

## TUESDAY, MARCH 31.

At a late banquet given to the Hon. John W. Foster in the City of Mexico, a most brilliant display of rhetorical rockets was let off in honor of the "bird," or rather, the birds of freedom. For as Bishop Simpson, who was present said, the victorious Mexican eagle "has a right to fly as high as ours." Dr. Julius A. Skelton, the consul general, and by the way, who escaped the low diet of Latin and Greek roots at the Wesleyan university, of Middletown, Connecticut, in 1852, with the customary sheepskin, presided at the banquet. There was a formidable array of official gilt and gold lace present, with unpronounceable Spanish and Italian names, and some sixty Americans. To sum up six columns of a report in one sentence, everybody was duly toasted, and everybody responded with supreme felicity. Even the good Bishop Simpson, whose speech was singularly brilliant, condescended to some very reckless punning about sitting beside a skeleton (Skelton) and being a-sured that "all our interests will be most Bliss-fully Foster ed," alluding to Minister Foster and the Secretary of the Legation, Mr. Bliss. Sr. Nunez Ortega, the only Mexican who could speak English was forced to respond to several toasts in succession, and Minister Foster made repeated speeches to hold the program level. The occasion was evidently delightful in all respects, and must have been especially so to General Foster, who seems to have been well received and to have already won the popular esteem. If he shall be as fortunate as his predecessor, General Nelson, in promoting the mutual interests and friendship of the two republics, not only he will have occasion for pleasure, but the state of Indiana will be doubly proud in being twice so worthily represented abroad.

It is conceded, though the least possible is said about it, that Chicago has outgrown herself in some directions. She has too much for grandeur and too little for use. It is a characteristic vice of the ambitious city. In the first place she has the finest school houses in the nation, but cannot furnish seats for much more than half her children. The money to build with is used up on costly structures. Next, it is stated that the new trade palaces erected since the fire do not find tenants. They are too grand and expensive. Merchants who would do a modest business cannot pay the rent, nor, if they could do that, could they carry the stocks to

fill such houses. Rents of medium dimensions are scarce, while the gorgeous rooms stand empty and idle. Again, the hotels are too great and too grand for the compensations of business. They are overdone in plan and costliness. In short, Chicago has a whole menagerie of elephants on her hands that will be an awkward burden for some time to come. It will be hard to carry and will encumber her progress for a time. By and by the volume of business will rise to the anticipated mark and make the immense investments remunerative. But the mistake is plain enough to be avoided by this and other cities. Medium dwellings should be in excess, if anything. Vast business structures should come slower. Indianapolis is not subject to criticism on the point of overbuilding for business. Certain branches of her trade are notable in lack of pretensions. For instance, her grocery trade is comparatively modest and limited. Smaller towns of the state excel this. But it is an error on the safe side to wait for business to come to the builders. On the other hand, rooms for the people, houses for families should be plenty and cheap.

[illegible]

The Nation put considerable trust in General Grant, and even forebore uttering disagreeable truths about his advisers. It now makes his evil advisers responsible for the amazing scandals and follies of his second term. This part of the charge concerns us at home here. We have a mighty man at Washington, who is popularly reported to be a decisive guide to the chief magistrate. One whom the president never presumes to displease. One whose advice is eagerly courted at the white house, Mr. Morton. If this is true, and there are good reasons for supposing it is, then Mortonism is Butlerism one and indivisible. It is Morton who is responsible for the audacious misdeeds that have affronted the country, and we must accept him as the wicked partner who makes reform impossible to the president.

