

66
ville, Butler County." This letter officer Murphy mailed. Mr. Reed, in some remarks, in reference to this letter, intimated a purpose to connect it with one which had previously been produced, and identified by Lackey as in the hand writing of Pratt. The letter is not yet in evidence, and it is not proper here to state its singular substance.

Coming Home by Telegraph.

Mr. Wm. Downing, the clerk and superintendent in the office of House's telegraph, in this city, being called and sworn, a paper was shown him, which he stated to be one of the slips from the N. York terminus of that line, and which he knew to be in the hand-writing of one of the clerks in that office. The original of the communication, therefore, ought to be in the office here, and at the request of Mr. Reed, he produced it. Mr. Reed then read the original of the communication, and also the copy, and gave them to the jury in evidence, stating the original to be in the hand-writing of Edward McGowan. The communication was in the following words:—

"PHILADELPHIA, June 8, 10 o'clock.

To Miss Mary Still, Merchants' Hotel, 41 Cortland street, New York.

DEAR MARY—Did you get my letter, and the money? And will you be home to-night. Send an answer in these words—"I got it, and will be home to-night," by telegraph.

Answer immediately by boy."

Lackey stops at King's Hotel.

The next witness called was William King, the keeper of a public house in Third street below Willow, who stated that Lackey came to his house with horses on the 17th March last, and remained there until the 25th, when he returned home, leaving his horses, a wagon, and a set of harness. He came there with Benjamin Pratt, a few days prior to the 17th, for the purpose of making arrangements for the keeping of his horses, his own board, &c. He was introduced by Pratt, and when he returned home left his horses in charge of Mr. Blosson for sale. Mr. Pence was also there several times, but the witness did not know whether he came with Pratt or not. He had no acquaintance with him, and could not have recognized him had he not been pointed out to him. After Lackey left, the horses were sold to Pratt, and a certain amount of money paid for them in Mr. King's house, Pratt telling Mr. Blosson that if he would go with him to the Penn tavern he would there "plank down the times."

An Admission.

The prosecution offering to call Mr. Joshua Raybold, to prove that Mr. McGowan was an officer of the Moyamensing police, the defence admitted the fact. Mr. Reed said he wished to show that he was not only an officer, but the superintendent of the Moyamensing police, and that he had been, until recently, connected with the detective police of the city. These facts were also finally admitted by the defence.

THE CHESTER COUNTY BANK ROBBERY OF DECEMBER, 1847.

Trial of Pratt, Pence, and McGowan, for Conspiracy to pass the Stolen Money.

STILL FURTHER DEVELOPMENTS.

THE THIRD DAY.

The Progress of the Trial.

The trial was again resumed on Saturday, the usual business of the last day of the term being postponed, with a renewal of recognizances, &c., for that purpose, and the interest felt in the case seemed to increase rather than to diminish, much curiosity being felt to hear the character of the defence. There was an evident and very gratifying improvement, however, in the police regulations of the Court, and notwithstanding the immense crowd, there was a good degree of order preserved. Upon the opening of the Court, Mr. Deputy Attorney General Reed, [who, we have heretofore omitted to state, is assisted by James Hanna, Esq., in the conduct of the case,] laid before the jury a number of papers in evidence, and after calling two or three additional witnesses, closed by producing the mysterious letter alleged to have been written by Pratt, just before his arrest, to officer James Young, of the city police, and giving it to the jury in evidence, reserving the other papers in his possession to be produced if called for by the defence, or if circumstances shall require their introduction. The defence for Pratt and Pence was then opened by Col. Fairlamb, who in an address of about an hour stated what he expected to prove, it having been arranged between the counsel for the defendants that the defence of these two should be made, as far as relates to the evidence, before the defence for McGowan should be opened. Messrs. Barton and Fairlamb accordingly proceeded to adduce their evidence as to the good character of Pence, the manner of his obtaining the money, &c., which occupied until about two o'clock, when they were prevented from going on by the absence of their witnesses, and quite a "scene" occurred in consequence, the Court being determined that the case should be progressed with until three o'clock. Finally an adjournment was had, a few minutes before three, at the request of the Attorney General, and the case continued until to-day, when it will be resumed in the lower District Court-room, as Judge Parsons will occupy the Criminal Court-room in holding the October term. The Court intimated that the session to-day would be a long one, and probably it will run far into the evening. A portion of the evidence in relation to Pence, all the evidence in relation to Pratt, and also McGowan, is yet to be produced, and the argument of counsel to be heard, so that whatever may be the disposition of the Court, it is probable that the case will not be concluded before to-morrow. It will be observed that the commonwealth chiefly relies upon the testimony of Lackey, which though in a great measure unsupported by direct testimony, is strongly fortified by circumstances, and the defence will make a lead-

