The New Orleans Crescent.

OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE STATE OF LOUISIANA.

J. O. NIXON, Editor and Proprietor.

OFFICE, No. 94 CAMP STREET.

FRIDAY MORNING, FEBRUARY 28, 1868.

IMPEACHMENT.

The Speeches in the House of Representatives.

Speeches Against Impeachment by Mr. Brooks.

SPEECHES ON THE OTHER SIDE BY VARIOUS GENTLEMEN.

CONVERSATIONAL DEBATE.

In the House of Representatives on the 23d, the report having been read, Mr. Stevens said:

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention in the first instance to discuss the question, and if there be no desire on the other side to discuss it, we are willing that the question shall be taken on the knowledge which the House already has. Indeed, the fact of removing a man from office while the Senate is in session, without the consent of the Senate, is itself, if there was nothing else, and always has been, considered a high crime and misdemeanor, and was never before practiced. But I will not discuss this question unless gentlemen on the other side desire to do so. If they do I shall, for the present, give way to them, and say what I have to say in conclusion.

Mr. Brooks then took the floor, and after referring to his want of time to prepare a minority report, said he was utterly inadequate to discharge the duty which had devolved on him on this august day—the anniversary of the birth of the Father of his Country—and to express himself with that deep solemnity which he felt in rising to resist this unholy and unconstitutional proceeding. He knew not why the ghost of impeachment had approached in a new form. It had been laid hitherto in the House. But a minority of members on the other side forcing its influence and power on the majority, had at last succeeded in compelling its party to attempt impeachment of the president. We have been, he said, in the midst of revolution. Long has the country been agitated in the throes of revolution, but we are now approaching the last and final stage of that revolution. There is nothing new in what we are doing. We but repeat the history of the past. We are traversing over and over again the history of Cromwell and Charles the First and Charles the Second; and we are traversing over and over again all the scenes of the French revolution. We have been told, though not here and now, that the president should be impeached because he was an obstacle in the way of restoring certain States, or rather an obstacle in the party which would be, but is not directly in power. Sir, we are all obstacles to that party. My associates and myself, we all have been and intend to be obstacles in the way of its high-handed proceedings, and if the president is to be removed as an obstacle in the way of the party in power, it is equally within their power, by the exercise of a tyrannical majority, to remove every obstacle and have the sole control of the government. But I bid them beware, in no spirit of defiance, but from a devoted love to my country. I solemnly bid them beware, and to proceed no further in their revolutionary steps. Speaking in behalf of those who have sworn to support the Constitution; in behalf of my associates here; in behalf of those standing majorities whose voices are roaring outside of this capitol, and who are waiting for a constitutional opportunity to enter, I bid you beware. Your impeachment will avail you nothing. The president is to be tried before the Senate with all the forms of law, and before you can achieve the final result he will be removed from your authority by the constitutional termination of his office. If you proceed further and depose the president by violence; if you suspend him; if you throw him out of office, except by due process of impeachment, I tell you, in behalf of thousands, and tens of thousands, and hundreds of thousands, and millions of the people that we will never, never, so help me God, never, never submit. (Laughter on the Republican side.)

Sir, we have the physical power of the country with us. The labor, the industry, the bone and the muscle of the country are ours. The heroism of the country is ours. Four-fifths of the army of the United States is composed of the Democracy of the country, and if you proceed to introduce politics into the army, the Democratic soldier will follow Democratic instinct, and will stand by the Constitution and the laws. I therefore, Mr. Speaker, bid you beware of unconstitutional, or illegal, or extraordinary proceedings. Proceed in your forms of impeachment through all the manipulations and sinuosities and tergiversations of the law, and we shall cheerfully submit, because it is our duty so to do as constitutional, obedient men. But step an inch over the bounds of the Constitution, and proceed, as is frequently proposed, in a violent and revolutionary manner, and you precipitate violence and revolution.

Mr. Brooks went on to argue that the matter on which impeachment of the president was proposed was a legal question, and the president had as much right to judge of the constitutionality of the tenure of office act as the House or Senate had. If he were advising the majority of the House to its overthrow, he would hurry on this matter. Andrew Johnson had little or no power as a president of the United States. He was without authority, or influence, or patronage. Congress had so managed him as almost to overthrow the executive power, and if they did not succeed in re-electing him to the presidency, they would at least immortalize his name on the page of history as one of the most glorious defenders of liberty that ever lived under any constitutional government whatever. (Laughter among the Republican members.)

The resolution of impeachment was supported in speeches by Mr. Spaulding and Mr. Bingham.

