



BLISHED DAILY AND TRI-WEEKLY BY EDGAR SNOWDEN.

MONDAY EVENING, NOVEMBER 12, 1877

The discussion now in progress in the Southern Historical Papers between Mr. Jefferson Davis and Mr. R. M. T. Hunter concerning the conference at Hampton Roads, between the agents of the United States and those of the Confederate States, though very able, is ill-timed and out of place.

After the army appropriation bill had been completed, in the U. S. House of Representatives, last Saturday, it was discovered that the amendments were so conflicting that it would have to be revised.

Mr. Thompson may not be much of a sailor, but his intention of overhauling the books of his predecessor in office, and his ideas about labor at the navy yards—fixing the time at ten hours, but permitting those who want to work only eight hours to stop at the expiration of that time, and to be paid two tenths less than their fellow workmen, prove that, notwithstanding Mr. Conkling's and Mr. Wendell Phillips' assertions to the contrary, President Hayes was not as unfortunate in his selection of a Secretary of the Navy, at least, as was the idol of the stalwart republicans—Gen. Grant.

Judge Guion seems determined that the retail liquor dealers of Richmond, at least, shall comply with the terms of the Moffet law. He has made the Commissioner of Revenue of that city report those whose registers indicate the lowest assessment, and has issued an order against them to appear on the first day of the December term and show cause why their licenses should not be revoked, upon the grounds that the business done by them, as indicated by the registers in their places of business, does not justify them in paying the license of a bar keeper or retail liquor dealer.

The leaders of the so-called workmen's party in Philadelphia are accused by the rank and file of treason and incompetency, and of selling them at the late election; and doubtless the charges are true, for those who try to obtain office by exciting the hatred of one class of people against their neighbors, with all the bribes attending such hatred, would not refuse a bribe for any such consideration as party fealty—the obligations of which they not only fail to recognize but can not appreciate.

Some of the Virginia newspapers, in their classification of the members elect to the House of Delegates, put down Capt. T. P. Wallace, of Orange, as a "reagister." The Captain, doubtless, like many others of the successful class, dates, is in favor of any compromise between the State and her creditors that will be perfectly satisfactory to both parties, but the idea of consenting to any attempt to enforce a compromise upon unwilling creditors has never entered his head.

The President's Policy. The Washington correspondent of the New York Times says:—The republican Senators held a caucus Saturday, about which unusual secrecy is observed. It is known that it was mainly devoted to the consideration of the civil service policy of the President and the course that should be pursued by the republicans with reference to the confirmation of Executive appointments. There was a very full and free expression of opinion. All those present gave expression to their views, which enables the details of the caucus to be more securely guarded. Senator Conkling took a prominent part in the discussion, and is understood to have advocated the rejection of all nominations made to succeed officers whose terms have not expired, and against whom no charges are made. Several Senators, including Messrs. Hoar, Dawes and Christiancy, opposed Mr. Conkling's views, and advocated the confirmation of all proper nominations according to the usual custom. There was considerable feeling manifested between Mr. Conkling and those who opposed his views, and he was plainly given to understand that he will not be permitted to use republican Senators in an effort to create antagonism between them and the President merely to gratify his personal ambition and malice. Mr. Conkling's late interview published in a New York paper was referred to by some of the speakers, and the terms in which he spoke of the President and some members of the Cabinet were characterized as unjust and impolitic. It was plainly shown at the caucus that Mr. Conkling cannot carry a majority of republican Senators into an indiscriminate crusade against the President's nominations, and it is reasonably certain, after the demonstration of Saturday, that those republican Senators will not be deterred from voting for the confirmation of the New York appointments merely because the persons nominated may be distasteful to Mr. Conkling. No formal action was taken by the caucus, but the pretty free expressions of opinion indulged in will serve as well for all practical purposes as if the caucus had formally acted.

Jack Frost vs. Yellow Jack. PORT ROYAL, S. C., Nov. 12.—There was a heavy frost here last night. There was not a single case of sickness in town at present, and the quarantine at Beaufort against this place has been raised.

SYNOD OF VIRGINIA. AFTERNOON SESSION—SATURDAY.

The Synod was called to order at half past three o'clock Saturday afternoon by the Moderator, and.

On motion of Rev. Mr. Shanks, the report on the division of Synod was docketed.

Rev. T. W. Simpson was invited to sit as a corresponding member.

