deemed the meanest thing that crawls on testimony like that. Counsel again referred to the interview in the Recorder's office, and suggested that Mrs. Connolly had intimated that her husband could give evidence in this case. But, said he, when the husband, Connolly, came on it was found that he knew nothing of the case, and then he was thrown out, with a promise that he should not be tried, if his wife would tell an effective story against Judge Stuart. The proposition was agreed to, and we have had the woman on the stand to convict a judge, and to sacrifice her paramour, a thief. But this, he said, was not the only deplorable aspect of this case. There was a judge—Recorder Smith—himself interested in the case, in the Star Chamber, secretly laboring for the ruin of his fellow judge. In that same judge is the political opponent of the accused, and one who, it is well known, sat in the Board of Police Commissioners in opposition to Judge Stuart and in conjunction with the Mayor. Besides him, there was a District Attorney who imagined he had been injured, and a thief, and the paramour of half a dozen thieves, all meeting together in secret, and struggling for the conviction of an honest judge and of a noted villain. Such was the combination against Judge Stuart; and such a combination, it was to be hoped, would never be made against the vilest person in the community. Here was a woman known to be a thief and a prostitute, coming upon the stand and swearing that, in the eye of the law, she was the principal offender. She offered the bribe—and that alone constitutes her an accomplice. Counsel descanted upon the sort of corroborative evidence sought to be given in this case, by the production of her bank book, and showed how unworthy an attempt it was. He said that a like sum of $500 appeared to have been drawn three months before—on the 5th of November, and suggested that that fact m'gat, with as much justice, be used as a sort of corroboration to support a charge which might have been made against the Recorder. Still less worthy, and more contemptible, was the sort of corroboration sought to be lent to the prosecution in the case, by the proof that Judge Stuart was in adverse pecuniary circumstances. He thougut, or took for granted, that there was no thirst for blood here; that there was but a desire to discharge professional duties; but he thought the gentleman's (Mr. Cutting's) conceptions of professional duties in criminal cases was somewhat distracted by his practice in criminal cases. In conclusion, he intimated that he would not be surprised if the jury should manifest their appreciation of this woman's testimony, by returning a verdict of acquittal without leaving their box.

The learned counsel sat down, overcome by his emotion.

The Court then took a recess for fifteen minutes, and re-assembled at a quarter past 5 o'clock, when

Mr. Cutting proceeded to sum up on the part of the prosecution. After an eloquent exordium, in which he descanted on the danger to republican institutions flowing from judicial and official corruption, he continued to recite and bring out in bold relief the most salient points of the evidence in the case.

THE JUDGE'S CHARGE.

Judge Roosevelt then proceeded, amid the deepest attention, to charge the jury. He said—This case, gentlemen, I believe, is the first of its kind in our judicial annals. In English history we have all read, as an insulated instance, of the bribery of Lord Chancellor Bacon. He confessed the offence, and was ignominiously dismissed from office and branded, as you may recollect, with the epithet of

The greatest, wisest and meanest of mankind.