Mr. Spaulding having had five minutes allowed him from Mr. Bingham's time, said: Mr. Speaker. I feel myself to be in no proper frame of mind or heart, to attempt a rhetorical display on this occasion. I can appreciate the sentiment of the gentleman from New York (Mr. Brooks), when he says the question before us is filled with solemnity. But when he, with his usual eloquence, attempts to use gasconade to drive members of this House from a conscientious discharge of duty, I say to my friend he has mistaken his calling. Sir, no more important duty can devolve upon this House of Representatives than that of considering the question whether articles of impeachment shall be preferred against the head magistrate of the nation, and for long months—nay, for years, I have resisted with my personal influence, the approach to the crisis which I now see before us. The president has done many censurable things, but I would not in my conscience say the president should be holden to answer on the charge of the commission of high crimes and misdemeanors, unless something could be made tangible whereby he had brought himself in conflict with the laws of the nation. It has seemed to me for weeks that high officers were counting the very hour and the very occasion which are upon us, and the consequence of which will be upon him. He has thrown himself violently in contact with the act of Congress passed on the 2d of March last, by the vote of the constitutional number of two-thirds of the Senate and two-thirds of the House of Representatives over his veto assigning his reasons to the contrary. It matters not how many acts can be found in statute books in years gone by contrary to the principles of that act. The gentleman from New York (Mr. Brooks) numbered three, and he might have numbered thirty or three hundred. But still, if, within the past nine months, Congress has, in a constitutional manner, made an enactment against which the chief executive of the nation throws himself, he commits the act for which he should be impeached, just as clearly and conclusively as if there had never been legislation to the contrary. This enactment, if it be a legal and a constitutional enactment, repeals by its own force all those prior enactments to which the gentleman from New York alluded. And in nothing is that act more clear than in this, that the president shall not remove any civil officers who have been appointed with the concurrence of the Senate of the United States, without the concurrence of that body when it is in session. It is true that the right of suspension was given to the executive during the recess of the Senate, but that right of suspension ceased so soon as the Senate convenes. And now, not only in the face of the decision of the Senate, saying that the suspension of the secretary of war, made during the recess, was without good cause, but in the face of the penalties of the act of March 2, 1867, entitled, "An act regulating the tenure of certain civil officers," the president yesterday sent to the Senate a message declaring in terms that he had removed Edwin M. Stanton, secretary of war. The sixth section of that act declares that every removal or appointment or employment, made, had or exercised contrary to its provisions, shall be deemed, and they are declared to be a high crime and misdemeanor, on conviction of which the offender may be fined not exceeding ten thousand dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding five years or may suffer both fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.

Mr. Woodward desired to ask a question, but Mr. Spaulding declined to yield, and continued his argument.

He said: Now sir, if there be any efficacy in the enactment of Congress, we are not called upon to ascertain through a committee whether this act of the president be a high crime and misdemeanor, because Congress has already, on the face of the enactment, decided it to be such. And the president, as if to do despite to the action of Congress, has thrown down the glove. He has assumed the boldness to say to the Senate, notwithstanding your reasons to the contrary, that I had not the right to suspend the secretary of war. I assume the constitutional right to throw that officer from his position entirely, and I do it, your law and your action to the contrary notwithstanding. I am brought to the conclusion that so long as we submit to these violent assaults upon Congress and upon all its doings, we never can have peace, and I am brought to the conclusion that we must all with unanimity vote for the resolutions to-day introduced.

Mr. Bingham took the floor.

Mr. Pruyn desired to inquire as to the probable course of the debate, and whether an opportunity would be offered for members generally to express their views in regard to this very important question.

Mr. Bingham said he was not able to answer the question further than to express his own wish and hope that the House would deliberate freely on the question.

Mr. Stevens, of Pennsylvania, said so far as he had anything to say in the matter, he would let the debate go on until the last moment of to-day, but that he desired to have the vote tallied before the House adjourned.

Mr. Pruyn asked Mr. Stevens to be kind enough to indicate whether he meant, when speaking of the last moment of to-day, sunset, midnight, or the usual hour of adjournment.

Mr. Stevens said he would say 5 o'clock.

Mr. Pruyn remarked, then we are to discuss this question between now and 5 o'clock?

