THE NEW YORK PRESS.

EDITORIAL OPINIONS OF THE LEADING COURNALS UPON CUBRERT TOPICS-COMPILED EVERY DAY FOR THE EVENING TELEGRAPH.

The Conflict of Civil and Military Au-

From the Herald. As the indications come from all points of the political compass, we perceive prepara-Hons for new strife between the various facfions. The party journals seem disposed to Involve the country in another quarrel. They are evidently eager for a light upon some issue, and they do not seem particular as to what it is. The removal of General Sheridan from his command in Louisiana and Texas, where he has apparently used his authority under the law of Congress with firmness allied to discretion, and we believe enjoys the full approbation of General Grant in the performance of his duties, forms a portion of the policy of one branch of the party press, and is just as earnestly resisted by the other. The decision of the Cabinet council restricting the functions of the Military Commanders of the Southern Districts, would seem to leave General Sheridan and the other four commanders shorn of their powers.

It is clear that military and civil authority cannot be coexistent. They cannot exercise co-ordinate jurisdiction. Either the military authority must have free scope to employ its functions as a police—which we regard it as now constituted in the South—and remove all obstructions to the proper enactments of the law, whether these obstructions appear in the shape of civil office-holders or private indi-viduals, or it must be abandoned altogether. Any attempt to harmonize the two systems must prove a failure. Hence the denial of the right of military commanders to remove civil officers brings the two authorities at once into conflict, and places the elements of the Federal and the State Governments in

We are not assured that the President has accepted the advice of his Cabinet on this question of the conflict between military and civil power. We can see through the clouds and storms that darken the horizon a pretty clear pathway. Let the programme set down in the laws of Congress tending to reconstruction be carried out according to the President's interpretation of them in his messages, and there will be little difficulty. But how far are we from such a result? It is evident that the different political factions are opening up questions of the most radical and revolutionary character. Such agitators as Wendell Phillips are preaching confiscation of Southern property and a code of persecution. Senator Wade advocates in his feeble way the principle of Proudhon, that property is robbery, and so it is with all the factionists who are contributing their little efforts to drive the country to destruction.

In so far as the adage is universally true that history repeats itself, we are not at a loss for a parallel for our present political condi-tion. The war of factions, which may be set down as an inherent evil in all great nations, has produced like results everywhere; nor can we, with all our boasted civilization, "modern improvements," intelligence and experience, learned from history, claim an ex-emption from the general law. From the turbulent days of ancient Rome, when Lucius Cornelius Sylla, the iconoclast of Athenian art, and the master mind of conscription and confiscation in his own country, led the aristo-cratic faction and ground plebeianism into the dust, until the time of the second Casar Augustus, fanaticism ruled the destinies of Rome. In the person of Augustus the "oneman power" was asserted; its hand was placed firmly on the helm, and the factions which consummated their agitation in the homicide of the first Casar were brought under control. From that time faction lost its sting. Augustus was master of the situation. Although renowned as the patron of art and poetry, he was none the less observant of political events, nor less able to control them.

We may find another evidence of the mischief of faction as developed by the English revolution of King Charles' time. From the first evidence of popular discontent with the administration of the government the country was divided into factions, and the Parliament was the nursery of all the factious feeling that pervaded the public mind; but Cromwell suppressed them all when he grappled with the Parliament, and on his individual responsibility, with the army at his back, wiped them out of existence and took the authority into

his own hands. In the French revolution of 1789 factionism ruled the hour. It prevailed in the Convention; it governed the national policy, so far as there was any policy then existing; it organized proscription; it inaugurated confiscation, and it sanctified the guillotine. It was the interposition of military power by Napoleon which alone saved France from the anarchy and bloody horrors that faction had imposed upon it. As with Rome, with England, and with France, we cannot escape the inevitable event which follows a revolution; but we reach the end in a far different way. While other nations had to rely upon military dictators and the appliance of arms for their reconstruction, we propose to send our military chieftain into power as President of the republic by the voice of the people, expressed through the ballot-box, in accordance with the law and the Constitution, and we expect, furthermore, that after the election of Grant we shall enjoy a government as secure as that which Washington left us after the Revolution. All the hostile and disturbing elements will be subdued. In the North and the South his elevation to the Presidency will be equally welcomed, and we shall probably find our Casar, our Cromwell, and our Napoleon embraced in the one name-Grant-the choice of the people, who will quietly put all the factions out of sight, and set the country on its feet. When this comes about, we shall have no further trouble about the conflict of military and civil authority in any portion of the United States.

