all; the murdered man was stabbed in the back, and this wound of itself, would have been fatal. Mr. R. presumed that the gentlemen on the other side would not dispute these premises; the question at issue is, who was the individual who inflicted these wounds. I say the body was so mangled as to prevent recognition. The body lay in the position in which it had been found, until the brother of the deceased made in the afternoon a minute examination, and was only able to recognize the body by the clothing, and no one else could determine who the individual was. So much for the offence. Who is the offender? The individual in the bar is now on his trial for that offence. Suspicion rested on him from some cause, and on the Saturday after the murder, he was arrested as he returned from the steamboat Maryland, and carried to a police office, there to be examined. On his way from the steamboat to the police office, he was asked for his papers, and he put his hand in his pocket and pulled out a few insignificant papers, such as little bills, &c. saying they were all in his possession He was asked for his father's will, but denied having it, or knowing any thing about it. At the police office he was searched, and the will not being found upon his person, it was proposed to search his hat, which was laying on the floor. The hat was picked up, and in it was found the father's will. The prisoner on seeing it, exclaimed. "Good Lord! I didn't know that was there." That will, gentlemen, was made five days before the death of the deceased, and left to the prisoner all of which he was possessed. Upon the person of the prisoner there was found papers containing eight or ten balls, and also, some powder; and when the prisoner was asked what he was doing with them, he answered that they belonged to his pistols. He was asked where his pistols were, and he replied that they were at the residence of his uncle, Thos. Stewart, upon a shelf in the clothes press. These pistols, said Mr. R. holding up two in his hands, were found there, with other powder, a bullet mould, & two balls. Upon examination, one of the pistols was found loaded and half-cocked: the other one was discharged and the pan open. The pistol which was unloaded gave evident marks of having been recently fired It was found on Saturday, and we alledge that it was fired on Thursday. The pistol unloaded and other causes excited curiosity, and after the body of the deceased was buried, it was taken up to discover if possible the ball, and what was the character of it. Dr. Durkee performed the examination after the exhumation, and found in the body a ball that corresponded precisely with the ball of the other pistol, and fitted the one discharged. Permit me here to observe, said Mr. R. that these pistols are screw-barrel pistols, and such pistols have this peculiarity that the powder is put into a chamber and the ball placed on it without wadding; if the ball do not fit exactly the barrel and chamber, the powder will fall out There is another peculiarity in screw-barrel pistols: they are the only species of fire arms (with the exception of a certain kind of gun which is sometimes used,) where the barrel is not of the same size throughout; in screw barrel pistols the chamber is larger than the rest of the barrel, and a ball when discharged from them takes an oblong figure. A ball (not previously discharged from the pistol) which you can put in the chamber you cannot put in the muzzle. The ball found in the body of the deceased was oblong in its form, but the part which was next to the powder, fitted the chamber, and the ball could be inserted in the muzzle, thus showing it had been discharged from such a pistol and had fitted it. So much for the pistol.

Another instrument of death used was a hatchet, which I now hold in my hand. It was found about 100 yards from the person of the deceased, and its appearance gave strong evidence of its having been buried deeply in the person of the deceased; even far up on the handle it was stained with blood. A similar hatchet, or this one, was purchased by the prisoner, at the store of Mr. Drake, on the day previous to the night of the murder, and Mr. R. expected to prove that no hatchet precisely similar can be purchased elsewhere in the city of Baltimore. Some can be found of the same make and shape, but they are blackened on the blade while these are blue. —On the day mentioned, the prisoner entered the store of Mr. Drake, between 10 and 11 o'clock, and asked to see some hatchets; he looked at several, and then took up one of this discription and asked the price. He was told it was one dollar, and he put down the money, and taking the hatchet, he was leaving the store, when Mr. Drake asked him if he would not have it wrapped up. He refused to have it wrapped up, saying he was going to use it immediately, and so left the store This hatchet we expect to prove is the one found about one hundred yards from the deceased. When Mr. Drake saw the prisoner at the magistrate's office, he asked him what he had done with the hatchet; he answered that he had left it at Mr. Whiteley's auction store to be sold. On Friday (the day after the murder) an individual went into Mr. Drake's store, (but the witness who will prove the fact, does not know whether it was the prisoner) and asked the price of this kind of hatchet. He purchased one, and Mr. Drake's son asked him if he would have it wrapped up. He said yes, and the hatchet was wrapped in paper and tied with a peculiar kind of twine. This was between 6 and 7 o'clock. Between those hours the prisoner, as we will prove, carried a hatchet to Mr. Whiteley's, wrapped in paper and tied with twine, such as we think we can prove Mr. Drake uses, and left it to be sold. I shall not be able to prove that the person who bought the hatchet from Mr. Drake on that day was the prisoner, but I can prove that he took on that day such a hatchet to Mr. Whiteley's, and wrapped in such paper and tied with such twine as Mr. Drake uses — And I shall therefore argue that the hatchet which Stewart took to Mr. Whiteley's on the morning after the murder, was not the hatchet which he purchased the day previously from Mr. Drake, but that he used it as a blind as to what he did with the other hatchet.

