

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JULY, 1861.

No. III.

ARTICLE I.—*The Kingdom of Christ.**

THE art and mystery of our religious life consists in the exercise of faith. The faith which is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen, has, by its nature, a claim to supreme authority in man, and always tends, like the conscience among the moral faculties, towards entire predominance. It proposes, as the most excellent of possible attainments on earth, that we shall walk by faith and not by sight, and becomes in us the power and the desire to live as seeing Him who is invisible.

It is the chief design of the things that are seen to help us in conceiving and enjoying the things that are not seen. Our Lord Jesus Christ appeared in the flesh to aid us in realizing that he lives in the Spirit. The imaginative powers which blend themselves so readily with our religious faith, are stimulated to conceive more vividly what is behind a visible veil, than what is described, as in its nature invisible. The mercy-seat in the Jewish tabernacle, which was veiled from the people,

* The following article is an enlarged form of the discourse of the Rev. Dr. Yeomans, at the opening of the late General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia.

ART. VI.—*The General Assembly.*

THE General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in the United States met in Philadelphia, May 16, 1861, and was opened with a sermon by John W. Yeomans, D. D., Moderator of the last Assembly, on John xviii. 36, "My kingdom is not of this world." After the completion of the roll, John C. Backus, D. D., was chosen Moderator, and the Rev. D. J. Waller, Temporary Clerk.

The following order for attending upon the anniversary reports of the several Theological Seminaries and Boards of the Church was proposed by Dr. Schenck, and adopted, viz.

Resolved, That it be the order of the day for to-morrow, (Friday,) at 10 o'clock, to receive reports from the several Boards and Theological Seminaries, and that it be the order of the day for Saturday, at 10 o'clock, to hear the report of the Board of Church Extension; for Monday next, at the same hour, to hear the report of the Standing Committee on the Board of Education; Tuesday, the Board of Publication; Wednesday, the Board of Domestic Missions, and Thursday, Foreign Missions.

Resolved, That the evenings of the several days on which the above reports from the Standing Committees are received, be set apart to devotional exercises, interspersed with short addresses, having reference to the work of the particular Board that day reported on.

After many motions and much voting upon the subject, the hours of meeting and adjournment were fixed as follows:—A. M., from nine to one o'clock; and P. M., from four to six o'clock.

Overture from the Board of Foreign Missions.

The Committee on Bills and Overtures reported an inquiry from the Board of Foreign Missions, whether the word *baptizo*, in the versions of the Scriptures made by our missionaries, should be translated or transferred? The answer adopted by the Assembly was, that, in all cases where it is practicable, the

word should be transferred. In coming to this conclusion, the Assembly was, no doubt, influenced partly by long-established usage. In the English, Latin Vulgate, and most other versions, the Greek word has been transferred. To our ears, *to baptize* is as familiar an expression as *to wash*, or *to immerse*. Another obvious consideration which influenced the Assembly is, that no translation could be acceptable to all denominations of Christians. The Baptists would not consent to have βαπτίζω rendered by a word signifying *to wash*; and others could not allow it to be translated by a word which means only *to immerse*. Besides, baptism is not simply a washing nor simply an immersion; it is a sacred and peculiar rite, and should have its own appropriate designation.

What is the legitimate operation of the motion "To lay upon the table?"

The Rev. Dr. Spring moved that a special committee be appointed, to report whether it was wise and expedient for this Assembly to make any expression of attachment to the American Union and to the Constitution and Government; and if so, what that expression should be. The Rev. Mr. Hoyt moved to lay the resolution on the table. A vote was taken, and the Moderator pronounced it carried. A division was called for, and the vote was taken by rising, which resulted—122 for laying on the table, to 102 against it. So the motion was lost. Some members then called for the yeas and nays. The Moderator decided that as the vote had already been taken and announced, the call for the yeas and nays was out of order. To meet this difficulty, Mr. Clarke, of Detroit, moved to take up the motion just laid on the table, and on that motion he called for the yeas and nays. This gave rise to the question of order: Can a motion or paper laid on the table by a vote of the house, be taken from the table without a motion to reconsider? This question was not immediately decided by the Moderator, and gave rise to some debate. On the one hand, it was contended by Dr. Spring, Hovey K. Clarke, Esq., Mr. Walter Lowrie, Judge Allen, Mr. Waller, and others, that the design and effect of the motion to lay on the table was simply to dispose of a subject for the present, to be called up at any time at the will of the house. On the other hand, it was con-

tended that the design of the motion is to make a final disposition of the matter; that it is equivalent to a refusal to consider it, and, consequently, that no question thus disposed of could be again called up, except on a motion to reconsider, sustained by a two-thirds vote. It was admitted on both sides that every deliberative body must have the power of protecting itself from the discussion of unnecessary or unsuitable questions. The only point of difference was, how this should be done. In some bodies this object is attained by the motion, Shall the subject be entertained? This question being taken without debate, if decided in the negative, ends the matter. This, as was admitted, is not our usage. The only way to get rid of an improper subject, according to one view, is to move its indefinite postponement, and then on that motion call for the previous question, which must be taken without debate. We admit that such is the method often adopted in other deliberative bodies, but we deny that it is either in accordance with our usage or with our rules. Our book says, "Motions to lay on the table, to take up business, and to adjourn, and to call the previous question, shall be put without debate." This proves, at least, that the motion to lay on the table is designed to dispose of a subject without debate. The only question is, whether this disposition of the matter is final, unless by a motion to reconsider. To determine this, we quote the next rule, which says, "When a question is under debate, no motion shall be received, unless to adjourn, to lay on the table, to postpone indefinitely, to postpone to a day certain, to commit, or to amend; which several motions shall have precedence in the order in which they are herein arranged." If when a subject is introduced the house is ready for its consideration, it becomes the subject of debate. If deemed important, and the time is not suitable for its discussion, it is postponed, and made the order of the day for a certain day and hour. If it is a proper subject for discussion, and yet, in the view of any member or members, decidedly objectionable, the proper motion is, that it be indefinitely postponed. This does not preclude debate. If a proper subject for consideration, and not of special importance, and the house is not ready for its discus-

sion, it is placed on the docket, subject to be called up at any time.

But what is to be done, if the topic introduced be deemed altogether unsuitable, or one which the house does not wish to debate? It is obviously necessary that there should be some method by which deliberative assemblies can protect themselves from the introduction of improper subjects of debate. Suppose a member should propose that the General Assembly would appoint a committee to test the merits of rifle-cannon, or to petition Congress to re-open the slave trade. On the motion to indefinitely postpone, every member would have the right to speak once. How can the matter be at once and finally disposed of without debate? Only, according to our usage, by a motion to lay on the table. It is said, indeed, that this can be attained by moving the previous question, on the motion of indefinite postponement. But, in the first place, this is not the way adopted in our courts. The previous question is never moved except when a subject has been long under debate, and the original question has got encumbered with various amendments. Under these circumstances, the house becoming weary, a call is made for the previous question. If that call is sustained, it not only stops further debate, but cuts off all amendments, and brings the house to a direct vote on the original motion. In the second place, the very nature of the previous question, as it is prescribed in our book, shows that it was not designed to get rid of improper subjects without debate. The book says, "The previous question shall be in this form: Shall the main question be now put? And when demanded by a majority of the house, shall be put without debate; and until it is decided, shall preclude all amendments and further debate on the main question. If the previous question be decided in the affirmative, the main question shall be put without debate; if in the negative, the debate may proceed."

In the present case, Dr. Spring moved the appointment of a committee on the national crisis. Had any one moved the indefinite postponement of that motion, and called the previous question, the vote would not have been on the motion to postpone indefinitely, but on Dr. Spring's motion for a committee. "Shall the *main* question be now put?" can only mean, shall

Dr. Spring's motion be now put. That was the *main* question. The house may indeed thus vote a matter down. But there is a great difference between rejecting a proposition, and refusing even to consider it. And for this latter purpose there must be some regular provision. Another consideration on this subject is, that if a motion laid on the table can be called up at any time by a vote of the majority, then there is no difference between laying on the table and placing on the docket. In our courts, when the house is not prepared at the time to consider a subject, it is by vote placed on the docket, from which it can at any time be called up. This is a perfectly familiar fact. To lay on the table, and to place on the docket, are not one and the same thing; there is, however, no difference between them, if a proposition laid on the table can be called up by a vote of the majority. It was indeed said, that the house is obliged to dispose of everything placed on the docket, whereas it is not bound to act on subjects laid on the table. Even if this were true, it is not a difference sufficient to call for two specifically different modes of action. It is not, however, correct. The docket is simply a memorandum to prevent items of business being passed over. The house may act or not act on the several items as it sees fit. After this matter had been debated for some time, the Moderator decided that Dr. Spring's motion could not be taken from the table, unless a motion to reconsider the vote placing it there should be moved and seconded by members voting with the majority, and be sustained by two-thirds of the house. This ended the matter.

Church Extension.

Dr. Monfort presented the Report of this Board, and the Rev. Mr. Coe, Secretary of the Board, spoke as follows:

“The command of an ancient general to his army, marching through a desert, was, ‘Keep the wells open.’ He saw that his host must perish, and every oasis in that waste disappear, if the drifting sands were permitted to fill and choke its fountains. Regarding the local churches of our land as the wells that gather and pour forth the waters of salvation for its inhabitants, the providential voice of the great Captain

of Israel seems at this time to say to his people, 'Keep the wells open.' They are now in peculiar danger of being closed. Amid the dust of the mighty conflict that fills our land, every interest of the church may be buried. Your heralds of the cross to foreign lands, your home-missionary reapers, your students girding on the armour of light, your colporteurs scattering the printed pages of truth, your ministers, driven by age or disease to drop the sickle, are all likely to be overlooked amid the tread of armies and the confused noise of war. But none of these departments of your work are more likely to be neglected than your church extension enterprise—the enterprise that seeks to throw the sheltering sanctuary over your houseless churches—your unprotected wells of salvation. Not a few seem to think that all church building will now cease, and that, for a time at least, no more aid need be given in the erection of houses of worship. While it is probably true that comparatively few sanctuaries will be begun in these troublous times, it is also true that the number of applications to your Board is nearly up to the usual average; and that one hundred requests for aid, calling for almost \$40,000, are now on file, awaiting the receipt of means to meet them. We have the names of nearly seven hundred churches in our connection who have no sanctuary, and, one by one, these churches, with those annually added to our roll, are coming to the point where they must build or die. Hence, for years past, about two hundred church buildings have been annually begun in our midst. Hence, too, we have constantly many church edifices in such a stage of progress that a pause will entail almost entire loss of what has been done, and many others so nearly completed that a small amount of aid will fit them for occupancy. We must now, also, have at least two hundred and fifty churches greatly oppressed with debt. Some of these debts can remain; but some are due to enemies, who will gladly foreclose them; some of them to poor men, whose families will suffer if they remain unpaid; and some to insolvent estates already in the clutches of the sheriff. There are brethren in this Assembly whose sanctuaries may be sold away from them before they return to their homes. In not a few instances, the honour of religion, as well as the life of the

churches, is at stake. Shall we not prove the fellowship of the saints in this hour of need? Shall we not bear the burdens of our sinking brethren, and so fulfil the law of love? The highest patriotism, too, now bids us keep our wells of salvation flowing. We have fallen on times in which the basest as well as the noblest passions of men are stirred to the uttermost. It must be the mission of the church to cherish all that is true, and right, and lawful, and loving, and to repress all that is bad, malignant, and vindictive. If she cast not the healing salt of grace into the bitter fountains that gush so fiercely on every side, barrenness and death must overspread our heritage. If, as far as in her lieth, she follow not the things that make for righteous peace, she will be found wanting in this time of trial. If she suffer her destitute flocks to scatter and disband; if she sets adrift her labourers in her wastes, she must cover herself with the shame of one that fainteth in the day of adversity. Small, indeed, must be the strength of our church if she cannot sustain her benevolent enterprises in their present proportions. One cent a month from every communicant in our connection will keep the treasury of your Board of Church Extension as full as ever it has been. Four cents a week from every member of our body will carry on all your Boards with undiminished resources. Is there a poor widow, or a child in our Sabbath-schools, that by diligent self-denial could not give this? Brethren, we have left the luxury of doing good too much to our rich churches and to our rich men. God seems to be crippling many of these, that all may learn their responsibility and share the blessing. The question, whether your Board can go forward with your work, is resolving itself into the simple question, whether our ministers and ruling elders will give every member the opportunity and the earnest invitation to put a hand to the burdens now grown too heavy for the few who have hitherto borne them."

Dr. Musgrave would not have risen but for his desire to make a remark or two, in relation to the enterprise of church extension. His experience in connection with the Board (of Domestic Missions,) which he had served so many years, impressed deeply upon his mind the very great importance of

providing houses of worship for our congregations, especially in missionary fields. He was persuaded that, if the brethren could look at this church building enterprise from the standpoint which he had long occupied, they would be convinced that it was true economy, even in regard to other Boards of the church.

