New Orleans Republican.

OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE UNITED STATES.

OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

[Advertisement.]

HISTORY OF THE GAINES CASE.

How the Matter Should be Settled.

With a view to save a portion of the property holders of the city from expensive litigation, and probably heavy ultimate loss, by quieting titles to their property, and to save the city from further expensive litigation, it seems to one who feels a deep interest in the prosperity of the city that the present is a favorable time, just on the reorganization of the city government under the new charter, to settle, if it can be done on fair terms, the claims of Mrs. Myra Clark Gaines, as heir and legatee of Daniel Clark, against property in the possession of the city, and of persons to whom the city has sold and stands as warrantor, so far as those claims have been adjudicated on and recognized by the Supreme Court of the United States.

A careful examination of the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States will show that Mrs. Gaines' title to certain lots and land in the city, as heir and universal legatee of Daniel Clark, has been fully and finally settled in her favor. A very large amount of other city property is similarly situated to that covered by those decisions, so far as title is concerned. Most of this other property has passed through the hands of the city and been sold to various persons by the city, and to whom the city is warrantor. Suits have been instituted by Mrs. Gaines against several hundred of those purchasers from the city, and the city has been or will be called in warranty in all those cases.

A brief reference to those decisions of the Supreme Court, and to the other property similarly situated in regard to titles to that in litigation in those cases, will be important to a proper understanding of the subject.

On the twenty-seventh March, 1857, Mrs. Gaines filed a suit in the Circuit Court of the United States, against Duncan N. Hennen and seventeen others, who were in procession of lots of ground, composing part of the square bounded by Circus, Perdido, Phillippi and Poydras streets. This case was decided against Mrs. Gaines in the Circuit Court, and she took an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States, which was finally deciding by that court in 1860, reversing the decision of the Circuit Court, and decided in favor of Mrs. Gaines. See 24 Howard, 553. The decree amongst other things ordered as follows:

And the court doth now here remand this cause to the said Circuit Court for such further proceedings as may be proper and necessary to carry into effect the following directions, that is to say:

1. To cause the said defendant, Hennen, forthwith to surrender all the property so claimed and held by him as aforesaid, into the hands of the said Myra Clark Gaines, as a part of the succession of Daniel Clark.

2. To cause an account to be taken by the proper officers of the court, and under the authority and direction of the court, of the yearly rents and profits accrued and accruing, from the said property, since the thirteenth of May, 1844, when it came into possession of the defendant, Hennen, and to cause the same to be accounted and paid to the said Myra Clark Gaines; the account to be taken subject to the laws of Louisiana in cases of such recovery as is now decreed in favor of the said complainant.

3. To give such directions and make such orders from time to time as may be proper and necessary for carrying into effect the foregoing directions and for enforcing the due observance of the same by all parties and by the officers of the court.

The substance of this decision is that the property be delivered to Mrs. Gaines and that she also recover the rents and revenues thereof from the time it came into the possession of Hennen on the thirteenth of May, 1844.

The decision as to the other seventeen parties, who hold their property through the same chain of conveyances as Hennen, follow the decision in his case.

This square of ground belonged to the succession of Daniel Clark, and was sold by Relf & Chew "under pretended authority of testamentery executors of the said Daniel Clark and of attorneys in fact of Mary Clark," and by sundry subsequent conveyances came into the possession of the New Orleans and Carrollton Railroad Company on the twenty-seventh of May, 1836. See the Hennen case, pages 615 and 616.

The New Orleans and Carrollton Railroad Company sold a portion of this square, to wit: One hundred and ninety-one and five-twelfths feet on Poydras street, by about forty-two feet in depth, to the Municipality No. 2, on the fourteenth September, 1836, which slip of ground has been converted into a market-house and street, and is now held and used by the city as such. Under the authority of the decision in the Hennen case, there can be no doubt but that Mrs. Gaines can recover this lot from the city, with the rents and revenues thereof from the fourteenth September, 1836.

On the twenty-second December, 1856, Mrs. Gaines filed a suit in the Circuit Court of the United States against the city of New Orleans, claiming that, as heir and legatee of Daniel Clark, she was the owner of the tract of land within the city of New Orleans bounded by the Bayou St. John, Canal Carondelet, Dorgenois and Bellishasse streets, containing about one hundred and thirty-five acres, and known as the Blanc tract, and which has been divided by the city into streets, squares and lots.

