THE NEW YORK HERALD.

Vol. X., No. 203—Whole No. 3803. NEW YORK, TUESDAY MORNING, JULY 23, 1844. Price Two Cents.

THE NEW YORK HERALD.

AGGREGATE CIRCULATION

THIRTY-FIVE THOUSAND.

To the Public.

THE NEW YORK HERALD—daily newspaper—published every day of the year except New Year's day and Fourth of July. Price 2 cents per copy—or $7 26 per annum—postages paid—cash in advance.

THE WEEKLY HERALD—published every Saturday morning—price 6¼ cents per copy, or $3 12 per annum—postages paid, cash in advance.

ADVERTISERS are informed that the circulation of the Herald is over THIRTY-FIVE THOUSAND, and increasing fast. *It has the largest circulation of any paper in this city, or the world, and is, therefore, the best channel for business men in the city or country.* Prices moderate—cash in advance.

PRINTING of all kinds executed at the most moderate price, and in the most elegant style.

JAMES GORDON BENNETT,
Proprietor of the Herald Establishment,
Northwest corner of Fulton and Nassau streets

Revival of Business and Everything — Prospects of the Country.

Every person must admit that the country, in all the elements of prosperity, intelligence, and morals, notwithstanding an occasional outbreak, is going faster forward than ever it did at any former period of its history. Prosperity seems to be falling upon the land, like the dew of heaven, silently, and perceptible only at stated periods by the general results. Trade is increasing—manufactures are increasing—the crops are increasing, every year increasing. Travel is increasing. The revenue of the railroads is increasing. And fortunately the excitement of politics—fanaticism in religion—and extravagance of opinion on all subjects are decreasing, and separating their isolated movements from the general common sense movement of the country. In finance—in religion—in politics—in literature—in morals—in almost every department of human life, from high to low, the same general progress may be observed.

We could refer to a number of general facts in proof of the accuracy of this view of the great and growing prosperity of the country, but we may as well confine ourselves to one of which we can speak with a degree of certainty, beyond any other, and that is the remarkable progress during the last few years—and we may say the last few months—of the *New York Herald* establishment. When intelligent, industrious, and business newspapers are successful, they furnish one of the best possible pieces of evidence in favor of the general prosperous movements of the country at large. Now we are happy to say that the *New York Herald* at this moment, has a circulation and a business probably one-fourth greater than at any period of its most prosperous career heretofore, and is going ahead with a momentum equal to the general momentum of the country at large. The aggregate circulation at present is far beyond what it ever has been before, and now reaches nearly 35,000 copies. The cash receipts of last week, by cash book, were over $2,500, making, if every week were similar, nearly $130,000 per annum. We pay to our paper-maker alone a sum varying from $700 to $1000 a week, according to circumstances. We employ, by the publication of the paper, probably more than two hundred persons, here and elsewhere. In short, in the midst of a Presidential election—in the midst of religious, financial, and other excitements—in the face of an opposition of the whole press, and of all those who arrogate to themselves the position of leading elements in society, the *New York Herald* is going faster ahead in all its business operations, and in its healthy tone, and moral influence, than ever any paper did in this country, or in any other country in the world.

These facts are given, as forming merely a small part of the evidence, showing the general progress of the country. We have, from the commencement, in spite of the lies and falsehoods circulated against us, advocated the highest principles in morals, politics, ethics, religion, and every department of human life. No doubt, errors have been committed, for, wherever there is humanity, there will be error; but we believe that we have done more good in the brief period of our existence, by the inculcation of sound principles, and the exposure and condemnation of bad ones, than any other journal in existence. In politics we have always fearlessly maintained an independent stand, discussing the measures which divide the two parties on the highest principles of philosophy, and treating the personal and venal vituperation of the lower order of the journals, of both factions, with that contempt and severity which they merit. We believe the position which we have assumed in the contest, now fitfully going on over the country between Clay and Polk, has been of advantage to the management and morality of both sides. They are less personal than they were six months ago—less violent—less vituperative; and one of the most unprincipled, proscriptive, and vulgarly abusive of them all, the *Courier and Enquirer*, seems, at last, to have come to the serious discussion of the measures at issue in this contest, and to have abandoned, in some degree, its vituperation and scurrilous abuse.

In relation to religion, and to the introduction of religion into political controversy, we have followed the same course, and adhered to the same general principles, treating with propriety and decorum every Christian sect, which may have its foundation in eternal truth, but invariably setting our face against the introduction of the clerical character into the political field; the mingling of religion with the dirt of this world. When Catholics have been unjustly assailed by Presbyterians, we have defended them; and when Presbyterians have been unjustly assailed by Catholics, we have defended them also. But uniformly, we have fallen upon both, when they departed from that golden rule of the author of the Christian faith—"Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them."