The crime which Bacon confessed is imputed to, but strenuously denied by, the defendant now on trial; and it will be for you, gentlemen, after what you have heard, and after the few observations which I shall now proceed to make to you, to say whether the imputation—grave and solemn as we must all admit it to be—is or is not well founded. Some time in the spring of 1853, a man whose real name was Connolly, but who chose to assume, for reasons of his own, that of Cosgrove, was arrested under the latter name for, burglary committed in the New York Hotel. About two years afterwards, without trial or punishment, the prosecution of the trial was discontinued, or supposed to be, by an entry in the records of the Court of Sessions, not made by leave of the Court, at the instance of the District Attorney, but at the instance of the Court, by the leave of the District Attorney. And the allegation now is, that the entry so made was the result of a corrupt understanding between the Judge and the wife of the person charged. In other words, it is alleged that a bribe of $500, paid to and accepted by Judge Stuart, was the motive influencing the act. The case, therefore, presents two leading points of inquiry. First—was there, in point of fact, any such proceeding? And second—what, if so, was its object and intent? I shall consider first the evidence of intent, for the obvious reason that, unless a corrupt intention be shown, the charge of receiving a bribe cannot, on the other evidence in the case, be sustained. Intent, if unlawful, is seldom avowed. It is deduced from conditions and circumstances, from acts which speak sometimes dubiously, sometimes clearly, and sometimes louder than words. Let us look, then, into the acts of the parties as delineated in the evidence before us, taking them up mainly in their chronological order, and in connection incidentally with any words used, and giving the defence, as you are bound to do, the benefit of every reasonable doubt. Let us see to what conclusion they naturally, fairly and lawfully lead. In the year 1847, and down to the 1st of January last, the present City Judge, now on trial, was connected with the police of the city, having at one time the jurisdiction of examining and committing magistrate. Some years before 1847, there were two young women—the elder called Margaret, now called Mrs. Connolly or Duval; the younger Elizabeth, now Mrs. Fish—residing with their mother and brother in the county of Otsego. The elder, subsequently known as Mrs. Ascensio, then as Mrs. Duval—an assumed name—and now as Mrs. Connolly, came to this city in or about the year 1837. Her age was then about eighteen. Her manner of life, unless so far as it may affect her credibility, it is unnecessary to dwell on. After having lived here twelve years, she had occasion, it appears, to go to the police office at the Tombs. The clerk in attendance was the defendant now before us, and that was the occasion on which she says he first made her acquaintance. It was in 1847. She then lived in Leonard street. Soon afterwards, in the same year, she moved to Church street, and there the defendant, she says, visited her house. In the following year, 1848, she was married, she says—and her sister, who attended the wedding, confirms the statement—to a Spaniard or Cuban, of the name of Ascensio. This is the first time we are introduced to her as a married woman *de jure*, if not *de facto*. Their conjugal felicity was of short duration. In two days after their ill-starred union, he, in a fit of jealousy, attacked her life, and she, in terror, fled to the police magistrate for protection, where she saw the new City Judge. On her complaint a warrant of commitment was issued against the violent groom, who some time after was committed to prison; and after some time, being released, he left the country for Cuba, where, it is said, he died. From Church street Mrs. Ascensio, or Mrs. Duval, removed to Laurens and thence to Wooster street, in both which places, it is alleged, the defendant was in the habit of visiting her. So that all the time when the alleged bribery, if at all, was consummated, was during the acquaintance which was one of seven or eight years' standing. I assume that, although open to criticism, it was a lawful and proper acquaintance, and that one of the objects of the defendant in his visits was to induce this woman to lead a different life. The evidence on that point, except to prove the intimacy of the parties, was inadmissible. This is not an action for a divorce, and the defendant is not now on trial for any alleged offence against the marriage law. You will not, therefore, be justified in inferring further that on the 17th February, 1855, the two alleged actors, in this act of bribery, were intimate with each other, [redacted] so for several years previously. We will no[redacted] a period of about two years, to the commen[redacted] the prosecution, whose defeat in some form, by dismissal or sham trial, was the great object of the anxiety of both parties. In April, 1853, Mrs. Duval was living with a man whose character is sufficiently apparent of the name of William Connolly. Part of the evidence calls him her man. What they mean by that I do not exactly know. This man, when arrested, gave his name as William Cosgrove, and was carried to the Jefferson Market station. The magistrate, at first, deeming the case to be one of a very aggravated character, was inclined to hold the offender in actual custody, and to allow no bail. Being pressed, however, by the counsel of Connolly, he consented to admit him to bail, fixing the sum at $5,000; an amount which it was found impossible or inconvenient to procure; and this bail, though much reduced afterwards, was retained at a sum of $3,000. This evidence is of no further importance than as showing the official as well as individual opinion, at that time entertained by the City Judge of the criminal, for whose release he afterwards, as is said, evinced so much solicitude. And the Grand Jury seems to coincide in opinion with the City Judge. The Grand Jury promptly formed and returned the bill of indictment, and on the 3d of May following, and again on the 19th, the case was called for trial before the General Sessions, when the party indicted failing to appear, a bench warrant was issued against him and judgment of forfeiture pronounced on the bonds in the case. The culprit, it appears, as soon as he was liberated on bail, had left the State; his female friend, the widow Duval or Ascensio, by a previous understanding, in a few days afterwards met him in Philadelphia. A very curious understanding there is there. On the 29th of April, 1853, the impediment to a legal union being now removed by the death of Ascensio, the parties were legally married to each other. She returned the same night to New York, leaving her indicted husband, as a matter of precaution, out of this State. There was some criticism, gentlemen, as to that certificate of marriage; but it appeared to me perfectly plain. At all events there is no doubt as to the date of the marriage. When the Court of Sessions met and was ready to go on with his trial, Cosgrove, when called, made no response; and thus it was that Mr. John B. Fink, who had been induced to go bail for him by an advance of one thousand dollars and a mortgage on Mrs. Connolly's house, was introduced, and becomes an actor in this extraordinary drama. While Mrs. Duval, in addition to freeing her husband, would naturally be desirous to get back her $1,000, and get rid of her mortgage, Frank, as naturally, for a time at least, would like to retain both, and get rid of the judgment against him by the people. Mrs. Duval did not sell out her establishment in Wooster street—where the accused continued his visits, as she and the colored woman state—till the 27th of March, 1854. It may be sufficient, at present, to observe that Mrs. Connolly swears she had, during that year, numerous interviews with Mr. Stuart on the subject of her husband's case, and that Mr. Stuart was, in November of that year, elected to the office of one of the two Judges of the Court of General Sessions of the Peace. He was to take his seat, by law, on the 1st of January, 1855, and to hold his Court by arrangement in the month of February following. On Tuesday evening, February 13, by previous appointment made in the building, she called on the Judge at his residence in Twenty-seventh street, on the subject of her husband's difficulty, and had an interview with him, in which he said that these cases (meaning such as her husband's) cost money; and that though he was willing to do his share in it as a matter of charity, still about $200 would be requisite; to which she replied that she had $500 lying in bank, of which her husband knew nothing, which she would willingly give to have a *nol. pros.* entered. Another interview was then arranged for the next evening at the same place; and here I might remark that if her statements as to being at that private house were not true, it seems but natural to think that it would have been disproved by calling persons to shew she was not there. At this next interview he told her, she says, that the matter could be arranged for the $500; and it was concluded that she was to draw it out of the bank on the 15th, and bring it to the Judge at his office in this building. She brought it accordingly, she says, in five bank bills of $100 each, which she handed to the Judge, and which the Judge—having looked over them—put into his vest pocket, telling her that it was all right, that he would get a *nolle prosequi* entered for her that day, and that she might come to his house that evening and learn the result. She went to his private house that night; and having waited in a cold room from 6 to 10—is that not true?—the Judge came in, and after apology for having detained her. He said in substance that he had not been able to do anything for her that day. The next interview was fixed for Saturday evening, at the Judge's house. Now I might as well remark, here, gentlemen, that it is a well established maxim of the law, and one which will not fail to commend itself to your good sense, that testimony of conversation, especially when there is no other person present, and more especially when the character of the witness is not free from blame, and is a party to the transaction, must be received with great caution. The statute of 1853 has in express terms made the testimony of an accomplice not only admissible but compulsory. A person refusing to testify may be sent to prison and kept there. It is a pretty rigorous act. Such testimony is to be believed or not believed, however, from its intrinsic credibility or incredibility, or from the corroborative or contradictory circumstances, and is not to be disbelieved merely on the ground that it comes from the lips of a *particeps criminis*. This is the law of the land. Keeping this rule in view, we now proceed to the important interview of the parties on Feb. 17, 1855, of which Mrs. Connolly gives you substantially the following version:—