It was admitted in this suit, and the proof fully sustains the admission, that this tract of land belonged to the succession of Daniel Clark; that Relf and Chew as pretended executor of his will of 1811, and as attorneys in fact of Mary Clark, sold this tract of land to Evariste Blanc, on the thirtieth October, 1821, and said Blanc sold the same to the city, on the thirtieth July, 1834.

The city having sold the quarter portion of this land as city lots, before the institution of this suit, could only defend the same as to five squares, Nos. 33, 34, 41, 42 and 46, still held by the city, the city having sold forty-seven squares, containing over one thousand lots.

The decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in this case, affirmed in every point the previous decision of the same court in the case vs. Hennen, and decreed the land claimed by Mrs. Gaines, then in the possession of the city of New Orleans, being the five squares above stated, to be delivered to her. This decision was rendered in December, 1867.

The decision in this case will be interesting and satisfactory for any person who takes an interest in the matter to read, so I give a careful abstract from it:

EXTRATCS.

Supreme Court Ninth United States.—No. 82, December Term 1867.—Myra Clark Gaines, vs. the City of New Orleans—Appeal from the Circuit Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.—Mr. Justice Davis, delivered the opinion of the court: "It was supposed after the decision in Gaines vs. Hennen (24 Howard), that the litigation pursued in one form and another for over thirty years by the complainant to vindicate her rights in the estate of her father was ended.

But this reasonable expectation has not been realized, for other cases involving the same issues and pleadings, and supported by the same evidence, are before us, and we are asked to review the principles of law and questions of fact on which the Hennen decision was pronounced, and they reopen the whole controversy. The legal principles on which that case was decided are no longer open for consideration. They were fully and finally settled, and are controlling in all other disputes relating to the same subject.

The influence of the probate of the will of 1813 in deciding the civil status of Mrs. Gaines cannot be over-estimated. Without the evidence which it furnishes, her legitimacy might be questioned, but with it, in connection with other evidence in the record, it is hard to see how it can be longer doubted.

The circumstances under which the will was recognized are peculiar, and entitles the court which pronounced it valid the tribute of our admiration.

This will, thus allowed to go to probate, contains the following clause: "I do hereby acknowledge that my beloved Myra, who is now living in the family of Samuel B. Davis, is my legitimate and only daughter; and I leave and bequeath unto her, the said Myra, all the estates, whether real or personal, of which I may die possessed, subject only to the payment of certain legacies hereinafter named."

But it is said the probate of the will in dispute can not stand, because there was no direct action by the Louisiana court annulling the probate of the will of 1811. This was not necessary. The probate of the will of 1813, by the mere fact of its probate, necessarily annulled the will of 1811, so far as its provisions were inconsistent and so far as the estate was legally administered under it. And this precise point was decided in the Hennen case.

We find, therefore, as a further fact in this case, that Daniel Clark contracted marriage with Zulime Carriere in good faith. As Clark was in good faith when he married the mother of the complainent, it follows that she can take the estate under the olagraphic will of 1813. It is conceded the property in dispute, and which the defendants admit they were in possession of, is a part of the estate of Daniel Clark, left at his decease, and devised to complainant in his late will. She is therefore entitled to the relief sought by her bill, unless prevented by some of the special defenses interposed, which we will now proceed to notice. It is claimed as a question of law that the decree of this court in Gaines vs. Relf (12 Howard) is res judicata, both as to the present claim for the property and the civil status of the complainant. But this point was met and disposed of adversely in the Hennen case, and will not be further considered.

Two defenses have been prominent throughout this litigation, and as they are both applicable to some of the cases now before the court, and as one opinion will, in fact, dispose of all the cases, we will consider in this case all substantial defenses to the recovery by Mrs. Gaines of her father's estate.

In bar of the claim of the complainants' titles acquired under Relf and Chew, executors of the will of 1811, are set up. But these titles cannot avail the defendants, because Relf and Chew, as executors of the will of 1811, had no authority to make the sales, and could, therefore, pass no interest to the purchasers. This is not only clear from the law itself, but also from the judicial decision of the State Court. Chief Justice Martin, in Donaldson vs. Hall, 7 Martin, N. S., page 113, says: "A sale by executors without an order of court, and by private contract, is void;" and to the same effect is the case of Lanfear vs. Harper, 13 Annual, page 548. The defendant having failed to prove that any order of court was ever given to make these sales, they are nullities and convey no titles. And this is the decision in Patterson vs. Gaines, in 6 Howard, which is reaffirmed in Gaines vs. Hennen, 24 Howard. It is useless to discuss the point further, as we see no reason to question the correctness of the conclusion at which the court arrived in these cases.