In financial and commercial affairs, we have carried on a war against ignorance, impudence, and pretension, from the first inception of this journal, up to the present time—from 1835 to 1844—nearly ten years. In this contest we have met with the strongest opposition from the speculators, the bankrupts, the blacklegs, and corrupt financiers of all kinds. But having planted ourselves on the principles of honesty and common sense, we are happy to say that the sea is now smooth around us—that the whole country has almost adopted the principles of finance which we have announced and defended, and that the currency is now in a better condition, and better understood by the people, than it was before.

These are some of the causes which have contributed to the success of this establishment, and have placed it beyond the reach of its foes, either high or low. We have been in the midst of a financial, moral, political, and religious revolution ever since we started. We have now passed the most dangerous parts of that revolution, and begin to reap the fruits of having advocated throughout adherence to right principles in every department of human life. The recent riots in Philadelphia and Illinois, and the excitement in this city, in which the prelate of a certain church participated so largely and so foolishly, are but the remnants—the expiring efforts of the troubled spirit of a day now passed for ever. These recent explosions will only tend to give a new force and momentum to the public mind in the right path; and also to give to those journals which understand their position and the time, a greater circulation and a greater influence than ever.

With these few remarks, on our present position and prosperity, we proceed on our way rejoicing. The prospect before us is a brilliant one, and nothing can prevent it from being realized to the fullest extent by all who understand the "signs of the times."

LOUISIANA ELECTION.

TO THE PUBLIC.

THE ELLIOTT VOTES.

The circumstances attendant on the recent election having become the subject of public discussion, it is important that the precise facts of the case should be known. I, therefore, have to request a perusal of the return made by the Inspectors for the First Ward of the Second Municipality, a copy of which is hereunto annexed.

It having been generally reported that the Whig Inspectors had agreed not to receive the votes of persons holding certificates of naturalization issued by Judge Elliott, I called upon James P. Freret, Esq., my associate to superintend the election, the day previous, to know if he had determined to reject such votes without enquiry as their validity. His reply was, that he had so determined, and that he would not listen to any arrangement or compromise in relation thereto.

I considered it my imperative duty to refrain from prejudging any case which might be presented to the Inspectors for their decision, and communicated those opinions to the Democratic citizens of the Ward, notifying them of the determination of Mr. Freret, and that it would not be in my power to receive any vote objected to by him, however well the validity of the certificate might be established.

Having received my appointment from the Hon Charles Maurian, Judge of the Parish Court, to whom the return of the election was to be made, I considered it proper for the inspectors to be guided by his opinion on all law points which might be presented, and about which they might differ; and in case my associate would not yield thereto, I felt compelled to resign my office, that I might not be an obstacle to the receipt of the vote of any citizen legally entitled to the elective franchise.

Entertaining such opinions, I addressed a letter to Judge Maurian, in words following:

"New Orleans, 1st July, 1844.

"Hon. Charles Maurian, Judge of the Parish Court:

"Dear Sir—Unable to have the election conducted according to the requirements of law, I wish your advice in the matter, and have therefore to ask, as a personal favor, your immediate attendance at the Poll of the First Ward, Second Municipality, at the St. Charles Hotel, that another may be appointed in my place in case your explanation of the law should not so enlighten the Inspectors as to induce them to harmonize on the proper course to be pursued.

With great respect, I am, dear sir,
Your obedient servant,
JACOB BARKER."

I made great exertion to have this letter placed in the hands of Judge Maurian early in the day; not being successful, I agreed to such a course of proceeding as is detailed in the return of the Inspectors, and as, in my opinion, would be most likely to counteract the effect of the aforesaid determination to prejudge the cases to be tried, and such as would facilitate the election, secure to all the free exercise of their elective franchise, and consign to rest hereafter the question as to the legality of the Elliott votes, and at the same time to enable Congress, the Convention and the Legislature, to have the whole matter before them, so as to decide advisedly on the qualifications of all persons claiming to have been elected. In the latter I think I have succeeded, although there were but five Elliott votes received—one of which was for the entire Whig ticket, and the other four the entire Democratic ticket. It however remains to be seen when the action of those bodies shall be had on the matter.

I do not know of any law requiring the production of naturalization papers: as to other qualifications, the oath of the voter is deemed to be sufficient; and if sufficient as to the requirements of a law in one case, why not in all? and if not in all, who has the power to make a difference unknown to the law? The penalty for perjury relied on for protection, and the fear of delay in conducting elections, has induced our law-makers to yield to the argument of convenience in not interposing any other restriction, and are we to be told that the oath of a French, a German, or an Irish citizen, is not entitled to the same faith as if born in New England, when the oath of the latter, without a certificate, is taken to be satisfactory evidence of his having become a citizen of Louisiana by the year's residence required by the Constitution.

Those persons who approve of my associates' having placed in the ballot box the vote of Mr Kelly, in defiance of my positively expressed will, should remember that I had the same right to have placed in the ballot box the Elliott votes, in defiance of his positively expressed will. Had I done so, what would have been the public opinion?

