The Officers of the Late Texas Navy.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE HERALD.

WASHINGTON, D. C., Feb. 9, 1851.

Your paper of yesterday contains an article in relation to "the officers of the Texas Navy," which requires a reply from me, because statements are made in it not justified by the circumstances of the case, and entirely misrepresenting several important facts of a controversy in which I was involved many years since, with certain prominent officials in the then republic of Texas, arising out of personal considerations, which I would have preferred to let remain in Texas, where they more properly belong, had they not been revived by the three commanders named in the article to which I am now replying, by their publishing the pamphlet that has been sent to you. I obtained possession of it a few days since, on my return from Texas, and have now in press a reply, which I will send you in a day or two. By its perusal you will see that those three commanders have given anything but a fair view of the case.

I will now reply, as briefly as possible, to the points stated in the article signed M. First, It is not true, in point of fact, that the officers or men of the Texas navy were disbanded by the act referred to as dated 16th of January, 1843. No such act is to be found in the published laws of Texas.

Laws of Texas, Fifth Congress, page 106, section 9, will show that there was a permanent naval establishment. The law is in these words:—

"Be it enacted, &c.—That the naval establishment of this republic shall be composed of one captain, one master commander, eight lieutenants, ten midshipmen, with such other warrant and petty officers as may be necessary for the establishment, upon the scale provided for by this act, with sixty seamen and marines, one lieutenant of marines, one surgeon, one assistant surgeon, and two pursers. Approved January 18th, 1841."

The above law was in full force and effect at the time of the annexation of Texas to the United States.

Secondly and thirdly. It is asserted that I "disobeyed repeated orders to surrender the vessels," &c. To sustain this, reference is made to that extraordinary document, the proclamation of President Houston, published when I was off the coast of Yucatan, in 1843, under the orders and sanction of the government, through one of the commissioners who were sent to New Orleans to control my action and movements, and who brought orders from the proper department to me, "to act under, and be governed by, his instructions until I received further orders from the department." The commissioner was with me all the while. It appears by his evidence, and the orders, that I never received orders to surrender the vessels, as is asserted. The letter of Secretary Hill is also referred to; it is only a repetition of the anomalous proclamation of the President of Texas, which need only be read to convince any one of the absurdity of the allegations it contains.

I appealed to the Texas Congress for, and obtained a trial, by means of an act passed establishing an especial tribunal to investigate the charges alleged against me, in those two high-handed and oppressive documents, in which the laws of the land were disregarded.

The court acquitted me of all the charges, six in number, with 22 specifications, except four specifications under the charge of disobedience of orders; the letters or orders referred to in which, were all conditional, and beyond my ability to carry out. Of these the court found me "guilty, in manner and form as set forth in the same." It was not pretended by me, on the trial, that they were executed. My letters to the department, written on the receipt of each one of them, report my inability to carry them out. They are not correctly stated in the document that is re-published by those three commanders.

As proof that I was not found guilty, I will here insert the action of the President of Texas on the finding of the Court:—

The President disapproves the proceedings of the Court in toto, as he is assured, by undoubted evidence, of the guilt of the accused, in the case of E. W. Moore, Commander of the Navy.

(Signed) SAM HOUSTON.

DEC. 7, 1844.

The government had entire control of the prosecution and the selection of the Court. Comment on such proceedings is unnecessary.

Fourthly. The veto of President Jones (June 27, 1845) was simply of a joint resolution re-appropriating a part of my pay, which had been withheld in accordance with the relentless persecution that had been carried out against me. It had no other object or interest. To carry out that persecution, some of the charges were thus revived against me, of which I had been honorably and unanimously acquitted by the Court; the proceedings of which having been quashed by the predecessor of President Jones, six months previously, as I have already shown he had no right or authority to, and would not have thus revived them against me, but for the reasons already stated. The Congress of Texas declared that "the action of the Court was final and conclusive;" and I have long since drawn the money from the Treasury of Texas.

I regret the necessity that has compelled me to make these matters thus public. It has become necessary, in my defence against the mis-statements made public by those three commanders, and the article in your paper signed "M." They should have informed themselves better before they made these personal attacks.

Fifth. As to "M.'s" version of the opinion of the Supreme Court, in the case of Brashear vs. Mason (not Broadhead), by reference to the case, it will be seen that that part of the opinion cited in the unfair view to which reference is made, is purely incidental, and is not the legal grounds on which the decision of the lower court was made.

The opinion says:—

The plaintiff made application to the lower court for a mandamus against the Secretary of the Navy, to compel the payment of $2,100 arrearages of pay, which he claimed to be due him from the government as a commander in the navy of the United States.

After citing the constitution and laws of Congress prescribing the forms under which money is to be drawn out of the Treasury, the opinion of the Court says:—

In the case of Mrs. Decatur vs. Paulding. (14 Pit., 497.) it was held by this court that a mandamus would not lie from the Circuit Court of the District to the Secretary of the Navy, to compel him to pay to the plaintiff a sum of money claimed to be due her as a pension under a resolution of Congress.