A. He told me there had been a *nolle prosequi* entered, but he had forgot to bring up the papers, and that he would write me a paper which I could take to Connolly, and bring him to this city, where I might give him all the comforts I could if he was sick; I did not tell Mr. Stuart that he was in the city at the time; he wrote the paper and handed it to me, and I saw there was a mistake in the date and in the name; he had it Wm. Connolly, and I told him that he was indicted by the name of Cosgrove; he tore up that paper, and wrote a second one; he set the name of Wm. Cosgrove down on a slip of paper, and kept that himself, and gave me the paper which he wrote; I looked at the paper, and told him there was a mistake in the date; "That," says he, "makes no difference;" well I did not read the balance of it, but folded it up and put it in my pocket, for I was anxious to show it to my husband; it was then about 11 o'clock at night, for it was after 12 when I got home.

There is no pretence but that this certificate is genuine. There is no doubt of its being in the handwriting of the defendant. Here, then, is a fact not pretended to be controverted. The paper is in these words:—

CITY AND COUNTY OF NEW YORK, } Office of the City Judge, Feb. 19, 1855. }

This is to certify, that on the motion of the District Attorney of said city and county, a *nolle prosequi* was this day ordered and entered of record by the Court of General Sessions of the peace in and for the city and county aforesaid, in the matter of the indictment against Wm. Connolly, discharging the said indictment, and dismissing the complaint and accusation found and preferred against him in the month of April, 1853.

There being now no indictment in said Court against the said Connolly for any criminal offence whatever.

S. H. STUART, City Judge.

This paper, she says, the defendant handed to her that night. The endorsement on the back of the envelope is "William Connolly, Esq." The error in the date was this: he had dated it on the 19th, whereas it was the 17th. The witness says:—

This paper I took off with me, and gave it to my husband; there was an error in the date of the paper, the second as well as the first; it was Saturday, the 17th, and he dated it 19th, and I called his attention to that, when he said it made no difference; he said the *nol pros* was entered, but it had slipped his mind, and he did not bring over the papers; that he had not spoken to Hall about it that day, but that it was all right; and that if I would call on Monday morning for the paper, which he would get from Mr. Hall, he would give it to me; I promised him I would call on Monday, but I did not; I was actually ashamed to run there so much, and there were always so many people in the office; I had given him the address of my brother, and told him he might write to me there, and send it to me to the address of my brother, which was South Worcester, Otsego county; he said he would do so.

