

GLEANINGS FROM EXCHANGES.

NEW YORK CITY has lately been the scene of an unusual number of most desperate crimes. A whole family of boarders was poisoned by the servant girl, simply to gratify her revenge against the landlady. Two of the unfortunate victims—a man and a woman—died a day or two afterwards, and several others were in a dangerous condition. A correspondent of the *Alta California* says the evidence against the servant girl is so strong that "it is only mockery to put her under the ordeal of a trial. She should be disposed of in a summary manner. The twaddle about her sex, the hanging of a woman, etc., is insulting to common sense, and the sooner the world is rid of such fiends, the better."

What if this correspondent's idea of administering justice were adopted? Would not the result prove even more disastrous than the prevalence and enormity of the crimes complained of? When the law prescribes a just penalty for a given crime, let that law be executed!—whether the offender be male or female—but we do and always have protested against the inhuman and outrageous practice of hanging—it is not alone revolting to every nobler impulse of our nature, but heinous in the sight of the Great Law Giver and Author of Being who has set forth, in language not to be misunderstood, that the murderer should expiate his crime—not by strangulation on the gallows—but by the shedding of his blood—that the smoke thereof might ascend to heaven in atonement of his guilt; for, "without the shedding of blood, there is no remission of sins." This correspondent, if he be not an immediate relative of Judge Lynch, has striking proclivities to that gentleman's peculiar construction of law.

A man named Farrell was murdered by two policemen, because he made resistance when they attempted to arrest him on the charge of drunkenness; when, at the same time, the man was perfectly sober and known to be a remarkably temperate man at all times. He was a stranger in New York city, had but a few hours previously arrived there for the purpose of bringing home again to the country his three children, who had been for a short time, staying with their uncle, his brother; and the attack was made, it is stated, with a design to rob him. The correspondent says, "with a few honorable exceptions, as I have more than once said, a more rascally force than the New York police does not exist."

Charles Sturges was killed in an oyster saloon. He went into the kitchen to "have some sport with the girls." While there, a quarrel ensued between him and John Fulmer, keeper of the saloon, who drew a revolver and shot Sturges twice—both balls penetrating the left lung.

A boy named McElroy was fatally stabbed with an awl, in a difficulty with Thomas Miller, his shopmate.

Arthur May stabbed Henry Fry, a married man and occupant of the same house with May—Fry having made unlawful advances to his wife. The guilty paramour was yet alive, but could not long survive.

As Mrs. Kennedy was late returning home from her work, she was assailed by two men, who attempted to ravish her. In her efforts to free herself from them, she broke her leg. When found by the police she was insensible and was conveyed to the city hospital. Refusing to have the limb amputated, having lingered a few days in the most extreme agony, she expired. One of her murderers, Thomas Doty, whom she recognized as the person who was the means of breaking her leg, was arrested. "To show the heartlessness of the reprobate," says the writer, "I will here state that, while the coroner's jury were considering the verdict, he sang nigger airs and danced nigger jigs."

The above is the catalogue of murders, so far as reported, occurring in the city of New York, during a single week! We are here forcibly reminded of a certain prophecy, recorded in the New Testament, the fulfillment of which, in the alarming increase throughout Christendom of crime of every grade, seems hastening to its fullness:

1 THIS know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come.

2 For men will be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy.

3 Without natural affection, truce breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good.

4 Traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God;

5 Having a form of godliness; but denying the power thereof; from such turn away.

6 For of this sort are they which creep into houses, and lead captive silly women laden with sins, led away with divers lusts,

7 Ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth.

8 Now as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also resist the truth; men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith.

9 But they shall proceed no farther; for their folly shall be manifest unto all men as theirs also was.—[2 Ti. iii.]

—JACOB ELLYEA was sentenced, by Judge Creanor, of Stockton, California, on April 28, to be hanged, June 3, 1859. When asked by the judge, "Have you anything to say why sentence should not be pronounced, the prisoner, deadly pale and in an agitated voice, said:

"All that I have to say, is, to ask what I have done to be used in this manner for the last fifteen months. I am not guilty of the murder, and that Turk has sworn to a falsehood, from beginning to end. I would not tempt the Spirit of my God, or risk his displeasure, but this is true. So help me God in Heaven, Judge, I know no more of this murder than you do."

The judge replied:

"This is not a sufficient legal cause for me to suspend your sentence, and it remains my duty to pronounce it. The sentence of this court is, that you be taken from this court to the jail, from whence you came. From thence, upon Friday the third day of June next, between the hours of ten and four in the afternoon, you will be taken to such place of execution, in San Joaquin county, as the Sheriff shall select, and there you will be hung by the neck until you are dead."

