

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JULY, 1855.

No. III.

John W. Alden

ART. I.—*The Zurich Letters; or, the Correspondence of several English Bishops, and others, with some of the Helvetian Reformers, during the reign of Queen Elizabeth.* Chiefly from the Archives of Zurich. Translated from authenticated copies of the autographs, and edited for the Parker Society, by the Rev. Hastings Robinson, D. D., F. A. S., Rector of Great Warley, Essex, and formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. Second edition, chronologically arranged in one series.

WHAT will be the ultimate destiny of the established Church of England, it is perhaps impossible to foretell, and therefore, vain to conjecture. We know of no book, however, which throws so much light upon its origin, genesis, growth and complicated structure, as the one before us. It completely exposes the hypothesis lately put forth by D'Aubigné, that the English Reformation proceeded primarily from the people, and was a purely religious Revolution. It is equally at variance with the opposite sentiment, that it was nothing more than a political change dictated by the pride or the policy of her rulers. The truth is, as usual, to be found in the mean between the two extremes. The circumstances of the times were, unquestionably, favourable to the progress of the Reform-

forms. The best parts of the English Prayer Book are derived from sources common to all Protestants. We believe a book could be prepared without including anything not found in the liturgies, framed by the continental Reformers, which, as a whole, would be far superior to any prayer-book now in use. As to the want of the sacredness which belongs to antiquity, this, of course for the time, is an unavoidable defect. The most venerable tree, however, was once a sapling. It is no good reason for not planting a tree, that it has not, and cannot have, the weight of centuries on its boughs. No man objects to founding a new college because it cannot at once be an Oxford or a Harvard. Besides, this objection would be in a measure obviated, by including in such a book nothing which had not been in the use of the Protestant Churches ever since the Reformation. Let it be remembered, that we have not advocated the introduction of a liturgy, but simply the preparation of a book which may be used as the occasion calls for it.

Thos. Hodges.

ART. VI.—*The General Assembly.*

THE General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church met in the First Presbyterian Church, Nashville, Tennessee, at eleven o'clock, A. M., May 17th, 1855, and was opened with a sermon by the Rev. H. A. Boardman, D. D., Moderator of the last General Assembly, from 1 Tim. iii. 1: "This is a true saying, if a man desireth the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work."

After the sermon, the Moderator proceeded to constitute the sessions with prayer.

On motion, a Committee on Elections was appointed, consisting of Messrs. Gildersleeve, James Wilson, and Judge Fine, to whom any cases of informal commissions and want of commissions, should be referred in the organization of the Assembly.

The sermon of Dr. Boardman was, by a vote of the Assembly, referred to the Board of Publication to be published as a Tract.

The Rev. Nathan L. Rice D. D., of St. Louis was elected Moderator.

Theological Seminaries.

The second annual report of the Directors of the Danville Theological Seminary was read. Twenty new students have been received. There have been thirty-seven students present during the year. The report speaks encouragingly of the assiduity and piety of the students. Also that all the students had been taught, according to the plan of instruction adopted by the last Assembly, as one class, in all the various studies, with the exception of Hebrew, and the Faculty speak highly of the effect of this mode of instruction. The Trustees have purchased a valuable Library for \$5,000, which is especially rich in works relating to Ecclesiastical History, the Papal controversy, Polemic Theology and Biblical Literature. They have also purchased a suitable building for the students, and recitation rooms, &c. This arrangement is merely temporary. The Board discourages any curtailment of the time of vacation now extending through the summer. Some of the students have even now felt the pressure of their studies on their health. It had been hoped that the fund for the endowment of another Professorship would be provided by the Southwestern Synods, but the financial embarrassments of the past year have prevented any effort to make collections until after this meeting of the Assembly. The Board very earnestly calls the attention of the Assembly to the difficulty of obtaining the Presbyterial recommendation which is necessary for candidates desiring aid from the Board of Education, and requests that it may be made allowable for two of the Professors to give such recommendations. The report was referred to the Committee on Seminaries.

The second annual report of the Trustees of Danville Theological Seminary, was also read, which gives an encouraging account of the financial affairs of the institution. No subscriptions have as yet been made out of the bounds of the Synod of Kentucky; the Board believes that but very little of the amount subscribed will fail to be collected. The report was referred to the appropriate Committee.

The annual report of the Board of Directors of Union Theological Seminary was read. The report announced that there have been twenty-three students present during the year, of which twelve were new students. A donation of 175 volumes has been made to the Library. It contains at present 4184 volumes. The conduct and progress of the students have been commendable. Three students have finished their course of study during the year. Arrangements have been made to give instruction in the department vacated by the death of Professor Sampson, and means set in operation to endow a fourth Professorship. The report was committed as usual.

The report of the Board of Directors of the Western Theological Seminary was read. During the year fifty-two students have been present: of which twenty were new members. Eleven have been graduated. Mr. Samuel Wilson has been elected Assistant Professor in Hebrew and History, in order that the time of the other Professors may be more fully applied to the fulfilment of the duties of the fourth Professorship, which is now vacant. The Board ask that the same division of labour and departments be made in the Professorships as was made last year, with respect to Princeton—Dr. Elliot being made Professor of Polemic and Historical Theology and Church Government; Dr. Jacobus's chair being entitled that of Oriental and Biblical Literature and Exegesis, and Dr. Plumer's chair, that of Didactic and Pastoral Theology; and the remaining chair, now vacant, that of Ecclesiastical History and the composition and delivery of Sermons.

The forty-third annual report of the Board of Directors of Princeton Theological Seminary was read. The report shows that fifty-two students had been received during the year. The whole number present during the year was 109. One student has died. The conduct of the students has been exemplary. Several have the foreign missionary work in contemplation. Owing to frequent absence from examination at the end of sessions, a resolution was passed by the Board that no student then absent shall be admitted to his standing in his class next year, until after a satisfactory examination. Thirty-two students have been graduated. The Board recommend the increase

of the Professors' salaries to \$2,000 each, owing to the increased price of living.

The thirtieth annual report of the Trustees of Princeton Theological Seminary was read. It included the report of the Treasurer. By will of Miss Catharine Naglee, which has been decided by the courts, after litigation, in favour of the Seminary, the sum of \$9,053.06 has fallen to the Seminary fund, two-thirds of which have been paid. They have appropriated, according to the discretion given by the terms of the will, \$2500 of this fund as a Scholarship—to be called the Catharine Naglee Scholarship, and \$2800 to purchase a house, to be occupied by Dr. McGill. They report also the bequest of \$4000 by Mr. John Huff of Philadelphia, to be applied to education. Also a bequest of \$250 by Dr. Patrick Gannon of Albany, which is directed by the will to be loaned to indigent theological students, and returned by them when they are able. They report also various liberal donations to the library, among which are 730 volumes, many of which are very rare and valuable, from Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, from whom it is understood another donation will be soon made, including a library on the subject of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, amounting now to 1400 different publications; another on the Sabbath, numbering about one hundred different treatises; another on the Divinity of Christ, now numbering near 200 volumes; and another on Church Government; and another on the Baptist Controversy.

Various other donations have been made to the library from different individuals.

Memorial on Appeals and Complaints.

The Committee on Bills and Overtures reported an overture from the Synod of Cincinnati proposing the following question, viz., Does the language of the Book of Discipline, in Chap. vii. Sec. 4, imply that when notice of a complaint is given, the *reasons* of the complaint shall also be given as in the case of appeals?

On this overture the chairman of the committee stated that the committee were divided, the majority being in favour of recommending that an affirmative, and the minority recom-

mending that a negative answer be given. The report was accepted.

It was then moved that the report of the majority (which was the report of the committee) be adopted.

The adoption of the report recommending an affirmative answer to the above question, was advocated by Messrs. S. R. Wilson, Dumont, Peters, and Krebs, and opposed by Dr. Plumer, Messrs. Strahan, Banks, and Finley. Those who argued in favour of the report of the majority, urged that the reasons for a complaint should be given, as well as for an appeal, because the complaints and appeals are virtually the same. The opponents argued against the report, because complaints and appeals are different modes of redress. The fact is, they are alike in some respects, and they differ in others; and the Assembly were of opinion that the points in which they are alike, render the statement of the reasons as necessary in the one case as in the other, and therefore adopted the report of the majority.

Right of Presbyteries as to giving or withholding permission to prosecute a call, in certain cases.—The question was overtured whether, when a congregation and minister are agreed as to the amount of salary, the Presbytery has a right to refuse to install, because the salary is inadequate? The Committee recommended that the question be answered in the affirmative. Their report, after a slight debate, was adopted.

Board of Missions.

The Rev. Dr. Musgrave, Secretary of the Board, presented the report, of which the following is an abstract.

Operations of the Year—Statistical details.—The number of missionaries in commission, April 1, 1854, was 340, to which have been added, to April 1, 1855, 185, making the whole number 525, being more by two than in the year previous.

The number of churches and missionary stations, wholly or in part supplied, (so far as reported,) by our missionaries, is 819.

The number of newly organized churches, is 36.

The number of admissions on examination is 1,778, and on certificate 1,568, making a total of admissions of 3,346.

The number in communion with churches connected with the Board is 20,412.

The number of Sabbath-schools is 305; of teachers, 2,350; and of scholars, 14,548. (In this Report the Board have omitted all Union Schools, and have included only those which are Presbyterian or denominational.)

The number of baptisms is 2,125.

The number of houses of worship erected or finished is 51.

Of the 525 missionaries who have been in commission during the year, 179 have sent in no special report for the Assembly—more than one-third of the whole number; consequently we must increase all the returns one-third, to make them correct.

Appropriations.—The appropriations made to our missionaries from April 1, 1854, to April 1, 1855, have been, at the office in Philadelphia, \$48,735.42, and at the office in Louisville, \$25,759.00; making a total of \$74,494.42.

The appropriations made from April 1, 1853, to April 1, 1854, were, at the office in Philadelphia, \$42,547.50, and at the office in Louisville, \$32,874.42; making a total of \$75,421.92.

From this statement it appears that the appropriations made at the office in Philadelphia exceeded those made the year before, \$6,187.92, and at the office in Louisville they were less by \$7,115.42; thus making the total appropriations this year less than the year preceding, by \$927.50.

