The Press.

MONDAY, JULY 3, 1865.

DICKINSON COLLEGE.

Annual Commencement—Interesting Exercises.

Carlisle, Pennsylvania, was crowded this week with persons attending the annual commencement of Dickinson College. The exercises consisted of the Oratorical Prize Contest of the Junior Class, the Baccalaureate Address; the addresses before the General Society and Alumni, and the commencement. The anniversaries of the literary societies, which usually form a feature of commencement week, were held during the winter, and consequently there were fewer displays of oratory during the present week than usual.

The Oratorical Prize Contest of the Junior Class came off on Monday evening. Seven young gentlemen appeared as competitors for the gold and silver medals which are annually awarded to the two Juniors who, in the judgment of the committee, acquit themselves most creditably in oratory. The following is a list of the speakers and their respective themes:

Tragedy of History.—S. G. Grove, Columbia, Pa.

Success Once's Own Achievement.—J. Erastus McKelvy, Pittsburg, Pa.

Man Subordinate to Circumstances.—Henry F. Apple, Hagerstown, Md.

The Law of Inequality.—Louis E. McComas, Hagerstown, Md.

Our Rebellion—An Epoch in History.—Vincent Bierbower, York, Pa.

Life Principles.—Wilberforce Wells, Philadelphia, Pa.

American Eloquence in the Future.—J. Todd, Philadelphia, Pa.

On Tuesday evening the Baccalaureate address was delivered by Professor John K. Stayman, of Carlisle.

On Wednesday morning the address before the General Society was delivered by Hon. John W. Forney, of Washington. His theme was a comparison of the characters of Lincoln and Johnson.

On Wednesday evening the annual meeting was delivered by Rev. Henry B Ridgway. His theme was "Richard Cobden—an International Man."

The valedictory exercises were held on Thursday, and were as follows:

Salutatory Addresses.—Solomon H. Hoover, Washington.

Oration.—A Plea for Anarchy.—Singleton Ashenfelter, Phœnixville.

Dissertation.—Errors of Education.—Edmund P. Long, Baltimore.

Classical Oration.—* James M. Williams, Salisbury.

Oration.—Undeveloped Genius of America.—Edgar E. Hastings, Carlisle.

Oration.—Our Profession.—John Corsman, Carlisle.

Oration.—Primary Allegiance.—James L. Hines, New Oxford.

Oration.—Justice and Mercy.—Abraham Sharp, Smyrna.

Oration.—Our Position in History.—John M. Curtis, Washington.

Oration.—The World, the Mirror of the Mind.—Alfred M. Rhoads, Carlisle.

Oration.—Effects of Climate on Character.—David E. Hunt, Cumberland Valley.

Philosophical Oration.—* Samuel P. Strickler, Herndon.

Masters' Orations.—Daniel W. McCurdy, William Princeton Willey.

Oration, with Valedictory Addresses—Charles W. Reid, Brandywine Manor.

* The two equal in grade.

Letter from Rebel General Ewell—Why He Deserted the old Flag.

The rebel General Ewell lately addressed a letter to an old army companion in Minnesota, from which we quote. It is dated "Fort Warren, June 13, 1865." Speaking of how he came into the rebel cause, he says:

I came from Arizona, sick, in the spring of 1861. Staid in the country, in Virginia, my State, trying to get well, and found the war, to my bitter regret, had being started. At the breaking out of the war army officers were resigning, except General Scott, and he published a letter that the United States would divide into four parts, but no one would have thought all was over. A United States Senator said he would march a Northern regiment to help the South for every one that came to the North. Nothing was done with either of these men, or with others whose deeds were treasonable. A member of Congress, from California, made a public speech, calling upon the South to resist the election of Mr. Lincoln.

Now I found myself forced to fight against my brothers and all my friends and dearest relations, against my own State, when many abler men than myself contended she was right. By taking up the side of the South I forfeited a handsome position, fine pay, and the earnings of twenty years' hard service. All the pay I drew in four years in the South was as much as four years' pay in the old army. The greatest political favoritism against me I ever had was from Mr. Davis after the Mexican war.

It is hard to account for my course, except from a painful sense of duty—I say painful, because I believe few were more devoted to the country than myself; and the greatest objection I had to it was because of my predilection for a strong one. Now I see persons who did what they could to bring about the war, in this favor in the North, holding high office. It was like death to me.

En route here from New Mexico, in 1861, I volunteered my services to fight the Texans, intending for a United States post, and was careful to do nothing against the United States before resigning.

I have asked to be released from the oath of allegiance and return to my duties as a citizen. I see, though, that many persons, active in the first steps in bringing this war about, are still there, while I am here with no very good prospect of getting out; while my wife is under arrest in St. Louis, and has been since April, but up to this time has utterly failed even to find out why she is arrested. Neither she or myself have the slightest idea of the cause of her arrest. R. S. EWELL.

The Proposed Murder of President Johnson when he was Military Governor.