The President on Dangerous Ground. From the Tribune.

The National Intelligencer announces that at "a very recent consultation of the Cabinet it was decided that the military officers in command of the five districts into which the ten represented Southern States are divided, have no power to remove civil officers deriving their anthority from the State Governments as now organized." It is intimated that orders will soon be issued "replacing the deposed officers." Wells will again be Governor of Louisiana, Monroe will resume the Mayoralty of New Orleans, Abell will administer Louisiana juatice, and Withers will take his office in Mobile. The Intelligencer trusts that General Sheridan who is especially affected by this decision, will not apply to be relieved. If he does not ask to be relieved, we are assured he will not be removed for what the court journal calls "his

In other words, the made up his mind to construe the bill in his own way. He has got an opinion from Stanbery, and will issue his orders. If he can only induce Sheridan and Sickles to execute these orders, the country will not feel as badly as would be expected if he were to remove them. Sheridan may consider his "errors" forgiven if he will only do what he is told and

If this statement is true, we feel that the President has taken a very grave step, and is treading on dangerous ground. We have tried to show the purpose of this Military bill, and the moral obligation assumed by the President. We have earnestly entreated the President not to violate a law which it was understood he would execute. We sladm that it is not executing the law to restore Monroe red-handed to office, and to give Wells another chance at the four millious which are said to have excited his political cupidity. The organ from which we are quoting makes no such claim, but puts the decision upon other grounds. 'Andrew Johnson," it assures us, in that spirit of elegant toadyism which seems to be fficial, "is no less a patriot in the Executive chair than he was in the dark days of 1860," the radicals want a military regime in the South to perpetuate their power, "and the nation cares more for peace and permauent union than it does for any or all parties." In other words, this whole measure is a radical contrivance, intended as an electioneering dodge, and his Excellency, the patriot of 1860, intends to put his foot down and have no more of it. Instead of executing laws according to Congress, these "radical" Generals must obey his commands. If Sheridan will not, we presume Rousseau will, or, in a last resort, we have Custar. The country is expected to view these acts in the interest of "peace and permanent union."

The purpose of the Military bill is to give certain Generals supreme power. To that end each General commanding is absolutely in command, and all officers, civil or military, are merely so many lieutenants for the expression of his will. If any officer interferes with this duty, he is to be put aside. Congress intended this, and, what is more, the President recognized the intention. The power thus given to the commanding officer," he said in his veto message, "over all the people of each district is that of an absolute monarch. His mere will is to take the place of all law." "No master ever had a control so absolute over his slaves as this bill gives to the military officers over both white and colored persons." And so on, with the most elaborate argument. How can the President reconcile his present decision with the reasoning of the veto message? Congress intended these soldiers to have absolute control. But how can their control be so if under his command certain civil officers are permitted to exercise independent and irresponsible powers? How can General Sheridan carry out this bill with a hostile Governor like Wells, with Monroe con-trolling the police, and Abell proclaiming the law? If it is wrong to remove Wells, it is, of course, wrong to interfere with him, and if that person makes up his mind that the Reconstruction bill shall not be obeyed, what can Sheridan do? Behind Wells stands the President, and he bids his General to stay his hands, and allow these civilians to do as they please. He protects them as unassailable. In plainer terms, under the President's construction of this bill, the Generals Commanding have no more power in the South than General Meade in Pennsylvania or General Halleck in California. Reconstruction passes from the military to the civil power, and by civil power we mean the choice of the men who opposed us for five years in war. It is an impertinence to suppose that Congress intended anything of

We feel that the President is treading on dangerous ground-not only for himself, but for the country. His organ assures us that he does not forget he was a patriot in 1860which means, we fear, that he is in a combative, ugly humor, and intends to have another contest with the radicals. This humor is a small consideration. We leave the President and the radicals to fight it out. Beyond all we see danger to 'the country, Insecurity comes to the North, anxiety to the South; our discussions grow angry and bitter; the gentle, soothing work of reconstruction is arrested and postponed. We wish for the best; but we confess to much uneasiness. We had hoped for a reunion of these States in the next Congress on the basis of impartial suffrage and all rights for all. We still cling to that hope. The President seems disposed to postpone the day, but he can only postpone it. The day must come.

Mr. McCulloch's Last Letter.

