THE NEW YORK HERALD.

WHOLE NO. 7675. SUNDAY MORNING, SEPTEMBER 6, 1857. PRICE TWO CENTS.

FOUR DAYS LATER FROM EUROPE.

THE ARAGO OFF CAPE RACE.

THE BRITISH PARLIAMENT PROROGUED.

Difficulties Between Sardinia and Naples.

FAILURES IN LIVERPOOL.

PERSECUTION OF EUROPEANS BY MADAGASCAR.

COTTON ADVANCED ONE-EIGHTH PENNY.

BREADSTUFFS DECLINING.

CONSOLS 90 3-4,

&c., &c., &c.

ST. JOHNS, N. T., Sept. 5, 1857.

The United States mail steamship Arago, Captain Lines, from Havre and Southampton on the 26th August, passed Cape Race at about noon of Thursday the 3d instant. The Arago will be due at New York on Monday next. Her advices, which are four days later than those received by the Vanderbilt and Asia at New York, were obtained by a fishing smack and brought to this port. Commercially they are of considerable importance, but in a political point of view they are of but little interest.

This is the first successful attempt to obtain news from Europe by the steamers passing Cape Race, which in itself is a highly important achievement; demonstrating as it does the practicability of obtaining news, were a steamer employed, in about seven or eight days from Europe.

The Arago has about 230 passengers, and $100,000 in specie.

GREAT BRITAIN.

Parliament had been prorogued.

Spollen, who was acquitted of the murder of Mr. Little, of Dublin, had been re-arrested for his robbery, and would soon be tried therefor.

It was reported that Lord John Russell was about to be elevated to the peerage.

Several failures among commercial men at Liverpool are reported. The names are not given, however, in the despatch.

FRANCE.

French ships of war are ordered to render every necessary aid in their power to the English vessels proceeding to India with troops.

The news from Algeria is favorable to the French arms.

ITALY.

The differences between the cabinets of Turin and Naples are unsettled, and matters look decidedly unfavorable in that quarter.

RUSSIA.

The cholera was abating at St. Petersburg.

TURKEY.

The harvest in Turkey had turned out highly successful.

PERSIA.

The Shah of Persia was increasing his army.

MADAGASCAR.

The Queen of Madagascar had recommended the persecution of Europeans by her subjects.

FINANCIAL AND COMMERCIAL.

LIVERPOOL COTTON MARKET.

The Liverpool cotton market closed with an upward tendency, at prices ⅛d. per lb. higher than those of the previous Friday. The market had been quite active, the sales of Monday, the 24th, reaching 20,000, and Tuesday, the 25th, 12,000 bales.

LIVERPOOL BREADSTUFFS MARKET.

The Liverpool breadstuffs market was generally dull, with a declining tendency. Buyers demanded a reduction before effecting purchases.

LIVERPOOL PRODUCE MARKET.

Sugar was buoyant in the Liverpool market at 6d. advance.

CONSOLS.

Consols for money closed on Tuesday the 25th, at 90¾.

Right of Expatriation.

Subjected to the opinion of the Attorney General as to the right of expatriation:—

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE, August 17, 1857.

The note of Count Montgelas, transmitted to your department through Mr. Vroom, our minister at Berlin, asks for an explanation of the opinion given by Mr Cushing in October last, on the right of an American citizen to expatriate himself.

The specified case put by Count Montgelas is that of Julius Amthor, a native of Irmelshausen, in Bavaria, who came to this country, and, after being naturalized, returned again to Bavaria. His effort to recover his status as a native of Bavaria seems to be impeded by a doubt which the authorities there entertain on the question whether he can throw off his allegiance to the United States, and if so, in what manner it is to be done?

There is no statute or other law of the United States which prevents either a native or naturalized citizen from severing his political connection with this government, if he sees proper to do so, in time of peace, and for a purpose not directly injurious to the interests of the country.

There is no mode of renunciation prescribed. In my opinion, if he emigrates, carries his family and effects with him, manifests a plain intention not to return, takes up his permanent residence abroad, and assumes the obligation of a subject to a foreign government, this would imply a dissolution of his previous relations with the United States; and I do not think we could or would afterwards claim from him any of the duties of a citizen. At all events, the fact of renunciation is to be established, like other facts for which there is no prescribed form of proof, by any evidence which will convince the judgment. It is for the authorities of Bavaria to determine, first, whether they will admit Mr Amthor to the privileges enjoyed by a native subject of their king without an express renunciation of his American citizenship. If this be decided in the negative—that is to say, if they demand from him an express renunciation—they may take it and cause it to be authenticated in what form they please. They may demand an oath of abjuration as a test of his sincerity, or as a necessary part of his title to the future protection of the Bavarian government. Whatever satisfies them ought to be satisfactory to us, since, in all similar cases, we prescribe our own rules for the admission of Bavarian subjects as citizens of the United States.