I shall, continued Mr. R., prove moreover that William Stewart, on the day of the murder, was dressed in either a blue or a black *close bodied* coat and blue pantaloons, and that he was dressed in those clothes all that day. I shall prove that when he left the house of of his uncle, Thomas Stewart, on the morning following, he was dressed in a different suit—a black *frock* coat and white pantaloons, and in that dress he went on board the steamboat Maryland, to the Eastern Shore. I shall further prove that he went on board the steamboat with a bundle at least of the size of two of the largest hats upon this table, and that he arrived at Cambridge, on the Eastern Shore, with a bundle not one half the size of the one he had when he left the city. Gentlemen, the coat that William Stewart had on the day of the murder has not been seen since; no one can find that coat, and when the prisoner was asked what he had done with that coat he refused to give any information respecting it. From these facts, as they will be proven, I shall argue that the coat had been destroyed by the prisoner on his way to Cambridge.

Mr R. said he would also prove that the prisoner had left this city for Cambridge on the morning after the murder, having made a previous arrangement to go there in company with his father, but the father had not accompanied him. That he went to Cambridge for the purpose of transacting business, but he had returned the day following without doing any business, and on his return he had nothing in his bundle but this pair of pantaloons, [showing a pair blue cloth or cassimere pantaloons.] When the prisoner was examined at the police office, there was found upon his person an ounce bottle which contained spirits of turpentine. The pantaloons when taken from him were literally washed in spirits of turpentine and when the prisoner was asked why he had used the turpentine on the pantaloons, he answered it was to take out some paint he had got on them while on board of the steamboat; but the fact is that he had not worn the pantaloons on board of the steamboat, and it is therefore difficult to tell how he could have got paint on them. The officer who arrested Stewart will testify that when the pantaloons came into his custody they were thick with blood. If that fact can be established, I shall infer that the turpentine was used to obliterate the marks of blood. I can now, said Mr. R. (holding up the pantaloons) find no traces of blood on the outside of them—from the effects of the turpentine, or some other cause, they have been erased—but some how, in the Providence of God, a mark of blood still exists. The prisoner may have succeeded in obliterating the marks of blood on the *outside* of the pantaloons, but he forgot to look in the pocket, in which, if he be the murderer, he put his bloody hand.—There is here, said Mr. R. showing the inside of the pocket, marks of blood.

I shall prove, said Mr. R. that on Thursday (the day of the murder,) the deceased had a watch in his possession—a favorite watch with him—and which he wore in his waistcoat pocket in the same manner as I do mine, but without a guard chain. On the morning when the body was discovered, his pockets were found rifled of the watch and every thing else. When the prisoner was arrested, he was put into a hack, and his uncle, Thomas Stewart, (who, and the officers were with him in the hack,) asked him where his father's watch was. He answered he knew nothing of it. Here there is a chasm in the chain of circumstances, of which, no doubt, the defence will avail itself, for on searching the prisoner, the watch was not found on his person; but, ten or fifteen minutes after the hack containing the prisoner had passed, a negro man drove a dray down the same street, and after the negro had passed a certain spot, the watch of the deceased was found in the street, broken. Mr. R. repeated, that the watch was gone from the person of the deceased when discovered; that Wm. Stewart when in the hack declared he knew nothing about it; and that the watch was found in the street through which the hack passed, broken. The argument he should use, he would tell the gentlemen on the other side at once, would be, that as the watch was found there, it had been dropped by Wm. Stewart, as he passed the spot in the hack.