There was no question as to the amount due, if the plaintiff was properly entitled to the pension; and it was made to appear, in that case, affirmatively on the application that the pension fund was ample to satisfy the claim. The fund, also, was under the control of the Secretary, and the monies payable on his own warrant.

Still, the court refused to inquire into the merits of the claim of Mrs D. to the pension, or to determine whether it was rightfully withheld or not by the Secretary, on the ground that the Court below had no jurisdiction over the case, and, therefore, the question not properly before this Court on the writ of error.

The principle of the case of Mrs. D. is decisive of the present one. The facts here are much stronger, to illustrate the inconvenience and unfitness of the remedy.

Commander Brashear, of the late Texas navy, was induced to bring the suit with the double object of obtaining his pay from the date of annexation, and deciding the question legally; being also fully aware that before he could obtain a commission in the navy of the United States, the existing law, limiting the number of officers, would have to be modified or repealed.* On this point the opinion of the Court says:—

It will not do to say, that the result of the proceeding by mandamus would skew the title of the relator to his pay, the amount, and whether there were any money in the Treasury applicable to the demand.

Commander Brashear, as well as the other surviving officers of the late Texas navy, were not entitled to their pay as officers of the United States navy, because they had not been commissioned by the President and Senate. President Polk avowed repeatedly his anxiety to do so, but he was prevented by "the act of Congress of August 1842, limiting the number of officers in the navy." He suggested the resolution now before Congress, proposing to "authorize the President to increase the number of officers in the navy, by adding thereto a number of each grade, equal to the number of surviving officers of the Texas navy, who were duly commissioned and in the service of said republic at the time of its annexation to the United States."

To defeat this plain act of justice all sorts of false issues are made. If the officers of the Texas navy were incorporated into the navy of the United States, as is proposed by the bill reported to the House, by the Naval Committee, no officer at this time in it, would be deprived of his promotion for one moment—or of any other right or emolument he now enjoys.

It is argued by M. that "Texas sold her navy." There was no purchase in the matter of annexation. It was clearly intended to be "a union of the power and resources of two sister republics," who were in all respects equals. The officers in one navy equals of the officers in the other, holding similar commissions.

Sixthly—It is contended that "Captain Moore was discharged and another appointed in his place." If this were true, it would not affect the measure proposed by the naval committee. The certificate referred to by M. proves the illegality of the appointment of Jno. G. Tod. It was published by me for that purpose. It is not true in point of fact, that Captain Moore was dismissed by the President of Texas, who had no more authority, under the laws of Texas, to dismiss Captain Moore, then he had to dismiss the President of Texas. This pretended act was a mere nullity.

The law of the Texas Congress on that subject is as follows:—

Be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the republic of Texas, in Congress assembled, That it shall not hereafter be lawful to deprive any officer in the military or naval service of this republic for any misconduct in office, of his commission, unless by the sentence of a court martial.

Approved February 4, 1841.

Captain Moore has never made any such claim, either for rank or back pay, as is alleged by M. in his seventh set of assertions. It has been made "by some generous opponent of the Texas navy." First, as to his "old place in the navy," which he resigned twelve years since, prompted, as is freely admitted, by a spirit of enterprise and honorable ambition which he never supposed would have been attempted to be used to his prejudice; from the moment of the acceptance of his resignation he had no more claim to "his old place in the navy," than you have, Mr. Editor. Suppose he had never been in the United States navy, as is the case with all the other surviving officers of the late Texas navy, what would then be said of his commission as captain in the navy of a republic, which, during its political existence was equal to any other independent sovereignty, particularly those that had recognized its independence?

All that the officers of the Texas navy have claimed from the beginning, is, that, coming from Texas, they should be incorporated into the navy of the United States, in the commissions they respectively held in Texas, to date the day that republic merged her separate nationality into that of these United States.

The President, having the right, untrammelled, to make the nominations to the Senate, when Congress authorizes him to do so, by modifying the existing law limiting the officers in the navy, it rests entirely with him, when he submits the nominations to the Senate, to say whether the officers of the Texas navy shall take rank from the date of annexation or from the passage of the law proposed by the Naval Committee, or, in fact, whether he nominates them or does not.

Eighthly. It is contended by M, "thatthe regulations of Texas ought to have nothing to say in the premises, &c." It appears to me that Texas, being one of the parties to the compact of annexation, some weight should be given to her repeatedly and unanimously expressed opinion of what she believed she was doing, when she accepted the terms of annexation proposed to her.

It will be seen by the following joint resolutions of her Legislature, that she relies solely on the sense of justice, liberality and good faith, of the government of the United States, for the accomplishment of her well-founded wishes and expectations in this matter.

