Governor Wise was made, and met by cries of derision from the audience, he hastened to say that he had reason to think highly of that gentleman for his honorable support in a trying moment in his (Giddings') career. His remarks obtained much applause.

THE CARLISLE PRISONER.

CARLISLE, Pa., Oct. 24, 1859.

A woman, who called herself Cook's sister, arrived here this morning and had an interview with the man in custody here. She says he is not Cook. The prisoner was to have a hearing to-morrow. He asserts that he has not been at Harper's Ferry.

FRED DOUGLAS FLED.

Frederick Douglas failed to meet his engagement to lecture in Syracuse on the 21st inst. on "Self-made Men." The Syracuse *Courier* thinks the disclosures at Harper's Ferry have induced him to take the underground railroad to Canada.

THE BROOKLYN DEMOCRACY AROUSED.

Enthusiastic Ratification Meeting in the Park—Seward's "Irrepressible Conflict" Denounced—The Instigators of the Harper's Ferry Massacre Branded—Speeches of John Cochrane, Senator Spinola, A. O. Perrin, Colonel Doheny and Others.

A large convocation of the democratic electors of Brooklyn took place last evening, in front of the Brooklyn City Hall, for the purpose of ratifying the State, city and county nominations. A large and commodious speakers' stand was erected in front of the Hall steps, and with the aid of pyrotechnics, music, booming cannon, and general hilarity, the occasion was rendered one of the most inspiring ever witnessed in Kings county. There must have been several thousand persons present on the ground at 7½ P. M., the hour of opening the meeting.

Postmaster PECK called the assemblage to order, by naming for chairman the Alderman of the Third ward, Mr. John T. Moore, a well known merchant of this city.

Mr. MOORE, on taking the chair, acknowledged the compliment, and announced that the Committee of Arrangements would submit a list of Vice Presidents and Secretaries, and a series of resolutions, all of which were read and adopted.

The resolutions endorsed the State and local nominees of the democracy, condemned the irrepressible conflict doctrine of William H. Seward, denounced the course of the republican party on the canal question, demanded the repeal of the odious Metropolitan Police law and the Registry law, and endorsed democratic principles generally.

The following is the irrepressible conflict resolution:—

Resolved, That in the late insurrection at Harper's Ferry, by a gang of blood thirsty abolitionists, we have the first fruits of those incendiary doctrines put forth and defended by the great orator of the republican party. That it is the inauguration of a crusade by the enemies of the Union, which threatens to plunge a country now peaceful and prosperous into all the horrors of a civil war, to array section against section, State against State, brother against brother, until every sentiment which appeals to the patriotism of the citizen, every thought which inspires attachment to our institutions, and every hope that insures the observance of law, shall be crushed beneath the iron heel of an irrepressible conflict.

The President then introduced Hon. John Cochrane, of New York, who spoke as follows:—

SPEECH OF JOHN COCHRANE.