Mr. Bingham proceeded to argue in support of the resolution. He said all right-minded men must concede that the question under consideration is one of supreme importance to all the people of the country. I protest for myself that I am utterly incapable of approaching the question in the spirit of a partisan, and I repel the intimation of the gentlemen from New York (Mr. Brooks,) that I am careless of the obligation of my oath or unconcerned about the supremacy of the Constitution and the laws. I look upon the constitution of this country as the very breath of the nation's life. I look this day on the consideration of this great question as did the gentleman from New York. I ask him (Mr. Brooks,) in consideration of the matter to ponder upon these deathless words of the Father of our Country when he declared that the "Constitution which, at any time exists, until changed by the action of the whole people, is sacred and obligatory upon all." Sir, from the president to the humblest citizen within the limits of the republic, upon every human being standing within the jurisdiction of the republic, Washington but re-echoes the words which himself and his associates embodied in the Constitution, that this instrument and the laws made in pursuance thereof shall be the supreme law of the land. The issue involved is not, as the gentleman from New York said, the question of an office, but whether the supremacy of the Constitution shall be maintained by the people of the republic. The president of the United States has assumed to set himself above the majesty of the law. He has assumed to defy the law. He has assumed to challenge the representatives of the people to sit in judgment on his malfeasance in office. Any man who has considered and observed my conduct touching this question, which has so long agitated this House and this country, must have discovered that I have held myself back, and have endeavored to keep others back from making any unnecessary issue between the president and the representatives of the people, touching the manner in which he has discharged the duties of his great office. I had no desire to resort unnecessarily to this last power reposed by the people in their representatives and in their senators for the vindication of their own violated Constitution and laws, as long as there was any doubt hanging over the question, notwithstanding there was much in the conduct of the president to call for the interposition of the representatives of the country. Yet, so long as there was any doubt hanging over the question of his liability to impeachment, within the text and spirit of the Constitution, I was unwilling to utter one syllable in favor of such a proposition, or to record a vote to advance it. With the past I am entirely satisfied. I am responsible for it alone to those who sent me here, to the Constitution and the Common Father of us all. I have said nothing heretofore, I have done nothing heretofore which, dying, I would wish to change. I stand here, however, to-day filled with the conviction that the president of the United States has deliberately and defiantly and criminally violated the Constitution, his oath of office and the statutes of the country. I propose to make clear, in the short time which I will occupy, the proposition which I have just uttered, and, in attempting to do it, I desire to say it is a moment of pain, of sorrow and of grief to me to be compelled, as a representative of the people, to make the utterance that the president of the United States has set this bad example to the people of the country, by trampling the Constitution and law defiantly under his foot.

Mr. Bingham went on to argue the question of law involved in the matter, and to show that the president himself had virtually admitted the constitutionality of the tenure-of-office bill, by exercising the power of suspension, and sending his reasons therefor to the Senate, for which he had no authority, except by that law. The gentleman from New York (Mr. Brooks) had warned them to beware. Beware of what? Beware of rendering faithful obedience to their oaths as representatives? To beware of taking steps authorized by the Constitution to put this usurper of authority on trial before the only tribunal on earth authorized to try him for the crimes charged? Did not the gentleman know that it is written in the Constitution that the president, the vice president and every other civil officer of the United States shall be removed from office on impeachment for and conviction of high crimes and misdemeanors? Did he not know that it is written in the same Constitution that the representatives of the people shall have the sole power of impeachment; that it has no divided power? Did he not know that it is within the Constitution that the Senate shall have the sole power to try impeachments? And yet the gentleman told them to beware of putting the president on trial. He (Mr. Bingham) undertook to say there was enough in the correspondence submitted yesterday to justify the House in drawing the inference that the president is by his act guilty of another crime under another act of Congress additional to the act of 1867, which makes it a high crime, punishable by fine and imprisonment, for any person by force, threat or intimidation to attempt to prevent any person exercising the functions of an officer under the government of the United States. He undertook to say that on a full investigation into the case the president would be found guilty of attempting by threat and intimidation, if not by force, to prevent the secretary of war exercising the duties of the office to which he has been assigned by the solemn judgment of the Senate. It pained him to make such an utterance. If he had any control over the president, he would have prevented him from uttering such words as those which he had uttered to his adjutant-general, who had appeared to-day in person at the war office, demanding the surrender of the office, notified the secretary of war that he would not obey his orders or recognize him as secretary of war, and that he would take possession of the mails for the department of war, and all by order of the president. There was evidence enough to satisfy him that the president of the United States was so bent on his own destruction, or on the destruction of the republic, that he was capable of running to any extreme of madness. He proposed to treat him not in the spirit of a partisan, but in the spirit of a representative of the people, acting under the obligations of his oath. No one would rejoice more than himself to know that when the case should have been presented to the Senate, as a high court of impeachment, it should become clear to the satisfaction of that body that the president had only erred in judgment, and had not intended to offend the Constitution, to defy Congress or to set aside the supremacy of the laws. He would rejoice at his acquittal, not only for his own sake, but for the sake of the Constitution of the country. But in the light of what the president had already declared and put on record, he (Mr. Bingham) was forced to the conclusion that he meant nothing else than to defy the power of Congress, and say to Congress, "Whatever laws you have passed, or whatever laws you may pass, I will destroy them, whenever, in my judgment, I deem them not in accordance with, or not in pursuance of, the Constitution of the United States, and let you do your worst." That was the president's position. And, having taken it, he (Mr. Bingham) proposed to have him put on trial. The gentleman, (Mr. Brooks,) he continued, talks about liberty. Liberty is as dear to me as it can be to that gentleman or his party. I stand here to-day for that liberty which is regulated by law; that liberty which belongs alike to us all—which is not the exclusive prerogative of those who hold high official stations. That lawless liberty, the liberty which the kite shows to the dove, and which the wolf shows to the lamb, I will have none of it; the people of the United States will have none of it. They will insist on it that man shall enjoy liberty in this country in obedience to law and in subjection to law.