Whereas there were connected with the great measure of annexation to the confederacy of which we are now a member, various reciprocal rights and conditions, prescribed by the terms thereof, as well as others clearly implied and fairly deducible from the same, all of which Texas has on her part fully and completely redeemed; and whereas, it is the opinion of this Legislature, that the officers of our late navy, by a liberal and just, if not by a strictly legal construction of the terms of annexation, should be incorporated into the navy of the United States in their several ranks, and that they are justly entitled to the same, as well from the construction here put upon the terms of annexation by the Congress of the United States, as from their high characters, personal and professional, and the zeal, fidelity, patriotism, and valor with which they sustained the cause of their country while its navy was in existence. Therefore,

Sec. 1. Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Texas, That our Senators are hereby instructed, and our Representatives in Congress requested, to use their influence to procure the passage of a law by the Congress of the United States, incorporating the officers of the late navy of Texas into the navy of the United States, in the rank which they severally held in the late navy of Texas.

Sec 2. Be it further resolved, That the Governor be requested to cause copies of this joint resolution to be immediately forwarded to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Note—The above joint resolution passed unanimously, and was approved by the Governor, February 2, 1848.

Great weight is given by M., to the names attached to the pamphlet which he has sent you, and of which he says, he "merely analyzes the contents." I regret that he, like those three commanders, has made statements of my own acts as commanding officer of the Texas navy, and the condition of that branch of the service of that republic, which are entirely *ex parte*, and which I hope they would not have made, had they not permitted their judgment to be biassed by their feelings, in what they are pleased to denominate "an act of injustice to themselves and other officers of the navy; viz: the admission or incorporation of the officers of the late Texas navy into the navy of the United States; to which we believe we are clearly entitled, under a just and liberal construction of the terms of annexation, as is so plainly set forth in the report of the naval committee of the House of Representatives, which I herewith enclose.

I have not seen the gentleman who voluntarily wrote the article that appeared in your paper some days since, and which called forth the reply signed M. He will doubtless vindicate his own positions. I would not tax your kindness to publish this, did I not feel that I was called on to vindicate myself against reckless statements, that I fear have been made to create an undue prejudice against me and the other surviving officers of the Texas navy—now only thirteen in all. I have no fondness for newspaper controversies, and only hope that before these gentlemen make any more publications on this subject, they will better inform themselves of the facts in the case.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

E. W. MOORE, Captain Commanding,
Late Texas Navy.

* This officer died in the fall of 1849.

Gov. Barry, of Michigan, and the Compromise.

The message of Gov. Barry was transmitted to the Legislature of Michigan on the 6th instant. Speaking of the Compromise measures he says:—

The States of the North may look upon slavery, permitted in the South, as a great mischief or a great sin, or both; but sovereign themselves, they must respect the sovereignty of their sister States, and refrain from interfering with the institution deprecated. It cannot be regulated or abolished by the free States, nor by the central government; because, being a municipal regulation, each State possesses entire and exclusive jurisdiction in legislating upon the subject. Any interference by one State with another, or by the central government with any State, upon this or other like subject, would be a violation of the federal compact. The principles recently avowed by the executive authority, that a State, in which slavery is not now recognized, has no authority to establish that institution, is unsound and inadmissable. The particular question raised can have no practical application; but the principle involved denies to the State the entire control of their domestic relations. The general and uniform obligations of public laws, is a principle of government definitively settled; and all attempts to substitute opposite theories should be met by our prompt disapproval and unqualified condemnation. If individuals be permitted to declare legislative enactments nugatory by reason of their alleged immorality, or for other cause, the whole statute book would soon be repealed or deprived of its general application by whimsical fancies and tender consciences. Should States be conceded a like permission to judge of, and override, acts of the central government, the uniform and harmonious operation of its laws would be destroyed, and the most frightful and dire calamities ensue. The measures of compromise, adopted at the last session of Congress, and designed to quiet the unhappy agitations of the country on the subject of slavery, have been misrepresented and denounced. Fanatics of opposing creeds have avowed the intention of resisting their enforcement, and, in some instances, have made demonstration of executing their threats.

The compromises of the constitution partake not a little of the nature of a treaty between sovereign powers; and their violation is not less criminal than the violation of treaties. They possess all the validity of law, and the superadded obligation of the plighted faith of States, to give them effect. Without concessions the Union could never have been formed; and it is the duty of the national legislature, by appropriate enactments, to give effect to all the stipulations contained in the articles of compact. In return for the advantages secured by the Union, each of its members must perform its share of duties enjoined; and bear its portion of burdens imposed; and a refusal, in either case, is a palpable violation of faith, and, in its repetition, can only lead to disastrous results. Regarding with disapprobation and censure all unlawful manifestations of opposition, come from what source they may, it is the plain and undoubted duty of all to obey and enforce the laws in question. They were the result of the deliberations of wisdom and experience; and, in the spirit of the constitution, designed to secure the rights of the North and the South. Though we may not approve every provision in detail, we are not therefore relieved from the obligation of giving them effect. The right to resist, if indeed such a right could be named, is futile, and destitute of all foundation but the lucubration of a disordered mind. Obedience to the laws is inculcated alike by human and divine precept, and will alone give security to life, liberty and property. It will alone save us from the appalling evils of anarchy; and who ever counsels resistance clearly disregards the best interests of himself and his fellow men, and incurs the guilt of conspiring against his country. Michigan, it is confidently believed, will require no prompting in the fulfilment of duties pertaining to her federal relations. The laws of Congress will be executed in her borders with promptness and fidelity. If she misjudge for the moment, she will not fail soon to retrace a mistaken step. Though comparatively young in the sisterhood of States, she will be found second to none in attachment to the time-honored principles of our Union; and for their perpetuation, she will strive by earnestly supporting the compromises of the constitution and the supremacy of the laws.

