

BY TELEGRAPH.

IMPORTANT FROM WASHINGTON.

FAILURE OF IMPEACHMENT!

Grand Rally of the Radicals on the Eleventh Article.

THE DECISIVE VOTE.

GUILTY! 35; NOT GUILTY! 19.

THE REQUISITE TWO-THIRDS FAIL TO VOTE FOR CONVICTION.

HOW THE DOUBTFUL SENATORS STOOD.

THE FEELING IN WASHINGTON.

WASHINGTON, Saturday, May 16-1 P. M.

The Capitol was again thronged this morning, long before the hour at which the High Court was to meet. There was less excitement, however, than on Tuesday last, owing to the impression generally prevalent that the Radicals intended to dodge a vote by postponing the further consideration of the impeachment case until after the Chicago Convention. The result, however, showed that they had determined upon a different line of tactics.

Immediately after the High Court was called to order by Chief Justice Chase, Senator Williams moved that the sense of the court should be first taken on the eleventh article of impeachment. This motion developed the cunning programme which had been determined on in a secret caucus of the impeachers. They had ascertained that the eleventh article, though intrinsically the weakest of all, was likely to rally more votes in favor of conviction than any other; hence their resolve to test their strength on that article first, and in case of a failure to convict, to adjourn the case, and thus to hold their verdict on the remaining ten articles in *terrorem* over the President, besides taking the chances of any recessions of strength that the admission of Radical senators from the reconstructed States may bring to their ranks. The large majority which the Radicals hold in the Senate enabled them easily to carry out this scheme.

The vote was taken upon Senator Williams' motion and resulted—Yeas 34, nays 19; Mr. Wade voting in the affirmative.

The eleventh article upon which the vote was thus ordered to be taken reads as follows:

ARTICLE XI.

That said Andrew Johnson, President of the United States, unmindful of the high duties of his office and of his oath of office, and in disregard of the Constitution and laws of the United States, did heretofore, to wit: on the 18th day of August, 1868, at the City of Washington, and the District of Columbia, by public speech, declare and affirm in substance that the Thirty-ninth Congress of the United States was not a Congress of the United States authorized by the Constitution to exercise legislative power under the same; but, on the contrary, was a Congress of only part of the States, thereby denying and intending to deny that the legislation of said Congress was valid or obligatory upon him, the said Andrew Johnson, except in so far as he saw fit to approve the same, and also thereby denying and intending to deny the power of the said Thirty-ninth Congress to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States; and, in pursuance of said declaration, the said Andrew Johnson, President of the United States, afterwards, to wit: on the 21st day of February, 1868, at the City of Washington, in the District of Columbia, did unlawfully and in disregard of the requirements of the constitution, that he should ascertain 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 and contriving, and attempting to devise and contrive, means by which he should prevent Edwin M. Stanton from forthwith resuming the functions of the office of Secretary for the Department of War, notwithstanding the refusal of the Senate to concur in the suspension therefor made by said Andrew Johnson, of said Edwin M. Stanton, from said office of Secretary for the Department of War, and also by further unlawfully devising and contriving, and attempting to devise and contrive means then and there to prevent the execution of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1868, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1867, and also to prevent the execution of an act entitled "An act to provide for the more efficient government of the rebel States," passed March 2, 1867; whereby the said Andrew Johnson, President of the United States, did then, to wit: on the 21st day of February, 1867, at the City of Washington, commit and was guilty of a high misdemeanor in office.

The President, in his answer to this article, it will be remembered, denied that he had declared or affirmed that the Thirty-ninth Congress was an illegal Congress, or that he had made any of the allegations charged in the article. He had said nothing of the competency of said Congress to pass laws while Southern States were unrepresented. Lastly, he denied that he had attempted to defer the operation of the Reconstruction laws, or any other law of Congress.

Chief Justice Chase announced that, in accordance with the order of the court, he would now proceed to take the sense of its members upon the eleventh article of impeachment. The clerk was directed to report the article, and the names of the several senators were then called out in alphabetical order, the Chief Justice addressing to each the question:

Mr. Senator, how say you, is the respondent, Andrew Johnson, President of the United States, guilty of a high misdemeanor or crime, as charged in this article?