I have spoken of the laws of the United States. Virginia and Kentucky, two of the States, have statutes which require a certain formula or renunciation of citizenship. But these statutes have no application to this case. I do not understand Mr. Amthor to have resided in either of those States. If the federal government gives him up his obligations to the particular State in which he lived could hardly come into any practical conflict with those which he is about to assume toward his native country. I am, very respectfully, yours, &c., J. S. BLACK.

Hon. LEWIS CASS, Secretary of State.

ELOPEMENT FROM SARATOGA.—The police have been for several days looking after a couple who are reported to have eloped from Saratoga on Sunday last. The female is a miss of fifteen summers, the daughter of Geo. H. White, Esq., of Saratoga; and the man with whom she eloped is John Travis, a celebrated pistol shooter and sporting man, who kept a pistol gallery in Saratoga at the time of the occurrence. Miss White is represented to be a very beautiful and interesting young lady, well educated and of refined manners; and it excites wonder in the minds of her friends that she should make the acquaintance of such a man. Travis was seen in New York city on Monday, and threw dust in the eyes of a detective policeman by saying that he had only travelled a short distance with the girl, and that she had gone to her aunt's, at Troy. The father of the girl arrived in New York on Monday night in pursuit of the fugitives. They, however, after stopping all night at a house in Hudson street, started next morning for the West. Travis has been guilty of a like offence once before, and then came near losing his life. He is expected to be in St. Louis on the 25th of this month, as he is a party to a shooting match there, on which there is a large sum of money staked.—*Albany Argus, Sept. 4.*

The Late Tragedy at the New York Hospital—Death of the Victim—Coroner's Inquest.

Kearney R. Wagner, who was attacked and stabbed at the New York Hospital on Thursday morning by James Mead, a patient labouring under *mania a potu*, died of his wounds on Friday night. Coroner Perry being notified of the occurrence, proceeded to the hospital yesterday morning and held an inquest upon the body of the deceased, when the following testimony was elicited in relation to the melancholy affair:—

Thomas Walker, of the New York Hospital, being duly sworn, says:—I have charge of wards Nos 2 and 3; about one o'clock on Thursday last I left the ward of which I have charge to go to my dinner; there were in the ward at the time, deceased, James Mead and four others; they appeared to be perfectly quiet; as I entered the door on my return I saw Mead armed with a bread knife; he sprang at me and attempted to stab me, making several lunges at me, but the thickness of my vest and the dull point of the knife prevented any serious injury; he pursued me to my own door, when I shut it against him; I held the door for a few moments, and after getting a bludgeon went out into the hall, when I saw one of the patients and another person holding Mead; I assisted them in putting him in the lock up; I soon afterwards saw deceased lying in his blood from injuries received.

Thomas Rafferty, of the New York Hospital, being duly sworn, deposed that about one o'clock on Thursday he entered ward No 2 with medicine; as he opened the door and went in he saw Mead sitting on the side of his bed; he watched the door and seemed very restless; I closed the door lest he should get out, and proceeded to leave the medicine on the table, when Thomas Walker opened the door and was about coming in when Mead sprang at him with a knife and muttered something; I ran out and called for assistance; I did not see him stab deceased.

Dr. Thomas R. Dash, physician of the New York Hospital, deposed as follows:—Deceased was admitted to the hospital on the 1st of September, being partially deranged in mind; he was put in the ward set apart for that class of patients; there were three other patients in the ward, two of whom were convalescent; the third was suffering from delirium tremens, and was under treatment for such; this one was also admitted on the 1st inst.; he was not violent, and when spoken to answered questions rationally, but would soon relapse into a state of wandering; but I had no reason to apprehend any violence on his part, and consequently he was not put under restraint; I saw the patient, Jas. Mead, soon after the affray; he was then laboring under great excitement, and continued in such state for two hours, and then returned to his former condition; the man seemed to be laboring under a paroxysm of mania at the time the act was committed; such paroxysms occasionally occur with patients having that disease, but we are not in the habit of placing such patients in close confinement unless they show evidences of being dangerous to themselves or others. I saw the deceased soon after the occurrence. He was prostrated from loss of blood consequent upon the injuries received. I found two wounds penetrating the neck just above the collar bone. Death was caused by hemorrhage from those wounds.

Henry Buckley, M. D., physician to the New York Hospital, being sworn, says:—That he saw John Mead, on Thursday, September 2, 1857, at the New York Hospital, in a state of *mania a potu*. Moreover, that he deems him, on account of the peculiar and violent character of his mental derangement, too dangerous to be at large.

Thomas Walker, recalled, says:—I was absent from my room a few minutes, probably five minutes, when I left to go to my dinner; I left Murdock, a patient, in charge of the ward; I considered him competent to take charge in my absence, as he was rational and an intelligent man; he was a man of presence of mind; I had frequently left him in charge of the ward during my absence; while Murdock was washing the dishes I suppose Mead stepped slyly back of him; I took away the knife with which he inflicted the injuries.

The case was then given to the jury, when the following verdict was rendered:—

"Death by injuries from stabs and cuts inflicted by James Mead, and the jury believe that said Mead was at the time laboring under *mania a potu*."