Several days ago we copied from the Nashville *Union* a statement that amongst the private papers of Gov. Harris, of Tennessee, there was a letter from an individual who proposed the assassination of the then Governor Johnson. The following is the letter:

LAFAYETTE DEPOT, April 24, 1862.

GOVERNOR: The excuse I offer at present for addressing you is, that I believe you can accomplish, to the public through me. I reside, or did, in Franklin, Williamson county, Tenn.; am well known to the editors of the *Gazette* and *Examiners of the Union and American*—especially to Mr. James G. Griffith, who knows my past political affiliations and present *status*. I belong to the 1st Tennessee Regiment (disney's); was the first in my county to enlist. Now, what do I wish is this: for you to intervene for me to go to Middle Tennessee, and to capture or kill that vile traitor, Andrew Johnson. I say to you, because I know Nashville, and am not generally known there. And, moreover, if when I get there, I find I can't accomplish my object, I want authority to raise a company or companies of guerillas in Middle Tennessee, to harass the small garrisons left in the towns of that division of the State. Now, what I am well acquainted in all the counties.

I fear the enemy will treat our men behind too kindly, thereby conveying them to Yankee. Killing a few pickets, etc., would soon terminate their damnable civility. Be so kind as to address me thus: at Gorham——, Co. A, ——th Regiment, Tennessee Volunteers"—and oblige

Most respectfully yours,

S. J. COOKE.

P. S.—I refer you besides to Senator Hill and Representative House, from Williamson.

Specimens of the Chivalry.

A letter dated Macon, Georgia, June 14, and addressed to a Cincinnati journal says:

"I wrote you how a white woman had shot her negro servant, at Forsyth, upon slight provocation, the other day.

"She came down to report herself to Wilson, fearful of consequences, and demanding protection. Wilson promptly assured her that there was no 'legality' in shooting a fellow-creature, and told her to protect herself.

"Well, began the woman, signalling her excuse, 'she was insolent, and (snivelling) I do not allow no nigger to be insolent to me. I called to my little daughter to get the gun (more snivelling all the while.) I held her with my left hand, and with my right shot her in the head.'

Here is a specimen of the brute of the masculine 'Chivalry,' of Macon, who had accompanied this female specimen of Forsyth to the General, and who had once or twice 'put in,' to the great irritation of the young arbitrator, had the infatuation to bring up the rear of such an outrageous confession with the passionate endorsement beyond all pretence: 'Why ye hadn't killed her! pity ye hadn't killed her!' In an instant our 'young America' with two stars (may he have the third some day) collared the indignant, and with two well-directed kicks, sent him flying off the verandah into the clutches of a guard, who took him to durance vile on bread and water, with the General's parting assurance that if he ever attempted to illustrate, practically, his sympathy for such outrageous conduct, he should be sent to the Penitentiary, 'and for Young America!' Wish we had a few more Wilsons."

GENERAL GRANT'S SHOT "HITS" ROUND THE WORLD.—The London correspondent of the New York *Times* makes the following statement:

The close of the war in America has been a great disaster to Blondin and the trade of lion-tamers. It reminds one of the philosophical experiment of striking an ivory ball and seeing another fly off from the opposite side. Monday, on the opposite side of the world, feels the concussion of the sudden cessation of hostilities more than London. Of course, London's turn is coming, for the failure of half the commercial houses in Bombay cannot but affect their English correspondence. The rise in cotton and the immense influx of money to pay for it, is succeeded by such a fever of speculation as the East had never known. All kinds of joint stock companies were formed, and shares which cost £500 went up to £25,000. The news of Gen. Lee's surrender sent down the price of cotton one half, and exploded all these wonderful speculations. The Parsees are in mourning—their sun is darkened. Gen. Grant little thought that, when his artillery compelled the evacuation of Richmond, there was a city on the other side of the planet on which his batteries rained ruin.

THE PROTECTOR OF SAMUEL HOAR.—Intelligence of the death of Dr. Joshua R. Whittridge, at Greenville, South Carolina, on the 12th of April, has recently been received. He was known to many of this community, and respected and esteemed by them for his professional skill and worth of character. He resided before the war in Charleston, or at his plantation on Wadmalaw Island, and was Englanders going South for the benefit of their health, or for pleasure, were the recipients of his advice and his courteous hospitality. He was in a degree, the protector of Hon. Samuel Hoar, when the chivalry and the mob of Charleston so grossly insulted the State of Massachusetts by threatening that venerable citizen, acting as her commissioner, with Lynch law, unless he returned North at once. For his friendly counsel and firmness on that occasion, Dr. Whittridge won the esteem and love of a wide circle. The doctor, of course, remained true to the Union, and it may be his death was hastened by the losses, anxieties, and persecutions brought upon him by the treasonable rebellion. At the time of his decease he was nearly, if not quite, four score years of age.—*Boston Journal.*

ARREST OF THE POSTMASTER AT SPRINGFIELD, ILLINOIS.—Mr. Armstrong, postmaster at Springfield, Illinois, was arrested in that city a few days since, and placed under bonds in the sum of $10,000, for opening letters and taking money therefrom. The accusing was a leading member of Dr. Hill's Presbyterian Church, and has always sustained a most excellent reputation. A special despatch to the Chicago *Republican* says: Our best citizens appear sure that, if he opened letters, it was a motive of improper curiosity, rather than from a felonious intent. The letters opened were directed to females, and that which led to Mr. Armstrong's detection had $15 in it. It is said that the clerk's in the office were for some time suspected, and that he had been watched finally told the officer to direct a letter to a certain lady in this city, and that the postmaster would open it, which, it appears, turned out to be the case.