Hemp continues firm in the eastern markets, with a prospect of advance on previous rates. Should murders continue to increase, throughout the United States, at their present ratio, we may reasonably expect a considerable advance in the prices of that staple hanging commodity; would it not be policy for all corporations where these operations are likely to be frequently repeated, to purchase a supply at least for the next ten years? It would be a capital plan. But we submit, seriously, whether it would not, in the end, be still more saving to substitute the guillotine, or some other cutting machine—a Yankee invention, if preferred—and let it be introduced into all the yards of all the county jails throughout the country. Money being a great desideratum, we are quite confident, from a careful calculation of the relative expense of the two systems, that the latter named would be far the most economical. On the one hand, new ropes are to be constantly supplied (for what humane hangman, or strangulator, would choke two men to death with the same hemp)—while on the other, the expense would be simply the sharpening of the knife.

—COL. JOSEPH BOND was killed near Albany, N. Y., by Lucius Brown. The difficulty, it is stated, originated in Brown whipping one of Bond's negroes. Mr. Bond was among the largest cotton planters of the south.

—CHRISTOPHER COLSON, a fish dealer in Hartford, Conn., who was divorced from his wife on account of his habitual drunkenness and cruelty, afterward met her and endeavored to take her hand; but, being repulsed, he followed her and cut her throat, killing her instantly, remarking at the same time, that he hoped she was satisfied. During the same evening, after his arrest, he took a large dose of opium, which, with the stoppage of liquor, caused his death next day.

—THE CASE of James R. Maloney, who was expelled from San Francisco by the Vigilance Committee, and who brought suit in the New York Court of Common Pleas against James Dows, the Treasurer of that Committee, for the sum of one hundred thousand dollars, has been dismissed by Judge Daly for want of jurisdiction. Had Malony recovered the amount set as damages he might have thanked the Vigilants for kicking him out.

—THE ODD FELLOWS of California held a grand anniversary on the 26th of April, in San Francisco, that day being the fortieth anniversary of the introduction of that order into the United States. Their new, spacious and splendid hall was dedicated on the occasion.

—THE TRIAL of Daniel E. Sickles was brought to a close, about 3 p.m. of April 26—the twentieth day of its continuance.

On the eighteenth day—after the instructions which the prosecution asked the court to give the jury were read by Mr. Carlisle, Mr. Brady read the instructions asked by the defense.

Mr. Carlisle stated the grounds on which he thought the instructions asked by the prosecution should be granted.

Mr. Stanton presented some considerations in support of the points of law submitted by the defense. At the close of this speech, which is said to have been very eloquent, he stated:

"I have endeavored to discuss this question on principles which I believe, as a man, as a father and as a husband, to be essential to the peace and security of your home and mine. I have endeavored to discuss it on principles which are essential to the peace and prosperity of the society in which my home is planted, as well as yours; and I hope that, by the blessing of God, as it has been your Honor's good fortune to lay down the law which secures the family, in our respect, from the seducer of the sister, you may also plant on the best and surest foundations the principles of law which secure the peace of the home, the security of the family, and the relations of husband and wife, which have been in the most horrid manner violated in this case."

As the speaker resumed his seat he was greeted with another outburst of applause.

Senator Douglas occupied a seat at the lawyer's table.

The nineteenth day, Monday 25th, was consumed in hearing Mr. Brady on the instructions for defense and Mr. Ould for the prosecution.

FINAL DAY.—Mr. Ould concluded his speech. Judge Crawford addressed the jury, discussing, with great ability, the relative merits of the instructions asked for by both sides and giving his decision on each separate point.

By the mutual agreement of the counsel on both sides, the case was submitted to the jury without further discussion—the judge's decisions giving general satisfaction.

The indictment being handed to the foreman at 1:50 p.m., the jury retired. In the District of Columbia, the first sworn is not the foreman; he is chosen by the jury and, in this case, resulted in the selection of Mr. Reason Arnold.

The retiring of the jury was the signal for throwing off restraint. The crowd in the room rose to their feet and freely indulged in conversation—many crowding around Mr. Sickles—among them, Rev. Dr. Sunderland, of the Fourth Presbyterian Church, Washington, who, taking Sickles by the hand, said to him:

"Sir, I have come to express to you my heartfelt sympathy; and to say that if the voice of the people of this city could speak at this moment, your acquittal would be instantaneous. In case, however, an adverse verdict should be rendered, be sure that you have hearts around you, and mine not the least warm of them, to sustain you in your affliction."

The prisoner was much moved and expressed his thanks as well as his emotions would permit.

As the minutes passed, and grew into quarter and half hours, some expressed a little disappointment; they thought "the jury should not have retired at all—much less spend any time in consultation."

When seventy minutes had elapsed, the clock struck three and, before the sound had passed away, there was a movement at the door by which the jury had retired. The door is opened and the jury enter, taking their seats in the box. All restraint is forgotten. The telegraphic report to the *N. Y. Journal of Commerce* continues:

"Benches and forms and tables are mounted by the most excited or most venturesome. 'Here they come,' is heard hurriedly spoken on all sides. Then there is a succession of cries of 'Down in front!' 'Get off the benches,' 'Sit down,' 'Silence in Court,' 'Order, Order.' But it seems impossible to restore order till the Judge directs the Clerk to call the names of the Jury. The uproar instantly subsides, and as the Clerk calls the Jurors, and as they severally respond, one of the officers calls out the number. When the twelfth name is called and responded to, a pin might be heard to drop in the suddenly stilled Court."