FELLOW-CITIZENS OF BROOKLYN AND KINGS COUNTY—It is with feelings of pleasure that I have responded to the invitation of your committee to appear before you this evening, to speak upon the topics that excite a common and general interest. The specific occasion upon which you are assembled relates to the ratification of your county ticket. It is of no importance that I should comment on the details of that ticket. Its nominees are known to you all; they are proffered to you by your fellow citizens in regular convention assembled, and I need not say that the democracy of Kings county, equally with the democracy of other parts of the State, feel the obligation, and are always willing to support proper men offered them for their suffrages through the instrumentality of their regular conventions. It is, therefore, with propriety that I can remark, that not only by you, as patriotic citizens, but also by the democracy of other parts of the State, are the regular nominees of the party to be supported with confidence, and particularly may I hope that you will render them a cordial and effective aid. There are other themes, however, which demand equally your attention to-night; themes that are suggestive of the lofty principles of the democracy you profess, which are agitating the community and exciting the public mind. In the first place, you are directed to the support of the State ticket nominated, not only in regard to the executive functions of your representatives at the State Capitol, but also in regard to the justness of the men and to their personal fitness for office, qualified by their democratic education, and by the character of their principles they are the men who have borne the reputation of the State forward in its financial career; men who represent the democratic "stop and pay policy," the standard bearers of the party, who have opposed themselves uniformly to the expensive and impoverishing policy of the Seward-Ruggles clique; men who, when directing the affairs of the State, have ever directed them with reference to the financial power of its revenues, and not in respect to a credit, inflated by the necessities of a system devoted to party capital. One of the chief influences which have assembled you to-night, appeals to the condition in which the pecuniary affairs of the State are discovered. To State pride a State's reputation is of incalculable value. Whether the victim of repudiation, and involved in bankruptcy, or of creditable repute and sound financial ability, the honest democrat either wears an elated visage or shrinks with the shame of insolvency. It is now more than twenty years since the two opposing parties of the State took decided issue upon the nature of its financial action. The era of an expanded currency, inflated prices, and extravagant expenditure, was ushered in under the auspices of William H. Seward and his subservient political friends. Splendid schemes of political agrandizement demanded and inaugurated profligate schemes of State embarrassment. Year after year beheld the golden bubble's inflation. The effort, however, experienced temporary checks at the hands of the democratic party. The stop and pay policy of 1846 characterized the exertions of those old fashioned people who were not afraid of the homely but expressive proverb of "Pay as you go." Their exertions were, however, of but little avail; and now, after many vicisitudes, we find ourselves with a debt of $19,000,000 of old canal and general fund debt, to pay the annual interest of which the canal revenues are barely sufficient. Thus is the annual interest of $12,000,000—the new canal debt—unprovided for, and that too, designedly. For do you not remember that it was owing to the culpable remissness of a republican Legislature that the Comptroller of the State was recently compelled by a private arrangement to borrow of a corporation in Wall street the sum of $385,000, with which to defray the July, October and January interest of this debt, and to save from utter ruin the credit of the State? Let us but consider the slow but sure effect of such a system of borrowing for the purpose of liquidation. Of course interest thus becomes arithmetically compounded, and what is now but a $12,000,000 debt, will of principal and interest, have accumulated in twenty years to $48,000,000, in sixty years, to $778,000,000, and in seventy years to $1,557,000,000. Now the assessors' valuation of all the real estate and personal property in the State of New York for the year 1858, was only $1,404,907,679; so that, during the lives of your children, and before yourselves shall have passed from the scene of action, this process of compounding but this one branch of the State debt will have exhausted the entire property of the State. But I have as yet treated of the assets in possession, with which to liquidate the interest only of merely a portion of the State debt. A more serious question is the debt itself. What is its amount? A republican leader in our late Legislature announced it authoritatively to be $40,000,000. Every cent of this debt must be paid manifestly, or the State be subjected to the pains of repudiation. Then how is it to be paid? Why, as it is a lien upon every man's shop, house or farm, it requires no great wisdom to answer that it must be paid by taxation. And the taxes which will only and no more than cancel this enormous debt, must, upon accurate computation, be nearly eleven and a half times as large as the State tax for each county for the present year. Know, then, my fellow democrats of Kings county, that your appropriate quota by this computation will fix upon you an additional taxation of $2,998,487. Such are some of the fruits of the ruinous republican policy which has involved and is destroying the finances of the State. I might proceed farther with my enumeration of evils endured and still threatening our political existence, but I forbear, with an appeal to your sober judgment and patriotism in behalf of that democratic economy which would reduce the rate of expenditure to our means, and circumscribe the wild projects of political enthusiasts by the deliberate judgment of a sober minded, debt-paying people. Fellow citizens, there are several other subjects to which I should direct your attention, though but a few of them can be referred to by me this evening. You have heard of what has been termed the "irrepressible conflict."

A VOICE—What is your name? (frequently repeated).

Mr. COCHRANE—My name will be given to you before I finish this discussion; can't the gentleman who is so anxious for my name give the audience his own?

Considerable confusion was here occasioned by the process of hustling out the intruding gent.

Mr. COCHRANE continued—You have heard, fellow citizens, of the "irrepressible conflict." It was born of the brain of Wm. H. Seward. The accouchement was deliberate. Its growth has been prodigious. And in its unnatural strength you must meet it, and fellow democrats you must meet it now. It has been pronounced by this celebrated republican leader that the country is engaged in an irrepressible conflict, an irrepressible conflict of the free States against the slave States. If this be so, and an irrepressible truth, it is requisite and necessary that you should know it, and to meet the emergency should stand here to-night with arms in your hands opposed to your fellow citizens at the South. We have always insisted that we are the equal citizens of a common land, that when foreigners are received into our midst, and naturalized as our laws provide, they are in common with ourselves, and all native to the land, adopted into one common family, with equal rights and a common franchise. But this leader of the opposite hosts has fulminated the doctrine of an "irrepressible conflict" among our fellow citizens; the doctrine that they who have hitherto lived in peace and harmony shall be arrayed in hostility to each other; that the free States of the North are and must be opposed in arms to the slave States of the South, and that there is an enduring and irrepressible conflict now raging between them, and that there can be no cessation of hostilities until all the States shall have become free or all the States shall have become slave. Listen to his language:—

Thus those antagonistic systems, free and slave, are continually coming into closer contact, and collision results. Shall I tell you what this collision means? They who think that it is accidental, unnecessary, the work of interested and fanatical agitators, mistake the case altogether. It is an irrepressible conflict between opposing and enduring forces, and it means that the United States must and will, sooner or later, become a slaveholding nation or entirely a free labor nation. Unless the cotton and rice fields of South Carolina and the sugar plantations of Louisiana will ultimately be tilled by free labor, Boston and Charleston and New Orleans become marts for legitimate commerce alone, or else the rye and wheat fields of Massachusetts and New York must again be surrendered by their farmers to slave culture and the production of slaves, and Boston and New York become once more markets of trade in the bodies and souls of men.

