

Clearfield Republican.

D. W. MOORE,
G. B. GOODLANDER, Editors.

PRINCIPLES, not MEN.

TERMS—\$1 25 per Annum, if paid in advance

VOL. XXXII.—WHOLE NO 1636

CLEARFIELD, PA. WEDNESDAY, DEC. 25, 1861.

NEW SERIES—VOL. II.—NO 23.

Select Poetry.

TO MY COAT.

FROM THE FRENCH OF BERANGER.
Though hardly worth one paltry coat,
Thou art dear to me, my poor old coat;
For full ten years my friend thou'rt been,
For full ten years I've brushed thee clean;
And now, like me, thou'rt old and wan,
With both the glow of youth is gone;
But worn and shabby as thou art,
Thou and the poet shall not part.

One evening, I remember yet,
I, romping, feigned to fly Lisette;
She strove her lover to retain,
And thy frail skirt was rent in twain.
Dear girl, she did her best endeavor,
And paced thee up as well as ever;
For her sweet sake, old as thou art,
Thou and the poet shall not part.

Never, my coat, hast thou been found
Bending thy shoulders to the ground
From any upstart "Lord" or "Grace,"
To beg a pension or a place.
Wild forest flowers—no monarch's dole—
Adorn thy modest button-hole;
If but for that old as thou art,
Thou and the poet shall not part.

Poor though we be, my good old friend,
No gold shall bribe our backs to bend;
Honest amid temptations past,
We will be honest to the last;
Far more I prize thy virtuous rage
Than all the lace a courtier brings;
And, while I live and have a heart,
Thou and the poet shall not part.

Roads to Ruin.

It is the easiest thing in the world to find one of these roads, for they run in all directions over the special plain. They present, as the advertisements have it, "a wide field for choice." They comprise highways and bye-ways, round-about roads and cuts across lots, smooth paths and rough paths, ascents and descents; and as they intersect each other at points innumerable, travelers to the common terminus can turn out of the road they have started on into a new one, at their pleasure. The outfit for the journey, be it long or short, is not of much consequence, since destitution and despair await all who persist in pursuing it. Some set out with pockets full of gold; others with their pockets empty, hoping to fill them by the way. To some the Fiend Speculation plays the Cicerone, marshaling them to seeming Dorados in the distance, that melt into moonshine as they travel on. The Will-o'-the-wisp, gambling with his pasteboard signals, beguiles others to the brink of precipices, whence they tumble headlong into irreparable shame. The Goblin Run, leads a caravan of self-destructive sinners whose name is legion.

All "easily forgetting sins" pull one way, and betray their victims into one or other of the many roads to ruin. The only trust worthy safe-guard against their enticements is resistance at the outset.—When morbid appetite or inclination pulls ruin-ward, braze the moral system against it; put manhood against temptation; ask help from Heaven. Christian obstinacy is more than a match for Satan and all his agents. Misfortune is not ruin. In that terrible word, in its true interpretation, is involved loss of character, of self-respect, of moral courage, of all that renders life valuable. Beware of the first step leading to such a consummation!

A TOUCH ONE.—A correspondent of one of our cotemporaries, writing from Webster, Western Virginia, tells the following rather tough yarn:

"While out scouting," he says, "a captain and sixty-four men were surrounded by three thousand secessionists, so he stretched his men out in a long line, and as soon as they fired they would jump behind a tree; at the same time the captain was bellying out at the top of his voice for Col. so and so to bring up that battalion, tell Captain so and so to bring those cannon here, and kept bellying at such a fierce rate that the secessionists got frightened, and a general stampede took place. In their flight they threw away blankets, knapsacks, revolvers and swords. The captain hadn't a man hurt, but killed seventy of them, found over one thousand blankets, about two hundred and fifty knapsacks, swords and revolvers.

AN INVESTIGATION DEMANDED.—It is said that General Patterson has, at length demanded a court of inquiry, and we are informed that the necessary papers were sent to Washington more than a month since. It is said that no response has as yet been received. Recently the matter has again been agitated by the General, but, as before, without any definite results. As a reason for this delay, a Washington correspondent states that an investigation might affect the character of Gen. Scott. The friends of General Patterson, on the other hand, allege that the demand for a court was preferred before Gen. Scott left the country, and declared that an official report of the campaign must be obtained.—Philadelphia Press.