The State would prove, in conclusion, that Stewart and his father left, at a late hour in the afternoon, the house of his uncle, Thomas Stewart, where they were both staying, and walked out together. It would prove that at dusk they were were seen together, about one hundred yards from the spot where the murder was committed. It would prove by individuals whose credibility is good and cannot be disputed, that about 9 o'clock on that night, a pistol shot was heard in the direction of the spot where the body was afterwards found, and immediately after, the cry of 'Oh! Lord, Murder!' Another individual who heard the pistol shot, and the cry of murder, would state, that after it, there was a sound as if a raining of blows, and after each blow, the exclamation of "Oh! William," or a name very similar to William. Moreover it will be proved, that while Stewart was in his cell at prison, Mr. Tracy, who was at that time and is now one the deputy warders, entered his cell, and found Stewart in a somewhat moody state of mind He asked Mr. Tracey in the course of conversation, what the community thought of the accusation against him. Mr Tracey replied, that seven out of ten seemed to think him guilty. Stewart then asked him, where his uncle Tom, was, and whether he would not come to see him. Mr. Tracey answered him, that he supposed his uncle would call to see him shortly Stewart, apparently in connection with the conversation respecting his uncle, remarked that some individuals were making themselves very busy about this affair, but if they did not look out, they would get into the scrape He then became very moody, and went and leaned his arm upon the window sill of his sell, and while leaning there, apparently absorbed in thought, and without seeming to be aware that any one was present, he was heard by Mr. Tracy to utter these words: 'It would have been better for me if I had not gone to the Eastern Shore—all this comes from that bit of land." The land to which he probably alluded, was on the Eastern Shore, and it the only property of which the deceased was possessed—was left to the prisoner in his will.

If, said Mr. R. in concluding his address, I shall be able to prove these facts, then I shall use such arguments and inferences as may fairly be drawn from them, leaving to you, gentlemen of the jury, to deal with them dispassionately, and I have no doubt that you will come to a right conclusion in the case.

William P. Preston Esq'r, senior council on the part of the prisoner, arose after the council for the persecution had concluded his *expose*, and addressed the jury. He commenced by remarking that it was usual for the council for the prisoner, the council for the State having stated the grounds upon which he supposes he can substantiate the charge brought to advance what he conceives the defence, as set up against those charges One thing we cannot but observe, in all that has been advanced by the council for the state, advanced calmly, dispassionately, and with that candor and fairness which he ever displays, and which reflects credit upon that officer in the discharge of the painful duty which is this day imposed upon him—that although the array of what he is pleased to call *facts* are terrific, yet they are not facts to be proved against the prisoner, but *circumstances*, and which from the nature of the charge to be established by them, it would be fair to infer, could prove the principal, or a similar presumption against any other individual. The prisoner cannot be convicted on *facts*—but on circumstances which cannot be linked together, and which might be brought with equal force against some other individual. The defence would rely upon the innocence of the prisoner; it would show his previous good character, and the State cannot find any circumstances connected together, which it could show proved the accused to be guilty of the crime; but we will show such a chasm in the testimony, such a breaking in the links, as, under a beneficent and righteous God, who will not suffer the innocent to be punished, will prove conclusively that the prisoner is not guilty. I say it with knowledge that the horrible array of pistols, hatchets, watches, coats, bundles and pantaloons, which the learned gentleman has displayed before you, cannot be brought against the prisoner as facts, but only as circumstances, which cannot be linked together. We can also prove an entire want of motive in the accused to commit the deed. From the nature of the evidence in this case, he could not state what facts would be shown by the defence, but that would be drawn out in the cross-examination of the witnesses on the part of the State, and when we have heard the character of the testimony, by which the prosecution expects to prove the charge, we hope to be able to advance such testimony as will contradict their inferences and give an impression different from that the State expects to produce. It is apparent that many things advanced by the Attorney of the State, cannot be sustained as evidence against the prisoner, and we will be able to show them in a light that will reduce an absurdity what with his views would appear to be logical conclusions.

I must, said Mr. P. addressing the Court, in justice due to my client, ask your honors to order all the witnesses on the part of the State, and those for the prisoner, (excepting such as are to prove character,) be ordered to leave the court room, and forbidden, under pain of contempt, to enter the room until called for. Mr. Richardson said he was willing that such an order should be given, but all the witnesses must leave the room or none. The court then granted the motion, and the witnesses were placed under the charge of a bailiff, with orders not to permit their entering the Court Room until called for by the counsel.