If this doctrine is to be sustained, I would ask of you should you not all to night be engaged in arming themselves for an assault upon their brothers of the South? and your purpose would be to liberate the slaves, and drench with bloodshed and distress with rapine our Southern borders. Can you deprive them of the property which is theirs by the sanction of the constitution and of common right? You must say that such a doctrine would be unworthy of you. But should, on the other hand, it be admitted to be true and be urged as obligatory, I submit that your duty would be to march southward to plant your bayonets in the bosoms of the occupants of Southern soil. Such would be the effect of so monstrous a doctrine. Is this a theory of mine, or is it supported by facts? Let me direct your attention to what has been transpiring during the last few days at Harper's Ferry, in Virginia. There indeed you have seen the full working of what has been denominated "the irrepressible conflict." Is it true, do you think, that that insurrection was occasioned by the principles enunciated by Wm. H. Seward? What can be a more natural consequence from an adequate cause than that dreadful and atrocious effect? If I should here declare that, after having left this stand, I would march to the other side of the river this evening, and would enter my friend and neighbor's house, and sack it, and destroy it, and murder its inmates, and apply to it the torch; and if in the morning papers you should learn that such events have occurred, would you say that these events were not the natural sequence of my announcement here that they would occur? No. You would hold me accountable for the acts, and properly too; and so would any court of law, or any jury of twelve men in all the land. And so when you heard the proclamation at Rochester of the great captain of this irrepressible conflict (already developed in insurrection), that it must go on; that it must go on until the whole country shall become either wholly slave or wholly free, and when you see that upon the heel of that announcement—insurrection, bloodshed—a whole village placed under martial law, and men murdered in the streets, twelve honest jurors taken from the body of the country would pronounce all these events—the insurrection, the bloodshed and martial law—the natural sequence and effect of the principle announced by the very Vortruvius of this unparalleled atrocity. Now, fellow citizens, although our republican friends disclaim the act, they approve the treason; although they denounce the traitor, they approve the treason. They proclaim that Ossawatomie Brown is no friend of theirs—he belongs not to their communion—but yet, one of their principal organs in the city of New York, upon the arrival of the news that Ossawatomie Brown had perpetrated the outrage, virtually proposed its justification, when seeking its excuse in the charge, that the democratic party had perpetrated similar outrages in Kansas, and that this was but their natural requital. (Groans for Greeley.) But the plea of insanity is interposed. Brown was sane in Kansas—shrieking sane—How came it that Virginia made him mad? Oh, no, fellow democrats; what was speech at Rochester was insurrection at Harper's Ferry. What was Seward in New York, culminated, in Virginia, into Ossawatomie Brown. Mr. Cochrane dwelt at length upon this subject, and showing how important to the rebuke of the rampant spirit of treason it was, that the democracy of New York should, at the coming election, denounce its acts. He portrayed the effect that the success of the party would exert upon the fortunes of Seward, and how in either event New York State would be the battle field where was to be fought the Presidential contest of 1860. After having exhorted the masses to harmonious action, he took his seat, having occupied the attention of the vast throng during the space of an hour. Mr. Cochrane was frequently cheered by the attentive and enthusiastic crowd.

The Hon. F. B. SPINOLA was next introduced to the audience, and delivered an address of some length, but which, in point of illustration and substance, did not materially differ from the eloquent allocution of the Hon. Mr. Cochrane. Mr. Spinola reviewed the progress of the democratic party and the difficulties with which they have had to contend, showing how the black republicans had banded themselves together to prevent the progress of the enlightened principles of the democratic platform. A distinguished general once said, in the heat of battle, "Give them a little more grape, Captain Bragg!" His advice on this occasion amounted in substance to the same thing; he would say, "Give the republicans a little more grape." (Loud laughter.) The battle they had been always fighting was and always would be a victorious one. They had never turned their backs upon their duty, and no democrat would ever think of doing so. (Cheers.) Mr. Spinola then went on to consider the manifold objections to republican principles. Taxation was one of the most serious complaints that could possibly be presented to public view, and it was the constant effort of the democratic party to render this branch of the public service as light as it could possibly be. The republican creed was opposed to all progress, and he could show that there was no dependence to be placed upon the members of this party. He then spoke of the increase of taxation and the financial policy of the government of the republic. The republican party had refused to make any provision for the public debt or the interest thereon accruing. No native citizen, nor even any naturalized person, could justify such conduct. He spoke of the position of a failing merchant, who goes from bank to bank seeking for loans while his business is going to destruction. No one would trust such a man. Every one having accounts against him would seek to press his bills. And so it was with the republican party. They could not stand upon their merits, because they had none to rest upon. (Cheers.) Mr. Spinola continued, at length, to press his objections to the absurdities of republican principles, using considerable eloquence and tact in his remarks, while he commented in a strain of severe deprecation on the recent events in the South. The republican party, he said, have got their fires ready to be lighted in token of victory ——

A VOICE—We will quench them for you. (Loud laughter.)

Mr. SPINOLA—But I have no fear of them, for I have always manfully done my duty, and am still prepared to do so.