Secondly, Very much of the missionary funds of the Domestic Board is absorbed in sustaining missions which would soon be self-sustaining if they had suitable churches. Many enterprises that promise, at first, great success, are abandoned for want of houses of worship, whereas, if they had houses, they would not only be sustained, but would be able to support themselves.

Thirdly, We are constantly called upon in the Board of Domestic Missions to *continue* or to *increase* appropriations, because the people were burdened with church debts. Either the want of edifices, or the burden of debt on those who have houses, is the great cause of continued demands on the Domestic Board. The very *best method of economizing* the missionary funds is to build houses. Build houses, and they will find occupants who will rent pews and sustain the missionaries.

Dr. Musgrave suggested that it was usual to vote on the reports as wholes, and showed the propriety of it. He moved that, in the case of this Board, the report of the Committee be adopted as a whole, which was done; and the election to fill vacancies was made the order of the day for Tuesday at 10 o'clock.

Disabled and Aged Ministers' Fund.

Dr. Musgrave moved that the Rev. Joseph H. Jones, D. D., who has been acting under appointment of the Trustees of the General Assembly, be heard in regard to the matter of the fund for aged and infirm ministers, and the widows and orphans of ministers.

Leave was granted, and Dr. Jones read a report of the receipts and expenditures by the treasurer of this fund, and of the principles on which the fund was managed. He explained the manner in which the judicious dispensation of this fund

was guarded and secured. He mentioned (without names) several touching cases illustrative of the great importance of this lovely and necessary charity. He described the condition of many of the individuals and families, giving (anonymously) the statistics of the beneficiaries, and of their circumstances. The whole report, and the facts and statements of Dr. Jones, made a profound impression upon the Assembly in regard to this most important duty of the church. He read a number of letters from persons who had been assisted, all of which tended to deepen the impression made by the report. He stated that the Trustees had been pained by the indifference of the churches to this interesting object; that only 241 churches out of the 3541 churches of our body had responded to this call for aid. The report expresses the belief that the method adopted by the General Assembly for managing this important object is the *simplest, cheapest, most efficient* and convenient.

Rev. Mr. Mehaffey moved a committee, in response to this subject, similar to those appointed upon other subjects of the church's efforts. Adopted.

Board of Education.

The Rev. Dr. W. C. Mathews, from the Committee to which was referred the report of the Board of Education, made a report.

The report being under consideration,

The Rev. Dr. Chester, Secretary of the Board, began his remarks with an eloquent and impressive tribute to the late Corresponding Secretary, the Rev. Dr. Van Rensselaer. He spoke of his lovely, well-balanced, and unique Christian character; of his singular devotion to *all* the interests of the Presbyterian church; of his self-sacrificing toils and liberal benefactions; of his large-hearted zeal for all the interests of Zion; of the breadth of his views, and the devotion of his aims, and the liberality of his hand in every wise scheme of Christian philanthropy. He dwelt touchingly upon the intimacy and sweetness of their private fellowship as ministers, friends, and officers of the Board; and upon the peculiar zeal and efficiency of that lovely and beloved man in the great cause that

claimed the efforts of the Board of Education. Dr. Chester, in regard to the present condition of the Board, said that they had gotten through the year without borrowing any money—the first time in twenty years that the thing had been done. The Board had never violated a pledge to any of our young candidates. The hand of Breckinridge had written upon their banner this resolve of faithfulness to pledges, and it had never been broken. He spoke of the difficulties surrounding this Board. It was the least popular of the Boards. Their task was peculiarly delicate and difficult. The young men had to be *tried*; sometimes they did not stand the test, and had to be dropped; and difficulties inseparable from such an enterprise had to be encountered in performing their mission. The Board was little else than a machine in the hands of the Presbyteries. To the Presbyteries it pertained to select and recommend candidates; and if errors were committed by the Presbyteries, the blame of all such blunders was laid by popular voice upon the Board, who really have no control over the matter. He urged upon the Presbyteries the importance of renewed care and firmness in watching over the moral and spiritual character and condition of the candidates under their care; and urged that the Board, with all the diligence they could, with their present force, exercise, could not keep themselves minutely informed of these things. No candidate ought to be recommended except after the most thorough, searching, and honest examination; and perpetual vigilance over the growth in grace, and in every other element of ministerial character, ought to be exercised. The Board had power to dismiss only in such cases as the Assembly had prescribed; and they could only reach the facts upon which they could act through the reports of teachers and professors. He called attention to the fact that the Board was left with an empty treasury, and urged immediate efforts to replenish it. He spoke of the amazing and lamentable apathy of the churches in regard to this great enterprise; detailed the large number of churches that did nothing; appealed touchingly and earnestly to the heart and conscience of the people of God in behalf of the candidates—many of them ministers' sons, some orphans,

all poor—who must suffer unless the churches come up to the help of the Board.

Dr. Chester spoke of the efforts of the Board to aid colleges and seminaries, and detailed the success of the Board. He said one *good work* in which the Board had been successful was in killing colleges. He meant diminishing the *number*, and increasing the efficiency of colleges. They had been instrumental in inducing some colleges to cease operations, and to join in supporting others, which he deemed a great gain. He called attention to the fact that in this college enterprise such caution had been exercised by the Board, that not a dollar had been lost. He urged universal attention on the part of the churches, and said that if every church that was able would give ten dollars each, the funds would be abundant.

Hon. Judge Ewing inquired why it was that some of the candidates never reported to the Board, and yet were supported by the Board?

Dr. Chester replied that the Board, by the rules prescribed to them by the Assembly, depended upon the Presbyteries to say how long aid should be continued to the candidate, and depended upon the surveillance of the Presbyteries, the Board needing only to be informed, by the teacher's report, that the candidate was still pursuing study.

Judge Ewing would recommend that no money be paid to candidates, unless upon yearly requisition by the Presbytery.

Rev. Mr. Waller moved the re-commitment of the seventh resolution, (the one making two Co-ordinate Secretaries,) with instructions to inquire and report whether the business of the Board could not be carried on with one Secretary.

Dr. Mathews hoped the motion would not carry, alleging that it was made under a misapprehension. He said the Committee recommended nothing concerning that matter, but left it discretionary with the Board.

Rev. Mr. Farquhar asked Dr. Chester if there was no way of discharging a young man from the aid of the Board, except through the Presbytery.

Dr. Chester replied, that for certain causes, well ascertained, a candidate might be dropped by the Board; but in all cases

affecting character the Board referred it to the Presbytery, and in all cases the Presbytery was informed of the proceedings in the case.

Rev. Dr. Wines inquired whether the Board did not sometimes recommend that the name of an accused candidate be stricken from the list?

Dr. Chester replied, that the Board had no power of discipline, but always referred the case to the Presbytery; but in cases where the Assembly authorized the Board to drop a candidate, it was done; but when character was involved, it was always referred to his Presbytery.

Dr. Wines explained his reasons for inquiring, and said that the faculty of Washington College (of which he was once a Professor) had exercised great care to inspect the conduct of candidates of the Board under their tuition, and that the faculty of a college had better opportunities of knowing the *status* of young men.

Dr. Chester expressed gratitude to boards of teachers who had aided in such supervision; but insisted that no supervision could supersede the necessity of constant vigilance and faithfulness on the part of Presbyteries.

Rev. Dr. Edwards wished to say a word upon Mr. Waller's motion, if before the house. He said that he hoped it would not be deemed discourteous to the committee to recommit. The circumstances of the Board have greatly changed since last year. The beloved Secretary (Van Rensselaer) had been taken from us. During his incumbency the expenses of the Board were not materially increased by the fact that there were two Secretaries. Now the case is changed. An additional Secretary will be an additional expense. He explained the present condition of the Board, and he moved an amendment to Mr. Waller's motion, which the mover accepted, viz., that the committee be instructed to revise the Constitution and By-laws of the Board of Education, and report what alterations may be needed. A division of the question was called, and both parts of the resolution were passed.

Dr. Mathews offered an additional resolution, to be part of the report, appointing the last Thursday of February next as a day of prayer for colleges, schools, and for the youth of the

church; and that a collection in aid of the College Fund of the Board be that day made.

The report of the committee was then read by sections, and adopted.

Board of Publication.

Rev. Dr. McPhail, from the committee to whom was referred the Report of the Board of Publication, made a report, closing with a nomination to fill vacancies in the Board. The report was accepted.

Rev. Dr. Schenck, Secretary of the Board, addressed the Assembly. He said that as the report was before the Assembly, and a religious meeting in regard to its interests would be held to-night, he deemed it unnecessary to dwell long upon them now. He would touch upon but a few points. The history of the Board for the last year was one of mingled light and shade, prosperity and adversity, hopefulness and trials. Four of the members had departed—all valuable men. But in the death of Mr. William S. Martien, the Board, the church, and the community had lost a most valuable member, whose uprightness, piety, and public spirit, while he lived, made him much missed and deeply deplored now that he was dead. We have lost, too, Joseph P. Engles, a man of great eminence in all the qualifications of usefulness, as a Christian and a citizen. To both of these gentlemen he paid an affectionate and eloquent tribute. Of Mr. Engles he spoke as a man not only of devoted business energy in the service of the Board, but also as a man of great learning in general science, and especially in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew literature. He spoke of the operations of the Board during the past year, which, but for the blighting reverse of the times, would have been twenty to thirty per cent. in advance of former years. It gave him great satisfaction to report so vast an amount of valuable and precious religious truth scattered over this broad land by the agency of this Board. He recited facts showing that not only our own people, but other denominations welcomed with peculiar favour the works published by this Board. The books of the Board advance our religious views, even where our preachers could not go. He spoke of the gratifying success of the *Sabbath-School Visitor*—that its circulation had increased,

and the apparent interest in it was much greater. He called attention to the Distribution Fund, and exhibited the rich blessings which this fund, small as it is, had spread over the land, among the poor churches and mission Sabbath-schools. Vast good had been done in this way. He would that thousands who had means might hear him plead for contributions to sustain a work which shed such light and such blessings, especially in the darker corners, where other means of grace were not abundant. He called attention to the Colportage system. The number of colporteurs is greater by forty, than ever before, and a much larger amount of labour, as will appear by the Annual Report, has been done. He dwelt upon the great value of this arm of the Board's service. The fund for this enterprise was rapidly increased during the early part of the year, but fell off during the latter part, owing to the times; still it is six hundred dollars in advance of last year. He mentioned as a gratifying fact, that more churches have contributed during the last than any former year; but he still lamented that so many churches did nothing. He made an earnest appeal to the ministers and ruling elders, to bring up their churches and Presbyteries to more general and efficient coöperation. He concluded with an urgent request that this good cause should receive a greater amount and a deeper fervency of prayer by all the ministers and people of God. While Christians pray for the living ministry, he feared they too much neglected to pray for these silent yet mighty preachers. The page, like the preacher, will be unblessed without the Spirit of God, and prayer must invoke that Spirit.

The discussion of the recommendations of the committee approving of the operations of this Board, and commending its "economy and efficiency," gave rise to a debate, protracted, through many interruptions, until near the close of the sessions of the Assembly. Dr. Edwards, Dr. Musgrave, and Mr. Waller, were the prominent speakers in opposition to the plans of the Board. Their objections were principally the following. 1. It was urged that the Board or its officers refused to make a full and fair exhibit of their affairs. We do not know, it was said, what its capital, what its assets, what its net profits, what its expenses are. This is a business concern, and

must be conducted on business principles, and be able to stand the application of those principles. The Assembly was entitled to be informed on all the points above indicated, and the refusal or neglect of the executive committee to communicate this information, was made a serious ground of complaint. 2. The next objection was, that the Board was not economical in the conduct of its business. Under this charge there were numerous specifications adduced in its support. The salary of the Corresponding Secretary was said to be too large; a salary of \$1000 was given to a treasurer, and \$700 or \$1000 to a book-keeper, when one man could easily perform the duties of both offices; the colportage department was said to be extravagantly conducted, a business of \$41,000 cost \$3000 in salaries alone; and as proof of general want of economy, it was said, that while the sales for the last year were about \$91,000 the expenses were \$17,000, or more than nineteen per cent. It was further charged that more was paid for printing than was proper, because the same work could be done by responsible houses at less price; fifteen cents a token, it was said, might be saved on the printing. 3. The efficiency of the Board was also impugned; their business might be enlarged, and their sales increased; the price of their books should be reduced; depositories could then be established elsewhere than in Philadelphia. Instead of this, the Board went on, year by year, adding to their capital, instead of using their profits to the reduction of their expenses and increase of their operations. 4. Another objection was, that the Board was too intimately allied with the *Presbyterian*. Two editors of that paper are members of the executive committee, a brother of another was lately an officer, and a brother-in-law, by marriage, also. The printer of the *Presbyterian*, moreover, was the printer of the Board. "It was a nice little family affair." The printing, instead of being given out for competition, was almost entirely in the hands of one favoured house, the printers, and, in large part, the proprietors of the *Presbyterian*.