Here then, whatever may be said of the other particulars of the interview, is strong if not conclusive proof under his own hand, that on the 17th, if not the 19th, Judge Stuart in his official capacity gave to Mrs. Connolly or to her husband a formal certificate that the indictment against Wm. Connolly was discharged and the complaint dismissed. This certificate, if given on the 17th, was in every sense untrue, and its falsity in that event would throw a strong light on other points in the case. There is no pretence that any *nolle prosequi*, regular or irregular, had been entered in that matter before the 19th. A cloud of witnesses and the record of the Court put this point beyond dispute. May we not suppose, however, and in that way reconcile the seeming contradiction that Judge Stuart in fact wrote and delivered the certificate on the 17th, in the full assurance that its contents, though not true when written, would be true when dated, on a principle which we lawyers know as *nunc pro tunc?* Certain it is that on Monday he exerted himself, and in a manner neither usual nor regular, to make the certificate true. Instead of waiting for the District Attorney to ask leave of the Court, he, as the Court, asked the leave of the District Attorney to have this *nolle prosequi* entered. He procured a note from the District Attorney to John Sparks, and got the certificate of entering from the clerk. He had obtained, he knew, from the District Attorney, a written consent for the discharge of Wm. Connolly, a person whose offence he represented to be of a comparatively insignificant character, and had applied it to the case of Wm. Cosgrove, a case of which he had often spoken to the District Attorney, and which he had considered of so grevious a character that he had practically almost refused bail. When, therefore, he directed the clerk to make an entry of the discharge of Wm. Cosgrove he had no warrant from the District Attorney, either in fact or in intent, in saying that he had made the order at the motion of the District Attorney. The important discrepancy between the names was remarked to him by Mr. Vandervoort, but he said it was all right. Why was not the order suspended till the return of Mr. Hall to the office, next morning? or why, at least, was not the issue of the certified copy delayed for a few hours? And why, when issued, was it taken by the Judge himself and transmitted to Connolly, instead of being returned, as was promised, to Mr. Hall? And why did he afterwards tell Recorder Smith that no such proceeding had been or would be taken? And why, further, when Mr. Smith confronted him on this subject, did he not give some satisfactory explanation, if any could be given? Neither Mr. Hall nor Mr. Smith knew anything at this time of the alleged bribe being paid. All they knew was that the indictment against Cosgrove was dismissed in an extraordinary manner. No explanation was given of it by Judge Stuart. On the contrary, you will recollect, so dissatisfied were they for the want of explanation, that instead of acquiescing in the discharge of the complaint, they, or one of them, in a few days afterwards, caused a new indictment to be found against Connolly, a bench warrant to be issued, and subsequently an indictment to be found against the Judge himself. But the efforts of the Judge did not, it is said, end here, but were continued to thwart the course of the new indictment. But Mrs. Connolly had many interviews with the Judge after that date, is proved by several witnesses, particularly by Elder, his confidential officer. I will not detain you, gentlemen, at this late hour, by recapitulating the testimony on this point. I will barely observe that it is only important, and indeed only admissable, as throwing a probability on the truth of the main charge against Judge Stuart. The scene is laid, according to her account, in the Judge's private apartment, attached to his public office. Assuming that an interview actually occurred at the time and place specified, we have next to inquire what are the probabilities or improbabilities of the truth of the rest of her statement. A woman, however intelligent, who for years has been the companion of thieves and prostitutes, who gives false answers to questions which she deems counsel have not the right to put, is obnoxious to the severest criticism, and her evidence is hardly of itself a sufficient basis for a conviction, without corroborative circumstances. The hour is so late, gentlemen that I shall not go through these things in detail. These corrobatory circumstances, I will therefore observe, are numerous, and some of them imposing. They have been detailed to you by the evidence, and have been clearly laid before you by the distinguished counsel, both for the prosecution and for the defence. You will weigh them carefully, gentlemen, without prejudice on the one hand or fear on the other. It is your province to determine whether the accused is guilty or not guilty and it is your duty, on your oaths, yielding neither to clamor nor sympathy, to give a true verdict according to the evidence, and to give it also as your own independent judgments, and uninfluenced, if you deem proper, by any suggestions, one way or the other, which may have fallen from the bench.

The jury then, at 10 o'clock, P. M., retired; the court room being all the time, up to this late hour, crowded with spectators.

ACQUITTAL OF JUDGE STUART.

At a quarter to 12 P. M., the jury came into court, when the interest and excitement of all present came to a culminating point. The jury took their seats, and Mr. Vandervoort, the Clerk, called their names. Having answered to their names, the Clerk asked—

Gentlemen—Have you agreed to your verdict?

The FOREMAN—We have.

The CLERK—How say you, gentlemen, is Sydney H. Stuart guilty or not guilty?

The FOREMAN—Not guilty.

Here there was some applause in the court, which was promptly suppressed by the officers.

The FOREMAN—We have a recommendation. Shall we hand it to you (Mr. Cutting) or to the Court?

Mr. CUTTING—The Court.

Judge ROOSEVELT (after perusing the paper)—The jury, in addition to their verdict, make the following recommendation:—

The jury are unanimously of opinion that in the entry of the *nolle prosequi* by the City Judge he has been guilty of irregularities, and it is the unanimous recommendation of the jury that Judge Stuart resign.

Mr. CUTTING—I move that that paper be filed on the records.

JUDGE STUART'S SPEECH.