Rev. Dr. Martin, of Danville, presented the narrative of the state of religion within the bounds of the Synod, showing a decided improvement in all branches of the Church work.

Rev. H. W. Brown presented the report of the committee appointed to prepare an address in response to the addresses of R. V. Dr. Melville, Wadell, and Wilson, on sustentation, education and foreign missions, which was adopted.

G. D. Gray, esq., presented the minority report of the committee on the division of the Synod, recommending that the Synod be not divided, which was docketed.

The reports of the committee on East Hanover Presbytery and of the committee on theological training were also docketed.

The report of the committee on Union Theological Seminary was docketed.

The case of Rev. Dr. Baird being resumed, Rev. Dr. Theodor Pror, of East Hanover Presbytery, closed the argument on behalf of the commissioners appointed to represent the Presbytery.

He said that in consequence of the able speeches already made he would occupy the available time for comparatively a short time, but having been appointed to represent East Hanover Presbytery, he would do his duty in upholding the dignity of that body.

The Presbytery stood before the Synod at some disadvantage. It was a part of our nature to sympathize with the unfortunate, and the very presence of Dr. E. T. Baird excited sympathy in his behalf. He would not raise his voice against Dr. Baird were it not his duty to do so.

The Presbytery which he represented had a high and responsible duty to perform, and they performed that duty in the fear of God. The good of the Church demanded it, public opinion, which should not altogether be disregarded, demanded it, and the book of discipline demanded it, in that it required them to look after the private and official character of the ministry of the Church.

While Dr. Baird never heard of the rumor of his defection until he read in the newspapers the action of the Presbytery, he (Dr. Pror) heard of it, and read it in the public print long before the Presbytery met. When the very air was reeking with defection, extending to every branch of society, the news was published to the country, that a prominent and trusted minister of the Presbyterian Church was a defaulter, and every department of the Church work was at once paralyzed, and the cause of Jesus Christ suffered great injury—wounded in the house of his friends.

Now, said Dr. Pror, what was East Hanover Presbytery to do? What would the Synod of Virginia do under the same circumstances? It did simply what it was its duty to do. He was astonished and surprised to hear Dr. Baird say that he was not conscious of crime. What would be thought of a young man, who, desiring to visit New York, put his hands into the coffers of his employer and appropriated to his own use the money of another? Would that not be crime? If appropriation of other people's money to our own private use was not crime what on earth could be considered crime? Dr. Baird, Dr. Pror said, spoke of his destruction. Did the Presbytery destroy him? No, Dr. Baird destroyed himself. The Presbytery was charged with being unjust, unrighteous, and unmerciful, and prejudiced against Dr. Baird, whereas the truth was that there never has been a man so pure, so upright, and so devoted to his duty as Dr. Baird, and he did not know how the other brethren of that Presbytery felt, but, as for his part, he was willing to go direct to the bar of God with his record in the matter, and answer for his action, poor, weak, sinful creature that he was. If he ever sinned a man in his life, that man was Dr. Baird, and it caused him great pain and sorrow to cast his vote against him, but he loved the Lord Jesus Christ more than he did any man on earth. Not only did his heart go forth in sorrow to the poor unfortunate man, but the whole Presbytery was grief-stricken at the action they were compelled to take. Dr. Baird, he said, spoke of throwing himself into the river at Toronto—committing the crime of self-destruction. If he had, the news of such a fate would only have added fresh sorrow to that already felt for him by the members of East Hanover Presbytery, and he thanked God that he did not yield to temptation, and that he is a live man today, and that his prayer was that God, by His Spirit, would follow him throughout his earthly pilgrimage, and at last bring him safely into the port of everlasting peace, there to enjoy the blessings of Heaven, and sit down in glory with all God's redeemed.

Dr. Pror's address was not a long one, but any one that heard it could see, from the very face of the gentleman, that he felt, from the bottom of his heart, every word that he spoke, and he succeeded in showing one thing, at least, that there was no prejudice in his mind against Dr. E. T. Baird.

A motion to reconsider the vote to meet at half past nine o'clock Monday morning was then adopted, and the Synod decided to hold a night session.

Dr. Dabney said that it was evident, from the impatience of the members, that they were not in a proper spirit to go on with judicial business, and in view of the commission services to-morrow (Sunday) he thought it would be eminently appropriate to consider business of a more peaceful character than the case of Dr. Baird, and he would therefore move that the Synod adjourn to meet at 7 o'clock, to hear the memorials of deceased ministers.