The reader can well understand what impression such charges, urged by able and earnest men, must make on the Assembly and on the public. They were, however, satisfac-

torily met by Dr. Schenck, Secretary of the Board, and by Dr. McPhail, chairman of the committee to whom the report of the Board had been referred. 1. As to the charge of concealment, it was answered that every information desired by any member of the church was cheerfully afforded at the office, when requested. In reply to the question by Dr. Hall, whether Dr. Edwards had ever been refused any information which he sought, Dr. Schenck answered, emphatically, Never. In the second place, the Assembly annually appointed a committee to which was referred the Report of the Board. All the books, accounts, vouchers, and exhibits of expenses, &c., were placed in the hands of the committee, and they had free access to all the sources of information they could desire. In the third place, these books, containing all the minutes and accounts, were annually produced and laid upon the table of the Assembly, open to the inspection of the members. What greater publicity than this could be desired? These details were not published to the world, because this was an unusual course in such institutions, and, in the judgment of practical men, would be injurious to the business of the Board. If, however, the Assembly thought otherwise, the Board sought no concealment, and was willing to publish everything directed. 2. As to the charge of want of economy, the objection had reference, first, to the amount paid in salaries; and, secondly, to the mode of conducting the business operations of the Board. As to the salary of the Secretary, it was shown that it was not greater than the average salaries of ministers living in our large cities, nor more than was required to meet the necessary wants of a man with a family. If the salary was reduced, the office could be held by no man who was not either rich or a bachelor. Because the average salary of our ministers is not more than eight hundred dollars, that does not prove that a man could live in Philadelphia, where he must pay five hundred dollars for a house. It was objected that a thousand dollars are paid annually to the treasurer. This officer, however, is under bonds to the amount of fifteen thousand dollars. A thousand dollars was a small per centage to pay for the safe custody of the funds of the institution, and the responsibility and services attached to the office. It was said that the salary

of twelve hundred dollars for the editor was exorbitant, as his chief duty was to read proof-sheets, which service could be secured for three hundred. To this it was answered, that the editor paid six hundred dollars a year out of his salary for the reading of proofs, which was, after all, the least responsible part of his duties. He has to read piles of manuscripts, and sit in judgment on their merits; he has to examine the current religious literature of the day, and select suitable books for publication; his office calls for the exercise of taste, judgment, piety, and wisdom. These are qualities not found in every man, and their services are cheaply secured at the six hundred dollars which remains of the salary of the editor.

As to the want of economy in the mode of conducting the business of the Board, Dr. McPhail forcibly remarked, that it was founded on the assumption that the Board was a money-making concern. It was no such thing. It was primarily and preëminently a benevolent institution. It was not designed to publish popular books, the sale of which would yield large profits, but to send abroad books which ordinary publishing-houses would not print. It must often publish books at a loss. It is to be remembered, too, that the capital of the Board is not so much cash, but consists largely in stereotype plates, and books on hand. Much of this is of necessity dead capital. It cannot be turned into money or rendered profitable, and yet it answers the end for which the Board was instituted. Thousands of dollars are thus invested in the plates for Calvin's Institutes, Calvin's Letters, the Assembly's Digest, and other such costly works, which were never published with a view to profit, but to supply the churches with important works which could not otherwise be obtained. It was further shown, that the objection was founded on wrong estimates; that instead of the expenses amounting to nineteen, or even, as some said, to forty or fifty per cent. on the business done, they were really not more than from eight to ten, or thirteen per cent. A comparison was made in this respect between the operations of the Board and those of other similar institutions, altogether in favour of the former. The Secretary also exhibited to the Assembly books published by different societies, and showed that the copies issued by the Board were at once the cheapest

and the best. As to the want of efficiency of the Board, and the complaint that they went on adding to their capital, instead of enlarging their operations, it was answered, that in this matter they were obeying the instructions of the Assembly, which required them to add six per cent. annually to their capital. In this way it had been increased from thirty-seven thousand dollars to about two hundred and forty thousand. Whenever the amount reached was considered adequate, the Board was ready to take all the profits and employ them to the reduction of expenses. The objection that the Board was too intimately related to the *Presbyterian*, was met by the statement that no one connected with that paper had ever sought or obtained any advantage from the operations of the Board. All the printing and binding was done by contract. If most of the printing was done by the printer and publisher of the *Presbyterian*, it was only because he did the work on more advantageous terms than it could be elsewhere performed; no cheaper or more favourable offers from responsible houses had ever been declined.

This discussion resulted in the entire vindication of the Board, as the Assembly adopted the report of the committee commending its "economy and efficiency" by an overwhelming majority. We doubt not the church will sanction this decision. A Board which has raised its capital from forty to two hundred and forty thousand dollars; which pays all its bills at the end of every month; which does not owe a cent; whose publications are among the cheapest and the best in the market, deserves the confidence and support of the whole church. It was said by one of the speakers, that the Boards breathed more freely whenever the Assembly adjourned. "This," Dr. McPhail remarked, "is as true as holy writ. They have been so accustomed to this annual castigation, and holding up to the public even their private personal affairs, that it is no wonder that they experience a sensation of relief when the rasping is over." It appears to us that these painful discussions about our Boards, arise in good measure from a misapprehension of the relation between them and the Assembly. The Boards are created by the Assembly, are dependent upon it, and responsible to it for all their acts. But it does not

follow that the Assembly itself is to conduct the work assigned to the Boards. What are the Boards for? What is the use of any such organizations, if the Assembly is to come into immediate contact with the executive committees, and examine all their contracts, all their appointments, all their expenditures? This is a work a body of three hundred men sitting annually for a fortnight, first in one place and then in another, and having the care of all the churches, is utterly incompetent to perform. Congress and the executive government are elected by the people, are dependent upon them, and responsible to their constituents. But this does not prove that the people *en masse* must actually administer the government. Neither does it prove that they can authoritatively decide upon the propriety of every appointment, or the wisdom of every measure. This is not their function. It is one which it is impossible they should perform. Our government is not and cannot be a pure democracy. It is a representative republic. It is a government in which the people act through agents, chosen by themselves, and dependent on them for the continuance of their powers. They may discuss in the public papers, and in other ways, the measures of the government, to enlighten the public mind, and if dissatisfied with the conduct of their rulers they can displace them. The will of the people must prevail. It is so in our ecclesiastical government. The Assembly does not, and cannot itself conduct the work of foreign missions, of education, and publication, or of theological training. It elects and appoints Boards, with certain limited powers, to exercise these several functions. These Boards are created by the Assembly, derive all their powers from that source, are responsible for their action, and dependent for their existence on the will of the body. But the Assembly does not itself do the work, nor can it properly sit in judgment on its details. It must confide in the agents of their own selection. The propriety of any act of the Boards, the wisdom, efficiency, or economy, of their measures, are fair subjects of discussion in the church journals; and if the conviction is produced that the affairs of any Board are unwisely or improperly conducted, its members can be displaced and others substituted. It is, however, plainly impossible that a body constituted as is our

Assembly, and sitting only for two weeks in a year, can itself investigate the details of all these complicated operations. It appoints committees to examine the reports of the Boards; to these committees every facility of examination is afforded, so that if there is anything calling for a change, it may be effected.

As this is the normal and only possible relation of the Assembly to the Boards, so it is, in point of fact, the principle on which the Assembly is accustomed to act. The Assembly appoints directors over our theological seminaries. Those directors are entrusted with the supervision of the professors and the examination of the students. They make their annual reports to the Assembly, and the Assembly confide in their representations. It does not take the work out of the hands of the directors, and arraign one professor for incompetency, another for neglect of duty, and another for false doctrine. It must trust to the directors as its own appointed supervisors. So also we appoint committees to examine the synodical records, and approve them on the report of those committees, in the majority of cases without further investigation. If anything amiss is detected, it is reported to the house, and the matter is discussed and decided. We do not hear members asserting their right to examine these records, each for himself, and calling up every vote of the Synod for revision, and declaring that they cannot in conscience vote to approve its minutes until they have investigated the propriety of every such vote. This would effectually clog the wheels of our system. The course pursued of late in the Assembly must destroy our Boards. It is, at least, precisely the course originally adopted by those who aimed at their destruction. We well remember, years ago, in the infancy of the Board of Missions, when its report was presented to the house, and a committee was appointed for its examination, which recommended that it be approved, a distinguished leader of the New-school party—a party opposed to ecclesiastical Boards—made a very pious speech against it. He claimed his right as a member of the Assembly, to exercise his own judgment on all the acts of the Board. He put himself upon his conscience, and declared that he could not in good faith vote to approve of the report,

until he had examined into the qualifications of every missionary appointed, and his fitness for the field assigned him; into the wisdom of the means adopted for raising money; into all the expenditures of the Board, &c. As this was an impossible work, he designed thereby to show that the Assembly could not conduct missionary operations, but must leave that work to voluntary societies. It is very possible that the gentleman referred to was sincere in all this. In the posture in which his mind then was, it is possible that his conscience did require all this previous examination, before he could give a vote of approval. He had, however, only a few days before voted to approve and adopt the report of the American Home Missionary Society, without examining one of its many hundred appointments.

We do not question the motives or good faith of our own brethren, who claim that their conscience forbids their approving the acts of our Boards, without satisfying themselves that they deserve approbation; but we are persuaded that the principle on which they act must work the destruction of the Boards. We are no less persuaded that these brethren do not carry out their principle. They do not examine the gas, the coal, the stationery bills of the several Boards, and bring them up before the Assembly, to have that venerable body discuss the price of gas or coal, and the different modes in which it can be most economically purchased or employed. Neither do they refuse to vote to approve the records of a Synod, until they have examined all its acts.

There is another serious evil to be considered. The Secretaries of our Boards have duties to perform which require high qualifications. Suitable men cannot be induced to assume those duties, if they are to be subjected to annual scrutiny into their private affairs. The executive committees, who are the responsible agents, and the members of the Boards themselves, give their time and labour gratuitously. How long will reliable men be found to fill these positions, if their social and family relations are to be annually brought up and discussed before the Assembly, or their motives brought into question? It is evident, we think, that no one of our Boards can stand many such discussions as that through which some of them had to pass in

the last Assembly; and we do not see how public confidence in them is to be sustained under such repeated criminations. These discussions, we doubt not, have done great injury not only to the church, but to the cause of religion. We are not pleading for independence, or for irresponsible action. We are in favour of public discussion, and of rigid responsibility; but we are persuaded that the floor of the Assembly is not the place for such discussions, and that all due responsibility can be secured by demanding full reports, and the exhibition of all records and accounts to the examination of the committees appointed by the house. If those committees report anything amiss, it can be further examined into. But such personal criminations, and inquisitorial investigations of a man's personal expenses and modes of living, and social relations, cannot be sustained by men competent to the work which the church needs to have performed.

Board of Domestic Missions.

The Rev. Mr. Donaldson presented the following paper in reference to the Report of the Board of Domestic Missions, which, after protracted discussion, was adopted by a vote of 94 to 68.

1. The General Assembly approve the Report, and desire it to be published.

2. The Assembly gratefully acknowledge the disposing grace of God, who has enabled those who conduct the operations of the Board to increase the number of missionaries 106 over that of the preceding year; making the whole number in commission 707, resulting in the organization of 52 churches, affording the means of grace to 1239, and bringing into the communion 2429; also 1689 admitted by letter.

3. While the Assembly learn with deep regret that many of our churches still fail to come up to the help of the Lord in this great department of his work, it is gratifying to find that the delinquents are diminishing in number; that 117 more have contributed during the past than in any preceding year, the entire number contributing through this Board being now 1822; and from this chief source of reliance under God

the contributions have exceeded those of the preceding year about \$8120.

4. The Assembly is still further gratified that, in accordance with its recommendations of former years, the French, Welsh, and Germans in our land, as also the coloured population of the South, have had the gospel preached to them more extensively by our self-denying missionaries, most of whom practice itinerancy to some extent, sixty being wholly employed in this toilsome service.

5. The Assembly notice with special satisfaction that during the last quarter of the past year, when it was feared that the salaries of the missionaries must be so reduced as to occasion painful embarrassments, in answer to a special appeal by the Secretaries to the missionary churches, they promised to supplement what the embarrassed Board were constrained to withhold. Thus, it is hoped, the apprehended evil will be averted, and the missionaries will continue to receive their promised support.