Judge STUART, with great evident emotion, addressed the Court. He said:—

I have one word to say. The question of my resignation must be left alone to my sense of propriety, to my regard for public opinion, and to my own consciousness of my innocence or guilt in the premises. I shall, in the consideration of this subject, advise with wise and fair friends, among whom are the distinguished gentlemen who have come to my aid in this dreadful calamity, with others whom I might with propriety name; and as they shall advise so will I be governed. I declare, in the face of God, that however censurable my conduct may have been, however indiscreet my acts may seem, as they have been presented in part on truthful evidence, and in part on perjured testimony—however indiscreet, unwise and imprudent the aspect and phase of the case may be, in regard to my conduct touching this bad woman, I repeat in the face of Heaven and before my God that I am innocent of any criminal conduct, so far as the question of bribery or corruption is to be considered. Much of her evidence is true; very much of it false. Part of her evidence is true, and—unfortunately for me—to a degree which seems to give some color of reality to that which is utterly false. I would to God that this auditory, this Court, and the public at large, knew from first to last the whole facts of this case. Indeed, indeed, my friends might perhaps blush for me in view of my indiscretions; but in truth, in real truth, my dearest friends or my worst foes could not say that I have acted wilfully, intentionally, corruptly, or criminally wrong in any particular. This I most solemnly avow.

Many persons crowded around Judge Stuart, and congratulated him on his acquittal.

Judge ROOSEVELT—The paper will be put on file. In view of the late hour, the Court will stand adjourned till Thursday morning at 10 o'clock.

The Court was accordingly, at 12 midnight, adjourned.

Kansas Affairs.

THE KANSAS FREE STATE CONVENTION.

[Correspondence of the St. Louis Democrat.]

TOPEKA, Thursday, Nov. 1, 1855.

The two parties—democrats and republicans—of which the Convention is constituted, will have no further difficulty about the question of excluding free negroes from Kansas. Col. Lane, who, with Messrs. Delahay and Parrott, leads the democratic and administration party, has introduced and carried a resolution by which the admission or exclusion of free negroes will be settled by a direct vote of the people on the day when the constitution is submitted to the sovereign squatters for rejection or ratification.

On this question the whigs join with the democrats. I believe that as soon as Kansas is admitted as a State, the whigs will "fuse" with the democrats, rather than adopt the "republican" creed. Col. Lane regards the negro as the connecting link between man and the ourang-outang; Mr. Delahay considers him as an animal merely, while Dr. Robinson, the leader of the republicans, looks on him as a man and brother.

Dr. Robinson is not an abolitionist, but acts with parties only as they act against the extension of slavery. While the democrats laud the doctrine of squatter sovereignty, he is opposed to the admission of another inch of slave soil, and consequently to that peculiar principle "as enunciated of the Kansas Nebraska act." The Territory, I believe, is democratic by a large majority.

To-day the question of permitting the establishment or prohibiting banks by constitutional provision, has occupied the attention of the Convention to the exclusion of all other topics. It originated on the report of the standing Committee on Banks, of which I subjoin a copy:—

The standing Committee on Banks and Currency have instructed me to make the following report, to wit:—

Sec. 1. The General Assembly shall have no power to create or incorporate banks or any banking institution whatever, or to authorise the making, emission or putting in circulation of any bill of credit, bond, check, ticket, certificate, promissory note or other medium intended to circulate as money.

Sec. 2. The General Assembly shall prohibit by law the circulation of foreign bank paper within the State.

Sec. 3. The business of borrowing and dealing in money shall be left free to all, subject only to such restrictions as may be provided by law, provided that no special privileges or exemptions shall ever be granted to those engaged in such business, nor shall any person, either natural or artificial, be allowed to deal in or issue paper money.

M. W. DELAHAY, Chairman.

The forenoon was spent in attempts to amend the constitution, and defences of the article as it stands. The subject was discussed in every possible light.

Colonel LANE finally offered a resolution referring the report back to the committee, with instructions to provide a clause authorizing a system of free banking, to be submitted to the people for ratification or rejection. The resolution prevailed, although warmly opposed.

POPULATION OF KANSAS.

In the debates to-day, Colonel Lane declared the population of Kansas to be from 40,000 to 50,000, while Mr. Latta, of Leavenworth, denied that there were more than from 20,000 to 25,000 souls in the Territory. I believe there are about 32,000 or 35,000.

STATE ORGANIZATION.

The convention met again at half past six. The order of the evening was the question of State organization. Mr. Schuyler, of Council City, opened the debate with an able speech against the organization of a State government before the decision of Congress in relation to admitting Kansas as a State. Mr. Schuyler is a speaker of great ability, conservative but liberal in his political ideas. His dignified demeanor, just discrimination, and sound judgment, give weight to his opinions on all questions he debates. In referring to the fact, assumed as an incontrovertible proposition by the advocates of an immediate organization, that the House of Representatives would instantly pass a bill admitting Kansas as a State, he said he believed we had more to fear from our friends than enemies; that the free soil party of the North had made arrangements to carry on the next Presidential campaign on the Kansas question, and would, therefore if any excuse was given them to do so, refuse to settle the troubles created by the repeal of the Missouri compromise by our immediate admission. He opposed it, also, on the ground that if we were admitted, the Territorial government and the free State organization would come in conflict. He said that Governor Shannon, with a conversation with him, had not only expressed his firm determination to carry out the laws of the Barons of the Shawnee Mission, but given him to understand that he had authority from President Pierce to call out the military force to assist him in their execution.