General Coburn, has made a very good record in his several terms of congress service. He has in almost all cases been found voting on the side which represented the real interests of the people—when he was not, it is pretty safe to say that, his mistake was one of judgment, not intention. He placed himself in a trying place on the restitution of the franking swindle, but it is only fair to credit him with a good intention, as he presumed that he was working in the interests of the press in advocating a measure which gave it certain privileges apparently necessary to its widest usefulness. In that he misjudged, but his error was by no means a flagrant or fatal one. In the late appointment of a district collector, however, the General has come squarely in contact with the deep-seated convictions of the people of this district. The General has been in Washington so long and has become so accustomed to the tacit ignoring of the civil service rule on the part of the administration, that it is hardly surprising that he should forget the home sentiment on the subject. In appointing Mr. Bagges to the office, which by the rule of the service should have been filled by the next in rank, General Coburn has demonstrated anew the utter hollowness of the republican platform, which explicitly promised this greatly needed reform. Of his mistake the general will receive many reminders before the subject is forgotten, but it is doubtful whether a more significant reproach could be made, than that contained elsewhere in the resolution of the veteran soldiers. The gentleman overlooked in the appointment of Mr. Bagges, was not only qualified for the office, and entitled to it under the civil service rules, but had the record of a good soldier to present as a claim. This, General Coburn should have appreciated. He is a soldier and should have remembered his old comrade and given him a chance, if he is in other respects fitted for the place,

On Thursday afternoon last theatrical performances were held in the chief theatres of New York city, for the purpose of giving the proceeds to the poor. Five places of amusement were thus advertised, and each of them was crowded to overflowing, while hundreds were turned away. The gross receipts of the benefits will amount to \$30,000. This is only another evidence of the hearty sympathy which is felt in our large cities for the suffering poorer classes, and such opportunities to show their sympathy are always eagerly sought. This is a most commendable means for aiding such a charity, and it should be repeated in all our large cities.

THE LAST OF THE COUNCIL.

THE VERDICT—A RE VIEW OF THE WHOLE MATTER.

NEW YORK, March 25. — The following is the text of the decision rendered by the Congregational council, after a secret session lasting two days and a half: This council has listened carefully to the committees of the churches by which it was convened, and has received from them a clear and earnest statement of the aims and principles which have determined the action of the churches in the proceedings which they ask us to review. We have also received from Plymouth church a communication declining an invitation from this council as well as from these two churches to send a permanent committee, and assist in the presentation and discussion of the questions before us, but at the same time offering suggestions and arguments which we have carefully and candidly considered. We cannot doubt the right of these two churches to ask advice from churches regularly connected with the character of what they have done in their dealing with Plymouth Church. No church is beyond the reach of the public opinion of other churches, expressed indirectly or through an ecclesiastical council. We are unanimous in our opinion that final and complete independence may be in the exercise of reasonable discretion to consider the public action of one church, may in proper methods express its approval, and may make that public action the subject of friendly correspondence and remonstrance, or, if it be necessary, we are unanimous in our opinion that the exercise of such independent action or acts of inter-communication There has been laid before us a series of letters that have passed between these two churches and Plymouth church. On that correspondence it is our unquestionable right to have an opinion, and to express it. We are unanimous in our opinion that if a church as a party before us, we have a right to say then that the letter of remonstrance and admonition, with which the correspondence began, was not uncalled for. The churches throughout the United States, and the general public also, felt a painful anxiety to know the result of the correspondence in the city of Brooklyn, and involving the honor, not of Congregational churches only but of christianity itself. Without any more explicit reference to the question, it will be suffice to say that in Plymouth church a complaint was circulated against a member, that he had circulated and promoted scandals derogatory to the christian integrity of the pastor, and injurious to the reputation of the church. The person complained of appeared in the church meeting and declared that four years before that time he had, by his own volition, terminated his connection with the church, and therefore his name was, by the vote of the whole church, dropped from the catalogue of its members. What action of Plymouth church was the occasion in which these two churches interposed their friendly conference. In this act they represented the interests of the fraternity of Congregational churches whose principles of discipline and whose fair christian name were endangered by the course which Plymouth church had taken. We think, however, that moral heroism they deserve thanks, even should

