difficulty in grasping them for refutation." In accordance with this sound line of remark we took pains to sift this poison story as soon as its secret circulation came to our knowledge, and we succeeded in tracing it to its original source and putting it on record, for easy refutation if there was no good evidence to support it. Our publication yesterday narrowed it down to a single witness and enabled the friends of Mr. Beecher to go directly to that witness and verify our report. If there is a mass of concealed facts it is better that they be brought to light and weighed before the trial ends, and not be held in reserve to destroy the moral effect of the verdict after it shall be rendered. If the counsel and Court deem the new facts important we suppose the case can be reopened for the admission of further evidence; but if on examination out of Court they are thought to possess no weight they will have no subsequent effect in unsettling public confidence in the verdict. We can see no sound moral objection to the publication of new facts in a case which has been so long obtruded on public attention.

There is one statement in the Eagle's telegram from Whitestone which will make an unpleasant impression. Mr. Leys, the druggist who sold Mr. Beecher the poison, is represented as saying to the Eagle reporter that "he never talked about it except to the physician of the village, Dr. Bloecker, and the latter is too honorable to say anything to the injury of Mr. Beecher." The purport of this is that it is an obligation of honor to suppress facts and stifle evidence if they make against the defendant. Without discussing this curious point of honor we may, perhaps, be pardoned for raising a question as to the extent to which it has been applied by the friends and partisans of Mr. Beecher. Do they make it a point of honor to smother evidence against him? Are there more facts of the same startling character as this purchase of poison, which the possessors have felt it obligatory to suppress and hide during the progress of the trial? Are Mr. Beecher's adherents in a tacit league with each other to smother and conceal the truth, and to pour out the vials of their hot indignation upon everybody who ventures to state what he knows? The temper they exhibit at the disclosure of Mr. Beecher's purchase of prussic acid proves that they would have suppressed this fact had it been in their power, and makes it credible that they would suppress other facts and all facts which are inconsistent with the theory of his innocence. If it should turn out that this policy of concealment has been so far successful as to have withheld from the jury evidence which might control their verdict is it the duty of the press or the duty of any lover of fair play to enter into their confederacy for hiding the truth? If Mr. Beecher's purchase of poison in 1871 has no proper bearing on the case his friends have no reason to object to its publication. But if it does bear on the case and is pertinent evidence justice and morals forbid its suppression. It is for counsel to judge, or, rather, it is for the Court to judge, if counsel should make an application to that effect, whether the new witnesses whose statements have at last come to light shall be brought into Court to testify and be cross-examined. If they have hitherto withheld important evidence from a false sense of honor that is surely no reason why the press should become their accomplices in concealment when the facts come to its knowledge. It was the clear duty of Mr. Leys to communicate Mr.

Beecher's purchase of poison to the counsel for the plaintiff before their evidence was closed; but his failure to act in the interest of justice is no excuse for initiating his bad example.

To-Day's Centennial.

It is not easy to keep the run of centenaries nowadays; and in these spring and summer months, when a century ago great events succeeded each other so rapidly, one is very apt to lose sight of substantial anniversaries. Of such is that which should be commemorated to-day. Without disparagement to the just bygone Lexington, the near-at-hand Bunker Hill and next year's Independence, let us never forget that this day, one hundred years ago—the 15th June, 1775—George Washington was made Commander-in-Chief of the Continental Army.

We know pretty well how the great choice was made, and that odd self-revelation, the diary of the elder Adams, tells us what risks were run about it. There was, we read, except, perhaps, in the case of General Ward, no professional or military rivalry, but there was sectional antagonism and civil aspirations. The great difficulty was in the East. "Mr. Hancock and Mr. Cushing," we read, "hung back; Mr. Paine did not come forward, and Mr. Samuel Adams was irresolute." The truth is, Hancock, who had never seen a battalion in the field, wanted to be Commander-in-Chief himself. When John Adams determined to support Washington's nomination, and did so, he tells us that "on Hancock's face mortification and resentment were expressed as forcibly as a face can exhibit them." The nomination strictly came from Maryland, though the suggestion is due to John Adams, whose high distinction it is, with all his defects, that to him we owe, in their respective high functions, George Washington as Commander-in-Chief, and twenty-five years later, at a peaceful crisis of almost as great moment, of John Marshall as Chief Justice.