A VOICE—We all know that.

Mr. SPINOLA continued to maintain the principles which he has always supported, showing how the democratic party was always in the foremost rank whenever the interest of the people was under consideration. He concluded an excellent speech by apologizing for his inability to do justice to the subject because of indisposition.

The next speaker, an adopted citizen of Brooklyn, supported the views laid down by the previous speakers and manfully defended the principles of the democratic party. The recent events at Harper's Ferry came under his review and the principal facts of the late tumult were stated and commented upon by the speaker. He referred to the operations of Ossawatomie Brown and the miserable attempt recently made at insurrection, in very severe terms. They say, said he, that old Brown is crazy, and there could be no doubt of it, for everybody had long since agreed that the whole republican party is mad. (Laughter.) All the republicans are crazy, perhaps, with the exception of Henry Ward Beecher. But what must this reverend gentleman have thought, after the rebellion, on going to rest at night, after kissing his children, when he reflects that he had contributed twenty-five muskets towards killing innocent people at Harper's Ferry? There was a correspondent of the *Tribune* named Kagi. He thought it was a mistake, and that the word meant crazy. (laughter.) This man was despatched to the scene of the outbreak for the purpose of sending news to the *Tribune*, so that they might have a different statement of affairs from everybody else. These were tricks of the republican party. But this party was never triumphant upon principle in any case, and all these tricks would result in nothing but discomfiture and failure. He then spoke of the services of Senator Spinola, and the duty which the people owe him, dwelling particularly on the efforts which he has made to forward the interests of his constituents.

Mr. A. O. PERRIN was the next speaker. He reviewed the progress of the democratic party, going through all the phases of opposition which it has had to encounter and all the benefits which it has conferred upon the people. He said that some had doubted his loyalty and attachment to the democratic party, but he was there to give in person a denial to the outcry which had been made against him. (Tremendous cheering.) He was determined to stand by the principles of democracy, for they were the only ones that could bring health and happiness to the country. He then proceeded to consider the conduct of Henry Ward Beecher, condemning the propagandism which he is in the habit of preaching, and saying that while the ministers of Christ are giving Bibles for spreading Christian knowledge, and are trying to preach the Gospel to every creature, Beecher is contributing rifles and endeavoring to teach the abolitionists to "shoot the Gospel into every creature." (Loud and uproarious laughter.) The rest of Mr. Perrin's speech was much in the same strain.

The other speakers were ex-Judges Moore and Garrison and Thomas A. Gardner, &c. They all united in denouncing the "irrepressible conflict" principle so disastrously illustrated at Harper's Ferry, and the party headed by Seward, who privately and publicly have countenanced and encouraged the acts of Brown, and called upon the democracy to unite their votes to a man to throw the disunionists out of power by electing the ticket which contained the names of men who love order and prosperity, and desire the establishment of law throughout every part of the Union. They also reiterated many of the sentiments put forward by the first speakers, and their addresses were greeted with much cheering and enthusiasm.

Festival of the St. Vincent de Paul Society for the Benefit of the Poor.

The third annual festival and fair of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul commenced last evening at the City Assembly Rooms, which were crowded to excess by persons of almost every class, from the priest down to the laborer. The large double room was filled with stands, loaded by the fairest of the fair, and containing all sorts of articles—dolls, horses, cows, pigs, dogs, cats, rats, mice, jumping jacks, prayer-books, culinary utensils, paintings, crockery ware, ships, firemen, peacocks, eagles, jewelry of every description, silver baskets and cups, and last, but by no means least, food for the "inner man," in the way of tempting looking edibles and drinkables. The enchanting specimens of female loveliness were undoubtedly the greatest attraction, and by the winning, coaxing, irresistible ways in which they made their appeals, managed to attract considerable loose cash from the pockets of the subdued "lords of creation." The hardest hearts melted and the tightest purse strings loosened before the persuasive eyes and words of the dear coaxers, who were heard on every side exclaiming "Won't you please take a chance?—only 25 cents," or "Do try once," or "If you try here you will be sure to win," and a thousand other such like phrases. Some of the fast young bricks wished that the lovely creatures themselves, like the fair Portia, were only prizes, so that they might have a chance of winning. Among those who mingled in the picturesque scene were several distinguished clergymen, who came "down with the dust" as heavily as any others, and greatly contributed to the spirit and success of the first night of the festival. The Very Rev. Father Starrs, V. G., Dr. Cummings, Rev. Mr. Quinn, of St. Peter's, Dr. McEvoy, of the Cathedral, and many more were present. The churches represented were the Transfiguration, St. Peter's, St. Andrew's, St. Patrick's, St. Francis Xavier, St. Joseph's, St. Stephen's, the Holy Cross and St. James'.

The festival is got up entirely for the benefit of the poor; and as it is to last for four days there will be ample opportunity for all who may desire to go visit it.