Dr. LeFevre said he had several other gentlemen, acting on the faith of the Synod, thinking that it would adjourn till Monday morning, had telegraphed home that they would occupy their pulpits in Baltimore as usual, and that if the Synod proceeded with the trial of Dr. Baird at the night session they would not be competent to vote on the case, and therefore he would ask, on behalf of himself and other brethren, that they be excused from voting when the case came up for final action.

On motion, Rev. Drs. LeFevre, Munkland, Peck, Graham and Pitzer, and Rev. Messrs. Branch, Umphries and Elder Gray were granted leave of absence.

After a great many motions, amendments and substitutes, and a great deal of parliamentary debate, Dr. Dabney's motion was lost, and the Synod decided to adjourn to meet at seven o'clock at night to transact any business that came before it.

After the reading of a paper from Rev. Dr. Patton, President of Howard University, requesting the appointment of a committee to visit the theological department of that institution, which was referred to the committee of bills and overtures.

The Synod adjourned to meet at seven o'clock at night, the first business being to hear the memorials of deceased ministers.

NIGHT SESSION. The Synod was called to order at 7 o'clock Saturday night by the Moderator, who a vote of thanks was returned to Messrs. Green & Bro. for furniture provided for the use of the Synod.

The report of the committee on Sunday Schools was then presented and adopted.

The Moderator stated that when the Synod took a recess it was decided to meet at seven o'clock to hear the memorials of ministers that had died during the past year, and those papers were now in order.

The report of the committee on the memorial of Rev. J. D. Ewing, D. D., was then read by Rev. Samuel Brown and adopted.

The memorial of Rev. J. D. Mitchell, D. D., L. L. D., who, for a long time, was a resident of this city, and who died here a short time ago, was read by Rev. J. G. Bell, and Col. Preston paid a handsome tribute to the memory of Rev. Dr. Mitchell, reciting many pleasant recollections and reminiscences of that man of God, and said that under his teachings he first learned what faith was, and by connection with him his views of the religion of Christ were expanded.

Rev. Dr. Shepherdson also paid a tribute to the memory of Dr. Mitchell, and said a better man to work in the social circle he never knew.

Rev. E. H. Cumpston and Rev. Dr. Wm. T. Hall also spoke of Dr. Mitchell, testifying to his deep piety and great usefulness.

The memorial of Dr. Mitchell was then adopted.

The memorial of Rev. Wm. LeComte was then read by Rev. Dr. Pitzer and adopted.

On motion, the memorial of Rev. R. T. Berry, D. D., was postponed till next meeting of Synod, and the Moderator appointed the following committee to prepare the memorial:—Rev. Dr. Bullock, Rev. Dr. LeFevre and Rev. S. D. Stuart.

The memorial services were then closed with prayer by Rev. Samuel R. Houston.

The case of Dr. Baird being resumed, Rev. Dr. Wm. Brown, of East Hanover Presbytery, said he would not discuss the general question, but would address himself to but three points. He asked was the sentence of East Hanover Presbytery sustained by the evidence before it, and contended that it not only was sustained, but that the sentence was just and righteous, and that every member of that body was competent to sit in judgment on the case. Though wrong doing was admitted, he said the intention of crime was denied. He would admit that when Dr. Baird appropriated the money belonging to the committee to his own private use, he might not have intended to commit crime, but when he took the money, which he confessed, Dr. Baird had a motive. Now what was that motive? Dr. Baird said he thought that he would have to believe that Dr. Baird was void of understanding or that conscientiousness ceased to perform its functions. He said he had no objection to having the case sent back to Presbytery, and he would say in advance, and he spoke for the members of his Presbytery, that they had not the slightest prejudice, or one cent of personal interest in the matter. If the matter was sent back to the Presbytery he intended to exercise his rights, and nobody would deprive him of them.

Dr. S. J. Baird said he might enter into criticism of the action of East Hanover Presbytery and point out the unconstitutionality of every step from the beginning to the end of the great tragedy that hurled his brother from the Church of Christ. He knew the man who was pleading at the bar of the Synod. When more than fifty years ago he was called at the bedside of his mother and a brother was placed in his arms. From that time to this he had been his constant companion, and he knew him—his brother—and he believed from the bottom of his heart that there was not in the body a nobler and a purer man at heart than the man who was now debarred from visible communion with his Saviour.