It is insisted that the defendants are protected by reason of conveyances from Relf & Chew, attorneys of Mary Clark, the universal legatee under the provisions of the will of 1811. The invalidity of this defense has been also sustained by this court in the cases just referred to. The effect of the probate of the will of 1813, if Myra Clark Gaines is legitimate, and that we have found to be true, is to make her sole heir of Daniel Clark, and, as a consequence, Mary Clark could in law have no title as heir, and could convey none.

This brings us to the only remaining defense which we shall notice, and that is the bar by prescription. But the title of the complainant is not barred by prescription according to the laws of Louisiana. This defense was made in the case of Gaines vs. Hennen, so often referred to, and disposed of adversely to the defendant, and is no longer an open question in this court. The prescription relied upon in this case is the same that was relied upon by the defendant in that, and as the proofs are common to both, it follows, as the plea of prescription was not available in the one, it is not in the other.

To the discredit of the friends of Daniel Clark, this child grew to womanhood in utter ignorance of her rights and parentage, and did not ascertain them until 1834, (then not fully), since which time she has been endeavoring to obtain her rightful inheritance. Owing to the lapse of time, it was difficult to reach the truth, and necessarily for many years she groped her way in darkness; but finally, she was able to show the great fraud, perpetrated against; her for, in the judgment of the Supreme Court of Louisiana, she established the validity of that very will, which forty-three years before her father had executed in her favor. This action of the court settled, what was before doubtful, her civil status, and removed the difficulty she had formerly encountered in pursuit of her rights. The questions of law and fact to these rights were determined in the case of Gaines vs. Hennen. After argument by able counsel, and on mature consideration, we have affirmed that decision. Can we not indulge the hope that the rights of Myra Clark Gaines in the estate of her father, Daniel Clark, will *now* be recognized? The decree of the Circuit Court of the Eastern District of Louisiana is reversed, and this cause is remanded to that court, with instructions to enter a decree for complainant in conformity with this decision."

COPY OF THE MANDATE.

United States of America, ss: The President of the United States of America to the honorable the Judges of the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Louisiana, greeting:

WHEREAS, Lately in the Circuit Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana, in a cause between Myra Clark Gaines, complainant, and the city of New Orleans, H. E. Lamayre, Charles Hopkins, Dominique Lanata, L. Lalande Ferriere, defendants (in equity), whereon the decree of the said Circuit Court entered in said cause is in the following words, viz: "This cause came on to be heard at this term upon bills, answers and replications, exhibits and proofs, and was argued by counsel, and submitted to the court; whereupon, on consideration thereof, it is ordered, adjudged and decreed that the bill of complaint herein be dismissed with costs." Decree entered nineteenth April, 1858; decree signed twenty-third April, 1858, as by the inspection of the transcript of the record of the said Circuit Court, which was brought into the Supreme Court of the United States, by virtue of an appeal agreeably to the act of Congress in such cases made and provided, fully and at large appeare; and

Whereas, in the present term of December, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-seven, the said cause came on to be heard before the said Supreme Court, on the said transcript of the record court was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and decreed by this court, that the decree of the said Circuit Court in this case be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs, and that the said complainant recover against the defendants, the city of New Orleans, et al., one thousand eight hundred and seventy-five dollars and fifty-six cents for her costs herein expended, and have execution therefor. And it is further ordered that this case be, and the same is, hereby remanded to the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Louisiana, with instructions to enter a decree for the complainant in conformity with the opinion of this court.

In this case Mrs. Gaines, on the first of September, 1868, submitted a proposition to the city; suggesting the propriety of quieting and perfecting the titles of the vendees of the city to the property acquired by the city from Blanc in 1834. This proposition was referred to the Finance Committees of both boards, and on the thirty-first of December, 1868, a report was made by the Finance Committees, who, after reciting the chain of titles to the property, and other facts, conclude by saying:

"Your committee did not deem it within the province of their duty to give any opinion upon the legality of the claim of the petitioner, but as it is a question of great importance, not only to the city, but to the large number of persons who have acquired titles to property from the city, and in view of the magnitude of the case, and that the other duties of the City Attorney precludes him from giving his time and attention to the study of the claim and case, we have asked the *opinion* of attorneys of *known ability* who have no *bias of opinion for or against the claimant*, and whose opinion attached hereto we recommend as a basis for final action, and offer the accompanying for the sanction of the Council."

