

Pittsburgh Gazette.

VOLUME LXXXIII.

PITTSBURGH, THURSDAY, APRIL 16, 1868.

NUMBER 90.

SECOND EDITION.

FOUR O'CLOCK A. M.

FORTIETH CONGRESS.

The Impachment Trial—Mr. Stanbery Not Present—The President's Message to the Senate, on the Subject of the Disapproval by the Senate of His Action in the Stanton Matter, Offered in Evidence—It is Ruled Out by the Chief Justice—The Ruling Sustained Without a Vote.

(By Telegraph to the Pittsburgh Gazette.)

WASHINGTON, April 15, 1868.

SENATE.

After reading the Journal, Senator ED-

MUNDS offered an amendment to Senator

Sumner's order, so that additional argu-

ments of Managers shall be filed before the

conclusion of the closing argument.

Senator CONNELL offered a substitute,

allowing as many to speak on both sides as

desired, provided only four days be consumed

by each side. Lost—19 to 27.

Senator DOOLITTLE offered an amend-

ment that the opposing counsel speak alter-

nate days until all have finished.

Senator DRAKE moved to postpone the

subject indefinitely. Agreed—34 to 15.

Mr. EVARTS said although Mr. Stan-

bery was not yet able to be present, yet

desiring to avoid delay, counsel would pro-

ceed to offer documentary evidence to-day,

and hoped they could to-morrow go on with

oral testimony.

D. Clarke, Executive Clerk of the Senate,

verified the message nominating Thomas

Ewing as Secretary of War, received Feb-

ruary 22d.

Mr. EVARTS then offered a message,

dated February 24th, in response to Senate

resolution concerning the removal of Stan-

ton.

Mr. BUTLER objected. He said the ar-

ticle of proof is not objected to, but the

proof itself is for a very plain reason. This

message was sent after the President was

impeached by the House, and of course his

declarations put in testimony to be put in

after his impeachment, whether directed to

the Senate or anybody else, cannot be given

in evidence. The exact order of time may

not be in the minds of the Senate. I will

therefore, state it. On the 21st of February

a resolution was offered in the House looking

to the impeachment of the President, and

on the 22d of February the Committee reported

and the House actually voted. Then

intervened Saturday, the 23d. Any message

sent on the 24th of February must have

been known to the President to be after his

impeachment.

Mr. CURTIS. It will be recollected the

Hon. Managers put in evidence a resolution

of the Senate to which this message is

in response. The question is whether

the Managers can put in evidence a resolve

of the Senate, transmitted to the President,

with reference to the removal of Stan-

ton, and refuse to read a reply, which the

President made to that resolve.

Mr. BUTLER. I have only to say that

this is an argument to relieve and not to

convict. I will my learned friends oppose

that, and I will say that they have read of a

case, after the indictment of a criminal,

where, after the indictment of a criminal,

put in evidence his statement of his own

case? If so, where does that right

cease? We put in evidence a resolution

of the Senate, and we are not asked

to determine upon, and not we are

asked to admit the criminal's declaration

after that day. I only ask the Senate to

consider it as a precedent hereafter, as well

as being a great wrong upon the

part of the President, after impeachment,

the President can send in a message which

shall be taken as evidence.

Mr. EVARTS. The learned Managers ask

whether we dare to do something. We

have not been in the habit of considering a

measure for the conducting of the trial

disposition to be a question of daring.

We are not in the habit of applying such

epithets to opponents, nor in the habit

hitherto of receiving them. The measure

of duty of counsel is the measure which

we shall strive to obey, and not the mea-

sure of daring, if for no other reason than

that on questions of law, of fact, and of

evidence we may perhaps expect some su-

periority, but not on measures of daring.

[Laughter.] Is the learned Managers ask

whether we dare to do something. We

have not been in the habit of considering a

measure for the conducting of the trial

disposition to be a question of daring.

the resolution of the Senate would have

been a great deal better than pages of argu-

ment. I will not use the word "dare," for

I know that counsel would dare to do all that

good lawyers would dare to do in fact, but

their client but I will say that the gentle-

man has not shown any sound reason on

which this can be done.

The CHIEF JUSTICE directed the coun-

sel for the President to put in writing what

they proposed to offer.

While they were engaged in doing so,

Mr. BUTLER said that to prevent mistake

he had sent the Clerk of the House for the

record of the proceedings on impeach-

ment.

Mr. McPherson, Clerk of the House, hav-

ing come in soon after and handed the

House Journal to Mr. Butler.

Mr. BUTLER said—I find upon examina-

tion that the state of the record is this: On

the 21st of February the resolution of im-

peachment was passed and referred to a

Committee. On the 22d the Committee re-

ported and that report was debated through-

out the 23d and into Monday the 24th, and

the actual vote taken on Monday the 24th.

Mr. EVARTS. Late in the afternoon, at

5:30 o'clock, so I was correct.

Mr. BINGHAM. I do not state further

reasons, for we insist upon this objection.

The House, as appears by the Journal, voted

on the 24th of February that Andrew John-

son be impeached of high crimes and mis-

conduct. On the day preceding the 23d of

February, it appears the Senate received

from the House a message of the Presi-

dent, in which he made the removal of

War E. M. Stanton, then Secretary of War.

