[illegible]

The Daily Crescent.

OFFICIAL JOURNAL
Of the Council of the Second Municipality.

NEW ORLEANS:
THURSDAY MORNING, NOV. 13.

[illegible]

Fall of Letters.—The list of letters remaining in the office will appear in the Crescent to-morrow, as usual.

Law Department of Louisiana University.—The talented and distinguished gentlemen of this branch of our University have delivered their introductory lectures. As we only learn yesterday of the commencement of Judge Rocheblave's lecture, we regret that we could not attend, and classic, as we know it to be, and coming from the intelligent jurist and profound lawyer. Of Mr. Rouelline's lecture we have not been enabled to give a single sketch in our paper, but we hear, and it was one of the ablest, most eloquent, most [illegible] which the learned professor so well knows how to make. Unprecedent complexity of cases and a new game to and where the real [illegible] of such men as Rouelline and McCaleb.

[illegible]

Disgraceful Affair.—The splendid stranger [illegible] that Sherman was against a play at Buffalo on the night, and with great difficulty we got into the place, where she played to crowds.

The packet ship Lorenzo was totally wrecked in Tuscaloosa Bay, Lake Ontario, during the gale on the same day. All hands were saved.

The schooner Pilgrim, when ashore off Gilbert Point, Connecticut, on Sunday night, and is a total loss. The crew were all saved.

Immigration to New York.—We learn that 21,187 immigrants arrived at that port during the past month, of whom 11,000 were from Ireland, 3,000 from Germany, 2000 from England, and the remainder from other European countries. The number during the present year is unprecedented. It is ascertained that in New York alone 100,000 Germans have arrived since the first of January.

[illegible]

Contested Election of the Sheriff.

So far as we are informed, [illegible] there is one common [illegible] sentiment of indignation [illegible] to the attempt to invalidate the election of Mr. Freret. Some of the wealthiest citizens of this city, [illegible] to the fact, [illegible] to the heights, speak of it to the highest tones, and swear that never again will they vote for Mandeville Marigny. Had that question been one of illegality, we and they could have quietly abided the issue; but this smacking of mere, dear mere formalities, mere technalities, is repugnant Mr. Freret, and obtain possession of the office, plainly disgusts the community. Should Mr. Marigny gain the office (of which there is no chance) he would be the most generally commented man in the community, and public scorn and indignation could be boundless.

We say there is no chance; and what are the facts? The public is entitled to the facts; even if (as we regret should necessarily be the case) individuals should suffer by the exposure we are compelled to make to establish a clear view of the points at issue.

John Claiborne, of Plaquemines memory, Notary Public, is the counsel for Mr. Marigny—nominally; behind "the shade of a name," nestlers another, stands somebody else—we believe, John R. Grymes, for whose eminently distinguished ability, doubtless, a round sum was paid. John Claiborne was denied admittance to the counting of the votes in the Sixth Ward, Second Municipality; and testimony before us states that he was denied admittance because apparently in a state of inebriety and indicating a riotous disposition. This testimony will come up on trial, or we should forbear to state it now. The names of the witnesses who will so testify are in our possession, and at the service of Mr. Claiborne and his friends. We state this, because Mr. Claiborne is generally understood to be the chief witness in the premises; and as his exclusion is preferred by himself as a matter of evidence, we can see no reasonable objection to our stating the offest. If he was in such a condition, he was properly excluded; if he was not, he suffers severely and unjustly in the premises. We may add, that further testimony states that one door of the poll in Sixth Ward, Second Municipality, was open all the time; and though the crowd was, when manifestly growing noisy and riotous, requested to retire, there was complaint upon no one; those who retired, did so of their own free will, and as many persons as pleased, conducting themselves in an orderly manner, so as not to embarrass the counting of votes, were permitted to be present. The law does not, and will not, in any honest or common sense point of view, require that the commissioners shall admit any, even the disorderly, even those who interrupt their proceedings, to the counting of the votes.

We have also information, from a reliable source, that the polls of the Second Ward, First Municipality, were removed from the place in which the votes were received, and that many of the citizens of the ward were refused admittance to the room in which they were counted. The ward gave 23 majority for Marigny.

This is not all. For the same reason, if reason it be, the Seventh Ward, Second Municipality, must be excluded. Respectable gentlemen were denied admittance to it; and if it be thrown out, Mr. Marigny loses 67 votes.

Well, there is 20 votes majority gone from Marigny.

In the Fifth Ward, First Municipality, Marigny got 190 majority. There every thing was irregular, according to evidence before us. Only one judge counted, only one judge signed the returns, the two clerks and the other judges retired and left Mr. George Clarke solitary and alone, and contrary to law, to complete the count.