6. Though the Board, under the supposed *animus* of the Assembly of 1859, and under the impulse of its new modification, resulting from that Assembly, may perhaps have expanded its operations with undue haste, the Assembly is reluctant to take any backward step in the way of diminishing either the number of missionaries or the amount of their meagre but well-merited support; and therefore it urges upon all the churches so to enlarge their contributions as that the Board may again be enabled to meet all its engagements, and also to have on hand a needful working balance at the close of each year.

7. The Assembly does not deem it expedient at this time, either to retract its prohibition of last year against granting certificates of honorary membership, to entitle donors to take a place as members of the Board, nor to abolish the Western Executive Committee, as overtured by the Presbytery of Cedar.

Respecting the Memorials from the Synod of Pittsburg and the Central Presbytery of Philadelphia, on the subject of the Co-ordinate Secretaryship, which was assigned to your committee, they beg leave to report that—

1. They find it impracticable to "investigate" "the measures" which "are alleged" to have been employed "by certain members of the Board to bring about the creation of this office," further than by the committee's conference with the officers of the Board, and consultation of their books, and by the discussions of the Assembly.

2. In view of the wide-spread disaffection with this office, as involving a needless expenditure of precious funds, and still more, in view of the severe pecuniary pressure of the present time, not likely soon to pass away, the Board should at once abolish the office, and employ but one Secretary.

3. They are fully persuaded that there is such dissatisfaction prevailing throughout large portions of the church in regard to this feature in the organization of the Board, that confidence and cordial coöperation can only be restored by the Board passing by, at its election in June next, both the existing Secretaries, and selecting a new man to fill the place.

The two principal points about which diversity of opinion existed in reference to this Board, were, 1. The policy of expansion, as it was called, or the demand for the enlargement of the operations of the Board. The one party insisting that its expenditures and obligations during the past years were as great as its resources would warrant; and the other contending that if the Board went forward and increased the number of its missionaries, and the amount of their salaries, the church would not fail to contribute the requisite funds. Two years ago the Assembly at Indianapolis made such a change in the organization of the Board as to secure the triumph of the friends of expansion. At the present Assembly, it was contended that the result had been, that the Board was virtually bankrupt. The other point of difference was, whether there should be one or two Corresponding Secretaries; the friends of expansion insisting upon two, and the other party maintaining that one only was needed. With these questions of principle a good deal of personal feeling, and many complaints of unkindness and unfairness, were mixed up, which gave the debate on this subject a very painful character. The decision of the Assembly, although decidedly in favour of the cautious

policy of which Dr. Musgrave was the advocate, was designed to be conciliatory, and hopes were entertained that all contention on this subject might cease, and the friends of the Board be able to act harmoniously in its support.

Board of Foreign Missions.

Rev. Dr. Dickinson, from the Committee on the Report of the Board of Foreign Missions, presented the report of that Committee. The report was accepted; and the election to fill vacancies in the Board made the order of the day immediately after the other elections.

On motion to adopt the report,

Hon. Secretary Lowrie made a very interesting and impressive historical statement of the rise and progress of this work in our branch of the church. He said his object was simply to give a succinct and clear view of the present *status* of the work, so that the Assembly might have a distinct knowledge thereof. He came not here to exhort the Assembly, but to give them facts. He read a syllabus of the present force now in the missionary field, and their distribution, as follows:

Brief statement of the Missions.

1. *Indian Tribes.*—20 stations, 15 ministers, 3 native ministers, 14 male teachers, 48 female teachers, 8 native teachers, 2179 communicants, 237 boys boarding scholars, 225 girls boarding scholars, 246 boys and girls day scholars.

2. *Africa.*—11 stations, 12 ministers, 5 male teachers, 7 female teachers, 6 native teachers, 250 communicants, 74 boarding-school boys, 33 boarding-school girls, 125 day-school boys, 10 day-school girls.

3. *India.*—15 stations, 23 ministers, 3 native ministers, 2 native teachers, 21 female teachers, 48 native assistants, 259 communicants, 16 boys in boarding-schools, 49 girls in boarding-schools, 3265 boys in day-schools, 145 girls in day-schools.

4. *Siam.*—2 stations, 6 ministers, 5 female teachers, 1 native assistant, 8 communicants, 31 boarding scholars.

5. *China and Chinese in California.*—4 stations and 3 sub-stations, 13 ministers, 3 male teachers, 15 female teachers,

17 native assistants, 161 communicants, 30 boys boarding scholars, 30 girls boarding scholars, 128 day scholars, of whom 58 are girls.

6. *Japan, South America, and the Jews.*—6 ministers, 1 school of 20 scholars in Bogota.

7. *Papal Europe.*—Funds remitted \$6210.

Aggregate.—75 ministers, 6 native ministers, 25 male teachers, 105 female teachers, 80 native assistants, 2857 communicants, 388 boys in boarding-schools, 337 girls in boarding-schools, 3586 boys in day schools, 333 girls in day schools.

After reading this epitome, Mr. Lowrie said, that in carrying forward this extensive agency it was a work of faith—faith in God—faith in the agencies—and the missionaries must have confidence in all. Now, to start with this year we have twenty-eight dollars. If we had in our safe \$185,000, the work would be simplified; but we have it not. It must come from you and from the churches. Our trust is in God, and our reliance upon his people. He detailed the manner in which the estimates are made each year: first by the missionaries at the several stations, for a year in advance; these are reviewed, modified, and adopted by the Board, and for this the Executive Committee become responsible. The Trustees of the Board are *legally* bound to honour the drafts of the missionaries; this is by the law of the State of New York. The Trustees are personally responsible. They would be left as poor as their Master was, without a place to lay his head, if the churches should leave them to meet but a few of these drafts. It is both a work of faith and of dollars and cents. He read one of the estimates (that from Ningpo,) to show with what care and economy these estimates are made. He showed that this Board, above all others, must be punctual in meeting their engagements, or our dear brethren must be left destitute and suffering in distant foreign lands. There they cannot turn their hands to something else for a livelihood. They must suffer or be sustained. Shall they who have gone out on the faith of the church's Head, and the pledge of the church to sustain them, be left to suffer? He read the list of estimates, and of the large abatements made by the Executive Committee, so as to reduce expenses. He proceeded to show that of our

3500 churches only 1500 had paid anything to this Board, leaving 2000 which had not given one cent to this object; and yet in these churches were more than 500 ministers, either as pastors or stated supplies. How can it be that our brethren are so indifferent to their Master's cause?

He alluded to the once united, but now divided, state of the country, and showed the unhappy influence which this division might have upon this cause. He said that the South had contributed liberally; many of God's dear people who loved this cause lived in the South. But what they might be able to do, and what they might be willing to do, we cannot tell. This is a cause of great embarrassment. He dwelt with much earnestness, and was moved to tears as he did so, upon the fact, that whilst many well educated and faithful men were willing and waiting to go, and while the heathen natives were perishing by millions, here were sixty thousand communicants, with many ministers among them, who stood coldly by, and did not give one cent to this cause. He went into statistics of the past and the present, and most feelingly pressed the claims of this cause. He then presented a resumé of the missionaries returned, and of those ready and desirous to go. He detailed the pressing need for labourers at several fields; mentioned suitable labourers that were anxious to go, but means were wanting. Here in the Assembly were men who were anxious to go back, two of them the best scholars in the Punjabi language in the world. Brother Mackey from Corisco, the brother from China, eminent for scholarship, were anxious to return; but means were wanting. He spoke of the necessity of employing female missionaries, and of the great value and efficiency of Christian women in this work. Satan seemed especially to hate woman, and loved to degrade her where he had sway. He illustrated the value of the example set by woman's Christian elevation upon heathen sentiment. He pressed the importance of the *power of littles*, and the importance of drawing out universally the small contributions of the people. He regretted the necessity of going into so many small details, but he wished the Assembly to have the facts—upon these facts they could reason without his help, and could ponder and feel them.

Mr. Moderator, said he, we see the flag of our country flying

at every point. I have no objection to this, for I love that flag, always did love it; but there is another and a more glorious standard—the banner of the Cross! Let that advance to victory; let us rally around it; let us bear it forward; let us look to it; let us remember that the throng around the throne behold it too! There Herron, and Edgar, and Murray, and the beloved Van Rensselaer—the many great and venerated dead of the last year—are gathered with those who have gone before; and with those that from Africa, and India, and China, have met them there. They all behold that broad flag, and expect us, and the Master expects us, to stand by it, and bear it onward!

Great interest was expressed in every part of the house in this great cause, and numerous pledges were given to increased efforts in sustaining the Board under the embarrassments necessarily arising from the unhappy state of the country. The almost certainty that the thirty or forty thousand dollars usually contributed by the Southern churches to our foreign missionary operations, must, for the coming year at least, fail to reach the treasury of the Board, imposes the obligation on the other portions of our church to double their contributions.

Have non-communicants the right to vote in the election of a pastor?

This subject was brought up by the Judicial Committee, who reported a complaint of the Rev. Dr. R. J. Breckinridge, against a decision of the Synod of Kentucky. That Synod had decided that none but persons in full communion with the church, had the right to a voice in the choice of a pastor. The committee reported in favour of sustaining this complaint, on the ground that the decision of the Synod is contrary to our constitution, Form of Government, chap. xv., § 4. In that section it is said, that the pastor is to be chosen by “the electors of the congregation;” and from the class of electors, those only are excluded who, first, refuse to submit to the censures of the church, regularly administered; and, secondly, those who do not contribute to its necessary expenses. Dr. Yeomans, Dr. Anderson, Judge Ewing, and Mr. Clark (ruling elders,) spoke in support of the recommendation of the committee;

Mr. Ogden, Mr. Watts, Mr. Miller (ruling elder,) Mr. Reaser, and others, spoke warmly against the complaint, and in favour of the action of the Synod. The debate on this important subject was interrupted by the all-engrossing discussion on the state of the country; and the matter was finally referred to the next Assembly.

It is certainly remarkable that this should be, at this late period, an open question. Our church has existed as an organized body in this country more than one hundred and fifty years. During that time there have been many thousand elections for pastors; and yet the General Assembly are divided in opinion as to who have the elective franchise! In nine hundred and ninety-nine out of every thousand of these elections, non-communicants have voted, without their right being called into question. It is now proposed to deny that right. This can only be accounted for by the adoption of some new theory, or by the increasing prevalence or development of a theory already more or less consciously adopted. The argument on this subject is very simple. The election of a pastor is a function of the church. Only members of the church have the right to exercise that function. Non-communicants are not members of the church; therefore non-communicants have no right to participate in such election. This argument, simple as it appears, is fallacious. It is true that the choice of a pastor is a prerogative of the church. It is true that only members of the church are entitled to exercise that prerogative. But it is not true that non-communicants are not members of the church; nor is it true, as the argument seems to take for granted, that the right of election is inseparable from church-membership. The mode in which pastors shall be chosen is a matter of compact or law, whether common or statute.

The President of the United States is not chosen by the people, but by electors chosen for that purpose. In the Dutch Reformed church, the pastor is chosen by the great consistory, which includes the elders and those who in that congregation have held the office of an elder. In the Congregational church, he is chosen (so far as the church is concerned) by the male members of the church. With us, as a matter of fact, he is chosen by the stated members of the congregation who consti-

tute the body to which he ministers, and who contribute to his support. It cannot be denied that this has been our general usage from the beginning. If this usage is to be changed, if a most important privilege is to be taken away from so large a part of our people, it must be on grounds of overwhelming necessity. The plan has worked well. It has not corrupted the church. It has not filled our pulpits with unsuitable or unfaithful ministers. In some few cases it may have frustrated the wishes of the better part of our congregations. But such occasional evils are incident to any possible mode of election. It is not the practical working of the system, it is a theory which is made the ground of opposition, and the pretext for revolution. Much horror was expressed that "the wicked," "the world," "the outsiders," should have a voice in the control of the church. The election of a pastor is a spiritual function, and therefore to be exercised only by the spiritual. It is a sacred prerogative of the church, and therefore to be exercised only by members of the church. All this assumes that the church consists only of communicants. But this is the peculiar doctrine of Baptists and other independents or congregationalists. It is not the doctrine of Presbyterians or of Protestants generally. It is indeed admitted that the true church, the body of Christ on earth, in whom he dwells by his Spirit, consists, not indeed of communicants as such, but of the truly regenerated children of God, just as true Christians are the true (as distinguished from the professed) worshippers and followers of Christ. Thus the apostle says, "He is not a Jew who is one outwardly. But he is a Jew who is one inwardly; whose circumcision is of the heart, and by the Spirit." This, however, does not prove that none but regenerated Jews were to be recognised as Jews, nor allowed to exercise the religious and covenant privileges belonging to the ancient church. This distinction between the church visible and invisible, the true and the empirical, is fundamental and vital. It is recognized in the symbols of every Protestant church. While therefore we maintain, as against Romanists, that the true church on earth consists exclusively of the true people of God; we as Presbyterians insist no less strenuously, as against the Baptists and Brownists, that the visible church,