The discussion on State organization closed about ten o'clock, after Judge Wakefield had spoken in favor of and Dr. Robinson against immediate organization.

EMIGRANT AID SOCIETY.

Dr. Robinson said, that, as an agent of that Society, he wished to contradict certain false statements regarding it, which had been circulated for months past in pro-slavery papers, and he found were believed by members of the free State party. He then stated the object of the society, which agreed with the account given in its recent address to the citizens of Missouri, and added that every prominent member of its committee, Mr. Thayer alone excepted, were known as the most conservative men in New England—Webster whigs or "hunkers," as they are called in politics—men whom the Eastern abolitionists abuse as pro-slavery doughfaces. The society, he maintained, was merely a commercial organization; its object was to facilitate emigration to the West by reducing railroad fares, starting mills, hotels and other necessary, but expensive requirements, in new countries; and that to all the advantages it might confer on settlers, the slaveholder from South Carolina with his negroes were as much entitled, by the laws of the society, as any abolitionist.

THE DUEL BETWEEN MESSRS. LANE AND LOWREY.

The *Democrat's* correspondent says:—

I presume that very few of your readers have been engaged in "personal affairs," and that still fewer of them do not take interest in account of duels. Perhaps the interest taken in hostile private encounters is the sign of a morbid public morality, but whether it is so or no, none will deny that it is great, and universally felt. I sent you a copy of a challenge and acceptance that passed, a few days since, between Col. James H. Lane and Mr. G. P. Lowrey, the private secretary of ex-Governor Reeder, and informed you, also, that an amicable arrangement had prevented a fatal termination of the affair. I subjoin a transcript of the *amende honorable*:—

In regard to the conversation had between M. J. Parrott and G. P. Lowrey, with reference to reports in circulation about Col. J. H. Lane, to which exceptions have been made by said Lane, Mr. Lowrey states that whatever was said by him in regard to said reports was intended in confidence to Mr. Parrott, as a personal and mutual friend, without pretending to vouch for their truth, or to injure Col. Lane.

And Mr. J. Parrott, as the friend of Col. Lane, accepts this statement as satisfactory, and he and James F. Legate, the friend of G. P. Lowrey, consider the affair honorably and finally settled, and the said Lane and Lowrey withdraw their correspondence.

MARCUS J. PARROTT, in behalf of Col. Lane.
JAMES F. LEGATE, in behalf of G. P. Lowrey.

George S. Park Returned to Parkville.

The citizens of Platte county have issued an address, recommending that George S. Park, formerly of the Parkville *Luminary*, be permitted to reside in Parkville without molestation. It is signed by eleven citizens, who were appointed a committee on the subject. We quote the report, as indicating a favorable change in the tone of public opinion on the border:—

TO THE CITIZENS OF PLATTE COUNTY AND THE STATE OF MISSOURI:

We, the citizens of Parkville, in Platte county, Missouri, feeling duly impressed with the importance of the occasion which has induced us to address the public at large, desire to be distinctly understood as desiring to assume no unjust or illegitimate privileges or powers, in issuing the following address:—

In order to a full and perfect understanding of the question now involved, we present the following facts: During the spring of 1855, a portion of the citizens of Platte county, adjudged certain penalties to certain citizens then residing within its limits, if found within her borders in a given time.

Steps were taken to expel them from our midst, and resulted successfully. Considerable time has elapsed since that period, and the business relations which now exist between a very large proportion of the permanent and chief citizens of Parkville and vicinity, have demanded the recall of George S. Park.

In obedience to the wishes and calls of this class, he has been induced to return, and a few days since appeared in mild and civil demeanor, and declared his purpose to be in readiness to respond to the numerous calls which had been made upon him.

In this immediate community, with only an occasional and rare exception, a due sense of gratification was felt at the prospect, on the part of those whose claims deserve to be respected, at a result which was so likely to arrange in a satisfactory and legal manner all the important and necessary measures of business which would inevitably suffer by delay.

Under these circumstances, a portion of the citizens of the county, upon learning the fact of the return of George S. Park, called and held a private meeting in a neighboring town, and considered upon the adoption of a course regulating and prescribing our action.

A committee was appointed by that secret body for the purpose of conferring with the citizens of Parkville, concerning the propriety of again immediately expelling said Park, and assumed the prerogative of prescribing a limit to his stay.

These relations, so important in their consequences, could not be hastily sundered without a serious violation of individual rights, to say nothing of that spirit of dictation which is, and must ever remain, most repulsive to all claiming to be men.

Under all the circumstances of the case, we ask in all seriousness, of those who may anticipate the use of violence or threatening, to desist. Such measures must inevitably result in creating a breach, which time alone can never heal, and consequences most direful to the best interests of flourishing and extensive regions of our country must result.