The evidence was closed, and Mr. Richardson opened the pleadings on Thursday afternoon, by a neat and lucid recapitulation of the facts and circumstances he expects to have proven, and the inferences he intended to draw from them. On Friday morning Mr. Preston commenced his argument on the defence, and continued to speak for six hours and a half, with an eloquence that few of his most ardent admirers expected, and which was listened to with admiration by a concourse of spectators with which the room was crowded. Mr. Z. Collins Lee, followed at 6 o'clock last evening, and continued an able and masterly argument until 7 o'clock, when the Court adjourned.

GEN. HAMILTON--DAN. O'CONNEL.

To the Editor of the Richmond Enquirer.

SIR—In the letter I addressed to you, from London, on the 15th of August, enclosing a copy of the correspondence which has just taken place between Mr. O'Connell and Mr. Stevenson, I promised to investigate the truth of the declaration of the former, that the report of that part of the speech at the anti-slavery meeting of Birmingham, in which a highly offensive allusion was made to Mr. Stevenson "*was not correct*"—I now proceed to redeem this pledge.

After Mr. Stevenson had closed his correspondence with this individual, and I was preparing to transmit it to you, just before the departure of the mail for the Liverpool packet on the 16th August, an American gentleman called on me, and remarked that he had read with much satisfaction Mr. Stevenson's correspondence with Mr. O'Connell, but not without some surprise, as he had arrived at Birmingham the day after the memorable festival of the 1st, and that every body there spoke of Mr. O'Connell's having used the very same language, in reference to Mr. Stevenson, which was to be found in the reported speech.—But there was indeed one very material omission in the report in question, and that was Mr. O'Connell's gross attack on the memory of Washington—'That this man,' to use the gentleman's own language, 'had endeavored to fix upon the memory of the Father of our country, the conjoint guilt of the basest avarice and the most disgraceful hypocrisy by declareing, that even our boasted Washington was a slave holder, who had purchased the cheap renown of emancipating his slaves, but that he had not manumitted them until death, and the want of progeny had rendered them of no further value to him.' I then declared, that I regretted that I had not allowed Mr. Stevenson to push the libeller to the wall, when some conjuncture might have arisen in which he might have been punished for this previously unknown outrage.

With these preliminary observations, I will now pass to the object of this communication—and in order that the American public may understand what Mr. O'Connell had denied, I will show what he is reported to have uttered.

He observed in the report of his speech to which I refer—"We have got more to do;—we are only beginning the fight. We have the power of British humanity on our side.—How delighted have I been at the language of our eloquent and honored friend this evening." (Dr. Lushington, who had indulged in a tissue of gross and abusive libels on the people of the U. S.) "America, through her thousand villages, along her multitudinous streams, amid the roar of her waters, shall hear the echo of his voice. She will hear that one of the most eloquent living orators of the British Parliament, one of the most successful professional men, one of the most highly gifted of our ecclesiastical judges, has passed sentence of eternal infamy upon her. Oh yes! they are infamous! It was the judge who pronounced this sentence—but I want the verdict of a jury on the same question.—As many of you as are of opinion that they are infamous, say aye! (A loud shout of aye burst from the whole assembly.) 'Aye, they are infamous. Infamous, slave-holding America. I believe there very Ambassador is a slave breeder; one of these beings who rear up slaves for the purpose of traffic. Is it possible, that America would send here a man who traffics in blood, and is a disgrace to human nature? I hope the assertion is untrue, but it is right to speak out"

On Mr. Stevenson's demanding to know of Mr. O'Connell whether the above was a correct report of what he did say on the occasion in question, in illusion to himself, he received as you are aware, the following reply from Mr. O'Connell:—

No. 16, *Pall Mall*, Aug. 10, 1838.

Sir—In consequence of your letter of yesterday's date I examined the report of my speech in the Spectator of the 4th, and have no hesitation in saying, that the paragraph you have selected is not a correct report of what I said on the occasion.

The very next sentence does, to my mind, show that this report could not have been correct, and having examined another report since, as well as from distinct recollection, I repeat that the report is not correct.

I have the honor to be Sir,
Your obedient servant,
D. O'CONNELL.

Hon. Mr. Stevenson.

To this note, you are aware, that Mr. Stevenson replied as follows:

'Presuming that you intend your reply as a denial of the offensive expression in that part of your reported speech, which had allusion to myself, I am satisfied with the answer you have given.