United States Marshal's Office.

FEB. 14—*The Gang of Counterfeiters.*—A young girl, named Jane Thompson, was arrested on Thursday evening, by officer Rackelewitz, at the Old Brewery, Five Points. She will be a material witness for the prosecution against the gang already in custody, charged with extensive counterfeiting, and is retained as evidence on the part of the United States.

Superior Court.

GENERAL TERM.

Present, Justices Oakley, Sandford and Paine.

FEB. 15—*Henry Wood, vs. Peter Lambert, etc.*—Order setting aside final judgment, on the ground that notice of the application to settle the same should have been given to the defendant's attorney.

Albert L. Comstock, defendant in error, ads. Leonard Brown, plaintiff in error.—Motion denied without costs.

George W. Soule vs. William H. Burroughs.—Order made at the special term affirmed, without costs to either party.

Eugene Lentilhon vs. the Mayor, etc., of New York.—Motion of the plaintiff, to strike the cause from the calendar of the general term, granted without costs.

Sarah Ann Post vs. Isaac Adriance.—Order at special term, striking out part of the reply, modified so far as to provide that no costs be given to either party on the motion below. No costs to either party on the appeal.

Edward Roberts vs. Jesse F. Randall.—Order made on the 25th of January last modified so that the order below is reaffirmed without costs.

Samuel Huffman ads. John Leslie.—Motion for new trial granted on payment of costs, unless plaintiff stipulate within ten days to enter verdict and judgment for $72 50, with interest from 1st September, 1845, in which case motion for new trial denied.

Eugene Keteltas and others, appellants, vs. Lucius E. Bulkeley, respondent.—This cause was tried before Judge Vanderpool, in the Superior Court. It was an action for malicious prosecution, in charging Mr. Bulkeley with having committed perjury as an attorney in an action brought by a man named Bradley, against Mr. Keteltas, for an assault. The alleged perjury consisted in Bulkeley having sworn that he had no interest in the result of that trial, for which the appellants entered a criminal prosecution against him, which resulted in his favor. The cause was argued before this Court on a bill of exceptions. Chief Justice Oakley, in giving the decision of the Court, said that they could not see any error committed by the Court below to induce them to interfere in the matter, and they must, therefore, leave it as they found it. The appellants must take such steps in relation to it as they may be advised. The motion for new trial denied.

Robert L. Crooke and others vs. Wm. P. Furniss.—Motion for new trial denied.

John Chester, appellant, vs. Levi Mills, respondent.—Judgment at special term reversed, and new trial ordered. Costs to abide the event.

LIST OF LETTERS REMAINING IN THE NEW YORK Post Office, February 15, 1851.

OFFICIALLY PUBLISHED IN THE PAPER HAVING THE LARGEST CIRCULATION.

Please mention the date of the list in which they are advertised.

LADIES' LIST.

A

Armm Mrs Eliza
Abraham Mrs, Division st
Andrews Mrs Martina
Alexander Ann
Anthony Mrs S W
Adams Miss Julia
Andrews Mrs Mary
Anderson Miss Isabella
Aldrich Miss Sarah G
Anthony Emily
Armstrong Miss Mary

B

Bates Miss Ann Elizabeth
Barber Mrs, Chambers st
Barker Miss E J
Barry Mary
Barnum Miss Elizabeth
Brannan Miss Ann
Brannan Miss Margaret
Bell Mary Ann
Bedford Phoebe A
Bernard Miss Helen
Brexfogle Mrs J C
Brien Mrs Mary
Brickley Catharine
Brooks Mrs
Booth Miss Margaret
Brown Elizabeth
Bowen Miss Mary Ann
Boyle Mary
Buckley Miss, Norfolk st
Buckman Mrs Florence
Burlock Miss Ann E
Butterly Catharine
Burns Miss Emma
Byrnes Mrs Mary
Bailey Mrs Samuel
Barley Miss Eliza M
Barker Mrs Mary J
Barrett Miss Mary
Barton Mrs Cora
Brannan Mary
Beach Miss Caroline A
Bell Mrs John
Benners Miss Julia
Brower Mrs, S, 8th avenue
Breist Mrs Isabella
Bliss Mrs P W
Bigham Miss Sarah
Booth Mrs C, 13th st
Brown Julia Ann C
Brown Mrs Wm M
Boyle Miss Mary
Boyl n Alice
Burke Widow, of Berson Wm Walter
Brush Miss Caroline
Burns Miss Bridget
Byrne Ellen
Bryan Honora
Bunn Miss Lucy

