

FROM LANCASTER: January 7, 1862.

The high court of impeachment having just now adjourned, I sit down to communicate the proceedings which took place this day.

This morning, about ten, the house of representatives formed a committee of the whole, David Mitchell, of Cumberland, was called to the chair.

Soon after, the senate entered the chamber of the house of representatives. Robert Whitehill, speaker of the senate, and president of the court, was conducted to the chair usually occupied by the speaker of the house of representatives. The chairman of the committee of the whole, Mr. Mitchell, was seated on the right of Mr. Whitehill, and the senators were seated in front of the chair, where desks, covered with green cloth, were prepared for them;—twenty-four senators were present, and but one, Mr. James Poe, of Franklin county, absent.

For the clerks of both chambers were appropriated the places usually occupied by the clerk and his assistants of the lower house.

In front of the president of the court, and of the senators, on the left seats were prepared for the parties impeached and for their counsel, and in a line with them on the right were placed the managers of the impeachment and their counsel.

The members of the house of representatives, occupied all the right side of the house and part of the left, on each side of the members of the court.

Places were also appointed for persons, who had applied for stations most convenient for taking reports of the proceedings.

About eleven o'clock the members of the court were sworn in as follows: ROBERT WHITEHILL, speaker of the senate, and president of the court;—from Cumberland.

- John Porter, From the district of James Gamble, Philadelphia county and city, and county of Delaware. Edward Weston, William Pickett, Joseph Hart, Bucks county. John Richards, Montgomery. John Kean, Berks and Dauphin. Gabriel Hester, Chester. John Heister, Lancaster. Christopher Meyer, William Reed, Edw. Swangler, York & Adams. Daniel Montgomery, Northumberland. James Harrison, Northampton, Wayne The Mechanic, Luzerne. James Harris, Mifflin, Lycoming, and Centre. John Eyer, Bedford, Huntingdon, and Somerset. James Brady, Westmoreland, Armstrong and Indiana. Presby Carr Lane, Fayette and Green. Joseph Vance, Washington. Thomas Morton, Allegheny, Beaver and Butler. William McArthur, Crawford, Erie, Venango, Mercer and Warren.

MANAGERS OF IMPEACHMENT: Nathaniel Bonneau, Montgomery. Hugh Ferguson, Philadelphia city. James Ennis, Philadelphia co. Jacob Bucher, Dauphin county. Abner Lucebeck, Beaver county.

COUNSEL OF THE GRAND IMPROVER OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA: CESAR A. RODNEY, of the state of Delaware. COUNSEL OF THE ACCUSED, A. J. DALLAS and JARED INGERSOLL, of Philadelphia.

The judges entered the court at fifteen minutes after eleven o'clock, attended by their counsel. A. J. Dallas, and by several of their friends, the attorney general of the commonwealth, Charles Smith, Esq., and some others.

The judges having been seated, in the place appointed for them; the president of the court directed the clerk to call the accused.

Whereupon the clerk called Edward Shippen, chief justice, Jasper Yeates and Thomas Smith, associate judges of the supreme court—and they answered severally.

Then, the president of the court said: "You, Edward Shippen, Jasper Yeates and Thomas Smith are accused, by the house of representatives of this commonwealth, of certain misdoings in your official capacity, whereupon you stand impeached: the clerk will read to you the articles of impeachment."

The clerk then read the charge as follows:—

Article of accusation and impeachment against Edward Shippen, Esquire, Chief Justice, and Jasper Yeates and Thomas Smith, Esquires, assistant justices of the supreme court of the commonwealth of Pennsylvania, preferred by the house of representatives of the said commonwealth in their name, and in the name of the people.

That on the 5th of December, 1861, an attachment was awarded against the said Thomas Passmore, and he was bound with sureties to appear in court to answer such interrogatories as should be exhibited to him, and to abide the sentence of the court.

That interrogatories were accordingly exhibited to the said Thomas Passmore, which are as follows: together with the answers filed by the said Thomas Passmore to the same, viz: In the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania. The commonwealth of Pennsylvania versus Thomas Passmore.

That on the 5th of December, 1861, an attachment was awarded against the said Thomas Passmore, and he was bound with sureties to appear in court to answer such interrogatories as should be exhibited to him, and to abide the sentence of the court.

That interrogatories were accordingly exhibited to the said Thomas Passmore, which are as follows: together with the answers filed by the said Thomas Passmore to the same, viz:

In the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania. The commonwealth of Pennsylvania versus Thomas Passmore.

On attachment for contempt. Interrogatories exhibited to Thomas Passmore, by the aforesaid defendant.

1st Interrogatory. Was there an action depending in the supreme court of Pennsylvania on the eighth day of September, 1861, wherein you were plaintiff, and Andrew Pettit and Andrew Bayard, merchants and co-partners, trading under the firm of Pettit and Bayard, were defendants. If yes, when was such action instituted, and is the same still depending in the said court.