Now, it is quite manifest among gentlemen, that after Mr. O'Connell's denial of the correctness of the report of his remarks in relation to Mr. Stevenson, he was under the highest obligation of truth and honour to correct any erroneous inferrence which Mr. S. might have made of his intention to wound his feelings. Mr. O'Connell's silence, after Mr. Stevenson had announced his intention to make their correspondence public, confirms and justifies Mr. Stevenson's deduction, and makes Mr. O'Connell's disavowal plenary and decisive.

I must, however, confess, if we had any other antagonist to deal with, I should not have seized on this point in the pleadings to drop the correspondence. If we had a reasonable subject, or if it had been Mr Stevenson's fortune to have opened his correspondence with an individual who, entertaining scruples in relation to such obligations, (as they are understood among gentlemen) but who, nevertheless, having perpetrated an unprovoked wrong against an individual, would have felt, by itself, the moral obligation of making him atonement, I would have consented that Mr Stevenson should have gone a step further, and demanded of Mr. O'Connell an explicit declaration of what he had said in relation to Mr. S. But I knew, from what I had heard of Mr. O'Connell's character, such an appeal would have been hopeless. With this view of the subject, my friend, Capt. Perry, not only entirely concurred, but suggested the course that was finally adopted. And we believed that, as every body was aware of the extraordinary accuracy of the stenographers of England, the conclusion would be readily formed, that Mr. O'Connell had resorted to a disingenuous artifice, it not a palpable untruth, to sneak out of the difficulty, and this, after all, was the only triumph which could be obtained over the reckless libeller of our country.

That this untruth was uttered, I will now prove. About a fortnight or three weeks after the correspondence between Mr. O'Connell and Mr. Stevenson had been closed, business carried me to Birmingham, where I met with several individuals, who all concurred in declaring that the report in the Sun, was almost, if not entirely, verbatim what Mr. O'Connell had said in relation to the American Minister, in his speech of the 1st of August; yet, as an unwillingness was felt to give certificates of the very fact they averred, from the state of public opinion, (I presume, on the slave question, in Birmingham.) I was, therefore, without this testimony in an authentic shape, until I had the good fortune to meet with a highly respectable gentleman, a resident of Birmingham, who, without the slightest hesitation addressed to me the following note, in reply to one which I wrote him, and whose authority I have to use it, as I may deem proper:

SEPTEMBER 6 1838.

My Dear Sir—I heard M. O'Connell deliver his celebrated and anti slavery speech at Birmingham on the 1st ultimo. His allusions to the American Minister, reported in the Sun and Spectator, were not only correctly, substantially, but I believe literally, what Mr. O'Connell uttered.

He was, likewise, guilty of the remarkable indecorum of making a fling at the memory of General Washington, by asserting that he was not only a slave holder, but that he had never manumitted his slaves until his death, when they could be of no longer service to him.

I remain, dear Sir, with much respect, your obedient servant,
HENRY VANWART.

General Hamilton

I do not know that I have any thing more to do with Mr. O'Connell, unless by his own seeking. I have convicted him of being a wanton and vulgar libeller, not only of my country, but of the most precious memory embalmed in its history. I have convicted him of a palpable untruth to avoid a just atonement towards a gentlemen; against whom he had been guilty of an unprovoked outrage; a gentleman who never did him wrong and whose official, if not his personal station, ought to have entitled him, not to the abuse, but to the protection and hospitality of every man in the British nation.

It is not a part of my purpose, sir, to enter into a defence of American slavery in the abstract, or in its practical manifestations among ourselves although. I fully concur in the opinion expressed by one of the most philosophical of our public writers, that American slavery had done more to civilize the African, than all that the missionaries have been able to accomplish from the commencement of the Christian dispensation to the present time, in the regions of that vast continent. Nor could I sustain this position with better authority than British authority. In the admirable journal of the expedition of Capt. Owen on the Western coast of Africa in 1822, I find these just reflections, which I recommend to the special notice of Mr. O'Connell and his great ecclesiastical judge:—"The wild savage is the child of passion, unaided by a ray of religion and morality to direct his course; in consequence of which, his existence is stained with every crime that can debase human nature to a level with the brute creation. Who can say that the slaves in our colonies are such? Are they not, by comparison with their still savage brethren, enlightened beings? Is not the West India negro, therefore, greatly indebted to his master for making him what he is—for having raised him from a state of debasement in which he was born, and placed him in a scale of civilized society? The man who has seen the wild African roaming in his native woods, and the well fed, happy looking negro of the west Indies, may perhaps be able to judge of their comparative happiness. The former, I strongly suspect, would be glad to exchange his state of boasted freedom, starvation and disease and become the slave of sinners, and commisseration of saints"