C

Caffrey Mrs
Callahan Sarah
Campbell Susan
Clark Widow, Lewis st
Carr Mrs H H
Carroll Miss Bridget
Carlon Margaret
Cass Mrs Ann
Cassidy Miss Annie
Clawson Mrs Elizabeth
Cheney Louisa M
Chevalier Madam
Clifford Miss Elizabeth
Chilsaham Margaret
Coghlan Catharine
Coleman Mrs Rachael
Colbert Johanna
Coulter Margaret
Courtain Mrs, Pearl st
Courtney Bridget
Cowden Miss Catharine
Cullen Mary
Cummings Miss Catharine
Cusack Bridget
Collins Mrs Mary
Coling Amanda M
Connor Catharine
Connor Mrs Timothy
Connelan Rose
Conklin Mrs J W
Cook Mrs B, Hudson st
Caffrey Miss Catharine
Cameron Miss Harriet
Clark Mrs, Spring st
Carr Mrs, Grand st
Carroll Mrs, 12th st
Carroll Miss Cordelia
Carlon Margaret, Church st
Cassion Miss Mary
Casey Hanora
Cunningham Rose
Cumisky Bridget
Church Miss Susan
Curran Mary
Cutting Charlotte A
Cosgrove Mrs
Clough Miss Christina A
Cunningham Widow, 15th st
Cunroff Mrs M, Pearl st

D

Daley Ann, Chestnut st
Dane Miss Louisa
Danahy Hannah
Davis Mrs Sarah J
Demoy Mary
Desmond Mrs Hanora
Devoe Mrs, Suffolk or Norfolk st
Dewey Mrs F
Dilley Mr and Mrs Levi
Dixon Miss Esther
Dooly Bridget
Doody Miss Ellen
Donahoe Margaret
Dowaing Mrs Warren
Dow Mrs Mary A
Doyle Miss Ann M
Duggan Miss Julia
Denis
Dunne Mrs, Washington st
Dunne Miss Mary C
Dunbar Miss Hannah
Daley Mrs Ann, Monroe st
Dashield Miss Esther
Deehan Margaret
Desmond Mrs, Canal st
Detritch Mrs Sarah S
Devereaux Mrs Mary
Devany Bridget
Drewey Miss Margaret
Dinneford Mrs Robert
Doherty Margaret
Doody Mrs
Dron Miss Isidor
Donovan Mrs Jerry
Downey Mrs, Mott st
Dougherty Mrs R
Doyle Eliza
Dunlay Miss Cathe
Dunne Miss Ann
Dunne Miss Margt
Duncan Mrs Harriet
Dunton Mrs Anna

E

Egan Miss Mary Ann
Emery Miss Sarah
Evans Maria
Edmonds Miss Jane
Elliott Mrs, 9th st
Ewing Mary E

F

Flagg Mrs Eliza
Fallons Mary
Fahy Mary
Ferral Miss Eliza
Farrow Mrs
Ferris Miss Sarah
Fleming Bridgt
Fleming Mrs Rose
Fields Miss Rachela
Finegan Mary
Finegbun Margt
Fox Mrs, Mott st
Flynn Bridget
Flood Mrs, mother of Bernard and Wm
Ford Miss Mary
Foster Miss Eliza F
Flynn Mrs, 28th st
Fallon Ann
Fahy Anne
Farrell Cathe
Farrand Miss M G
Fenn Miss Elizabeth M
Fitzpatrick Eliza
Frith Mrs, Thompson st
Finn Mrs Margt
Finnegan Nancy or James
Fitzgerald Bridget
Fitzsimmons Margt
Flood Margt
Flynn Miss Mary
Forman Mrs Sarah Ann
Farrell Miss M
Fleming Mary

G

Gale Mrs Martha
Graham Anne
Gardiser Mrs Mary A
Gaynot Miss Matilda
Gready Miss Anne
Gregory Mrs Chas A
Gregory Mrs Eliza C
Griffin Miss Ellen
Gilman Mrs Sarah A
Gillespie Mrs Eliza
Gore Mrs Elizabeth
Grondon Miss Hellen
Goodridge Mrs Sophia
Guilfoyle Miss, Catharine st
Grace Bridget
Graham Mrs Eliza
Garrison Mrs Amelia
Greer Mrs Mary A
Gregory Mrs Delia
Geraghty Winnefred
Grills Miss Mary
Gibney Anne
Gilluly Miss Mary Ann
Given Mrs Emily
Grogan Margaret
Goldsmith Mrs Mary
Goulding Mrs Harriet B
Glynn Catharine