On the 30th of April last, ferty-three "merchants, manufacturers, and professional men of Boston" cordially invited Secretary McCulloch to meet them at dinner and give them an opportunity to express their appreciation of his ability and integrity.

Mr. McCulloch's answer is dated May 22-a severe trial, no doubt, to the patience of the forty-three-and is, like everything that Mr. McCulloch writes, full of wisdom. Though nominally addressed to forty-three private, though distinguished, "men of Boston," it is really an official declaration of the views entertained by the Secretary at that time on the condition and prospects of the national finances; and hence it can scarcely be on account of its private character or from regard for the feelings of the forty-three inviters, that the letter has received so little notice from the public press. The indifference, whatever cause it may arise from, is certainly not warranted. It is true the letter is long, without containing any very striking novelty of statement, idea, or expression, but there are a great many good, old, sound, conservative ideas in it that cannot be repeated too often, and that in this progressive age we are too apt to lose sight of. To these Mr. McCulloch clings with steady perseverance and a faith utterly regardless of consequences; and in addition to the old-time wisdom there is sufficient new wisdom, in it to justify us in giving this last letter of our Secretary's a hearty welcome.

We, and all public men with us, have to thank the Secretary for furnishing us with another striking and warning example of the danger of writing letters instead of making speeches. Mr. McCulloch's off-hand remarks after a Boston dinner with weighty "merchants, manufacturers, and professional men' could be made light of by those who disagree with him, while even his friends and sup-porters would scarce dare appeal to them in seriousness. But when the Secretary, in the Treasury at Washington, after three weeks' delay, sets forth his views in writing, his staunchest opponents are compelled to listen. while his friends know precisely what to rely upon. Thus, when he assures the forty-three that he will administer the Treasury so as to merit their confidence, we may laugh at doubting Europe, that values our "promises to pay" at 78 cents on the dollar, and repose upon our greenbacks as upon gold and silver bars. When he assures

them that they must not expect the next debt statement to show a decrease of debt, but even that a temporary increase is unavoidable, our first thought is to measure the possible increase. When he assures us that he has not for some months past reduced the circulation of United States notes, we naturally turn to rebuke our Wall street friends for their constant clamor against contraction, which they pretend is the cause of the tight money market; and when, on the 29th day of May, seven days after being written, this important docu-ment is published in the New York papers, and gold and stocks begin to advance there-upon, we dare not rebuke the heartless men, Wall street speculators and gold gamblers, who insinuate that it was a nice thing for the forty-three Bostonians to have known the Secretary's views in advance of the outside public. If it were not lamentable, however, it would be laughable to see the contrast between Mr.

McCulloph's letter dated May 22, and the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury to the people of the United States dated June 1.

The increase in the debt, which on May 22 was unavoidable, has on June 1 become a decrease of \$5,171,000; the contraction which on May 12 had, for some months past, and for four excellent reasons, been suspended, has on June 1 resulted in a withdrawal of currency amounting to the enormous figure of \$39,000,000, and the faith of the forty-three in Mr. McCulloch's ability to administer the Treasury so as to merit their and their fellowcitizens' confidence is somewhat rudely shaken. The fact is, that Mr. McCulloch and all future Secretaries of the Treasury had better confine themselves in their after-dinner remarks or their ante-dinner letters to simple facts, and not indulge in prophecy. The pre-sent Secretary has scarcely ever made a public statement relating ever so remotely to the future which has not been completely contradicted by himself, or falsified by events within a very short time, and each time the result has been more and more mischievous. In the present instance we can only wonder at the mysteries of the Treasury accounts which could have kept the Secretary himself so entirely in the dark. We do, seriously and sincerely, believe in Mr. McCulloch's integrity of purpose; but we also believe that he is controlled in many things, against his will, or without his knowledge, by unprincipled un-derlings and a vicious system, both inherited from the time of Mr. Chase, both symbolized by Mr. Chase's "private memorands," both demonstrated by Mr. Fessenden's unwillingness to put his name to any important paper emanating from the Treasury, both bearing fruit in the present condition of the Government balances in the national banks-to which we refer below-and both lending color to the rumors current in Wall street that the statement has been made to look favorable by the intentional withholding of requisitions and other measures well known to the initiated. It is not, however, for the sake of pointing out Mr. McCulloch's minor errors, or in order