How quickly Democrats rally to the support of the President when he places himself upon the platform of the Constitution, is shown in the general acclamation of the Democratic press, sustaining him in his controversy with Fremont.

See a man who likes to hear a woman scold has just hired a saw-filer to play him a sleep.

THE WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS.

SPEECH OF MR. PENDLETON.

The following is a full report of the speech of Mr. Pendleton, delivered in the House of Representatives on Tuesday the 10th inst., a brief abstract of which appeared in the telegraphic summary of the proceedings:

Mr. Pendleton, of Ohio, moved that the memorial of Messrs. Howard, Gatchell and Davis be referred back to the Committee on Judiciary, with instructions declaring that Congress alone has the power, under the Constitution, to suspend the writ of habeas corpus. Mr. Pendleton said: "Mr. Speaker: These memorialists are members of the Board of Police of the City of Baltimore. On the 1st day of July last, at the dead hour of the night, they were arrested and conveyed to Fort McHenry by a detachment of U. S. soldiers, under the command of Gen. Banks. They were in the performance of the duty assigned to them by the laws of their State. The peace of the city was then unbroken. The Federal courts were in full operation within her limits. Judges, Marshals and the District Attorney were in the exercise of their accustomed functions. The process of the courts, if I am rightly informed, had not been interfered with, except in one memorable instance, and then by the authority of the President of the United States himself. These gentlemen were arrested without a warrant. They have been detained without an indictment. They are deprived of their liberty without due process of law. They have not been confronted with their accusers. They are not informed of the nature of the accusation against them.—They have been denied the right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury. The President of the United States, in his message to this House, in response to a resolution of it, has declined to furnish the grounds for their arrest. On the very same day when he did so, while their petition for redress of a great grievance was pending before the house, the President had them conveyed out of the district and State in which they had been arrested, and where, if at all, they had committed the crime, first to Fort Lafayette and then to Fort Warren. They are arbitrarily held by military power. They have presented their memorial to Congress, asking that Congress may examine their case or that it may be remitted to a judicial tribunal, to be legally heard and determined, and my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee can find no more fitting response to a reasonable request like this than that this respectful petition shall lie unanswered on the table. The writ of habeas corpus was invented for the purpose of meeting the exigencies of just such a case as this. It commands that the body of a prisoner shall be produced, that the cause of his commitment may be inquired into, and that he may be discharged if he is illegally held, or remanded if he is held by competent authority on a charge of crime. These gentlemen would have been glad to avail themselves of this writ, which the President commanded his general to suspend and to hold them at his own sole will and pleasure.

The President, in his message at the extra session of Congress, gave us his reason for his action in the matter. He says: "I have authorized that it is writ of habeas corpus be suspended," and before he did so he talked considerably of his right and the propriety of his doing so. The privilege conferred by the habeas corpus is to institute and command an inquiry as to whether a person is held by competent authority under a charge of crime. If a person is so held he is remanded, and if he is not he is discharged. That provision of the habeas corpus act has never been invaded by the executive power till now.—Sir, the object of this suspension and the effect also of it is to prevent inquiries into the legitimacy of the imprisonment under military power. The object of this evasion of the great charter of liberty is to enable military officers or others who have like power to arrest and imprison men though they have committed no crime against the laws of the land, and to punish them, not as the law prescribes, but in whatever way those who have the power may ordain. If I rightly construe the message of the President, he claims authority to seize, to hold and detain all persons not engaged in the land and naval forces, not men engaged in enterprises against the Government, but all persons whom he may suspect, and to imprison them without regard to the provisions or process of law. This President further claims the authority of the Constitution, of which it is a complete violation, to arrest whoever in his judgment he may think proper. The President says his authority is derived by implication, and because, I suppose, he deems it inconvenient to have the right to suspend the writ of habeas corpus vested in Congress alone. Now, the only clause which refers to the subject is one which provides that the writ of habeas corpus shall never be suspended except in cases of rebellion or invasion, or under circumstances when the public safety demands it. This is undoubtedly the only implication that can be derived authorizing the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus. Who shall suspend it? That is the question. It is not vested in the executive exclusively, but in all the departments of Government. I grant that, under the arbitrary rule of Elizabeth of England, and during the early part of the reign of Charles the First, it was exercised by those monarchs, but Charles was compelled at the price of his throne to assent to the Bill of Rights, by which he bound himself never to imprison a man without due process of law. Charles did not stand by his interpretation of the ancient constitution, and after ten years of struggle with his people he lost his throne