Referring to Mr. Brooks's intimations about the Democratic Party taking the part of the president, he reminded him and the House that that party had not very long ago attempted to act above law and rise in rebellion against the government, but that its rebellion had been crushed by the government. He desired to see the question discussed fully and fairly, and should be glad to hear whatever the gentleman had to say against the rightfulness of these proceedings in extenuation of the president's conduct. But he wanted to hear no more warnings of the uprising of the Democratic Party, and no more proclamations as to that party being a majority of the people of the country.

Mr. Farnsworth, of Illinois, said they had been told by the gentleman from New York (Mr. Brooks) that if the president should be tried and convicted the Democratic party would not stand it. The gentleman, in a dramatic and sensational manner, had also told the House that he never would stand it. Hearing these things, he (Farnsworth) thought they were carried back years ago, when he listened to similar threats on this floor, just preceding the rebellion. The galleries were at that time filled by a class of people different from that which occupied them now, and who applauded to the echo the threats and menaces then expressed. He would tell the gentlemen that when the president should be impeached in the mode pointed out by the Constitution for high crimes and misdemeanors in office, if it were not profane, he would call God to witness that the gentleman must stand it. When the Democrats and secessionists told us, if we raised an army to conquer the rebellion, they would not stand it, we told them that they should stand it; and he would say to the gentleman, when the same party is arrayed against the Union, that only half a million of men were slain in the war, but a million of those who took part in the contest still live, and when necessity demands they will come like the waves, come when the tempest prevails, and as thick as autumn leaves, to maintain the supremacy of law.

The gentlemen had told them that the army was made up for the great part of Democrats; so it was, but the rebellion broke out, and they left and went with the disunionists. By this the army was purified. It might be that since the close of the rebellion the army has been recruited from disloyal men, but this made no difference. The friends of the Union will cleanse the way again. He had heard enough of the threats of the Democratic party years ago. It was the same old party which they met in the field and at the polls and vanquished. They were the same men to-day, and would be again defeated. What was in this question? A great deal. He trusted that he came to its discussion in a proper spirit. It was not a new question whether Andrew Johnson should be removed from office. There were other and greater interests involved. The question was whether the Union spirit in the States should be crushed out and rebels again have the supremacy; whether the government should be maintained and the trophies richly earned during four years of bloody war shall be wrested from the hands of a liberty-loving people, or kept and maintained.

He cared little for Andrew Johnson. For months past he never had a doubt that the man should be impeached. He had believed that the evil in the man would come out step by step, develop itself until he capped the climax by violating the supreme law of the land, and the Constitution of the United States.

In the correspondence with General Grant the president said his action with reference to the suspension of Stanton, was not under the tenure of office bill, but under the Constitution and outside of that law, and that he was only exercising his constitutional rights. What does the president say now? Is he acting under the tenure of office bill or the Constitution?

Mr. Farnsworth read from the Constitution as to the powers of the president to appoint to office with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Mr. Barnes, with the consent of Mr. Farnsworth, read from another part of the Constitution, the following: "The president shall be commander in chief of the army and navy."

Mr. Farnsworth—I would inquire whether the secretary of war is any part of the army or not.

Mr. Baines—I contend the secretary of war is a part of the army of the United States.

Mr. Farnsworth—The secretary of war is a civil officer. Such a thing as the removal of a cabinet officer during the session of Congress was done by a president. President Jackson removed his secretary of the treasury, but this was during the recess of Congress and at that time the whole party of which the gentleman from New York was not only a zealous but an excellent member, made no protest against Jackson for removing a cabinet officer during the vacation. But here, a few days ago, after the Senate had gravely declared that the reasons assigned by the president for the suspension of Secretary Stanton were not sufficient, the president sent to the Senate a mere letter stating that he had removed Mr. Stanton not under the tenure of office law, but by virtue of his authority under the Constitution. The president addressed his letter to Mr. Stanton as secretary of war, that his functions as such officer would cease after its reception.

Mr. Farnsworth said the president had acted in flagrant violation of the law regulating the tenure of office, and if he had looked all over the laws to court impeachment he could not have succeeded better than he had on this occasion. Both the law and the Constitution had been violated by him. When the president took the oath to support the Constitution it was also his duty to see that the laws are faithfully executed. Who was this Andrew Johnson who sets himself in defiance of the Constitution and laws?

A member answered that Andrew Johnson was one for whom his party voted. Another said Johnson was a Republican president.

Mr. Farnsworth replied, I say no. Were we deceived I repented of my vote. The Republican party were cheated into his support. The ungrateful, despicable, mean traitor turned his back on the men who elected him, and the friends who rallied around him. He turned his back on men, including those in Tennessee who supported him, and went over to the party he had fought, not only at the ballot box but in the field.

Who is this Andrew Johnson that he should set himself up against Congress, the courts and the people; by what authority did he take upon himself to oppose the laws passed in accordance with the constitutional forms? Was it because God gave him more brains and moral character and a clearer judgment than he had given to other men? Let this House and the Senate teach Johnson that there is a power stronger than the president, namely, the power of the people, whose representatives were speaking here to-day.