By previous action of the Senate, the Sen-

ate, in which he made the removal of

War E. M. Stanton, then Secretary of War.

By previous action of the Senate, the Sen-

ate, in which he made the removal of

War E. M. Stanton, then Secretary of War.

your time. Yet he has not hesitated to

say, and again to repeat, that there is no

color of justification for the attempt of the

law of the land enjoins upon the Senate

the duty to act upon the report of the Presi-

dent, and that, upon the evidence ac-

companied it, in pursuance of the require-

ments of the second section of the Tenth

article of the Constitution, the President

is bound to remove him, and that, in ac-

cordance with the law, the Senate con-

cluded that the President's removal was

unlawful. The law, by every in-

terpretation, provides that if the Senate

removes him, it shall notify the Secretary

of War that he may, in obedience to the

express requirement of the act, forth-

with remove him in execution of the

act, and that the President is bound to

obey the law. The law, by every in-

terpretation, provides that if the Senate

removes him, it shall notify the Secretary

of War that he may, in obedience to the

express requirement of the act, forth-

with remove him in execution of the

act, and that the President is bound to

obey the law. The law, by every in-

terpretation, provides that if the Senate

removes him, it shall notify the Secretary

of War that he may, in obedience to the

express requirement of the act, forth-

with remove him in execution of the

act, and that the President is bound to

obey the law. The law, by every in-

terpretation, provides that if the Senate

removes him, it shall notify the Secretary

of War that he may, in obedience to the

express requirement of the act, forth-

with remove him in execution of the

act, and that the President is bound to

obey the law. The law, by every in-

terpretation, provides that if the Senate

removes him, it shall notify the Secretary

of War that he may, in obedience to the

express requirement of the act, forth-

with remove him in execution of the

act, and that the President is bound to

obey the law. The law, by every in-

terpretation, provides that if the Senate

removes him, it shall notify the Secretary

of War that he may, in obedience to the

express requirement of the act, forth-

with remove him in execution of the

act, and that the President is bound to

obey the law. The law, by every in-

terpretation, provides that if the Senate

removes him, it shall notify the Secretary

of War that he may, in obedience to the

express requirement of the act, forth-

with remove him in execution of the

act, and that the President is bound to

obey the law. The law, by every in-

terpretation, provides that if the Senate

removes him, it shall notify the Secretary

of War that he may, in obedience to the

express requirement of the act, forth-

with remove him in execution of the

act, and that the President is bound to

obey the law. The law, by every in-

terpretation, provides that if the Senate

removes him, it shall notify the Secretary

of War that he may, in obedience to the

express requirement of the act, forth-

with remove him in execution of the

act, and that the President is bound to

obey the law. The law, by every in-

terpretation, provides that if the Senate

removes him, it shall notify the Secretary

of War that he may, in obedience to the

express requirement of the act, forth-

with remove him in execution of the

act, and that the President is bound to

obey the law. The law, by every in-

terpretation, provides that if the Senate

removes him, it shall notify the Secretary

of War that he may, in obedience to the

express requirement of the act, forth-

with remove him in execution of the

act, and that the President is bound to

obey the law. The law, by every in-

HAYTI REVOLUTION.

Bloody Battle Fought—Government Troops

Defeated with Heavy Loss—Towns Cap-

tured by Insurgents.

New York, April 15.—The Herald's spe-

cial from Hayti, dated the 4th, says: A

bloody battle has taken place near Gon-

zales. The Government forces amounted

to six hundred men, with two cannon.

The Cacos numbered four thousand.

The latter lay in ambush, and after the town

of Gonzales, Valerio, Ferche, Pagnon, Raphael

and Michel. They captured many prison-

ers, and the enemy's cannon. The com-

manding General, Victorin Chevalier, is

missing. General Augustus Montes, brother

of the late General Leon Montes, re-

viewed the Cacos two days afterwards, and

found them in excellent order. Their

headquarters are at the town of Michel,

covering the most important points. A de-

cisive struggle is at hand. It is expected

that a change in the Government will take

place after Easter.

President Solano's exploits have been

exaggerated. His reported capture of

Fort Ciboero is doubted. Solano

was, when last heard from, was at Gon-

zales, making a tour before returning to

the capital. Reliable advices inform us

that there was an open rebellion at Gon-

zales, but we have no details.

St. Domingue advises that the United

States steamer Saco had arrived. Saco

was expected within a week. Thirty pri-

soners were taken, and the sea route was

not free from the American Consulate.

A great tidal wave had visited Guad-

aloupe, smashing a British steamer, and

the waves at Guadaloupe were similar

to the one that rushed into St. Thomas

harbor last fall, but larger. The sea

exploded with a fearful concussion. The

engine house was badly demolished, and

burning fragments were thrown in every

direction. The crew, who were at work at

Oil Region Items.

—A Young Men's Christian Association

has been organized at Oil City.

—The freight house of the Oil Creek and

Allegheny River Railway, at Shafter, is be-

ing torn down and will be removed to Mil-

ler Farm.

—An act has passed the Legislature au-

thorizing the Reno Company to issue pre-

ferred stock, and to acquire, hold, manage,