For the purpose of further comparison we may state, that the appropriations made from April 1, 1852, to April 1, 1853, were, at the office in Philadelphia, \$35,273.58, and at the office in Louisville, \$21,637.50; making a total of \$56,911.08.

From this statement, it appears that the appropriations made at the office in Philadelphia exceeded those made two years before \$13,461.84, and at the office in Louisville, \$4,121.50; thus making the total *excess* of appropriations this year above those made from April 1, 1852, to April 1, 1853, \$17,583.34.

Receipts.—The total amount of receipts from all sources from April 1, 1854, to April 1, 1855, is \$71,834.47; to which add balances on hand in the different Treasuries, April 1, 1854, \$22,654.58; making the available resources of the Board during the year, \$94,489.05.

The amount paid out at the different Treasuries for the same time, is \$78,944.76, leaving an available balance in all the Treasuries on the 1st of April 1855, of \$15,544.29. The amount due the missionaries at the same date was \$10,004.59, leaving an unexpended balance of \$5,539.70.

The aggregate receipts have fallen off, as compared with the preceding year, \$3,373.33. The falling off has been in individual or special donations and legacies \$2,827.03, and in the contributions of the churches \$546.30; owing no doubt to the pecuniary pressure and commercial embarrassment throughout our country during the past year. While the receipts at the office in Philadelphia, including the Presbyterial Treasuries were larger by \$1,958.76, the receipts at the office in Louisville show a falling off of \$5,332.09. The wants of the Western Executive Committee, were, however, fully met. Drafts by that Committee upon the Treasury at Philadelphia, during the year, to the amount of \$13,091.00, (which was more by \$7,600.60 than the year preceding,) were promptly paid, and repeated instructions forwarded by the Corresponding Secretary of the Board to that Committee, not to reduce their appropriations to the missionaries, nor to defer the payment of their salaries, but to draw promptly and freely upon the Treasury at Philadelphia, whenever their funds were insufficient to meet their liabilities.

The balance in the Treasury on the 1st of April, 1855, is less by \$7,110.29 than the amount which was reported in hand on the 1st of April, 1854. This in connection with the fact that at the close of the fiscal year, the amount due the missionaries was \$10,004.59, shows the indispensable necessity of enlarged contributions by the friends of the cause, and the imperative duty of increased caution on the part of Presbyteries in recommending, and the Board in granting future appropriations. Indeed it is obvious that unless the resources of the Board are augmented, they will not be able to continue much beyond this year, their present scale of appropriations without involving themselves in debt; and as the appointments are generally made for twelve months, if the current receipts are not increased as the year advances, retrenchment must

commence before the termination of the year, if a debt is to be avoided during the year succeeding.

Clothing.—Clothing valued at \$9,137 40 has been received during the year, and distributed among the missionaries who needed it. Of this amount, \$6,150,18 were received at the office in Philadelphia; \$2,107:34 at the office in Louisville; and \$879.88 at the depot in Pittsburgh. From the letters of the missionaries acknowledging the receipts of the clothing sent, we have no doubt that it has been very gratefully received, and that it has added very much to their health and comfort. Our friends, however, are cautioned against permitting their donations of clothing (which are never deducted from the salaries of the missionaries) to interfere with their *cash* contributions to the Board.

Resolutions of the General Assembly.

Dr. Backus, from the Committee on Domestic Missions, reported the following resolutions on the report of the Board:

Resolved, That the General Assembly has reason to express profound gratitude to Almighty God, for the success with which he has been graciously pleased to crown the efforts of our Church in the prosecution of this most important and interesting work. Notwithstanding the past year has been one of uncommon commercial embarrassment, and extensive failure of the crops throughout the country, which has affected severely all benevolent operations, yet the receipts have been but very slightly diminished; and the Board has been able to increase the number, and enlarge the salaries of its missionaries; and the Great Head of the Church, while granting no little encouragement to nearly all our missions, has visited many of the churches under the care of the Board with special outpourings of the Holy Ghost.

Resolved, That this Assembly would express its approbation of the faithful, judicious, and efficient execution, on the part of the Board and its officers, of the important trusts committed to them; and would call the attention of the Presbyteries and Churches to the earnest appeals made in the report in favour of a more diligent and liberal co-operation in this great work. No cause has a stronger claim upon the Christians of this land, with its immense territory and rapidly increasing population,

than that of Domestic Missions. The Assembly is pained, therefore, to learn that 1546, more than one half, of our churches, still withhold their contributions from this important work.

Resolved, That this Assembly approves of the conduct of the Board in increasing its appropriations to its missionaries; and while it earnestly desires that the present scale should be continued and even increased, yet it cannot recommend such an anticipation of funds as would involve any large debt at the close of the year; but would urge the Board and Presbyteries to renewed efforts to bring out the liberality of the churches, that while graduating their receipts they may still further increase them; that thus our missionaries may be relieved of many of those privations they have endured, and their efficiency and usefulness be greatly increased.

The Assembly moreover would embrace this opportunity to urge upon all our churches to cherish a deeper sense of their responsibility in this matter, and systematically to contribute of their substance to meet the increasing demands of our country and the world.

On motion of Dr. Plumer the following resolution was adopted, viz.

Resolved, That this Assembly rejoices in the evidences submitted to it, of the abundant labours and faithfulness of the Secretaries and other Executive officers of our several Boards; and feels it a privilege to give this public expression of its confidence in their wisdom and energy.

The subject of Church Extension embraced in the report of the Board of Missions, as it gave rise to the most protracted and interesting debate of the late Assembly, will be noticed under a distinct head.

Board of Education.

The report of this Board was presented by the Rev. Dr. Van Rensselaer.

Candidates.—The number of new candidates is 125, which is much the largest number of any year since the division of the Church. The number last year was 104, and in late years it has sunk down even to 60. Thanks be to God for his mercy! The total number of candidates on the roll this year is 364, against 342 of the previous year.

Officers and Agents.—Dr. James Wood has been chosen an Associate Secretary. Dr. McCluskey and Rev. Thomas Castleton have acted as agents in different parts of the field, but they have recently entered upon other arrangements.

State of the Treasury.—The total income of the year, in all departments, including balances, has been \$55,366.88, and the expenditures \$52,131.97. The Board will need an increase in its receipts next year, in order to continue the scale of increased appropriations to candidates, and to do justice to the work committed to their hands.

Christian Education in Schools, Academies and Colleges.—*Parochial or Primary Schools.*—Some new schools have been established during the year, several of which are of great interest and importance. But the aggregate number, judging from imperfect statistical returns, has not increased. The munificent sum of \$5,000 has been, for the third year, placed at the disposal of the Board, by one of the friends of the cause.

Presbyterial Academies.—The number of these institutions is fifty-two. They are found in all sections of the Church, and are doing a great work in the cause of literature and learning. Some of them have been favoured with revivals of religion during the year; and one of them reports, since its organization, the conversion of about one hundred of its youth, of whom ten or twelve are looking forward to the ministry.

Colleges.—The report gives a notice of each college under Synodical supervision. The total number of our ecclesiastical colleges, in operation, or with charters expecting to commence operations, is twenty. Several of these, however, are yet in their infancy, and most of them are struggling to effect an endowment. All such institutions have their trials and troubles; but the foundations must be laid in season, and the results be left with God.

The Rev. Dr. Wines, chairman of the Committee on Education, reported the following resolutions, which were adopted:

Resolved, That the Assembly has heard with emotions of fervent gratitude to God, of the prosperity which has attended the operations of the Board during the past year; that our joy in view of the increased number of candidates for the ministry, is proportioned to the sorrow felt in former times, at the small-

ness of the numbers reported as seeking this holy office, and that we offer solemn thanksgiving to the Head of the Church for these gracious tokens of his favour.

Resolved, That while all suitable scriptural efforts should be made to enlighten the young men of the Church on the nature and importance of the Christian ministry, and so direct their thoughts to that field of labour, yet our Presbyteries ought to use great care in requiring of their candidates such gifts of intellect, learning, piety, and aptness to teach, as give reasonable assurance of usefulness in the sacred calling.

Resolved, That as the knowledge of God is almost the only knowledge that men cannot do without, so religious instruction is almost the only kind of instruction that may not be excluded from our schools, it being the end of learning "to repair the ruins of the fall by teaching to know God aright, and out of that knowledge to love him and obey him;" that, therefore, the General Assembly re-affirms its approval, so often expressed in former years, of the policy of the Board in reference to the establishment of Christian schools, academies and colleges.

Resolved, That this General Assembly, in recommending the establishment of institutions under its own care, has never intended to depreciate truly Christian schools, academies, or colleges, under private, corporate, or State management, but cordially acknowledges and welcomes them as co-partners in a great work, and invokes the blessing of God upon their instructions. And, although the public schools are far from being what they ought to be in respect to religious teaching, yet, instead of the withdrawal of Presbyterians from the support of the public system, the General Assembly recommends the putting forth earnest efforts, wherever practicable, to improve its condition, especially by keeping in the public schools the Bible, as the great text-book of human instruction.

Resolved, That the Presbyteries be reminded of the increased wants of the Board, and the necessity of increasing contributions to meet them, and that they be requested to adopt such measures for the accomplishment of the end in view, as to them may seem proper.

Resolved, That the General Assembly has a high appreciation of the importance of infant baptism, as an ordinance of

God and a means of grace, and enjoins it upon the pastors and elders of our churches to enlighten Christian parents on their duty and privilege, and to use all proper means to induce them to dedicate their offspring to God in this holy sacrament. Further, the Assembly earnestly calls the attention of the lower judicatories to the relation of baptized children to the Church, and recommends to church sessions to maintain a Christian watchfulness over these lambs of the flock, and to use faithful and affectionate efforts to bring them to the communion of the Church.

Resolved, That the Assembly has full confidence in the efficacy of prayer, and therefore, while it would exhort the members of all the churches under its care, to "pray without ceasing," that "the Lord of the harvest would send forth labourers into his harvest," it appoints the last Thursday of February, eighteen hundred and fifty-six, to be observed as a day of special prayer, for the outpouring of the Spirit on our baptized children and youth, more particularly those who are under instruction in our various institutions of learning, and recommends that public services be held in all our churches on that day.

Dr. Plumer said one of the resolutions called for the printing of the annual report. It is known there is a dispute in Scotland as to the plurality of Theological Seminaries. This report takes sides on that controversy. He moved that that part of the report be stricken out. The motion to strike out was carried.