The gentleman from New York said if we enter on the trial the term of the president would expire before the trial was concluded. The president's letter to Mr. Stanton and General Thomas presents a complete and perfect case. We need swear no witnesses and take no testimony. Read the law, read the Constitution, and the case is all there as plainly as if the president had confessed the fact. I trust the Senate will do its duty fairly and completely. If the president could remove Mr. Stanton he could remove every other member of his cabinet and all other officers excepting the members of the judiciary.

We see by the newspapers that the president has created a new department, the department of the Atlantic. We now see that, failing to make a tool of General Sherman, he rescinds so much of the order as assigns that officer to the command. We hear that he has a pliant tool for the command. No doubt he will find other tools. Why create an additional department now? Ignoring General Grant, the president issued his orders direct to his subordinate. If the president did that, when he had a pliant tool he might order General Grant into arrest, who doubts his purposes; and when he has the war department and the army at his back and General Grant under a rest, where are we? The army in the hollow of his hand, and where are we? If he can turn out others, he can turn us out. What is the effect? No reconstruction. The country is to be told that with his pliant tools he will force the Democratic party to nominate him and keep his seat warm.

Mr. Getz—I don't think the Democratic party can be forced in that way.

Mr. Farnsworth—Do you say you will not support him?

Mr. Getz—Yes, if he shall be nominated.

Mr. Farnsworth—That's old Democratic Party practice of going it blind. (Laughter.)

Mr. Getz—Oh, no.

Mr. Farnsworth, resuming, said he understood Mr. Brooks to remark that two-thirds of the army was recruited from rebels.

Mr. Brooks replied that he had not said anything like it. The gentleman must be dreaming.

Mr. Farnsworth—What did you say, then?

Mr. Brooks—There is my speech; I will not charge it.

Mr. Farnsworth—If the gentlemen will not tell, I will maintain the gentleman said so.

Brooks—I said the larger number of the army was made up of Democrats. (Laughter.)

Farnsworth—If that is the correction I stand corrected. I had supposed they were convertible terms; I know they were in 1860; when the war came they were rebels.

Brooks—I said if the president was impeached for the cut of his coat or the color of his hair, it was our duty to submit.

Farnsworth—I understand the gentleman to declare, in an emphatic manner, that he never would submit.

Mr. Brooks—The gentleman has been dreaming.

Farnsworth—Did not the gentleman say he would not submit?

Brooks—I said you had the right to impeach the president.

Mr. Farnsworth—What did you mean by saying the Democratic party made up the strength of the army?

Mr. Brooks—I said that as long as the majority of the army acted in conformity with the Constitution and laws of the land, it was our duty to submit; but if proceeding independently of and against the laws of the land, we would not submit.

Mr. Farnsworth—The gentleman sets up his idea of law. That is what the rebels said in 1860. Then Lincoln was a sectional candidate, and "we defy you to elect him," said they. They said in both Houses that they would not submit if we elected a president according to constitutional forms; and said that one Democrat was as good as five Republicans, and all that. Now, I would say to my friend from New York that I come from a district which gave me a majority of fourteen thousand votes, and I will put any one of them against two secession Democrats. (Laughter.)

Mr. Getz—Does the gentleman propose to inaugurate another civil war?

Mr. Farnsworth—I propose to put it down.

Mr. Pruyn—I ask if Congress should pass an act affecting the gentleman's person and property without color of law, would he submit or not when resistance to oppression was to commence?

Mr. Farnsworth—The gentleman's question is a contradiction. I would appeal to the courts—this would not be resisting the law, because a remedy is afforded. We must never resist the law; never, until you reach the final point of revolution. The Constitution gives us a court of impeachment, and we are in it to day, and propose to urge the law to a conclusion, and when judgment is pronounced then will come the question whether the people will stand it or not.

Mr. Pruyn—I don't understand the gentleman as censuring the president in consequence of differing in opinion as to law?

Mr. Farnsworth—Do I not understand that the president differs with me. I cannot find in his letter to Stanton or Thomas whether he has an opinion of law one way or the other.

Mr. Farnsworth gave way to Mr. Kelly, who moved that the House take a recess for one hour and a half, and that the evening be devoted exclusively to debate. After remarks by several it was agreed that the debate be continued this evening, and resumed Monday and continued until 5 o'clock that day, when a vote on the pending proposition should be taken, each speaker being limited to thirty minutes.

The House then took a recess until half-past seven.

Evening Session.—Mr. Farnsworth concluded his speech, expressing the belief that the Senate had patriotism and firmness enough to convict Andrew Johnson and remove him from the office he so long disgraced.

Mr. Baker spoke in support of the impeachment resolution. It was plain to him that the well being of the republic made it the duty of representatives of the people to arraign the president for high crimes and misdemeanors.

Mr. Phelps spoke in opposition to the impeachment, defending the president as supporter of the Constitution he was solemnly sworn to preserve, protect and defend.