The jury were all standing, when the clerk ordered Mr. Sickles to stand up and inquired of the jury:

"How say you, gentlemen, have you agreed to your verdict?"

Mr. Arnold.—We have.

Clerk.—How say you, do you find the prisoner at the bar, guilty or not guilty?"

Mr. Arnold.—NOT GUILTY."

As these words fell from the lips of the foreman, one loud, wild, thrilling, tumultuous hurrah was sent up by the spectators. The continuous cheering in the court room was echoed by the multitude outside, with a two-fold vehemence. Hats and handkerchiefs were waved and there was one general rush for the prisoners' dock.

Various movements were made during the intense excitement which prevailed—to have the prisoner immediately discharged—calling to order by the marshal, &c., &c.

When order had been partially restored, the clerk said, again addressing the jury:

"Your record is, gentlemen, that you find Daniel E. Sickles 'Not Guilty.'"

The Jury nodded affirmatively.

Clerk. And so say you all.

Another affirmative nod from the Jury.

Mr. Stanton. I now move that Mr. Sickles be discharged from custody.

Judge Crawford. The Court so orders."

Mr. Stanton, turning round, said, with great animation, "Now go it."

It was with the utmost difficulty, however,

that Mr. Sickles was got out of the court room. As he passed the jury box, on his way to the door, a mutual salutation was most heartily exchanged with the jurors, who had signified their desire to congratulate him.

As soon as he reached the door, the cheers and shouts were again taken up.

The news of the acquittal ran like wild-fire through the city.

There was nearly a score of carriages in front of the City Hall as Mr. Sickles, supported by his immediate personal friends, stepped down the stone steps of the building.

After he and his friends had got into one of the carriages, a movement was made by the crowd to take the horses from the carriage and to draw it themselves, but the movement was detected in time and prevented. They drove to the house of Mr. McBlair, next door to Mr. Sickles' former residence.

A long procession or cavalcade followed the carriage in which Sickles and his friends were, which, as it passed with railroad speed, through the streets of Washington, were greeted with loud and enthusiastic cheers.

Thousands of people were gathered in front of Mr. McBlair's house, and continued to come and go through the evening.

The counsel of Mr. Sickles were serenaded in the evening. They intended to serenade Mr. Sickles, but were requested to forego their intention, as he wished to retire to rest undisturbed. They proceeded to serenade Rev. Dr. Haley and the jurors.

Nine or ten of the jurors, after the intensity of the excitement was over, came to Mr. Brady's parlor in the National Hotel and, in the freedom of unrestrained conversation, expressed their real sentiments. One of them, Mr. McDermott, said:

"I want you, sir, to tell the people of New York that the citizens of Washington are not behind those of any other part of the country in devotion to the family altar."

This juror was spoken of, all through the trial, as one who would probably dissent from the rest.

Another juror, named Knight, brought with him the fiddle with which he had solaced himself and his fellow jurors during the long evenings of their seclusion, and played several airs. He too had been mistrusted, on account of certain Know Nothing antecedents. But, said Mr. Brady, "if we had known that he played the fiddle, we might have made our minds easy, for no fiddler was ever known to find a conviction of murder."

The foreman, Mr. Arnold, said that his only fear had been that his health might not last him through the trial, and he hoped that his latest posterity would honor his memory from his having served on this jury. In fact, the sentiments of the jury individually expressed in this unrestrained conversation, were but a familiar and homely illustration of the opinion contained in their formal verdict of "not guilty."

It is said that when the jury retired, one of them withdrew into a corner, and on his knees invoked Divine guidance—got up—entered into conversation—again retired to the corner—and finally rose with his mind fully made up in favor of acquittal.

Mr. Arnold, the foreman, after an affectionate greeting with Mr. Stanton, expressed his gratification that he had lived to render such a verdict. The same juror, in congratulating Mr. Sickles, said that he hoped and believed the Great God would acquit as the jury had done.

Mr. Hopkins, another of the jury and the wag and mimic among them, expressing himself in regard to the justification of Mr. Sickles, said he would not for himself have been satisfied with a Derringer or revolver, but would have brought a howitzer to bear on the seducer.

The emotions of the counsel when the jury returned their verdict were manifested in various ways. Mr. Brady, in spite of all his experience as a criminal lawyer, became pale, nervous and agitated.

"Mr. Stanton," continues the report, "unable to repress the emotions of his big heart, is described as having almost rivalled David when he danced before the Ark of the Tabernacle; the usual stolidity of Mr. Phillips gave way, and covering his face with his hands, he wept like a child; Messrs. Magruder, Ratcliffe and Chilton pressed and greeted their liberated client; Mr. Meagher, in the exuberance of his heart, clapped people on the back, and asked if it was not "glorious;" Mr. Graham was passive and undemonstrative, but was one of the first to welcome back his client to free-

[Continued on the Last Page.]