If the refusal of one Inspector to receive a vote presented, disposed of the question as to that vote, how does it happen that the refusal of the other Inspector to receive another vote presented, did not equally dispose of the question as to that other vote? in place of which it is claimed, that while the refusal of one rejected the vote and disposed of the question, the refusal of the other conferred the right on a single Inspector to deposite the ballot in the box in defiance of the other.

It seems to me that the rule to be sound and tenable should work both ways.

How far the putting Mr. Kelly's vote into the ballot box may vitiate the whole election, is yet to be decided. Should such be the result, those who so boisterously urged the Inspector to put in that vote, will have to thank themselves, and may perceive the impolicy of intermeddling in a clamorous and frantic manner, with the duties of public officers who should be left to act calmly and considerately on the responsibility of their oaths.

It will be seen by the process verbal, that I did not object to the impeachment of any Elliott certificate presented, or that might be presented; all I contended for was, that without evidence they could not be deemed fraudulent.

The naturalization papers retained were not investigated or read by the inspector until after the polls closed; beyond the fact of their having been issued by Judge Elliott; no evidence was adduced that they were a part of the 1748 inquired about by the Senate, or of the 19 impeached.

Mr. Conlon, about whose vote the first difficulty arose, had resided in this city fourteen years, and had been, as he supposed, legally naturalized by Judge Elliott—suppose he had purchased an American ship, and taken out a register in his own name, would a just public allow that ship to be forfeited as belonging to an alien, without allowing the validity of the certificate to be investigated? If not, they would not allow his citizenship in any case to be impeached without proof and without trial. Jacob Barker.

INSPECTORS' RETURN.

New Orleans, St. Charles Hotel, 1st July, 1844.

The Poll for the Election to be held this day for the first Ward of the Second Municipality:

The Poll was opened under the inspection of James P. Freret and Jacob Barker, Wm. C. Auld, Secretary, at 10 o'clock, and all the legally qualified voters who offered for about one hour were received, when Stephen Conlon presented himself and demanded the right to vote, his naturalization papers having been issued by the City Court of Lafayette over which Judge Elliott presided at the time; his vote was on that account objected to, when the following proceedings took place.

Stephen Conlon presented himself and claimed the right to vote, his right being challenged, the oath was administered—he swore that he had resided in the State for one year immediately preceding the election, superadding that he had been a resident of the city of New Orleans for nearly fourteen years, that he had resided in the ward six months immediately preceding the election, that he had paid a tax to the State within the last year, and being asked if he was an adopted citizen of the United States, said he was and presented the papers hereunto appended marked A. and B., whereupon James P. Freret, Esq., one of the Judges of election, objected to receiving the same, and Jacob Barker, the other Judge, insisted on its being received and proposed to hear *any* evidence going to its impeachment that might be offered—where upon Mr. Freret stated that it had been impeached by the Senate of Louisiana, that he would not listen to any testimony beyond that his certificate of naturalization was from Judge Elliott—Mr. Barker denied that it had been impeached and demanded proof—the said Stephen Conlon being further interrogated whether he had paid a tax to the State within the last six months, answered affirmatively and referred to a receipt in his possession to ascertain the date of payment, which receipt Jas. P. Freret requested to see, and it was handed to him—objected to on the ground of erasures—it was afterwards handed in and appended, marked C. Mr. Barker proposed to mark on the back of the vote, Elliott, and put it in the box and in the certificate of returns to set forth all the facts of the case that might come before a higher tribunal to be acted on, which Mr. Freret positively refused, and the vote was not put in.

(Signed,) JACOB BARKER,
JAMES P. FRERET.

(Signed,) Wm. C. Auld, Sec'y.

Paper marked (A.)

The State of Louisiana—City Court of Lafayette—Be it remembered, that Stephen Conlon, late of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, appeared in the City Court of Lafayette on the 28th day of June, 1843, and declared on oath in open Court that it was bona fide his intention to become a citizen of the United States, and to renounce forever all allegiance to every foreign Prince, Potentate, State or Sovereignty whatever, and particularly to Victoria, Queen of Great Britain and Ireland.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of said Court, at the city of Lafayette, this 28th day of June, 1843, and of the Independence of the United States the 67th.

(Signed) A. PHELPS, Clerk.

Paper marked (B.)

United States of America—the State of Louisiana—Parish of Jefferson—City Court of the City of Lafayette—To all to whom these presents may come, greeting:—Whereas, at the City Court of Lafayette, held in the City of Lafayette, this eighth day of September, Anno Domini one thousand eight hundred and forty-three, and in the sixty-eighth year of the Independence of the United States of America, Stephen Conlon, late of the Kingdom of Great Britain, came and appeared in said Court, and made application to be made a citizen of the United States of America; and having complied with all the conditions and requisites of the acts of Congress in such cases made and provided, for establishing a uniform rule of naturalization, and the oath to support the Constitution of the United States of America, and to renounce all allegiance and fidelity to every foreign Prince, Potentate, State or Sovereignty whatever, being administered unto him in open Court, present the Hon. B. C Elliott, Judge of said Court, he, the said Stephen Conlon, is, by virtue thereof, and the premises, declared and enrolled a citizen of the United States

In testimony whereof, I have affixed the seal of said Court at the City of Lafayette, this eighth day of September, in the year of our Lord, one thousand eight hundred and forty-three, and the sixty-eighth of the Independence of the United States of America.