to warn him against the dangers of prophecy, that we refer to this remarkable letter. Our main object is to protest against Mr. Culloch's interpretation of the duties to which he is assigned. The Secretary of the Treasury is appointed to obey the laws made and provided for the collection and disbursement of the public revenues. When he seeks to make laws, when he undertakes, in imitation of the sumptuary enactments of bygone ages of ignorance and barbarism, to force the people of the United States, at his bidding, to increase their production, to cease their speculation, to diminish their extravagance, he only renders himself ridiculous. Mr. McCulloch wants to check speculation by contracting the currency. Does he forget that there are bears in Wall street as well as bulls-men as ready to speculate for a fall as for a rise? Is he ignorant that his letter has done more to induce speculation than any one event of the last three months?

Mr. McCulloch wants to increase production by contracting the currency and lowering prices. Does he not know that men hesitate to produce on a declining market, and that the stoppage of production is more than half due to his foolish and persistent threats of that contraction and return to specie payments which never comes? Mr, McCulloch wants to restore to the American people their former habits of economy, all by the magic wand of currency contraction. The American people are quite competent to judge of the wisdom of their expenditures. They began to economize. as many a pinched face and threadbare coat will prove, long before Mr. McCulloch underthe care of their individual pockets. Whatever remnant of extravagance may have remained is rapidly disappearing before a more impressive teacher than contraction-the tax-gatherer. The law autho rizes Mr. McCulloch to contract four millions a month. He preaches contraction on all occasions, but "for some months past has not reduced the circulation." "He is as much persuaded as ever of the importance of contraction," but he fails to contract mainly in order that contraction may not be accused of causing some existing financial evils. On May 22 he writes page after page to make this clear to all men's minds, and on June 1 shows that he has virtually contracted thirty-

nine millions during the month. We have directed Mr. McCulloch's attention to the national balances in the national banks for the following reason:-At the close of March it was commonly reported in Wall street that the Treasury was very short of currency, and no little surprise was expressed on the appearance of the April debt statement showing a currency balance in the Treasury of over thirty-four millions. The surprise diminished, however, when the subsequent quarterly bank statement showed that the Treasurv had over twenty-seven of the thirty-four millions on deposit with national banks throughout the country-of course free of interest. Now, it is a remarkable fact that for the last six months the amount thus deposited has varied very little, and certainly has not fallen, as far as the public is aware, below twenty-seven millions, looking very much as though these twenty-seven millions were on a sort of permanent deposit, or could not be entirely relied upon to be forthcoming, if wanted suddenly. It is also rumored that even in Mr. Chase's time of abundance certain Treasury drafts on banks in this city were not promptly met, and many people are inclined to think that a good part of the twenty-seven millions referred to would meet the same fate if urgently called for. Here are important topics for McCulloch's next letter.

The Future of the Republican Party. From the Times.

The Richmond Conference has resulted an arrangement which, if followed throughout the South, will probably avert the division with which the Republican party in that section has been threatened. The position assumed by the Virginia extremists in favor of confiscation and other penal measures as supplementary to the enacted policy of Congress, found no favor with the larger and more influential portion of the party. Under the leadership of Governor Pierpont and Mr. When he assures | Botts, a counter movement was set in motion

pointing to the reconstruction plan as the basis of party organization and effort. Sona for Wilson and delegates from the Union League Clubs intervened to prevent a disrup-tion which would have thrown the influence of Virginia against reconstruction, and a call for a State Convention has been issued under auspices which apparently insure the defeat of the Hundcutt anarchists.

In Louisiana the same good sense and mode ration have been averted in circumstances of yet greater difficulty. There party unity was in immense jeopardy. Local jealousies and differences had led to the organization of conflicting interests, and these again to the moral weakness of the party. Gradually, however, wiser counsels have prevailed, and though extremists still carry on an outside struggle, their influence is insignificant. The primary elections for members of a Convention developed both enthusiasm and harmony. "As for certain factions clubs with fancy names, says the New Orleans Republican, a journal not open to the charge of exaggerated conser-

"If they choose to rehearse in separate bodies their part in the political drama which is to restore Louisiana, let them do so; but when the time arrives for their public performance they must come on the stage as regular members of the Republican party; otherwise they doom themselves to the fate of all schlamatics. They may weaken their friends a little and strengthen their enemies as much by maintaining at that important moment a separate organization; themselves they cannot benefit."