and his life as the penalty of his infraction of it. His successor tried all means and every kind of scheme to retain this arbitrary power, which was at last swept away forever by the great charter. We are told by the eminent historian, Macaulay, that Charles II sought to repeal the habeas corpus act, for that he hated it as only tyrants can hate whatever stands between them and their own despotic wills. And this habeas corpus act was the most stringent curb ever imposed by a legislature on tyranny. When William and Mary came to the throne they declared that the crown did not possess the power of suspending the writ of habeas corpus, and from that hour to this, one hundred years before the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, England had no monarch during all her foreign wars and intestine troubles, wayward and wicked enough, though some of them were, who dared to suspend the writ of habeas corpus, or whoever claimed that they had power to imprison a citizen without due process of law. All history of which I have access confirms this view to the case—Hume and Macaulay claim this right as the principle in the great structure of the English constitution. But here, according to the novel theory of Government, the President may suspend the Constitution and the laws of the United States made under it. He may, as it is claimed, do all this, supersede them all, disregarding the limitation enjoined for the exercise of his prerogatives. He may abolish all the laws of the land, and substitute in their place his own will. He may abolish the whole system of government built up and bequeathed to us by our revolutionary fathers, and he may build up for himself a new and entirely different system. All this he may do, it is claimed, rightfully legitimately, and without interference. I hold this assumed position is untenable and indefensible; that there is no warrant for it in the Constitution, or in the principles which underlie the theory of our government, nor in the genius of the American people, nor in the spirit of liberty which is the boast of our institutions. Such a proposition will destroy the law. It will reduce this nation, if deliberately adopted to the theory of government to the condition of slavery, and I say that any nation that will willingly adopt it is lost to all sense of manly independence, is lost to the appreciation of its own dignity and national rights, and for them the yoke of the slave is the only fitting emblem.

We are told, in defence of this theory, that it would not exist only in cases of rebellion against the Government. We are also told that it was not intended that the Constitution of the United States should not be operative in times of civil war. Our fathers hoped that civil war might never befall us, but they knew human nature too well to expect that we should forever enjoy profound repose.—They had freed themselves from the yoke of oppression, they had successfully conquered enemies without and Tories within, and then they formed a constitutional government, recognizing in them that honesty and good sense which marks the patriot. It is to be supposed that they would adopt a constitutional government only in time of peace, and that that Constitution should be superseded whenever discord of war would present an opportunity to set it aside and substitute for it the will of military power? The Constitution gives to the several departments of the Government all the power ever intended to be used for any purpose. If the laws of the United States are too lenient, they may be made more stringent. If judges are imbecile, let them be impeached. Let the whole machinery of government be revised and improved, if you will; but whoever goes beyond that to support the government, would destroy the Constitution under the pretence of preserving them. The government has no right to break down the Constitution to uphold itself. It never was intended for a moment that the Constitution under any circumstances should be superseded. The President holds office under the Constitution, you sit there under it, the judges sit and pass judgment in virtue of the provisions of that instrument alone, and if you supersede it, neither you, nor the judges, nor the President himself, possesses any more power than the humblest man in the land. Supersede the Constitution! You might as well try to repeal all the laws for the guidance of society, and let the nation go adrift to ruin at once. The only way to preserve the government is to preserve the Constitution, to observe its limitation and to obey its prohibitions. When the Constitution fails, then indeed the Government falls. This is not the way to preserve Governments. Ambition makes its own opportunity, and under this system of superseding the Constitution in times of public calamity, the public mind will become degraded, the people on every fresh occasion for the exercise of this power will yield still a little more to these encroachments, till the public will will be destroyed, the public intellect warped, the national character tarnished, and the national life of liberty and independence overthrown. They will become the plaything of every tyrant, and each successive invasion of their rights and freedom is forever lost. It is in vain to say that this is an idle dream—the realization of the fact is before us. Six months ago, when the habeas corpus act was first suspended in the case of Merriman, who was held on a charge of treason, the public mind was intensely excited. Now what is the fact? Citizens are committed and imprisoned because in the public newspapers they dare criticize the acts of the Government. Newspapers have been suspended, and the whole power of the Government despotically exercised without a public murmur.