The resolution is as follows:

"*Resolved*, That a joint committee, composing three members of the Board of Assistant Aldermen and two of the Board of Aldermen, be appointed to investigate the claims of Mrs. Myra Clark Gaines and to recommend an amount that should be paid to said Mrs. Gaines, in compromise, to quiet her titles to all property sold by the city and now claimed by her."

The lawyers consulted by the committee were E. Wooldridge and C. E. Whitney, who submitted written opinions to the following questions:

"First. Does the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Mrs. Myra Clark Gaines vs. the City of New Orleans affect the case of the present claim now before the Council? If so, to what extent?

"Second. Do you advise, after an examination of the case, that the city shall still defend the case, or should settle the matter by compromise? If the latter, on what terms?"

Those attorneys fully concurred in opinion, and, in answer to the first interrogatory, said that "said decision is conclusive as to all the ground in controversy not alienated by the city prior to the twenty-second of December, 1856, the date on which Mrs. Gaines filed her suit."

"And as to that part of the ground in dispute, which had been alienated by the city prior to the institution of said suit, and is now claimed and occupied by the city's vendees (against whom Mrs. Gaines is now prosecuting another suit in the United States Circuit Court), they are of opinion that the decision in question virtually settles every point that can be raised by the defendants on the trial of said last mentioned suit, except such special defenses as may apply individually to the vendees respectively, and these special defenses can only be of two kinds, to wit:

1. Defendants may successfully resist Mrs. Gaines' suit by showing title in themselves acquired from her.

2. By showing title by prescription—that is, by showing they have held the property for ten consecutive years, under a title translative of property acquired by them *in good faith*.

No one claims titles acquired from Mrs. Gaines, which disposes of the first point.

The question of prescription, these attorneys show, can not avail the defendants, but they show that, so far as the city is concerned, it makes no difference whether Mrs. Gaines gains or loses the suit against the city's vendees, as if Mrs. Gaines gains the suit the city will be responsible to their vendees, the defendants, in warranty, and if the defendants gain the suit, the city will be liable to Mrs. Gaines for the same amount that she would have been in warranty to the defendants if they had lost the case. They say: "It will be seen that, so far as the city is interested in discharging her legal responsibilities, as well to Mrs. Gaines as to all other parties interested in this controversy, her liability is fixed by the decision in question."

She will stand unaffected or affected as much the one way as the other, whether her vendees win or loose the suit now prosecuted against them by Mrs. Gaines.

If this be true, how idle is further resistance on her part, when we consider the necessary waste of money thrown away in contesting an already twice decided case, and both decisions rendered by the highest judicial tribunal of the nation, if not of the world, and the last, a most lengthy, labored and emphatic decision, rendered after having given long and attentive audience to the ablest counsel of the nation, who, for more than a quarter of a century had been engaged in prepairing the cause. The counsel further says: "For all of said ground sold by the city prior to the twenty-second December, 1856, the city is bound to refund the purchase money with interest. And this, in any event, whether her vendees win or loose the suits now pending against them."

In response to the second interrogatory, these counsel say they "can not advise the city longer to defend the case, and do advise a settlement of the same by compromise, if possible." On the basis of the liability of the city, as stated, they say: "Mrs. Gaines' claims adjusted, our city real estate titles will be clear, and large portions of the city, now falling into decay for want of repair, will at once be improved, and soon attain a quadruple value. Thus, by way of taxation, yielding large revenues to the city, as well as lopping off the enormous annual expenses to which the city has been put for many years in defending herself against the claims of Mrs. Gaines."

A careful examination of the decisions of the Supreme Court, and of the opinions of those attorneys selected by the Finance Committees of the City Council, "of known ability, who have no bias of opinion for or against the claimant," together with the resolution offered by the committee as part of their report, to appoint a committee to "recommend an amount that should be paid to said Mrs. Gaines in compromise, to quiet her titles to all property sold by the city, and now claimed by her," fixes the conclusion irresistibly upon the mind of any unprejudiced person that further litigation by the city in this matter will be simply vexatious and wasteful, and that the city owes it, in good faith to those who have purchased portions of this property from her, to quiet their titles by a settlement of the matter with Mrs. Gaines.

