

Several communications, and other matters are excluded by length of President's answer to articles of Impeachment. We published the articles.

The Spring Elections.

The elections all over the State, as well as elsewhere else, show large Democratic gains, at every point where party lines are drawn. Harrisburg and other cities and principal Democratic towns give unprecedented majorities; while many doubtful and heretofore Radical strongholds, are carried to the right side by the popular current.

In view of impending impeachment, and the Presidential election, there can be no doubt as to what these results portend—the impeachment of Congress, and the election of a Democratic President.

Impeachment, &c.

The President's answer was read to the Court on the 23d, and clearly shows there is no just cause for proceedings against him. Thirty days time was asked for, to prepare for trial, but refused by the Radicals, who, having resolved on conviction, insist upon closing the farce before reason and justice shall supercede party passion. The managers on the part of the House, filed their replication on the 24th; it being a mere contradiction of the answer. The trial was to begin on the 30th—yesterday.

The question with the Radicals is not: Has the President committed high crimes that warrant his removal? But it is this: Can we not gain, politically, by deposing the President; and can we control two-thirds of the Senators to vote for conviction?

The conspirators consider it a mere party issue, and the bolder of them admit it; others doubt the expediency; and if the President is not deposed it will be because some Republican Senators fear public opinion too much to allow a party caucus programme to draw them into open revolution. So far, about a dozen of them hesitate, and vote for a little time; but it remains to be shown that their party passions are not stronger than all sense of duty and justice.

The President vetoed the act denying to the Supreme Court jurisdiction in habeas corpus cases; but it has been passed over the veto by party majorities; the object being to prohibit the court from deciding questions that may show the unconstitutionality of reconstruction acts.

The Senate has not taken final action on the amended bill to exempt certain articles from taxation. The bill does not affect any articles made and sold in March.

Legislation will be suspended during impeachment proceedings.

in his political relations as President of the United States to the people of the United States, in the exercise of such freedom of opinion and freedom of speech in the same manner, form and effect as he has in this behalf stated the same in his answer to the said tenth article, and with the same effect as if he here repeated the same.

And he further claims and insists, as in answer to said tenth article he has claimed and insisted, that he is not subject to question of impeachment and incalculable in any form or manner, or concerning such rights of freedom of opinion or freedom of speech, or his said exercise thereof. And this respondent further denies that on the 21st day of February, 1866, or at any other time, at the city of Washington, in pursuance of any such declaration as in that behalf in the said 11th article alleged, or otherwise, he did, unlawfully and in disregard of the requirement of the Constitution that he should take care that the laws be faithfully executed, attempt to prevent the execution of an act entitled "an act regulating the tenure of certain civil offices," passed March 2, 1867, by unlawfully devising or contriving, or attempting to devise or contrive measures by which he should prevent Edwin M. Stanton from forthwith resuming the functions of Secretary for the department of war; or by unlawfully devising or contriving, or attempting to devise or contrive means to prevent the execution of an act entitled "an act making appropriations for the support of the army of the army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1868, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1867; or to prevent the execution of an act entitled "an act to provide for the more efficient government of the Rebel States," passed March 21, 1867.

And this respondent further answering to the said 11th article says, that he has in his answer to the 1st article set forth in detail the acts, steps and proceedings done and taken by this respondent, and towards or in the matter of the suspension or removal of the said Edwin M. Stanton in or from the office of Secretary for the department of war, with the times, modes, circumstances, intents, views, purposes and opinions of obligation and duty under and with such acts, steps and proceedings were done and taken; and he makes answer to the 11th article of the matter in his answer to the 1st article, pertaining to the suspension or removal of said Edwin M. Stanton, to the same intent and effect as if they were here repeated and set forth.

And this respondent further answering the said 11th article denies that by means or reason of anything in said article alleged, this respondent as President of the United States, did, on the 21st day of February 1866, or any other day or time commit, or that he was guilty of a high misdemeanor in office, and this respondent further answering the said 11th article, says that the same and the matter therein contained do not charge or allege the commission of any act whatever by this respondent in his office of President of the United States, nor the omission by this respondent of any act of official obligation or duty in his office of President of the United States, nor does said article nor matters there contained name, designate or describe any act or mode or form of device, contrivance or means, or of attempt at device, contrivance or means, whereby this respondent can know or understand what act, or mode, or form of attempt, device contrivance or means are imputed to or charged against this respondent, in his office of President of the United States, or intended so to be, or whereby this respondent can more fully or definitely make answer unto said article than he here does.

And this respondent in submitting to this honorable court this his answer to the articles of impeachment exhibited against him, respectfully reserves the right to amend and add to the same from time to time, as may become necessary or proper, and when and as such necessity and propriety may appear.