Board of Publication.

Rev. Mr. Schenck, Corresponding Secretary of the Board of Publication, read the report of that Board, of which the following is an abstract.

The report reviewed three departments of the operations of the Board: 1st. The Department of Production. 2d. Of Distribution. 3d. Of Sustentation.

I. *Of Production.*—1st. The great object of this Board is to furnish to the Church and the world a religious literature. This literature is not to be either a substitute for, or a rival to the pulpit, but an auxiliary. Bible history contains many intimations of the propriety of making a vigorous use of the press,

many of which were noted: The providence of God teaches the same lesson. The Church must use the press in self-defence, for every evil principle is making diligent use of it. The Board of Publication is issuing and diffusing a literature which shall lead men to repentance, faith, duty, and finally to heaven. All other objects are subordinate to this. 2d. It is an object of the Board to set out the whole system of divine truth in all its completeness. It believes that this is the likeliest way to save souls. 3d. It is another object to provide a denominational literature. While it teaches to love all who bear the Saviour's image, it exhibits the peculiar claims of our own Zion on our love and veneration. 4th. It seeks to furnish such works as may be useful to ministers of the gospel. The minds of her ministers are the foundations from which the ordinary supplies of truth are derived by the Church. Many ministers are able to purchase very few theological works. The Board aims to supply the best, and as cheaply as possible, to them. 5th. It aims to supply a juvenile literature, especially a Sabbath-school library. Many of the numerous religious books now published, and especially for Sabbath-schools, are very defective. The Board aims by its publications, to "feed the lambs." 6th. The Board calls attention to the great variety of its publications.

The Publishing Agent reports that the Board has published, during the year ending March 31, 1855, as follows: 37 new books, of which 83,750 copies have been printed; 12 new tracts, including the "Presbyterian Almanac," of which have been printed 65,000 copies. Total copies of new books and tracts, 148,750. Reprints of former publications, 317,700 copies. Total copies of books and tracts, 466,450.

Total of copies of books and tracts published since the organization of the Board, 4,954,688.

Periodicals—Circulation of *Home and Foreign Record*, 17,000 copies; increase within the year, 1,750 copies. *Sabbath School Visitor*, 41,000 copies.

II. *Distribution*.—173 colporteurs have been labouring in 27 States and in the British Provinces. They have sold 97,853 volumes; given away 10,780 volumes; distributed 1,046,964 pages of tracts; number of families visited 79,092.

Donations made by the Executive Committee, 6,365 volumes, and 342,662 pages of tracts. Total number of volumes put in

circulation during the year in every way, 262,403. Let the distribution of the Board continue to extend at the same rate as for the last six years, and at the end of ten years it will be found distributing annually over two and a half millions of copies of its publications.

| | |
|---|----------|
| Receipts for the past year, from all sources, | \$87,599 |
| Total payments for past year, | 91,319 |
| Excess of payments, | 3,719 |
| Receipts from sales of books, | 65,793 |
| do. for Colportage, | 14,015 |
| Balance now in Treasurer's hands, | 14,476 |
| Deficiency of Colportage Fund, | 4,176 |

The number of churches contributing to Colportage is steadily increasing, although yet far too small. Very little collecting agency has been employed, and the Board has every reason to feel encouraged with the progress of the past year, and the prospects before it.

Dr. Jones stated that there was an entire unanimity among the members of the Committee on all the resolutions except the fourth. The resolutions are as follows:

The Committee to which was referred the report of the Board of Publication, together with sundry papers pertaining to the same general subject, submit for the consideration and action of this Assembly the following resolutions, viz.

Resolved, 1. That our ministers and elders be earnestly exhorted to secure a wide circulation to the "*Home and Foreign Record*," now published at so reduced a price, as to make it accessible to the poorest members of our Church.

Resolved, 2. That this Assembly regards with much satisfaction the efforts of the Board to provide a class of books appropriate to the wants of ministers, and also a choice collection of volumes suitable for Sunday-school libraries. It would also renew its recommendation of the "*Visitor*," believing it to be a valuable supplement to this department of our religious literature.

Resolved, 3. That we commend the policy of the Board in increasing, during the past year, the amount of donations of books to seminaries of learning, indigent ministers, and others;

and we recommend the continuance of the same policy, to the utmost extent compatible with the finances of the Board.

Resolved, 4. That the Board be instructed to prepare, with as much expedition as practicable, a collection of Tunes and Hymns, together with a system of instruction adapted to the young; in order, by this means, to promote the cultivation of sacred music by our youth, and to facilitate the use of this delightful part of devotional service in family worship; and in making this collection, the Board is authorized to add to such tunes and hymns as may be adopted from the "Psalmist," one-third as many more to be selected at its discretion. (Afterwards laid on the table.)

Resolved, 5. That the success attendant on the labours of our colporteurs calls for gratitude to the Head of the Church; and that we exhort all our churches and ministers to co-operate in this important department of labour, both by making annual collections for the Colporteur Fund, and by furnishing every facility for the thorough visitation of all our congregations by our colporteurs.

Resolved, 6. That we regard with special gratification the resolution of the Reformed Dutch Church to adopt and place its "*imprimatur*" on a portion of the volumes issued by our Board; and we hereby authorize the use of the German Hymn Book, prepared by the Reformed Dutch Church, in the German congregations belonging to our own branch of the Church.

Resolved, 7. That the matter of translating our Confession of Faith into the German language, be left to the discretion of the Board of Publication, and that it be recommended to increase the number of tracts, in the German language, already issued by our Church.

Resolved, 8. That the Board be authorized to make a selection, not exceeding fifty in number, from Rouse's version of the Psalms, and to have the same printed on separate sheets, in such forms as to admit of their being bound up with our other Psalms and Hymns, whenever desired.

Resolved, 9. That a preacher be appointed by this and ensuing Assemblies, to deliver a discourse before each General Assembly, in behalf of the Board of Publication, and the cause it is designed to promote.

Foreign Missions.

Rev. Joseph Warren, of Northern India, from the Committee on the Board of Foreign Missions, reported that they had examined their report, approved it, and recommended that it be printed. Also recommended the adoption of the following series of resolutions :

1. *Resolved*, That this Assembly desires to express the unabated interest of the Church in the work of Foreign Missions, still to approve the principle on which the work has been carried on by the executive committee and officers of the Board; and to render to our divine Master sincere thanks for all the encouragements that have attended it, during the past year, in connection with the missions.

2. *Resolved*, That we are especially bound to be grateful for the degree of interest felt on the subject by the churches, as manifested by the support the Board has received during a year of great financial embarrassments, the donations from the churches having largely increased, when no collecting agents were employed.

3. *Resolved*, That while the Assembly are encouraged by the advance of the spirit of evangelization, which is the spirit of Christ, thus exhibited by the churches, they are still grieved to recognize, in the absence of contributions, year after year, by many churches, the evidence that much is yet to be done to secure for the foreign missionary cause a proper place in the hearts of the people of God. Out of 2,976 churches, only 1,357 have reported collections for this cause.

4. *Resolved*, That it is the duty of every Christian in our communion, to work for Foreign Missions, and that, therefore, our pastors and church sessions will have failed in their duty, until an opportunity shall have been offered to every member of our churches to aid this cause.

5. *Resolved*, That the present remarkable state of the countries, in both Europe and Asia, calls loudly upon us to extend greatly our operations for the evangelization of the world; because our opportunities and means are the measure of our duty.

6. *Resolved*, That in order to enlarge our operations among the Indian tribes of North America, an opportunity for doing which has been so graciously afforded us, the Board be authorized and encouraged to employ such additional assistance as the exigencies of this branch of the missionary work may require.

7. *Resolved*, That this Assembly rejoices in what God has wrought for, and by, the ancient and honoured Church of the Waldenses; and regretting that there is still lacking the sum of \$7,000 of the \$20,000 which it was intended to raise in this country for the Theological Seminary of that Church, recommends the completion of that scheme to the benevolence of all our people, especially to those to whom God has entrusted abundant means.

The report was accepted.

The Committee also handed the Clerk a list of nominations for Directors, to fill vacancies occurring during the present session.

Walter Lowrie, Esq., Corresponding Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions, addressed the Assembly at length, giving a detailed report of the agencies at work in the various foreign fields.

The following is an abstract of the printed report of the Board, which gives the most important statistical information:

Abstract of the Eighteenth Annual Report of the Board of Foreign Missions.

The Board acknowledge with gratitude to God their obligation for the distinguished favours that have been conferred upon every department of their work during the past year.

The receipts from all sources, including a balance

| | |
|-------------------------------|--------------|
| from last year of \$1,267.52, | \$184,074 17 |
|-------------------------------|--------------|

| | |
|---------------|------------|
| Expenditures, | 175,705 10 |
|---------------|------------|

| | |
|------------------------------|------------|
| Leaving a general balance of | \$8,369 07 |
|------------------------------|------------|

Of which, unexpended amount of moneys received for sale of the Omaha Reservation, and appropriated to Indian Missions in Kansas and Nebraska,

| |
|------------|
| \$8,282 00 |
|------------|

Leaving a balance in the Treasury for the general purposes of the Board, of \$87 07

Publications.—The Board has continued to occupy the usual number of pages in the *Home and Foreign Record*, which has a circulation of something more than 16,000 copies.

Of the *Foreign Missionary*, 20,000 copies of the newspaper and 3,250 of the pamphlet edition of thirty-two pages, have been printed and circulated. Various circular letters have been printed and circulated among the churches, and upon these and the *Missionary Journals*, the committee have relied mainly to do their agency work.

Missionaries and Assistant Missionaries sent out.—Six Missionaries (one of whom had been in this country on a visit) and twenty-two male and female Assistant Missionaries, making 28 in all, have been sent out during the year.

Missions among the Indian Tribes.—The Board has seven Missions among the Indian Tribes, viz. among the Chippewas and Ottowas of the State of Michigan, among the Omahas of Nebraska, among the Iowas and Sacs of Kansas Territory, and among the Creeks, Seminoles, Chickasaws, and Choctaws of the Southwestern Indian Territory. Measures have been adopted for the commencement of a new Mission among the Ottoes of Kansas.