As the members of the High Court severally responded guilty or not guilty, a breathless silence prevailed in the hall, and a thousand pencils anxiously recorded the character of

each vote. The result of the vote was as follows:

VOTING GUILTY.

Benjamin F. Wade, O. Henry B. Anthony, R. L. Simon Cameron, Penn. A. G. Catell, N. Y. Zach. Chandler, Mich. Cornelius Cole, Cal. Roscoe Conkling, N. Y. John C. Fremont, Cal. H. W. Corbett, Oregon. Aaron B. Drake, Mo. G. F. Edmunds, Vt. O. S. Ferry, Conn. John Sherman, O. Wm. Sprague, R. I. John M. Thayer, Neb. G. H. Williams, Oregon. D. L. Morton, Minn.

VOTING NOT GUILTY.

Wm. P. Fessenden, Me. J. A. Bayard, Del. C. B. Buckner, Penn. J. S. Fowler, Tenn. (Rep.) Gerrit Davis, Ky. J. Trumbull, Mo. (Rep.) J. W. Grimes, Iowa (Rep.) J. R. Henderson, Mo. (Rep.) E. G. Ross, Ka. (Rep.) P. G. Van Winkle, W. V. W. T. Wiley, W. V. (Rep.) Geo. T. Vickers, Md.—19.

The announcement by the Chief Justice that the vote had resulted in the acquittal of the President as to the eleventh article, two-thirds of the court not voting in favor of conviction, was received without any demonstration of applause, though exultation was visible on the countenances of the President's friends in the galleries and on the floor.

The result hinged chiefly upon the vote of Senator Ross, of Kansas, who had given no indications whatever up to the last moment of his views and intentions.

After the buzz which succeeded the vote had subsided, Senator Williams rose, and moved that the Court adjourn to the 26th of May.

The Chief Justice ruled that the Senate was now in process of carrying out the order to proceed to vote upon the articles of impeachment, and that no motion was now in order while that was pending.

Senator Conner appealed from this decision, and the question being put to the Court, the decision of the Chief Justice was overruled by a vote of yeas 24; nays 30.

The question then coming up on the motion to adjourn, Senator Henderson moved to amend by striking out the 26th of May and inserting the 1st of July. The amendment was not agreed to—Yeas 20; nays 34. The question recurring on the motion of Senator Williams, it was agreed to—Yeas 32; nays 21. So the High Court adjourned until next Tuesday week.

To-day's proceedings, it is admitted on all hands, had been a splendid victory for the President. The impeachment managers had counted confidently upon Senator Ross voting for conviction, and their disappointment is so great as to render them desperate. They now say that the President must be turned out, by fair means or foul, before the close of this month.

On the other hand, the President's friends are delighted and encouraged at the result, and declare that he has nothing to fear in the future—his opponents having done their worst to-day.

PROCEEDINGS IN CONGRESS.

WASHINGTON, May 16.—IN THE SENATE the Judiciary Committee reported without amendment a House bill for the admission of Arkansas, which lies over under the rule.

The Omnibus Admission bill from the House of Representatives was referred to the Judiciary Committee.

After the adjournment of the High Court, Mr. Wade resumed the chair. After a long debate, a joint resolution proposing to adjourn to the 26th was negatived, and the Senate adjourned as usual.

The House refused to entertain a resolution appointing a committee of inquiry in reference to the conduct of the Missouri delegation.

A resolution was adopted that for the further and more efficient prosecution of the impeachment of the President, the managers be instructed to summon and examine witnesses under oath, to send for persons and papers, to employ a stenographer, and to appoint subcommittees to take testimony, the expenses thereof to be paid from the contingent fund of the House. The House then adjourned.

WASHINGTON, May 17.—The resolutions passed by the House, setting the impeachment managers to work again, had the following preamble:

"Whereas, information has come to the managers which seems to them to furnish probable cause to believe that improper or corrupt influences have been used to influence the determination of the Senate upon the articles of impeachment exhibited to the Senate by the House of Representatives against the President of the United States, &c."