ANDREW JOHNSON, HENRY STANBURY, B. R. CURTIS, THOS. A. NELSON, WM. M. EVARTS, W. S. GROESBECK, of Counsel

SPECIAL NOTICES.

ABEL TURRELL is continually receiving new supplies of Genuine Drugs and Medicines, which will be sold as low as any other Store in Montrose.

AMONG THE MANY RESTORATIVES which nature has supplied to relieve the afflictions of humanity, there is no more favorite one for a certain class of diseases than the "medicinal gum" of the Wild Cherry Tree; but however valuable it is, its power to heal, to soothe, to relieve and cure, is enhanced tenfold by scientific and judicious combination with other ingredients, in themselves of equal worth. This happy mingling exists to a remarkable degree in Dr. Wistar's Balsam of Wild Cherry.

Dr. Wistar's Balsam of Wild Cherry, whose value in curing, coughs, colds, bronchitis, whooping cough, croup, asthma, Pulmonary affection, and incipient consumption is testifiable.

GRACE'S CELEBRATED SALVE CURES in a very short time cuts, burns, scalds, sores, bruises, eruptions, erysipelas, salt rheum, ringworm, chapped hands, boils, frozen limbs, felons, chilblains, &c. It is prompt in action, removes pain at once, and reduces the most angry looking swellings, and inflammations, as if by magic, thus affording relief and a complete cure.

And this respondent, further answering the tenth article and the specifications thereof, says that at St. Louis, in the state of Missouri, and on the 8th day of September, in the year 1865, he was attended by a numerous assemblage of his fellow citizens, and in deference and obedience to their call, and demand, he addressed them upon matters of public and political consideration, and this respondent believes that said occasion and address are referred to in the third specification of the tenth article; but this respondent does not admit that the passage therein set forth as if extracts from a speech of this respondent on said occasion, correctly or justly present his speech or address upon said occasion; but on the contrary, this respondent demands and insists that if this honorable court shall deem the said article and the said third specification thereof to contain allegation of matter cognizable by this honorable court as a high misdemeanor in office, within the intent and meaning of the Constitution of the United States, and shall receive or allow proof in support of the same, that proof shall be required to be made of the actual speech and address of this respondent on said occasion, which this respondent denies that the said article and specification contains, or correctly or justly represents.

And this respondent further answering the tenth article, protesting that he has not been unfaithful, of the high duties of his office, or of the harmony or courtesies which ought to exist and be maintained between the executive and legislative branches of the government of the United States; denies that he has ever intended or designed to set aside the rightful authority or powers of Congress; or attempted to bring into disgrace, ridicule, hatred, contempt or reproach, the Congress of the United States, or either branch or to impair or destroy the regard or respect of all or any of the good people of the United States, for the Congress or the rightful power thereof or to excite the odium or resentment of all or any of the good people of the United States against Congress and the laws by it duly and constitutionally enacted.

This respondent further says, that at all times he has, in his official acts as President, recognized the authority of the several Congresses of the United States as constituted and organized during his administration of the office of President of the United States; and this respondent, further answering, says that he has from time to time, under his Constitutional right and duty as President of the United States, communicated to Congress his views and opinions in regard to such acts or resolutions thereof, as being submitted to him as President of the United States, in pursuance of the Constitution, seemed to this respondent to require such communication; and he has from time to time, in the exercise of that freedom of speech which belongs to him as a citizen of the United States, and in his political relations as President of the United States to the people of the United States as upon fit occasions a duty of the highest obligation expressed by his fellow citizens his views and opinions, respecting them as such, and proceedings of Congress, and that in such address to his fellow citizens, and in such his communications to Congress he has expressed his views, opinions and judgment of and concerning the actual constitution of the two houses of Congress, without representation therein of certain states of the Union, and of the effect that in wisdom and justice, in the opinion and judgment of this respondent, Congress in its legislation and proceedings should be given to this political circumstance, and whatsoever he has thus communicated to Congress, or addressed to his fellow citizens or any assemblage thereof, this respondent says was and is within and according to his right and privileges as an American citizen, and his right and duty as President of the United States; and this respondent, not waiving or at all disparaging his right of freedom of opinion and of freedom of speech, as hereinbefore or hereinafter more particularly set forth, but claiming and insisting upon the same.