ing point of the fact that he was an accomplice, now seeking shelter, and that to McGowan he was utterly unknown, while his previous character was tainted with the worst of suspicions.

Pence and the Chester County Bank.

In continuing the evidence for the prosecution, Mr. Reed called Mr. Wm. W. Jeffries, the first teller of the Chester County Bank, who testified that Pence had never, during the year 1843, or at any previous time, made a deposit at that Bank. One of the \$1,000 notes which had been identified by Dr. Daxington, was then shown him and identified, having the endorsement upon the back, in his hand-writing "Pay to Drexel & Co., W. W. Jeffries." This note, with others of the same denomination, was sent to Mr. Drexel, in a letter, a few days prior to the 23d of December last. Mr. Reed also here put in as evidence, the notes found upon Pence and Lackey, at the time of their arrest in Bedford, on the 19th of May last, [and which were taken from them and marked by Squire Mason with his own private mark,] and also the two notes passed by Pence at the store of Messrs. Caleb Cope & Co., in paying the debt of Messrs. Lynn & Claypool.

McGowan's Visits to Islington Lane.

The next witness called was Alderman John S. Nicholas, a magistrate of the county, and whose office is at the toll-gate, on the Ridge Road, near Turner's lane, which he also keeps. He stated that he knew McGowan and also Pratt, as well as where the latter resides in Islington lane, about a quarter of a mile from the toll-gate. During the last summer and spring he had seen McGowan pass where he lived ten or a dozen times, sometimes going up in the afternoon and coming down in the morning, and generally walking; but he did not remember ever having seen him going out after dark—there were other modes, however, of approaching Pratt's residence than by his [Nicholas'] house. He knew nothing as to where McGowan was going, except by what he [McG.] had told him, and he thought he had spoken to him at least three times, saying he was going to Pratt's to buy a horse; he had his suspicions, however, that that was not his real errand, and that it was not exactly a "horse" that he was going to look at. Sometimes, in going out, McGowan would stop at the toll-gate and converse with him for half an hour, and he believes he [Nicholas] at one time hinted to him his suspicions as to the object of his visits. He had made an examination of Pratt's house, with Squire Jones, and he constable of the township, and had found several papers, which were handed to Squire Jones. [Several others, telegraphic dispatches and memoranda were here shown to the witness, some of which he identified as having been found in the house, but in reference to others he was not so certain, as he did not examine them carefully at the time, but he believed them, to the best of his recollection, to be the same.]

The Mysterious Letter, and How it came to be Opened by Mayor Swift.

The prosecution then called Mayor Swift, to testify in relation to "that letter," Mr. J. W. Gibbs, the messenger of the Mayor's office, having previously testified that it was brought to the office by the letter-carrier, and laid upon the clerk's desk, where letters for the officers were generally put. Mayor Swift being sworn, the letter was handed to him, when he stated that he received it from Mr. Gibbs; he thinks on Friday two weeks, [the 15th] and it being addressed to one of his officers, he opened it. The circumstances under which he received and opened it, were these:—He was called on by Mr. Deputy Attorney General Reed, and having learned from him that such a letter was in the possession of Mr. Gibbs, he sent for him and a key him concerning it. Mr. Gibbs stated that he had such a letter, and immediately handed it to him. It was directed to Mr. James Young who was then absent from the city, and he opened and read it in the presence of Mr. Reed, and afterwards handed it to him, and he presumed it had been in his [Mr. R.'s] possession since. Mr. Young had since returned, and was now in the city.

