

WASHINGTON, June 13, 1942.

The Senate today disposed of the Revolutionary claim in behalf of the heirs of Silas Deane, and allowed the amount reported by the Committee, qualified by an unimportant amendment.

In the course of the debate on the subject a rare scene was witnessed between Mr. McRoberts of Ill. and Mr. Ferry Smith of Conn. The Senator from Ill., in the fervor of his opposition to the bill, took occasion to indulge in some unbecomingly harsh reflections upon the memory of Mr. Deane, and seemed to challenge a reply from the advocate of the claim. The Senator from Connecticut, being thus called upon, promptly sprung to his feet, and hurled back the imputations with most laudable emphasis, and in the very best Saxon English. He said he deemed it his duty to inform the Senator that his allegations (repeating them) were altogether gratuitous, and unworthy the character and dignity of the body. In the midst of this indignant harangue, the Senator from Ill. rudely interrupted the speaker by exclaiming, "It is false—it is false!" The redoubtable Senator from the East coolly rejoined, "It is not false; I have barely repeated your expressions; and if you were not a sick man, I would soon make you personally sensible of the truth of what I have said."

Mr. McRoberts, boiling with wrath, assured the gentleman from the "land of steady habits," that "whenever he should think proper to make the occasion, he would find him well enough to meet the Senator, in any manner and in any place. The issue of this unfortunate dispute was manifestly becoming dangerous, and the mutual friends of the parties felt it their duty to interpose. Mr. King and Mr. Benton, by the indulgence of the Senate, expostulated with Mr. Smith, and deplored his violation of the propriety of debate, and attempt, in the most patronizing manner, to instruct him as to the parliamentary rule on such occasions. Moreover, they advised him to make a personal acknowledgment to the Senator from Illinois, as they feared things might proceed to fearful extremities. This dignified and complacent admonition was lost upon the bellicose Senator from Connecticut, who very calmly observed that he could perceive the necessity of apologizing to a gentleman for being abused by him; nor was he very clear as to the propriety of the interference of a third party, however accomplished in the rules of civility or of legislation. And here the matter ended for the present. Whether there will be a stir among the civil authorities to-morrow or not, remains to be seen. He of Connecticut certainly had blood in his eye, and I assure you the Senate will be most agreeably disappointed if the affair shall be amicably adjusted.

The Senate then proceeded to the consideration of Executive business, which, after a session of an hour and a half, resulted in the rejection of James H. Caldwell as Superintendent of the Branch Mint at New Orleans without a division, and the confirmation of the following appointments: WILLIAM WELTON, N. Y., Consul at Cowes; JAMES GARSDY, J. Penn., Consul, Kingston upon Hull; GERDONS BRADLEY, Conn., Consul, Mayaguez, Porto Rico; G. F. SNOW, Mass., Consul, Pernambuco, S. A.; ALEX. OTT, Ill., Consul, Altona, Spain; E. A. WEBSTER, Mass., Consul, Bombay; C. EDWARDS LESTER, N. Y., Consul, Genoa; A. M. GREEN, Va., Consul, Yokosuka, Japan.

Treasury Department. J. A. GRANDELL, Rec. Pub. Money, Granada, Miss.; ISRAEL McFARRAN, Rec. Pub. Money, Jackson, Miss.; RICHARD G. BANKS, Surveyor Port Hampton, Va.; JOHN CHEW, Surveyor Port Havre de Grace, Md.; ROBERT HOWARD, Naval Officer, Charleston, S. C.; ARCHIBALD BLACK, Collector, St. Marys, Ga.; THOS. S. WATSON, Surveyor, Port Savannah, Ga.; HENRY F. DEKING, Col. and Ins. Sag Harbor, N. Y.

War Department. RICHARD W. CURRIS, Lieut. Agent, Fort Leavenworth. You will perceive by the enclosed reports of the Committee on Naval Affairs that the members are divided upon the subject of the message nominating sundry officers for promotion in the service. The reasons assigned for and against the views of the Department in this regard are shrewd and plausible, and the decision of the Senate will finally rest upon the result of their action upon the Navy Appropriation now before them. I hold it to be good economy to preserve an imposing Military Marine, and trust the service will not be much curtailed.