(Signed) A. PHELPS, Clerk.

Paper marked (C.)

Received, Parish of Washington, 30 day of January, A. D., 1844, of Mr. Stephen Conlon, of New Orleans, no dollars six cents, in full for his Parish and State Tax for 1843, on one-sixth of an acre of land situate and lying in the Parish of Washington.

(Signed.) A. C. BICKHAM, Sheriff and ex-officio Collector of Taxes for the Parish of Washington.

The date, name and quantity (of land) in the aforesaid receipt, appears to have been written on erasures.*

Soon after the process verbal had been signed by the Judges, the said Conlon withdrew, and the Inspectors went on receiving all legally qualified votes, until John Clarkson presented himself to vote; he was objected to for reason that his naturalization certificate had been issued by Judge Elliott. He was duly sworn, and testified that he was an American citizen, that he had been in the country more than six years, was duly naturalized, and that he had resided in the State for one year, and in the Ward six months last past, and that he had paid a tax to the State within six months last past, whereupon the ticket was marked Elliott, retained at the request of Mr. Barker, but not put into the ballot box, whereupon the following process verbal was made:

John Clarkson presented his vote under similar circumstances as Stephen Conlon, when similar proof, similar interrogations under oath, and similar answers were given by the applicant, with the exception that the tax receipt appeared regular, and the applicant stated his residence in the United States to have been for upwards of six years, and the Judges came to the same decision as they did in the case of Stephen Conlon.

(Signed) JACOB PARKER,
JAMES P. FRERET.

Wm. C. Auld, Secretary.

Immediately after the last aforesaid proces verbal had been signed, A. D Kelly, Esq., presented himself and demanded that his vote should be received. Mr. Barker objected, alleging that until Mr. Clarkson's case had been concluded, no other could be considered. Mr. Freret insisted that he would receive it and put it in the ballot box on his own responsibility, whether Mr Barker consented or not. Mr. Barker said he would not oppose any physical force to prevent him, but that if he did so, he could not sign the certificate that the election had been conducted according to the requirements of law; whereupon the Judges made and subscribed separate statements, filing them with the Clerk, viz:—

A. D. Kelly presented himself and claimed to vote. James P. Freret, Esq., considered it a good vote, and wished to put it in the box. Mr. Barker objected, considering the question, while the Inspectors had under consideration the application of John Clarkson, who continued at the polls, demanding that his vote should be put in, which was the case. Mr. Kelly demanded of Mr. Barker to know if he did not consider him entitled to vote. Mr. Barker said that he had no other answer to give than the preceding, adding at the same time, that he had a perfect conviction that Mr. Kelly had a right to vote as soon as the other case was disposed of; whereupon Mr. Freret said he would put the vote in on his own responsibility. Mr. Barker stated that he should not oppose his doing so by force, but he could not certify the election when it was over, as having been legally conducted. (Signed,) JACOB BARKER.

Wm. C. Auld, Secretary.

The above is the individual statement of Jacob Barker, one of the Inspectors of election.

In reply to it, James P. Freret, the other Inspector, declares that he did not consider as alleged by Jacob Barker, that any question was under the consideration of the Inspectors at the time that A. D Kelly presented his ballot to the Inspectors; that it is true that just before Kelly presented his vote, the question as to the right of an individual to vote under a certificate from Judge Elliott, had arisen, but in my opinion, that question had been disposed of

The Inspectors had differed in relation to it, and had noted that difference in their proces verbal, as will appear from the minutes of the Clerk; Jacob Barker giving the opinion in writing that the Elliott vote was good, and J. P. Freret giving his opinion that it was bad.

The ballot alluded to was not put in the ballot box, but retained by the Clerk at the request of Jacob Barker.

After this occurrence, A. D Kelly, an old and respectable and well known citizen, presented his ballot to the Inspectors; Jacob Barker refused to take it, and when asked by Mr. Kelly the cause, said that he could not take another vote until the Elliott vote, which *had been* in question, should be decided upon, and that he considered that as still under consideration. J. P. Freret asked if any one had any challenge to make to Mr. Kelly's vote; that he, Mr. Freret, knew Mr. Kelly to be entitled to a vote, and that if there were no challenge, he would put the vote in the box. Jacob Barker was then asked by Kelly if he would challenge his vote. Barker replied he had a perfect conviction that Mr. Kelly had a right to vote, but that he had nothing else to say than what he had already said; he would take no vote until the Elliott vote which, according to his opinion, was under consideration, should be acted upon Upon this, J. P. Freret declared that as Mr. Kelly's vote was not challenged, and he knew it to be good, and as there was nothing else before the inspectors than the question as to Kelly's vote, he would, under the circumstances, assume the proper responsibility of his office, and put it in the box, Mr. Barker alleging that if the vote of Mr Kelly was put in the box, he would not sign the certificate of the return of the election as having been conducted according to law. I, deeming the vote of Mr. Kelly to be unquestioned, put the vote in the box. (Signed) JAS. P. FRERET.