2d Interrogatory. If such action was brought, and is still depending in the said court, state whether the same was referred by consent of parties; whether the referees made report, and when; whether exceptions were filed to the report, by whom and when; whether an affidavit was made by the said Andrew Bayard in support of the said exceptions; when, and before whom, the said affidavit was made; and whether the said exceptions and affidavit were filed in the said court or before the 8th day of September, 1861?

3d Interrogatory. Petition the paper filed in this court purporting to be signed by you, dated Philadelphia, 8th Sept. 1861, whereupon the motion was made in this court for a rule to show cause why an attachment should not issue against you for a contempt of the said court, and declare whether the said paper is written and subscribed by you, and when the same was written and subscribed, and whether the said paper so written and subscribed, was by you or by any other person, and who, your request and direction placed and fixed to a board in the exchange room, in the city tavern, in the city of Philadelphia, and attached to the said board in the said room, by waters, in the manner advertised therein as there usually pointed up and fixed.

4th Interrogatory. If the said paper was subscribed and written by you, and by you or by some person by your request and direction, placed and affixed as above mentioned, state whether the declaration in the said paper contains, to wit:—That Andrew Bayard, the partner of Andrew Pettit, did on the 14 or 15th instant, go before John Inskeep, Esquire, alderman, and swear to that which was not true, refers to the said affidavit taken and filed in this court by the said Andrew Bayard as aforesaid in support of the said exceptions filed to the said report of the referees in the said action depending in this court as aforesaid, between you as plaintiff, and the said Pettit and Bayard, as defendants?

(Copy) A. J. DALLAS. SUPREME COURT—PENNSYLVANIA. The commonwealth of Pennsylvania versus Thomas Passmore. Sur attachment for contempt.

The answer of Thomas Passmore to the interrogatories filed in this court.

The first interrogatory. To the first interrogatory I answer as follows:—That to the best of my present recollection there was no action depending in the supreme court of Pennsylvania on the 8th day of September, 1861, wherein I was plaintiff, and Andrew Pettit and Andrew Bayard, merchants and co-partners, trading under the firm of Pettit and Bayard, were defendants.

The second interrogatory. To the second interrogatory I answer as follows:—That on the 5th of December, 1861, an attachment was awarded against the said Thomas Passmore, and he was bound with sureties to appear in court to answer such interrogatories as should be exhibited to him, and to abide the sentence of the court.

The third interrogatory. To the third interrogatory I answer as follows:—That on the 5th of December, 1861, an attachment was awarded against the said Thomas Passmore, and he was bound with sureties to appear in court to answer such interrogatories as should be exhibited to him, and to abide the sentence of the court.

The fourth interrogatory. To the fourth interrogatory I answer as follows:—That on the 5th of December, 1861, an attachment was awarded against the said Thomas Passmore, and he was bound with sureties to appear in court to answer such interrogatories as should be exhibited to him, and to abide the sentence of the court.

The fifth interrogatory. To the fifth interrogatory I answer as follows:—That on the 5th of December, 1861, an attachment was awarded against the said Thomas Passmore, and he was bound with sureties to appear in court to answer such interrogatories as should be exhibited to him, and to abide the sentence of the court.

The sixth interrogatory. To the sixth interrogatory I answer as follows:—That on the 5th of December, 1861, an attachment was awarded against the said Thomas Passmore, and he was bound with sureties to appear in court to answer such interrogatories as should be exhibited to him, and to abide the sentence of the court.

The seventh interrogatory. To the seventh interrogatory I answer as follows:—That on the 5th of December, 1861, an attachment was awarded against the said Thomas Passmore, and he was bound with sureties to appear in court to answer such interrogatories as should be exhibited to him, and to abide the sentence of the court.

The eighth interrogatory. To the eighth interrogatory I answer as follows:—That on the 5th of December, 1861, an attachment was awarded against the said Thomas Passmore, and he was bound with sureties to appear in court to answer such interrogatories as should be exhibited to him, and to abide the sentence of the court.

The ninth interrogatory. To the ninth interrogatory I answer as follows:—That on the 5th of December, 1861, an attachment was awarded against the said Thomas Passmore, and he was bound with sureties to appear in court to answer such interrogatories as should be exhibited to him, and to abide the sentence of the court.

ties to that suit were admitted of, which a notification was not given either by the said Andrew Bayard or by the referees when they made their adjournment. That the said defendant was not present, nor notified, on the 14th or 15th instant, to appear in court to answer the said interrogatories, and that the said defendant was not present, nor notified, on the 14th or 15th instant, to appear in court to answer the said interrogatories, and that the said defendant was not present, nor notified, on the 14th or 15th instant, to appear in court to answer the said interrogatories.

The tenth interrogatory. To the tenth interrogatory I answer as follows:—That on the 5th of December, 1861, an attachment was awarded against the said Thomas Passmore, and he was bound with sureties to appear in court to answer such interrogatories as should be exhibited to him, and to abide the sentence of the court.