The effect of this defect in titles on those who have purchased portions of this property from the city is exceedingly injurious in this: It prevents them from improving the property, as no one will improve property when they know the title is defective. They can not use it as a security on which to obtain loans, as no capitalist will lend on mortgage on property when the title is defective; and they can not sell, as no one will purchase property when they know the title to be bad. The consequence is that this large district of the city, comprising forty-seven squares and more than a thousand lots, is dilapidating and deteriorating in real value, the city and State thereby losing the revenue that would accrue from the improvement and prosperity of that portion of the city.

This is a propitious time to compromise this matter, for the reason that Mrs. Gaines, though a resident of New York, and advanced in age, is present in the city, and the City Council under the new charter, composed of but one body, and few in number, and of the highest character and business capacity, and assisted by a city Attorney of great ability, there is every prospect that a fair and equitable settlement can be made, if the matter is postponed. Life is uncertain, and in the event of Mrs. Gaines' death the business will become complicated by her rights falling into other and several hands, and instead of dealing with one person as now, many persons may have to be consulted, and should Mrs. Gaines find it to her interest to sell out her claims, those who might purchase would do so for a speculation and would extort every cent the law would give them.

No one can read the first and last paragraphs of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Gaines vs. the city of New Orleans, 6 Wallace, 697 and 718, without being impressed with the belief that the court considered the litigation in that suit unnecessary and vexatious, and an unwarrantable attempt to deprive Mrs. Gaines of her just rights. If another suit, involving the same questions, should be taken to that court, it would be treated with little favor.

It is proper here to remark again that we refer, in this communication, only to such property claimed by Mrs. Gaines, the titles to which have been substantially settled in her favor by the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, in the cases of Mrs. Gaines vs. Hennen and the city of New Orleans.

May not a reasonable hope be entertained that the city authorities will take up this matter and settle the same, or, at all events, do all they can in the premises? Certainly, Mrs. Gaines has showed a disposition to settle this matter, and the late city government, as far as they went, also showed that a settlement ought to have been made. The writer of this has never heard any reason why the matter was allowed to rest where it was left by the report of the Finance Committees herein referred to. CITIZEN.

It is stated that George Roberts has sold the Westmoreland Hotel, with the intention of embarking once more in newspaper enterprise. He is one of the oldest living newspaper men in the United States. He founded the Albany *Transcript* in 1836, the Boston *Daily Times* about the same time, the Boston *Yankee Notion* (the first of the Boston weekly sensation papers), the enormous *Constellation* (published in this city), was the founder of the American Club House, in Union square, and the architect and builder of the popular Westminster Hotel, in Irving place. He has been a very enterprising man during his extended career.

If you are troubled with asthma Laplace's Indian Turnip Pectoral Balm will relieve you. Sold at all well assorted drug stores, Price one dollar.

TAX COLLECTOR'S NOTICE.

OFFICE STATE TAX COLLECTOR, First District, City of New Orleans. State of Louisiana, May 26, 1870.

The following named parties are hereby notified to call at my office, No. 126 Carondelet street, room No. 31 Davidson's Court, and settle the amounts set opposite their names, for taxes due the State for 1869, within TWENTY DAYS from date, or I will proceed to collect the same according to law:

II

Hecker Fred	$83 70
Hewner M	5 70
Higgins Patrick	42 45
Heaton Mrs Ann	34 75
Hughes John No 1	19 95
Hughes John No 2	23 70
Haggerty Dennis	27 45
Henry Henrietta	148 70
Hube Michael	12 45
Helen Mrs W S	11 70
Hardly Mrs	1 70
Halloran Mathew	8 70
Hurt Mrs Catherine	52 70
Herndson M	4 95
Hearsay estate Mrs George	15 20
Holbrook A M	488 70
Hall E & Henry S	86 45
Hoy Joseph	16 20
Hale Thomas	2422 70
Huntington Walter	38 70
Huss Frank	25 95
Huss Moses	12 45
Holland Mrs Mary J	45 20
Higginbotham Mrs Thos	30 20
Henderson Mrs H	37 70
Hyland Michael	17 70
Huck John	166 20
Haas Leon	34 95
Heiner J A	3 45
Hiller Mrs Mathias	60 20
Hildress Mrs M	7 70
Hall Mrs W P & M Bigney	38 70
Henderson Mrs William	37 70
Hodgson Mrs W J	22 70
Howell Eliza Ellen	63 20
Horst A	70
Huntington G W	57 45
Henry John	124 95
Hewitt J [illegible]	61 20
Heno André B	38 70
Hutchinson E E W G and C A	151 20
Hines Daniel	19 95
Howard M	9 45
Henderson Mrs John	15 20
Harris widow William	18 95
Howell Mrs Jane	30 20
Hudsall Mrs George A	30 20
Hands Edwin V	46 20
Holliday Dr D C	85 95
Hogan J	4 95
Hahn Bernard	102 45
Hausman J	4 95
Hillman George	98 70
Hackett John	8 70
Hockart A	2 70
Holtzman Gaorge H	17 70
Heafy Michael	17 70
Hoetz Joseph	12 45
Hollie Mrs G E H	9 20
Heinen M T	10 20
Haug Fidele	19 95
Huckmaller B	46 20
Haggerdon Mrs Adam	22 70
Hall Mrs John M	7 70
Hit George	2 70
Hickey estate Mary E	3 20
Hardy G W	6 45
Henderson John	259 95
Handlin W W	88 95
Hale James	563 70
Hennessy Richard & John	30 20
Heavy John	2 70
Holzel Philip	316 20
Hanley Peter	12 45
Hunt Mrs C	135 20
Hirsch Mrs Catherine	112 70
Hutkinson M	22 70
Holskemper John	16 20
Huner John	16 20
Hewitt James	38 70
Hart Mrs Ann	9 95
Houghton Mrs G W	22 70
Horan John	9 20
Happi John	16 20
Harris William	61 20
Hyde E C	53 70
Hildebrand George	46 20
Hollander Frederick	175 20
Halpin Patrick	292 95
Hughes widow James E	30 20
Hussman H	5 70
Hyland M	48 45
Herman Mrs M	16 20
Harrison W C	8 70
Horrell, Gayle & Co	38 70
Hart L	17 70
Hyman Soliman	68 70
Harper Mrs L H	82 70
Hogan William	46 20
Horan Mrs Mathew	18 95
Hillman William	2 70
Hughes James E	34 95
Henderson Mrs Catherine	22 70
Howell Abraham	53 70
Hart Arthur and F A Jacobs	17 20
Henry Gustave	3 45
Harney Mrs J H	90 20
Hughes widow J E	30 20
Hall J M	37 70
Haber Federick A	121 20
Hirsch Mrs Amelia	67 70
Hirsch Henry	53 70
Hartley F	3 45
Huseman Moses	25 20
Heaton George	173 70
Henter Ferninand	38 70
Harley Samuel	19 95
Hirsh Abraham	16 20
Herlitz Henry A	14 70
Hassam Thomas	100 20
Hinberger F A	4 95
Hendricks Mathew	37 20
Hill widow Henry	11 45
Huppenbauer Fred A	295 95
Holmes Newton	31 20
Hussy John	8 70
Hemard Charles	46 20
Holdrith L	10 20
Hesse Frederick	6 20
Hickey Cornelius S	10 20
Henson Edward	5 70
Hahn Conrad	19 95
Henning Peter	4 95
Hyland M and M Brennan	6 20
Holmes Hannah	7 70
Harrington Mrs J	1 70
Hesse Barbara	3 20
Hogan John	3 45
Hart James	3 45
Hart Thomas	4 20
Heneban Michael	3 45
Hennehan P	3 45
Haggerty, Michael R	53 70
Hart E	83 70
Hodges J J	12 45
Huth John	2 70
Heaton L A	2 70
Holey John	53 70
Houssion John	42 45
Hale Mrs Josephine	22 70
Hilsman Thomas	31 20
Henriquez F H	91 20
Hippz Peter	3 45
Harding F	43 20
Holmes John & T S. Salter	264 70
Harnan P	7 70
Hay & Mehle	39 70
Huber Z	3 45
Hays, Tunsall & Co	40 70
Hitchcock G D	76 20
Hart widow John	47 45
Hoyle J M	137 70
Hoyt S W	38 70
Haresch & Addler	62 20
Hubbel J C	19 95
Hopkins J W	6 45
Hansell B	173 70
Hernsheim S	98 70
Horton A	171 45