Admissions by the Defence.

The defence, here, to obviate the necessity of its being proven, admitted that McGowan was in Baltimore at the time of the last Baltimore Convention, which assembled on the 22d of May last, and further that the lady before alluded to, [Miss Still,] went to and returned from Baltimore with him, remaining there while he remained.

Pratt sells a Wagon to Pence &c.

The memorandum which Lackey had identified as being in the hand-writing of Pratt, and which Ald. Nicholas had recognized as one of the papers found in Pratt's house, was produced by Mr. Reed, and given in evidence, as a record in part, of the transactions between Pratt and Pence, at the time Pence and Lackey were despatched to pass the money. It was the half of a letter, [the other half being torn off,] and on the back of it was the direction of a letter to "Benj. Pratt." The memorandum was in these words:— "May 12th, 1843, sold A. Pence one Rockaway wagon, for \$50, do one bay horse, no price set. May 7th, 1843, sold John Colflesh one brown horse, for \$80, received at same time \$10, and on the 10th received of Mordcaei Moore one brown mare on above for \$27.50. June 7th, 1843, received of John Colflesh, on brown horse, \$10."

The Introduction of the Letter.

The letter which Lackey had identified as being in Pratt's hand-writing, and in reference to the receipt and opening of which Mayor Swift had been examined, was then again produced by Mr. Deputy Attorney General Reed, for the purpose of giving it to the jury in evidence, when Mr. Barton objected, contending that the letter bore another than Pratt's signature, and that there was no evidence that it was in his hand-writing, which ought to be satisfactorily established before the letter could be received. Mr. Reed said the hand-writing had been sufficiently proven to justify the introduction of the letter as evidence in the case, and it had been, moreover, shown by the testimony of Col. Murphy, by whom Pratt was arrested about the 20th, that upon his arrest he addressed a letter to his wife at Slippery Rock, where he had left her a few days previous; and the letter which he now proposed to introduce relating, by the fairest construction of language, to the very matter of this conspiracy, though written to a police officer high in confidence, was mailed at the same post office. It would remain for the jury to compare the writing with that which they had already before them, and to judge as to the sufficiency of the evidence. [The letter was addressed and post-marked as follows:—

Slippery Rock. Paid 10.
Sept. 10.
Mr. JAMES YOUNG, Police-officer,
Philadelphia,
Filbert street above 12th, Pa.
No. 1174.

Objections were also raised to the introduction of the letter, by Horatio Mubbell, Esq., who appeared as the representative of Mr. Young, and protested against his being dragged into the matter. Finally he handed to the Court a written argument giving sundry reasons why the letter should not be admitted, which were in brief, that Mr. Young was not in Court for any crime, and had been charged with none, and not being on trial had no opportunity of defence against any charge or misrepresentation that might be preferred against him. Judge Kelley, after reading the paper and also the letter, said he could see nothing in the reasons which could affect his judgment, and if the letter was rejected it would be on other grounds. Mr. Reed then proceeded to adduce authorities to justify the introduction of the letter and to show that the hand-writing had been sufficiently proven. The fact that it did not bear Pratt's signature was no reason, under the circumstances, which should throw doubt over its genuineness, but rather an evidence that it was his. He ventured to say that if all the letters which Pratt had written in relation to this affair could be procured, few of them indeed, would be found to bear his own name. Lackey had sworn that the letter was in Pratt's hand-writing to the best of his belief, in fact he fully believed it was Pratt's, and this was all the law required, before allowing a paper to go to a jury. The Court after some further remarks from Mr. Barton, decided to admit the letter, believing it had been sufficiently proven to be in Pratt's hand-writing, and remarking at the same time, that they had had occasion, on the trial of Notherman, to examine the law in the case very fully. John M. Read, Esq., here desired to say a single word on the part of Mr. Young, and remarked that it was often necessary for police officers to hold correspondence with rogues, and even if this letter were Pratt's, he might have introduced matters in it of which Mr. Young knew nothing.—Mr. Dep. Att. Gen. Reed, readily admitted the first mentioned fact, and added that the mere fact of such correspondence being had was no cause of censure, for it might be carried on with a view to the promotion of public justice; but participation in a transaction was another thing.