Theatrical and Musical.

Arrangements are now making for the first appearance of Miss Juliana May in grand concert. The high social position of this young lady, and her reputed professional capabilities, have created quite an interest in the fashionable world for her success.

ITALIAN OPERA.—The celebrated M'lle Frezzolina and various other eminent artists are to make their first appearance in America, in the opera of "La Sonnambula," at the Academy of Music to morrow evening. As everybody is anxious to hear the distinguished prima donna it will be necessary to secure seats in advance or else to be at the doors at an early hour.

NIBLO'S GARDEN.—The favorite danseuse, M'lle Rolla, is to appear in a new ballet entitled "Acalista," to-morrow night. This piece proved highly successful during this lady's engagement at Her Majesty's theatre, London, and it is thought that it will meet with equal approbation here. It is to be followed by the glorious pantomime of "Pongo," in which all the Ravels appear.

BOWERY.—Mr. and Mrs. Rynar, whose artistic abilities are favorably spoken of by the presses of the interior, are to make their debut here to morrow evening, in the exciting dramatic spectacle of the "Wandering Jew," in which Mr and Mrs. Eddy, Miss D'Courcy, and Messrs. Fenno, Fitzgerald, &c., will also appear. The entertainments are to close with the tragic play entitled "Lucretia Borgia."

BURTON'S.—Mr. Murdoch, the American comedian, whose performances have recently won for him so many laudations from both the public and the press of London, is to make his first appearance since his return from Europe to-morrow night in his great character of Young Mirabel, in the favorite comedy called "The Inconstant." The farce of "The Omnibus" is to be the afterpiece.

WALLACK'S.—Miss Matilda Heron, who has been for some time occupied in translating from the French a five act drama denominated "Flamenina," will make her first appearance in the new production to-morrow evening. She is to be supported by a number of old favorites, including Mrs. Hoey and Messrs. Dyott and Davenport. As a matter of course the house will be full to overflowing.

LAURA KEENE'S.—The latest production by Tom Taylor, a new comedy styled "The Victims," is to be brought out with a strong array of artistic talent, including Miss Keene, Messrs. Wheatleigh, Burnett, Jefferson, &c., to morrow night. This comedy has lately created an unusual sensation at the Haymarket, London. Miss Keene and Mr. Jefferson will also appear in the amusing "Overjugal Lesson."

OLYMPIC.—The managers of this snug little establishment are still industriously and successfully engaged in rendering all who visit them happy and merry. To-morrow Miss Saxon and Mr. Allen will perform the "Morning Call;" Miss Turnbull will play three characters in the melo drama of "The Wizard Skiff," and Mr. and Mrs. T. B. Johnston are to personate the comical hero and heroine in "Poor Pillicoddy."

AMERICAN MUSEUM.—Among the recent additions to this extensive establishment none have proved more interesting than the beautiful dissolving views of scenes in America, which embrace, among other things, life-like representations of celebrated battles, &c. Professor Wyman, the renowned wizard and ventriloquist, and the "bogus Burdell heir," are to remain here but one week more, positively, it is said.

GEO. CHRISTY AND WOOD'S MINSTRELS have arranged a fresh programme of songs, burlesques and dances, for the edification of their friends during the coming week. By the way, quite an excitement was created the other day by the appearance in the streets of what is supposed to have been a full sized representation of George in one of his great Ethiopian characters, astride a white man's shoulders.

THE BRYANTS, notwithstanding the long run they have sustained, evince no disposition to suspend; on the contrary, they have fairly weathered the summer without the least drawback, and their stock of merriment is at this moment as extensive and varied as at the commencement of the season. Among the racy things on their bill for to-morrow are the "Shakspearean Readings."

THE BINGHAMPTON THEATRE is to open to-morrow evening under the stage direction of the popular actor Mr. W. Hield, who is to play Duke Aranza to the Juliana of Miss Mary Agnes in the comedy of the "Honey Moon." The farce of "The Wandering Minstrel" follows, with Mr. Vincent and Miss Partington in the principal parts.

The New Steam Sloop-of-War.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE HERALD.

In your paper of yesterday you very properly express the desire that the contract may be awarded to the best model, plans and specifications for building the steam sloop-of-war. You also state the amount of cost of the steamers Missouri and Mississippi, as proposed to be about the same size—but in reality smaller—of the one about to be built; but you do not show the distinctive features of each.

The Mississippi draws twenty feet water, and the vessel to be built is to draw but sixteen feet by limitation, and must not exceed it. The private builders are called upon to do that which the naval constructors of our navy have never been able to do, viz: build a vessel of light draft of water. The lightest mark the naval constructors could make for this vessel was eighteen feet, and now the private builders are compelled to do—and within sixty days—that which any naval constructor would require six months to accomplish. And who are the persons to determine the best model? Why naval constructors, whose interest it is to select such model as will defeat the enterprise and break up this innovation, which must either send them to a school of experience or on the retired list; for it matters not what plans are selected by the officers in the arrangements of deck or rig, or what kind of engines, propeller and boilers are adopted by the engineers, if the model be wanting, the enterprise will be a failure.