The Moderator said that the book of discipline required that the members of East Hanover Presbytery and Dr. Baird should retire.

Rev. Dr. Baird then retired, and the members of Synod allowed five minutes each in which to express their opinion as to what should be done with the case.

The following are the expressions of opinion in regard to the action of East Hanover Presbytery in deposing Dr. Baird from the ministry and suspending him from the communion of the church. The names of the speakers are left out in deference to the expressed wish of some of the members of Synod.

Rev. Dr. — said his opinion had already been expressed, and he would prefer to wait and give a further expression of it by his vote.

Rev. Mr. — thought there had been irregularities in the proceedings against Dr. Baird by East Hanover Presbytery, and desired the case to be referred back to that Presbytery for a new trial.

Rev. Mr. — was in favor of the case being referred back to the Presbytery for a new trial.

Rev. Mr. — thought that the case must go back for a new trial, because the Presbytery had been too hasty in taking up the case of Dr. Baird; the proceedings had been unconstitutional and irregular, and that the sentence had been too severe.

Rev. Mr. — was in favor of referring the case back for a new trial; thought the sentence had been too severe, but he was in favor of suspending Dr. Baird from the ministry for a time.

Rev. Dr. — was in favor of sending the case back to East Hanover Presbytery. He had perfect confidence in that Presbytery, but he thought they had acted in haste, but that haste was because of their intense desire to relieve the Church of the reproach brought upon it by Dr. Baird, and purge the Gospel ministry, for which desire he honored them. He would not trust Dr. Baird with \$10,000 to manage business with, but he would trust him with untold treasure to deliver in a distant city, not having the slightest doubt but that it would be delivered safe. He did not think to refer the case back for a new trial would be any assurance upon that Presbytery, which was composed of high toned, honorable Christian gentlemen. He believed firmly that Dr. Baird was a child of God.

Rev. Dr. — thought there ought to be a new trial of the case because there had been gross irregularities and unconstitutionality in the proceedings. The Presbytery of East Hanover had no right to profess to try the case on the paper presented to them by Dr. Baird, and then introduce other evidence, and on its base their judgment.

Rev. Dr. — said in his mind there was not sufficient proof to establish the guilt of the crime alleged. Dr. Baird did not waive his rights, but if he did, the Presbytery had no right to waive the constitution, for the very foundation of the Church depends upon their adherence to the constitution. He was in favor of a commission to try the case.

Rev. Mr. — thought there was precipitancy on the part of the Presbytery, but he was in favor of remanding the case back to be tried just as if it had never been taken up.

Rev. Mr. — believed East Hanover Presbytery had acted with propriety in view of the circumstances surrounding the case, and the light they had before them. He thought light had been shed upon the case during the trial before the Synod sufficient to enable East Hanover Presbytery to render a milder decision. He was in favor of referring the case back to that Presbytery.

Rev. Mr. — thought the case ought to be referred for a new trial, and the amplest opportunity should be given Dr. Baird to prove himself innocent of the grave crime alleged against him.

Rev. Dr. — thought the case ought to be referred because there were irregularities in the proceedings of the Presbytery against Dr. Baird. He said they were too hasty, too severe, misconstrued Dr. Baird's paper, and there was no evidence to establish the guilt of the crime alleged in the indictment on which he was convicted.

Rev. Dr. — said the sentence was terrible, taking the very life of the man, and could not have been worse had Dr. Baird been the vilest reprobate. He thought the whole thing was worse than unconstitutional; it was unjust, unrighteous and unmerciful. In this thing, he said, was allowed to go on the ministerial life of none of them would be safe. He thought the outward manifestation of East Hanover Presbytery showed that they were not a fit

tribunal to try the case. Dr. Baird, he said, had suffered enough already.

Rev. Mr. — wanted the case sent back for a new trial, but thought the Presbytery had done nothing worthy of censure.

Rev. Mr. — said at the time of the trial of Dr. Baird there was a kind of panic, and East Hanover Presbytery yielded to that panic, and to say the least, the thing was done in haste. He thought that the defection was so mixed up with the purchase of the printing press, which the Committee of Publication consented to, that Dr. Baird was not alone responsible.

Mr. — said it was clear in his mind that the action of East Hanover Presbytery was just and that their action was demanded, but he thought there were irregularities in the proceedings.