The House have been all the day engaged upon the Appropriation bill, and after a tedious debate, refused to concur in the Senate's amendment of the Ratio of Representation by a vote of 112 to 95. It is believed that a number between 60 and 70 would stand will be adopted, and that the Senate will concur. I should not omit to say that Mr. Adams must be excepted from my general reflection upon the debate. He was, as he always is, distinguished by his great ability and learning, and furnished an interesting relief to the dull monotony of the discussion. It is to be hoped the bill will be revised and returned to the Senate to-morrow; and that the will be Tariff resumed without delay.

Beach is re-nominated as Receiver in Missouri, and Mr. Johnson as Surveyor General for the States of Ohio, Indiana and Michigan. There are several others who I will give you in my next.

Re-nomination of the One-Hour Rule!—Resolution—One-Hour Rule, &c., &c. Correspondence of The Tribune.

WASHINGTON, June 13. In SENATE, today, Mr. WOODRUFF presented the credentials of Hon. LEONARD WILCOX, (now holding his seat by appointment of the Governor of New-Hampshire,) elected Senator from New-Hampshire for the unexpired term of Franklin Pierce, resigned. Mr. W. was re-qualified.

After the presentation of numerous memorials on the subject of the Tariff, the bill for the armed occupation of Florida was taken up, and after a debate of some length was passed over.

A message from the President was received, transmitting, in answer to a Resolution of the Senate, a Report of the Secretary of State and accompanying documents relative to the proceedings under the Convention of the 11th April, 1839, between the United States and Mexico.

The bill to provide for the permanent employment of certain Clerks at present temporarily employed in the Post-Office Department was passed.

The bill for the adjustment of the claims of Silas Deane was debated at some length, and the Senate went into Executive Session.

In the HOUSE the regular order, the reception of resolutions, being taken up, Mr. PENDLETON moved a resolution providing for taking the vote without further debate on any pending question in Committee of the Whole on the Union. Mr. CAYE JOHNSON moved to lay the resolution on the table; carried, Yeas 102; Nays 91. Mr. BOTTS at a subsequent period of the day gave notice of a motion to reconsider this vote.

Mr. COWEN offered the one-hour resolution—providing that no member in Committee of the Whole or in the House shall speak more than one hour on any question. Mr. C. moved the previous question. Mr. ARMSTRONG moved to lay the resolution on the table; negatived, Yeas 83; Nays 113.

The resolution was then adopted, Yeas 120; Nays 84. Mr. MEDILL offered a resolution instructing the Committee on the Judiciary to report a bill to amend Gen. Jackson's law. Mr. J. G. LLOYD moved to lay it on the table; negatived; Yeas 81; Nays 126. Mr. M. moved the previous question on the resolution, which was not sustained—Yeas 73; Nays 95, and that the resolution lies over (never again to be reached) for debate.

On motion of Mr. ESKRITT, the rules were suspended by Yeas 192; Nays 25, and the Appropriation Bill was taken up, the question being on concurrence in the amendments of the Senate. Mr. E. moved a concurrence in the amendments (which change the ratio from 50,179 (as adopted by the House) to 70,630, and provide for the representation of major fractions) and moved the previous question. Mr. ADAMS expressed a desire to debate, and a hope that the previous question would not be seconded.

The demand for the previous question was not sustained, Yeas 75; Nays 97. Mr. ADAMS made an animated speech of an hour in opposition to concurrence in the amendment of the Senate changing the ratio and in advocacy of that providing for the representation of fractions. The latter, notwithstanding the veto of Gen. Washington, he considered constitutional and just, as by it a whole people were more nearly represented. He opposed, with much spirit, the increase of the ratio as proposed by the Senate, advocating in accordance, as he contended, with the first principles of Democratic Government and of the Constitution as large a representation of the people as could practically be made for deliberation and legislation, and repelled, with some indignation, the apparent spirit of dictation with which the Senate had amended the bill to reduce the numbers and power of the House, contending that it was the province of the House to decide on the ratio of representation by the people, and declaring that he would sooner see twenty bills than concur in the amendment of the Senate.