AN ILLINOIS SOLDIER COMMITS SUICIDE.—Last night between eleven and twelve o'clock, a soldier committed suicide in front of the Louisville theatre. No one could tell the cause that led to the rash act. He had been seen in the theatre during the performance, perfectly sober. Just as the theatre was about closing, he was seen to strike himself in the left breast.

Lieutenant Ingraham, who was standing near, asked him why he had stabbed himself. He replied that he would not live to be a slave to any negro." The deceased evidently belonged to company D, 57th Illinois infantry, as he had an order on the commissary signed by Lieutenant O. Anderson, of that company. On his person was found $8 60.—*Louisville Press of June 26.*

THE COURTS.

Supreme Court of Pennsylvania—Before Hon. Justice Thompson.

THE COZZENS HABEAS CORPUS CASE.

FURTHER PROCEEDINGS THEREIN ON SATURDAY—THE RELATOR PRODUCED IN COURT BY THE MILITARY AUTHORITIES IN OBEDIENCE TO THE WRIT.

The Commonwealth ex rel. Wm. N. B. Cozzens vs H. A. Frink, provost marshal. A further hearing was held in this case on Saturday, at which the questions of contempt on the part of Col. Frink, in his refusal to regard the writ of habeas corpus issued by the court, and also his subsequent forcible resistance to the execution of a writ of attachment issued by the same authority, was discussed.

The provost marshal was represented by John G. Knox, Esq.; the relator (Mr. Cozzens) by *Messrs.* F. C. Brewster and Daniel Dougherty, and the Sheriff by Chas. Gilpin, Esq.

Having taken his seat upon the bench Judge Thompson inquired if the Sheriff (Mr. Howell) was in court.

Mr. Dougherty. The Sheriff *is* not in court, but the defendant is.

Judge Thompson. The Sheriff should be here in person. Let him be sent for.

The Sheriff having come in, Judge Thompson said if he had his commission; that he should like to see it.

Mr. Howell said that he had not; that it was at his house.

Mr. Gilpin, for the Sheriff, said that the return made at the previous hearing of Friday, was understood to be a sufficient return up to that time. After the adjournment he followed what appeared to be the usual course of writs of habeas corpus, and coincided that the case should rest, in order to see if the parties would not change their determination. The parties were now in court, and, with permission, he would now present, on behalf of the Sheriff, another and further return, that he had the respondent, Colonel Frink, now in court, as commanded by the attachment.

Judge Thompson said there was more than one respondent, and he desired a return as to the others also.

Judge Knox explained that the other respondents were but subordinates of Colonel Frink, acting under his orders, in that in dealing with Colonel Frink the court would in fact be disposing of their cases also.

Judge Thompson said they must also appear, but he would allow time for that purpose. In the meantime he would proceed with the present case.

Mr. Gilpin then read the Sheriff's further return to the writ of attachment, as follows:

"In pursuance of the command of the within writ, the Sheriff says that he has, and now produces, the body of H. A. Frink, one of the defendants, as within commanded."

Judge Knox. May it please your Honor, this is about the close of my four years' labor as counsel for the Government, during all of which time I have laboured, and with success, to prevent any conflict between the military and civil authorities. If your Honor thinks there has been a contempt of court, we are willing to make any explanation.

Judge Thompson. I certainly think there has been.

Judge Knox then proposed to examine Col. Frink, and desired to know whether his statement should be received orally, or whether it should be in writing.

Judge Thompson said his statement could be made orally.

Col. Frink was then sworn, and interrogated by his counsel, Judge Knox, with the following result:

Judge Knox. State the circumstances under which the writ was served upon you.

Answer. It was served between 4 and 5 o'clock on Thursday afternoon, by the Sheriff. I told him I could not make a return until I had seen or heard from General Cadwalader.

Question. Did you make an effort to see General Cadwalader?

A. I did.

Q. Is General Cadwalader your commanding officer?

A. I am under his command; he is my military superior.

Q. Was it upon his order you made this arrest?

A. The order came through him from the Secretary of War.

Q. At what hour were you notified of the attachment?

A. My impression is about half past eight o'clock in the evening.

Q. What occurred then?

A. Two or three gentlemen came to my office and showed me the attachment; I refused to be arrested; they said they would take me, and I ordered out the guard.