The eleventh interrogatory. To the eleventh interrogatory I answer as follows:—That on the 5th of December, 1861, an attachment was awarded against the said Thomas Passmore, and he was bound with sureties to appear in court to answer such interrogatories as should be exhibited to him, and to abide the sentence of the court.

The twelfth interrogatory. To the twelfth interrogatory I answer as follows:—That on the 5th of December, 1861, an attachment was awarded against the said Thomas Passmore, and he was bound with sureties to appear in court to answer such interrogatories as should be exhibited to him, and to abide the sentence of the court.

The thirteenth interrogatory. To the thirteenth interrogatory I answer as follows:—That on the 5th of December, 1861, an attachment was awarded against the said Thomas Passmore, and he was bound with sureties to appear in court to answer such interrogatories as should be exhibited to him, and to abide the sentence of the court.

The fourteenth interrogatory. To the fourteenth interrogatory I answer as follows:—That on the 5th of December, 1861, an attachment was awarded against the said Thomas Passmore, and he was bound with sureties to appear in court to answer such interrogatories as should be exhibited to him, and to abide the sentence of the court.

The fifteenth interrogatory. To the fifteenth interrogatory I answer as follows:—That on the 5th of December, 1861, an attachment was awarded against the said Thomas Passmore, and he was bound with sureties to appear in court to answer such interrogatories as should be exhibited to him, and to abide the sentence of the court.

The sixteenth interrogatory. To the sixteenth interrogatory I answer as follows:—That on the 5th of December, 1861, an attachment was awarded against the said Thomas Passmore, and he was bound with sureties to appear in court to answer such interrogatories as should be exhibited to him, and to abide the sentence of the court.

The seventeenth interrogatory. To the seventeenth interrogatory I answer as follows:—That on the 5th of December, 1861, an attachment was awarded against the said Thomas Passmore, and he was bound with sureties to appear in court to answer such interrogatories as should be exhibited to him, and to abide the sentence of the court.

That the said defendant was not present, nor notified, on the 14th or 15th instant, to appear in court to answer the said interrogatories, and that the said defendant was not present, nor notified, on the 14th or 15th instant, to appear in court to answer the said interrogatories, and that the said defendant was not present, nor notified, on the 14th or 15th instant, to appear in court to answer the said interrogatories.

That the said defendant was not present, nor notified, on the 14th or 15th instant, to appear in court to answer the said interrogatories, and that the said defendant was not present, nor notified, on the 14th or 15th instant, to appear in court to answer the said interrogatories, and that the said defendant was not present, nor notified, on the 14th or 15th instant, to appear in court to answer the said interrogatories.

That the said defendant was not present, nor notified, on the 14th or 15th instant, to appear in court to answer the said interrogatories, and that the said defendant was not present, nor notified, on the 14th or 15th instant, to appear in court to answer the said interrogatories, and that the said defendant was not present, nor notified, on the 14th or 15th instant, to appear in court to answer the said interrogatories.

That the said defendant was not present, nor notified, on the 14th or 15th instant, to appear in court to answer the said interrogatories, and that the said defendant was not present, nor notified, on the 14th or 15th instant, to appear in court to answer the said interrogatories, and that the said defendant was not present, nor notified, on the 14th or 15th instant, to appear in court to answer the said interrogatories.

That the said defendant was not present, nor notified, on the 14th or 15th instant, to appear in court to answer the said interrogatories, and that the said defendant was not present, nor notified, on the 14th or 15th instant, to appear in court to answer the said interrogatories, and that the said defendant was not present, nor notified, on the 14th or 15th instant, to appear in court to answer the said interrogatories.

That the said defendant was not present, nor notified, on the 14th or 15th instant, to appear in court to answer the said interrogatories, and that the said defendant was not present, nor notified, on the 14th or 15th instant, to appear in court to answer the said interrogatories, and that the said defendant was not present, nor notified, on the 14th or 15th instant, to appear in court to answer the said interrogatories.

That the said defendant was not present, nor notified, on the 14th or 15th instant, to appear in court to answer the said interrogatories, and that the said defendant was not present, nor notified, on the 14th or 15th instant, to appear in court to answer the said interrogatories, and that the said defendant was not present, nor notified, on the 14th or 15th instant, to appear in court to answer the said interrogatories.

That the said defendant was not present, nor notified, on the 14th or 15th instant, to appear in court to answer the said interrogatories, and that the said defendant was not present, nor notified, on the 14th or 15th instant, to appear in court to answer the said interrogatories, and that the said defendant was not present, nor notified, on the 14th or 15th instant, to appear in court to answer the said interrogatories.

That the said defendant was not present, nor notified, on the 14th or 15th instant, to appear in court to answer the said interrogatories, and that the said defendant was not present, nor notified, on the 14th or 15th instant, to appear in court to answer the said interrogatories, and that the said defendant was not present, nor notified, on the 14th or 15th instant, to appear in court to answer the said interrogatories.