Mr. WM. C. JOHNSON moved that the House disagree to all the amendments of the Senate. Subscribing in part to the arguments of Mr. Adams that the House ought to determine solely this question of representation. Mr. J. went into an examination of the relative powers of the House, the Senate and the Executive; contending that the House was the weaker branch, that the number of its members as determined on by it should not be diminished, but should rather be increased. He expressed his willingness to increase it to a House of 350 members. He opposed the fractional amendment of the Senate.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—John A. Marked was tried for receiving stolen goods knowing them to be such, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, which was stolen from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last, supposed to have been taken from his house by Catherine Holt, who came to obtain a situation as a housekeeper for a nurse to take care of children. She had been employed by Low for some time, and took the watch and seal for the purpose of selling it for \$5 to a friend of her name, who she had met at a party given by her at her house on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—Catherine Holt was put upon her trial for receiving stolen goods, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—John A. Marked was tried for receiving stolen goods knowing them to be such, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, which was stolen from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last, supposed to have been taken from his house by Catherine Holt, who came to obtain a situation as a housekeeper for a nurse to take care of children. She had been employed by Low for some time, and took the watch and seal for the purpose of selling it for \$5 to a friend of her name, who she had met at a party given by her at her house on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—Catherine Holt was put upon her trial for receiving stolen goods, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—John A. Marked was tried for receiving stolen goods knowing them to be such, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, which was stolen from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last, supposed to have been taken from his house by Catherine Holt, who came to obtain a situation as a housekeeper for a nurse to take care of children. She had been employed by Low for some time, and took the watch and seal for the purpose of selling it for \$5 to a friend of her name, who she had met at a party given by her at her house on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—Catherine Holt was put upon her trial for receiving stolen goods, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—John A. Marked was tried for receiving stolen goods knowing them to be such, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, which was stolen from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last, supposed to have been taken from his house by Catherine Holt, who came to obtain a situation as a housekeeper for a nurse to take care of children. She had been employed by Low for some time, and took the watch and seal for the purpose of selling it for \$5 to a friend of her name, who she had met at a party given by her at her house on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—Catherine Holt was put upon her trial for receiving stolen goods, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—John A. Marked was tried for receiving stolen goods knowing them to be such, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, which was stolen from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last, supposed to have been taken from his house by Catherine Holt, who came to obtain a situation as a housekeeper for a nurse to take care of children. She had been employed by Low for some time, and took the watch and seal for the purpose of selling it for \$5 to a friend of her name, who she had met at a party given by her at her house on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—Catherine Holt was put upon her trial for receiving stolen goods, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—John A. Marked was tried for receiving stolen goods knowing them to be such, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, which was stolen from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last, supposed to have been taken from his house by Catherine Holt, who came to obtain a situation as a housekeeper for a nurse to take care of children. She had been employed by Low for some time, and took the watch and seal for the purpose of selling it for \$5 to a friend of her name, who she had met at a party given by her at her house on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—Catherine Holt was put upon her trial for receiving stolen goods, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—John A. Marked was tried for receiving stolen goods knowing them to be such, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, which was stolen from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last, supposed to have been taken from his house by Catherine Holt, who came to obtain a situation as a housekeeper for a nurse to take care of children. She had been employed by Low for some time, and took the watch and seal for the purpose of selling it for \$5 to a friend of her name, who she had met at a party given by her at her house on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—Catherine Holt was put upon her trial for receiving stolen goods, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—John A. Marked was tried for receiving stolen goods knowing them to be such, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, which was stolen from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last, supposed to have been taken from his house by Catherine Holt, who came to obtain a situation as a housekeeper for a nurse to take care of children. She had been employed by Low for some time, and took the watch and seal for the purpose of selling it for \$5 to a friend of her name, who she had met at a party given by her at her house on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—Catherine Holt was put upon her trial for receiving stolen goods, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—John A. Marked was tried for receiving stolen goods knowing them to be such, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, which was stolen from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last, supposed to have been taken from his house by Catherine Holt, who came to obtain a situation as a housekeeper for a nurse to take care of children. She had been employed by Low for some time, and took the watch and seal for the purpose of selling it for \$5 to a friend of her name, who she had met at a party given by her at her house on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—Catherine Holt was put upon her trial for receiving stolen goods, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—John A. Marked was tried for receiving stolen goods knowing them to be such, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, which was stolen from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last, supposed to have been taken from his house by Catherine Holt, who came to obtain a situation as a housekeeper for a nurse to take care of children. She had been employed by Low for some time, and took the watch and seal for the purpose of selling it for \$5 to a friend of her name, who she had met at a party given by her at her house on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—Catherine Holt was put upon her trial for receiving stolen goods, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—John A. Marked was tried for receiving stolen goods knowing them to be such, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, which was stolen from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last, supposed to have been taken from his house by Catherine Holt, who came to obtain a situation as a housekeeper for a nurse to take care of children. She had been employed by Low for some time, and took the watch and seal for the purpose of selling it for \$5 to a friend of her name, who she had met at a party given by her at her house on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—Catherine Holt was put upon her trial for receiving stolen goods, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—John A. Marked was tried for receiving stolen goods knowing them to be such, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, which was stolen from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last, supposed to have been taken from his house by Catherine Holt, who came to obtain a situation as a housekeeper for a nurse to take care of children. She had been employed by Low for some time, and took the watch and seal for the purpose of selling it for \$5 to a friend of her name, who she had met at a party given by her at her house on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—John A. Marked was tried for receiving stolen goods knowing them to be such, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, which was stolen from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last, supposed to have been taken from his house by Catherine Holt, who came to obtain a situation as a housekeeper for a nurse to take care of children. She had been employed by Low for some time, and took the watch and seal for the purpose of selling it for \$5 to a friend of her name, who she had met at a party given by her at her house on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—Catherine Holt was put upon her trial for receiving stolen goods, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—John A. Marked was tried for receiving stolen goods knowing them to be such, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, which was stolen from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last, supposed to have been taken from his house by Catherine Holt, who came to obtain a situation as a housekeeper for a nurse to take care of children. She had been employed by Low for some time, and took the watch and seal for the purpose of selling it for \$5 to a friend of her name, who she had met at a party given by her at her house on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—Catherine Holt was put upon her trial for receiving stolen goods, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—John A. Marked was tried for receiving stolen goods knowing them to be such, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, which was stolen from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last, supposed to have been taken from his house by Catherine Holt, who came to obtain a situation as a housekeeper for a nurse to take care of children. She had been employed by Low for some time, and took the watch and seal for the purpose of selling it for \$5 to a friend of her name, who she had met at a party given by her at her house on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—Catherine Holt was put upon her trial for receiving stolen goods, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—John A. Marked was tried for receiving stolen goods knowing them to be such, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, which was stolen from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last, supposed to have been taken from his house by Catherine Holt, who came to obtain a situation as a housekeeper for a nurse to take care of children. She had been employed by Low for some time, and took the watch and seal for the purpose of selling it for \$5 to a friend of her name, who she had met at a party given by her at her house on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—Catherine Holt was put upon her trial for receiving stolen goods, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—John A. Marked was tried for receiving stolen goods knowing them to be such, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, which was stolen from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last, supposed to have been taken from his house by Catherine Holt, who came to obtain a situation as a housekeeper for a nurse to take care of children. She had been employed by Low for some time, and took the watch and seal for the purpose of selling it for \$5 to a friend of her name, who she had met at a party given by her at her house on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—Catherine Holt was put upon her trial for receiving stolen goods, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—John A. Marked was tried for receiving stolen goods knowing them to be such, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, which was stolen from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last, supposed