Q. Did they say what they wanted to do with you?

A. They stated that they wished to lodge me in *Moyamensing*; after the guard was turned out, I agreed to go with one of the gentlemen next morning to the office of General Cadwalader for instructions; in the meantime I received instructions from General Cadwalader for me to make a return to the writ; I made the return as soon as I could find Judge Knox.

Judge Thompson. Did you return that habeas corpus to the Sheriff?

A. No, sir.

Judge Thompson. Did you return the body of the person in custody?

A. I did this morning; I received an order from the Secretary of War, last night, to produce the parties.

Judge Thompson. I shall take time to consider Colonel Frink's case, and ask the Sheriff to bring him into court on Monday morning. He is still in the custody of the Sheriff, and he must take such control of him as is necessary. The Sheriff can do with him as he sees proper.

Judge Knox then read the following in return to the writ of habeas corpus:

In the Hon. James Thompson, Judge of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania:

The undersigned, one of the respondents in the within writ, respectfully makes return thereto, that the relator, Wm. B. N. Cozzens, was on the 29th day of June, inst., arrested, by order of this respondent, and is now detained by him as a prisoner, under the authority of the President of the United States; and that the other respondents mentioned in said writ are officers and clerks under the command of this respondent, and further say nothing.

H. A. FRINK,
Colonel and Provost Marshal of Philadelphia.

Sworn and subscribed, etc., this 30th day of June, 1865. DAVID BEITLER, Alderman.

Judge Knox then proceeded to discuss the question of the contempt of court in the refusal to allow the privilege of the writ of habeas *corpus* had been suspended by the President, and that there had never been a revocation of that suspension. We all hope that the rebellion is over; we all believe that the most wicked and causeless war the world has ever known is at an end; but who has said as an authoritative? The President has not, and no one else can do so. Mr. Knox urged that the President's proclamation suspending the privilege of the writs is in full force at the present time, and that the return to the writ, that the prisoner was arrested by and held under the authority of the President, was sufficient. He considered Col. Frink a contractor for the manufacture of tents, and had been charged with fraud.

Under an act of Congress, which declares that contractors under the Government shall be taken to be a part of the army and naval force of the United States, he was tried before a court-martial; that court has made up its verdict and transmitted it to Washington; pending the action of the President, Mr. Cozzens is arrested. He contended that it was strictly within the power of the authorities at Washington, conferred by act of Congress, to impose this course; and said that it was a gross abuse of power for courts here and elsewhere to order that persons against whom criminal charges are pending, and who may be at large on bail, shall be taken into custody.

He submitted the matter to the court with confidence that, in accordance with the precedents in similar cases, the writ would be dismissed and the relator remanded.

F. C. Brewster, Esq., counsel for the relator, said they desired to file exceptions to the *sufficiency* of the return of the respondent, and they wished time for consultation. For this purpose, until Wednesday next was allowed, and, in the meantime, Mr. Cozzens remains in military custody.

Common Pleas—Judge Ludlow.

Hornberger et al. vs. the Thirteenth and Fifteenth-streets Passenger Railway Company. This was an application for an injunction to restrain the defendants from consummating a project which is in contemplation for the leasing and consolidation of the Thirteenth and Fifteenth-streets Passenger Railway Company with the Broad-street Railway Company, and the ultimate severing that they are stockholders in the Thirteenth and Fifteenth-streets Company; and if the project is carried out, will work a great irreparable injury, &c.

The court confined to hear argument, but made an *experte* order restraining the defendants from doing any action touching the matter in question, as of July inst., as proposed, and enjoining them from taking any further or other steps towards said merger or consolidation until the further order of the court, on the first Monday of August. O'Byrne and Colsteclager for complainants; W. R. Wister and Bullitt for defendants.

Decisions were rendered in a number of matters as follows:

By LUDLOW, J.—Hancock vs. The Insurance Company. Judgment for plaintiff on the point reserved.

Estate of E. W. Carr. Rule to set aside a sale. Rule discharged.

McGrath vs. Donnelly. Judgment reversed.

Connelly vs. Arundell. Judgment reversed.

McElroy vs. Edwards. Motion to quash. Rule discharged.

Reed vs. Featherston. Judgment affirmed.

Parents vs. Cooper. Exceptions to master's report. Report referred back to master.

The City vs. Slator (two cases). In one rule, absolute; in the other rule, discharged.

Sharp vs. Grover. Rule for a new trial. Rule absolute.

Roberts vs. Roberts. Rule for alimony. Order: $35 counsel fee, and $7 per week alimony, until September term.

In re petition of Elizabeth Kenzie. Petition for leave to invest funds *re* in railroad securities. Petition refused.

By ALLISON, J.—Spering vs. Fuller. Demurrer overruled.

Court of Quarter Sessions—Hon. Joseph Allison, Associate Justice.

ARSON.