H

Hackett Joseph or Ann
Harris Mrs, Pearl st
Harris Miss Lucy A
Hardiman Miss Ann
Hanson Miss Fanny E
Hanly Betty
Hanxhurst Amy
Hedley Mrs A R
Hendon Miss Hannah B
Herbert Margaret
Hesten Mary
Hicks Mrs Wm H
Hill Mrs Letitia
Hilt Miss Catha M
Hoffman Miss Eliza
Hogan Miss Mary
Holden Miss Susan
Hopkins Mrs M, Mercer st
Houghton Mrs H B
Hoyt Miss Mary
Heyben Mrs, 11th st
Hunt Miss M S
Hurley Margaret
Hale Miss Ann Maria
Harris Mrs R, Mercer st
Hardcastle Miss Elizabeth
Hamilton Miss Marinda
Hanson Fabina
Havemyer Miss Catharine
Heberton Miss Letitia B
Henry Sarah
Hendrick Miss Fanny
Hopkins Mrs Jane
Hogan Miss Bridget
Holmes Mrs Hannah
Homidenu Mrs Elisabeth L
Hosmer Mrs Lucy
Hoyt Miss Elizabeth
Hoyt Mrs Lucinda
Humes Miss Rebecca
Huntington Mrs, White st
Hurnane Catharine

I

Ingersoll Miss Louisa
Irestrum Mrs Rebecca

J

Jackson Mrs C
Jeffery Miss Elizabeth
Jackson Mrs Thomas
Jennings Miss Catharine
Jordan Catharine
Jones Mrs Sarah
Johnston Mrs Margaret
Jones Mrs Margaret
Johnston Mrs R W
Jenkins Miss Emma M
Jones Mrs Jane A
Josephine Miss, Franklin st
Jenkins Mrs Elizabeth
Jervis Miss Rebecca
Jerolt Miss C
Jones Mrs Jane

K

Kane Miss Catharine
Kearney Mrs
Kelly Miss Ann
Kelly Miss Eliza
Kelly Margaret
Kenny Miss, James st
Kenny Bridget
Kerney Mrs Margaret
Keough Ann
Kilroy Mary
King Mrs Maria
Kirk Miss Mary
Knapp Miss S Maria
Kavanagh Miss Maria C
Keehan Bridget
Kelly Miss Catharine
Kelly Miss Julianna C
Kent Miss Mary E
Kenny Miss Catharine
Kerney Miss Almira
Kilron Rebecca
King Mary
Kirk Mrs Mary
Kyle Mrs John

L

Lacken Ellen
Larner Miss, Clark st
Leahy Catharine
Lenon Mrs Emelie A
Leonard Mrs, 8th avenue
Leonard Miss Sarah J
Leva Mrs Luna
Lewis Mrs Clarissa
Lewis Mrs Mary
Lily Mrs Mary
Longery Mary
Lenard Margaret
Ledge Miss Catharine
Lombard Mrs, James street
Ludlam Miss
Lynch Mrs Anna
Lyons Catharine
Langhern Mrs
Laurance Sarah
Leeson Mrs Susan
Lennon Miss Harriet
Leonard Eleanor
Lewis Mrs Abbey
Lewis Mrs Lovina
Lewis Mrs Phebe
Linehan Mary
Logan Miss Ellen
Lowen Miss Louisa
Loughlan Mrs, Mott street
Lunny Catharine
Lynch Miss Julia
Lyons Miss Lydia S
Lyndesey Mrs

M

Mackie Mrs
Maguire Helen
Mahady Eleanora
Male Miss G A
Malone Eliza
Manly Mrs Julia
Manning Miss Ellen
Martin Mrs Harriet B
Martin Miss Mary Ann
Marshall Mrs Caroline M
Marean Madam Greenwich street
Mawhinney Mrs, Howard street
Meredith Miss Ann
Meyrat Madlle Elise
Miller Mrs Hannah H
Miner Miss Mary
Monaghan Miss Catharine
Moore Mrs Sarah E F
Morgan Ellen
Morris Mrs Julia Ann
Mooney Mary
Mott Mrs Elizabeth M
Moylan Miss Mary
Mulhall Mary
Murry Onny
Murphy Miss Ann Maria
Murphy Ellen, 8th street
Mooney Miss Ellen
Magone Miss Rose
Mahoney Johanna or Mary
Mallon Catharine
Malory Miss Mary D
Mannion Bridget
Mansfield Miss, Chambers street
Martin Miss Winnofred
McAlvara Alis
McCabe Miss, Henry st
McCarten Mrs Ann
McCarthy Mary
McClenahan Mrs
McCormack Bridget
McDaniel Mary
McDonnell Mrs, 21st st
McDevitt Mrs Margaret
McGerrill Miss Bridget
McIntyre Elizabeth
McGuiness Mrs Cathe
McMann Bridget
McManus Elizabeth
McRory Miss Mary
McQuade Isabella, 16th st
Mcauliffe Julia
McCann Sarah
McCarthy Ellen
McClean Elizabeth
McCormack Miss Ann
McCutcheon Mrs Wm, Pearl st
McGuire Mrs Julia
McGuire Mrs Sophia
McNamara Mrs Jane
McNamara Miss Rebecca
McQuade Isabella, Suffolk st
McQuade Rosey