EXCELSIOR.

LOVE AND ARSENIC.—The Niagara Falls, *Gazette* says of the Mr. Ehrig who lately poisoned himself "for love" in this city:—"The lady referred to, is the daughter of Mr. Uhl, late Editor of the *Staats Zeitung*, a New York German paper. She, with her mother, had been stopping here some time; they left for New York in the morning, and he followed them the same evening. We are told that his attachment was reciprocated on the part of Miss Uhl and that an engagement existed, waiting only the consent of Mrs. Uhl, who was at first much opposed to the match. It is said that Mrs. Uhl finally gave her consent, and at an interview, Miss Uhl informed him that she had only been joking. We of course cannot vouch for the truth of this report, but if it is true, it exhibits a refinement of cruelty not often met with in the most inveterate fiends. Ehrig was a person of very nervous temperament and possessed a warm and generous heart. We can imagine the effect such an unexpected rebuff would have upon a person of so sensitive a nature. He probably acted from the impulse of the moment, yet we are told that he had no desire to recover, and was perfectly resigned to his fate. He was buried at New York. Mr. Ehrig, who by the way is much respected, leaves a brother and sister residing at this place."

THE PRESBYTERIAN SCHISM SOUTH.

Fourth Day's Session of the Richmond Convention.

Proposed Reunion of the Old and New School Secessionists.

Dr. Boyd, of Va., Denounces the Inconsistency of the Movement.

REPLIES OF DRS. MATHEWS AND LEACH, &c. &c. &c.

RICHMOND, VA. Aug. 31, 1857.

The Convention met this morning at 9 o'clock.

The pending question was upon the amendment offered by Dr. Leach to the fourth resolution to strike out all after "1858," and insert therefor "for the purpose of organizing the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church South."

To render the amendment more intelligible I will give the whole resolution:—

Resolved, That the Convention recommend to all the Presbyteries in the Presbyterian church, which are opposed to the agitation of slavery in the highest judicatory of the church, to appoint delegates in the proportion prescribed by our form of government for the appointment of Commissioners to the Assembly to meet at Knoxville, Tennessee, on the third Thursday in May, 1858, for the purpose of organizing a general Synod under the name of "The United Synod of the Presbyterian Church in the United States."

Another slight amendment was offered to Dr. Leach's amendment, such as introducing the word "constitutional" in connection with the designation, to which no reference seemed to be had.