I have to inform you that Mr. Fenton has with-drawn from the further pursuit of the nomination for Vice-President of the United States at the Chicago Convention. The same authority says Mr. Fenton does this with the understanding that Mr. Wade will give him a position in his cabinet in case he (Wade) becomes President. It is also stated that Mr. Wade has positively promised Forney the Secretaryship of the Treasury and General Slicks the War Department.

IMPORTANT LETTER FROM SENATOR HENDERSON ON THE VERDICT.

The Missouri delegation in the House of Representatives having impertinently Senator Henderson of that State to take sides against the President, he addressed them the following reply:

WASHINGTON, May 14, 1868.—Gentlemen: In an answer with you on the day before yesterday you suggested that my position on the impeachment question was against the almost unanimous wish of the Union party of our State, and that you feared that our blood might follow the President's acquittal. Inasmuch as I loved my position here to that

Our European Dispatches.

LONDON, May 16.—France has sent her ultimatum to Tunis.

LONDON, May 13.—The House of Commons met in session this evening. The excitement in the Irish Church question subsided considerably among the members since the reception of the Queen's reply to the address of the House received yesterday.

After the Speaker had taken the chair, and in accordance with the general understanding arrived at in the House last night, Mr. Gladstone moved a bill providing for the restraint of the Crown and Cabinet in the making of further appointments to livings in the Irish Church for a specified period.

The bill provides for the suspension of the proceedings of the church inquiry commission, appointed last year under the royal warrant, which is now sitting in Ireland under the presidency of Earl Stanhope, taking testimony as to the working, income, congregations, lands, gables, colleges, schools and other matters and property of and belonging to the Established Church. The new bill goes on to authorize the suspension of the Stanhope commission during the same period that the Crown is restrained from making ecclesiastical appointments.

BREITEN, May 14.—The Budget of North German Confederation has been made public. The total expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year are estimated at 73,000,000 thalers; of this sum 72,000,000 are required for military and marine administration. The total incomes from the customs and imposts levied by the Zollverein, from postal and telegraphic services and from other federal sources, is estimated at 50,000,000 thalers. Individual States of the confederation, including Prussia, are to contribute the balance of 23,000,000 thalers, according to their respective financial quota as apportioned by the federal constitution.

LONDON, May 14, 9 P. M.—In the House of Commons to-night the bill to suspend operations in the Irish Church passed to a first reading. The bill is to remain in effect until August 1, 1868.

Politics in Georgia.

SAVANNAH, May 17.—From reliable authority it is now understood that the Georgia Legislature will be composed of three parties—the Democrats, the Radicals and the Conservative Independents—the latter holding the balance of power. Their prospects, so far, are decidedly Democratic. Mr. Gordon and United States Attorney Fitch will probably receive the Democratic nominations for United States Senators.

Illness of Governor Brownlow.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, May 16.—Governor Brownlow, of this State, is reported to be in a dying condition at Knoxville, from the effects of a stroke of paralysis.

New York Bank Statement.

NEW YORK, May 16.—The Bank Statement shows an increase of loans of \$1,988,000; of deposits \$2,036,000; of legal tenders \$71,000. Also a decrease of specie \$347,000.

Reconstruction.

AUGUSTA, May 16.—A soldier on guard at the barracks to-day killed a negro, the servant of the sutler.

IMPEACHMENT GOSSIP.

THE PROSPECT—LEADING RADICALS LOSE HOPE—NEW ARTICLES PROPOSED—RADICAL SENATORS FROM THE SOUTH TO BE ADMITTED—FORNEY'S RESIGNATION A SHAM.