One Thomas Kennody, who was charged by Dr. Jeffries with, in his presence, had a hearing on the coroner's corpse. According to the evidence, Dr. Jeffries was induced to invest in the Davis Oil Company by the representations of the relator, who understood by the Doctor to say that the lands of the company were paid for in full. Jeffries invested to the amount of $1,500, and the investment it was strictly within the power of the authorities at Washington, conferred by act of Congress, to pursue this course; and said that it was a gross abuse of power for courts here and elsewhere to order that persons against whom criminal charges are pending, and who may be at large on bail, shall be taken into custody.

He submitted the matter to the court with confidence that, in accordance with the precedents in similar cases, the writ would be dismissed and the relator remanded.

F. C. Brewster, Esq., counsel for the relator, said they desired to file exceptions to the *sufficiency* of the return of the respondent, and they wished time for consultation. For this purpose, until Wednesday next was allowed, and, in the meantime, Mr. Cozzens remains in military custody.

Common Pleas—Judge Ludlow.

Hornberger et al. vs. the Thirteenth and Fifteenth-streets Passenger Railway Company. This was an application for an injunction to restrain the defendants from consummating a project which is in contemplation for the leasing and consolidation of the Thirteenth and Fifteenth-streets Passenger Railway Company with the Broad-street Railway Company, and the ultimate severing that they are stockholders in the Thirteenth and Fifteenth-streets Company; and if the project is carried out, will work a great irreparable injury, &c.

The court confined to hear argument, but made an *experte* order restraining the defendants from doing any action touching the matter in question, as of July inst., as proposed, and enjoining them from taking any further or other steps towards said merger or consolidation until the further order of the court, on the first Monday of August. O'Byrne and Colsteclager for complainants; W. R. Wister and Bullitt for defendants.

Decisions were rendered in a number of matters as follows:

By LUDLOW, J.—Hancock vs. The Insurance Company. Judgment for plaintiff on the point reserved.

Estate of E. W. Carr. Rule to set aside a sale. Rule discharged.

McGrath vs. Donnelly. Judgment reversed.

Connelly vs. Arundell. Judgment reversed.

McElroy vs. Edwards. Motion to quash. Rule discharged.

Reed vs. Featherston. Judgment affirmed.

Parents vs. Cooper. Exceptions to master's report. Report referred back to master.

The City vs. Slator (two cases). In one rule, absolute; in the other rule, discharged.

Sharp vs. Grover. Rule for a new trial. Rule absolute.

Roberts vs. Roberts. Rule for alimony. Order: $35 counsel fee, and $7 per week alimony, until September term.

In re petition of Elizabeth Kenzie. Petition for leave to invest funds *re* in railroad securities. Petition refused.

By ALLISON, J.—Spering vs. Fuller. Demurrer overruled.

Court of Quarter Sessions—Hon. Joseph Allison, Associate Justice.

ARSON.

One Thomas Kennody, who was charged by Dr. Jeffries with, in his presence, had a hearing on the coroner's corpse. According to the evidence, Dr. Jeffries was induced to invest in the Davis Oil Company by the representations of the relator, who understood by the Doctor to say that the lands of the company were paid for in full. Jeffries invested to the amount of $1,500, and the investment

THE COUNTERFEIT CITY WARRANTS.

Clement C. Wilson, the man who printed the bogus city warrants which have been floating around for some weeks past, also had a hearing on habeas corpus. He was remanded for trial.

TOUCHING THE CUSTODY OF A CHILD.

A habeas corpus case, wherein John M. Leich and Maria Clark, the mother and grandfather of a child, sought to recover its possession from the-father, Raymond Clark, was also heard. The evidence showed that the mother was a woman of very intemperate habits, who before marriage had been placed by her father in the House of Refuge, and who, on account of such habits, had since been in the Almshouse, and that she was entirely unfitted to have charge of a child of tender years, being unable to take care of herself. Her husband had been compelled to leave her because of her conduct. The child was remanded to the custody of the father. The court then adjourned.

THE POLICE.

[Before Mr. Alderman Beitler.]

CHARGED WITH BURGLARY.

Detective Officer Sommers introduced one Wm. Thompson to the attention of the alderman, and charged him with having committed burglary in Chester, Delaware county. A number of things taken from the house were also produced in this city, and the tickets found upon Thompson. Prior to the hearing, Mr. Smith, the turnkey at the station-house, heard an unusual noise, and called the attention of High Constable Clark to the fact. The cell was watched, and it was discovered that Thompson had a small iron drive screw secured to his person, with which he had broken a large-sized padlock nearly to pieces. He is evidently an expert workman, as he could not in any time see the feet, and could use but one hand in working at it. He was committed, in default of $5,000 bail, to await the action of the authorities of Delaware county.

[Before Mr Recorder Earle.]

BREAKING THE IRON.