Connected with these Missions there are eleven stations and out-stations, and nearly as many more preaching places, eight Missionaries, sixty-three male and female Assistant Missionaries, and five Native Helpers; seven churches and two hundred and ten church members; eight boarding and two day schools, embracing five hundred and fifty pupils, in various stages of their education.

The number of communicants in connection with these churches, has more than doubled during the past year. The schools have had a larger number of pupils, and better attendance, than in former years; whilst most of the tribes, but especially those in the State of Michigan and in the Southwestern Territory, are making most encouraging progress in every department of civilization.

Missions in Africa.—The Board has two Missions in Africa;

one in Liberia, which operates upon the coloured emigrants and the natives of the country; and the other at the island of Corisco, twelve or fifteen hundred miles to the south and east of Liberia, and nearly under the equator, which operates exclusively upon the aboriginal population of that island and the neighbouring continent.

In connection with these Missions, there are six stations, six ordained Missionaries, three Licentiate Preachers, nine male and female Assistant Missionaries, of whom eight are white persons, and the remainder coloured emigrants from this country; seven schools, one of which is a classical school, with one hundred and fifty pupils; five churches, and about one hundred and fifty church members, being an increase of about thirty over the number reported last year. One small volume has just been printed in the language spoken by the Corisco people, and most of the Missionary brethren there are engaged in the study of the language, and will soon be able to proclaim the unsearchable riches of Christ to thousands of the people around them in their own tongue.

Missions in India.—In India, the Board has four Missions, viz. Lodianna, Furrukhabad, Agra, and Allahabad; thirteen stations and out-stations; twenty-six ordained Missionaries, two of whom are natives of India; twenty-three female Assistant Missionaries from this country; thirty-four Native Helpers; eleven churches, with two hundred and ninety native communicants; four printing presses, from which have been issued over 8,000,000 pages; thirty-six schools, several of which are high schools, with upwards of 4,700 pupils. These statistics show an increase of two churches, thirty native converts, about 1,700 pupils, and 5,000,000 printed pages over the last Annual Report.

Some of the church members have finished their course and have been enabled to triumph over the last enemy. There is still a loud call for more labourers in this field.

Mission in Siam.—In Siam there is one Mission, connected with which there are two ordained Missionaries, one Licentiate Preacher and physician, two assistant female Missionaries, and one Native Helper; one boarding school, with twenty-six pupils.

The missionaries have sustained the usual religious services, and have devoted more time than usual to missionary tours in different parts of the country, and in some regions where the gospel has never before been heard. One of the missionaries is still engaged in the work of translating the Scriptures in Siamese. The report contains brief notices of large unevangelized communities, other than the Siamese, but who are accessible at Bangkok, and to whom the gospel might be preached. Who will be the first to go and carry them the glad tidings of salvation?

China.—The Board has three missions in China, viz. at Canton, Ningpo, and Shanghai, and a mission, also, to the Chinese, in California. Connected with these missions there are fourteen ordained missionaries, two physicians, fifteen female missionary assistants, three native helpers, eight schools, with one hundred and seventy pupils, two printing-presses, from which have issued upwards of 4,000,000 pages. The missionaries have been actively employed in the various duties of preaching, translating, teaching, distributing religious books and tracts; and those of the medical profession in the duties of the dispensaries, in addition to their other labours.

Mission in South America.—The only mission that has yet been established in South America, is at Buenos Ayres, and this, though of only one year's continuance, has already received very encouraging tokens of the divine favour. Measures have been adopted for the commencement of another mission at Bogota.

Missions to Papal Europe.—The Board has no missionaries in Europe under their immediate direction. Their appropriations have been made to evangelical societies, which are known to be prosecuting the work of evangelization with zeal, energy and wisdom; and the results of their labours, especially in France and Italy, are most encouraging. The appropriations made by the committee to these societies, including \$4,827.88, contributed for the endowment of the Theological Seminary at La Tour, during the year, have amounted to \$12,613.98.

Mission to the Jews.—The Board has three missionaries among the Jews of this country—viz. in New York, Philadelphia and Baltimore—two ordained ministers, and one licentiate

preacher. These missionaries have free access to their brethren in all these places, and in many cases, it is believed, with happy results.

Summary.—The Board has under its direction, besides what is done for Papal Europe, twenty separate missions; 59 ordained missionaries, 5 licentiate preachers, 114 male and female assistant missionaries, 43 native helpers, 25 churches, and about 659 native communicants; 26 schools and 6,596 pupils; 6 printing-presses, from which have been issued more than 12,000,000 of pages during the year.

Systematic Benevolence.

Dr. Thornwell, chairman of the Committee on Systematic Benevolence, presented the report. It sets forth the following points: That the benefactions of God's Church have been lamentably small; that our people have been too much in the habit of looking on giving as a matter of Christian liberty; those who apply for aid to any great cause, have been regarded as beggars. The reason of this has not been because the people of God are niggardly, but because the principle of giving has been misunderstood. The Scripture view is clear. It is God who honours us in receiving our gifts, instead of our honouring him, or rather he honours us in permitting us to honour him. We are the beggars who solicit the favour of having our gifts accepted. Thus almsgiving has ever been found a blessing to the donor. This principle needs to be extensively understood. This alone is necessary in order to excite our people to do their full duty in this matter. The Assembly have done right in urging all the churches to cultivate this grace. The pastoral letter of the Synod of Baltimore on this subject received special commendation, and a wider circulation of it was suggested. It also recommended the re-enacting of the resolutions of last year.

Who have a right to vote for Pastors?

The Committee of Bills and Overtures reported an Overture from the Rev. Angus Johnston, asking, whether baptized persons attending and supporting a Church should be allowed to vote for pastors.

Considerable adversity of opinion seems to have prevailed as to the proper answer to be given to this question. The Committee recommended that it should be answered, by saying, that communicants in good standing, baptized persons attending and supporting the Church and submitting to its authority, are entitled to vote in the election of pastor—thus restricting the right of suffrage to communicants and baptized persons. Dr. Plumer moved to strike out that part of the report allowing baptized persons, not communicants, to vote; thus restricting the right to those in full communion. This view was sustained by Rev. Mr. Hart, Mr. Hays, and Dr. James Smith; the last named gentleman stated, that in the congregation of which he is pastor, the baptized persons and those contributing to the support of the gospel, but not communicants, had under his influence, publicly renounced their right to vote. He said, he would be much mortified to see the Assembly take opposite ground. Judge Fine said there were two classes of persons entitled to vote for pastor; first, church members, and second, those contributing money to support the pastor, and as the overture simply asked, whether baptized persons, when not communicants, had a right to vote, he proposed the assembly should answer by a simple, Yes. This would give the right of suffrage to communicants and contributors, whether baptized or not. Finally the whole subject was laid on the table and the overture dismissed without an answer. The Assembly no doubt preferred allowing the several congregations to act as they saw fit in the premises, under the general guidance of the Book, which says, “In the election of a pastor, no person shall be entitled to vote, who refuses to submit to the censures of the church, regularly administered; or who does not contribute his just proportion, according to his own engagements or the rules of the congregation, to all its necessary expenses.” As this excludes from the right of voting only those who refuse to submit to censure, or neglect to contribute to the necessary expenses of the congregation, it follows that all other members of the congregation, whether communicants or baptized, or neither, are entitled to vote. It seems to us, therefore, that the view presented by Judge Fine is the only one consistent with our Book. At the same time, if any congregation chooses

to restrict the right to narrower limits, they are free to do so, provided they do not violate the rule quoted above. We are glad to see the Assembly declining to answer questions which the Book has already settled. If the motion to restrict the right of voting to communicants had prevailed, it would have effected a change in our standards, and, therefore, been null and void.

Synod of Baltimore.

The Rev. Dr. Backus presented a memorial from ministers and elders of the Presbytery of Baltimore, and also one from the ministers and elders of the Presbytery of Carlisle, asking the General Assembly to dissolve the Synod of Baltimore, erected last year. Rev. Mr. Henry presented a protest from the Presbytery of Baltimore against dissolving the Synod of Baltimore, and also the action of the said Synod to the same purpose. A paper was also presented from the Synod of Philadelphia, asking that the Synod of Baltimore should be dissolved, or that the Presbytery of Carlisle should be restored to the Synod of Philadelphia; also, a memorial from the Presbytery of Philadelphia asking that in case the Presbyteries of Carlisle and Baltimore wished to be restored to the Synod of Philadelphia, this be done.

These papers were referred to a select committee, which subsequently, through their chairman, Professor Phillips, made a report, recommending the continuance of the Synod of Baltimore, composed substantially of its present Presbyteries, directing the Synods of Philadelphia, Baltimore and Virginia, to settle their respective boundaries, as best to secure the efficiency of their own bodies, the convenience of individual members, and the harmony of the Church; and further recommend to the parties concerned to agree that the Susquehanna river be the western boundary of the Presbytery of Donegal, and also to consider whether it will not be the best for their own interests to detach the Presbytery of Huntingdon from the Synod of Philadelphia, and attach it to the Synod of Baltimore, and to transfer the Presbytery of Luzerne from the Synod of New Jersey to the Synod of Philadelphia, and that the Rappahannock river be the boundary between the Presby-

tery of Winchester in the Synod of Baltimore and the Presbytery of East Hanover in the Synod of Virginia, according to the petition of the church in Fredericksburg, and the consent of the Synods interested.

The Rev. Dr. Backus moved the indefinite postponement of that report, to offer a paper proposing to dissolve the Synod, and restore the Presbyteries to their former connection, and directing the Synod of Philadelphia to take the division of that body into consideration, and report to the next Assembly such a line of division as, placing the cities of Baltimore and Philadelphia in different Synods, shall best promote the convenience and wishes of its members, and the advancement of religion in its bounds.

The Rev. Dr. Backus said the committee, though aiming to act in a conciliatory manner, had regarded the question as one of etiquette, and had omitted all reference to principles. He admitted that there had been some feeling excited by this subject, and that it had manifested itself through the press. A periodical of some little notoriety has actually been sent here for circulation, to bear upon this question, a reply to which, in proper terms, would require the use of language unbecoming this House. He wished to say, however, that the charge that the Secretary of the Board of Missions had meddled with this subject, was entirely without foundation. He had kept aloof from it.