The Letter—Verbatim, etc.

The letter was then read, and proved to be, aside from its purport, neither a very tasteful or highly finished literary production, somewhat defective orthographically, and rather "rough" in its language; we, however, publish it *verbatim, et literatim, et punctuatim*. Its reading was listened to with much curiosity, for it had been made the subject of much converse out of doors; and notwithstanding the crowded state of the room, a pin-fall might have been heard, as word by word its choice expressions fell from the lips of the prosecuting officer. It was as follows:

Mr. Young—Wensday, September 6th, 1843.

Dear Sir—You will please excuse me for taking the liberty of writing to you and saying I received some news from the east that very much astonish me. any other country but hell is too good for a man like him. you will confer a great favor by letting me know particulars what the result may be and whether my wife can come home or not as she knows noby [nobody,] but I. I think there is men enough in his own town will swear they would not believe him on oath. I will have your money the fore part of next month and money enough to pay all debts dues and demands if all go right as I am ride side up with care. now tell Mr. Mc. not to fear the dam villian as one whimper never escaped my lips or no name age or size did I ever mouth. he has agreed to swear any dam lie for the god dam foul party as they have feed him up that they could play the devil and get his pay. you will please excuse my rugh language as my feeling are much rougher toward the dam villian. please let me know particulars by return mail as if there is know show soon I must get the family away or the wife home.

Yours respectfully

A. C. FRIEND,

please direct to quinton J. Steel,
Franklin,
[Hereafter let us hear no more of Venango county,
of phonetics and all that rep.]

The Date of Pratt's Arrest.

Col. J. K. Murphy was then re-called for the purpose of fixing the date of Pratt's arrest, and stated that he made the arrest in Mercer, on the 20th of September. In reply to an inquiry by Mr. Barton as to Pratt's behavior in coming on, and whether he put irons upon him, he replied that he did not, he had never put irons upon but one person in all the arrests he had ever made. He had nothing to say against Pratt's conduct. He made no resistance, and if he had it would have been useless, as he had another officer with him, [officer Hague, of Pittsburgh.] He chose to take every necessary precaution to avoid difficulty. Here the commonwealth closed.

Col. Fairlamb's Opening for the Defence.

The defence [for Pratt and Pence,] was then opened by Col. J. P. Fairlamb, who in setting out explained some circumstances which Lackey had referred to in his testimony in reference to himself, he having when first arrested, employed Col. F. as his counsel, and subsequently Mr. Barton with him; and said all the statements which he had then made to him were in that confidence which usually marks the intercourse of counsel and client, and however much Lackey might have added to them, he could not allow himself to take the stand to refute them—that however would be done sufficiently by others. He then proceeded to state what the nature of the defence would be, and in an exceedingly able effort laid before the jury, in a manner as concise as possible, what they expected to prove. It would be shown in what manner Pence received at least a portion of the money found upon him, and that it had been received by him in payment for horses, without suspicion, and further that the whole amount fell short of what he had received before leaving the city, as he had sold about 30 horses, which averaged him about \$100 each. The testimony of Lackey, which as far as he [Pence,] was concerned, was wholly unsupported, they should show to be unworthy the belief of the jury, if not, in-