The Washington correspondent of the Baltimore Gazette writes under date of May 14:

I have an important announcement to make to-day. The leading Radicals here have given up all hope of convicting the President under the present articles. The managers, therefore, held a meeting this morning in the basement of the capitol, with a view of preparing new charges to be submitted, probably, after the adjournment of the Senate, and still other articles of impeachment. The managers had under examination this morning, I understand, one of the private secretaries of the President. Another had been summoned, and still others have the nerve to pursue this course? Will they comprehend, with the Conservatives, ample force to keep out the new senators until the question of impeachment shall have been finally settled to their satisfaction. Will they have the nerve to pursue this course? Will they comprehend, with the Conservatives, ample force to keep out the new senators until the question of impeachment shall have been finally settled to their satisfaction. Will they have the nerve to pursue this course? Will they comprehend, with the Conservatives, ample force to keep out the new senators until the question of impeachment shall have been finally settled to their satisfaction.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 17.—Great danger to the peace of the country and the Republican cause if impeachment fails. Send to your senators, before Saturday, public opinion by resolutions, letters and delegations to the President.

The Providence Journal reads the over-zealous impeacher a needed lesson on decency. It says the dispatch which came to that city created "profound mortification" and continues: "The members of the Senate have been engaged for several days in the hearing of this case, and now, according to the demand of General Schenck, their decision is to be dictated to them by constituents who have given the subject no close attention."

STANTON IN A FIX.

The New York World says he will, of course, "stick" until the vote is taken, but "he appears by this time see that he holds his office by a frail and brief tenure. He will retire when the nomination is acquiesced in, and will be humiliated man concerned in these disgraceful proceedings. To support him in his unparalleled audacity and insolence the Republicans have sacrificed all the hopes of their party."

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

STANTON IN A FIX.