Further answering the said tenth article, says that the views and opinions expressed by this respondent in his said addresses to the assemblies of his fellow citizens, as in said article or in this answer thereto mentioned, are, not, and were not intended to be other or different from those expressed by him in his communications to Congress; that the eleven States lately in insurrection never had ceased to be states of the Union, and that they were then entitled to representation in Congress by loyal representatives and Senators, as fully as the other States of the Union, and that, consequently, the Congress as then constituted was not, in fact, a Congress of all the States, but a Congress of only a part of the states. This respondent, always protesting against the unauthorized exclusion therefrom of the said eleven States, nevertheless gave his assent to all laws passed by said Congress, which did not, in his opinion and judgment, violate the Constitution, exercising his constitutional authority of returning bills to said Congress with his objections, when they appeared to him to be unconstitutional or inexpedient.

But further this respondent has also expressed the opinion, both in his communications to Congress and in his addresses to the people, that the policy adopted by Congress in reference to the States lately in insurrection did not tend to peace and harmony and union, but on the contrary, did tend to disunion and the permanent disruption of the states, and that in following its said policy laws had been passed by Congress in violation of the fundamental principles of the government, and which tended to consolidation and despotism, and such being his deliberate opinions, he would have felt himself unfaithful of the high duties of his office if he had failed to express them in his communications to Congress or in his address to the

the said article nine lays no foundation whatever for the conclusion stated in the said article, that the respondent, by reason of the allegation therein contained, was guilty of a high misdemeanor in office.

In reference to the statement made by Gen. Emory that this respondent had approved of said act of Congress containing the section referred to, the respondent admits that his formal approval was given to said act, but accompanied the same by the following message addressed and sent with the act to the House of Representatives, in which the said act originated, and from which it came to respondent:—

"To the House of Representatives:—The act entitled 'Act making appropriations for the support of the army for the year ending June 30, 1868, and for other purposes,' contains provisions to which I must call attention. These provisions are contained in the second section, which, in certain cases, virtually deprives the President of his constitutional functions as Commander in chief of the army. And in the sixth section, which denies to ten States of the Union their constitutional right to protect themselves in any emergency, by means of their own militia. These provisions are out of place in an appropriation act, but I am compelled to defend these necessary appropriations if I withhold my signature to the act. Pressed by these considerations, I feel constrained to return the bill with my signature, but to accompany it with my earnest protest against the sections which I have indicated.

"WASHINGTON, D. C., March 22, 1867." Respondent, therefore, did no more than to express to said Emory the same opinion which he had so expressed to the House of Representatives.

ANSWER TO ARTICLE 10.

And in answer to the tenth article and specifications thereof, the respondent says that on the 14th and 15th days of August in the year 1866, a political convention of delegates, from all or most of the States and territories of the Union, was held in the city of Philadelphia, under the name and style of the "National Union Convention," for the purpose of maintaining and advancing certain political views and opinions before the people of the United States, and for their support and adoption in the exercise of the constitutional suffrage in the elections of representatives and delegates in Congress, which were soon to occur in many of the States and territories of the Union, which said Convention in the course of its proceedings, and in furtherance of the objects of the same, and adopted a declaration of principles, and an address to the people of the United States, and appointed a committee of two of its members from each state, and of one from each territory, and one from the District of Columbia, to wait upon the President of the United States, and present to him a copy of the proceedings of the Convention. That on the 15th day of said month of August this committee waited upon the President of the United States at the executive mansion, and was received by him in one of the rooms thereof, and by their chairman, the Hon. Reverdy Johnson, then and now a Senator of the United States, acting and speaking in their behalf, presented a copy of the proceedings of the Convention, and addressed the President of the United States in a speech, of which a copy, according to a published report of the same, and as the respondent believes, substantially a correct report, is hereto annexed, as a part of this answer, and marked, exhibit C.

That thereupon in reply to the address of said committee by their chairman, this respondent addressed the said committee so waiting upon him in one of the rooms of the executive mansion, and this respondent believes that this, his address to said committee, is the occasion referred to in the first specification of the tenth article; but this respondent does not admit that the passage therein set forth, as if extracts from a speech or address of this respondent upon said occasion, correctly or justly present his speech or address upon said occasion; but on the contrary this respondent demands and insists that if this honorable court shall deem the said article and the said first specification thereof to contain allegation of matter cognizable by this honorable court, as a high misdemeanor in office, within the intent and meaning of the Constitution of the United States, and shall receive or allow proof in support of the same, that proof shall be required to be made of the actual speech and address of this respondent on said occasion, which this respondent denies that said article and specification contains, or correctly or justly represents.