The lessons thus taught are at once, an enemies

.The lessons thus taught are at once an encouragement and a warning. They exemplify the controlling power of the more moderate element in the Republican party. And they convict the ultra faction who clamor for confiscation and the imposition of other conditions and penalties yet undefined, of pursuing a course which, while it "dooms themselves to the fate of all schismatics," must "weaken their friends a little and strengthen their enemies as much."

These facts cannot be too distinctly apprehended by the managers of the Republican party movement in the Southern States. They cannot afford to experimentalize with popular feeling, to pander to ignorant passion at the expense of right, or to encumber the party with more than its proper burdens. Least of all can they afford to invest with importance the heads of "certain factions clubs with fancy names," or to yield to the dictation of persons whose avowed purpose is to delay the restoration of the South to the Union.

The strength of the party at the South is derived from its proclaimed desire for speedy reconstruction and its known ability to effect it. By raising the confiscation standard it might indeed succeed in rallying the negro vote, and by dividing the races lay the foundstion of a contest between them. But such a policy could not possibly confer power. That is dependent whelly upon the good faith and judgment of the party in the working of the existing law. The plea is that the Republican party, notwithstanding its exaction of unpalatable conditions, is the friend of the Southern people. It offers to them, as evidence of this, the plan matured by Congress, and it declares through its Congressional Committee that that plan is designed to be a finality. The party comes before the South, then, as its best friend -as the agency through which it may regain the peace and privileges of the Union, and the prosperity which will attend reëstablished confidence. There can be no shrinking from this position without dishonor. There can be no paltering with its promises, no evasion of its responsibilities, without destroying the chance of securing the supremacy of the Union

party in the future politics of the South.

The opportunity, if lost, will not recur. The tendency among the influential classes of the South is to gravitate towards the Republican party. The conviction which animates General Longstreet governs the judgment of thousands. They consider the Democracy the embodiment of principles which received their quietus in the war, and they took hopefully to the Republican party as that by which the regeneration of the South may be effected. They take it at its word, and declare their adbesion to it as the party of the future. And they predicate their estimate upon the honest aim of the Reconstruction law as a peaceoffering whose acceptance will end existing difficulties. In a party as well as in a national sense, it is essential that these expectations be fulfilled. They are reasonable and just expectations, in view of the action of Congress and the more recent averments of representative Senators and members, and the party must take care that they be realized. If this be done without needless waste of time-if the confiscationists and malcontents generally be passed by unheeded, or be treated as abettors of the enemy-the Republican party may obtain the mastery at the South. And with preponderating strength there, the fault will be its own if the party be deprived of national nower.

To promote party success at the South, however, the Northern Unionists must make manifest their moderation and fairness by an unequivocal indorsement of the reconstruction scheme as a finality. They owe to themselves and to those whose cooperation they seek, the repudiation of the disorganizing schemes which are put forward as pretexts for prolonging the dismemberment of the Union. These are not trifles which they can tolerate with impunity. Simply to be suspected of a leaning towards confiscation would be to provoke the opposition of ninety-nine-hundredths of all, North or South, who have aught to lose. For confiscation as proposed by Stevens and Phillips, or a division of land as suggested by Senator Wade, is a war upon property, which once begun, would not be confined to the South. The North has its agrarians and repudiators, who will not be slow in turning to account any movement for destroying the inviolability of property rights in the Southern States. Hence the importance of crushing at the outset every attempt to fasten upon the Republican party either affiliation with or responsibility for these projects of the extremists. The hope of the party's future lies in its steadfast adherence to the principles which conducted it to victory, and the policy of re construction with the success of which its for tunes are identified.

Women and Juries,

From the Nation. It appears to be a settled principle of jury made law that offenses against chastity may be punished with death by the woman's nearest male relative, or, in default of a male relative, by herself, and that no warning need be given to the culprit nor explanation asked of him. Moreover, it is no longer necessary that he be taken flagrante delicto in order to warrant his killing, or that the evidence against him be at all conclusive. A simple statement of a woman that a man has insulted or seduced her is now regarded by juries as sufficient to justify his being slain unawares, with all his imperfections upon his head. We might fill a column with illustrations of what we are here asserting, in the shape of stories of cowardly murders perpetrated by women, or friends of women, which juries were asked in vain to punish.

The last case of this kind is one of which

Old Rye Whiskies. THE LARGEST AND BEST STOCK OF

FINE OLD RYE WHISKIES

IN THE LAND IS NOW POSSESSED BY

HENRY S. HANNIS & CO.