Mr. Kelly spoke in favor of impeachment. It was just that Andrew Johnson be without undue delay degraded from the high office he has disgraced.

Mr. Beck spoke against the resolution and spoke in approval of the action of the president.

Mr. Logan spoke in favor of impeachment. The case was a very plain and simple one. He believed it was the intention of Johnson to inaugurate rebellion and revolution, and intimated that he had none but Democrats to sustain him. He did not think they wanted any more fighting, for he (Johnson) would not stand by them a week.

Mr. Holman opposed the resolution, and sent to the clerk's desk and had read Washington's farewell address.

Mr. Peters made a point of order. He said the address was not pertinent to the subject before the House.

The speaker pro tem., Mr. Blaine, sustained the point, and the reading was suspended. Afterwards Mr. Peters's point of order was withdrawn and Mr. Holman was allowed to have the farewell address printed in his speech in the Globe.

Mr. Ingersoll spoke for impeachment, and presented the following telegram:

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., EXECUTIVE DEPT., February 22, 1868.

The usurpations of Andrew Johnson have created a profound sensation in the State. His last act is the act of a traitor. His treason must be checked. The duty of Congress seems plain. The people of Illinois, attached to the Union, firmly believe, demand his impeachment, and will heartily sustain such action by our Congress. The peace of the country is not to be trifled with by that presumptive demagogue. We know the national Congress will proceed wisely and cautiously, but let it proceed. Millions of loyal hearts are parting to stand by the stars and stripes. Have no fear; all will be well. Liberty and order will again triumph!

(Signed) R. J. OGLESBY.

After some further debate the House, at a quarter past 1 o'clock, took a recess until Monday morning.

Fires.

The stamped tin and japanned manufactory of A. G. Garfield, Chicago, was burned Friday night. Loss $96,000; insurance $56,000.

A fire in St. Louis, on the 23d, in the notion store of Wait, Shelby & Co., No. 117 Main street, destroyed pretty much all the stock and badly damaged the adjoining furnishing store of R. & W. Goldstein, on the north, and the hat and cap store of J. B. Coblertz & Co. on the south. Two or three other stores were also damaged. Total loss estimated at $75,000.

A fire broke out in Toledo, on the 22d, in Breed Block, on Summit street, near Perry, occupied by A. Rutherford & Co., ship chandlers; Spear, Johnson & Co., printers; W. McKinley, sail loft; and W. C. Cheeney, painter. This block, together with one adjoining, was entirely destroyed. The latter was owned by John Mulheany, and occupied by J. McKinney, clothing; A. Nesbit, groceries; and Jesse Sissons, restaurant. Total loss $60,000; insurance about $36,000. The next day a second and more disastrous fire occurred, originating in the Bronson Block, on Summit, between Madison and Jefferson streets. This block, which was the finest in the city, and but just completed, was occupied by Spencer & Simmons, wholesale coach and harness hardware dealers; R. & J. Cummings, wholesale boots and shoes, and Babbitt & Herman, wholesale millinery goods. That portion occupied by the first named firm was entirely destroyed. The rest of the structure was materially injured. The adjoining block, owned by Wm. Bolles, occupied by Secor, Berdan & Co., wholesale grocers, and Cummings, Mason & Bolles, wholesale dry goods, was badly damaged, the store of the latter firm being a complete wreck. The bulk of the stock saved is in a damaged condition. The flames also crossed the street, destroying four frame buildings occupied by F. Tillman, West Market; J. Cooper Price, gentlemen's furnishing goods; Wilkinson & Hardie, merchant tailors; Rosenbush, tobacconist; S. G. Baldwin, news depot, and Blackburn, photographer. The loss by this fire will probably reach $100,000, which is thought to be nearly covered by insurance, mostly in New York and New England companies.

The nail mill recently erected in Bellaire, Ohio, and in operation but a few weeks, was totally destroyed by fire on the 22d, supposed to be the work of an incendiary. The loss is about $70,000. Partially insured.

The large six-story malt house of John G. White & Son, in Hudson street, Albany, was totally destroyed by fire on the 22d. It contained barley, malt, etc., to the value of $126,000, which is a total loss. The building was valued at $60,000. The firm's loss is $400,000 above insurance.

A fire in East Boston on the 23d, destroyed Munson & Peterson's planing mill, with valuable stock and machinery; loss $50,000; Grurding & Stow's furniture manufactory; loss $15,000, and a block of wooden dwellings occupied by several families; loss $7000, partially insured.

FROM SHREVEPORT—*Red River Rising.*—The following dispatch was yesterday received by Captain T. H. Pitts of the steamer Starlight:

SHREVEPORT, 27th February.

The river has risen thirty (30) inches, and is still rising. Come on with the Star light.

The Starlight, we understand, will leave for Shreveport Saturday evening at 5 o'clock.

Dry goods at wholesale fifteen per cent. below New York prices by L. H. Gardner & Co., 91, 9 and 95 Common street, adjoining the City Hotel.