To say nothing of the example which such proceedings will have upon other communities who have marked the past history of Platte county, and of Parkville in particular, an attempt at the enforcement of such unjust demands must destroy whatever of good name may still be left.

In a word, we here publicly declare to all our friends in Platte county and to the world, that we hold ourselves qualified, in every sense of the word, to guard our own interests of every character, and we most emphatically declare it to be our fixed and unalterable purpose, as men and citizens of Missouri, to submit to no aggression on the rights which may come properly within the purview or meaning of this declaration.

Personal Intelligence.

ARRIVALS.

From Savannah, in steamship Alabama—A A Bostick, W B Hall, W H Race, S B Purple, J J Houghton, Miss Howard—10 in the steerage.

From Charleston, in steamship Marion—Wm Burrows, E B Davis, Miss E Gibson, S Hoppenheim, Mrs R Anderson, three children and nurse, Mr Inglies, R McKenzie, L Harwood, Jr, Miss Irwin, James E Harvey, M P O'Connor, Mrs Foley, J Falconi, Miss Falconi, Mrs Mansfield, S P Roberts—18 in the steerage.

From St Jago de Cuba, in bark Paul Boggs—R Cabes, Mrs Williams.

City Intelligence.

THE EXPRESS ROBBERY OF $50,000.—Our readers will remember that on the 17th of September last, $50,000 in gold was stolen from the Express Company of Wells, Butterfield & Co., while in transit from Dubuque, Iowa. On arriving at New York, the package was found to contain bullets instead of gold. The government, to whom the money belonged, laid claim to the amount, which the company promised to pay, provided time was given them. Yesterday the $50,000 was paid into the Sub-Treasury by the company. The following is the receipt:—

To Adams' Express Co., Wells, Butterfield & Co.

I certify that the above fifty thousand dollars has been received for that amount said to have been lost while in transit from Dubuque, Iowa, to my office. JOHN J. CISCO,
Asst. Treas. U. S., at New York.

NEW YORK, Nov. 20, 1855.

SUPPOSED SUICIDE BY ARSENIC.—Information was received at the Coroner's office, yesterday afternoon, that a man named James Caffrey, residing at No. 316 Hudson street, had committed suicide by taking arsenic. The deceased kept a grocery store at the above place, and some weeks ago attempted to destroy himself by taking arsenic. On Monday night he came home from Hoboken, where he had been with some friends. On going to bed, he commenced to vomit very violently, and continued to do so until death put an end to his sufferings. The deceased was a very respectable man, and has left a wife and two children behind him. Coroner Hilton has taken charge of the case, and will probably conclude the case to day. Dr. Finnell is engaged in making a post mortem examination upon the body. No person saw Caffrey take poison; and as he was not left alone all day Monday, death may have been caused by disease of the heart.

Spiritualism in a New Circle.

INVITATION TO DR. HARE.

NEW YORK, November, 1855.

Prof. ROBERT HARE, M. D.:—

SIR—Having a high appreciation of your abilities and life-long labors as a man of science, and learning that you have recently been employing your vast resources of ingenuity and experience in the investigation of the current phenomena known by some as "spiritual manifestations," and having, moreover, been informed that you have, in this investigation, employed such mechanical apparatus and other contrivances as, in your judgment, were calculated to preclude all possible deception, and exhibit the precise nature of the agent involved in the production of the phenomena aforesaid, the undersigned, citizens of New York, would respectfully invite you to explain your experiments, with their results, in a public lecture, in this city, to be delivered at your earliest convenience:—

J. W. Draper, M.D.	J. M. Carnochan, M.D	David Bryson,
J. S. Crane, M. D.	L. T. Warner, M.D.	J. A. Deveau,
R. F. Gibson, M. D.	J. T. Derrickson,	J. W. Orr,
E. Bayard, M. D.	L. S. Haskell,	J. B. Merrick,
R. O. Doremus, M.D.	H. C. Reynolds,	J. S. Redfield,
E. H. Davis, M. D.	J. H. W. Toobey,	J. W. Edmonds,
A. D. Wilson, M. D.	S. T. Munson,	S. B. Brittan,
H. M. Banks, M. D.	Wm. N. Noe,	A. Smith,
A. M. Jones, M. D.	E. K. Collins,	W. Fishbough,
C. R. Gilman, M.D.	John Bigelow,	Benj. Ellis,
S. R. Kerby, M. D.	John Cochran,	S. C. Brown,
J. F. Gray, M. D.	I. V. Fowler,	Fred. Cook,
J. H. Thomas, M.D.	John Odell,	Danl. Griffin,
O. H. Wellington MD	Henry Hebbard,	Sidney Kopman,
J. H. Allen, M. D.	Robt. P. Duncan,	Jas. Y. Watkins,
R. T. Hallock, M.D.	J. B. Hyde,	P. E. Farnsworth,
J. E. Snodgrass, M.D.	H. H. Hall,	Chas. Partridge.
C. Knapp, M. D.	Ira B Davis,	

Nearly one hundred additional names are appended to the call.