I do not know that I can make more manifest, or conclude this communication more appropriately, than by speaking of Mr. O'Connell in the same language in which he was addressed by the intrepid and talented Ruebuck, in his letter to the Irish Agitator, on the 4th of August, in which he convicted himself of the grossest injustice to Mr. Papineau and the rest of the Canadian patriots and of a servile truckling to the Ministry:—"I write, not to shame you, but to prove to my own countrymen, how wanting you are in truth, in justice, in generosity to mark for their instruction, the worthlessness of your authority; to hold you up to the scorn and the contempt of the brave, the truth-loving and the generous.,'

I regret, sir, that I should have occupied so large a space in your paper, on a subject so essentially disgustful.

I remain, very respectfully,
Your obedient servant,
J. HAMILTON, of S. C.

THOS. RITCHIE, } New York, Oct. 10th. }

FEDERAL WHIG SENTIMENTS.

"A farmer with his huge paws on the statute book, what can he do? As well might a blacksmith attempt to mend a watch as a farmer to legislate.'—*Boston Courier, a whig paper.*

Again, in noticing the return of General Jackson to the Hermitage, the same paper says:

'What mischiefs are sure to be enacted, when a man born for nothing but the plough-tail takes to politics! But a blockhead is sure to be late in finding his level.'

"Mechanics and Labourers have neither the means nor the inclination to study the science of Government; and are, therefore, from the very nature of their occupations, unsafe depositories of the public trust.'—*Senator Leigh, of Virginia.*

'Let government protect the rich and the rich will protect the poor.'—*Daniel Webster.*

'Men who have an interest in the soil only are allowed to vote in Rhode Island. Our elective franchise has been so free, so unchecked, so heedlessly ruinous, that Americans are not rulers in their own land. Rhode Island has shown us the importance of checks and restraints on this right of voting.'—*New York Star, Tory paper.*

'Every vote in Rhode Island represents a certain portion of the surface of the soil; the hills and the valleys, and the rocks and the woods, and the streams speak at the polls.—No man is here allowed to vote unless he has an interest in the soil.—*Providence Journal, Tory paper.*

Benjamin C. Perkins, Esq., President of the Federal Whig County Convention held in Etyria on the 31st of August last, publicly declared that there "never was a purer set of men ever assembled, than the members of the Harford Convention.' Again, he publicly said, that 'it was wholly useless to make the private property of stockholders in banks holden for the redemption of their bills—that such a provision would not add to the safety of bank paper.'

Biddle and the British, vs. U. States.

The Liverpool Mail, an English paper, makes use of the following language in reference to England:—

'Mr. Biddle must dictate his own terms to the government of America. He must PUT DOWN THE GOVERNMENT. He must drain the deposite banks of Specie, or perish.

From the Tallahassee Floridian Oct 13.

Gen. Taylor, with two companies of Dragoons from Tampa Bay, passed through this city on Tuesday, on his way to Chattahoochee. The General had with him, a chief of the Tallahassee's, the son of Neamathla, and his negro interpreter. His object, we learn, is to endeavor to find the fugitive Creeks and induce them to emigrate, as well to aid in the removal of the Apalachicola's. We understand the Tallahassees and Miccosukies have of late shown a disposition to be friendly—several of their head men have been in at Tampa and signified their determinating to collect their people, and emigrate to the West. General Taylor, is, however, making active preparations for a winter campaign. He at least hopes to induce the Indians to remove east of the Sumannee, and thus give peace and quiet to the frontier settlers. The Indians, General Taylor informs us, are not embodied, neither is it believed they will be again found in any considerable numbers.

It is said that the poet Campbell and Boz, the author of the Pickwician papers, are both coming to this country in the course of a short time.

There are fifty four members to be elected to Congress next month. Forty will be chosen in New York, on the first Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday in November—twelve in Massachusetts on the second Monday—one in Delaware on the second Tuesday—and one in Michigan on the first Monday and Tuesday in November.