Rev. Dr. — said with the evidence before him, it would be impossible to acquit the accused, nor did he think the sentence too severe, but he admitted irregularities in the proceedings. As to Dr. Baird not being present at his trial, he having waived that right, the speaker asked was not Lord Bacon convicted by the English House of Lords, on his own confession, and that without his presence. He could not censure the Presbytery for their action, but in order to give Dr. Baird every opportunity to establish his innocence, he was in favor of remanding the case for a new trial.

Rev. Mr. — said he believed the action of the Presbytery was unconstitutional, hasty, and the sentence too severe, and if it could be done, he would prefer that the case should be tried by a commission of the Synod.

Rev. Mr. — was in favor of sending the case back to East Hanover Presbytery. He did not think Dr. Baird intended to commit crime. He thought the sentence too severe, and he would not be willing to be tried again by that Presbytery.

Rev. Mr. — thought the sentence ought to be reversed in part. He did not think he would like to be tried again by that Presbytery.

Rev. Mr. — was unable to see that the sentence was unjust, or that East Hanover Presbytery deserved to be censured.

Mr. — thought the case ought to go back to the Presbytery for a new trial. The proceedings were too hasty and unconstitutional. He said the sentence ought to have been milder, for he did not believe Dr. Baird was guilty of intentional crime. He could not see that a new trial before the Presbytery promised much for Dr. Baird; he would therefore favor a commission, but if the case was sent back to the Presbytery, it ought to be accompanied with some instructions. He wished it to be understood that he did not, in the slightest degree, impeach the Presbytery.

Mr. — did not believe the verdict was sustained by the evidence, and if Dr. Baird had been guilty of willful crime his confession ought to have entitled him to some mercy. He favored a commission, but if sent back to the Presbytery, let it be with instructions to bring in a milder sentence.

Rev. Mr. — thought the members were inclined to give way to a sentimental feeling. He was in favor of recommitting the case for a new trial, requiring a full and thorough investigation.

Rev. Mr. — thought there was some misapprehension as to the sentence passed upon Dr. Baird. It was not excommunication but merely a suspension from the Church.

Rev. Mr. — thought East Hanover Presbytery had committed a great blunder. He was surprised that in a body composed of so many members as the Presbytery that tried Dr. Baird there was not one dissenting voice to the severest sentence that could be pronounced on a man. Dr. Baird was sentenced on one-sided evidence, and his own confession was used to prove his guilt. He was in favor, however, of a new trial.

Rev. Dr. — believed Dr. Baird was guilty of the crime alleged and did not believe he had repented of it. If the case was sent back he believed the sentence would have to be repeated, but in order to give Dr. Baird every opportunity to establish his innocence, he was willing to send the case back for a new trial.

Rev. Dr. — said he was in favor of giving the accused every opportunity to substantiate every claim made in his appeal. If injustice to Dr. Baird had been committed he had no fear of its repetition, from the fact that East Hanover Presbytery knew that the accused had the right, and would exercise it, of appeal. He felt perfect confidence in the Presbytery and was willing for the case to be tried by that body.

Mr. — thought that the Presbytery had no right to deprive Dr. Baird of his rights or to try him at their first meeting. The whole proceeding was unconstitutional and a dangerous precedent. He was in favor of sending the case back, and desired the Presbytery to give Dr. Baird every opportunity to prove himself an innocent man.

Rev. Mr. — thought the sentence was just as the case stood before Presbytery, but too severe.

Rev. Dr. — thought that the proceedings of Presbytery were irregular and unconstitutional, and therefore unjust, and considered Dr. Baird grossly aggrieved. He did not think the Presbytery a safe tribunal, but in the absence of something better, he would vote to send the case back.

Rev. Mr. — was of opinion that the sentence was just.

Rev. Dr. R. L. Dabney then offered the following as the judgment of the Synod in the case, which was adopted:

Resolved, In the appeal of the Rev. E. T. Baird, D. D., from the censures of East Hanover Presbytery the Synod finds as follows:

1. That the sentence was not a punishment for irregularities in the process.

2. Inasmuch as East Hanover Presbytery appear to have acted to the best of their judgment and with good intention, Synod implies no censure on them.

3. That the case is sent back to East Hanover Presbytery for a new trial at the earliest convenient date, and that court is instructed to proceed regularly and make a thorough investigation.

4. Until this new trial is issued the sentence appealed from shall remain provisionally in force.

The Committee on Bills and Overtures presented their report, which was adopted.