those whom we are bound to recognise as within its pale, includes all those who profess the true religion, together with their children. And by professing the true religion, is not to be understood, professing regeneration and coming to the Lord's table; but as knowing the truth of Christianity, and submitting to the government and discipline of the church. The visible church, therefore, does not consist exclusively of the regenerated, nor of those who profess to be regenerated, nor of those whom church officers may pronounce to be thus renewed by the Holy Ghost, but of all who have been baptized and have not renounced their baptismal covenant, or been formally excommunicated. Those who are in this sense members of the visible church, have not, however, all the same privileges. Their rights as members depend upon their qualifications for the proper exercise of those rights. The male members have some privileges which the female members have not. Adults can do what minors or infants are not allowed to do. It does not follow, from the church membership of infants, that they may be admitted to the Lord's table; nor does it follow, from the church membership of adults, that they have all the qualifications for full communion, any more than that they have the qualifications for the eldership, or for the ministry. They may, however, have the qualifications of electors. The whole theory, therefore, that the visible church consists, (so far as adults are concerned,) exclusively of those who have been admitted to the Lord's table, is anti-Presbyterian and anti-Scriptural; and, consequently, the inference drawn from that theory that communicants alone are entitled to vote for pastors, is as much opposed to the doctrine, as it is to the practice of the church. The exclusion of all but communicants from the exercise of the elective franchise, is not only contrary to our doctrine and usage, it is also eminently unjust and unreasonable. A father of a family is allowed to choose what secular teacher he pleases for his children; is he to have no voice in the far more important matter of the selection of their religious teacher? He is expected and bound to contribute to the support of such teachers; must he submit to have them chosen exclusively by other men? This would obviously be inconsistent with our whole civil and ecclesiastical system. There is no real danger in this course

to the purity of the church. The choice of the congregation is limited to men who have been trained and licensed under the supervision of the Presbytery. The Presbytery has at all times a veto on the choice; and, after the election, the minister is still accountable for his doctrine and conduct, not to the people, but to the Presbytery. No improper man, therefore, can be installed pastor of a congregation without the connivance of the Presbytery, and ultimately of the Synod and of the General Assembly. So obviously just and reasonable is it that those who support the minister and sit under his instruction, should have a voice in his election, that even in New England, where the church is assumed to consist only of communicants, non-communicants are allowed to vote. The pastor is there chosen, first by the church, and then by the parish, or congregation. Both must concur to make the election valid. And in many of our States the right to vote for the minister is secured by the civil law, and cannot be denied without making the election legally invalid. We cannot doubt, therefore, that Dr. Breckinridge will be sustained in his efforts to preserve the rights of the people, and to maintain the true theory of our constitution, by the great majority of our church.

The State of the Country.

The debate on this subject, in its character and consequences, was one of the most memorable in the history of our church. The country was engaged in civil war; the South and the North stood arrayed in hostile camps; Presbyterians were in arms against Presbyterians; the public mind was agitated to its lowest depths; no man could be unaffected; no man could stand neutral; silence was a declaration of hostility. Under these circumstances the General Assembly was called upon to take sides. This had been an easy and obvious duty, if all Presbyterians represented in the Assembly, and whose organ it was, had been of one mind on the subject. But alas! this was not so. Our church was as much divided as the country. It was the case of a mother who was called upon to take part for one child against another. It was in vain she urged that both were her children; that it was not her province to decide the point in dispute between them. She might have her own

opinion on the subject, but God had not made her a judge or divider in such matters. This plea availed nothing. She was in the hands of the more powerful of the two, and speak she must. It will be admitted that the Assembly was in trying circumstances—more trying, perhaps, than any in which it had ever before been placed. Public sentiment, both in and out of the church, was almost overwhelming in favour of an open declaration of loyalty to the Constitution and the Federal Government. The eyes of the whole country were converged on the house in which the Assembly sat. The secular press was clamorous for an open avowal of allegiance. Threatening murmurs against clerical traitors were heard on every hand. Those who resisted the action of the Assembly were denounced in the streets as secessionists, as pro-slavery, as trucklers to the South, as traitors to their country. The scourge of public indignation was lifted over their heads. It was threatened that the people would desert a church by thousands which hesitated to speak out in such a time as this. The yeas and nays were called on every possible occasion, in order that every man should be held responsible for his vote. The Assembly has had severe conflicts in her past history, but none analogous to this. When the public mind seemed to be set in favour of voluntary societies, those who stood up for ecclesiastical Boards had the support not only of a large party in the church, but of their own convictions. When the rage for new measures and new doctrine seized upon the people, those who opposed them were firmly convinced that those measures were unscriptural and those doctrines false. When zeal for temperance became a fanaticism, and every man was denounced as a transgressor who did not vote the use of intoxicating liquor a sin, and when the fell spirit of abolitionism had rent almost every other church in the land, still those who withstood these extravagances had no sympathy with them. But in the present case it was far different. Those who resisted the action of the Assembly were themselves filled with the spirit which animated the public mind. They too were loyal to the Constitution and the Federal Government. They regarded the war which had been declared against the Union, as one of the most unjustifiable and wicked upon record. They looked with exulting admiration on the rising of a whole people in defence not

so much of their secular interests, as of an idea and of a sacred right. They felt the glow of the patriotic ardour which impelled the nation to risk everything in the protection of its national life. They approved of the sentiments and the object of the very paper against which they felt constrained to vote. They had to do violence to their feelings in obeying their conscience. They had elsewhere, by speech and pen, advocated those sentiments, and that, in some instances at least, at great personal sacrifice. Why then did they refuse to avow them in and through the General Assembly? For the same reason that they would refuse, at the command of an excited multitude, to sing the "Star Spangled Banner" at the Lord's table. They refused because in their judgment it was wrong and out of place.

It would fill a whole number of our journal to reprint the report of the numerous and protracted speeches delivered in the course of this debate. It might be well to have those speeches collected and published, after revision by their authors when possible, in a pamphlet form. All we can attempt is to state the course which the discussion took, and to vindicate in few words the part taken by the minority. The venerable Dr. Gardiner Spring, on the third day of the sessions of the Assembly, introduced a resolution proposing the appointment of a committee to consider whether any declaration of the sentiments of the Assembly on the present state of the country was desirable, and if so, to report a paper for the consideration of the house. This resolution was by a vote of 122 to 102 immediately laid on the table. On a subsequent day Dr. Spring proposed the adoption of a paper appointing a day of special prayer, and containing a declaration of loyalty to the Constitution and Government. After the debate had continued for several days, it was determined to appoint a committee of compromise, of which the Rev. Dr. Musgrave was chairman, to whom was referred Dr. Spring's resolutions, together with some eight or ten different papers, which had been presented as modifications or substitutes. That committee made a majority and minority report, which are as follows:

"Gratefully acknowledging the distinguished bounty and care of Almighty God towards this favoured land, and also

recognizing our obligation to submit to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, this General Assembly adopt the following resolutions:

“Resolved, That in view of the present agitated and unhappy condition of this country, Monday, the first day of July next, be hereby set apart as a day of prayer throughout our bounds, and that upon that day ministers and people are called upon humbly to confess and bewail our national sins, to offer our thanks to the Father of Lights for his abundant and undeserved goodness to us as a nation, to seek his guidance and blessing upon our rulers and their counsels, as well as upon the Congress then about to assemble, and implore him in the name of Jesus Christ, the great High Priest of the Christian profession, to turn away his anger from us, and speedily restore to us the blessings of a safe and honourable peace.

“Resolved, That the members of this General Assembly, in the spirit of that Christian patriotism which the Scriptures enjoin, and which has always characterized this church, do hereby acknowledge and declare their obligation, so far as in them lies, to maintain the Constitution of these United States, in the full exercise of all its legitimate powers, to preserve our beloved Union unimpaired, and to restore its inestimable blessings to every portion of the land.

“Resolved, That in the present distracted state of the country, this Assembly, representing the whole church, feel bound to abstain from any further declaration, in which all our ministers and members, faithful to the constitution and standards of the church, might not be able conscientiously and safely to join, and therefore, out of regard as well to the interests of our beloved country as to those of the church, the Assembly adopt this minute as the deliverance of the church.”

Dr. Anderson, as the minority of the Committee, reported Dr. Spring's original resolutions, with very slight modifications. The first resolution recommending a day of prayer, was the same in both reports. The second resolution of the minority report was as follows:

“Resolved, That this General Assembly, in the spirit of that Christian patriotism which the Scriptures enjoin, and which has

always characterized this church, do hereby acknowledge and declare our obligation to promote and perpetuate, so far as in us lies, the integrity of these United States, and to strengthen, uphold, and encourage the Federal Government in the exercise of all its functions under our noble Constitution, and to this Constitution, in all its provisions, requirements, and principles, we profess our unabated loyalty. And to avoid all misconception, the Assembly declares that by the term 'Federal Government,' as here used, is not meant any particular Administration, or the peculiar opinions of any political party, but that central Administration, which, being at any time appointed and inaugurated according to the terms prescribed in the Constitution of the United States, is the visible representative of our national existence."

The vote on the majority report was as follows:

YEAS.—Messrs. Kennedy, J. T. Backus, L. Merrill Miller, Aitken, Lane, Hall, Westcott, Lindsley, Imbrie, Martin, Hornblower, Hodge, Hamill, Studdiford, Adams, Snowden, Schenck, Watts, Musgrave, Happersett, McPhail, Latta, Gayley, Jas. Williamson, Lawrence, Yeomans, Dickson, Murray, Joseph Clark, Motzer, McMichael, Stockton, Alrich, Mahaffey, Lloyd, Hunt, Layman, Scott, Goodman, Bergen, Heckman, Lyon, Barnett, Taylor, Hamilton, Haines, Mutchmore, Wines, Mathes, Slagle, Matthews, Condit, Hawthorn and Ogden, *Ministers*. Messrs. Church, Newland, Guest, Lockwood, Ballantyne, Rankin, Osborne, Scudder, Robert Barber of Burlington, Morris Patterson, Henry McKeen, Macalester, Deal, Henry, Rea, R. Barber of Northumberland, Giles, Linn, Meredith, Sheets, William Semple, H. K. Clarke, Houston, Mercer, Young, Harbison, Warren, Tunstall, Hubbard and White, *Ruling Elders*.—84.

NAYS.—Messrs. William Clark, Kellog, Bullions, Cochran, Drake, Baldwin, Crane, Hubbard, Reeves, Barr, Kehoo, Edwards, Farquhar, Hastings, Donaldson, Coulter, Critchlow, S. J. M. Eaton, Annan, William Eaton, Maxwell, J. D. Smith, Kelly, Sackett, Semple, Pratt, Dubuar, William Campbell, Badeau, Eastman, Thomas, Monfort, Elliott, Long, Lee, T. M. Hopkins, Pelan, Irwin, Forbes, Fisk, John A. Campbell, Laird, Newell, Stone, Price, Crozier, Vaill, Hanson, Coon, Lord, Swan, Mathers, Robertson, Thayer, Jones, Dodd, Conkey, McGuigan, Stryker, Reaser, Symington, Leighton, Rutherford, McInnis, H. M. Smith, Gillespie, McNair, and Anderson, *Ministers*. Messrs. E. B. Miller, Wilkin, Lowrie, Beard, Hutchinson, Fithian, Gulick, William Wilson, Humphrey, Cunningham, Little, Dungan, Martin, Kinkead, Lawson, Ewing, John Johnston, Bailey, McConnell, Rodgers, Hamilton, Banks, Moore, Alexander, Lewis, Dary, Thomas Johnston, Samuel Price, Graham, L. H. Stewart, Hazeltine, Conn, Thomas, Frost, Neal, McChord, Kinnear, Fisher, J. L. Meredith, J. L. Williams, Seller, Neely, Waddel, Reynolds, Gregg, Row-

land, Spring, Scates, Stirrat, Baldwin, Mason, Russell, Windsor, Wayland, Claypool, and Caldwell, *Ruling Elders*.—128.

Messrs. Peden, Balch, and T. C. Stuart, *non liquet*.

Mr. Hoyte was excused from voting.

The majority report having been rejected, that of the minority was adopted by the following vote:

AYES.

Synod of Albany—Clark, Kellog, Bullions, Cochran, Newland.

Synod of Buffalo—L. M. Miller, William E. Guest, E. B. Miller.

Synod of New York—Westcott, Drake, Martin, Wilkin, Lowrie, Rankin, Beard.

Synod of New Jersey—Baldwin, Crane, Reeves, Hubbard, Studdiford, Barr, Snowden, Kehoo, Mackey, Osborne, Lytle, Hutchinson, Scudder, Fithian, Ryerson, Gulick, Humphrey, Cunningham.