DR. HARE'S REPLY.

TO MESSRS. JOHN W. DRAPER, M. D., E. K. COLLINS, AND OTHERS:—

GENTLEMEN—The letter bearing your signatures, in which I am honored with an invitation to give an exposition of my inquiries respecting spiritual manifestations, is just received.

In reply to your request, I hasten to say that it will gratify me much to comply with your wishes on Friday evening next. I am, gratefully, your well wisher,

November 20, 1855. ROBERT HARE.

The lecture will be given in the Broadway Tabernacle, Friday evening, 23d instant.

The Hudson's Bay Company and the Russian Possessions.

We learn from a communication in the Montreal *Gazette*, of the 16th inst., that the Hudson's Bay Company have guaranteed to the Russian authorities the unmolested possession of the Russian territory upon this continent while the war shall last, upon condition that the posts and trading operations of the former in the neighborhood of that territory shall continue during the same period to be free from attack by the latter. The British government has sanctioned this guarantee, by which the Hudson's Bay Company are saved the expense of strengthening their posts by any military defences during the present war, while they obtain the absolute monopoly of the fur trade in that quarter—the Russian commerce being entirely cut off.

The writer thinks this arrangement a great folly, and expresses his opinion of the selfishness of the Hudson's Bay Company with great freedom, and says:—

Now, for the petty interests of so selfish, so unpatriotic, and so useless a body as the Hudson's Bay Company, why should England forego the opportunity she has of possessing herself of the Russian territory upon this continent, which, in reality, is of far greater value than the small and scattered Hudson's Bay posts situated to the south of it? Of what good is this Hudson's Bay Company to England or to the region which this policy excludes from participating in that enterprise, and those agencies of civilation which are accomplishing so much in nearly every other country upon the face of the globe? The two cargoes of furs annually sent home are surely not of such account to a country possessing so vast a commerce as England, as to compensate for the sacrifice to both countries which the existence of this company entails. Why, then, should any new sacrifice be conceded to them?—Though many extensive tracts of the region under their charge are highly adapted for settlement, they neither people those tracts themselves, nor encourage nor permit others to do so; but feeling that an end would be put to their close monopoly should the country become properly known and appreciated, they picture it as utterly worthless, except as a preserve for wild animals; keeping out of sight what the Russians have done upon this continent north of the Hudson's Bay territory on the Pacific, and what has been accomplished in the far more inclement and unpromising region of Siberia.

The writer insists that but for the influence of this company the Red River settlement, planted about forty years ago by the Earl of Selkirk, and had not numbers of its young men been driven to emigrate to the United States, there would have been one hundred thousand souls there, where there are but ten thousand, and the present desolate route from thence to Canada would have been the highway of a large and flourishing commerce, and the scene of many thriving settlements. He then proceeds:—

It is now time that Canada, whose frontier should already meet that of the Red River settlement, and who may reasonably look forward to the extension of the Province at no distant period over the north-west territories to the Pacific, should identify her interests with those of the Red River and Vancouver's Island colonists, and take up their cause as her own.

A movement by the Province in this direction could not but be attended with important results; for, notwithstanding all the influence in Europe of the wearers of fine furs, such a relic of an almost barbarous period as the monopoly of the Hudson's Bay Company over a region about as large as the whole of Europe, cannot be preserved whenever that contest, which must come at some time or other, shall be entered into between this Province and the Hudson's Bay Company.

Here, then, is a great and national object to be gained, in the prosecution of which all parties in the Province may unite. All minor agitations which now divide them, such as the maintaining or the repeal of the act of union, should be forgotten in the importance of the one now presented to him.

Why should not the people of both countries be permitted to participate in the fur trade, or to embark in the coal, copper and other valuable mines known to exist there, but which are neither worked by the company, nor allowed to be worked by others? Canada must not become stunted in her growth for the sake of the interests of such a body as the Hudson Bay Company.

The Province is fast stretching out to the West, and may, if unimpeded, soon reach and take in the Red river colony, and from thence proceed to plant settlers along the fertile and beautiful valley of the Saskatchewan, through which our railways in the Province should be continued to the Pacific. Besides this route being the best for the construction of a railway across the continent, the climate along it becomes milder the farther we travel towards the West, till the climate of the south of France is met with as we approach the Pacific.

On that side of the continent, even as high up as ten degrees north of Quebec, the winters of England are hardly exceeded in rigor, there being little snow or frost, and the harbors being open all the year round. Such is the climate of much of the Russian possessions upon the coast.

There, the Russians (unlike the Hudson's Bay Company), do not confine themselves to the fur trade, but make use of all the resources within their reach. Instead of their principal stations of Sitka and Kodiak being mere fur depots of some half dozen traders or so, they each contain a population of from one thousand to fifteen hundred souls, engaged in many profitable pursuits; they have dockyards and arsenals, and are both defended by exceedingly strong fortifications. Upon those at Kodiak are mounted upwards of one hundred pieces of cannon, while Sitka can boast of nearly as many.

The other posts of the Russian