New Orleans, 1st July, 1844.

Mr. Barker refusing to recognise any further proceedings as the doings of the Inspectors, and the Secretary saying he could not act without two Inspectors, the following compromise or arrangement was entered into, viz:

A misunderstanding having arisen between the Inspectors, in relation to the Elliott votes, the Inspectors entered into the following agreement: That all the legal votes thereafter offering, should be placed in a separate box except the Elliott votes, and that the Elliott votes should be kept in a separate box; that all questions of law arising out of the case as detailed in the proces verbal, should be submitted to Judge Maurian for his opinion thereon and if such opinion should be obtained before closing the polls his judgment should control the conduct of the Inspectors on all questions of law; otherwise the contents of both boxes were to be mingled and counted together, but it was expressly agreed that the Elliott vote should not be counted in the general return, but a separate note made of them, and the whole proceedings, duly signed by both the Inspectors. (Signed,) JACOB BARKER,
JAMES P. FRERET.

W. C. Auld, Secretary.

New Orleans, July 1st, 1844.

After making the aforesaid agreement the election progressed under the superintendence of the two inspectors and secretary, during which the following named individuals, viz: Charles William Bardels, Thomas Kelly, and Henry Cortjohn presented themselves and claimed the right to vote. They were challenged on the ground they had been naturalized citizens; the oath that they would true answers make to all questions which should be propounded to them, touching their right to vote was taken by all, and they all stated that they had obtained their naturalization certificates from Judge Elliott's Court, that they were citizens of the United States, that they had resided in the state for one year and in the ward for six months immediately preceding, and that they had paid taxes to the State of Louisiana within the last six months: whereupon the said James P. Freret refused to consider them entitled to vote, and their ballots were marked Elliott and retained agreeably to the terms of the aforesaid agreement.

Great efforts were made through the day to obtain the presence of and opinion of Judge Maurian—they not being successful, the Poll was closed at the appointed hour and the ballots mingled by placing those from the second into the first box, when the inspectors proceeded to count the same, and there appeared to have been received—

FOR REPRESENTATIVES TO CONGRESS FROM 2D DISTRICT: Alcée Labranche received 133 votes. B. Thibbdaux received 285 votes. Jno. Shidell received 6 votes.

FOR REPRESENTATIVES TO THE STATE LEGISLATURE.

	Votes Received.		Votes Received.
Guyarré	134	Lavergne	239
Johnson	132	Burthe	242
Durrive	133	Lathrop	238
Ramos	127	Gardére	237
Fonteneau	133	Pilie	239
Walker	133	Crossman	238
Winthrop	142	Avery	240
Locke	139	Farrar	243
Vason	137	Duvignaud	238
Daunoy	138	M. Cannon	1
Cruzat	242	S. J. Peters	1

FOR SENATORIAL MEMBER TO THE CONVENTION: John R. Grymes received 147 votes. Martin Blache received 230 votes.

FOR PARISH MEMBERS TO THE CONVENTION:

	Votes Received.		Votes Received.
J. B. Plauché	135	W. Christy	238
W. Bogart	137	W.C.C.Claiborne	239
P. Soulé	135	A. Mazureau	238
H. B. Cenas	128	J. P. Benjamin	247
B. Marigny	128	R Hunt	262
M. Cannon	124	A. C. Bullitt	250
J. C. Larue	120	Jno. Culbertson	242
E. Lasere	127	Gardere	1
N Jourdon	127	Winthrop	1
E Eustis	138	J Barker	1
C. Roselius	255	Crossman	1
C M. Conrad	242	J. R. Grymes	1
S. J. Peters	238		

(Signed,) JAMES P. FRERET, Inspector.
JACOB BARKER, Inspector.

Wm. C. Auld, Secretary.

N B. Four of the five Elliott votes aforesaid and not included in the count aforesaid, were for Alcée Labranche for Congress.

For Legislature.		For the Senatorial Convention.	
Gayarré	do	Jno. R Grymes	do
Johnson	do	J. B. Planche, for Parish	do
Durrive	do	W Bogart	do
Ramos	do	P. Soulé	do
Fontoneau	do	H. B. Cenas	do
Walker	do	B. Marigny	do
Winthrop	do	M. Cannon	do
Locke	do	J. C Larue	do
Vason	do	E. Lesare	do
Dauncy	do	N. Jourdan	do
		G Eustis	do

The other one not included in the aforesaid count, was for B. Thibodaux for Congress.