Synod of Philadelphia—Schenck, Musgrave, Edwards, Latta, Farquhar, Williamson, Lawrence, Waller, Patterson, Dungan, Macalester, Henry, Martin, Kinkead, Rea, Barber, Lawson.

Synod of Baltimore—Murray, Clark, Linn.

Synod of Pittsburg—McPherson, Jacobus, Hastings, Donaldson, Ewing, Johnston, Bailey, McConnell, Rogers, Hamilton.

Synod of Allegheny—Coulter, Critchlow, Eaton, Annan, Banks, Moore, Alexander, Lewis.

Synod of Wheeling—Eaton, Maxwell, David.

Synod of Ohio—Smith, Kelly, Sackett, Semple, Pratt, Johnston, Price, Sheets, Graham, Stewart.

Synod of Sandusky—Dubuar, Badeau, Clarke, Hazeltine, Conn.

Synod of Cincinnati—Eastman, T. E. Thomas, Montfort, Elliott, Long, William Thomas, Frost, Neal.

Synod of Indiana—Lee, Hopkins, Pelan, McChord, Kinnear, Fisher, Houston.

Synod of Northern Indiana—Irvin, Goodman, Forbes, Fisk, Campbell, Meredith, Williams, Seller, Neely.

Synod of Illinois—Laird, Newell, Bergen, Stone, Price, Crozier, Waddell, Reynolds.

Synod of Chicago—Vaill, Hanson, Coon, Lord, Swan, Gregg, Rowland, Spring, Scates.

Synod of Wisconsin—Matthews, Hickman, Robertson.

Synod of St. Paul—Thayer, Lyon, Barnett, Stirrat, Baldwin.

Synod of Iowa—Jones, Dodd, Conkey, Mason.

Synod of Southern Iowa—McGuigan, Taylor, Stryker, Hamilton, Haines, Russell, Windsor.

Synod of Upper Missouri—Reaser.

Synod of Missouri—Wines, Slagle.

Synod of Pacific—Anderson, Caldwell.

Yeas—154.

NAYS.

- Synod of Albany—Kennedy, Church.
 Synod of Buffalo—Aitken, Lane, Hall, Lockwood, Ballentine.
 Synod of New York—Sprole, Lindsey, Imbrie, Childs, Wells.
 Synod of New Jersey—Hornblower, Hodge, Hamill, Wilson, Simpson.
 Synod of Philadelphia—Watts, Happersett, McPhail, Gayley, Yeomans, McKeen.
 Synod of Baltimore—Dickson, Murphy, Motzer, Giles.
 Synod of Pittsburg—McMichael.
 Synod of Wheeling—Stockton, Alrich, Mahaffey, Meredith.
 Synod of Ohio—Lloyd, Hunt, William Semple.
 Synod of Sandusky—Layman.
 Synod of Indiana—Scott.
 Synod of St. Paul—Mercer.
 Synod of Missouri—Mutchmore, Leighton, Mathes, Wayland.
 Synod of Kentucky—Hopkins, Matthews, Frazer, Cheek, Offatt, Condit, Hawthorn, Harbison, Warren, Tunstall, Hubbard.
 Synod of Virginia—Brown, Claypool.
 Synod of Nashville—Harrison, White.
 Synod of Mississippi—Peden, Balch, Rutherford, McInnis, Smith.
 Synod of Memphis—Gillespie, Stewart.
 Synod of Texas—McNair, Baker.

Nays—66.

Dr. Hodge, Mr. Hoyte, and several others, gave notice that they would enter a protest against the vote just passed; and Mr. Lloyd gave notice of dissent.

Agreeably to notice, the following protest was presented and placed on the minutes:

We, the undersigned, respectfully protest against the action of the General Assembly in adopting the minority report of the Committee on the State of the Country. We make this protest, not because we do not acknowledge loyalty to our country to be a moral and religious duty, according to the word of God, which requires us to be subject to the powers that be; nor because we deny the right of the Assembly to enjoin that and all other like duties on the ministers and churches under its care; but because we deny the right of the General Assembly to decide the political question, to what government the allegiance of Presbyterians, as citizens, is due, and its right to make that decision a condition of membership in our church.

That the paper adopted by the Assembly does decide the political question just stated, is, in our judgment, undeniable.

It asserts not only the loyalty of this body to the Constitution and the Union, but it promises, in the name of all the churches and ministers whom it represents, to do all that in them lies to "strengthen, uphold, and encourage the Federal Government." It is, however, a notorious fact, that many of our ministers and members conscientiously believe that the allegiance of the citizens of this country is primarily due to the States, to which they respectively belong; and, therefore, that when any State renounces its connection with the United States, and its allegiance to the Constitution, the citizens of that State are bound by the law of God to continue loyal to their State, and obedient to its laws. The paper adopted by the Assembly virtually declares, on the other hand, that the allegiance of the citizen is due to the United States; anything in the Constitution, or ordinances, or laws of the several States, to the contrary notwithstanding.

It is not the loyalty of the members constituting this Assembly, nor of our churches and ministers in any one portion of our country that is thus asserted, but the loyalty of the whole Presbyterian Church—North and South, East and West. Allegiance to the Federal Government is recognized or declared to be the duty of all the churches and ministers represented in this body. In adopting this paper, therefore, the Assembly does decide the great political question which agitates and divides the country. *The question is, whether the allegiance of our citizens is primarily to the State or to the Union?* However clear our own convictions of the correctness of this decision may be, or however deeply we may be impressed with its importance, yet it is not a question which this Assembly has the right to decide. A man may conscientiously believe that he owes allegiance to one government, or another, and yet possess all the qualifications which the word of God or the standards of the church authorizes us to demand in our members or ministers. As this General Assembly represents the whole church, the acts and deliverances of this Assembly become the acts and deliverances of the church. It is this consideration that gives to the action of this Assembly in this case all its importance either in our own view or in the view of others.

It is the allegiance of the Old School Presbyterian Church to

the Constitution, the Union, and the Federal Government which this paper is intended to profess and proclaim. It does, therefore, of necessity decide the political question which agitates the country. It pronounces or assumes a particular interpretation of the Constitution. This is a matter clearly beyond the jurisdiction of the Assembly.

That the action of the Assembly in the premises does not only decide the political question referred to, but makes that decision a term of membership in our church, is no less clear. It is not analogous to the recommendation of a religious or benevolent institution, which our members may regard or not, at pleasure; but it puts into the mouths of all represented in this body a declaration of loyalty and allegiance to the Union and to the Federal Government. But such a declaration made by our members residing in what are called the seceding States, is treasonable. Presbyterians under the jurisdiction of those States cannot, therefore, make this declaration. They are consequently forced to choose between allegiance to their States and allegiance to the church.

The General Assembly, in thus deciding a political question, and in making that decision practically a condition of membership to the church, has, in our judgment, violated the constitution of the church, and usurped the prerogative of its Divine Master.

We protest, secondly, against this action of the Assembly, because it is a departure from all its previous actions. The General Assembly has always acted on the principle that the church has no right to make anything a condition of Christian or ministerial fellowship, which is not enjoined or required in the Scriptures and the standards of the church.

We have at one time resisted the popular demand to make total abstinence from intoxicating liquors a term of membership. At another time the holding of slaves. In firmly resisting these unscriptural demands, we have preserved the integrity and unity of the church, made it the great conservative body of truth, moderation, and liberty of conscience in our country. The Assembly have now descended from this high position in making a political opinion a particular theory of the Constitution, however correct and important that theory may be, the

condition of membership in our body, and thus, as we fear, endangered the unity of the church.

In the third place, we protest because we regard the action of the Assembly as altogether *unnecessary and uncalled for*. It was required neither to instruct nor excite our brethren in the Northern States. It was not needed as a vindication of the loyalty of the North.

Old-school Presbyterians everywhere out of the so-called seceding States, have openly avowed and conspicuously displayed their allegiance to the Constitution and the Government, and that in many cases at great cost and peril. Nor was such action required by our duty to the country. We are fully persuaded that we best promote the interests of the country by preserving the integrity and unity of the church.

We regard this action of the Assembly, therefore, as a great national calamity, as well as the most disastrous to the interests of our church which has marked its history.

We protest, fourthly, because we regard the action of the Assembly as unjust and cruel in its bearing on our Southern brethren. It was, in our judgment, unfair to entertain and decide such a momentous question when the great majority of our Southern Presbyteries were from necessity unrepresented in this body. And it is, in our judgment, a violation of the law of love, to adopt an act which must expose the Southern churches that remain in connection with our church to suspicion, to loss of property, to personal danger, and which tends to destroy their usefulness in their appointed fields of labour.

And finally, we protest because we believe the act of the Assembly will not only diminish the resources of the church, but greatly weaken its power for good, and expose it to the danger of being carried away more and more from its true principles by a wordly or fanatical spirit.

Charles Hodge; William Chester; John C. Backus; Cyrus Dickson; Daniel Motzer; W. S. Giles; Thomas A. Ogden; Charles K. Imbrie; George Fraser; John H. Condit; Thomas S. Childs; John D. Wells; Charles Hubbard; George Meredith; W. E. Hunt; W. Semple; W. McMichael; H. B. Scott; J. Trumbull Backus; M. Peden; R. McInnis; John W. Yeomans; G. Wilson McPhail; Henry McKeen; Duncan

Kennedy; J. B. White; W. A. Harrison; Robert Lee; J. P. Lloyd; John Leighton; W. R. Mercer; A. L. Lindsley; J. T. Balch; Samuel A. Gayley; J. V. Harbison of Kentucky; T. C. Stuart, Chickasaw Presbytery, Miss.; Daniel McNair, Brazos Presbytery, Texas; E. H. Rutherford, Presbytery of Central Mississippi; W. C. Matthews, Presbytery of Louisville, Ky.; James M. Brown, Presbytery of Greenbrier, Va.; W. D. Symington, Presbytery of Upper Missouri; Henry R. Tunstall, Presbytery of Muhlenburg; L. L. Warren, Kentucky; Abraham Wayland, Presbytery of Wyaconda; Robert Watts, Presbytery of Philadelphia; William Ballantyne, Rochester City; A. A. Mathes, Presbytery of Potosi; Thomas G. Murphy, Presbytery of Lewes; William M. Baker, Presbytery of Central Texas; S. B. Cheek, Presbytery of Transylvania; Stephen Lockwood, Buffalo City Presbytery; William H. Hornblower, Passaic Presbytery; Samuel Mahaffey, St. Clairsville Presbytery; J. H. Gillespie, Memphis; J. W. Hoyte, Tennessee; Henry M. Smith, New Orleans; H. H. Hopkins, Kentucky; James Hawthorn, Kentucky.

Rev. Dr. Thomas, from the Committee to answer the Protest of the Rev. Dr. Hodge and others, presented a report. The paper was adopted, and is as follows:

Answer to the Protests.

The Committee appointed to answer the protests of Dr. Hodge and others, respectfully present the following:

The action of the General Assembly, in reference to which these protests are offered, embraces two resolutions, against the former of which no objection is alleged. The whole stress of the protestation is directed upon the following sentence in the second resolution:—“*Resolved*, That this General Assembly, in the spirit of that Christian patriotism which the Scriptures enjoin, and which has always characterized this church, do hereby acknowledge and declare our obligation to promote and perpetuate, so far as in us lies, the integrity of these United States; and to strengthen, uphold, and encourage the Federal Government in the exercise of all its functions under our noble Constitution; and to this Constitution, in all its provisions, requirements, and principles, we profess our unabated loyalty.”

The first and main ground of protest against the adoption of this resolution is, that the General Assembly has no right to decide purely political questions; that the question whether the allegiance of American citizens is due primarily and emi-

nently to the State or to the Union, is purely political—of the gravest character—dependent upon constitutional theories and interpretations, respecting which various opinions prevail in different sections of our country; that the action of the Assembly virtually determines this vexed question; decides to what government the allegiance of Presbyterians, as citizens, is due; and makes that decision a term of communion.

That the action of the Assembly has political as well as moral bearings is readily admitted. So had the decision of our Divine Master, when he said to the Pharisees and Herodians, “Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar’s,” (Mark xii. 17,) a decision still binding upon all men, and underlying this very act of the Assembly. The payment of the required tax was both a moral and a political duty.

“There are occasions,” says the author of an able article on the State of the Country in the January number of the *Princeton Review*—“There are occasions when *political questions rise into the sphere of morals and religion*; when the rule of political action is to be sought, not in considerations of state policy, but in the law of God. . . . When the question to be decided turns on moral principles; when reason, conscience, and the religious sentiment are to be addressed, *it is the privilege and duty of all who have access in any way to the public ear to endeavour to allay unholy feeling, and to bring truth to bear on the minds of their fellow-citizens.*” The General Assembly heartily approve these principles, and doubt not that if ever there was an occasion when political questions rose into the sphere of morals and religion, the present circumstances of our beloved country are of that character.