We are told that when this public danger shall have passed away the Constitution will be restored to its pristine vigor, and the people will be allowed to resume their accustomed liberty. When was this

ever so? When were the invaded and restricted rights of a people ever restored to their exact position except by the sword? When was liberty, once surrendered, ever restored except by blood? For the willful surrender of their rights no nation ever resumed them only through the agencies of a revolution, and you cannot make a nation sensible of its rights that in time of danger possesses no rights. You cannot increase and strengthen virtue, and courage, and patience, in a people by teaching them that in times of great public calamity and danger to the State, they must rely for their safety, not on their own virtue, and courage, and constancy, but on the power and good will of their rulers. No free nation ought ever to listen for a moment to the argument of State necessity. The history of those people who have been so deceived is written in the wreck of free institutions. It is marked with wrongs, with high hopes destroyed, and noble aspirations violated and trampled upon. If we look over the pathway of desolation thus exposed to view, we may easily imagine that we see the spirit of American independence and American freedom hovering over this day, tearfully praying it, too, may not be added to the long list of victims immolated on the altar of state necessity.

This argument of state necessity always proceeds from the executive power. It is the voice which issues from the throne itself, and unless speedily answered—unless answered now—ere long comes the mandate to surrender to military power. An imperial throne rises on the ruins of an overthrown republic; oaths are violated, liberties swept away; rights trampled on, and a nation is prostrated in the dust. This is but the familiar picture which presents the dire effect of a people submitting to the plea of state necessity. We are further told that in times of great public danger the people ought to sustain the hands of their rulers by confiding in the integrity of motives and disinterestedness of action. Yes, sir, I would sustain with the public confidence while they adhered to the provisions and principles of the Constitution; but I would paralyze them, sir, with distrust, whenever they commence the work of usurpation. It was Demosthenes, in his divine philippic, who told the Athenians that the surest defence of a free people against tyranny was distrust. The Athenians did not heed his warning, and from that hour to this Grecian independence and Grecian liberty have been but a name. William, Prince of Orange, wisely taught the same lesson to the confidence in his administration, and they wisely heeded the lesson, and the immortal glories which clustered for two hundred years around the Dutch republic testify to the truthfulness of the axiom. I, sir, speak not in behalf of the memorialists—upright and honest men as they are, and unjustly deprived of their liberty as I know them to be—I speak in behalf of the Constitution, I speak in behalf of the liberties of the nation, I speak in behalf of myself and in behalf of you, my colleagues on this floor. And I say here that the proposition that the President has the power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus, arbitrarily and without reason, without regard to the principles and provisions and process of law to detain the citizens of any portion of this country, is utterly and entirely indefensible. And I further say, that it becomes every member of this House, in virtue of his oath taken here before the tribune of the people, to support and preserve the Constitution, and in virtue of the position we hold here to support the framework of the Government, and as representatives of the people, solemnly in the face of heaven and of our responsibilities to protest against it.

WHERE ARE YOU WOUNDED?—It had become a matter of habit with the fair ones to open conversation with the very natural inquiry, "Where are you wounded?" and accordingly when a party of three or four the other day approached our cell they launched out in the usual way. Paddy made believe that he didn't hear exactly, and replied, "pretty well I thank ye." "Where are you wounded?" again fired away one of the ladies. "Faith, I'm not badly hurt at all. I'll be traveling to Richmond in a week," replied Pat with a peculiarly distressing look, as if he was in a tight place. Thinking that he was deaf, one of the old ladies in the back ground put her mouth down close to his ear, and shouted again, "We want to know where you are hurt?" Pat, evidently finding that if the bombardment continued much longer he would have to strike his flag anyhow, concluded to do so at once, and accordingly, with a face as rosy as a boiled lobster, and with angry kind of energy, he replied: "Sure, leddies, it's deaf that I am; but since you are determined to know where I have been wounded, it's on me sate.—The bullet entered behind my me breeches. Please to excuse me feelings and ax me no more questions."

COMBINATION TO PROLONG THE WAR.—The Cincinnati Commercial states that a conspiracy has been entered into by Government contractors, and others, who prosper from the present civil war, to use all their power in making it a long one, and thus filling their own pockets at the expense of the people at large. The immense power that can be wielded by a heavy moneyed interest is notorious, and will be felt by the Federal Government.

A terrible accident occurred near Honesdale, Pa., on the 14th inst., at the coal pockets of the Delaware and Hudson Canal Company. A car fell through fifty feet, killing four persons and wounding six others severely.

Why is life the riddle of all riddles? Because we must all "give it up?"

IMPORTANT FROM ENGLAND.