Nos. 218 and 220 SOUTH FRONT STREET,

WHO OFFER THE SAME TO THE TRADE, IN LOTS, ON VERY ADVANTAGEOUS

Their Stock of Rys Whiskies, IN HOND, comprises all the favorite brands extant, and runs through the various months of 1865, 66, and of this year, up to piezent date.

Liberal contracts made for lots to arrive at Pennsylvania Railroad Depot, Erricason Line Wharf, or at Bonded Warehouses, as parties may elect.

Carpetings, Canton Mattings, Oil Cloths. Great Variety, Lowest Cash Prices.

REEVE L. KNIGHT & SON.

NO. 807 CHESNUT STREET, (Below the Girard House).

everybody in this State is now talking-the murder of Mr. Hiscock, a member of the Constitutional Convention at Albany. He is shot suddenly by one of his friends, a General Cole, and in defense of his crime the murderer tells three different stories-first, that Hiscock had violated his wife; secondly, that he had seduced her; and thirdly, that he had simply insulted her-all of them resting on the state ment of the wife herself, who, it appeared, did not discontinue her intercourse with Hiscock in consequence of anything that had happened. The only bit of corroborative evidence drawn from the husband's observation consisted, it seems, of the highly suspicious circumstance that the murdered man asked him one day, "when was he going away?" So that if Cole should be acquitted we shall have fresh support for the theory that any woman who has a jealous or crack-brained husband, and little regard for her own reputation, may have any man shot or knifed by reporting him as having behaved unhandsomely to her. In fact, a bad woman who had tried to seduce a man and failed, might in this way gratify her rage and desire of revenge by having him incontinently "taken off;" and if juries allowed this doctrine to take root and flourish, the best and most proper man in the community would hold his life at the mercy of any worthless couple who happened to have an acquaintancee with him and might for any reason desire his destruction. The law, we believe, forgives the slaying by a husband of a man taken in adultery; but it

does so not because it approves of the practice of avenging one's own injuries, but because it supposes some injuries to be too great for ordinary mortals to submit to them in cold blood. In other words, it is presumed that a man who witnessed his own dishonor would be sure to lose all self-control. But there is in this no sanction whatever for the modern doctrine that if A. hears or suspects that B. has been ruining his domestic peace, he may go in search of him with deadly weapons, and whenever he meets him, be it days or months

afterwards, kill him on the spot. In fact, a good many of these moral murders are now committed not only in cold blood, but by gentlemen and ladies who are not much troubled at all by the loss of their "honor," and sleep just as soundly as if they still had it in their keeping. They kill "seducers" simply because it is "the thing" to do, and the public expects it of them; or because they hink it will procure them a little pleasing notoriety. Nothing could better prove the debauched condition of public opinion, as expressed by juries, than the fact that some of the murderers whose wrongs have excited most sympathy have been themselves rakes and adulterers of the worst kind, and, after polluting other people's homes for years, have been supposed—poor fellows !—to be incapable of enduring the pollution of their own.

We all know the way in which these beautiful justifications of the uncontrollable indignation of the injured husband or the be trayed woman are got up. The murder is generally committed in some public place, so that there may be plenty of witnesses. soon as it is done, the murderer, though pale, becomes perfectly calm, and surrenders with out difficulty, and after giving some slight signs of intended but easy-to-be-foiled suicide, is conducted to prison, where he is the object of marked attention on the part of the jailor or his wife, and is waited on soon after by some of the liveliest and most graphic members of the "reportorial corps."

Then come the most delicious moments of the whole drama. The murderer gives hi own version of his wrongs, with the delightfu consciousness that he cannot be contradicted the only person who could contradict him being dead. He tells of his agonies, of "the fire in his brain," his sleepless nights, his horrible misgivings, his early happiness, his passionate love, his wonderful sacrifices for "the frail being" for whose sake he has assassinated; and down it all goes on paper, and soon appears in print. And while the tale is fresh the newspapers are never weary of making additions to it, and the hero enjoys more notoriety than ever he hopod in his wildest dreams.