be traceable in some of the details of their procedure. In our consideration of the letter then addressed to Plymouth church, we find that the impression made by it in some measure differed from what was intended by its author, written under the pressure of apprehension and anxieties long suppressed. It seems to have infringed more painfully than was intended on the sensibilities of those to whom it was addressed. To many, the letter was explained as a condemnation of the church and in manner, and entirely appropriate to the occasion, while to others it seems unnecessarily severe in the tone of its condemnation of the proceeding complained of. In their second letter of complaint, the churches explained the impression which was made by the remonstrance, offered an explanation, which we trust was not unacceptable. Concerning the reply of Plymouth church to that letter, we say nothing more than that an intemperate expression of the opinion which prompted Plymouth church to rid itself of an offending member, by an exceptional method, might have brought the correspondence to an early and happy termination. We can see no significant reason why the remonstrance of the churches, and the fraternal conference should not have been granted. In the subsequent correspondence we see, on the part of the complaining churches, an expression of their desire to unite with Plymouth church in a friendly letter to the council, and to the advice of a council. We find on the part of Plymouth church no definite expression either of consent or refusal, yet inasmuch as Plymouth church did not directly refuse to unite with the churches, and we do not regret that the complaining churches did not urge their request till a refusal or an evasion should have become unequivocal. We are not invited nor do we take it upon ourselves to advise Plymouth church to change its method of dealing with offenders, but we are invited to advise these two churches on certain questions. Therefore, we say distinctly, that the idea of membership in a Congregational church is the idea of a covenant between the individual member and the church, having the character of a covenant, the member is responsible to the church for his conformity to the law of Christ, and the church is responsible for him and that his responsibility does not cease till the church, by some formal action, has acted, and dissolved the covenant. This covenant may be broken by the member. He may offend and when duly admonished may give no satisfactory evidence of repentance. In that case he is cut off from communion. The church having given its testimony, is no longer responsible to him, and he is restored only by the removal of the censure. The voluntary absence of a resident member from the communion of the church and from its public worship does not dissolve the covenant, but is a reasonable ground of admonition, and of exclusion, if the

SINCE THE

When a regular complaint is made against such a member that, in some other respect he violates the law of Christ, and especially the law of the complaint that he has circulated and promoted scandals derogatory to the christian integrity of the pastor and injurious to the reputation of the church. The consideration that he has long ago forsaken the church, and is no longer a member, is no excuse for such a fault. In regard to the future relations between these churches and Plymouth church we express our hope that the very extraordinary proceedings which have taken place for correspondence and for this council will not be a precedent for the guidance of that church hereafter. Could we suppose that such proceedings could be repeated in any other church, and that of the first principles involved in the idea of church membership and the idea of the fellowship of the churches with each other, would remain the strongest and most sacred principle, but the communication from Plymouth church to this council makes professions and declarations which justify the hope that such a deviation from the christian spirit will never be repeated. The accused person in the case

had not been retained in the church, nor commended to any other church. We recite some such affectionate and reasonable inquiry as shall show that the evil is real, that the causes of it are within the control of the church, that the evil is not a transfer of evil, such as may befall any church, but is permanent and tending to increase rather than to diminish, while it is not to be forgotten that this communication from Plymouth church is entirely subsequent to the case, as well as upon the committee of this council. When Plymouth church, by its action of the fifth, had declared itself responsible for no other church, and no other church for it, in respect to doctrine, order and discipline, which action interpreted in the circumstances then existing, as a withdrawal to the ground of total indifference as to what church is to be fraternally judged by its latest utterance. These professions on the part of Plymouth church may be accepted by other churches as indicating its intention to maintain an efficient discipline, and to regard the mutual responsibility of churches. At the same time the council feels constrained to say that these declarations seem to us inconsistent with the mode of interpretation adopted by Plymouth church on December 5th, 1874, and with other acts and statements appearing in the published documents. We trust that the action of that church, as presented in these documents, if unmodified, would justify these churches in withdrawing fellowship, yet assuming as Plymouth church seems to us to admit in its communications to use the