In the remarks he would make, he contended, 1. That the practice of dividing a Synod without consulting, is contrary to the spirit of our constitution, and tends to create dissatisfaction, and opens the door to disorder. This principle seems to have been admitted from the origin of our Church, with but few exceptions, and some of these exceptions were afterwards reversed. Dr. Backus cited a number of cases, showing, in numerous instances, where the Assembly had been applied to, to change boundary lines, &c., and where the Assembly had steadfastly refused to grant the requests, simply upon the ground that parties interested had not been consulted. For instance, in 1839, the Synod of Mississippi and Presbytery of Tombigbee sent up a petition to the Assembly to include the Presbytery of Tombigbee in their bounds; but the Assembly

refused on the ground that the Synod of Alabama had not been consulted. The next year, and the next, the subject was brought up in the same form, and the Assembly refused to grant the request because the Synod of Alabama had not acted; and to grant the petition without such action, would be affecting the constitutional rights of that Synod.

The Assembly does not divide Synods, nor Synods Presbyteries, nor Presbyteries churches, without consulting them. What would members of any Presbytery here say, were their Synod to cut their Presbytery in two without saying a word to them about it? Or, what would you say, if this Assembly this year should, without consulting you, cut your Synod in two, no matter how sincere the representations that it was for your good and that of the Church? The Synod is placed there to have charge of that particular section of the Church; and by calling its Presbyteries together, all necessary arrangements can be made for such action as may be desired. Is there any thing in this oldest Synod of yours that she should be treated so unceremoniously? It has been said that this Synod has had this subject before it for twenty years, and has been unable to come to any decision. But it has been before the Synod but five times in twenty years, and one of those times the Synod petitioned to be divided, and the Assembly refused to do it.

It was urged in the last Assembly that such a city as Baltimore ought to be the centre of a Synod; but will it be believed that eleven out of fourteen of the ministers in the city of Baltimore are opposed to any such Synod, according to the division which has been made?

2. The act of the last Assembly in dividing the Synod of Philadelphia, and erecting the Synod of Baltimore, was an aggravated case of interference with the rights of an inferior judicatory. The brethren who took the lead in that movement, were ignorant of the true state of the case. It is not true, as has been asserted, that the last Assembly had all the facts before them. The ignorance of the promoters of this scheme, appears in the fact that the old Synod of Philadelphia is cut into two separate parts. This may be said to be a matter of little importance; but you surely do not intend to chop up the

Church in this fashion. Three of your Presbyteries have shown their strong desire to have you retrace your steps, and the others concerned seem to admit that there should be some modification.

No lines in our Church deserve to be drawn with more care than those of this Synod. The old Synod, extending over Mason and Dixon's line, was a band to bind together our country's union. The brethren who moved in this matter agree that to retain this feature is an important point. But by the present arrangement scarcely any territory from the slave States is left in the Synod of Philadelphia, and, therefore, you at once establish sectional lines. Again: The whole tendency of this division is to draw brethren off from institutions with which they have always been connected, and attach them to those to which they do not naturally belong. Is it fair for brethren to come in among us, and attempt to disturb our old attachments, before they are hardly warm in their seats? As things stand, there must be a constant contention on this subject, or one party or the other must succumb.

Moreover, unless you reverse the decision of the last Assembly, you establish a *precedent*, which he could not believe this body would be willing to do. All he asked was that the Assembly would just put them where they were before; and then direct the Synod in any way you choose. This is not only the constitutional method, but it is the only practical way to do what needs to be done. The Synod of Baltimore cannot, by any possibility, of itself make the lines satisfactory. The Synod of Philadelphia was engaged in a course for bringing about a division, when you unceremoniously took your knife and cut us in two. He hoped they would place the old Synod where they found it, and allow them some voice in fixing their own lines.

Rev. Mr. Emerson said he represented the Presbytery of Carlisle. He referred to the Book for the constitutional right to divide Synods. For twenty years it had been felt that the Synod of Philadelphia should be divided, but the Presbyteries never could agree; and there was a prospect that there never would be a division if the matter was left to them. For this reason the matter was brought before the last Assembly.

Three Presbyteries had acted in the matter before it came before that Assembly, and in favour of it. The Presbytery of Carlisle instructed its Commissioners to the General Assembly to take ground in favour of the decision. The Synod was erected by the Assembly, but no sooner was it done, than an anonymous paper was circulated, urging the members of Carlisle Presbytery not to attend the new Synod, but to go to the Synod of Philadelphia. [Mr. Emerson then read the action of the Synod of Baltimore, protesting against its being dissolved.] We have heard a great deal about taking care that these ecclesiastical divisions should not become sectional lines. But as things now stand, both the Synods of Philadelphia and Baltimore extend across Mason and Dixon's line. Immediately on the adjournment of the Synod of Baltimore, secret emissaries had pervaded their churches, with persuasions and entreaties to them to go back to the Synod of Philadelphia. But, with the matter fully before them, the Presbytery of Carlisle had voted nineteen to twelve against the proposal to go back to the old Synod, or against dissolving the new Synod. Carlisle Presbytery wishes that the General Assembly will let them alone. He was astonished to find a protest here from thirteen ministers and a large number of ruling elders against the action of the last Assembly. Of these ministers, six are not pastors; and of the elders, many are in the same church, or in vacant churches.

But you are counselled to dissolve this Synod for the sake of peace. But it will *not* promote peace to send us back where we do not wish to go, and such a course would assuredly divide Carlisle Presbytery. He had seen a map of the territory circulated here, to show that the territory of the Synod of Philadelphia had been cut in two by the new Synods. He denied it. There is a right of way of fifty miles or more of territory, which they may occupy if they choose. The reason they have to go through Baltimore Synod is because the railroads run that way.

Rev. Mr. Sheddan said he held in his hand the map which had been alluded to. He had felt some indignation that he had been accused of showing it around in this Assembly. He spurned such an imputation. He had brought it here this

morning because the subject was to come up, and it had simply got out of his hands for a few moments.

Rev. Dr. Andrews here stated that the Second Presbytery of Philadelphia had resolved that it was expedient to abide by the decision of the last Assembly.

Mr. Sheddan resumed, and explained the map he held in his hand, showing that the right of way alluded to was thirty miles of mountains, occupied by nobody, and that the Synod of Philadelphia was virtually cut in two. He had been in the Synod of Philadelphia before his removal to New Jersey, and he would say there was never a more united Synod; and he knew, by his own observation, that Carlisle Presbytery was strongly attached to Philadelphia. The Synod of Philadelphia was caught napping last year; and then it was that the knife was inserted. Now there could come up to you nearly half of Baltimore, and nearly half of Carlisle, and say, We are unwilling to be separated from our old relations. It has been said Carlisle would divide if restored to Philadelphia; but there is evidence enough that there is contention there already, and that it will be there whether you restore them or not.

Rev. Dr. Spotswood presented the instructions of the Presbytery of New Castle—the oldest but one of the Presbyteries of our Church, and therefore entitled to some consideration. There is no excitement in his Presbytery on the subject, and they will acquiesce in any measure the Assembly may adopt. They are in favour of the motion for dissolving the new Synod. They are dissatisfied because the Assembly did not act with due courtesy, and also dissatisfied with the lines.

Professor Charles Phillips, from the Committee on the subject, said the Committee had heard the parties, and had hoped that some things said here would have been omitted. He then read the report they had presented, explaining its details, and justifying the course recommended. Nothing material had been said here this morning, which was not heard by the last Assembly. The Assembly has a right to come in and settle the bounds of Synods and Presbyteries, although this right should be exercised with courtesy. The Synod of Virginia, in this particular case, had been treated with as much discourtesy

as the Synod of Philadelphia, and yet they had said nothing about it.

Rev. Mr. Wilson of Winchester had hoped that the report of the committee would have been adopted. Among the first things he had learned, was to regard with veneration the acts of the General Assembly. At Buffalo, it was understood that the subject had been thoroughly canvassed in the lower judicatories, and petitions had been adopted by them and sent up to the Assembly. The Presbytery to which he belonged had with difficulty come to the resolution to ask the General Assembly to unite them to the new Synod. They had entertained great regard for the brethren of their previous connection. But since it had been done, they had seen it to be best. The fact that the Synod of Philadelphia objected to the decision of the Assembly should not be a reason for a reversal of the last Assembly's order. Other Synods had been thus divided by lines not altogether agreeable to them, but they had submitted. So should the Synod of Philadelphia do. They have promised to do so in their ordination vows. The Assembly has not transcended its powers. Why should not its decision be acquiesced in? He was greatly amazed at the declaration of his brother, Dr. Backus. The last time he had seen Dr. Backus was at the close of the second meeting of the Synod of Baltimore. Dr. Backus had there voluntarily arisen and stated, that although at first opposed to the division, he was now satisfied, and that from his first hearing of the Assembly's vote he had determined to bow to that decision, and give his cordial support to the new Synod. How had he fulfilled that resolution? He was also amazed because Dr. Backus's opposition was founded on reasons which do not exist. He had said he was fearful that there would be a drawing off from the institutions to which he was attached. There was no ground for such a fear. Not one of the members of those Southern Presbyteries would interfere with any brother's preference. Could Dr. Backus suppose that the speaker could ever lift *his* hand or voice against the beloved institution at Princeton, where he had sat at the feet of the same venerated instructors? He had preached in three States, and there is no more promising field than that lying between the two existing Synods.

There were no Presbyterian churches there, and he thought it well that members in passing through that section should see it. He wished the conservative influence of these Synods to be preserved. Winchester and Eastern Shore Presbyteries are unanimous in this request. So is a majority of Carlisle Presbytery. Shall we, then, go home, spend a year in contest, and then come up to make the same request? He believed that the last General Assembly had acted wisely with all the facts before them, and he hoped that the present Assembly would confirm their decision. His impression was that this opposing influence was outside of the Synod, and if those outside would only let them alone, it would be seen that the new Synod was an efficient one, and that they could act in harmony. But any other course will increase the difficulties already existing. He hoped, therefore, that the Synod should be continued until facts showed that they deserved censure, or until it was shown by their opposition to their sister Synod that they ought to be disbanded.

Rev. Mr. Lapsley moved to lay the resolution of Dr. Backus on the table, and the motion was carried.

The question then recurred on the report of the Committee. The previous question was called for and sustained.