CAPE RACE, Dec 15.—The steamer city of Washington passed here at 11 o'clock this morning, with dates by telegraph the 5th inst.

The ship lady From London to New York, put into Plymouth on the 3d inst. She took fire the same night and was scuttled to extinguish the flames. Some Southerners shipped among the crew are suspected of firing her.

The steamer Australasian has been chartered to convey troops and a battery of artillery, and was to sail on the 12th.

The San Jacinto affair monopolizes the attention of the press, which denounce it in strong terms, and active naval preparations are making.

The latest by telegraph to Queenstown, to the 5th instant, says the excitement is unabated.

The Paris Temps says that Napoleon has tendered his services as a mediator.

At the banquet at Rockdale, Mr. Bright made an elaborate speech on American affairs, but declined to give a decided opinion in the Trent affair. He believed that if illegal, the United States will make fitting reparation. He strongly condemned any warlike feeling, and scouted the idea that the American Cabinet had resolved to pick a quarrel with England, and made a brilliant peroration in favor of the North.

A letter from Gen. Scott, in favor of the maintenance of friendly relations between England and America, attracts much attention.

The export of arms, ammunition and lead to America is prohibited.

The Paris Patrie has an editorial forecasting the disposition of France to recognize the Southern Confederacy if England sets the example.

When the Europa sailed there a more hopeful look and consols and cotton slightly improved, but after digesting the tone of the American press, a reaction set in, and fears were entertained that the Washington Government would justify the seizure of Mascu and Sidel.

The English journals are very bitter and hostile, continuing to treat the affair as an intolerable insult.

The instructions to Lord Lyons, on which the Cabinet was unanimous, are explicit and determined.

The London Post says an acknowledgment of error and a surrender of the prisoners will be received with great joy, but if the Federal government fails to comply, no male in England will blind his eyes to the alternative that England must do her duty.

The London Times continues to assert that it has been Mr. Seward's policy to force a quarrel with England and calls for energetic military preparations in Canada.

A serious decline is daily taking place in Canadian securities amounting to 12 per cent.

The London Times predicts three things to follow an outbreak with the United States, namely, the destruction of the Southern blockade, the complete blockade of the Northern ports, and the recognition of the Southern Confederacy by France and England.

The Daily News that the American Congress meets before the English demands can get out, and hopes that it will act with honor and dignity and that the golden opportunity will not be lost.

A large number of naval vessels are ordered to be ready for immediate commission. The transport Melbourne was to leave Woolwich Arsenal on the 5th, for Halifax, with 30,000 stand of arms, large quantities of ammunition and Armstrong guns. She will be conveyed by the Orpheus of 21 guns.

The iron-plated steamer Warrior is to be ready for foreign service immediately, and her destination will depend upon the answer from Washington. The shipment of rifles from England for New York continues.

The English funds fell 1/2 per cent, on the 3d.

The London Post gives a rumor that Napoleon had been proposed as the arbiter of the question.

WHAT GENERAL SCOTT IS REPORTED TO HAVE SAID—THE ACT CONTEMPLATED IN CABINET AT WASHINGTON.

Referring to the report that the seizure was the act of the American commander, not expressly directed by the government, the London Times says it means that the Federal had deliberately determined to seize the Southern commissioners, and it is understood that Gen. Scott has declared, since his arrival at Paris, that the seizure had been made the subject of Cabinet discussion at Washington long before he left.

The American authorities might have warned the English steamer at Havana that it they took on board the Southern envoys they would subject the vessel to seizure and forfeiture in a prize court.—They made no remonstrance against taking them on board, as they were bound to do, but secretly planned the outrage for which we now seek reparation. Messrs. Sidel and Mason were, at the most, civil servants to a hostile power, and were traveling from one neutral port to another, in a neutral vessel. If the government at Washington declare them rebels, then the right of asylum has been clearly violated.

The Times concludes by adjuring the government and northern people to do justice in the matter.

The London Post confirms the Times' statement, and says: "The demand of Lord Lyons will be plain and brief, and if not complied with the diplomatic relations will be at once suspended."

A FRENCH VIEW OF THE AMERICAN DIFFICULTY.—Letters from France state that the news of the American difficulty caused immense sensation in Paris, and the first general impression was that ample reparation must be made to prevent a collision. Communications have taken place between the English and French governments, and a good understanding on the

subject was believed to exist, as already does the question of policy to be carried out with reference to the American question generally.