The protestants “deny the right of the General Assembly to decide to what government the allegiance of Presbyterians, as citizens, is due.” Strictly speaking the Assembly has made no such decision. They have said nothing respecting the allegiance of the subjects of any foreign power; or that of the members of our mission churches in India, China, or elsewhere; who may hold connection with our denomination. The action complained of relates solely to American Presbyterians, citizens of these United States.

Even with regard to them, the Assembly has not determined, as between conflicting governments, to which our allegiance is due. We are the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in the United States of America. Such is the distinctive name, ecclesiastical and legal, under which we have chosen to be known by our sister churches, and by the world. Our organization as a General Assembly was cotemporaneous with that of our Federal Government. In the seventy-four years of our existence, Presbyterians have known but one supreme government, one nationality, within our wide-spread territory. We know no other now. History tells of none. The Federal Government acknowledges none. No nation on earth recognizes the existence of two independent sovereignties within these United States. What Divine Providence may intend for us hereafter—what curse of rival and hostile sovereignties within this broad heritage of our fathers, we presume not to determine. Do these protestants, who so anxiously avoid political entanglements, desire the General Assembly to anticipate the dread decisions of impending battle, the action of our own government, the determination of foreign powers, and even the ultimate arbitration of Heaven? Would they have us recognize, as good Presbyterians, men whom our own Government, with the approval of Christendom, may soon execute as traitors? May not the highest court of our church, speaking as the interpreter of that holy law which says, "Ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake," Rom. xiii. 5, warn her communicants against "resisting the ordinance of God?" Rom. xiii. 2. In the language of the learned Reviewer above cited, "Is disunion morally right? Does it not involve a breach of faith, and a violation of the oaths by which that faith was confirmed? We believe, under existing circumstances, that it does, and, therefore, it is as dreadful a blow to the church as it is to the state. If a crime at all, it is one the heinousness of which can only be imperfectly estimated."

In the judgment of this Assembly, "this saying is true;" and, therefore, the admission, on the part of the Assembly, that Presbyterians may take up arms against the Federal Government, or aid and comfort its enemies, and yet be guilt-

less, would exhibit that "practical recognition of the right of secession," which, says the Reviewer, would "destroy our national life."

But we deny that this deliverance of the Assembly establishes any new term of communion. The terms of Christian fellowship are laid down in the word of God, and are embodied in our standards. It is competent to this court to interpret and apply the doctrines of the word; to warn men against prevailing sins, and to urge the performance of neglected duties. We regard the action against which these protests are levelled, simply as a faithful declaration by the Assembly, of Christian duty towards those in authority over us, which adds nothing to the terms of communion already recognized. Surely the idea of the obligation of loyalty to our Federal Government is no new thing to Presbyterians. And this is a sufficient reply, also, to the second article of this protest. Having established no new term of membership, this Assembly is not liable to the charge of having departed from the old paths.

A third ground of protest is the allegation that this action of the Assembly is uncalled for and unnecessary. Yet, on the admission of these protestants themselves, it is "a notorious fact" that many of our ministers and members believe themselves absolved from all obligations of loyalty to our National Government; believe, in contradiction to the Princeton Reviewer, that disunion is morally right; and some are already in arms to vindicate these opinions. What, when "a crime, the heinousness of which can only be imperfectly estimated"—"striking as dreadful a blow at the church as at the state," is already committed; when thousands of Presbyterians are likely to be seduced from their allegiance by the machinations of wicked men; when our national prosperity is overclouded, when every material interest is in jeopardy, and every spiritual energy paralyzed—when armed rebellion joins issue with armed authority on battle-fields where tens of thousands must perish—when it remains a question whether our national life survives the conflict, or whether our sun sets in anarchy and blood—is it uncalled for, unnecessary, for this Christian Assembly to renew, in the memories and hearts of a Christian people, re-

spect for the majesty of law, and a sense of the obligation of loyalty? Let posterity decide between us.

That this decision of the Assembly is unjust to a portion of our church not now fully represented in this body, is a fourth reason of protest. We need only reply that the roll of this Assembly shows delegates from Virginia, Kentucky, Missouri, Tennessee, Mississippi, Louisiana and Texas. All might have been as easily represented. Besides, this action has no local or sectional character; the subject is of national relations, as well as of such pressing urgency, that to have waited for a full Southern representation, in a future Assembly, would have been to lose for ever the critical moment when action would be productive of good.

As to the final ground of protest, it is enough to record our simple denial of the opinions expressed. We sincerely believe that this action of the General Assembly will increase the power of the church for good; securing, as we humbly trust it will, the favour of her exalted Head in behalf of those who testify for a suffering truth.

Signed, THOMAS E. THOMAS, JESSE L. WILLIAMS,
 WILLIS LORD, N. EWING,
 WILLIAM C. ANDERSON,

Committee.

It will be perceived that the prominent ground of protest against the action of the majority of the house, in this case, is the denial of the constitutional right of the Assembly, under the circumstances, to adopt Dr. Spring's resolutions. To understand the views of the protestants in this matter, it is necessary to remark that there are two theories which have been advanced as to the legitimate jurisdiction of the church. Two years since, at Indianapolis, the extreme doctrine was advocated that the power of the church is so purely spiritual, and its province so entirely limited to its own members, that it cannot lawfully recommend any voluntary society, however scriptural in its object or conduct, or express any judgment for or against any act of the civil government. On this ground, the right of the Assembly to recommend the Colonization Society was denied; and it was asserted that should the govern-

ment chose to reopen the African slave-trade, or to perpetrate any similar enormity, the church dare not open her lips. Great indignation was felt at the promulgation of a doctrine so inconsistent with the true mission of the church, and so diametrically opposed to past action of our General Assembly. The advocates of this new doctrine were the first to abandon it, when an emergency arose to put the principle to the test.

The doctrine of our church on this subject is, that the state has no authority in matters purely spiritual, and the church no authority in matters purely secular or civil. That their provinces in some cases overlie each other; that civil rights and religious duties may be involved in the same question, is indeed true. Slavery, for example, is a civil institution, and lies within the province of the state, and the state may, within the limits prescribed by the divine law, determine the extent of the master's power and of the slave's obligation to obedience. Nevertheless, the relative duties of masters and slaves, as prescribed in the word of God, it is the prerogative and duty of the church to teach, and as concerns her own members, to enforce. The same is true in a multitude of other cases. It may therefore often be a difficult question to decide where the power of the state ends, and where that of the church begins. Nevertheless the two institutions are distinct, and their respective duties are different. "Synods and councils," says our Confession of Faith, "are to handle or conclude nothing but that which is ecclesiastical; and are not to intermeddle with civil affairs which concern the commonwealth, unless by way of humble petition in cases extraordinary; or by way of advice for the satisfaction of conscience, if they be thereunto required by the civil magistrate." Chap. 31, § 4.

The General Assembly last year passed a resolution, without a dissenting voice, in which, on the one hand, it disclaimed "all right to interfere in secular matters," and, on the other hand, asserted it to be "the right and duty of the church, as God's witness on earth, to bear testimony in favour of truth and holiness, and against all false doctrine and sin, wherever professed or committed." As this resolution was unanimously adopted, we ought to be of one mind as to the principle, however we may differ in its application. It is agreed that it is

the duty of the church to proclaim, and, within its own pale, to enforce the law of God. It is agreed that the divine law determines the relative duties of parents and children, of husbands and wives, of masters and slaves, of magistrates and people. It is agreed that loyalty to the government under which we live—submission to the higher powers, as ordained of God, is a moral duty; and therefore that the church is bound to teach that duty to all men, and to enforce its observance on its own members. So far there can be no difference of opinion.

But suppose there is a difference of conscientious conviction among the members of the church as to the government to which their allegiance is due, what is the province of the church in that case? This is a matter of frequent occurrence. In almost every country in Europe there have been numerous instances of disputed succession to the crown. The claims of the parties sometimes rest on questions of legitimacy; sometimes on the proper interpretation of treaties; sometimes on the view taken of the organic law. Is it the province of the church to decide these matters? Could the church have rightfully determined the points at issue between the houses of York and Lancaster in England, between Charles I. and the Parliament, between William III. and the adherents of the house of Stuart? Has the church the right to determine whether the abrogation of the Salic law in Spain, which regulated the descent of the crown in that country, was valid or not? No one, we presume, will answer any of these questions in the affirmative. But on the decision of the points therein involved depended the allegiance of the subject. While, therefore, the church was bound to inculcate in all these cases the duty of loyalty, the question to which claimant of the throne allegiance was due, was of necessity left to every man's conscience. The church, acting under the law of God, had no right to decide it. The Scriptures give no rule by which she can determine whether a child had been born before or after the marriage of its parents; whether the Constitution of England admitted of the overthrow of the royal authority, or its transfer to the house of Hanover, or not. When this country declared its independence of the crown of Great Britain, the Christians of England and Scotland, in good conscience, and it may be, with good reason,

regarded us as rebels. They deemed our armed opposition to the authority of the mother country a great crime. But neither the Church of England nor that of Scotland attempted to decide the question of allegiance. Neither of them issued mandates of loyalty to King George, or declared it to be obligatory on Christians in this country to do all that in them lies to strengthen, uphold, and encourage him in the exercise of the prerogatives of his crown. Had any such attempt been made, the American Presbyterians would doubtless have said that the church had exceeded its powers, that it was not her province to decide on the political questions at issue, that we must be allowed to determine those matters for ourselves on our responsibility to God.

All this seems to us undeniable. The application of this principle to the case before the Assembly, seems to us no less plain. It cannot be denied that two theories, as to the nature of our Constitution, have, from the beginning, more or less prevailed among the people. According to the one theory, our Union is a mere confederacy of sovereign States, from which any one or more of them may withdraw at pleasure. This is what is meant by the right of secession. According to the other, our Union constitutes us one nation, in such a sense that it can be lawfully dismembered only by common consent. The question is not, which of these theories is true. It is admitted that the people in the Northern States, almost with one voice, and the great majority in the South, cordially adopt the latter. Every Northern member of the late Assembly, and, with very few exceptions, every delegate present from Southern Presbyteries, regarded the doctrine of secession as a political heresy, destructive, in its practical operation, of our national life.

We need not say that such is our own personal conviction. We believe the course of the South, in its attempt to break up our glorious Union, is unreasonable, ungrateful, and wicked. We believe that the war in which the government is now engaged is entirely righteous, necessary for the preservation of our existence as a nation, and for the security of the rights, liberty, and well-being not only of this generation but of generations yet unborn. We believe that it is the duty of every man in these United States, to do all that in him lies "to

strengthen, sustain and encourage the Federal Government" in the conflict in which it is now engaged. Such is the conviction which we have not only avowed, but which we have done our best to justify and to impress upon the minds of others. But our private convictions have nothing to do with the rights of the General Assembly. Our Presbyterian brethren in South Carolina are as fully entitled to their convictions as to the true construction of the Federal Constitution as we are to ours. One or the other must be fearfully wrong, and fearfully guilty in the sight of God; but it is not the province of the General Assembly to decide between us. Two men may be contending for an estate. Each may be sincerely convinced of the justice of his claim. Each may think the other dishonest or rapacious. One or the other is in the wrong, but it is not the prerogative of a church-court to decide between them. During the Revolutionary war, some of the best men in this country conscientiously believed that their allegiance, notwithstanding the declaration of independence, was due to the crown of England; others thought differently. The one class were traitors, and the other rebels, in the estimation of the other class. Treason and rebellion are great crimes, and therefore they mutually regarded each other as great criminals. But was this a question for the church to decide? Presbyterians being all on one side in that struggle, were at liberty to declare their sentiments in Synod and elsewhere, as freely as they pleased. In the present case, however, Presbyterians are divided. And the Assembly had no more right to say to our brethren in South Carolina, your theory of the Constitution is wrong, and therefore you are rebels, than the Church of Scotland had a right to decide whether George I. or Charles Stuart was lawfully the king of England. Let it be remembered, that the moral question in all these cases depends on the political one. If the Jacobite theory of the English constitution was right, their allegiance was in fact due to the house of Stuart; if the whig doctrine was right, then they were rebels. In like manner, if the doctrine of secession is the true, then the Presbyterians in South Carolina are bound to renounce allegiance to the Federal Government. If it is wrong, they are in rebellion, and may, and ought to be treated accordingly by the state, but not by the church.

It must not be supposed that we hold that if a man thinks a thing be right, to him it is right; that a man's conscientious convictions are his rule of duty. The Bible teaches otherwise. Paul thought it right to persecute Christians, but he confessed himself therein, and therefor, to be the chief of sinners. Many men have conscientiously believed that they might innocently commit murder or theft. Such a plea would avail nothing at the bar either of the state or of the church. When the thing for which a man pleads the approbation of his conscience, is in itself sinful, and is so declared by the word of God, then his conscientious conviction does not free him from responsibility, either to the church or to the state. But when the thing is in its own nature indifferent, *so far as the church is concerned*, he may act according to his conscience.