All these risks were run, all these rocks and shoals avoided, and Washington was chosen, and instantly accepted—less than twenty-four hours intervening—the high trust conferred on him, which, while peril threatened, he never relinquished. More than eight years afterward, the "Independence and sovereignty" of the United States being secured, he returned his commission to the body which bestowed it, with words quite as solemn as those in which he announced the acceptance. "I close this last act" (how poorly did he forecast his future) "of my official life by commending the interests of our dearest country to the protection of Almighty God and those who have the superintendence of them to His holy keeping."

It was three days after his being commissioned—a hundred years ago next Friday—that Washington wrote to his wife the only letter of all of his to her which has survived, telling of what had been done. It is a modest, manly, affectionate and, if we may coin a word, husband-like letter, at the end of which we find a passage which seems to conflict with one of John Adams' assertions as to the antagonism of at least one of his Virginia friends. He tells his wife that he has made his will, and had employed his dear friend and colleague, Edmund Pendleton, to draw it.

Such are some of the thick coming memories and associations which crowd upon us as we think of the century which to-day expires. Let us do full honor, if only a reverential memory, to the 15th of June, 1775.

The Suicide Clause in Life Policies.

Life insurance has come to involve the interests of such multitudes of people that everything relating to the conditions which affect the contract is of great concern. A contemporary, speaking of some recent decisions, recommends to the companies "to so frame their contracts as to be clearly not liable for payment in the event of the death of the insured by suicide." We suppose that the most careful and prudent companies have gone as far as they can go in aiming to be free from liability when the insured puts an end to his own life. We happen to have before us at this moment four policies issued respectively by four of the best conducted companies in this country. The exception clause in the Mutual Life's policy is, "die by his own act or hand, whether sane or insane;" that of the Continental reads, "die by his own hand or the hands of justice;" that of the Equitable is, "die by his own hand within two years from the date hereof;" and that of the Travellers', of Hartford, runs, "shall die by suicide, felonious or otherwise, sane or insane." How much these various forms of excluding the risk of suicide from the risks of the policy tend to secure to the company absolute immunity in any and every case of suicide may, perhaps, admit of question. It is probably implied in every contract of life insurance that the insured will not put an end to his own life. But self-destruction is so liable to come to any man without that conscious intent which legal and ethical philosophy makes the test of wrong-doing that the courts have held that to constitute a suicide, which is to be followed by any legal consequence, the act must be premeditated and fully comprehended. The self-destruction of an insane person is not suicide in the legal sense. The Court of Appeals of this State, construing the terms "dies by his own hand" and "suicide," has held that they mean the same thing, and that both expressions refer to an act of criminal self-destruction—namely, one that is perpetrated under circumstances of moral responsibility. To avoid this discrimination has been the purpose of the clause which declares that the company shall not be liable if the insured shall "die by his own hand, whether sane or insane." This is an express stipulation on the part of the insured that if he dies by his own hand the company shall be absolutely exonerated from payment of the policy, even if he is morally irresponsible for his own death. Whether the law would regard such a contract as valid may possibly admit of question. On the one hand it may be said that there is some repugnance between the terms "suicide" or "death by his own hand" and "insanity." "Suicide," rightly defined, means in its legal sense the self-destruction of a sane person, and the self-destruction of an insane person is not "suicide." It might be contended, therefore, that the terms "sane or insane" are to be rejected as inoperative, and that the clause is to be interpreted as an avowal

ment that if the insured commits "suicide" or "dies by his own hand" the policy is to be payable or not payable according to the circumstances which make the death, in the legal sense, death by suicide or death by an act of insanity. On the other hand it may be said that it is competent to parties to make any contract that they see fit to make; that self-destruction by an insane person is one of the risks against which the underwriter chooses to guard, just as he chooses to guard against the risk of death by the hands of justice, and that the one is just as likely to occur as the other; and that when the contract is that the insurer shall not be liable if the insured "dies by his own hand, sane or insane," there is no repugnance, because the insane man who destroys himself in his insanity "dies by his own hand" as literally and legally as the man who puts an end to his own life in full possession of his reason. The Court of Appeals, in deciding the case to which we have referred, said that it was competent no doubt for the insurer so to frame his policy as to exempt him from liability for a death occasioned by a fit of insanity.

Upon the whole, however, we are inclined to think that the best course for life insurance companies to pursue in regard to this particular cause of death is to stipulate that they will not be responsible in case of suicide, leaving it to the law to determine what constitutes suicide. They would thus insure against death inflicted by the insured on himself in a fit of delirium, just as they insure against death by smallpox or any other disease; and we do not see why men may not properly seek and be allowed to have the continuance of their reason insured, as well as to insure the continuance of their health in any other respect. It is no more difficult for a competent medical examiner to estimate the present average soundness of a man's mind than it is to estimate the present average health of his body.