The Paris Patrie maintains that the American government had no right to arrest the Southern commissioners while on an English steamer, and asserts that the British government should be immediately prepared to send reinforcements to Canada.

The same journal also gives a report that Admiral Milne, commander of the British East India squadron, on hearing of the San Jacinto affair, detailed three vessels to escort the steamers between Havana and St. Thomas, for the protection of Southerners traveling by that route.

The Americans in Paris paid a complimentary visit to Gen. Scott—Mr. Dayton acting as chairman.

VIEW OF THE GERMAN PRESS.—The German press generally takes the part of England. The Augsburg Gazette says that the Blockade of Charleston is ineffectual, otherwise the escape of the Theodora would have been impossible. The commissioners having reached a Spanish port and embarked in a neutral English steamer, could not be lawfully seized by the North.

PROCEEDINGS OF CONGRESS.

In Senate, Dec. 16, Petitions for the abolition of slavery, and for the employment of Jewish Chaplains in the army, were presented by Messrs. Grimes of Iowa, and Sumner of Mass.

Mr. Ten Eyck of N. J. offered a resolution that the present war is for the Union according to the Constitution, and the object was to save the former and enforce the latter. It was so in the beginning and should be so to the end. That extremes and radical measures, and in themselves disruptive, involving in a common fate the loyal and the disloyal, should not be resorted to; and that in suppressing treason the Government cannot prove a traitor to the organic law. Laid over.

Mr. Wilkinson, of Minn., offered a preamble and resolution, as follows:

Whereas, Jesse D. Bright, Senator from Indiana, did, on the 1st day of March last, write a letter to Jefferson Davis [the letter was here read, introducing a Mr. Lincoln to Mr. Davis as having an improvement in firearms.]

And whereas, Such letter is an evidence of disloyalty; therefore,

Resolved, That the said Jesse D. Bright be expelled from the Senate of the United States.

Mr. Cowan, of Pa., moved a reference of the subject to the committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. Bright, of Indiana, said that perhaps it was not improper for him to say a word as to the truth of the charges which had been made against him through a licentious press. It had been charged that he had absented himself from the Senate from fear of such a resolution of expulsion being offered. It was not so. He had been confined to his room. He had no objection to the resolution. He believed that in a service of seventeen years he had done nothing inconsistent with his duty as an American Senator, citizen, or gentleman. He courted an investigation into all his acts, public and private, and asked to have a letter read in answer to the one already brought to the notice of the Senate. The letter alluded to was then read.

It was addressed to Mr. Fitch, his colleague, saying that he was opposed to the Abolitionists, but had always been for the preservation and integrity of the Union. He was, however, opposed to the coercive policy of the Government.

The resolution was then referred to the committee on the Judiciary.

In the House, Mr. Conway, of Kansas, rising to a question of privilege, alluded to a dialogue between himself and Mr. Fouke, on Thursday. The former had included the battle of Belmont as in the series of defeats to our arms. Mr. Fouke had ineffectually asked Mr. Harding, who had the floor, to yield it to him that he might in his own language nail the falsehood to the counter. Mr. Conway had explained that he obtained his information from the newspapers, and, as he did not at that time hear the offensive language, he now desired to know whether Mr. Fouke intended to make the charge of falsehood personally applicable to him.

Mr. Fouke, of Ill., replied that he had never heard of any newspaper paragraph to that effect, excepting in the Chicago Tribune, which was afterwards contradicted. He then made a brief statement of the battle of Belmont, to show that it was unkind in Mr. Conway to insist on characterizing it as a defeat. He would permit the gentleman to make the application of the language he had heretofore uttered, as he (Mr. C.) was the only judge in the matter.

Mr. Conway, in reply, said Mr. Fouke had refused to avail himself of his generosity; he submitted to the candid judgment of the House whether such conduct did not clearly manifest a deliberate purpose to bring on a personal collision with-out cause, and whether such conduct was not unbecoming a member of the House—but rather that of a backguard and scoundrel. (Sensation)

Mr. Richardson, of Ill, immediately called the speaker to order, saying this was not the place to settle such difficulties. [Cries of order, order.]

Mr. Fouke wanted to say one word in reply.

The Speaker informed Mr. Fouke that no debate was in order.

Mr. Fouke, amid cries of order, was understood to say that Mr. Conway was a disgrace to the nation and to humanity.

Here the matter ended in the House.