Rev. S. Randall and lady, N. J.; Rev. L. C. Newman, Pa. Hon. Colonel Bolle, Adjutant General, Canada; Captain Du Pont, U. S. N., and Rev. T. B. Lynam and lady, Pa.; are in Washington.

The Diamond Wedding.

HOSTILE CORRESPONDENCE—A SUIT FOR LIBEL THE FINALE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TRIBUNE.

Rumors of a hostile correspondence between Lieutenant W. A. Bartlett, U. S. N., father of Mrs. Oviedo, and E. C. Stedman, Esq., author of a satire entitled "The Diamond Wedding," which recently appeared in your paper, having been afloat for three or four days, and actually found their way into one of the papers, and Mr. Bartlett having expressed his determination to prosecute Mr. Stedman for libel, it is deemed advisable by Mr. Stedman's friends to publish the correspondence entire, with a statement of the circumstances, that the public may judge the merits of the case.

It is proper to state that Mr. Bartlett first declared his intention to publicly cowhide Mr. Stedman; but the friend to whom he subsequently referred the matter, declined to have anything to do with it if he persisted in this determination, and only took the matter in hand with the understanding that Mr. Bartlett was to conduct the affair in accordance with the code of honor.

With this understanding he consented to act as Mr. Bartlett's friend, and was the bearer of the following note to Mr. Stedman:—

[No. 1, COPY.]
39 WEST FOURTEENTH STREET, OCT. 18, 1859.

MR. EDMUND C. STEDMAN.—SIR—I have just seen in the New York Daily Tribune of this date an article in verse, entitled "The Diamond Wedding," ending with the line, "On the other side of Jordan," and setting forth that it was "written for the New York Tribune by Edmund C. Stedman."

The object of this note is to inquire if you are the Edmund C. Stedman referred to, and if so, if the article so entitled was written and published by you. WASH'N. A. BARTLETT.

To this note Mr. Stedman immediately made the following reply, and Mr. Adams was the bearer of the same to Mr. Bartlett:—

[No. 2, COPY.]
106 EAST FOURTEENTH STREET, OCT. 19, 1859.

CAPT. WASHINGTON A. BARTLETT.—SIR—Your note of the 18th inst. has been handed me by your friend, Mr F. C. Adams. In reply, I would say that I am the Edmund C. Stedman referred to in your letter, and the author of a poem called "The Diamond Wedding," published in yesterday's Tribune.

EDMUND C. STEDMAN.

To Mr. Stedman's reply Mr. Bartlett rejoined as follows:—

[No. 3, COPY.]
39 WEST FOURTEENTH STREET, Tuesday, P. M.

SIR—By your note of this date, in reply to mine handed you by Mr. F. C. Adams, you admit that you are "the Edmund C. Stedman referred to in your (my) letter, and the author of a poem called 'The Diamond Wedding,' published in yesterday's *Tribune*."

I have now to say that the "Poem" (as you term it) referred to is a gross libel upon several members of my family, and therefore offensive in the highest degree.

That it is false in its pretended relation of facts, conceived with the sole object of ridiculing, and, if possible, degrading those whom you do not know, and licentious in vulgar description and allusions.

Myself and family whom you have thus insulted, have never intruded themselves upon your notice; and such conduct toward them on your part can only be atoned for by prompt and adequate satisfaction.

It remains to be seen whether you are disposed to make such an amend as can be accepted.

My friend Mr. F. C. Adams is fully authorized to act for me and waits upon you with this note.

WASH'N A. BARTLETT.

Mr. EDMUND C. STEDMAN, 106 East Fourteenth street.

Accompanying this letter was the following extraordinary document, which Mr. Stedman was asked to sign:—

I, Edmund C. Stedman of New York, having admitted to Washington A. Bartlett, Esq., as per my note of October 19th inst., that "I am the Edmund C. Stedman referred to in your (his) letter, and the author of a poem called "The Diamond Wedding," published in yesterday's *Tribune*," (18th Oct. inst.), do hereby declare that I publicly recall said poem from circulation, and hereby forbid its republication, declaring that said poem, in all that relates to Mr. and Mrs. Bartlett, Mr. de Oviedo, and his bride, to be an entire perversion of the facts of the case, and utterly unworthy to have been written or published by me at any time or place, and much more, of parties whom I do not know personally, and who have not in any manner conducted themselves as related by me in that poem.

I therefore make this public recantation of said poem, and apologize to Capt. Bartlett and Senor de Oviedo and their families for all allusions to them, and to the public for having written and published said poem.

At this stage of the correspondence, my own connection with the affair commenced. I was sent for on Thursday evening, October 20, by Mr. Stedman, who showed me the above correspondence, and requested me to act as his friend. After reading the letters, I told him there was but one construction to be placed upon the matter, and that, in my opinion, Mr. Bartlett's letter was as direct an invitation as was ever written, either to sign the apology he sent or to fight a duel. Although I was opposed to the duello, I had no hesitation to act, since I was satisfied that a man who could ask another to sacrifice his self respect so far as to sign the absurd and degrading apology he had sent, could not himself possess self respect enough to stand to a challenge. Furthermore, I supposed Mr. Bartlett possessed common sense enough to know that to provoke a duel on so trivial a matter, in a community where duelling was held in abhorrence, would be to subject himself to an amount of ridicule and contempt he would be unwilling to incur. Further, that since there was nothing in the poem deserving the censure Mr. Bartlett had given it, there was, of course, nothing to apologize for, and that in my opinion the proper course was to reply to this effect denying the charges of Mr. Bartlett and refusing any apology.