On Saturday afternoon a fellow calling himself Jas. Williams entered the building in which the Recorder has his office, and, proceeding up stairs, climbed over a railing at the upper front of the building, and, reaching a door leading into a room occupied by Mr. Edward Donaghey, the janitor of the building, forced open the door by a quantity of force, and proceeded to submit themselves fully to the court, and trust they never not knowingly been in contempt. He then said: "On Thursday last a Mr. Cozzens was arrested and placed in the custody of the provost marshal of this city. Your Honor on the same evening issued a writ of habeas corpus, which was served late that evening at the Girard House. The writ was taken in consult with his superior officer before he made a return. He made at once an effort to see Gen. Cadwalader, but was unable to do so. On the same evening a writ of attachment was issued against the provost marshal for contempt of court, in having failed to make a return to the habeas corpus. The attachment was served upon the respondent, but he did not permit himself to be arrested. On Friday, it seems your Honor's writ of attachment of Saturday last of the provost marshal had no notice. He laid the matter before General Cadwalader, at twelve o'clock yesterday. I immediately proceeded there to find Mr. Brewster, and having done so, stated to him that a return would be made to the writ this morning. I am now prepared, simply to make a return to the writ and produce the body of the relator, *but to submit the whole matter to your Honor's judgment.* Then I will undertake to show that the matter should be suspended."

Judge Thompson. I want a return to the attachment. These gentlemen disregarded the writ of attachment. The writ of habeas corpus is nothing.

Judge Knox. If we at this time submit a return to the writ in full, under the statement I have made to your Honor, then there can be no difficulty about the attachment.

Judge Thompson. Certainly there is. While I hold a seat on this bench I will not allow these things to be done with impunity. These respondents had treated the court with contempt. They had resisted, by an armed force, the execution of the process of this court. This was no offence against him individually, but it was a grave offence against the majesty of the law. He desired now to have a return by the Sheriff on Monday morning. He is still in the custody of the Sheriff, and he must take such control of him as is necessary. The Sheriff can do with him as he sees proper.

Judge Knox then read the following in return to the writ of habeas corpus:

To the Hon. James Thompson, Judge of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania:

The undersigned, one of the respondents in the within writ, respectfully makes return thereto, that the relator, Wm. B. N. Cozzens, was on the 29th day of June, inst., arrested, by order of this respondent, and is now detained by him as a prisoner, under the authority of the President of the United States; and that the other respondents mentioned in said writ are officers and clerks under the command of this respondent, and further say nothing.

H. A. FRINK,
Colonel and Provost Marshal of Philadelphia.

Sworn and subscribed, etc., this 30th day of June, 1865. DAVID BEITLER, Alderman.

Judge Knox then proceeded to discuss the question of the contempt of court in the refusal to allow the privilege of the writ of habeas *corpus* had been suspended by the President, and that there had never been a revocation of that suspension. We all hope that the rebellion is over; we all believe that the most wicked and causeless war the world has ever known is at an end; but who has said as an authoritative? The President has not, and no one else can do so. Mr. Knox urged that the President's proclamation suspending the privilege of the writs is in full force at the present time, and that the return to the writ, that the prisoner was arrested by and held under the authority of the President, was sufficient. He considered Col. Frink a contractor for the manufacture of tents, and had been charged with fraud.

Under an act of Congress, which declares that contractors under the Government shall be taken to be a part of the army and naval force of the United States, he was tried before a court-martial; that court has made up its verdict and transmitted it to Washington; pending the action of the President, Mr. Cozzens is arrested. He contended that it was strictly within the power of the authorities at Washington, conferred by act of Congress, to pursue this course; and said that it was a gross abuse of power for courts here and elsewhere to order that persons against whom criminal charges are pending, and who may be at large on bail, shall be taken into custody.

He submitted the matter to the court with confidence that, in accordance with the precedents in similar cases, the writ would be dismissed and the relator remanded.

F. C. Brewster, Esq., counsel for the relator, said they desired to file exceptions to the *sufficiency* of the return of the respondent, and they wished time for consultation. For this purpose, until Wednesday next was allowed, and, in the meantime, Mr. Cozzens remains in military custody.

Common Pleas—Judge Ludlow.

Hornberger et al. vs. the Thirteenth and Fifteenth-streets Passenger Railway Company. This was an application for an injunction to restrain the defendants from consummating a project which is in contemplation for the leasing and consolidation of the Thirteenth and Fifteenth-streets Passenger Railway Company with the Broad-street Railway Company, and the ultimate severing that they are stockholders in the Thirteenth and Fifteenth-streets Company; and if the project is carried out, will work a great irreparable injury, &c.

The court confined to hear argument, but made an *experte* order restraining the defendants from doing any action touching the matter in question, as of July inst., as proposed, and enjoining them from taking any further or other steps towards said merger or consolidation until the further order of the court, on the first Monday of August. O'Byrne and Colsteclager for complainants; W. R. Wister and Bullitt for defendants.

Decisions were rendered in a number of matters as follows:

By LUDLOW, J.—Hancock vs. The Insurance Company. Judgment for plaintiff on the point reserved.

Estate of E. W. Carr. Rule to set aside a sale. Rule discharged.

McGrath vs. Donnelly. Judgment reversed.

Connelly vs. Arundell. Judgment reversed.

McElroy vs. Edwards. Motion to quash. Rule discharged.