Dr. A. H. H. BOYD, of Va., being entitled to the floor, took his stand upon the platform, and said:—Mr. President and Brethren of the Convention—We occupy a peculiar and somewhat trying position. In the providence of God, those of us who compose this Convention have been called to separate from brethren whom we loved, in whose principles, ecclesiastically, for the most part, we concurred, and with whom we were disposed to labor in the vineyard of our Divine Master. I feel, as I call to mind to day our past history, from the time of the division of the Presbyterian church—I may say nominally in 1837, although the actual division did not take place till 1838—I feel as I think of what occurred then and of what has taken place since that period, in respect to us as the Christian church of Christ, and in connection with the recollections of the past—as I call to mind our present position, I confess to deep sorrow of heart, not because, as I conceive, any great responsibility rests upon us as in reference to our present position—not because I think that we who compose this Convention have any reason at all to regret the part which we have heretofore acted—not that I have the slightest idea that there was anything essentially wrong in the course which we took when we felt that it was our duty to separate from our old school brethren and to identify ourselves with that branch of the church technically called the new school. I may say, if you permit me to do so in regard to myself personally, that if I had consulted my own personal feelings, my peculiar domestic and social relations in life, and other considerations, I should have identified myself with the other branch of the church. I was licensed by the Presbytery of Winchester in the fall of 1837. I received my theological education at Princeton, under that good and sainted man, Dr. Chalmers; so that so far as education and association are concerned, I would have been induced to connect myself with the other branch of the church. But, sir, I acted from principle in this matter. I felt that it was my duty as an individual, upon every principle of honor, to act according to what I believed to be right and proper in the sight of God, and what would be for the interests of humanity. Hence, after the division in the old church, having no reason to be prejudiced against the old school, I did not hesitate to unite with my brethren of the Synod of Virginia that met in the city of Washington in the fall of 1837. I sided in the organization of that Synod; and in common with the others with whom I associated in that instance, adopted its declarations as the expression of my sentiments, and they went forth to the world as the platform upon which we were to stand in the future. I say to-day, that for my part—and I think I may say the same in behalf of my brethren—I have nothing whatever to regret as to the course that was then taken. It was a matter of personal, of Christian honor; otherwise I would say, as my friend Mr. Tucker said, I would have severed this right arm from my body, before I would have consented to act the part of schismatic, and to have identified myself with the New School branch of the church, by separating myself from the Synod of Virginia. No, sir! no, sir! I was surprised when I heard my friend Mr. Tucker—for whom I entertain the highest personal esteem—press himself so strongly in favor of abandoning those high principles which governed us hitherto. I say, for my part, I would never consent to abandon what I regard to be the principles of honor and of right, in a matter identified with the glory of God here and with the glory of the church and the happiness of mankind; so that all that my friend says in reference to honor and acting in accordance with Christian principles, I endorse, except that I think he placed too low an estimate on Christian honor. We are to act upon principle in reference to this matter. We cannot disregard conscience in matters connected with the Church, any more than we would in reference to anything else; and the man who has no regard for his honor in carrying out the principles of the church must have a very indifferent conception of the obligations that are resting upon him. I am persuaded that if my friend gave his attention to the principles involved in the rescinding acts of 1837, he would not have taken the position which he has taken on this floor. I know him well, sir; I know him intimately enough to be satisfied that he would never, never have consented to a union with the old school branch of the Presbyterian church, unless there was an abandonment and an open discourse of the principle involved in the rescinding acts of 1837. It is well perhaps for him, looking to his own personal interests, to advocate this union. There are associations and other family and social considerations which no doubt were calculated to influence him towards this course; but it was well perhaps that he has not given his attention to this matter. We all know well that it is not preferable to us that we should be thrown into a warfare, and therefore I think my friend has acted wisely in not giving his attention to these matters; nor am I surprised at the position which my friend occupies, peculiar but intimate as the relations have been between us. I know the peculiar relations that my friend sustains to others—aye, even to some who are gone to heaven—and I do not wonder that these associations, these relations, should have an influence in the formation of his judgment. I will say that when I identified myself with this branch of the church, everything in my relations would have induced me to have taken the opposite side; and when I consented to identify myself with this body, it was truly from principle. I thought that it was the duty of all who were determined to regard constitutional rights, the constitution of the Presbyterian Church, and who loved Presbyterianism, to abandon a body composed, as it may have been, of brethren whom we loved, and whose spiritual and eternal welfare we had at heart, which imposed obligation that rendered association with it impossible. I make these remarks because I am well aware that a very considerable number of those who compose this convention and belong now to the church, have come into it within the last few years, and since 1837. The brethren who were not in the war, and especially if they have not given their attention particularly to this subject, may to some extent be excused if they advocated a departure from the principles which have distinguished our branch of the church hitherto, and rushed into the arms of the old school branch, without requiring an abandonment on their part of a single principle that led to the disunion. If that be the case in regard to some, it cannot be that those who have lived in the church since 1837 are now to be carried headlong and precipitated into the other branch of the church. I say here, what I shall prove at the proper time, that unless our old school brethren do in effect abandon the principles which have characterized them heretofore. I should expect the sun to fall from the heavens before I could expect those who abandoned their brethren from principle to proclaim now to the world that they regretted the course they had pursued, and that they repent and acknowledge their error without any abandonment of principles on the part of our old school brethren. Sir, that cannot be done. It so happens that we are apart from our old school brethren, and abolitionism has been the cause of it. I am of opinion that if his slavery agitation continues in the country, every church in the land that has a Northern connection will sooner or later be rent asunder on this ground. If this agitation would cease, there would be some hope, and I have no doubt that but for the Kansas agitation, which has grown up we would to-day have been associated with our Cleveland brethren. Now, I know some of the history of this matter, and I feel justified in making the assertion that not twenty men would have been found in 1860 who would have opposed the action than has been passed in 1857. It was the excitement in reference to Kansas and Fremont that caused such a difference of opinion. That was the reason that such anxiety grew up in reference to this question. And, sir, what has been the case in regard to us, I verily believe will be the case in regard to others. There is some reason to believe that the churches themselves will be entirely free from the discussion of this subject, but we have politicians in the churches, and so long as they have any aims to accomplish by continuing this agitation, they will be sure to keep it up. Why, sir, there was a remarkable developement of this in the Cleveland Assembly. The very men who seemed to be most active in getting up the excitement were the politicians. They gave rise to the idea that there is a grave question of morality connected with this subject of slavery, thus playing the part of the demagogue under the veil of the church. But, sir, we are separated, and the question is, what shall we do? Three things are proposed: first, a union with our old school brethren; second, an association together in separate Presbyteries and Synods; third, a new organization upon a platform which we have literally adopted in regard to slavery, that it is a subject so far as the relations of master and slave are concerned, and so far as it is a State institution which should never be introduced into the church. It is necessary in the discussion of this subject that we consider the difficulties in the way of a reunion with our old school brethren. And I will say here, plainly, that I intend to express my views upon his subject very clearly. But in doing so, if there is any old school brother in this house, I wish him to understand that I do it because the subject has been forced upon me, and in perfect consistency with the most fraternal feeling for every individual member of that church. When I look at them ecclesiastically—look at their principles—and contrast them with ours, the inquiry that suggests itself to my mind is this: can we get upon such a platform that we can both stand there without any prospect of a disunion hereafter? And in order to determine this question it is necessary to look at the