For Legislature.		For the Senatorial Convention.	
Cruzat	do	Martin Blache	do
Lavergne	do	C. Roselius, for Parish,	do
Burthe	do	C M. Conrad	do
Lathrop	do	S J. Peters	do
Gardére	do	W. Christy	do
Pilie	do	W. C C. Claiborne	do
Crossman	do	A. Mazureau	do
Avery	do	J P Benjamin	do
Farrar	do	R Hunt	do
Duvignard	do	A. C Bullit	do
		Jno. Culbertson	do

(Signed,) JAMES P. FRERET, Inspector.
JACOB BARKER, Inspector.

Wm. C Auld, Secretary.

New Orleans, 31 July, 1844.

* Mr. Barker having refused to receive any other vote so long as the said Conlon continued at the polls, demanding to have his vote put in; in consequence the preceding process verbal was made.

Curious and Interesting Extracts from Late Foreign Journals.

[From the John Bull, June 22.]

The Case of Mr. Belaney.—The case of this gentleman, accused of poisoning his wife by prussic acid, acquires deep interest. On Monday the inquest was resumed before Mr. Baker, the Coroner, at Stepney. We may remind our readers that Mr Belaney and his wife arrived in London on Tuesday, the 4th inst., and took lodgings at Stepney, where they appeared to live on most affectionate terms. The lady is described as having been very handsome On Saturday morning, the 8th, Mr Belaney called the landlady of the lodgings, in great apparent alarm, to his wife's assistance, and in a few minutes afterwards she died in the landlady's arms, the prisoner at the same time observing that her mother had died of a similar attack about nine months before. A *post mortem* examination was held upon the body; and at the inquest which afterwards took place it was proved that Mr. Belaney admitted to several persons that he was in the habit of taking prussic acid to correct his stomach, and owing to an accident he left some exposed in a tumbler in his wife's bed-room, into which he presumed she poured some water and drank it off in a mistake, having previously taken some salts. He explained his not making this statement before, by saying that he was ashamed to admit such neglect respecting so deadly a poison on the part of a medical man. He was apprehended, and a double investigation has since been carried on, before the Coroner and before the Thames Police Magistrate.

On Monday Mr. O'Donnoghue, the surgeon from whom Mr. Belaney had purchased the poison, said that, on the Monday morning after Mrs. Belaney's death, Mr. Belaney and Capt. Clarke called upon him, when Mr. Belaney explained that her death had been caused by his wife having taken the prusic acid by mistake, he having incautiously left it in her way. Captain Clarke, in his evidence, asserted that this interview took place on Tuesday.

Mrs Stobbs, an aunt to Mrs. Belaney, said she had rented a farm from her late sister, Mrs. Skelly, the deceased's mother. She understood that the property which she rented, on her sister's death passed to Mrs. Belaney, and from her to her husband When Mrs. Skelly died she was residing at Mr. Belaney's house. He told her that Mrs. Skelly was asleep, having taken laudanum; and the witness understood that Mrs. Skelly had died the same day.

The inquest was adjourned to Thursday.

On Thursday the inquest was resumed. The additional evidence was the same as that taken on the previous day before the Police Magistrate, and which is given below.

Mr. Baker, the coroner, then summed up the evidence at considerable length, pointing out the strong circumstances of suspicion which it contained; and the jury, after a deliberation of between three and four hours, returned a verdict of "wilful murder" against the prisoner.

On Wednesday the investigation of the case was resumed before Mr. Broderip, at the Thames Police Court, which was crowded to excess.

Some of the prisoner's personal friends, persons of great respectability in the counties of Durham and Northumberland, and amongst others a county magistrate, a near neighbor of Mr. Belaney's, occupied the reserved seats in Court, and his brother, a Clergyman of the Established Church, who, it is understood, has a living at Arlington, in Essex, and to whom, it appears, from one of the letters put in evidence, the prisoner was about to proceed on a visit with his wife, sat on one of the benches appropriated to solicitors.

The first witness was Inspector Haynes, who had been collecting evidence in the north. He gave in certain documents which he had procured, and which were read. There were several letters from the prisoner to Mr. Bell, agent for limeworks in Sunderland, in which the prisoner was a partner. The first was dated June 5, and mentions their arrival in London, adding that Mrs. Belaney was rather unwell. This letter was dated from the Euston Hotel, although the prisoner had removed to Green street, Stepney, on the preceding day. The next letter was dated the 8th, the day of Mrs. Belaney's death. In it he said:—

"I have had her removed from the hotel to private lodgings, where, with two medical attendants, she remains dangerously ill. Symptoms of premature labor came on a few days ago; but, what is still worse, one of the medical men pronounces the heart to be diseased. Of this I have had some dread myself."

Mr. Broderip—It is in evidence Mrs. Belaney died on the day this letter bears date.

Mr Symons.—That is so, sir; on the morning of June 8.