N

Naylor Miss Susan
Nelson Miss Mary A
Neylan Bridget
Nourse Mrs
Nell Rose
Night Miss
Newman Lydia
Newlen Bridget
Neally Ellen

O

Ogden Miss G G
O'Connors Jane
O'Dowd Miss Mary
O'Neill Miss, Mott st
O'Dowd Bridget
O'Donnell Mrs Eleanora
O'Donnell Margaret Ann
Oserton Miss Jerusha H

P

Peck Mrs Susan
Peabody Miss C E
Phillips Miss M, Clinton street
Pratt Mrs Geo
Patterson Miss Catharine
Parish Mrs Mary E
Peat Catharine
Perry Mrs Chas
Perkins Coroess Ann
Post Matilda
Porter Mrs Catharine
Powers Miss Anna
Powers Eliza
Phillips Mrs Clarinda
Phillips Mrs Rachel

Q

Quintana Mrs Ellen
Quinlinans Miss, Canal st
Quinlan Miss Johanna
Quayle Anne

R

Ramsey Miss Sarah
Rafter Mrs L I
Reilly Rose
Reilly Mary
Redmond Mary Ann
Reynolds Ann
Rice Mrs Mary C
Rich Mrs German
Riordon Miss Ellen
Roach Mrs Johanna
Robinson Miss E, Laurens st
Robinson Miss Julia
Robinson Margt
Roe Miss Rachel
Ross Alic*
Rodgers Miss Bridget
Runey Miss Mary
Russell Mrs Ellen
Ryan Ally
Ransom Miss Harriet A
Rebola Miss T
Reilly Mary, Jay st
Reilly Miss Mary Ann
Reinhardt Gertrude
Reynolds Miss Caroline
Rich Miss E
Richardson Miss Eliscor
Rierden Mary Catharine or Julia
Robinson Miss M A, Orchard st
Roe Jane
Rogers Mrs
Rogers Miss Emma Jane
Ross Miss Cathe
Rush Cathe
Ryan Miss, St Catharine's Convent
Ryan Mrs Daniel

S

Stafford Miss Marcia A
Shames Miss Cordelia M
Stanley Mrs F
Stanley Mrs Catherine
Sandford Mrs Philena
Sarles Mrs Delia J
Stratton Mrs Ann B
Swallie Mrs Margaret
Seaman Mrs Anna
Shee Mrs, Washington st
Slevin Miss
Spencer Mrs
Smith Miss P, Maiden lane
Shelton Miss Virginia
Smith Miss Ellen E
Smith Elizabeth, 2d avenue
Smith Mrs Mary C
Smith Miss Sarah
Smyth Bridget
Singleton Mrs
Stone Mrs Trypha
Stoughten Miss F
Sullivan Miss Mary
Smart Mrs Susan F
Sampson Miss Jane
Stanley Anne
Skanlin Ann
Sharpless Mrs Harriet
Shaw Miss Frances E
Stead Mrs
Scanlan Mrs Isabella
Seften Mrs Catharine M
Selby Mrs Isabella
Shearman Anne
Sergeant Miss L H
Stevens Mrs S L K
Sexton Debora
Smith Miss Anna
Smith Amelia D
Smith Miss Elizabeth, Greenwich st
Smith Mrs Mary Ann
Smith Mrs Sarah
Simons Mrs H
Sones Louisa
Snyder Mrs Delight
Sherman Miss Harriet
Stewart Miss Jane
Shriver Mrs Falacia
Sullivan Ellen

T

Tracy Miss Hanora
Travers Julia
Tree Miss Annie
Treschle Mrs Wm
Tilly Miss
Tompkins Miss W B
Thompson Bridget
Turner Mrs Hannah
Treacy Mrs Mary
Taylor Mrs Robert
Terry Mrs Susan
Tims Mrs H, Houston st
Toley Mrs, Canal st
Thompson Miss Elizabeth
Tuohy Mary
Thrston Miss Ann C
Tierney Mary
Truesdell Mrs Chole

V

Voris Miss Meril F
Van Nouten Mrs Mary
Voorhees Mrs A
Van Norden Mrs A
Van Wagener Miss Christiana

W

Ward Miss Caroline
Walsh Mrs Margaret Ann
Walker Miss Anna M
Waters Catherine
Waterson Mrs Sarah J
Whipple Margaret J
Wharton Miss Mary M
Whelton Miss Mary
Watkins Miss Mary B
Willis Mrs
Young Mrs Wm
Wilson Mrs C
Williams Sarah
Williams Mrs G G
Walden Mr and Mrs Frederick
Watson Mrs W G
Whittaker Mrs G W
Wheeler Miss Sarah C
Ward Bridget
Westlake Nancy G
Whelpley Miss Charlotte H
West Mrs Sarah
Wilber Miss Harriet
Williamson Miss Eliza
Wilson Miss Ann
Wood Mrs Helen
Walters Miss Ann Eliza
Armstrong Dr Wm
Armstrong Lambert
Ash Parry
Ayres John J

GENTLEMEN'S LIST.