Fifty dollars! Sloat elliptic sewing machine triumphant. Highest premium Louisiana State Fair. For sale at 87 Canal street.

A cadaverous looking individual called the other day at a certain house in the lower portion of this county, and asked for a bucket of water. A negro brought a bucketful, and our cadaverous friend, so-called, drank it all, whereupon the negro remarked that he must be thirsty. "Yes," said the stranger, "this is the first water I've had since I was killed at Chickamauga." Julius Cæsar! but didn't the negro run!

(Winchester (Tenn.) Journal.

AUCTION SALES.

G. DE FERIET'S SALES.

POSITIVE AND UNRESERVED SALE ON ACCOUNT of Departure of Choice Furniture.

BY G. DE FERIET.

AUCTIONEER—Office and Salesrooms, 86 Bienville street.

SATURDAY, Feb. 29, 1868, at 11 o'clock A. M., on the premises, No. 188 Bourbon street, second District, on account of departure, will be sold—

The entire contents of the said premises, consisting of fine Parlor Sets, choice French Mirrors, elegant Sideboards, superb Clocks, costly and ordinary Bedsteads, Chairs, etc., etc.

—Also—

A variety of Gas Fixtures, Chandeliers, Empty Bottles, etc.

TERMS—Cash in U. S. Treasury notes.

VERY VALUABLE AND SUBSTANTIALLY BUILT THREE-STORY BRICK RESIDENCE, NO. 63 DAUPHIN STREET, BETWEEN BIENVILLE AND CONTI STREETS, AT PUBLIC AUCTION, TO EFFECT A SETTLEMENT.

BY G. DE FERIET.

AUCTIONEER—Office No. 86 Bienville street.

TUESDAY, March 3, 1868, at 12 o'clock M., at the Merchants' and Auctioneers' Exchange, Royal street, between Canal and Customhouse streets, by Public Auction, without any reserve or limit, will be sold—

A VERY VALUABLE LOT OF GROUND, situated in the Second District of this city, in the square bounded by Dauphin, Bienville, Burgundy and Conti streets, measuring 23 feet 7 inches and 4 lines front on Dauphin street, by an irregular depth of 208 feet 11 inches, the rear line measuring 19 feet 9 inches in width, together with the perpetual use of a common alley, 4 feet wide, adjoining the side line towards Bienville street, and of another common alley, 10 feet wide, running towards Bienville street.

The buildings and improvements consist of that elegant and substantially built three-story residence, No. 63 Dauphin street, with balcony in front, and containing on the first floor a fine hall, two splendid parlors, divided by sliding doors and a rear gallery; in the second story two large bedrooms and a cabinet or toilette, and in the third story a like distribution.

The wing and back building, being three-story high and also built of brick, contains on the ground floor four rooms, a pantry, coal room and a privy; in the second story four rooms, a cabinet and water closets, and in the third story also four rooms, a cabinet and privy. There is a side gallery extending the whole length of the building in the first and second stories.

The yard is neatly paved with bricks; the water is introduced, as also the gas, and the gas fixtures throughout the house belong to the property. There is a cistern on the premises and a large shed erected in the rear of the lot, which is used a wash house.

It will be borne in mind that Dauphin street is paved in a superior manner, with square blocks, the sidewalks paved with moss flags, and that the neighborhood of the property is most unexceptionable for a residence. The fact that the city cars will in a short time pass in front of the property (the contract having been sold and accepted), coupled with the proximity and easy access of the property to the markets, churches, schoolhouses, etc., certainly commends it to the serious attention of capitalists, and those desirous of purchasing a comfortable residence, which at all times can be available and made to yield a handsome rental.

The whole according to plan and survey made by Paul C. Boudousquie, engineer and architect, dated February 26th, 1868.

TERMS—One-third cash and the balance on a credit of one and two years, in notes secured by special mortgage and vendor's lien, and bearing eight per cent. interest per annum from the day of sale until final payment, the buildings to be kept insured and the policy transferred to vendor. In case of suit five per cent attorney's commissions will be added as a penal clause. The taxes of the current year to be assumed by the purchaser.

Act of sale, with U. S. Internal Revenue stamps attached, before Gottschalk & Magner, Notaries Public, at purchaser's expense.

SUCCESSION OF MRS. A. DESMAREST—NO. 30,031.

BY G. DE FERIET,

AUCTIONEER,

Office and Salesrooms 86 Bienville street.

THURSDAY, March 5, 1868, at 11 o'clock A. M., will be sold on the premises, No. — Elysian Fields street, between Morales and Goodchildren streets, Third District, by virtue of an order from the Hon. John W. Thomas, Judge of the Second District Court of New Orleans, dated February 18, 1868, the following described movables, belonging to said succession, viz:—

Chairs, Armchairs, Tables, Bedsteads, etc., etc.

TERMS—Cash in U. S. Treasury notes.

POSITIVE AND UNRESERVED SALE AT TWELVE MONTHS' CREDIT

—OF—

A HANDSOME PROPERTY SITUATED ON ELYSIAN FIELDS STREET, BETWEEN GOODCHILDREN AND MORALES STREETS.