On the 9th he wrote:—

"The worst that could be dreaded has come to pass Rachel is no more. You shall know all. Put the men off work at the new house. As such could not be done at the quarry and lime works without great inconvenience to the partnership, I shall not desire the same there. I am hardly able to sit up; but hope to be able to write to-morrow more particulars. As her death has occurred chiefly amongst strangers and so suddenly, an inquest and *post mortem* examination will be held. This has been mentioned to me. Of course, I do not object to it."

The next letter was dated June, without specifying the day, but had the post mark of June 14. It was addressed to Mr. Richard Hall, North Sunderland. It began:—

London, June, 1844.

"Dear Hall—O! I am distracted. I cannot write nor do any thing. I have lost my dear Rachel; and, what makes the loss so much the worse, it was caused by my own neglect, from leaving some medicine which I myself had been taking some portion of for my stomach, in a tumbler on the top of the drawers at the opposite end of the room where she was. She had gone for the tumbler, and poured some water into it without observing any thing in it, the medicine being only a small portion of liquid in the bottom of the glass, and clear as the glass or water. Then she had drunk it. Oh, my God! I know not what to do. My dear Rachel is gone, gone forever from me. You and all of you knew how happy we were together. I had just gone, leaving her in bed, out of the room for a minute or so, into the other room, in search of another bottle to put the medicine in; for I had broken the one it was in, and had got a tumbler in the meantime to secure the contents in, and she had got out of bed to use the —— and take some salts, which were on the table by her bedside, and, wishing to take some water after the salts, and supposing the glass an empty and clean one, she had gone to the other end of the room, unknowingly poured water into it, and, oh, God! have mercy upon us all, she drank a portion of it. I heard her cry for me in the other room. I flew to her; but, oh, God! it was all over in a few minutes, and I am now in a state of mind bordering on utter misery and madness. In the sudden shock I knew not what to do or say. I called for immediate assistance. It was brought; but of no use. The awful occurrence having taken place in a situation where I am entirely unknown, all are strangers around, and the people being much inclined to doubt my statement that she was my wife, and every thing else I said, I am in a terrible situation The law has a right to suspect me, and as yet I have not a creature found to prove my marriage, or what I am, or who I am. I have nothing to prove any thing as yet."

The letter, which was written in a trembling hand, and was in some parts scarcely legible, was of considerable length, and the prisoner earnestly entreated Mr. Hall to do all he could for him, and wait upon his friends and Mrs. Stobbs, the aunt of the deceased, and send them to London. It concluded with these words—"I must now stop; I am quite bewildered, as if in an unconscious dream."

The next was to Mr. Bell, apparently written the day after the above, and gave directions as to carrying on the business of the concern, and to obtaining and sending witnesses on the prisoner's behalf. There was also a letter from Mr. Clarke to Mr. Bell, and dated June 15, 1844, and stated that he was directed by Mr. Belaney, who was then in custody, and had been examined before the Magistrate, to state that he wished the business to go on as usual, and that Mr. Belaney's solicitor had advised that none of his correspondence should be seen, and to allow no one to see any of his private papers of whatever nature they might be. The writer also requested that all letters for Mr. Belaney should be sent under cover to him (Mr. Clarke,) at 17, King street, Stepney, to prevent their being seen or published.

Two wills, found in the prisoner's house, were read. They were by the prisoner and his wife, and in precisely the same terms, containing mutual bequests of all their property, from the one to the other. They were dated the 17th of May last. Wilson, a labourer in the prisoner's employment, said he had witnessed these wills the evening before Mr. and Mrs Belaney left home, both of them being present. More, a shoemaker, gave similar evidence.

Margaret Ronald, a servant of the prisoner and his wife, said that her mistress had once had a miscarriage during the night, but that no medical assistance was called in.

William Shaw, a police serjeant, produced a letter written by the prisoner in the station-house, which he intercepted. It was addressed to Mr Embleton, of Alnwick, Northumberland, and was very similar in its language to the one addressed to Mr Hall.

Mr. Broderip then remanded the prisoner till Saturday; intimating that, if no additional evidence were given, he should then commit the prisoner to take his trial for the wilful murder of Rachel Belaney.

The announcement, which excited a deep sensation in the Court, did not seem in any degree to shake the prisoner, who walked steadily back to his cell.

Colonel Stoddart and Captain Conolly.—The following very striking circular letter or address from Dr. Wolff, has just been received in this country. We regret to observe that his hopes are waxing fainter amid the difficulties which surround him; but his noble and intrepid efforts appear to be unabated:—

"Merve, *in the Tent of Ameer Savog the Toorcomaun, 230 English miles from Bokhara April 15, 1844.*

"To all the Missionary Societies, all the Philanthropic Societies, the Societies for the Abolition of Slavery, and all Scientific Societies of England, France, Germany, Austria, Prussia, and Russia, Sweden, Denmark, Hindostan and America.