Mr. STEDMAN concurred in this view of the matter, and wrote the following reply, which I, as his friend, delivered to Mr. Adams on Friday morning:—

No. 106 EAST FOURTEENTH STREET, Oct. 19.

SIR—I have this afternoon received, through Mr. Adams, your note of yesterday evening, together with a remarkable document drawn up by yourself for my signature.

I do not know whether to be more indignant at the unjust charges contained in the former, or at your expectation that any man, under any circumstances, could affix his name to a paper absurd and degrading beyond precedent.

In an ordinary case, the reception of such a letter would preclude an answer on my part; but I have a word to say in denial of your several allegations.

Instead of being "a gross libel" upon you or your family, "The Diamond Wedding" is simply a satirical poem, published in a reputable journal, showing the humorous side of events which have been both town and newspaper talk for an entire season.

The facts therein set forth are taken directly from the public journals, where they have been alleged over and over again, without denial on the part of yourself or friends.

I furthermore claim that, whatever may be the merits of the poem in question, there is not a line in it which any pure mind would deem "licentious in vulgar description." Nor has it been thus construed by the public, who have so long, in common with myself, familiar with the most sacred and private details of the courtship, dress, presents, &c., attendant upon the marriage lately celebrated in your family, that they feel, as I did, almost personally acquainted with every member thereof.

If this reply is severe, you have only to censure yourself for addressing me in a manner outlining the occasion or its cause.

Were I in the wrong, you have placed it out of my power to offer amends. Let me, however, distinctly say that in no event could I have retracted what seems to me, and to others, a humorous, not uncalled for criticism on one of the principal public events of the day.

My friend, Mr. A. C. Hills, is authorized to act for me, and will wait upon Mr. F. C. Adams with this note.

EDMUND C. STEDMAN.

WASHINGTON A. BARTLETT, Esq., 39 West Fourteenth street.

On Friday evening Mr. Adams called on me with a verbal statement that he had seen Mr. Bartlett, and that Mr. Bartlett was contemplating legal proceedings; that he (Adams) told him (Bartlett) that if such were his intentions he must wash his hands of the matter and have no more to do with it. Furthermore, that Mr. Bartlett now claimed that Mr. Stedman was not his equal socially, and on this ground he could not consent to meet him.

To this I replied, that to commence legal proceedings after having virtually challenged Mr. Stedman was an extraordinary and dishonorable course of conduct, and could be regarded in no other light than a subterfuge to shield him from the consequences of his own acts. Furthermore, that Mr. Stedman's social position could not suffer by a comparison with Mr. Bartlett's, since Mr. Stedman's family now moved in the best circles of Florence, his father having been *Chargé d'Affaires* in Sardinia, under President Taylor, since which time he has resided in Italy; and that Mr. Stedman is a gentleman of education and refinement, and numbers among his relatives and friends some of the best families in New York; that Captain Bartlett had himself recognized Mr. Stedman's equality by commencing such a correspondence; and that now to plead social superiority could only be considered as a pretext to avoid a meeting.

Mr. Adams stated that Mr. Bartlett had requested him to wait until three o'clock on Saturday afternoon for his decision, whether he would resort to legal or other measures, and that he would let me know the result on Saturday evening. Accordingly, on Saturday evening Mr. Adams called and informed me that Mr. Bartlett had decided to prosecute for libel, and that he (Adams) had told him he could have nothing to do with the matter. Mr. Adams also gave me a note from Mr. Bartlett to Mr. Stedman, which, upon perusal, I found to contain a threat of legal prosecution, coupled with what I regarded as a gross personal insult to my friend. I therefore declined to deliver the letter to Mr. Stedman, and returned it to Mr. Bartlett, with a note, in which I told him that as I was not Mr. Stedman's legal adviser, and could not be the bearer of a personal insult to him, I declined to deliver the note, and that since Mr. Adams informed me he was no longer acting as his friend in the matter, so far as a hostile meeting was concerned, I had no other way of informing him of my determination than to address him personally.

To this note I received one in reply from Mr. Bartlett, in which he denied having invited Mr. Stedman to a hostile meeting, and closed as follows:—"I stand on my rights and the law."

These are the simple facts of the case, and the whole affair may be summed up as follows:—Mr. Bartlett challenges Mr. Stedman unless he signs a degrading apology; and as soon as Mr. Stedman refuses to apologise, backs out of his challenge, and commences legal proceedings, under plea that Mr. Stedman is not his social equal—a pretext as false as it is dishonorable—one which, even if it were not false, he went too far to set up, when he recognized Mr. Stedman's equality by commencing a hostile correspondence.

