Report of the Impeachment Managers

WASHINGTON, May 25.

The Committee of Managers acting under the authority of a resolution of the House of Representatives, of the 16th of May instant, to wit:

That for the further and more efficient prosecution of the impeachment of the President, the managers be directed and instructed to summon and examine witnesses under oath, to send for persons and papers, to employ a stenographer, and to appoint such agents and to take testimony, the expenses thereof to be paid from the contingent fund of the House, etc.

Have attended to their duties, and have not been able, because of the time specified in the resolution, to report to the House, having appointed a sub-committee, of which Mr. Butler was the chairman, to take testimony.

Charles W. Woodward, of Cincinnati, Ohio, appeared before the committee on Tuesday, the 19th day of May, in answer to its subpoena, and, after answering sections of his part and an admitted statement to the committee, Mr. Woodward was sworn and testified, with some very considerable delay, because of his refusal to answer certain questions, his evasions of others finally terminating in a claimed right and privilege, which he attempted to exercise by argument, until the time of the session was exhausted for the day. During that day Mr. Wooley did not finally refuse to answer any of the questions the committee put to him. He was ordered to appear before the committee again on the next day for further examination, and on that day, the 20th, for further examination.

He did not appear, however, on that day, nor until after the House had passed a resolution on Saturday, the 23rd, authorizing further business till Monday, 25th, and instructing the Speaker to issue his warrant to the Sergeant-at-Arms for contempt, in refusing to answer certain questions, and to compel appearance of Mr. Woodward before the committee, a majority of the managers being present, Mr. Boutwell, of Massachusetts, *pro tem.*, during the absence of Mr. Bingham. The questions then being about to be constituted before the whole committee, as oath was again administered to him by the chairman, and he was ordered and about to be proceeded with. After being sworn he stated that he had a statement to make, and, after anything in his testimony given on Saturday, Wooley interrupted, he did not consider that he was under oath the day before, or that he had given any testimony whatever. He was then asked if what he had stated to the committee yesterday was not true, to which he declined to answer, alleging, in substance, that the oath administered was not binding, that he was threatened, what disposition he had made of the money he had received, that he was a poor man, and that he was not able to pay the fine and imprisonment, and, finally, that he was not able to believe had been relied for the purpose of corruptly influencing the testimony of witnesses, that he refused to answer, and to every question which would tend to show what he had done with the money, the purpose for which it was obtained, by whom it was furnished, and to what extent, if any, and to whom it was paid, he declined to answer, alleging only that it was for the relief of witnesses, and, for any purpose connected with the impeachment, a question which, he stated, was not a proper one to question. Wooley's counsel assented to these views, "he is a lawyer by profession, a speculative trader, does a great deal in stock speculations in this house. In. He is a Kentuckian, considers himself a Kentucky gentleman, and he has what money he has, he has a large property, and he has a good deal of money."

The insistance of Judge Dunlavy aptly describes a witness who, under the law, refuses to give testimony to the committee that he is, by the constitution, the agent of one of the managers of the concern of that body, one who so describes himself, and who, so popularly known as the "Whisky Ring." His first appearance, as connected with the impeachment, was on the day before the close, in the oath of Mr. Ray, by a telegram to the Chairman of the committee, from the President's Secretaries, W. W. Warden, ("Data" of the Baltimore *Sun*.) In his answer to this telegram from Mr. Woodley:

EXECUTIVE MANSION, May 4.

HIRAM H. WOODLEY:

Dispatch me your opinion of the situation. Will you be on Wednesday morning.

C. H. WOODLEY.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 4, 1868.

C. H. Woodley, 704 Street, New York City:

More assured to-day than ever that the President will be acquitted.

Such is the opinion now entertained by most of the Republican leaders, even of the radical, close observers, I have heretofore informed you that they now have doubt of the result, and that this change of opinion has taken place since Friday. The only persons who assert unqualifiedly that Mr. Johnson will be convicted are those who have been of the bitter working, &c. The best information received since, and there will be no doubt about it, Johnson.

(Signed) H. W. WARDEN.

Mr. Woodley next appears about the close of the last meeting in the room of the committee, when the Chairman, Mr. Bingham, which were present Mr. Wood, Mr. B. Wolcott, Mr. Wm. Selsby, Mr. Mr. Woodley.

To appreciate the importance of this meeting, it is convenient to describe the persons present and their connection with the attitude and exterior workings of the government. As it will be observed, Warden's dispatch says the Mr. Johnson will be removed are those who know the inside workings of the government, the Secretary of the Treasury, the office of the government, and connection with all manner of operations not public, and, in the case of Mr. Wolcott, a member of the House. Mr. E. D. Webster was for a long time connected with the Solicitor's Department; is a confidential friend of the Secretary and of Mr. Wood for many years; was afterwards and is now a confidential and trusted Agent to England, and is now Deputy Surveyor of the Custom House at New York. Mr. Sheridan Shook is a brother of Colonel Wm. Shook, late of the Thirty-second District, of New York, a man of large repute in the Treasury Department, who appears and answers before the committee where such as not to change our opinion of his integrity or truthfulness. The object and purpose of this meeting not yet fully plain in the words of the witness who described it, Mr Thurlow Weed, omitting the name of the Senators of which he spoke.