## CONGREGATIONAL PRINCIPLES

discipline and fellowship, we advise churches convening at this council to maintain with it the relations of fellowship as heretofore in the hope that Plymouth church may satisfy these churches of its acceptance of the principles which it has been supposed to disavow. We also desire in this connection to reaffirm and emphasize the doctrines laid down in all our platform forms of the obligations of fellowship. The duty applies to all christian churches. In the case of those instituted and united in accordance with the Congregational polity, it involves that more intimate communion which is expressed in asking and giving counsel, in giving and receiving admonition and other acts relating to the doctrines, order and discipline. This mutual responsibility which Congregational churches have characterized their systems from the beginning, distinguishing it from the simple independence with autonomy of the local church. It is one of the formative and essential principles of Congregationalism. It is the basis of the Christian community for that system of cooperative effort to which our churches are pledged. We regard, therefore, the principles of fellowship which the pastors and churches concerning us have so earnestly maintained, to be those which we are bound to maintain with the word of God. We appreciate and honor their fidelity to those principles, under circumstances of a peculiar and severe trial, and we offer our earnest prayer to the great God of the church, that He may bestow upon them, and the pastors and churches with which they have been in correspondence, wisdom and grace; that He may guide them in all their actions, and that He may quicken, in all our churches, the sense of the responsibility of our renewed fidelity to the sacred obligations of our covenants and on church communions and we pray that He to whom all power in heaven and on earth is given, and who has promised to be with His church always, will bestow wisdom and grace, and who under the inspiration of His spirit and His truth has joined these churches in a grand and memorable past, standing shoulder to shoulder in the great moral and spiritual battles of the age, may again unite them in the future to the same great end.

Clifton Avenue Congregational church,  
Brooklyn, March 28th, 1874.

Signed,  
LEONARD BACON, J. C. MERVINE,  
C. S. WALKER, A. H. QUINN,  
Moderators, Scribes.

It was stated from reliable authority that the final vote giving the deliberations of the council was as follows: 57 voted for the result as it stands, eight voted against and 23 refused to vote at all. In Plymouth church, while its members regard much of the council's final vote as unwarranted in general, they consider it an entire vindication of the liberal cause in Plymouth church, and they are greatly rejoiced over it. After the morning services at the Clinton avenue church, the Rev. Leonard Bacon, the moderator of the late council, read its decision to the congregation; but before the reading of the report of Rev. Henry Ward Beecher preached the not the slightest allusion was made to it.

THE COST OF LIVING IN EUROPE

A correspondent writing from Dresden gives some interesting facts concerning the cost of living in Germany: The meals at the "restaurations" are a fair sample of the cost of living here. Every beer saloon is a "restoration," and a "spiece kash" is found on the tables. All day long the people pour into these houses, drink a glass of beer, and get something to eat. The dishes vary from seven or eight cents to twenty-five. These eating-bar-rooms are all of about equal rank, and the prices do not vary three cents in the whole of the city. To say the truth, how much everything should cost, that anything like a variation from the regular prices would insure a total desertion from customers. Indeed, so low and regular are the prices at the eating-houses that near one-half of the population of the cities take all their meals in the city. They can save their homes the day of the cheese, and for an sum of money, however small. This regularity of prices is found in almost everything. The poorest man can ride in a carriage when he wishes, or when he arrives at a city in which he is unacquainted, and the ride to be taken to a certain hotel. The ride only costs him a few cents. The cost of the shoe has increased the number of hacks and business. It is a mystery to us how the keepers of restaurants can pay double as much for the meats of all kinds here as we do in the United States, and then furnish you at the table for one-third the same price. By the same rule if no one else paid more than as much as we do, they should charge three times as much in the restaurants.

### ANOTHER BOAT EXPLOSION.

TWO MEN DEAD AND OTHERS INJURED.  
MEMPHIS, Tennessee, 30.—The steamer Sam J. Hale from Cincinnati for New Orleans burst her steam pipe one hundred and twenty-five miles above here last night at 11 o'clock. The following are the casualties: P. Wagner, second engineer, slightly scaled; Richard Leonard, deck hand, severely injured and has since died; Frank Stewart, deck hand, John Johnson, deck hand, lost overboard; Charles Jones, colored fireman, killed. Captain J. L. Carter had a narrow escape but was unhurt. The City of Vicksburg overtook the Hale floating down this river and picked up the survivors. The only one wounded here. The Hale is uninjured save her bursted pipe.

A mass meeting of the colored citizens of New York city was held at Cooper Institute to-night in memory of Chas. Sumner. The hall was crowded to the doors.

## THE FATAL ENCOUNTER

THE BEGINNING OF THE TROUBLE—THE DIVORCE SUIT AND THE EXASPERATING QUESTION—COL. TERRELL'S RELATIONS WITH HIS VICTIM—THE SCENE OF THE SHOOTING—TESTIMONY AT THE CORONER'S INQUEST.