Reed vs. Featherston. Judgment affirmed.

Parents vs. Cooper. Exceptions to master's report. Report referred back to master.

The City vs. Slator (two cases). In one rule, absolute; in the other rule, discharged.

Sharp vs. Grover. Rule for a new trial. Rule absolute.

Roberts vs. Roberts. Rule for alimony. Order: $35 counsel fee, and $7 per week alimony, until September term.

In re petition of Elizabeth Kenzie. Petition for leave to invest funds *re* in railroad securities. Petition refused.

By ALLISON, J.—Spering vs. Fuller. Demurrer overruled.

Court of Quarter Sessions—Hon. Joseph Allison, Associate Justice.

ARSON.

One Thomas Kennody, who was charged by Dr. Jeffries with, in his presence, had a hearing on the coroner's corpse. According to the evidence, Dr. Jeffries was induced to invest in the Davis Oil Company by the representations of the relator, who understood by the Doctor to say that the lands of the company were paid for in full. Jeffries invested to the amount of $1,500, and the investment

SHERIFF'S SALES.

SHERIFF'S SALE.—BY VIRTUE OF A writ of Venditioni Exponas, to me directed, will be exposed to public sale or vendue, on MONDAY Evening, July 3, 1865, at 6 o'clock, at Sansom-street Hall, all the building, improvements, and lot of ground, situate on the north side of Washington street, 150 feet north of Master street, in the city of Philadelphia; containing in front on Washington street 20 feet, and in depth 121 feet 9 inches to Philip street.

N. B.—On the above lot is erected on Washington street a two-story brick dwelling and shop, with a story frame building, and on Philip street a three-story brick building.

(C. P. J. '65 45. Debt, $217 70. Pancoast.]

Taken in execution and to be sold as the property of Edward Matthew. HENRY C. HOWELL, Sheriff.

Philadelphia, Sheriff's Office, June 10, 1865. Je12-3t

SHERIFF'S SALE.—BY VIRTUE OF a writ of Venditioni Exponas, to me directed, will be exposed to public sale or vendue, on MONDAY Evening, July 3, 1865, at 6 o'clock, at Sansom-street Hall, all that two-story brick messuage and lot of ground, situate on the south side of Locust street, 203 feet 6 inches west of Schuylkill Fifth street, and containing in front or breadth on said Locust street 16 feet, and in depth of that width 100 feet, more or less (which premises Edward Ford, by deed dated August 28, 1863, conveyed unto James Henry in fee, reserving ground rent, $117.)

[C. P., J. '65. 53 Debt, $629 75. A. Burton.]

Taken in execution and to be sold as the property of James Henry. HENRY C. HOWELL, Sheriff.

Philadelphia, Sheriff's Office, June 10, 1865. Je12-3t

SHERIFF'S SALE.—BY VIRTUE OF a writ of Venditioni Exponas, to me directed, will be exposed to public sale or vendue, on MONDAY Evening, July 3, 1865, at 6 o'clock, at Sansom-street Hall, all that three-story brick messuage and lot of ground situate on the east side of Marshall street, 138 feet 1¼ inches north of Master street, in the city of Philadelphia; containing in front on Marshall street 17 feet, and in depth of that width 85 feet 6¾ inches. Which premises Zophar G. Howell et ux., by deed, dated April 1, 1865, recorded in Deed Book T. B., No. 53, page 406, &c., conveyed unto Edward M. Sales in fee, reserving ground rent of $61.

[C. P., '65. 46. Debt, $852 22. Letchw orth.]

Taken in execution and to be sold as the property of Edward M. Sales. HENRY C. HOWELL, Sheriff.

Philadelphia, Sheriff's Office, June 10, 1865. Je12-3t

SHERIFF'S SALE.—BY VIRTUE OF a writ of Venditioni Exponas, to me directed, will be exposed to public sale or vendue, on MONDAY Evening, July 3, 1865, at 6 o'clock, at Sansom-street Hall, all that three-story brick messuage and lot of ground situate on the east side of Marshall street, 138 feet 1¼ inches north of Master street, in the city of Philadelphia; containing in front on Marshall street 17 feet, and in depth of that width 85 feet 6¾ inches. Which premises Zophar G. Howell et ux., by deed, dated April 1, 1865, recorded in Deed Book T. B., No. 53, page 406, &c., conveyed unto Edward M. Sales in fee, reserving ground rent of $61.

[C. P., '65. 47. Debt, $852 22. Letchw orth.]

Taken in execution and to be sold as the property of Edward M. sales. HENRY C. HOWELL, Sheriff.