Q. I hold in my hand a telegram from Charles W. Woodley, dated May 7, 1868, to Hon. Thurlow Weed, New York:

"We will the Albany party be on hand for business? Shall we be ready? Answer. C. W. WOODLEY. Willard's Hotel."

A. That is the telegram in reference to Hastings.

Q. Did you understand this telegram when you received it? Q. I understood no more than anybody else would have understood from it. I understood that it asked when Hastings would be in Washington.

Q. Nobody else would have understood that it meant Albany party except High Hastings? A. I did, because I had a previous telegram.

Q. What business did it relate to? A. I understood the Albany party was Hastings.

Q. Did you understand High Hastings? A. Yes.

Q. Why should Mr. Woodley telegraph you to send for Hastings, which you understood to be Mr. Hastings? A. A previous telegram named Mr. Hastings.

Q. From Woodley? A. I think so; I may be mistaken; at any rate, I received a telegram from him to send Hastings to Washington.

Q. That was from Woolley, was it not? *Perhaps* it was.

Q. Here is one—

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 6, 1868.

To Thurlow Weed, Astor House, New York:

Will will be Thursday. Big Hastings. Shall be there right away.

Q. Do you know Mr. Weed, Hastings? A. Having such a telegram, but I do not say that I did not recognize.

Q. Who is "he" and what was "he" to do? A. I do not know; I did not know what he was to do.

Q. Don't you understand that you have already told us Mr. Hastings was the Albany party? A. I understood that "he" was to do it. Q. Who was "he" to do it? A. I did not understand who "he" was.

Q. Did you understand that "he" meant? A. No.

Q. I want to understand who "he" was? A. I have no knowledge of who "he" was. Q. Did you understand what "he" meant if I understood anything about it.

Q. "He" will do it; what did you understand "he" was to do? A. I did not understand "he" was to do anything. Q. Did you understand "he" was to do anything? A. I do not recollect that I understood that whatever the telegram contained, it, I was to do what I understand.

Q. Then you did receive the telegram on the 6th of May? A. Yes.

Q. On the 7th of May the next? To Hon. Thurlow Weed, New York. "When will the Albany party be on hand? Shall we be ready? Answer. C. W. WOODLEY."

Q. "Did you understand to refer to Hastings, and that he was the Albany party? A. I understood so.

Q. Then on the 6th of May I find this telegram addressed to Thurlow Weed, "Go to the Astor House and get from our friend (who says that meant Hastings) a dispatch for me." Who was the friend that Sheridan Shook call on you in obedience to this telegram? A. His sister called upon me; I presume I gave the dispatch.

Q. Who was your friend, "that means you? That means me," and yet an answer to my dispatch I do not remember what answer I gave. Do you remember what you send? A. I don't think I sent any. Q. Do you remember what you send? A. I don't think I sent any, because I had not received the dispatch. Q. Was it that three subsequent Hastings came to New York, and came down to Washington?

Q. Then, on the 11th, I find Mr. Webster telegraphs to Sheridan Shook, "Tell Hastings he is a fool fact," did not he write to you the grounds upon which he got his opinion? A. I think not.

Q. Did you know in any way? A. I did; I understand the grounds upon which he gave that. Q. Was this telegraph to your friend? A. Yes, I presume so. Q. Did you understand that? A. I did; I understand the grounds upon which he gave that. Q. Was the important business that you understood you were to transact with Hastings? A. Nothing in connection with impeachment.

Q. Something important that you was to do? A. I don't know that it was.

Q. You understood the telegram you sent Mr. Shook, which you say you remembered the telegram to come or send Mr. Shook. I think I have not seen it.

Q. What was the last telegram? A. I think that you were to when you got there. A. I don't know.

Q. Was it not your understanding that you understood it related to the impeachment? I cannot say my understanding is so.

Q. You can give the explanation. How was the telegram, what was the telegram, matter, or, if you and shook were talking about it? A. I don't know.

Q. What did you remember about it? A. I don't recollect to the impeachment. I cannot say. I may understand it to be.

Q. Was that important that that you were to do when you got there? A. I don't know.

Q. What did you remember about it? A. I don't recollect to the impeachment. I cannot say. I may understand it to be.

Q. You can give the explanation. How was the telegram, what was the telegram, matter, or, if you and shook were talking about it? A. I don't know.

Q. What did you remember about it? A. I don't recollect to the impeachment. I cannot say. I may understand it to be.

Q. Was that important that that you were to do when you got there