It is due to Mr. Adams to state that his conduct in the affair has been that of a high-minded gentleman.

A. C. HILLS.

No. 57 East Thirty-first street, New York, Saturday Night, Oct 22, 1859.

The Extension of Worth and Gold Streets.

The Committee on Streets of the Board of Aldermen held a meeting yesterday afternoon—Alderman Boole in the chair.

The subject of the proposed widening and extension of Worth street from Baxter street to Chatham square, was first taken up, there being a large number of property holders interested in the project present.

Councilman LENT asked that the Committee would defer reporting upon the subject until the Committee on Lands and Places of the Board of Councilmen hold a meeting to consider the propriety of making a park at the Five Points, which would interfere with the extending of Worth streets.

RICHARD L. SCHIEFFELIN said he appeared against the project, as one of the parties who will be assessed if it be carried out. He said the whole cost of the improvement would be $625,000, for which the property would have to be assessed, and many of them would have to mortgage their property to pay the assessments. The cost is more than the value of the improvement, and if the petition pass the Common Council it will be defeated in the courts, and the city put to unnecessary expense.

Ex-Alderman BARKER, representing the property of the Rutgers' Insurance Company, argued that the property in which he is interested is greater in value than that of all the petitioners together; yet he is opposed to the project, as are also other property holders representing three times the amount of property of the petitioners.

WILLIAM NELAS was opposed to widening the street, but was in favor of extension. He represented $50,000 in the line of the street, and could not understand why Mr. Barker considered his property, worth $60,000, more valuable than that of all the petitioners. He also said that the remonstrances presented are not signed by any but two persons owning property on the line of Worth street.

G. A. C. VAN BUREN, representing $20,000 worth of property on Worth street, was in favor of extending the street as proposed, and urged that the extension would tend materially to break up the "plague spot" around the Five Points. He considered the United States Government could not have done better than to have a Post Office erected there.

Several other persons spoke upon the subject, reiterating the arguments of those who preceded them, after which the committee adjourned the subject, and took up that of THE WIDENING AND EXTENSION OF GOLD STREET.

G. H. OCKERSCHAUSEN spoke against the alteration of Gold street, showing the immense destruction of valuable property necessary for carrying out this improvement, which would entail an assessment the amount of which would be immense. He also argued that Gold street is not required as a connection between Wall and Pearl streets.

No other person appearing to speak on the subject, the committee adjourned.

Court of Oyer and Terminer.

Before Hon. Judge Roosevelt.

THE CASE OF QUIMBO APPO, CONVICTED OF MURDER.

OCT. 24.—*The People vs. Quimbo Appo.*—The Judge delivered the following opinion in relation to the application of Quimbo Appo for a new trial:—

ROOSEVELT, J.—The prisoner Appo, a Chinaman by birth, was convicted at a Court of Oyer and Terminer, held in April last, of the crime of murder. Sentence of death was pronounced upon him, but its execution was temporarily suspended by the intervention of the Governor, to enable the defendant to apply for a new trial. That application he now makes, at a different term of the court, on various grounds stated in the papers. The District Attorney objects to its being granted: first, because the Court, as he insists, has no power; and second, because, in his view, the reasons alleged are insufficient.

After much examination and reflection I have come to the conclusion that these objections are not well founded.

The Oyer and Terminer is the highest court of original jurisdiction in criminal cases. Although at one time, in the earlier periods of English history, a mere temporary commission, it has long since ceased to be so, and is now a permanent court of record, recognized in the constitution as an existing superior tribunal over which a Judge of the Supreme Court is to preside, and not, according to the language of that instrument, an "inferior court," to be established at will by the Legislature, and to be abolished at any time by the same authority. And in a recent statute, (ch. 75, sec. 1,) passed in 1854, it is not only spoken of as having, like the Supreme Court, its regular terms, but—somewhat inaccurately, perhaps—as being "the Court of Oyer and Terminer of this State." The Code, too (sec. 20), declares that there shall be at least two terms of the Circuit Court and Court of Oyer and Terminer held annually in each of the counties, &c.

But although a continuous court, and not a temporary organization, dying at each final adjournment, it may still, it is contended, have no power to grant new trials.

In the case of Carnel, (1 Parker, 256,) decided in 1851, a motion for a new trial was entertained, and was denied, not on the ground of want of power, although the point was raised, but on the ground of want of merits. In the case of Morrison, (same vol., 625,) three years later, the whole subject was elaborately discussed by Judge Harris, all the previous authorities being reviewed, and a new trial granted.

The practice in England, it may be conceded, is not to grant new trials in cases of felony, but to leave the party, however strong the evidence may be of his innocence, to an application for the royal mercy. Such a practice may perhaps be in harmony with the spirit of a monarchical government; but, in the language of our constitution, it is "repugnant to the government" established by us; and, with all other parts of the common law of like character, has been, on three successive occasions, "abrogated and rejected" by our people. (Constitution of 1787, sec. 35; also Const. of 1822, art. 17; also Const. of 1846, art. 1.)