difficulties in the way of union. We can talk about honor, pride, the buttoning up of coats, the assuming of independent attitudes and everything of that kind, but the grand inquiry appertains to principles. I would sever my hand from my body—I don't hesitate to say it, sir—I would sever my hand from my body before I would disregard the principles which are involved in this matter, fundamental, sir, as I believe them to be. First, then, it is necessary to look, in order consider these difficulties and determine in an enlightened way whether there is a prospect for a safe union with our old school brethren. Let us look to the cause of the separation. What were the principles involved in this? I lay it down as a proposition which cannot be successfully disputed, that the principle which is essentially involved in the excinding acts of 1837 was this—that the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America has the power, by a mere act of legislation, to cut off ministers and private members without a charge or trial. Where is the man that will deny that? If gentlemen would take the trouble to look into the minutes of the General Assembly of 1837, they will find this fact to be as I state it. It will be found therein how ministers were cut off from the church, a large proportion of whom, it was ascertained, never since had a connection with any Christian church, and no one man of whom has ever come into the Presbyterian church, so far as has been perceived or ascertained, except in the manner prescribed by the constitution of the church—that is, by the rule adopted as the confession in the old school church. Talk about the plan of union of 1837! Any man who will take up that plan and examine it will say that it has nothing to do with the admission of ministers into the church. I challenge any man to lay his finger upon a single sentence in that plan of union that gives the slightest intimation of the admission of Congregational ministers into the Presbyterian church. Look through Virginia! In the old school and new school ministry of Virginia there are few if any of these ministers. Here is a constitutional principle in the old school branch; and I would ask are we prepared to unite ourselves with a church that stands alone amongst all the evangelical churches of this land, in claiming the right by their practice, and refusing to disavow that their General Assembly can, by an act of legislation, shut out a private member or minister for any cause which they may think proper without giving an opportunity for vindication? Now, sir, there is the act from Princeton, which has been admitted to be a constitutional act. Here, then, is a principle, and it behooves us to look into it. We took the position in 1838 that we could not conscientiously remain in connection with that church. Nineteen of us—brother Leach, brother Breden and others in the Synod of Virginia at that time—took the position that we could not conscientiously remain in connection with such a church. It so happens that I have got in my possession a report of the Farmville Convention, and I shall read a few sentences from it, in order to show how matters stood then. [And what they were then they are now. He read some passages from this report, which was substantially a declaration of the causes that induced the separation. They are contained in the arguments set forth in this speech.] Now, sir, here is the principle. The question, then, which must suggest itself to the mind of every one, has taken a part in these proceedings, and who acted from principle. Has anything since occurred which can be anything like a reasonable reason, if I may so speak, for disregarding that principle? Is there anything in our present position to justify a disregard of it? We were told then that we must abandon our old school brethren, whom we loved and honored, for the sake of the church. We did abandon them, and we raised the constitutional banner high in the land. Let us continue to raise it, and let the country and the world see that we stand upon our individual rights—that we are determined to act upon the principle which characterizes the laws of man; that is, that a man can never be deprived of his privileges as a minister or member of the church unless it be by a fair trial. Were you to abandon this church and go to them without any disavowal of this principle, I say I would look upon you as having acted a schismatical part. Are you ready to identify yourselves with a church that has acted upon the principle that their higher courts can assume legislative power and supreme legislation in the church? Do you identify yourselves with a body of that kind? Are you prepared to do it? What is the answer to this, my friends? Mr. Tucker is trying to get out of this difficulty. I know him. I know how he plays the player. I have heard him often, and I know he has said as much here upon the subject, and made as good use of the material furnished him for argument, as any man could make. He says, in the first place, that they were revolutionary, and that so is your withdrawal from the General Assembly. He says the old schools in 1837 were guilty of revolution, and, therefore, there was no reason why we should not go back and be brethren together in revolutionary acts. I suppose if my friend was in France he would be among the red republicans or the Jacobins in revolutionary times. He seems to think that it is a very small matter to be a revolutionist. I would ask my friend, in regard to that idea, if by revolution an abandonment of all former principles is enjoined, what would he think if these church abolitionists were to revolutionize the country? Now, my friend seems to justify the principle involved in this act of 1857 simply because it was a revolutionary act. Now, in regard to our being guilty of the same thing, it seems strange that such a charge would come from a gentleman entertaining such strong Southern feelings as his friend was well known to entertain. I suppose that we who left the assembly in 1837 were excinders. I suppose that Dr. Chalmers and his associates, who built St. George's church in Edinburg, Scotland, and raised the banner of free churchism and liberty of conscience to all men in regard to church matters, were excinders. Why, sir, no one can be influenced by an objection like that. It is a withdrawal upon principle—a withdrawal from a body that has violated ecclesiastical rights, and nothing more. When we found that our new school brethren had been guilty of virtual exclusion in the integrity of our confidence, and acting upon the same principle which dictated our action in 1837, we seceded. We said to them, you have got upon another platform, and, as we did in 1837, we leave you. But my friend says this is a mere abstraction. I know something of abstractionism—they accuse me sometimes of being an abstractionist. Now, sir, what is an abstraction? Is it a mere abstraction for an ecclesiastical body to say, "I will cut you off from all church privileges?" Here you have been in the church perhaps for forty years, as has been the case with Dr. Rice; you have preached for forty years in the church; you have worked faithfully and diligently; you may have done all that, but still we must sever you from our connection. I put it to the common sense of any man upon this floor, if the General Assembly of 1837 had a right to cut off these synods and presbyteries, had they not an equal right to cut off the Synod of Virginia for slaveholding? Why not? No man can answer the question without taking the position that we do. As a minister of the gospel I maintain the proposition that when a charge is brought against me I have a right to defend myself, and this is a mere abstraction with my friend over the way (Mr. Tucker.) I know, sir, that this principle enters vitally into everything like ecclesiastical right. Abandon the principle that there should be a fair trial upon any charge that may be preferred against you, and then, sir, you dissent from, you trample upon, the plain sayings of the Bible. You are revolutionists in the worst sense. And this is a mere abstraction. Again, my friend says that this was all done through sympathy with the excinded synods. I have seen the same stated in the newspapers, too. I think that those who make a charge of that kind seriously, after an investigation of the whole subject, must have a very poor idea of Christian Southern men who separated at that day. Can any man suppose that we here in Virginia have more sympathy with our brethren away in the North than we have with them?—that for mere sympathy, when there was no essential principle involved, we would have left those with whom we lived—whose pastoral labors we shared—those who were bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh—dwelling under the same roof, and participating in each other's domestic joy? Never, sir. I repudiate utterly, from the very depths of my soul, any such idea as that. No, sir—it was principle; and if it was not, every man of us ought to get upon our knees to our old school brethren and acknowledge that we did wrong, and ask for pardon. But if it was principle, let us not rush into their arms without examining the subject carefully. No, sir; it was not sympathy that led us into the secession, but principle. But my friend, Mr. Tucker, asked, "Why did you not secede in 1850?" I will say that there was no exclusion, virtually or actually, by the General Assembly in 1850. What did the General Assembly do at that time? I was a member of that body and took part in its discussions. I know the history of that whole matter, publicly and privately, and I say that the interpretation that we of the south put upon that act was the interpretation that was intended should be placed upon it. Why, Dr. Mason, of New York, and Dr. George Duffield would never have voted for it if it were otherwise than favorable to the South. And there was one fact which showed that such a thing was never intended, as had been intimated with reference to that act. Its this, that our brother, Dr. Stiles, of whom Mr. Tucker spoke, after making the most eloquent speech upon the subject that I ever heard from any man, voted for the resolutions. And why? On account of the interpretation which we knew would be put upon it.