HUNG BY A MOB.—Lynching generally defeats its object, for it makes the criminal whom it illegally punishes from the agony of suspense. It gives him but a short and sudden shrift. The most appalling picture which even the imagination of Dickens conceived is that of Fagin in prison, counting the days and hours before his execution. Nor can any one imagine cruelty greater than that of the cold, heartless process of the laws, acting like a merciless, soulless machine. We think, therefore, that the men who forcibly took from jail at Annapolis, Md., the negro Simms, and hung him in chains to a tree, actually saved him from prolonged mental anguish at the cost of brief physical pain. Our correspondence gives a full account of this useless act of vengeance, which defeated justice, saved the victim many days of uncertainty and fear, and did nothing to vindicate the unfortunate victim of his brutality. The captured Indian tries to provoke his captors to kill him, in order that he may escape the slow torture of the stake; and in this case an outraged society has rendered the wretched negro the last favor he could ask from it—a speedy death.

THE COAL TROUBLES are ceasing to be troublesome. The miners are preparing to resume their work, and the strike is evidently at an end for a time. But that it will begin again is unfortunately almost inevitable under the present arrangements.

PERSONAL INTELLIGENCE.

- On the 1st of June ten rabid dogs were killed in Paris.
Secretary Bristow is the only member of the Cabinet now in Washington.
Attorney General Pierpont arrived in this city from Washington yesterday.
Frenchmen are disposed to fancy that obstinacy is only their equivalent for gin.
Assemblyman George West, of Ballston, N. Y., is stopping at the Grand Central Hotel.
Colonel Thomas P. Ochiltree, of Texas, is among the late arrivals at the Everett House.
Congressman Thomas C. Platt, of Oswego, N. Y., is registered at the Hoffman House.
Captain Edward Simpson, United States Navy, is reading temporarily at the Everett House.
Miss Lotta, the actress, arrived in this city yesterday and took up her residence at the Glenham Hotel.
Joseph Yernet valued his pictures by the square foot—125 francs a foot—of three feet by four, 1,500 francs.
Senator Aaron H. Cragin, of New Hampshire, arrived from Washington yesterday at the Westmoreland Hotel.
Congressman John O. Whitehouse, of Poughkeepsie, has returned to his old quarters at the Albemarle Hotel.
General Thomas H. Nell and Surgeon William S. King, United States Army, have arrived at the Fifth Avenue Hotel.
The King of Sweden has personally conferred the Order of the Seraph, the highest in Sweden, upon Prince Bismarck.
Mr. H. C. Johnson, United States Commissioner of Customs, arrived at the St. Nicholas Hotel last evening from Washington.
Captain Anderson, chief astronomer of the Boundary Commission, left for Ireland yesterday, the work of the Commission having been completed.
There is a political doctor in Paris, who says—"I prefer tyranny to license; for tyranny disgraces us with slavery only, but license disgraces us with liberty itself."
The municipal authorities of Paris have in consideration the project of organizing a life-saving brigade of Newfoundland dogs, to be posted all along the banks of the Seine.
Her Majesty has conferred the distinction of Companion of the Order of St. Michael and St. George upon Colonel John Dyde, the oldest militia officer in the Dominion of Canada.
The last man hanged wrote as follows to the Sheriff:—"Please admit my friend, Mr. W. S. Grady, to my hanging to-day, at one o'clock."
JUNE 4, 1875. ALFRED ARING.
On dit that the Prince Imperial, who will pass the summer at Arenenberg, in Switzerland, says that in its retirement he finds "the oil with which the athlete prepares his body for the struggle." Another historic epigram invented by some one else.
Karl Blind has written an essay on the "Cremation Customs of the Tonicic Races from Ancient Times," which is to appear in Fraser. Besides the historical quotations from classic, Scandinavian and old German sources, it will contain what may be termed the poetry of "Fireburial," as the German expression is.
The dispute on etiquette that now troubles the English court is between the Princess Beatrice and the Duchess of Edinburgh. The Duchess claims precedence as an Imperial Princess, but Beatrice will not yield the rights of the royal family; and the war is fierce. In consequence the two do not appear at the same ceremonies.
In the papers of Guizot there have been found some additions to his memoirs, written in 1849, in which details a conversation held that year with the Duchess of Sagan, the niece of Talleyrand, who spoke of the revolution of 1848 as not having produced a man; and the Duchess said she had met in Germany a little Pomaranian named Bismarck, who would be talked of some day, if he should live.