party, and expected to support its men and measures, in the coming canvass especially, and if I depressed the consequences you thought might follow, then I did not do what you fear as such results, yet, in order to place myself beyond the possible censure of those whom I knew to be my best friends, I at once proposed to forward to the Governor my resignation as senator. To this you did not consent, and I then requested you, as my friends, to consult together, and determine what you thought was proper for me to do under the circumstances. I should not have done so, had I believed "the safety of the country and the interests of the loyal people of the United States demanded the removal of Andrew Johnson," you ask me to withhold my vote on any article of impeachment upon which you (I) cannot vote affirmatively. So soon as I had time to read and consider this paper, I found it could not comply with the request without the degree of humiliation and dishonor which I was satisfied, you, as honorable men, would not wish to subject me. I had already spoken in the Senate, and I thought conscientiously, at least so to me, regarding the subject, and I informed you that I was no less decided in my judgment against the sufficiency of two others, leaving me in doubt only as to one. If, with these clear convictions expressed in the Senate, I should now do otherwise, I would forfeit my own self-respect and stand defenceless before the world. You agreed to reconsider your opinion as expressed, and although you at first resolved to adhere to it, I am gratified that upon further reflection you agreed with me that the request was quite unreasonable, but you still insisted, as your opinion, that my duty required my vote to be cast as I might deem it necessary on some one article as to secure conviction. I at once mentioned the difficulty attending this suggestion. Senators had been and were still so resident on the subject, and were to be greatly divided on the several articles, and they were even liable to change their minds at any moment before the final vote would be cast. I should not have done so, had I believed "the safety of the country and the interests of the loyal people of the United States demanded the removal of Andrew Johnson," you ask me to withhold my vote on any article of impeachment upon which you (I) cannot vote affirmatively. So soon as I had time to read and consider this paper, I found it could not comply with the request without the degree of humiliation and dishonor which I was satisfied, you, as honorable men, would not wish to subject me. I had already spoken in the Senate, and I thought conscientiously, at least so to me, regarding the subject, and I informed you that I was no less decided in my judgment against the sufficiency of two others, leaving me in doubt only as to one. If, with these clear convictions expressed in the Senate, I should now do otherwise, I would forfeit my own self-respect and stand defenceless before the world. You agreed to reconsider your opinion as expressed, and although you at first resolved to adhere to it, I am gratified that upon further reflection you agreed with me that the request was quite unreasonable, but you still insisted, as your opinion, that my duty required my vote to be cast as I might deem it necessary on some one article as to secure conviction. I at once mentioned the difficulty attending this suggestion. Senators had been and were still so resident on the subject, and were to be greatly divided on the several articles, and they were even liable to change their minds at any moment before the final vote would be cast. I should not have done so, had I believed "the safety of the country and the interests of the loyal people of the United States demanded the removal of Andrew Johnson," you ask me to withhold my vote on any article of impeachment upon which you (I) cannot vote affirmatively. So soon as I had time to read and consider this paper, I found it could not comply with the request without the degree of humiliation and dishonor which I was satisfied, you, as honorable men, would not wish to subject me. I had already spoken in the Senate, and I thought conscientiously, at least so to me, regarding the subject, and I informed you that I was no less decided in my judgment against the sufficiency of two others, leaving me in doubt only as to one. If, with these clear convictions expressed in the Senate, I should now do otherwise, I would forfeit my own self-respect and stand defenceless before the world. You agreed to reconsider your opinion as expressed, and although you at first resolved to adhere to it, I am gratified that upon further reflection you agreed with me that the request was quite unreasonable, but you still insisted, as your opinion, that my duty required my vote to be cast as I might deem it necessary on some one article as to secure conviction. I at once mentioned the difficulty attending this suggestion. Senators had been and were still so resident on the subject, and were to be greatly divided on the several articles, and they were even liable to change their minds at any moment before the final vote would be cast. I should not have done so, had I believed "the safety of the country and the interests of the loyal people of the United States demanded the removal of Andrew Johnson," you ask me to withhold my vote on any article of impeachment upon which you (I) cannot vote affirmatively. So soon as I had time to read and consider this paper, I found it could not comply with the request without the degree of humiliation and dishonor which I was satisfied, you, as honorable men, would not wish to subject me. I had already spoken in the Senate, and I thought conscientiously, at least so to me, regarding the subject, and I informed you that I was no less decided in my judgment against the sufficiency of two others, leaving me in doubt only as to one. If, with these clear convictions expressed in the Senate, I should now do otherwise, I would forfeit my own self-respect and stand defenceless before the world. You agreed to reconsider your opinion as expressed, and although you at first resolved to adhere to it, I am gratified that upon further reflection you agreed with me that the request was quite unreasonable, but you still insisted, as your opinion, that my duty required my vote to be cast as I might deem it necessary on some one article as to secure conviction. I at once mentioned the difficulty attending this