to have been taken from his house by Catherine Holt, who came to obtain a situation as a housekeeper for a nurse to take care of children. She had been employed by Low for some time, and took the watch and seal for the purpose of selling it for \$5 to a friend of her name, who she had met at a party given by her at her house on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—Catherine Holt was put upon her trial for receiving stolen goods, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—John A. Marked was tried for receiving stolen goods knowing them to be such, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, which was stolen from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last, supposed to have been taken from his house by Catherine Holt, who came to obtain a situation as a housekeeper for a nurse to take care of children. She had been employed by Low for some time, and took the watch and seal for the purpose of selling it for \$5 to a friend of her name, who she had met at a party given by her at her house on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—Catherine Holt was put upon her trial for receiving stolen goods, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—John A. Marked was tried for receiving stolen goods knowing them to be such, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, which was stolen from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last, supposed to have been taken from his house by Catherine Holt, who came to obtain a situation as a housekeeper for a nurse to take care of children. She had been employed by Low for some time, and took the watch and seal for the purpose of selling it for \$5 to a friend of her name, who she had met at a party given by her at her house on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—Catherine Holt was put upon her trial for receiving stolen goods, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—John A. Marked was tried for receiving stolen goods knowing them to be such, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, which was stolen from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last, supposed to have been taken from his house by Catherine Holt, who came to obtain a situation as a housekeeper for a nurse to take care of children. She had been employed by Low for some time, and took the watch and seal for the purpose of selling it for \$5 to a friend of her name, who she had met at a party given by her at her house on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—Catherine Holt was put upon her trial for receiving stolen goods, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—John A. Marked was tried for receiving stolen goods knowing them to be such, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, which was stolen from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last, supposed to have been taken from his house by Catherine Holt, who came to obtain a situation as a housekeeper for a nurse to take care of children. She had been employed by Low for some time, and took the watch and seal for the purpose of selling it for \$5 to a friend of her name, who she had met at a party given by her at her house on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—Catherine Holt was put upon her trial for receiving stolen goods, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—John A. Marked was tried for receiving stolen goods knowing them to be such, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, which was stolen from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last, supposed to have been taken from his house by Catherine Holt, who came to obtain a situation as a housekeeper for a nurse to take care of children. She had been employed by Low for some time, and took the watch and seal for the purpose of selling it for \$5 to a friend of her name, who she had met at a party given by her at her house on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—Catherine Holt was put upon her trial for receiving stolen goods, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—John A. Marked was tried for receiving stolen goods knowing them to be such, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, which was stolen from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last, supposed to have been taken from his house by Catherine Holt, who came to obtain a situation as a housekeeper for a nurse to take care of children. She had been employed by Low for some time, and took the watch and seal for the purpose of selling it for \$5 to a friend of her name, who she had met at a party given by her at her house on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—John A. Marked was tried for receiving stolen goods knowing them to be such, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, which was stolen from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last, supposed to have been taken from his house by Catherine Holt, who came to obtain a situation as a housekeeper for a nurse to take care of children. She had been employed by Low for some time, and took the watch and seal for the purpose of selling it for \$5 to a friend of her name, who she had met at a party given by her at her house on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—Catherine Holt was put upon her trial for receiving stolen goods, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—John A. Marked was tried for receiving stolen goods knowing them to be such, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, which was stolen from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last, supposed to have been taken from his house by Catherine Holt, who came to obtain a situation as a housekeeper for a nurse to take care of children. She had been employed by Low for some time, and took the watch and seal for the purpose of selling it for \$5 to a friend of her name, who she had met at a party given by her at her house on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the watch. The accused pleaded a previous good character. The jury found her guilty.

TRIAL FOR RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS.—Catherine Holt was put upon her trial for receiving stolen goods, a watch with chain and seal, worth \$9, from Peter H. Low, of Canal-street, on the 15th May last. She was charged with the watch for certain jewels granted her. This was positively contradicted by Mr. Houghton, who deposed that he never gave her the