The report of the Committee embracing the preamble and resolutions was then adopted, and is as follows :

The Committee to whom were referred the papers relating to the Synod of Baltimore, reported that they find the matter in hand to be one of much difficulty and delicacy—one in which the feelings and the rights of beloved and esteemed brethren are deeply interested, and, therefore, one demanding much prudence and forbearance from all those immediately concerned; that the last Assembly had before it nearly all the material facts in the case, and that, whatever acts of discourtesy it may have committed, it but exercised what all admit was a power within its hands, although perhaps, an extreme one. The question is then reduced mainly to one concerning the propriety of certain boundaries of the Synod of Baltimore and Philadelphia. The Committee therefore unanimously recommend the following resolutions.

Resolved, 1. That the Synod of Baltimore be continued, composed substantially of its present Presbyteries.

Resolved, 2. That the Synods of New Jersey, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Virginia be, and they are hereby directed so to settle their respective boundaries, as to best secure the efficiency of their own bodies, the convenience of their individual members, and the harmony of the Church.

Resolved, 3. And the Committee recommends further, that it be suggested to the parties concerned, to agree that the Susquehanna river be the western boundary of the Presbytery of Donegal; and also to consider whether it will not be the best for their interests to detach the Presbytery of Huntingdon from the Synod of Philadelphia, and attach it to the Synod of Baltimore, and to transfer the Presbytery of Luzerne from the Synod of New Jersey to the Synod of Philadelphia, and that they all shall report to the next General Assembly.

Resolved, 4. That the Rappahannock river be established as the boundary between the Presbyteries of Winchester in the Synod of Baltimore, and of East Hanover in the Synod of Virginia, according to the petition of the church in Fredericksburg, and the consent of the Synods interested.

Delegates to, and from other Churches.

The Rev. Mr. Cumming was the delegate from the General Association of New Hampshire. The statistical information communicated, is to be found in the following paragraphs of his address:

“*Mr. Moderator*:—It is with pleasure that I extend to this Assembly the Christian salutation of the General Association of New Hampshire. Our General Association embraces one hundred and fifty eight ministers, divided into fourteen local Associations. We have on our minutes 187 churches, a few of which belong also to the Londonderry Presbytery. These churches contain 20,309 communicants. During the past year no general revival of religion has been experienced, yet we have enjoyed gentle showers in many places. Our Missionary Society is earnestly looking after the feeble and destitute churches, and trying to build up the waste places. Our treasury has received \$8,723 during the year, of which about

3,000 has been paid to the American House Missionary Society in New York, and the balance expended in sustaining forty-five missionaries in forty-nine feeble churches and congregations.

“Our Bible Society has raised about \$7,000, distributed 28,000 Bibles and Testaments, and by its Colporteurs visited 46,000 families. We design to have the whole State supplied as often as once in five years, and many places every year.

“Sabbath-schools are sustained in all our churches. They are attended by a large portion of our congregations, as well adults as children. Our Sabbath-school libraries furnish a large portion of our families with choice reading matter. Our Common-School system pervades the whole State, and every child from four to twenty has an opportunity of obtaining a good English education. Of a population of 320,000, 90,000 are reported as attending our Common-Schools. To sustain these schools, the State raises by tax \$205,000. We have also fifty-three incorporated Academies. The venerable Dartmouth College is efficiently pursuing its work under a corps of nineteen officers, with three hundred and fifty-three students. Our expenses for education are not less than \$300,000 for tuition; and including board, books, &c., would probably not fall below $1\frac{1}{2}$ millions.”

The Rev. Messrs. Sabin and H. M. Storrs, delegates from the General Association of Massachusetts, informed the Assembly that there were in connection with the Association over 500 ministers and about the same number of churches; that the Unitarians, formerly nearly equal in number to the Orthodox, were now reduced to 160 ministers; and that the Theological Seminary at Andover was in a flourishing condition, having one hundred students, a larger number than they had had for several years. Mr. Storrs said he was surprised to learn, since his visit to the West, that the people of Massachusetts were regarded as a staid, sober and settled community; whereas in fact there is no State in which thought is so unsettled, where Infidelity and Romanism are so active, if not so powerful.

This is a statement the correctness of which we do not question. It suggests an inquiry into the causes of this remarkable fact. Why is it that in a community founded by one

of the most orthodox and pious set of men the world ever saw, where the truth has always been free, where intelligence and education are more generally diffused than in any other community of equal extent on earth, why is it that in such a community thought is more unsettled, that Unitarianism is so prevalent, and that Infidelity and Romanism are more active than in any other State of the American Union? All such results are doubtless due to the joint operation of many causes. We do not pretend to be able to indicate them. We, however, are satisfied that one of the most efficient is to be found in the unscriptural church organization, which has prevailed in Massachusetts. If God has ordained a particular form of church polity, a departure from that form must inevitably be productive of evil. We believe that the independency of each worshipping assembly, is just as unscriptural and just as much opposed to the genius of Christianity, as the independence and isolation of each individual Christian man. Where there is no discipline over churches, the result must be the same, as where there is no discipline over individuals. If any Christian church should be organized on the principle of allowing every member to hold and profess just what opinions he pleases, it would very soon lose its distinction as a Christian character altogether. In like manner, where a denomination, or community of individual congregations, is organized on the principle of Independency, that community will be apt to lose its Christian character. If a garden is conducted on the plan of letting the weeds and fruits have an equal chance, the weeds will soon overrun the ground. There is a difference between license and liberty. The latter is not inconsistent with authority and supervision. What would become of a State in which each county and township was independent of all the rest? What would become of our national union, if we had no common legislature or judiciary? What would become of the Presbyterian Church, if one congregation might be Augustinian, another Pelegian, and another Socinian? So long as any man is free to join the Presbyterian Church or not, and so long as he is liable to no civil pains or penalty for renouncing its faith, there is nothing inconsistent with religious liberty in the exercise of spiritual discipline over all the churches embraced in

our communion. That thought is more unsettled and infidelity more active in a community in which Independency has been more fully carried out, than any other in our country, is just what, according to our views, might have been expected.

The Rev. Mr. Thayer, the delegate from the Consociated Churches of Rhode Island, stated in his address, that there were 53 churches with 2500 churches included in their body, which were in a prosperous condition.

Delegates were, as usual, appointed to represent the Assembly before the General Associations of New Hampshire, Massachusetts and Rhode Island. The Assembly declined to continue the interchange of delegates with the General Association of Connecticut, on account of the offensive character of the communications from that body, and for other reasons. Those reasons we have not seen fully stated in any report of the proceedings of the Assembly, but from what we know of the facts of the case, we are persuaded that the publication of the report of the committee, on whose recommendation the Assembly acted, will satisfy the Christian public that the discontinuance of our correspondence with the General Association of Connecticut was due to our self-respect and to the cause of truth.

The committee also recommended that in accordance with the action of the Assembly of last year no delegate should be appointed to the Synod of the German Reformed Church. This recommendation was not adopted, and after some debate, on the motion of Dr. Krebs, the committee were instructed to nominate delegates to that body. When, however, the nomination was made, Dr. Plumer, in view of the difference of opinion as to the propriety of sending any delegate, moved to lay the subject on the table, which motion was carried; and therefore no delegate was appointed.

Ashmun Institute.

Rev. A. Hamilton, D. D., from the Presbytery of New Castle, addressed the Assembly in regard to the interests of the Ashmun Institute. The name chosen for the Institute was that of an early and devoted friend of the African race. Its location is within the bounds of the New Castle Presbytery, which embraces Chester county in Pennsylvania, New Castle in Del-

aware, and Cecil county in Maryland. Its aim is thoroughly to educate pious young coloured men so that they may be able to preach to and teach their own race here and in Africa. A charter has been secured from the State of Pennsylvania. Local agents have been appointed, and about \$2,000 secured. A few words in regard to the necessity of such an institution: No such institution exists in our country. It is needed, for no college in the North or West admits them. There are occasional exceptions to this. The Governor of the State of Maryland, in Liberia, graduated at Bowdoin College, and is a man of fine talents. His State papers would do no discredit to the Governor of any of our States.

We have forty coloured churches in New Castle. The coloured people have a great tendency to segregate themselves in their religious worship, from the whites, and few coloured preachers have more than a common education. As a general thing, far more is doing in the South for them than elsewhere. Many men devote much of their time to preaching to the slaves—who does not recollect Dr. C. C. Jones?—some their entire time in this way. Our missionary efforts in Africa need them. White men only can labour there as a forlorn hope. Does not the General Assembly owe it to herself, placed as she is by God's providence, to use her efforts to elevate, educate and christianize the African race? Will she not help us in some way?

Dr. Plumer introduced the following resolutions in regard to the Ashmun Institute.

Resolved, That this General Assembly has heard with pleasure of the design and practical effort on the part of the Presbytery of New Castle, to establish a school in which coloured young men of piety may receive a thorough Classical and Theological education, fitting them for the work of the ministry, and for teaching among the destitute thousands of this country, and the millions of Africa.

Resolved, That we regard this work as an important preliminary work, aiming at the highest good of the African race, wherever found; and hereby express our cordial approbation of it, and recommend our churches cheerfully and liberally to cooperate in this work of faith and labour of love.

These resolutions were advocated by Drs. Plumer, Boardman, and S. R. Wilson, and adopted.

Commissions.

Dr. Lacy, from the Judicial Committee, reported on the resolution offered by Dr. Wines, instructing the Judiciary Committee to consider some action looking to the relief of the General Assembly in judicial cases, either the appointment of a commission to hear and issue such cases, or the adoption of an overture to be sent down to the Presbyteries, or some other plan.

In regard to the first suggestion, the committee reported it unconstitutional, and the second inexpedient; which conclusions the report argued at some length, and further reported by a small majority that it was inexpedient to attempt any change.

Judge Fine submitted a minority report favouring an amendment in the constitution, and proposing an overture to be sent down to the Presbyteries, asking—Shall the constitution be so amended as to terminate all judicial cases originating in church sessions in the Synod, and all originating in Presbyteries, in the General Assembly?

When the subject came up for discussion, Dr. Wines moved a resolution declaring that so much of the report of the committee as pronounced the appointment of a commission by the Assembly, unconstitutional, be not approved. His argument in support of this resolution embraced the following points.