The church can only exercise her power in enforcing the word of God, in approving what it commands, and condemning what it forbids. A man, in the exercise of his liberty as to things indifferent, may be justly amenable to the laws of the land; and he may incur great guilt in the sight of God, but he cannot be brought under the censure of the church.

Eating meat sacrificed to idols was, the apostle tells us, a matter of indifference. To eat it, however, under the circumstances in which the Corinthians were placed, was a sin not only against their brethren, but against Christ. He however expressly forbids the church interfering in the matter. To his own Master, in such cases, a man must stand or fall. Drinking wine, under some circumstances, may be a great sin, but it can never be made a ground of censure at the bar of the church. In like manner, an adherent of the Stuarts may have committed a great sin in refusing allegiance to the house of Hanover, and be justly punished by the state; but he could not be justly censured by the church. He might be a true Christian, and yet conscientiously believe that his loyalty was due to his exiled sovereign. Thus, too, a man who acts on the theory of secession, may be justly liable to the penalty of the civil law; he may be morally guilty in the sight of God; but he has committed no offence of which the church can take cognizance. We therefore are not inconsistent in asserting,

1. That secession is a ruinous political heresy.
2. That those

who act on that doctrine, and throw off allegiance to the Constitution and the Union, are guilty of a great crime; and, 3. That nevertheless they are not amenable in this matter to the church. The question whether they are morally guilty, depends on the question whether their theory of the constitution is right. If it is right, they are heroes; if it is wrong, they are wicked rebels. But whether that theory is right or wrong it is not the province of the church to decide.

This then is the first ground we assume in vindication of the protest. The General Assembly had no right to decide the political question, to what government the allegiance of Presbyterians as citizens is due, any more than the Church of Scotland had a right to decide between the rival claims of the houses of Stuart and Hanover. The next question is, Did the Assembly decide that point? This has been denied. It is said, in the answer to the protest, that the Assembly has "said nothing respecting the allegiance to any foreign power; or that of the members of our mission churches in India, China, or elsewhere. . . . The action complained of relates solely to American Presbyterians, citizens of these United States." This is perfectly true, and was taken for granted; and, therefore, the language of the protest was to be understood with that obvious limitation. The complaint was, that the Assembly decided the political question about which American Presbyterians are divided. But, "even with regard to them," continues the answer to the protest, "the Assembly has not determined, as between conflicting governments, to which our allegiance is due." This assertion is sustained by saying, "In the seventy-four years of our existence, we have known but one supreme government, one nationality within our wide-spread territory. We know no other now," &c.

That, however, is not the point. Is not South Carolina a government? Are not Georgia, Alabama, Virginia, commonwealths? These brethren do not presume to say that the Assembly did not decide the question, whether the allegiance of Presbyterians as citizens is due primarily to the several States to which they belong, or to the United States? The several States have constitutions, and laws, which their citizens are sworn to support and obey. They are recognized in the

Constitution and laws of the United States, by the Federal Government, and by all the nations of the earth. They are established, legitimate governments, to which allegiance, supreme or subordinate, is due. The answer, therefore, entirely ignores the real question in dispute. Its authors could not, of course, maintain that there was no difference of opinion among Presbyterians as to which of these governments, the State or Federal, they owe supreme allegiance. It is not correct, therefore, for them to say, that "the Assembly has not determined, as between conflicting governments, to which our allegiance is due." This is the very thing they did decide. The government of South Carolina is in conflict with the government of the United States; and the Assembly decided that Presbyterians in that State, and everywhere else in this country, are under obligations to strengthen, support, and encourage the Federal Government. If the public mind were not so excited, and, therefore, prone to misapprehension and injustice, it would not be necessary for us to say again that we agree with this decision of the Assembly; we only deny their right to make it. We fully believe that the allegiance of the American citizen is to the Union, anything in the constitution, laws, or ordinances of his particular State to the contrary notwithstanding, and consequently that those who, in obedience to their States, take up arms against the Union, are as much rebels as if they thus acted in obedience to a town council. Such is our conviction; but we have no right to call upon the Assembly to adopt our interpretation of the Constitution, nor to make that interpretation the ground of its official action. The advocates of Dr. Spring's resolutions themselves admit that the Assembly did assume and act on that interpretation. Dr. Wines, for example, says: "The Assembly claimed, unequivocally and emphatically, that the allegiance of the citizens of the United States is due to the Constitution of the United States, and to the government created by that Constitution, in all its constitutional functions." Exactly so; and as the Presbyterians of South Carolina emphatically deny that their allegiance is *now* due to the Constitution and the Federal Government, the Assembly has decided the question of contested allegiance—a question which we may safely challenge

any man in the world to prove that it had the right to decide. It is useless to discuss this matter any further. The main point in the debate, the very key of the whole position, was precisely this. The country is in a great conflict. The struggle between the two principles of State sovereignty and of national unity has been transferred from the Senate chamber to the camp. It is a struggle for life. The Assembly was called upon to pronounce judgment on one side or the other. While we concur in the judgment, we deny the right of the court to pronounce it.

The next prominent ground of the protest is, that the Assembly made allegiance to the Constitution and government a term of communion. By term of communion is not meant simply prescribed conditions of membership in a church. Anything which prevents a man otherwise qualified from being a communicant or minister in our church, becomes in his case a term of communion. The General Assembly has enacted that a foreign minister shall pass a probation of six months before he can be received into any of our Presbyteries. Such probation, therefore, is to that class of ministers a term of ministerial communion. Should the Assembly enact that no foreign minister should be thus received until he was naturalized, then naturalization would be a term of communion. Or, if the Assembly should ordain that any Presbytery which failed for two years in succession to be represented in that body, should be excluded from our church, it would practically cut off almost every Presbytery, with the churches under their care, established by us among the heathen. Or, if it should enjoin that every minister who did not at least once in two or three years attend the Presbytery to which he belongs, should have his name stricken from the roll, that would be a condition of membership with which few of our foreign missionaries could comply. The only question then is, have we any members or ministers who are so situated that they cannot remain connected with a church which professes its obligation to strengthen, sustain, and encourage the Federal Government in the present conflict? This is a mere question of fact. Many of our Southern brethren told us that they were so situated. They said their lives would not be safe, should they remain in the church after such a declaration.

It would be regarded as treason in the States in which they lived. They therefore implored the Assembly not to drive them out of the church in which they had been born, whose unity they had laboured to preserve, and for which they had already been called to suffer so much. To all men in such circumstances, the act of the Assembly became *practically*, as the protest asserts, a term of communion. In order to continue in the church, such men must renounce their charges, give up their fields of labour, and return to some State still loyal to the Union. Who gave the Assembly the right to attach this new condition to their remaining in our church? They have all the qualifications which our book, or the word of God prescribes; what right had we to demand anything more? To force out of our church some of our best and most devoted ministers, by passing certain resolutions on a subject which a decided majority of the Assembly had declared ought not to be touched, seems to us an act of cruelty as well as of injustice.

It has, however, been said that the report of the majority of the compromise committee, for which most of the signers of the protest voted, is liable to the same objections. Surprise has been expressed that those who voted for the one report should protest against the adoption of the other, since they are substantially the same. There is, however, an essential difference between them. The one says, "*The members of this Assembly declare their obligation*" to maintain the Constitution, &c. The other says, "*This General Assembly does acknowledge and declare,*" &c. The members of Congress may pass what resolutions they please, but for Congress to do it is a different affair. The members of the Assembly were willing enough to profess their own loyalty to the Federal Government, but they denied the right of the Assembly, speaking in the name of the Presbyterians of South Carolina and Georgia, to make that profession. This difference is perfectly plain, and was instantly perceived. It was said the Assembly might as well adjourn, and its members meet in the basement, as a convention, and pass the resolutions under debate. This was not what was wanted. It was the Assembly, as the organ of the church, and of the whole church, that was called upon to take sides, in the name of the church, with the general Government, against

the doctrine of secession and its consequences. In thus doing, they have rendered it impossible for some of our ministers and members to remain in the church. They have, therefore, practically made loyalty to the Federal Government a term of communion. If it is not a condition of salvation, the church has no right to make it a condition of membership in Christ's church. And therefore the protest.

Another ground of protest was, that the action of the Assembly in this matter was unnecessary. This we believe was the deliberate conviction of two-thirds of the members of the house. Many who deemed the introduction of the subject eminently unwise, when it was introduced felt constrained to vote for the resolutions. This was done by some, avowedly on the ground that the people demanded it. This consideration was urged with frequency and zeal. We were told that thousands would desert our standard, if we refused as an Assembly to take sides in the conflict which was rending the country. This fear of what the public would say and do, was openly appealed to in order to control the action of the house. Others, again, felt that they would be disloyal to vote against resolutions which affirmed allegiance to the Constitution and the Government. Thus Dr. Wines, for example, who had voted repeatedly to get rid of the subject, when the final vote came, sided with the majority. Others say, that to refuse to adopt the resolutions, when they had been once introduced, would have compromised the character of the Assembly. Still they all deprecated the discussion. The general feeling obviously was, that the wisest course for the Assembly, in the present state of the country, and in the absence of nearly one-third of the delegates, was quietly to attend to the necessary routine of business, and to adjourn. So strong was this feeling, that when Dr. Spring introduced his motion for a mere committee of inquiry, it was laid on the table immediately, by a vote of 122 to 102; although, by so doing, the danger of offence and misconstruction was encountered. If we ask ourselves what good could be reasonably expected from the passage of the resolutions, it will be hard to find a satisfactory answer. They were not required to excite the patriotism of the country. The country was already thoroughly aroused. It no more needed the action of our Assembly, than

a tornado needed to be assisted by a pair of bellows, or a prairie fire by a lucifer match. It was not required to strengthen the Government. Its whole tendency was to weaken the Government, and to sever the remaining bonds of the Union. The enemies of the country exulted over the passage of those resolutions. They saw in them a new source of exasperation between the North and the South, and a new blow given to our staggering Constitution. The evils likely to flow from the action of the Assembly can hardly be estimated. It is the first time, in the history of our church, that it has succumbed to pressure from without. It has lost the prestige acquired by its oft repeated opposition to popular excitement. No man present in the Assembly can doubt, that if the members had felt free to act in obedience to their own convictions, they would have avoided any action on the state of the country. This is apparent, as just stated, by their laying Dr. Spring's resolution for a committee on the table, which was felt to be apparently discourteous to a venerable man, as well as liable to misconstruction. But after that was done, the Assembly was assailed by outsiders, by letters, and telegrams, threatening or foretelling the indignation of the people; and then the house receded from the position which it had assumed. This was a defeat of the house by a power outside of itself, and may justly be regarded as a great humiliation. It is not, however, only in this concession to popular excitement that the evil consists. Who can estimate the lamentable consequences to the church, the country, and to the cause of truth and of religion, should the Old-school Presbyterian Church, so long regarded by friends and foes as the great bulwark of sound doctrine and of ordered liberty in our land, be dismembered. Its power for good depends in no small degree upon its nationality. Neither part can ever become, separately, what the two are conjoined. The one controls and modifies the other. The friends of religion and of conservative principles, in other denominations, were praying for the sake of the country and of the cause of Christ, that our church might not be divided, while we had not an enemy in the land which did not long for that consummation, and rejoice in the passage of Dr. Spring's resolutions. Papers

under the control of our New-school brethren, could not repress their joy that our time for separation and disaster had come. However, the Lord reigns, and it becomes us to submit. We were bound to resist a measure which we deemed wrong in principle, and disastrous in its consequences; but having done our duty we shall hope for the best. Although the action of the Assembly may force some of our brethren to leave us, we are far from thinking that it justifies a general withdrawal of the Southern churches. Nothing but necessity, or the preservation of a good conscience, can justify before God any thing so serious as the division of the church. An unjustifiable or unnecessary division is the crime of schism, from which we pray God we may be delivered.

Conclusion.

The length to which this article has been protracted forbids our dwelling on other topics of interest. The Rev. Dr. Krebs, of New York, was elected Professor of Theology in the Theological Seminary at Chicago; and the Rev. Dr. Moffat, of the College of New Jersey, was chosen Professor of Church History in the Theological Seminary at Princeton. A resolution was unanimously adopted, acknowledging the ability, courtesy, and fairness with which John C. Backus, D. D., had discharged the duties of Moderator, under peculiarly trying circumstances. Dr. Backus delivered a touching and appropriate farewell address; and the Assembly finally adjourned, having directed the next Assembly to meet in May next, at Columbus, Ohio.