A terrible tragedy occurred in Covington, Kentucky, on Saturday, the 28th instant, the scene of the shooting taking place in the office of Stevenson, Myers & Co. From the Cincinnati Commercial's statement of the affair, and also from the testimony elicited at the coroner's inquest, we obtained the following facts: During last December, while Col. W. G. Terrell was acting as the Covington reporter of the Commercial, he was stabbed by a young man named Francis, from the effects of which he had not fully recovered. He is now in the hospital for the crime. Col. Terrell says that he has been exceedingly ill ever since he was stabbed by young Francis. His physicians have been of the opinion that there was an abscess forming in his liver, which was probably scraped by the knife. He has been unable for more than a month to lie in bed, and could sleep only in a chair.

There has been, since 1870, a suit brought by his wife, Con-

once, brought by his wife. Concerning the suit, Colonel Terrell has been very sensitive and reticent. He has believed that the lawyers of his wife were aggravating the matter maliciously, and he has blamed them for the failure to settle the case, which grew out of infirmities of temper on his part, and the displeasure of his stepson at the disposition of some property which belonged to his mother. The stepson is Mr. John M. Thornton. At the time that Colonel Terrell was in peril of his life, after being stabbed by Francis, there was a hope of

### RECONCILIATION WITH HIS WIFE,

And he received evidences of sympathy from his stepson. He thought he had reason to believe that the attorneys of his wife (Harvey Myers and Oliver Root) were responsible for the continuance of the proceedings. Terrell had personal difficulties at different times with both Myers and Root. One difficulty with Myers occurred some years since, but that was settled. Again he had some difficulty with Myers, and talk of a duel was started. He was, however, dissuaded by agreeing to decide their trouble in the law. In such cases, and after they had come to the understanding that they would settle this matter in the law, Terrell had no more trouble. Root had constantly treated Myers, with the greatest courtesy. He considered, that owing to the engagement between them, it was his duty to be kind to him, and he should recognize each other as gentlemen. Root had, he considered, so recognized him, in agreeing to give him satisfaction in a gentlemanly way for the grievance that he had had with him.

Owing to the extreme delicacy of his health and his great sufferings, Colonel Terrell had made arrangements to leave the city last evening. He intended to go to Indianapolis, Ind., whence to Indianapolis and thence to Greensburg, proposing to thus break the journey to Greensburg, because he feared that he might not be able to ride that far continuously. It was important for him to finish taking a deposition yesterday. He was very anxious to get it done before he left for Indiana, feeling that there were some uncertainties in the case. During the time that Col. Terrell had exhibited the infirmities of temper that, in connection with other causes, led to the divorce suit, he had suffered terribly from neuralgic disease, and in the examination of the case, in the case, he had had the question raised as to whether he had the neuralgic disease to produce irritability, and cause unpleasant exhibitions of temper. On looking at the questions yesterday morning, prepared for the cross-examination of this medical expert, Terrell found, written in the questions, "Is it an inquiry if it was not the tendency of the illness to produce these neuralgic disorders that resulted in this loss of command over the temper. This was an inquiry that was