1. The General Assembly is a representative body, and does not act from powers original and primary. Its powers are not so extensive as those of the old Synod, which was a meeting of all the Presbyteries in one body. "The General Assembly is vested only with defined powers, which it cannot enlarge without the original constituencies—the Presbyteries."

This is a very common theory, but in our opinion an erroneous one, with respect to our constitution. All legitimate church courts act from inherent primary powers. Neither Session, Presbytery, Synod, nor Assembly, derives its powers from the constitution. The constitution is of the nature of a treaty, or compact between different portions of the Church, as to the way

in which their inherent powers may be exercised. If a Presbytery may ordain, or try a minister, what is to hinder a Synod or a General Assembly doing so? Nothing in the world but an agreement that they will not exercise these powers. All church councils representing the church are vested with all church power. A Presbytery may do all that a Session may do; a Synod can do all that a Presbytery or Session can do; and the General Assembly can do all that a Synod, Presbytery or Session can do—except so far as their hands are tied by a written agreement. Even a Presbytery can exercise its inherent powers only according to the prescriptions of the constitution. It is not the true theory of our government, therefore, that the General Assembly has only delegated powers. It has all church power, legislative, judicial and executive—though the exercise of these powers, as in the case of the Presbytery, is limited and guided by a written constitution; and therefore it is true that our Assembly, under the limitation of the constitution, has not the powers of the original Synod, of which it is the successor. Still the distinction here stated is one of importance. Much depends on the question, whether our constitution is a grant, or a limitation of powers.

2. The second point in Dr. Wines's argument is, that when the Assembly is constituted, its members, though chosen by the Presbyteries, &c., act as officers of the whole Church, and not as mere delegates or agents of their Presbyteries. The local appointment gives a title to the office of a member of the General Assembly; but it does not in any sense, limit or (so to speak) *localize* his functions or powers. His act, as a member of the General Assembly, is, in its influence and effect, the act of all the Church.

3. Fourteen commissioners, one-half at least being ministers, are a quorum, warranting the full and binding action of the body, in the exercise of all its functions and powers, with the same effect as if all the commissioners were present. It is not important to the validity of its acts, that its members should be delegates from different localities, nor that they should represent different Presbyteries or Synods. It is not important to such validity that there were originally a greater number of commissioners, and that the quorum is only those who remain

after others have left the Assembly. It is not important that there should be any elders, but only that at least one-half of the number be ministers. Hence, it is in the constitution of the Assembly, that its powers may all be exercised by a part of its members, such part being not less than fourteen. It cannot, therefore, be a violation in substance of the constitution, that a mere quorum should exercise its powers. Nor does it alter the case, whether there being but a bare quorum, arose from the fact that the other commissioners did not, from choice or necessity, originally join the meeting, or from the fact that they afterwards voluntarily left it.

4. It is competent, also, Moderator, for every General Assembly to make rules for its own government and the conduct of its business; and it can make such rules binding on itself as an Assembly, unless repealed by a majority of its whole number. This is a power inherent in all deliberative bodies, since it is a necessary check to the tyranny of majorities, and a necessary safeguard to the rights of minorities. Now, it is undoubtedly true, that no General Assembly can renounce any of its powers by any resolve, however positive, not to exercise them, and so bind itself from resuming them; since that would be simply resolving not to do what might be its duty; yet such a reason does not apply to rules requiring certain duties to be performed by a quorum of the body. Such a requirement would be but a legitimate and proper rule of business, and in no sense a renouncing of any duty.

5. If these positions be correct, it would be, in substance, quite within the power of any General Assembly to appoint a commission of fourteen or more, and to assign to it any special business, executory or ministerial in its character; and the act of this commission, fourteen being present, in the absence of all the other members of the Assembly, would be valid, since it would be the act, not of another body created by the Assembly and exercising merely delegated powers, but the act of the Assembly itself.

6. The only objection, on constitutional grounds, to this arrangement, as far as I can see, is the form of dissolving the Assembly. This, when performed by the Moderator, terminates its power of acting. But as the Assembly is not limited to

meeting once only, there can be no difficulty, at the close of its general business, to appoint certain business, consisting either of particular items or of particular classes of business, to be transacted by certain fourteen or more members, one-half at least always being ministers, and then to adjourn over the Assembly. The persons named would continue to be the Assembly, and, when its business was closed, the Moderator could then proceed to the form of dissolution. It is to be understood, as a matter of course, that any or all of the members of the Assembly would have the right to be present, deliberate, and vote in the commission.

7. I have spoken of assigning business, executive or ministerial, as that which might lawfully be done by such a commission. It may be urged that the mode of reasoning would warrant the commission in transacting all kinds of business, if the Assembly should choose to direct it so to do. Perhaps it would. But it would not be within a reasonable performance of duty by the body of the Assembly to make so wide a devolution of its powers, and therefore limited devolution alone should be thought of.

8. Every such plan as that which I have thus briefly sketched, is undoubtedly open to the observation, that by judicial and any other powers being confided to the large body of the Assembly, it is the fair understanding and meaning that they should be exercised by all the body, or, at least, by as many as can be convened. The observation is certainly weighty. But, on the other hand, the necessity requiring some such plan is still more weighty. The large body of the Assembly cannot continue together so long as to terminate every item, without the greatest inconvenience to its members and injury to the churches. Members, in a long session, must be continually leaving the body, and so reducing its number. And the question really is, whether the final residuum shall be an accidental or a selected quorum, and whether they shall be put to the inconvenience of an over-protracted meeting, or be permitted to enjoy the convenience of an adjourned meeting.

9. As one Assembly cannot make rules of business for

another, the plan would need to be renewed by the resolve of every General Assembly, acting for itself.

Judge Fine and Dr. Plumer opposed the adoption of Dr. Wines's resolution, and, on motion of Dr. Krebs, the whole subject was finally indefinitely postponed.

So far as we can judge from the reports of the debates, the objections to the appointment of a commission for judicial cases, were not urged with the plausibility and force with which they were presented last year by Chancellor Johns and Dr. McMasters. The great objection then urged was, that a court could not delegate its powers. What would be thought, it was asked, of the Supreme Court of the United States, if that venerable body should delegate its functions to a part of its members? The answer to this objection is, that there is no delegation of powers involved in the appointment of a commission. A quorum of a Presbytery, no matter how large the Presbytery may be, is the Presbytery; a quorum of a Synod is the Synod, and a quorum of the Assembly is the Assembly. In like manner, inasmuch as a commission must embrace at least a quorum of the appointing body, a commission of a Presbytery is the Presbytery, a commission of the Synod is the Synod, and a commission of the Assembly is the Assembly. A commission, therefore, is not of the nature of a committee with powers, but it is the appointing body itself, adjourned to meet at a certain time and place, for the transaction of a specific business—with the understanding expressed or implied, that while the whole body may convene, certain members are required to attend. When a candidate for the ministry is to be ordained, A B are appointed to take part in the exercises. It is understood that any member may be present, but in point of fact, few beyond those named are generally convened. They are the Presbytery, whether any other member is present or not; and they act as such. In many cases, they examine the candidate, they judge of his qualifications and orthodoxy, they decide whether he shall be ordained or not, and if the way be clear, they ordain him. Does any body cry out against this, as a delegation of powers? or against three or four men being trusted to exercise the functions of a body consisting it may be of eighty or a hundred members? In England, the House of

Lords is the court of ultimate appeal in judicial cases. When they have transacted their ordinary business, they adjourn to meet in their judicial capacity for the trial of causes, but it is with the understanding that none need attend but the law-Lords; and, in point of fact, few others ever do attend. What constitutional principle, then, forbids a Presbytery or Synod, when their ordinary business is transacted, adjourning to meet for the trial of a judicial case, with the understanding, that (as in the case of an ordination,) while the whole body may convene, certain specified members are obligated to attend? It may, however, be objected, that the Presbytery and Synods are permanent bodies, and the Assembly is an annual one, and is dissolved and not adjourned. The Assembly, however, may sit a whole year. It may sit a month, and then adjourn to meet at any time within the year it may see fit to appoint. We are, therefore, unable to see any constitutional objection to the appointment of a judicial commission. It is well known that our ecclesiastical courts have often appointed such bodies, and that the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland annually appoints a commission, to which all unfinished business is referred. It is said that this is because the session of that body is limited by law to ten days. This, however, does not apply to the Free Church. Besides, what difference does it make? If it is anti-presbyterial to act by a commission, the law of the State cannot make it Presbyterial. It is no presumption, therefore, to say that a mode of action which has been adopted for centuries by the most stringent and influential Presbyterian Church in the world, of its own free will, is not inconsistent with the principles of Presbyterianism.

It is, therefore, a mere question of expediency. Something must be done to relieve the Assembly of the pressure of judicial cases. To make appeals stop with the Synod, violates an essential principle of our system, and must tend to the dissolution of the Church. The appointment of a commission is a long tried and approved method of relief, and we hope it will be ultimately adopted, not only by the Assembly, but by Synods and Presbyteries.

It is said, that probably not more than forty members would attend a commission of the Assembly, and then we should have

a body not more than one-half as large as an ordinary Synod, acting as the supreme judicatory of the Church—with its two thousand ministers and two hundred thousand communicants. It is said, also, that if the decisions of such a body were not to be reviewed, its power would be alarming, and if reviewed, it would be of no use. It is further said, the Church would have no confidence in the judgments of such a body. It is evident, that these objections are addressed to the imagination, and not to the understanding. Fourteen members are a quorum of the Assembly, and may constitutionally act as the supreme judicatory of the Church. Seven members are a quorum of a Synod, and may act for the whole body. Three are a quorum of a Presbytery, even if it consists of an hundred members. The United States' Court consists of some eight or ten judges, and lays down the law for twenty millions of freemen. A dozen law-Lords make decisions affecting all the subjects of Great Britain. It is a mere chimera, that a commission would be a *monstrum horrendum*. Respect and confidence follow competency and fidelity, not numbers.

Complaint from the Synod of the Dutch Church.

Rev. Dr. Boardman presented certain documents which had been placed in his hands by the Rev. Dr. Lee, of the Reformed Dutch Church, relating to the action of the North River Presbytery in the reception of the Rev. Mr. Smuller, and the organization of a Presbyterian church at Kingston, New York, composed wholly of members of the Reformed Dutch Church, without dismissal. The General Synod of the Dutch Church consider this action as in conflict with the terms of correspondence between the General Assembly and this body. These papers were referred to the Committee to nominate delegates to corresponding bodies.