There is no fitness in compelling a free citizen, if innocent, to sue for pardon. Pardon implies guilt. We may well imagine a case in which the supposed victim of an alleged murder should appear in full life after sentence of death had been pronounced against his supposed murderer. Shall it be said, under our system of law, that with such newly discovered evidence staring it in the face, the Court has no power to grant a new trial? In the language of Judge Harris, "the most obvious principles of common justice require it;" and, "upon authority," also, I concur in regarding the power of the Court to grant a new trial, where the circumstances clearly call for it, "as established beyond all possible controversy." (See the cases collected in 1 Parker, 625.)

The next inquiry then is, has a sufficient case been made to warrant the intervention of the Court?

Laying out of view—for I attach no importance to it—the affidavit of Twaddel, I think it quite clear on the other papers presented, that the prisoner's poverty and his ignorance of our customs and institutions, natural to a Chinese subject, have deprived him of the benefit of substantial matters of defence, which, had they been presented, would, in all probability, have led to a different result—to a verdict of manslaughter, instead of murder, if not to a verdict of acquittal.

IMPORTANT CHARGE TO THE GRAND JURY ON THE ELECTION LAWS.

The panel of Grand Jurors was then called, when the following were sworn:—

Theodore Martine, foreman; John A. Appleby, Jerele Bull, David B. Bedell, Lewis S. Fellows, Peter F. Randolph, George R. Andrews, Charles W. Foster, Russell E. Glover, Charles C. Goodhue, James F. Hall, Gibbons L. Kelly, James Kearny, Oliver H. Lee, Joseph W. Meeks, Henry Marks, Thomas C. Odell, Jesse Oakley, Albert S. Smith, Samuel T. Skidmore, Isaac P. Williams, Martin Waters, Norman White.

The Judge delivered the following charge:—

The functions, gentlemen, of a Grand Jury have been so often stated and published that no well informed person can fail to be acquainted with them. Your oath in general terms clearly prescribes your general duties. There are several particular statutes, however, to which I am required by law to call your special attention. They are the statutes against lotteries, against usury, against official extortion, against drunkenness, against misconduct in reference to election, and against disclosing indictments for felony until the accused shall have been arrested.

As a general election is near at hand you are more immediately called upon to take notice of all offences which may have been, or which during your session shall be committed, in violation of any of the proceedings of the election law—such as false swearing, false subornation, bribery, menace, wrongful and double voting, and cheating by false ballots.

One section of the law, having a present application, and being supposed to be frequently violated, it is proper I should read to you. "It shall not be lawful," says that section, "for any candidate for any election office, with intent to promote his election, or for any other person with intent to promote the election of any such candidate, either,

1. To provide or furnish entertainment at his expense, to any meeting of electors, previous to, or during the election at which he shall be a candidate; or,

2. To pay for, procure, or engage to pay for, any such entertainment; or,

3. To furnish any money or other property to any person, for the purpose of being expended in procuring the attendance of voters at the polls; or,

4. To engage to pay any money or deliver any property, or otherwise compensate any person for procuring the attendance of voters at the polls; or,

5. To contribute money for any other purpose intended to promote an election of any particular person or ticket, except for defraying the expenses of printing, and the circulation of votes, handbills and other papers previous to any such election, or for conveying sick, poor or infirm electors to the polls.

Your foreman, gentlemen, appointed, as the law requires, by the Court, will administer oaths to such witnesses as may be summoned before you; and your clerk or secretary, one of your own number to be designated by yourselves, will preserve the minutes of your proceedings and of any evidence you may receive. When an indictment shall be found—which, you will remember, requires the concurrence of at least twelve of your number—your foreman will certify it to be a true bill and present it in your presence to the Court. Although twelve are sufficient to concur, sixteen or more must be present.

For any further legal advice you are authorized from time to time to apply to the District Attorney, whose duty it is, when required by you, to attend your deliberations, and who has the right also, on his own request, to appear before you to give such information as he may deem necessary and proper, relative to any matter cognizable by you. In your respective spheres I have no doubt you will most cheerfully aid each other to execute the laws and bring offenders to justice.

The Grand Jury then retired, and in about an hour came into Court with a bill of indictment; but as the party is not arrested its nature cannot be made public.

More Half Nude Stereoscopes.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT.

Before Hon. Judge Betts.

OCT. 24.—*The United States vs. one Case marked G. R. 930, containing Photographic Views, Beckel Brothers, claimants*—The trial of this case was commenced this morning, and quite a large number of witnesses examined on the part of the United States and the claimants, and was not finished when the hour of adjournment arrived. The views in this suit were similar to those in the former cases, and several artists gave as their opinion that they were not obscene or indecent.

FINANCIAL AND COMMERCIAL.

MONDAY, Oct. 24, 1859.

The bank statement made up this day compares as follows with that of last Monday:—

| Week ending | Loans. | Specie. | Circulation. | Deposits. |