SUCCESSION OF MRS. A. DESMAREST—NO. 30,031.

BY G. DE FERIET,

AUCTIONEER—Office, No. 86 Bienville street.

SATURDAY, March 14th, 1868, at 12 o'clock M., at the Merchants' and Auctioneers' Exchange, on Royal street, between Canal and Customhouse streets, by virtue of an order from the Honorable the Judge of the Second District Court of New Orleans, dated January 4th, 1868, at public auction, the following described real estate, belonging to said succession, will be sold, viz:—

A LOT OF GROUND, in the Third District of this city, in the square bounded by Elysian Fields, Morales, Frenchmen and Goodchildren streets, measuring 32 feet front on Elysian Fields street, by 127 feet 10 inches and 4 lines in depth, between parallel lines.

The buildings and improvements consist of a one-story Frame House containing three rooms three cabinets, a hall and a gallery in front; back Building containing one room; cistern, privies, etc.

This being the second and last auction the property will be definitively adjudicated to the highest and last bidder for whatever it will bring, at twelve months' credit; the purchaser to furnish bonds with good and solvent security to the satisfaction of the co-administrator of the estate, with special mortgage and vendor's lien on the property sold.

Act of sale, with United States internal revenue stamps attached, before Louis Duvigneaud, notary public, at the purchaser's expense; the purchaser to assume the payment of the taxes for the current year, 1868.

POSITIVE AND UNRESERVED SALE TO EFFECT A PARTITION.

SECOND DISTRICT COURT OF NEW ORLEANS—NO. 30,169.

MRS. WIDOW HENRY MULLER ET ALS VS. JOHN WITTENBURG, TUTOR.

BY G. DE FERIET,

AUCTIONEER,

Office and Salesrooms 86 Bienville street.

TUESDAY, March 17th, at 12 o'clock M., at the Merchants' and Auctioneers' Exchange, Royal street, between Canal and Customhouse streets, will be sold at public auction, by virtue of a judgment rendered by the Honorable John W. Thomas, Judge of the Second District Court of New Orleans, on the 4th of February, and signed on the 6th day of the same month and year, the following described real estate, viz—

A LOT OF GROUND in the Third District of this city, in the square bounded by Swatmen, or Dauphin, Louisa or Burgundy, and Piety streets. Said lot of ground forms the corner of Dauphin and Louisa street, and measures 31 feet 10 inches and 3 lines front on Louisa street, by 60 feet in depth and front on Dauphin street.

The buildings and improvements consist of a comfortable one-story house, containing 3 rooms, 1 cabinet, a double kitchen, privy, etc.

TERMS—Cash in U. S. Treasury notes.

Act of sale, with United States Internal Revenue stamps before A. E. Bienvenu, Notary Public, at purchaser's expense.

ATTENTION, RESTAURANT KEEPERS, PUBLIC CATERERS, ETC.

THE POPULAR AND FAR-FAMED BOUDRO RESTAURANT AND PISTOL GALLERY, SITUATED AT THE LAKE END OF THE PONTCHARTRAIN RAILROAD, AT PUBLIC AUCTION.

SUCCESSION OF L. BOUDRO—No. 20,804.

BY G. DE FERIET,

AUCTIONEER, Office and salesrooms, 86 Bienville street.

MONDAY, March 23d, 1868, at 12 o'clock M., at public auction, at the Merchants' and Auctioneers' Exchange, on Royal street, between Canal and Customhouse streets, by virtue of an order from the Hon. John W. Thomas, Judge of the Second District Court of New Orleans, dated February 11, 1868, the following described real estate will be sold viz—

1. A PARCEL OR PORTION OF GROUND, with the buildings and improvements thereon, situated in the town of Faubourg of Milneburg, at the lake end of the Pontchartrain Railroad, and measuring in American measure, 154 feet front on Elysian Fields street, the same front on Marigny street, by 285 feet 8 inches and 4 lines in depth and front on Lake Pontchartrain.

The Buildings and Improvements, well known as the farfamed "Boudro Restaurant," consist of a Frame Building, covered with slates, their ugly fin shed, containing two large parlors, two small rooms, front gallery, hall in center, large rear gallery, enclosed with Venetian blinds, and used as the dining saloon. The building has the necessary apparatus to manufacture the gas with which it is lighted, besides three large cisterns, a splendid cast iron fountain in front of the property, shelled walks, ornamental garden, privies, etc.

2. The Buildings on the Lot belonging to Mr. Philip Billman, one-half of which belong to the succession of Boudro, and which consist of a Frame House, covered with clapboards, containing two large parlors or saloons, and a large pantry, another building, containing two rooms, a cellar, a kitchen, with range, etc., three cisterns and privies; also, a building in front, well known as "The Pistol Gallery."

3. A LOT OF GROUND, in the square bounded by Elysian Fields, Marigny, Frankfort and Columbia streets, measu