When the day of trial comes on it is a grand day. The court is crowded; the audience and the jury lay in extra pocket handkerchiefs; the prisoner is dressed simply, but with care and wears an interesting and melancholy air. The leading masters of the balderdash at the bar are engaged for the defense, and the defense consists mainly of the fulsome praise of the assassin and abuse of his victim. All that fustian can do is done to make woman appear a kind of pretty animal without sense or discretion, or conscience, whom any naught man can sedace, and whom naughty me must, therefore, let alone on pain of death. Then comes the description of the husband's agonies, if the husband be the murderer. He is presented to the jury as a mad bull, whom the mere sight of "the destroyer of his peace" rouses into uncontrollable fury, and who has to go about trying to kill him by a law of his being, just as tigers have to prowl and spring and tear in order to satisfy their hunger.

Now, we think the better portion of the public has reached the conclusion that we have had enough of this sort of thing; that it is high time that the old doctrine that premeditated killing, no matter what the provocation

REMOVED.

OUR BEDDING STORE IS REMOVED

FROM THE OLD STAND TO

No. 11 South NINTH Street.

B. L. HNIGHT & SON.

may be, is murder, and deserves, in the interest of society, to be punished as murder, ought to be reasserted. The only possible excuse that can be put forward for the conduct of juries in refusing to convict "injured husbands" for killing seducers in cold blood, is that the honor of wives cannot be preserved in any other way; but this excuse we imagine very few men would be willing to accept as valid, if presented to them in its naked simplicity.

If wives need any legal assistance in preserving their virtue, it ought to be supplied in the regular way, by making adultery a criminal offense; so that when a man is accused of destroying anybody's peace, he will at least get a hearing for his version of the affair; and even if he is to be put to death on conviction, will be put to death with decent human for-malities instead of being shot like a mad dog. But pending the provision of legal punishment for these offenses, wives and husbands must be left to take care of their own honor, and must find other means of taking care of it than the use of deadly weapons against anybody the wife chooses to point out as her "be-

We think that, however opinions may differ as to woman's fitness for the suffrage, very few people will be found to de present state of mental and moral development, married women, at least, ought to be able to take care of their own chastity, and ought to be made to do it. Their whole training from childhood up is concentrated on their preparation for this one duty, and society and the Church have surrounded the discharge of it with the most terrible sanctions. Married women, too, have what young unmarried women have not, the knowledge and experience necessary to warn them of their danger; and there is something ridiculous in the popular theory that when they fall they are the

innocent victims, the men the real criminals.

Women, to be sure, are proverbially "frail." but so are men; and in the existing state of opinion a woman brings to the violation of the marriage vow a much stronger and more deeprooted sense of the sin of it than a man does, and is, therefore, on any sound theory of accountability, by far the guiltier of the two. The theory of woman's character and position on which blame, in cases of adultery, is now distributed, and on which the murder of seducers is justified, is really very little superior to that set out in the laws of Menu. She is so helpless, so conscienceless, so ready to fall, that to throw temptation in her way is considered the foulest act a man can commit and it is so hard to keep her from falling that public sentiment authorizes the husband to assassinate his best friends in broad daylight for the protection of her purity.

The case of young, unmarried women is, we admit, different. Whether rightly or wrongly, they are so educated that they neither know when they are running risks nor how to guard against them; and as long as this system of education is or has to be continued, fathers and brothers must be armed with summary powers for protecting them, or the legal penalties of seduction must be made vastly heavier than they are now. But, as a matter of fact, the women who take the law into their own hands, and kill their faithless lovers, and secure impunity from juries, are hardly ever youthful innocents.

They are generally tolerably mature spinsters, who know perfectly well what they are about, both when they are lavishing their affections on the unworthy object, and when they are pistolling him for running away, and there is probably no more repulsive spectacle to be witnessed than the mock trials of offenses of this kind by which our Courts are sometimes disgraced. In fact, side by side with the agitation in one portion of the community for woman's admission to greater social freedom, is growing up a tendency, in another portion, to release her more and more from both legal and moral responsibility. There is strong reluctance abroad to convict a good looking woman of any offense whatever.

We even doubt whether Bridget Dergan, who killed her mistress the other day in New Jersey, would, though not good-looking, have been convicted had she simply killed her master. But when it is made to appear that love is at the bottom of a young woman's crimes, juries become deaf to the claims of order and law and morality. As soon as the tender side of the tragedy begins to show itself in the evidence, the jurymen wipe their eyes, the Court blows its nose, the counsel's voice grows husky, and the "poor young thing" is dismissed with the deepest emotion, and the friends of the dead man sneak to their desolate homes amidst the frowns of the indignant and virtuous crowd.