Rev. Dr. S. J. Baird, brother of the accused case forward and said there had been a resolution impeaching him before the Synod for circulating a pamphlet bearing on his brother's case, and he now submitted himself for any action the Synod thought proper.

The resolution was laid on the table, and Synod adjourned with prayer and benediction by the Moderator at 12 o'clock.

The Tweed Ring. NEW YORK, Nov. 12.—The Aldermanic committee investigating the frauds of the Tweed ring met to-day. Harry F. Tainter, expert, testified that himself and assistants received \$30,565 from the Attorney General and \$73,750,544 from the Finance Department for working up the ring frauds. Of this amount he received \$65,000, which was paid about \$10,000 a year for the time he was employed in ferreting out the extent of the frauds.

Fire. BIDDYFORD, ME., Nov. 12.—Sunday morning a fire broke out at Konneknunkport, and burned the store of Wheeler & Bell, in which this post-office was situated, which was valued at \$20,000. House owned by W. J. Parker; loss \$20,000. E. O. Huff's meat market; loss \$500. The building was owned by C. C. and E. Perkins; loss \$1,000. The flames crossed the street and destroyed the building owned and occupied by Captain Brown; boot and shoe dealer; loss \$8,000. Two other buildings were damaged.

A train of cars from Little Rock, Arkansas, for Memphis ran through a trestle near Backfish Bayou, last night. Express messenger Beasley was severely injured.

Foreign News.

The contest for the Lord Rectorship of Edinburgh University terminated in favor of the Marquis of Harrington, leader of the Liberal party in the House of Commons. He received 932 votes, against 634 for Mr. Cross, Home Secretary.

Le Nord, the Brussels organ of the Russian Government, regards the speech of Lord Beaconsfield in London as an encouragement to Turkey to fight to the last extremity, but it does not think that the speech need cause fears of other complications.

Twenty additional American masons began work on the new law courts building in London Saturday.

The French Chamber of Deputies has definitely elected M. Jules Grevy President by a vote of 299 against 159 blanks. The former Vice Presidents and Secretaries of the Chamber were re-elected. M. Caillaux, Minister of Finance, announced that he would present the budget as soon as the House was finally constituted.

A telegram from Paris says:—"In the Chamber of Deputies to-day the republican members for the Department of the Rhone will present a resolution requiring the immediate cessation of legal proceedings against all Deputies and the release of those who are in prison. The second part of the resolution aims at the release of Bonnet Duverdiere. It appears certain that the resolution will be adopted. It is reported that in Saturday's Cabinet council it was decided that the question whether M. Bonnet Duverdiere should be released before his election is confirmed be left for the Duke de Broglie to settle in accordance with the letter of the law."

It is stated that the Ministry resolved to resign in principle, but it will meet the Chamber to explain its Electoral policy.

The Minister continues the report that the Ministry expressed the wish to resign to President MacMahon, who replied he was resolved upon forming a new Ministry, but not before he had ascertained by a vote of the Senate what support that body was ready to afford him. The Minister adds that MacMahon seems to be in an equivocal state to take the new Ministry from the group of the right. The debate on the Cabinet's management of the elections is expected to begin to-day.

General Grant attended President MacMahon's reception at the Elysee, in Paris, on Saturday evening. The entire diplomatic body was present.

A London paper states that, in consequence of the raids of warlike tribes on the frontier, the troops have been warned that a six weeks' expedition has been resolved upon. The correspondent remarks that this is not yet officially confirmed, but if correct would, in consequence of the excitement prevailing, be the commencement of a serious frontier war.

Admiral von Cape Town to October 23, says Henry M. Stanley arrived there on the 21st. There had been indefinite skirmishing with the Galla on the frontier.

Capt. man named Sullivan has been arrested at Cork, and will be prosecuted as a forger, for sending threatening letters to parties who refused to join him in a movement to turn off the gas and disperse the company during a dinner given by the Mayor of Cork to the Duke of Connaught.

A severe storm occurred yesterday on the British and French coasts.

The gravest fears are entertained for the life of the Pope. A short time ago his physician feeling anxious about the Pontiff's condition summoned some of the most eminent men of the medical profession in Italy, among others Vanzetti, Professor of Surgery at Padua, for consultation. After a most careful examination the consulting physicians have given up all hope of his recovery. His condition now is such that he may die at any moment and if he rallies the recovery will be only temporary. His lower limbs are paralyzed and he cannot live very long.