Now, admitting all Mr. Marigny says, and taking into view what we have stated, (stated upon the best authority,) Mr. Freret is still elected Sheriff by a majority of 168 votes. Every man who can count can see that. Did we not say that this matter of contesting an election was double-edged and cut both ways? But that inebriated man should be refused admission to a poll, can not vitiate an election; and the whole procedure is a farce.

It is worse than a farce. It seems to us a plain attempt to contest the election in a bitter and malicious spirit of mortification. A jury is appealed to; and what is the meaning of that? Who believes a jury can be found to agree? In the mean time (mark you this cunning) Mr. Freret is to be (as a matter of course) kept out of office, and thus the plainly expressed will of the people defied by these reckless intriguers. The present Sheriff is cunningly dragged into the matter by the choice of a jury. If he do not summon a jury, *en parte*, which will give a decision for Mandeville Marigny, there will be an outcry against his honor and honesty. We know what we say, and we know John L. Lewis is bitterly hated by the faction of his party with whom this petition originates. We believe he will summons a fair panel.

To illustrate upon these facts, clearly, we make the following showing:

MARIGNY'S LOSS.

Second Ward, First Municipality	23 maj.
Fourth Ward, Second Municipality	67 maj.
Fifth Ward, First Municipality	190 maj.
Loss	280 maj.

FRERET'S LOSS.

Fifth Ward, Second Municipality	235 maj.
Third Ward, First Municipality	109 maj.
Loss	344 maj.
Subtract Marigny's loss	280 maj.
Thus leaves net loss for Freret	314 maj.
Freret's actual majority	168 maj.
Freret's true majority	482 maj.
Leaves his majority of	109 maj.

It will require several supplemental petitions to catch up with this, even if the Sixth Ward, Second Municipality, returns can be successfully attacked, which they cannot be.

To the Hon. John C. Larue, Judge of the First District Court of New Orleans:

The petition of Mandeville Marigny, who resides in the Parish of Orleans, on oath doth shewes, that at an election held on the 7th day of November, in the Second Municipality of the said parish of Orleans, [illegible] the third day of the said month, [illegible] and Joseph F. Freret, who is candidate of said party, [illegible] for the office of Sheriff of the said Parish of Orleans, [illegible] the said Joseph F. Freret, according to the returns made to the proper tribunal of the said Parish, appears to have received a majority of votes for said office; but your petitioner shewes that illegal votes were given for said Freret, and that lawfully there was a tie, and that the office of Sheriff over your petitioner.

First, petitioner contests the election of the said James F. Freret, for the said office of Sheriff, on the following grounds, viz: That at the Polls of the Sixth Ward, Second Municipality, of the said Second Municipality of the city of New Orleans, the commissioners of said ward, Reuben H. Hyde, William Kennedy and Charles Gelpin, acting as judges, placing the Polls at the place prescribed by law, thereby of preventing immediately to enter the room set for the different candidates to witness of an honest polling of votes to be stated, but in violation of law and public policy, did close the ingress to said Polls to as many persons as chose to attend to the counting of the votes had, by locking the doors and other means of ingress to the same, and prevented country, in the presence of a very numerous crowd of persons chosen by themselves, and in the exercise of all others, to witness said votes—That during the course of the Parish of Orleans, some, [illegible] of said Ward, refused admittance to said building to citizens of said Ward, and that the same, [illegible] of said election, and that said counting of said votes, [illegible] was done by the said commissioners and inspectors of said election, [illegible] back passenger on the part of said petitioner, [illegible] of said Ward, [illegible] and that the returns of said Freret [illegible] and very, and that the returns of said Freret [illegible] Freret was then hundred and twenty-five votes or thereabouts.

Second, petitioner shewes, that, at the Polls of the Tenth Precinct, in the Fifth Ward, Second Municipality of the city of New Orleans, where of the Fifth Municipality of the Parish of New Orleans, [illegible] Richard A. Michel, and Joseph Chaquet, one either of the clerks of said Polls, [illegible] to be required by law, qualified to vote at that Precinct, [illegible] and that the votes [illegible] as had been received by law, and in violation of law and public policy, that [illegible] of said election, [illegible] said election, was by them received from the voters, one at a time, [illegible] the election had been held, in the room of the Sheriff [illegible] of the Council of Municipality No. One, of New Orleans, [illegible] a different precinct, where there was no election held, [illegible] to receive the votes of persons [illegible] the election of all such persons of which by law [illegible] other means of ingress to said room, [illegible] Freret, [illegible] Freret, [illegible] Freret