Mr. TUCKER (interrupting)—I would ask the gentleman, if he was not opposed to the resolutions why did he not vote for it?

Dr. BOYD—We acted upon the principle, and took that ground, that it was inappropriate and unwise to take any action as regarded the slavery question, particularly for the judicatory of the church. That was the reason why we protested against it, and not because of the sentiments themselves. We took the position, as we do and always have done, that the relation between master and slave should be allowed to continue until at least some scheme could be devised, or a state of things ensue, to improve those relations, if such was necessary; but no plan has been devised. Let it be remembered that our old school brethren have never changed on this subject of the excinding act. So far from it, they have been indirectly, and even directly, referred to as the principle of their acts. Look to their several writers. Where is the Old school man who went for the excinding acts of 1837 that will now take the position that the old school General Assembly ought to disavow the principle of those acts? I am aware that there are many in that branch of the church who have no liking for those resolutions; but I look at them as a body. The General Assembly did the thing, and where is the evidence that there is a disposition on the part of the General Assembly to disavow those acts? Are you ready to abandon the platform that you adopted in 1837? You abandoned the Cleveland Assembly because of a virtual exclusion, and you now want to rush into a body who were guilty of actual exclusion—you leave them and go to a body that has not dared hitherto to disavow that that was their intention. But it is said that the old school do not require you to approve of those acts of 1837. Why, every one knows that Dr. Hage denied that there was any such requisition made. We have been protesting for twenty years, and now, inasmuch as we have been doing so, we ought to give up our principles and go back. Why, the fact that we have been protesting for twenty years is a confirmation of the fact that the principles were vital. I suppose the national church of Scotland, that has inserted the protests of Drs. Chalmers and Welsh upon their records, would have been contented if, after a separation of ten years, they would return. I say the very fact that we stand here before the world protesting against these acts shows that there is a vital principle in this matter. We should look carefully into this matter, and not be influenced by the circumstances in which we are placed, to abandon these principles. I do not want to be misunderstood upon this subject. I go for union. I would rejoice if every brother of the old school in this country could be cordially united with us in the exercise of mutual confidence, bound together by a common ecclesiastical tie; and I should rejoice from the very bottom of my heart if our old school brethren and ourselves could be brought together in a way that would not compromise principles on either side. That has always been my doctrine. I never thought there was any occasion for the difference—I mean for the excinding acts; for there the disunion commenced properly. I never thought there was any occasion for such a measure, and for what preceded the acts of 1837. I felt that we were all substantially on the same platform, that our doctrines were the same; and if we differed about some technical terms, we stood upon the same basis. Dr. B. proceeded at some length to show some irreconcilable doctrinal differences which interposed insurmountable obstacles, in his opinion, to a reunion of the two churches.

