THE NEW ORLEANS DAILY BEE.
PUBLISHED & EDITED BY DUPUOY & LIMET, PROPRIETORS,
No. 73 Chartres Street.
TERMS OF THE BEE:
Terms of Subscription—Daily, per annum, in advance, $10; half-yearly, $5; quarterly, $3.
Price of the paper—Single copies, 10 cents.
The Semi-Weekly, published every Tuesday and Saturday. Subscription, $5 per annum, invariably in advance.
Rates of Advertising—Standard advertisements inside the run of the paper, first insertion $1 50 per square, each subsequent insertion, 75 cents per square.
First, or Editorial Page Standard Advertisements, each insertion, $1 50 per square.
Advertisements inserted at intervals, to be charged as new each insertion.
Rest, for Editorial Page, Monthly Advertisements, each square, $40 per month.
Regular advertisers, who advertise largely, shall have a most each discretionary from the above-named standard rates as may be agreed upon. In no case shall such discount exceed 25 per cent.
All Business Notices of Advertisements to be charged 10 cents net per line, each insertion.
All Transient Advertisements must be paid for in advance.
All Advertisements not marked for any number of insertions, will be published till forbid.
All bills with regular stipulations shall be rendered monthly.
NEW ORLEANS:
WEDNESDAY MORNING, JUNE 30, 1869.
TRY GEORGE ALCES' CIGARS.
1 85.....Rampart Street.....1 85

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF MILITARY MEN FOR INJURIES TO CITIZENS.

In England heavy damages have been given against members of a military court, under less reasonable circumstances than in Wheeler's case. By such suit, a jury of Texas would be able to express their judgment of the new decisions sought to be established.—*Galveston News' Washington Correspondent.*

We should greatly doubt it in reading that decision. Would the eminent legal mind of the *News* point it out? Tell us where we can find it; or was the sentence put in because it read well?

No such decision was ever made.—*Flake's Bulletin.*

The Washington correspondent of the Galveston *News* was perfectly correct in his comprehension of the law. Military men are not only liable in damages for injuries to citizens when they are answerable under the criminal statutes of the State. Will *Flake's Bulletin* be pleased to cite that law which exempts military men from such responsibilities? If he will read "De Lolme on the Constitution of England"—a work of authority—he will find the following observations at page 296: (Bohn's edition):

All courts of a military kind are under a constant subordination to the ordinary courts of law. Officers who have abused their private power, although only in the execution of soldiers, may be called to account before a court of common law, and compelled to make proper satisfaction. Even any flagrant abuse of authority, committed by members of courts-martial, when sitting to judge their own people, and determine upon cases entirely of a military kind, makes them liable to the misdemeanour of the civil judge.

To the above facts concerning the pre-eminence of the civil over the military at large, it is needless to add that all offences committed by persons of the military profession in regard to individuals belonging to other classes of the people, are to be determined upon by the civil judge. Any one they may make of their forces, unless expressly authorised and directed by the civil magistrate, but in connexion by what it may, makes them liable to be convicted of murder for any life that may have been lost. To allege the duties and customs of their profession in extenuation of any offence, is a plea which the judge will not so much as understand.

In a foot-note to page 286 DeLolme cites one of a great number of instances which he says might be added to prove the subjection of the military to the civil power. It is particularly remarkable.

A Lieutenant of marines, whose name was Frye, had been charged, while in the West Indies, with contempt of orders, for having refused, when ordered by the Captain, to admit another Lieutenant in carrying another officer prisoner on board the ship; the two Lieutenants refused to admit the order given in writing. For this, Lieutenant Frye was tried at Jamaica by a court-martial, and sentenced to fifteen years imprisonment, besides being declared incapable of serving the King. He was brought home and his case (after being laid before the Privy Council) appearing in a justifiable light, he was released. Some time after he brought an action against Sir Chaloner Ogle, who had been president of the above court-martial, and had given a verdict in his favor for one thousand pounds damages, as it was also proved that he had been kept fourteen months in the most severe confinement before he was brought to his trial. The Judge moreover informed him that he was at liberty to bring his action against any of the members of the court-martial by whom he had been tried.

The following part of the affair is still more remarkable. Upon application made to by Lords Frye, Sir John Willes, Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, issued his writ against Admiral Mayne and Captain Keatone, two of the persons who had composed the above court-martial, who happened to be at that time in England, and were members of the court-martial that was then sitting at Deptford, to determine the affair between Admiral Matthews and Lestock, of which Admiral Mayne was also president; and they were arrested immediately after the breaking up of the court. The other members resented highly what they thought an insult; they met two on the subject, and came to certain resolutions which the Judge Advocate was directed to deliver to the Board of Admiralty, in order to their being laid before the King. In three resolutions they demanded "satisfaction for the high insult on their president, from all persons, now in office, or who have been on foot the bench since