A

Adams J K
Abbot Benjamin J
Adams J P
Adler G T
Adam Jeham
Ahern Timothy
Almy Wm T
Alexander Wm
Allen Wm or A T
Allen Roswell
Amende Frederick
Andrews Mr
Andrews Charles W
Anderson Doct F H
Andrews Thomas G
Anderson James
Arnold Alfred
Armstrong Wm
Austin & Drake
Athony Philip B
Abbot John C
Adbert J
Adhair John
Ackley Capt Henry B
Allen William H
Alhal Enrico
Alexandria Jas
Alber Samuel
Alberton Milton B
Ahlmark C J
Airey John Moore
Ambla Dr Benj P
Anderson Robert
Anderson James A
Ansley Samuel
Awning John
Arthurs John
Atwater T C
Anderson Alexander
Addoms Chas
Acker Thomas
Abbott Martin
Adams Jas D
Adams Robert
Allen Russell W
Aimes Ernest F
Atwill S
Allen Henry
Aikman P
Alyer A C
Allen S D
Andrews A O
Andrews Reuben
Andrews Joel E
Ashley John
Armstrong Dr Wm
Armstrong Lambert
Ayres John J

B

Bacon Thomas H
Blackler Ward H
Babcock Chas B-2
Blackman C Jervis
Blake Wm R
Bailie Daniel
Baker George
Baker Dobell
Batty John
Blamphy Joseph
Braman Tobias S
Blanchee Andrew
Barker Joseph
Barber Charles P
Bassett L S
Barnes W L
Bartlett Julius A
Barr N V
Barlow William
Bassett George B
Bauman Moses
Berster Charles
Bearse Samuel H
Bukman W
Bleecker James E
Brennan Joseph
Benton J E
Bender Jacob
Beckwith Henry W
Bennett E
Brennan Thomas
Brewster John R
Breton Henry
Brewster John R 2d
Brewster Edward
Berney John
Briggs George Wm
Billin Samuel
Briggs John
Bissell Champion
Bishop Solomon
Bizzick George—2
Blodgett & Davis
Broint Mr
Brooks Thomas S
Brooks The Spencer
Beudroupe James
Brown Samuel
Brown Sylvester F
Brown & Loring
Brown Herace
Brown O H Ferry
Brown Jeremiah
Bourke James
Boyle Edward R
Boyle James
Boyle James
Bowler Thomas
Boyle Edward
Bothrack Samuel
Buckley John
Buckley Edw M
Buchanan Simpson
Bruff John
Bull Thomas F
Burel Mr
Burton J R
Byam J D
Burr S J
Butler Cyrus S
Burns Patrick
Black Mr
Blades John
Babbit Lewis
Brackett Harris L
Bailie George
Ballard Charles
Baird John Alonzo
Bailey Elias G
Baker Wm P
Banet Mr
Branwood John
Bramwell Wm
Banfield James
Barber Wm C
Barlow J Holmes
Barnes Myron S
Bartlette Dr Alonzo D
Barnes Henry W
Barker John
Baustle Mr
Bassford Jesse P
Beares Marcus
Bready Bibby
Bleecher John
Bellard Joseph
Benoit Pierre
Brannin Thomas
Bennett James
Bennett E B
Bennett Peter
Bertolini Antoni
Bertolet Michael
Brewster G R
Brewster Joseph
Besson J A B
Berlin C H
Brigg & Brother
Briggs A R
Brieg Robert
Brinien James
Birdsall James
Block A
Blodgett, Clark & Brown
Bromley Avery
Brooks Leonard
Blood George A
Brown Monseur
Brown William
Brown J B
Brown Amos
Browne Henry E
Broman Timothy
Bostwick James
Boyce Wm H
Bray Fred
Boynton Capt Wm
Boyles A F
Bullman John
Blunt Nathan
Brumley Ry Henry
Burgess James
Buckley John
Burrell Robert
Burleigh Capt
Byrne Timothy
Byrne William
Brubhaiham John
Burr, Brothers & Co
Black Mr
Blades John
Babbit Edwin D
Bradey Patrick
Blackall W
Bradbury Thos
Baldwin David
Blake Alexander
Baldwin James
Baldwin T F
Blake John
Brandamore Napoleon
Blank Leonhard
Barrett Thomas
Barrow Edward
Bamhon George
Bartlett Herman N
Barbier Monsieur
Barinell Stephen
Barnett William
Bassett D Jr
Bates Samuel Jr
Beck Peter
Beakley Doct Geo
Beenke Daniel
Bellemont P
Brenner James P
Brenen Patrick
Bennet Morris J
Benton J H
Benjamin E M
Berthoff John
Bethencourt Ed'd
Brewster M
Blethen W D
Berg Julius
Berry Thomas
Bigger Peter
Bliss William
Bixby John M
Bissel Wm D
Bristoll Henry
Blogan John
Boil Samuel
Borden H
Bordick James
Brooks Leonard
Borden Simeon
Brown Nathan
Brown W
Brown Dr M W
Brown