He was followed by the

Rev. R. MATHEWS, of Va., and Rev. J. H. C. LEACH, of Va., who advocated reunion.

Before the latter gentleman concluded, the Convention adjourned, to meet to-morrow at 9 o'clock A. M.

Religious Intelligence.

Rev. Theophilus Fiske will preach in the Sixth Universalist church, Twenty fourth street, near Sixth avenue, this morning and afternoon.

Rev. H. J. Eddy, of Bloomington, Illinois, will preach in the chapel, in Seventeenth street, immediately west of the Sixth avenue, this morning; in the evening the Rev. Dr. Church will preach at the same place.

There will be preaching to day in the John street First Methodist Episcopal church, John street, by the pastor, Rev. Charles E. Harris, a Christian Jew.

Rev. George H. Houghton, rector of the Church of the Transfiguration, will preach this evening in the Memorial church, corner of Hammond street and Waverley place.

There will be preaching to day in the North Reformed Dutch church, corner of William and Fulton streets, at 10½ A. M. and at 4 in the afternoon.

Rev. Dr. Marsella will deliver a discourse to the Hollanders, in their own language, this evening, in the lecture room of the church corner of Bleecker and Amos streets.

Divine service is held every Sunday in the Protestant Episcopal mission church, Clinton Hall, Astor place, in charge of the Rev. Robert S. Dickson. Subject this morning, "Treasured up Wrath."

The Rev. Dr. MacIlvaine's conversations with Romanists on the unscriptural character of their faith, continue to be held in the Mission church, Twentieth street, between First and Second avenues, on Sabbath evening.

There will be an evening service at the Protestant Episcopal free Church of the Holy Evangelists, corner of Beekman and Cliff streets, every Sunday evening, in addition to the regular morning and afternoon services.

RE-OPENING OF THE CITY CHURCHES.

The following churches, after being closed for a short time, will resume divine worship to-day: The Reformed Dutch church, in Seventh avenue; the Central Reformed Dutch church, Rev. Dr. Van Zandt's, in Ninth street; the N. W. Reformed Dutch church, Rev. H. D. Ganse's, in Twenty third street, between Sixth and Seventh avenues; the Market street church, Rev. George W. Wood's; the Broome street Reformed Dutch church, Rev. Peter Stryker's; the Madison square Presbyterian church; the Presbyterian church in University place; St. Stephen's church, corner of Broome and Christie streets, Rev. Joseph H. Price, pastor; the Universalist church, in Orchard street, near Broome, Rev. Dr. Sawyer, pastor; and the Rev. Dr. Bellows will resume service in All Soul's church.

St. Matthew's Episcopal church in Jersey City will be reopened to-day, on which occasion the rector, Rev. J. J. Bowden, will preach a discourse upon the death of the late Miss Robinson, who was lost on board of the propeller J. N. Harris, at the time of the recent disaster to that vessel upon the Sound. Miss Robinson was the soprano singer in the choir of St. Matthew's church, and had been for three years.

ORDINATIONS.

Rev. A. R. Nott, a graduate of the Rochester Theological Seminary, was ordained on the 2d inst. pastor of the First Baptist Church, in Broome street, with appropriate religious ceremonies.

Mr. Charles Freeman Foster, son of Dea. Ira Foster, of Dorchester, Mass. a graduate of Waterville College and of the Newton Theological Seminary, was ordained for the work and office of the ministry at the Baptist church in Neponset, on the 3d inst.

Mr T. G. Smith was ordained to the gospel ministry, and installed pastor of the Fourth Presbyterian church of Cincinnati, on the 19th of August.

INVITATIONS.

Rev. C. B. Boynton has received and accepted an invitation from the Vine street Congregational church, Cincinnati, to become again their pastor, and will return immediately to the field where he laboured for ten years.

The Second Presbyterian church of Wheeling, Va., has extended a call to the Rev. S. V. Dodge, of Springfield, Illinois. It is thought he will accept.

Rev. B. B. Beckwith pastor of the First Presbyterian church of Gouverneire, N. Y., has finally declined the call sometime since tendered him by Yellow Spring church, Ia., and remains with his old people.

Rev. J. J. Hill, of Wapello, Ia., has accepted a call to Glencoe, McLeod county, Minnesota Territory.

Rev. Charles Hawley, of Lyons, has received a unanimous call to become the pastor of the first Presbyterian church of Auburn, N. Y.

Rev. William S. Foster, late of Lawrence, Mass., has accepted an invitation to supply the Edwards church, of