"My dear Friends—Since I left Teheraum, the prospects of my finding well and alive and free my friends Stoddart and Conolly become, with the progress of my journey towards Bokhara, dimmer and dimmer, and daily more cloudy. I find everywhere, it is true, people who tell me that both are alive—and it is also a fact that no public execution has been witnessed in Bokhara; and it is also true that the Khaleefa, the holy dervish of Mowr, whose hospitable tent I left yesterday, escorted by one of his relations and other Toorcomauns towards Bokhara, tells me that Stoddart certainly was alive; but it is also certain that if they are alive, they must sigh in the miserable prison called Harum Seray—a room which is close to the room of the harem of the Umeer, so that there is no possibility for them to communicate their condition to a living soul. I therefore address to you these lines from here, where I am detained to-day by the snow, that I shall be at Bokhara in five or six days, if the Umeer does not send an order to stop my progress to Char-Joo, the first frontier place of Bokhara, and where I shall arrive after to-morrow

"In case that you should learn after my arrival at Bokhara that both Conolly and Stoddart are dead, and even my own head has fallen by the hand of the ruler of Bokhara, I beseech you, then, to exert all your powers for some higher purpose, for some more noble purpose than avenging the death of those excellent and gallant officers and other Europeans—I mean, exert your powers, then, for the purpose of ransoming 200,000 Persian slaves, and several Italians, as Giovanni, the watchmaker, etc., who have been brought there from Khorosaun and Persia; and many thousands of those Persians have been sold for the most immoral, unmentionable use to Bokhara and its neighborhood. They are not black slaves, but white slaves. And I also beseech you to learn, should you hear of my own execution, that there was a Jew who has been enabled, by God's grace, to expose his life for the purpose of saving the lives of Gentiles.

"And you, noble relations of my beloved Georgiana, should you hear that my head has fallen at Bokhara, be kind to my wife, and to my dear son, Henry Drummond Charles Wolff.

"Your affectionate friend,
Joseph Wolff, L. L. D., D. D.,
"Late Curate of High Hayland, in Yorkshire."

The Fur Company's Stores.—A great deal is heard at the east about the stores, in St. Louis, of the American Fur Company. A short description of them may not be amiss. The present are two large, fire-proof structures, recently built, but with one door of connection, which, in case of fire, may be closed up with double iron shutters, fitting airtight in the wall, so that one building may burn, and the other remain cool as an ice cellar. Spacious vaults and cellars, constructed of native rock, range beneath the front warehouse, and offices of convenience extend under the side walk of the street, having a subterranean jet off cut through the solid rock to the river. Through this runs the superflux of rain from the roofs, after the cisterns are supplied, and thus a high state of cleanliness is constantly preserved. Upon the first floor, ranging level with the street, are the director's rooms, and clerk's offices, together with an immense iron apartment, imbedded in brick, with vents in the wall for heat to escape, and sitting upon a solid foundation of stone. Ætna might belch lava upon it, and the books would be safe! Above that is an extensive room running the whole length of the building, where huge bales of blankets, furs, boxes of hardware, and other necessaries of the trade are stored. The floors above are divided into various wholesale and retail stores, some exclusively for traders, others for Indians. The large traders lead to one store, the poor trapper to another, and the Indian to another. There is no great subtlety and skill required in managing well the complicated peculiarities of the tree. The rear warehouse presents the appearance of an immense factory. A great number of men are constantly in active employ, sorting and arranging skins, packing, pressing, and putting them away in bales; a machine being used in the operation of pressing similar in principle, though smaller of course, than a New Orleans cotton press.

Our sketch is by no means a complete one, but may give those at a distance a slight idea of the extensive way in which the company carry on their operations.—*St Louis Reveille.*

Dreadful Tornado at Chambersburg.—We are indebted to an intelligent friend, for the following extract of a letter, dated

Chambersburg, Pa., July 19, 1844.—I write in haste, to inform you of the destruction of the large paper mill on the bank of the Conecocheague creek, in this town. A tornado passed over this place about two o'clock this afternoon It lasted but a few minutes, but when it had passed, this extensive building lay a mass of ruins. There were seventeen or eighteen persons in the mill at the time of the occurrence, all of whom were got out after considerable exertions. Among them were Dr. Culbertson, Sen., the proprietor, who escaped with some severe bruises and scratches—his two sons, Dr. Edmund and Mr John Culbertson, both of whom are severely injured; a little boy, grandson of Dr. C., who is very badly hurt; seven or eight females, some of whom are badly injured, and five or six men, some of whom are also badly hurt. This mill was erected several years since, at a cost of $30,000 It was employed entirely in the manufacture of straw paper and binders' boards; large quantities of which were in it at the time of the accident. The tornado passed from N. W. to S. E., and was very violent; we seemed to be just on the edge of it, for the sun shone brightly while the rain poured down in torrents I understand that it has done much injury to crops, buildings, trees, &c in the country. The wind seemed to go with a whirling motion, twisting off