Hinson G W	89 70
Haber & Moore	77 20
Hood J B & Co	39 70
Hathown & Pierson	39 70
Hailes & McNeil	4 10
Horter, Peterson & Fenner	78 20
Henry John & Co	189 70
Hutchison T W	2 70
Heath R	488 70
Hinton I T	12 45
Haley C C	14 70
Henning W H & Co	113 70
Hullen estate of J B	90 20
Hubee W	91 20
Hyman A	4 95
Halliday J	5 70
Howard C T	217 70
Hunt estate Thos H	122 70
Hill H T	144 45
Hurley D	4 95
Hoffner H	91 20
Howlett H M	4 95
Hallisy John	8 70
Harper Thomas	38 70
Hare Thomas	5 70
Hafner A	16 20
Huey J K & Co	39 70
Hogan & Patton	151 20
Hawkins John	61 20
Hopper B F	16 20
Hester Dr A	151 20
Howard J D & Co	39 70
Hart Judah	38 70
Hedrick M S	46 20
Hubert L	3 10
Honauld Charles	23 70
Huger & Bine	38 70
Herman, Hertz & Co	20 95
Hiller M & Co	162 45
Hernandez Joseph	600 20
Hand Mrs Chas and others	225 20
Hewitt Norton et als	225 20
Hiebler G	2 70
Harris Alexander	43 95
Heck Charles T	2 70
Howell B M & Co	77 20
Harrold Mrs C and others	135 20
Home Insurance Company of New Haven	100 20
Hare Robert	113 70
Higgins J P & Co	189 70
Hardee John T & Co	39 70
Hull Mrs S S	7 70
Hurley John	8 70
Hill Allen	247 70
Haley M	17 70
Haas C	78 45
Husch Adam	12 45
Hansley Mrs P	62 70
Hillsman A S	25 95
Herminger R	4 95
Hochemedel Michael	130 95
Herman Louis F	94 95
Hunt Mrs W H	101 45
Hunt Randell	16 20
Hissehberg H	6 45
Huberwald Rudolph	79 95
Hesse R	2 70
Hunter Mrs R	18 95
Hoffman & Kerner	4 45
Hyman Mrs	7 70
Hug F	4 95
Heiseman M	19 95
Hurt Mrs Daniel	37 70
Helm J G	4 45
Hersky J	2 70
Halpin P & J A Moran	77 20
Howard J B	23 70
Hugonin J G	23 70
Hubbard J B	353 70
Heren Narcisse	68 70
Habeny Charles	1 95
Harbolt H M	3 10
Haner Mrs S	52 70
Henn Peter	4 95
Hodgins Patrick	12 45
Hock Michael J	23 70
Harvey Mrs E	12 45
Hackreda William	23 70
Huchmedt William	31 20
Huppenbauer Fred	37 70
Hibbs J	23 70
Harris Miss P and others	30 20
Hasch Peter	31 20
Hagedom Adam	14 70
Hassam & Pooley	162 45
Hackett Patrick	8 70
Heno P	39 45
Hooper estate of Isaac	18 95
Heath Charles	16 20
Hearne John	4 95
Haan Julius	31 20
Hart J H	8 70
Hamburger widow P A	15 20
Hubert Augustin	23 70
Hughes David	16 20
Holmes Augustus	10 20
Hayben Francis O	25 95
Hutchinson heirs of	15 20
Henon Mrs Eliza	7 70
Henon Nicholas	16 20
Hodnett H	7 95
Hanson A	4 95
Holtz Joseph	4 95
Hopkins William	16 20
Hanly estate of Thomas	12 45
Heno widow A B	11 45
Horler A W	48 95
Henley John	19 95
Healey Patrick	16 20
Hoffman Christian	23 70
Hutchinson J W	7 70
Hawkins Benjamin	3 45
Honora Isabella	7 70
Henderson Patrick	10 95
Hoft Peter	19 95
Heffner Walter	4 95
Hussy Mrs John	18 95
Hite George	6 45
Hughes B W	4 95
Henning Mrs Sophie L	7 70
Hart Margaret	6 20
Hugg J and Mary Sexil	7 20
Hucks Anthony	7 20
Haze Mrs	1 70
Hart Perry	12 45
Hutton Michael	7 20
Herron Nicholas	7 95
Hauck Alexander	3 45
Handlin W W	6 45
Hatton Michael	7 95
Hillman George	7 20
Holle C	7 20
Hinninigan Edward	4 95
Hafte Frederick	12 45
Harris Osburn	7 20
Hilback, Joseph	6 45
Hertzberg Albert	3 45
Husted Henry	7 20
Husted Julius	4 20
Hays James	4 95
Hide Joseph	4 20
Heale Miss Parthenia	3 20
Hogan James	2 70
Hanley Patrick	4 95
Hefty F	4 95
Hart Arthur	6 20
Hyams Isaac	6 45
Hodgkins G	3 45
Hogan Dennis	2 70
Henry Lawrence	10 20
Hanley J	2 70
Hellen William	1 95
Hamilton M	3 45
Hepper William	7 95
Haas John G	12 45
Houth Newton	3 45
Hevia James G	31 20
Hyams J S	11 70
Hoyle J M and E A Chadwick	11 45
Hyams J S and H M	7 70
Hill Artemus	10 95
Hyams Henry M	4 20
Hopp L C	1 95
Hale C C and D Barlow	4 45