PARIS, Nov. 12.—It is reported here this afternoon that the Pope is dead. The report obtains credence in consequence of the unmistakable character of the latest reports of his condition.

Speech of Hon. John Goode. In the House of Representatives, on Saturday, in Committee of the Whole on the Army Appropriation bill, Mr. Hooker, of Mississippi, having offered an amendment to prohibit the use of troops in any State unless called for by the Legislature or Executive of such State, Mr. Goode, of Virginia, said:

I regret exceedingly, Mr. Chairman, to differ on this subject with my distinguished friend from Mississippi (Mr. Hooker), and to dissent to his amendment, but not for the reason assigned by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Garfield). In my judgment it would be exceedingly unwise and impolitic for this House of Representatives to incorporate such a provision upon this appropriation bill. In my judgment it would be regarded by the country as an imputation upon the present Executive. I know that my friend does not so intend it, but I believe that it would be so accepted.

It will be remembered that in the closing hours of the Forty-Fourth Congress this House undertook to enact such a provision as this upon the Army appropriation bill, and that appropriation bill failed to become a law because the two Houses could not agree upon that question. I voted then with the majority in the House. I do not regret, I never regreted that I voted then. Under similar circumstances I would give the same vote again.

We cannot, however, close our eyes to the fact that the circumstances which surround us to-day are altogether different from those which surrounded us by which we were surrounded then. We felt then that the public liberties were imperiled by the unauthorized use of the Army. We saw the State Houses in South Carolina and Louisiana surrounded by an armed soldiery who undertook to examine the credentials of members of the State Legislature and to deprive them and intimidate them in the discharge of their duties. We felt as the representatives of the people, that we would be derelict in duty, that we would disappoint the just expectations of the country, if we failed to interpose the legislative arm of this Government for the protection of an unarmed citizen and a defenseless people. We therefore refused to vote a dollar then, and we would have persisted in refusing to vote it, because we believe of such action was necessary to prevent an illegal and unauthorized use of the Army.

But what are the circumstances now? Is my friend from Mississippi (Mr. Hooker) blind to the changed condition of affairs? I know he is not. But I wish to call to the minds of members of this House the fact that immediately after the accession of President Hayes to the Presidency he issued an order directing the withdrawal of troops from the State Houses in South Carolina and Louisiana.

What did that mean? It meant to indicate that the President of the United States was willing to trust the people of the South. It meant to indicate that he regarded them as a brave and honorable people, who meant what they said when they professed to renew their allegiance to this Government. It meant to indicate that in his judgment the use of the bygone was not necessary to enforce the law and order and peace at the South. We felt as the way we understood it. We accepted it as an overtone of peace. And if I know the people of the South, there is nothing to-day which they so earnestly and anxiously desire as a lasting and enduring peace. We accept it as an overtone of peace, and the people who I have the honor to represent are not willing to refuse to take the right hand of fellowship when it is held out to them by the President of the United States.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The members of the Virginia delegation voted for the amendment, with the exception of Messrs. Goode and Harris.

The jury in the case of Congressman Smalls, of South Carolina, has returned a verdict of guilty. The indictment against Dr. Cass Garfield, for forgery, is the next to occupy the attention of the court at Columbia, S. C.

A pretty picture is a healthy looking and well cared for baby. By the use of Dr. Bull's Baby Syrup you can keep the health of your baby in splendid condition. 25 cents a bottle.

From Washington.

[SPECIAL DISPATCHES TO THE GAZETTE.] WASHINGTON, D. C., Nov. 12, SENATE.

The Senate met at noon, and after some memorials had been presented.

Hon. D. W. Voorhes, of Ohio, appeared, was shown in, and took his seat as Senator from Indiana. A large bouquet was placed on his seat just before he was sworn in.

Mr. Conkling, rising to a personal explanation, called attention to the report of an interview with him published in the Herald. He said that no such interview had taken place, and that many of the sentiments were foreign to him, which he had perhaps used others in private conversation.

Mr. Booth was appointed Chairman of the Committee on Patents, vice Mr. Wadleigh, transferred to the second place by his own request, he having been made Chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The Senate then took up the bill for the purchase of certain lots of ground to complete the great circle on the west front of the Capitol grounds. The bill was amended in some unimportant particulars and passed.