**EXTREMELY EXASPERATING**

to Terrell, or it was evidently meant to insinuate that he had been a sufferer from syphilis. The extreme irritability of Terrell on this subject arises in part from the fact that he has, for some years, had a personal deformity in his face, the result of a cancerous affection of the nose. Terrell was exceedingly angry with his wife, and was wrong, towards the attorney of his wife. He believed that he would have been reconciled to her and that all would have been well again in his family relations if it had not been for them. He thought also, considering the remarks made towards him and Myers, which we have detailed, that they expected to meet on the field of honor, the insinuation conveyed in the question was "gratuitous and wanton, as well as false." He therefore determined, that he was on the verge of leaving the city, that he was on Myer's doorstep, and that he was of him what he meant by it. He had made up his mind exactly what to say to Myers, and exactly when to stop. Owing to his difficulties with Francis and others, Colonel Terrell has habitually gone armed, carrying a large hunting pistol, and he was, therefore, unfortunately too much the habit in Covington. He carried this as regularly as his pocket knife. He went into the front office of Stevenson & Myers, where there was a young man sitting, and inquired for Myers, and, when he was told that Myers was not in, he walked then to the door, and said to Myers, he said a question there this morning that conveyed an insinuation, and wanted to know what was meant by it. Myers immediately sprang up in a state of great exasperation, and said to him, "Come in, then, to my office." Terrell turned about to go, when suddenly Myers caught him by the collar, and shoved him violently through the front office, then out into the hall and along the length of the hall, and at last thrust him against the wall. Terrell had said to Myers, as he caught him by the collar and was shoving him out, "You know I am a sick man." But he was hustled forward with increasing violence, when, at the brink of the stairway, thinking that he would not get away, he got a pool of out and fired. The distance from where he was first taken by the collar to the point where he fired is about forty feet. Terrell protests that he had no thought whatever of a difficulty on this occasion. He says that he was on his way to a law office, days ago with Oliver Root. But it was Terrell's desire to avoid a personal struggle. Terrell says there was no thought, of the remotest kind, in his mind, that the interview with Myers would result in any collision or that he would be forced to shoot. He says why such an insinuation had been made, and also to protest, in the name of his children, against what he deemed to be un-

A difficulty would have been impossible if he had not been seized by Mr. Myers, a very powerful man, and if he had not considered himself in mortal peril of being thrown down the stairway, which, in his invalid condition, would probably have terminated his life. A jury was immediately sworn and having heard the evidence they returned to the office of Stevenson & Myers, where testimony was taken. Nicholas Corcoran, a law student in the office of Stevenson & Myers, testified that Messrs. Wright and Russell having gone out, Colonel Terrell, who was the first to be asked, Mr. Myers was in the room. "I said I thought he was in this room (where the jury were then sitting). Terrell had his right hand in his coat pocket. He went to Mr. Myers and asked him some-

thing in reference to some questions which Mr. Myers had put to some witnesses in the Terrell case. The others answered he had "put them as an attorney," and "no more up." I heard Mr. Myers order him to go to the office. Terrell refused to go, and talked in a blustering manner. Mr. Myers then took hold of him to put him out. I saw Colonel Terrell then trying to pull his hand out of Mr. Myers' grasp. He said the door. I saw Mr. Myers' hand on the door handle, and he could not open the door, and Mr. Myers would be trouble, I ran round to the door and just as I opened it I heard the pistol shot. I saw Mr. Myers come in holding his hands to his body, and I saw Colonel Terrell come in there with the pistol in his hand and the doctor. Mr. Myers said, "Go for the doctor, he shot me." I started for a doctor, and met Doctor Wise. I told him Mr. Myers had been shot, and that he should go down. I told him that Terrell had done it. He told me to go for Dr. Thomas. I saw Dr. Thomas' son, who said his father was in Avondale. When I got back to the office Mr. Myers opened his eyes and told some one to go for his wife. When Mr. Myers came in he said, "Corcoran shot; oh, Nick, I am shot." Terrell's name was not mentioned. I saw Mr. Myers or Mr. Oliver Root, he would denounce them as his bitterest enemies. When he came in, he was blustering, and his man

### INDICATED VIOLENCE

He came with his hand in his pocket, and asked roughly, if Myers was in. He kept his hand in his pocket till he got out. He then tried to pull it out. I thought he had a weapon. I have previously heard him threaten Mr. Myers. I recollect once when his daughter, Miss Augusta Terrell, was brought here to give her evidence, I was taking the deposition, and Colonel Terrell became very much exercised and violent; he threatened he would have satisfaction from Mr. Myers, that he would fight him a duel, or else have him killed. The day was lost came in. At another time, when some depositions were to be taken in the Terrell case, Mr. Myers was at Frankfurt. I went to Rankin & Whittaker's office to see about the matter. The examiner said the deposition had been taken, the day before; afterwards O. W. Rood and I. Thayer came in, and I told them what had been told to me, and we left the office. A few days after I met Terrell. He asked was my name Corcoran, and what statements I had made in relation to the depositions. He then talked of Mr. Myers, and said he had called them dogs. He said Myers had made a brutal assault on him (in the Terrell case) and that the first time he saw Mr. Myers he would demand an explanation of him, and that he would shoot him. He said he would kill him. He said he would shoot him, not worth shooting. He said he would make Mr. Myers fight him outside of the state. I heard him once say, "Blood, blood, blood;" that he was going to have somebody's blood. That he would have a street fight, if not a duel. He said he would shoot Mr. Myers. I told Mr. Myers of these threats and advised him to be careful.