suggestion. Senators had been and were still so resident on the subject, and were to be greatly divided on the several articles, and they were even liable to change their minds at any moment before the final vote would be cast. I should not have done so, had I believed "the safety of the country and the interests of the loyal people of the United States demanded the removal of Andrew Johnson," you ask me to withhold my vote on any article of impeachment upon which you (I) cannot vote affirmatively. So soon as I had time to read and consider this paper, I found it could not comply with the request without the degree of humiliation and dishonor which I was satisfied, you, as honorable men, would not wish to subject me. I had already spoken in the Senate, and I thought conscientiously, at least so to me, regarding the subject, and I informed you that I was no less decided in my judgment against the sufficiency of two others, leaving me in doubt only as to one. If, with these clear convictions expressed in the Senate, I should now do otherwise, I would forfeit my own self-respect and stand defenceless before the world. You agreed to reconsider your opinion as expressed, and although you at first resolved to adhere to it, I am gratified that upon further reflection you agreed with me that the request was quite unreasonable, but you still insisted, as your opinion, that my duty required my vote to be cast as I might deem it necessary on some one article as to secure conviction. I at once mentioned the difficulty attending this suggestion. Senators had been and were still so resident on the subject, and were to be greatly divided on the several articles, and they were even liable to change their minds at any moment before the final vote would be cast. I should not have done so, had I believed "the safety of the country and the interests of the loyal people of the United States demanded the removal of Andrew Johnson," you ask me to withhold my vote on any article of impeachment upon which you (I) cannot vote affirmatively. So soon as I had time to read and consider this paper, I found it could not comply with the request without the degree of humiliation and dishonor which I was satisfied, you, as honorable men, would not wish to subject me. I had already spoken in the Senate, and I thought conscientiously, at least so to me, regarding the subject, and I informed you that I was no less decided in my judgment against the sufficiency of two others, leaving me in doubt only as to one. If, with these clear convictions expressed in the Senate, I should now do otherwise, I would forfeit my own self-respect and stand defenceless before the world. You agreed to reconsider your opinion as expressed, and although you at first resolved to adhere to it, I am gratified that upon further reflection you agreed with me that the request was quite unreasonable, but you still insisted, as your opinion, that my duty required my vote to be cast as I might deem it necessary on some one article as to secure conviction. I at once mentioned the difficulty attending this suggestion. Senators had been and were still so resident on the subject, and were to be greatly divided on the several articles, and they were even liable to change their minds at any moment before the final vote would be cast. I should not have done so, had I believed "the safety of the country and the interests of the loyal people of the United States demanded the removal of Andrew Johnson," you ask me to withhold my vote on any article of impeachment upon which you (I) cannot vote affirmatively. So soon as I had time to read and consider this paper, I found it could not comply with the request without the degree of humiliation and dishonor which I was satisfied, you, as honorable men, would not wish to subject me. I had already spoken in the Senate, and I thought conscientiously, at least so to me, regarding the subject, and I informed you that I was no less decided in my judgment against the sufficiency of two others, leaving me in doubt only as to one. If, with these clear convictions expressed in the Senate, I should now do otherwise, I would forfeit my own self-respect and stand defenceless before the world. You agreed to reconsider your opinion as expressed, and although you at first resolved to adhere to it, I am gratified that upon further reflection you agreed with me that the request was quite unreasonable, but you still insisted, as your opinion, that my duty required my vote to be cast as I might deem it necessary on some one article as to secure conviction. I at once mentioned the difficulty attending this suggestion. Senators had been and were still so resident on the subject, and were to be greatly divided on the several articles, and they were even liable to change their minds at any moment before the final vote would be cast. I should not have done so, had I believed "the safety of the country and the interests of the loyal people of the United States demanded the removal of Andrew Johnson," you ask me to withhold my vote on any article of impeachment upon which you (I) cannot vote affirmatively. So soon as I had time to read and consider this paper, I found it could not comply with the request without the degree of humiliation and dishonor which I was satisfied, you, as honorable men, would not wish to subject me. I had already spoken in the Senate, and I thought conscientiously, at least so to me, regarding the subject, and I informed you that I was no less decided in my judgment against the sufficiency of two others, leaving me in doubt only as to one. If, with these clear convictions expressed in the Senate, I should now do otherwise, I would forfeit my own self-respect and stand defenceless before the world. You agreed to reconsider your opinion as expressed, and although you at first resolved to adhere to it, I am gratified that upon further reflection you agreed with me that the request was quite unreasonable, but you still insisted, as your opinion, that my duty required my vote to be cast as I might deem it necessary on some one article as to secure conviction. I at once mentioned the difficulty attending this suggestion. Senators had been and were still so resident on the subject, and were to be greatly divided on the several articles, and they were even liable to change their minds at any moment before the final vote would be cast. I should not have done so, had I believed "the safety of the country and the interests of the loyal people