I

Insurance Company Merchants'	5058 95
Irwin Patrick	1282 70
Irwin J Q	14 70
Irwin widow John	37 70
Ingersol estate Doras	11 45
Iscerman widow Conrad G	15 20
Ingman S	3 45
Ivens Edmund M	316 20
Irvin William	8 70
Ivens E W	115 20
Isaac Simeon	23 70
Insurance Company Mound City	100 20
Insurance Company Phœnix Mutual	75 20
Insurance Company North British Merchantile	48 20
Imperial Insurance Company	150 20
Insurance Company Germania	712 70
Irvin W H	30 20
Insurance Company Equitable Life	20 20
Insurance Company Crescent Mutual	4012 70
Israel L	14 70
Insurance Company, London and Lancashire	258 20
Insurance Company Piedmont Real Estate and Life	22 20
Insurance Company New York Life	363 20
Ittman G B	12 45
Isaacson H	38 70
Israel F	37 20
Insurance Company Louisiana Equitable Life	135 20
Insurance Company Liverpool, London and Globe	360 20
Insurance Company Ætna Fire	100 20
Ilig G	3 45
Isnard Mrs J J	15 20
Irl J	4 20
Isabelle R H	10 95
Isabelle Thomas	3 45

J

Johnson Joseph	76 20
Joachim Henry	31 20
Joachim Mrs A M	4 20
Joeckel G	2 70
Jenevin John C	53 70
Johnson Mrs Jos	31 20
Jackson James	436 20
Joseph S H	4 95
Jewell J W	182 70
Jackson Robert	188 70
Johnson William John	31 20
Jacobs Henry	33 45
Jenkins Miss E and M E Morton	46 20
Johnston J M	4 95
Jones Mrs Arman	45 20
Johnston J B	8 70
Johnston Mrs M	75 20
Jehle Julius	13 20
Jeffrey John	10 95
Joubert B F	166 20
Jenkins Mrs A M	54 95
Jacobs J W	12 45
Josephine Louis	38 70
Jones Wm & Walter Lorie	24 70
Jewett Joseph	19 95
Jones P	67 20
Justus Francis	113 70
Johnson Henry	42 45
Jardet P E	23 70
Jungbeih Henrich	25 95
Jaegger widow Johannes	37 70
Jones Dr James and Son	32 20
Jones Mrs James	67 70
Johnston & Shields	11 95
Jirvin John	61 20
Jones David	34 95
Johnson Francis	23 70
Joyce Patrick	16 20
Jordan Mrs William	45 20
Johnson Patrick	53 20
Joyce Eleanor	7 70
Jacques Jacob	8 70
Jones Walter	4 95
Juif Jules Francis	11 70
Jabat Euge	10 20
Joanen Mrs Peter	10 20
Johnston J C	2 70
Jensen J H	19 95
Jackson Jas and Charles Manson	375 20
Johnston Andrew J	12 45
Jorda Thomas	3 45
Jacobs A	4 95
Jannen J	2 70
Jacobs M	23 70
Johnston C G	38 70
Jones J C	376 20
Jones Allen	38 70
Johnson Julian & Co	39 70
Jeanvennaud & Co	113 70
Jennings Yates & Co	76 20
Jurey & Harris	39 70
Juenger widow William	78 20
Jorda Thomas	91 20
Jones Thomas	25 20
Jordy M	12 45
James