Wright sworn—I saw Mr. Myers in his office this morning. He remained a short time and went out, telling me he would be back in half an hour. I waited until 10 o'clock, when Terrell came in. Rankin & Whittaker's office, and then left, and shortly after he came back. I went out for a while, and when I got back I heard of the shooting. I was not present at it. I came into the room, and saw Mr. Myers sitting on the floor, leaning down to take his hand; my other hand was under his head. He threw his arms round as though to throw off the coat which was over him. He said: "I must die; I am going to die." He tried to get up, but stimulants and keep quiet. Some one asked Mr. Myers.

### HOW IT HAD OCCURRED

and Mr. Myers said: "He (Terrell) followed me to my office armed; I was at my desk, when he came in and insulted me; (in reference to some question) I ordered him out and he refused to go; I got up to put him out, when he drew a pistol; I endeavored to prevent him shooting me, but he got the advantage of me, and shot me in the abdomen."

He died about twenty minutes afterwards. He repeated, "I am dying. I must die. My poor wife and children." After his wife and son came he told his boy frequently that he must be a good boy; and "What will become of my poor wife and children. I am dying. I must die. I must die. I am dying them?" A short time after the close of the testimony, the jury returned the following

**VERDICT.**

"We, the jury, sworn and impeached to inquire into and report as to the cause of the death of Harvey Myers, find, from the testimony adduced, that at about the hour of 10:15 A. M., on the 28th day of March, 1874, said Harvey Myers came to his death by a pistol shot, said pistol being at said time in the hands of and fired by W. G. Terrell, none being present but said parties, and that said W. G. Terrell is culpable of the deed; and we further find that said Myers died in the hall near the door of said Myers' residence, and that W. G. Terrell is the son of the late Dr. Williamson Terrell, a preacher formerly connected with the southern Indiana conference of the Methodist Episcopal church, who was a little more than a year since, Colonel Terrell, when a young man, was a teacher in or near Brookville, Ind., where he became acquainted with his wife. Immediately after their marriage in Newport, November, 1856, Mr. and Mrs. Terrell went to Louisville, Ky., to reside, and he might prosecute the lady under the law. It is well known, even down to very small detail, that from the hour of their marriage all expenditures were made from Mrs. Terrell's estate. After remaining in Louisville for some time, and again at Madison, Indiana, Mr. Terrell finally brought the Lafayette Journal or at least an interest in it. At a later date, after repeated importunities on his part, she consented to convey to him half of her estate, that "he might have financial aid, and that she might thereby be the better enabled to transact business." To accomplish this, Mr. and Mrs. Terrell visited Newport, with a Lafayette man, who was to receive the title from Mrs. Terrell, and immediately transfer the same to him. Mrs. Terrell, however, did not very carefully read the papers when presented to her. Months, or possibly years afterward, he, in the meantime having become more and more dissolute, Mrs. Terrell discovered that a deep and dark fraud had been practiced upon her, and she, finding it impossible to live longer with him, she reluctantly told her sorrows to her friends, and sought refuge in the desert, and there, at the house of Mr. Myers. Suits were brought and continued as long as possible by Terrell, when finally he conveyed the property to his wife; but he failed to comply with her desires in relation to the disposal of the property, and thus she was compelled to apply for a divorce.

Not commendatory of the council are the words of the Brooklyn Eagle: The point before the council now is one more abstract than practical, but that there is any point at all is due to the fact that an attack, gross as systematic, was made upon Mr. Beecher, and which remains now as a shade of the past, because of what the ministers who called the council contrived to do. All through this affair, desperate efforts have been made to conceal the cloven foot, but it has kept protruding until every person is now familiar with its shape.