Philadelphia, Sheriff's Office, June 10, 1865. Je12-3t

SHERIFF'S SALE.—BY VIRTUE OF a writ of Venditioni Exponas, to me directed, will be exposed to public sale or vendue, on MONDAY Evening, July 3, 1865, at 6 o'clock, at Sansom-street Hall, all that three-story brick messuage and lot of ground situate on the north side of Poplar street, 158 feet 7¾ inches west of Front street, in the city of Philadelphia; containing in front on Poplar street 16 feet, and in depth 85 feet, more or less. Which premises Sidney Longstreth and Samuel Morris, executors of the last will and testament of Samuel Morris, deceased, by deed, dated May 1, 1865, recorded in Deed Book T. B., No. 53, page 391, &c., conveyed unto Joseph S. Hart in fee, reserving ground rent of $61.

[C. P., J. '65. 52. Debt, $852 22. Letchw orth.]

Taken in execution and to be sold as the property of Joseph S. Hart. HENRY C. HOWELL, Sheriff.

Philadelphia, Sheriff's Office, June 10, 1865. Je12-3t

SHERIFF'S SALE.—BY VIRTUE OF a writ of Venditioni Exponas, to me directed, will be exposed to public sale or vendue, on MONDAY Evening, July 3, 1865, at 6 o'clock, at Sansom-street Hall, all that three-story brick messuage and lot of ground, situate on the east side of Leithgow street, 158 feet 7¾ inches north of Master street, in the city of Philadelphia; containing in front on Leithgow street 16 feet, and in depth 73 feet to a three-feet-wide alley extending thence eastwardly 85 feet to Marshall street. Which premises Thomas Wistar et ux., by deed dated April 11, 1865, recorded in Deed Book T. B., No. 53, page 395, &c., conveyed unto George W. Ferguson in fee, reserving ground rent of $92.

[C. P., J. '65. 54. Debt, $655 00. Morris.]

Taken in execution and to be sold as the property of George W. Ferguson. HENRY C. HOWELL, Sheriff.

Philadelphia, Sheriff's Office, June 10, 1865. Je12-3t

SHERIFF'S SALE.—BY VIRTUE OF a writ of Venditioni Exponas, to me directed, will be exposed to public sale or vendue, on MONDAY Evening, July 3, 1865, at 6 o'clock, at Sansom-street Hall, all that three-story brick messuage and lot of ground situate on the east side of Marshall street, 158 feet 7¾ inches north of Master street, in the city of Philadelphia; containing in front on Marshall street 17 feet, and in depth of that width 85 feet 6¾ inches.

To the Editor of the Portland (Me.) Press:

Enclosed please find a slip from the Maine *Farmer*.

I feel truly grateful to my friends for their kind thoughtfulness in the past, and the many voluntary donations for this testimonial of their appreciation of what they deem my public services. I trust God made at the previous hearing of Friday, was understood to be a sufficient return up to that time. After the adjournment he followed what appeared to be the usual course of writs of habeas corpus, and coincided that the case should rest, in order to see if the parties would not change their determination. The parties were now in court, and, with permission, he would now present, on behalf of the Sheriff, another and further return, that he had the respondent, Colonel Frink, now in court, as commanded by the attachment.

Judge Thompson said there was more than one respondent, and he desired a return as to the others also.

Judge Knox explained that the other respondents were but subordinates of Colonel Frink, acting under his orders, in that in dealing with Colonel Frink the court would in fact be disposing of their cases also.

Judge Thompson said they must also appear, but he would allow time for that purpose. In the meantime he would proceed with the present case.

Mr. Gilpin then read the Sheriff's further return to the writ of attachment, as follows:

"In pursuance of the command of the within writ, the Sheriff says that he has, and now produces, the body of H. A. Frink, one of the defendants, as within commanded."

Judge Knox. May it please your Honor, this is about the close of my four years' labor as counsel for the Government, during all of which time I have laboured, and with success, to prevent any conflict between the military and civil authorities. If your Honor thinks there has been a contempt of court, we are willing to make any explanation.

Judge Thompson. I certainly think there has been.

Judge Knox then proposed to examine Col. Frink, and desired to know whether his statement should be received orally, or whether it should be in writing.

Judge Thompson said his statement could be made orally.

Col. Frink was then sworn, and interrogated by his counsel, Judge Knox, with the following result:

Judge Knox. State the circumstances under which the writ was served upon you.

Answer. It was served between 4 and 5 o'clock on Thursday afternoon, by the Sheriff. I told him I could not make a return until I had seen or heard from General Cadwalader.

Question. Did you make an effort to see General Cadwalader?

A. I did.

Q. Is General Cadwalader your commanding officer?

A. I am under his command; he is my military superior.

Q. Was it upon his order you made this arrest?

A. The order came through him from the Secretary of War.

Q. At what hour were you notified of the attachment?

A. My impression is about half past eight o'clock in the evening.

Q. What occurred then?

A. Two or three gentlemen came to my office and showed me the attachment; I refused to be arrested; they said they would take me, and I ordered out the guard.

Q. Did they say what they wanted to do with you?

A. They stated that they wished to lodge me in *Moyamensing*; after the guard was turned out, I agreed to go with one of the gentlemen next morning to the office of General Cadwalader for instructions; in the meantime I received instructions from General Cadwalader for me to make a return to the writ; I made the return