of the United States demanded the removal of Andrew Johnson," you ask me to withhold my vote on any article of impeachment upon which you (I) cannot vote affirmatively. So soon as I had time to read and consider this paper, I found it could not comply with the request without the degree of humiliation and dishonor which I was satisfied, you, as honorable men, would not wish to subject me. I had already spoken in the Senate, and I thought conscientiously, at least so to me, regarding the subject, and I informed you that I was no less decided in my judgment against the sufficiency of two others, leaving me in doubt only as to one. If, with these clear convictions expressed in the Senate, I should now do otherwise, I would forfeit my own self-respect and stand defenceless before the world. You agreed to reconsider your opinion as expressed, and although you at first resolved to adhere to it, I am gratified that upon further reflection you agreed with me that the request was quite unreasonable, but you still insisted, as your opinion, that my duty required my vote to be cast as I might deem it necessary on some one article as to secure conviction. I at once mentioned the difficulty attending this suggestion. Senators had been and were still so resident on the subject, and were to be greatly divided on the several articles, and they were even liable to change their minds at any moment before the final vote would be cast. I should not have done so, had I believed "the safety of the country and the interests of the loyal people of the United States demanded the removal of Andrew Johnson," you ask me to withhold my vote on any article of impeachment upon which you (I) cannot vote affirmatively. So soon as I had time to read and consider this paper, I found it could not comply with the request without the degree of humiliation and dishonor which I was satisfied, you, as honorable men, would not wish to subject me. I had already spoken in the Senate, and I thought conscientiously, at least so to me, regarding the subject, and I informed you that I was no less decided in my judgment against the sufficiency of two others, leaving me in doubt only as to one. If, with these clear convictions expressed in the Senate, I should now do otherwise, I would forfeit my own self-respect and stand defenceless before the world. You agreed to reconsider your opinion as expressed, and although you at first resolved to adhere to it, I am gratified that upon further reflection you agreed with me that the request was quite unreasonable, but you still insisted, as your opinion, that my duty required my vote to be cast as I might deem it necessary on some one article as to secure conviction. I at once mentioned the difficulty attending this suggestion. Senators had been and were still so resident on the subject, and were to be greatly divided on the several articles, and they were even liable to change their minds at any moment before the final vote would be cast. I should not have done so, had I believed "the safety of the country and the interests of the loyal people of the United States demanded the removal of Andrew Johnson," you ask me to withhold my vote on any article of impeachment upon which you (I) cannot vote affirmatively. So soon as I had time to read and consider this paper, I found it could not comply with the request without the degree of humiliation and dishonor which I was satisfied, you, as honorable men, would not wish to subject me. I had already spoken in the Senate, and I thought conscientiously, at least so to me, regarding the subject, and I informed you that I was no less decided in my judgment against the sufficiency of two others, leaving me in doubt only as to one. If, with these clear convictions expressed in the Senate, I should now do otherwise, I would forfeit my own self-respect and stand defenceless before the world. You agreed to reconsider your opinion as expressed, and although you at first resolved to adhere to it, I am gratified that upon further reflection you agreed with me that the request was quite unreasonable, but you still insisted, as your opinion, that my duty required my vote to be cast as I might deem it necessary on some one article as to secure conviction. I at once mentioned the difficulty attending this suggestion. Senators had been and were still so resident on the subject, and were to be greatly divided on the several articles, and they were even liable to change their minds at any moment before the final vote would be cast. I should not have done so, had I believed "the safety of the country and the interests of the loyal people of the United States demanded the removal of Andrew Johnson," you ask me to withhold my vote on any article of impeachment upon which you (I) cannot vote affirmatively. So soon as I had time to read and consider this paper, I found it could not comply with the request without the degree of humiliation and dishonor which I was satisfied, you, as honorable men, would not wish to subject me. I had already spoken in the Senate, and I thought conscientiously, at least so to me, regarding the subject, and I informed you that I was no less decided in my judgment against the sufficiency of two others, leaving me in doubt only as to one. If, with these clear convictions expressed in the Senate, I should now do otherwise, I would forfeit my own self-respect and stand defenceless before the world. You agreed to reconsider your opinion as expressed, and although you at first resolved to adhere to it, I am gratified that upon further reflection you agreed with me that the request was quite unreasonable, but you still insisted, as your opinion, that my duty required my vote to be cast as I might deem it necessary on some one article as to secure conviction. I at once mentioned the difficulty attending this suggestion. Senators had been and were still so resident on the subject, and were to be greatly divided on the several articles, and they were even liable to change their minds at any moment before the final vote would be cast. I should not have done so, had I believed "the safety of the country and the interests of the loyal people of the United States demanded the removal of Andrew Johnson," you ask me to withhold my vote on any article of impeachment upon which you (I) cannot vote affirmatively. So soon as I had time to read and consider this paper, I found it could not comply with the request without the degree of humiliation and dishonor which I