And this respondent, further answering the tenth article and the specifications thereof, says that at Cleveland, in the state of Ohio, on the 3d day of September, in the year 1866, he was attended by a large assemblage of his fellow citizens, and in deference and obedience to their call and demand, he addressed them upon matters of public and political consideration, and this respondent believes that said occasion and address are referred to in the second specification of the tenth article; but this respondent does not admit that the passages, therein set forth, as if extracts from a speech of this respondent on said occasion, correctly or justly present his speech or address upon said occasion, but, on the contrary, this respondent demands and insists that if this honorable court shall deem the said article, and the said second specification thereof to contain allegation of matter cognizable by this honorable court as a high misdemeanor in office, within the intent and meaning of the Constitution of the United States, and shall receive or allow proof in support of the same, that proof shall be required to be made of the actual speech and address of this respondent on said occasion, which this respondent denies that said article and specification contains, or correctly or justly represents.

(Continued from 4th page.) ion before the Supreme Court of the United States, as has been heretofore set forth, and he prays the same benefit from his answer in the premises as if the same were here again repeated at length.

ANSWER TO ARTICLE 9. And for answer to the said article, the respondent states, that on the said 22d day of February, 1868, the following note was addressed to the said Emory by the private Secretary of respondent:—

Executive Mansion, Washington, D.C., Feb. 22, 1868. General:—The President desires me to say that he will be pleased to have you call upon him as early as possible.

Respectfully and truly yours, Wm. G. Moore, U. S. Army. General Emory called at the Executive mansion according to this request. The object of the respondent was to be advised by General Emory, commandant of the department of Washington, what changes had been made in the military affairs of the department. Respondent had been informed that various changes had been made, which in no wise had been brought to his notice, or reported to him from the department of war, or from any other quarter had he obtained the facts. Gen. Emory had explained in detail the changes which had taken place. Said Emory called the attention of respondent to a general order which he referred to, and which this respondent then sent for. When it was produced it was as follows:—

War Department, Adj. Gen. Office, Washington, D.C., March 14, 1867. General Orders, No. 17:—

The following acts of Congress are published for the information and government of all concerned:—

Public, No. 63. To make appropriations for the support of the army for the year ending June 30, 1868, and for other purposes.

Section 2. And be it further enacted, That the head quarters of the General of the United States Army, shall be at the city of Washington, and all orders and instructions relating to military operations issued by the President or Secretary of war shall be issued through the Gen. of the army, and in case of his inability, through the next in rank. The Gen. of the Army shall not be removed, suspended, or relieved from command, or assigned to duty elsewhere than at the said headquarters, except at his own request, without the previous approval of the Senate, and any orders or instructions relating to military operations issued contrary to the requirements of this section shall be null and void; and any officer who shall issue orders or instructions contrary to the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor in office, and any officer of the army who shall transmit, convey, or obey any orders or instructions issued contrary to the provisions of this section, knowing that such orders were so issued, shall be liable to impeachment for not less than two or more than twenty years upon conviction thereof in any court of competent jurisdiction. Approved March 2, 1867.

By order of the Secretary of War, E. D. TOWNSEND, Assistant Adjutant Gen.

Official—Assistant Adjutant General, A. G. O., No. 172.

General Emory not only called the attention of respondent to this order but to the fact that it was in conformity with a section contained in an appropriation act passed by Congress. Respondent, after reading the order, observed, "this is not in accordance with the Constitution of the United States, which makes me Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, or of the language of the commission which you hold." General Emory then stated that this law had met respondent's approval. Respondent then said in reply in substance, "Am I to understand that the President of the United States cannot give an order but through the General in Chief or Gen. Grant?" Gen. Emory again reiterated the statement that it had met respondent's approval, and that it was the opinion of some of the leading lawyers of the country that this order was constitutional, with some further conversation. Respondent then inquired the names of the lawyers who had given the opinion, and he mentioned the names of two. Respondent then said that the object of the law was very evident, referring to the clause in the appropriation act upon which the order purported to be based. This according to respondent's recollection, was the substance of the conversation had with General Emory.

Respondent denies that any allegations in the said article of any instructions or declarations given to the said Emory, then or at any other time, contrary to or in addition to what is hereinbefore set forth, are true. Respondent denies that in the said conversation with the said Emory he had any other intent than to express the opinion then given to the said Emory; nor did he then or at any time request or order the said Emory to disobey any law or any order issued in conformity with any law, nor intend to offer any inducements to the said Emory to violate any law. What this respondent then said to General Emory was simply the expression of an opinion which he then fully believed to be sound, and which he yet believes to be so—that by the express provisions of the Constitution, this respondent, as President, is made the Commander in chief of the armies of the United States, and as such he is to be respected; and that his orders, whether issued through the General in chief or by any other channel or communication, are entitled to respect and obedience; and that such constitutional power cannot be taken from him by virtue of any act of Congress. Respondent, doth therefore deny that by the expression of such opinion he did commit or was guilty of a high misdemeanor in office; and this respondent doth further say that