This subject was finally disposed of by the adoption, on the motion of the Rev. Mr. Gildersleeve, of the following resolutions, viz.

1. That though the Consistory of the Reformed Dutch Church may have been wrong in refusing dismissions to its members, yet this Assembly disapproves the action of North

River Presbytery in hastily organizing them into a Presbyterian church.

2. That though the Classis of Ulster may have done wrong in refusing the Rev. Mr. Smuller a dismission, yet the Assembly does not approve of the action of North River Presbytery in receiving him at that time.

3. That the Stated Clerk be directed to express to the General Synod of the Reformed Dutch Church, the deep regret of this General Assembly, that any cause of complaint should have arisen between the two bodies.

Church Extension and a Fifth Board.

The Board of Missions made a distinct report on the subject of Church Extension, of which the following is a brief abstract.

The balance of the Church Extension Fund, on the 1st of April, 1854, was \$6,332.17.

The receipts from April 1, 1854, to April 1, 1855, were, from individuals, \$1,669.24, and from churches, \$3,577.24; making the receipts \$5,246.48; which, added to the amount in hand on April 1, 1854, make a total of \$11,578.65. The appropriations paid from April 1, 1854, to April 1, 1855, amount to \$7,405.55, which leaves a balance in the Treasury, April 1, 1855, of \$4,173.10. There are, however, unpaid appropriations, amounting to \$5,840.00, which would more than consume this balance, and leave the Church Extension Fund in debt, \$1,666.90.

Appropriations have been made during the year to forty-six churches, scattered over twenty-four Synods, and within the bounds of thirty-seven Presbyteries.

Forty-nine churches have been finished during the year, and have received their respective appropriations.

For the purpose of comparison, we state, that the receipts for Church Extension from the 1st of April, 1853, to the 1st of April, 1854, were as follows:—From individuals, \$3,211.93, and from churches, \$3,086.16; making a total of \$6,298.09. From this it appears that the receipts this year were \$1,051.61 less than the year preceding. The number of churches which were finished last year, and which received their appropriations

was thirty-five; the number this year, was forty-nine, being fourteen more than the year previous.

As it may be desirable to know the gross amount that has been received from the commencement of the Church Extension Fund, we add the following statement. Cash received for Church Extension, from July 20, 1844, to April 1, 1855—from individuals, \$47,711.27, and from churches, \$20,832.79; making a total of \$68,544.06. The whole number of churches which have received appropriations during this period, is 382, and these are scattered over every section of our Church.

The importance of this subject, and the diversity of opinion in relation to the best method of carrying on this department of Christian benevolence, gave rise to the most protracted and able debate of the sessions of the Assembly. Several different plans were proposed.

First, the Rev. Dr. Backus, as Chairman of the Committee on Domestic Missions, moved the adoption of the following resolutions:

Resolved, That in view of the peculiar emergencies of the case, and the increasing demand for aid in erecting churches in the new and destitute settlements of the country, some more vigorous effort than is now in operation, ought to be made by our Church at large, to supply this need.

Resolved, That in order to carry out the purpose of the foregoing resolution, there be annually elected by the General Assembly, as long as it shall be found necessary, a Committee of Church Extension, consisting of ministers and elders, to superintend the business of collecting, appropriating and disbursing the necessary funds, with power to appoint a Corresponding Secretary and a Treasurer.

Resolved, That the Committee of Church Election be located at the city of .

In support of these resolutions, Dr. Backus presented the case as it came before the Committee, and the reasons which induced them to propose the appointment of a Committee, rather than a Board. They decided first, that the object was important, and one of peculiar importance at this time. 2. They believed the manner for carrying it out, as reported, the one most desired by the friends of the measure, and they had

voted for it. If they had thought a Board would be more desirable they would have voted for it. They had chosen the name of a Committee instead of a Board, for the reason that it was a temporary body, and something for a peculiar present necessity—something which the next general Assembly might or might not repeat, or might continue for a series of years and then discontinue.

2d. Others were in favour of establishing a fifth Board, and therefore moved that the report be recommitted with instructions to that effect. After a long debate that motion was lost by a vote of 102 to 106; “a large portion of the warmest friends of the Boards voting against the measure for a new Board.”

3d. Dr. B. M. Smith, of Virginia, and Mr. Beach of Mississippi, avowed themselves in favour of referring the whole subject of Church Extension to the several Synods.

4th. Dr. Boardman was in favour of a transfer of the existing committee of church extension, connected with the Board of Missions, to St. Louis, and introduced a resolution to instruct the Board to make that transfer. This motion was laid on the table by a vote of 113 to 83.

5th. Dr. Thornwell preferred a transfer of the Board of Missions to some other place than Philadelphia, and therefore moved a series of resolutions to that effect. This motion failed.

6th. Rev. Mr. Pelan moved the following as an amendment to the second resolution proposed by the Committee:—“*Resolved*, That in order to carry out the purposes of the foregoing resolution, there be elected by the General Assembly, as long as it shall be found necessary, a Committee of Church Election consisting of ministers and elders, one-third to be elected for one year, one-third for two years and one-third for three years, to superintend the business of collecting, appropriating and disbursing the necessary funds, with power to appoint a secretary and treasurer.” This motion prevailed by a vote of 134 to 57. The blanks as to the number of the committee were filled by 12 ministers and 12 elders, and St. Louis was selected as the location of the Committee.

We are able to present only an imperfect outline of the de-

bate on this whole subject. Dr. Plumer's remarks in favour of a fifth Board are reported as follows :

“The question has met the very kind of opposition, and from the very quarter, which he had predicted; and he was sorry to see it come from such quarters as it does. More than once he had been inclined to say, ‘Et tu, Brute!’ Let us remove the mists gathered about the subject. It has been said that building churches is not fit work for Christ's Church. And yet there was a sweet singer of Israel, who, after all his Psalms and noble works, had yet one great work to do which God would not permit him to do; yet God approved highly his intention. It was the building a noble temple to the God of Israel. God is pleased with this work of building churches when it is necessary. And he believed, if the first church in New York was burned down, and the congregation should put up a log house, God would be displeased with it. Look at what Haggai said to the Jews when God's house lay waste, and they dwelled in ceiled houses. Look at Ezra's time, when, under the great revival, every four hundred and seventy souls had a synagogue built for them; and as if that were not enough, synagogues were so built as to bring a synagogue within two miles of every man's dwelling. Building of churches, then, is an appropriate work for the Church of God. He was glad of the candour manifested in this discussion. One had called all the Boards *fungi*. He would look at the meaning. The word includes, according to Webster's Dictionary, ‘toadstools,’ ‘mushrooms,’ &c. Are our Boards toadstools? If they are, they are the prettiest toadstools I ever saw. Or does he mean that they are ‘proud flesh?’ for this also, the Dictionary says, is the meaning of *fungus*. He would show some of the fruit of one of the toadstools. Here were 20,000 copies of Dr. Alexander's tract on Justification. Excellent fruit this; and so through the whole catalogue of the Board of Publication. And there was another toadstool—the Board of Foreign Missions. He wished he could cause the army of missionaries to march in and around this building, and there should we see some of the noblest men in China, among our Indians, and throughout the world, marshalled together as the great labourers in the vineyard of the Lord. An excellent fruit! So might we say the

same of the other toadstools, the Boards of Education, and of Domestic Missions with its five hundred missionaries. He cared nothing for men's theories here, but for practical results. He would give some.

In 1843, a Board of Church Extension was moved, and next year was formed. And what have they done in eleven years? They have received and disbursed \$67,000. Where did this come from? \$47,000 came from a few private gentlemen; and from all the churches, about \$20,000. Is this sufficient? But we are told that last year the thing was got up on a grand scale. And what was the result? It was \$1300 less this year than last. He did not call this progress. None need be alarmed at the rashness of such progress. It was, indeed, following out the old proverb, "*Festina lente.*" Again, it has been openly stated, that by the decision of this question will be determined whether the Church is in favour of, or opposed to Boards. So it has been published, and so events have shown it, and so they will show it. Look at the arguments used before this House against a Board in this scheme. Let us now examine what is the difference between a Committee and a Board. The only difference is this. A Committee is a body appointed by the Assembly, whose term of office expires next year; whereas a Board is divided into classes. And for this reason you cannot kill the Board of Domestic Missions under three years. And it was this that saved us in our contest with the New-school, who at one time proposed men opposed to the Board; but even had they elected them, they would have been a minority, and three years must have rolled away before they could have succeeded in destroying the Board. Again, it had struck him as strange, that men opposed to centralization should oppose a Board, and yet vote for a Committee where the power was even more concentrated. But let us examine why Boards were constituted. He read from the Minutes of 1816, to show that the very object stated was to meet the fact, that the Standing Committee on Missions was not sufficiently energetic. They set aside even a *Standing* Committee after fourteen years' trial, to say nothing of a Committee from year to year. Now, the opinion of such men as Janeway, Green, Miller, and others, should have some weight in this House.

Then, too, add to this, that on this very subject the appointed Committee had been so inefficient as to fall off in one year \$1300. Again, it is said, the work of the Board is done. But look at the progressive necessities of our country. We need six hundred ministers for destitute places. Abandon our Board of Missions and how shall these be met?

Again, there is the flood of errors and of infidelity coming in upon us, and how shall we meet it without our Board of Publication? And are not the wants of a perishing world abroad as great as they ever were? How then are we to abandon our Foreign Board? Are the difficulties then the same or greater now than they ever were? How then can it be said, as has been said, that the Boards have fulfilled their work and may be laid aside? But it is said we cannot transfer our powers. Why not? Where is the harm? Did not Paul delegate powers to some to ordain elders and deacons in every city? There are some powers which we can delegate. It is objected that the Assembly ought to choose its Secretaries, and not the Board. But how can we in such an Assembly judge properly of men's qualifications? Often a man may make very eloquent speeches who yet would be most unfit, by an unhappy temperament, to fill the post of Secretary. And ought not the wishes, too, of the discreet men already Secretaries in our Foreign Board, for example, to be consulted if we were about to vote for a new Secretary in that Board? Besides, consider also that the public faith of the Church has been pledged for the perpetuity of these Boards. How so? They have been told to become incorporated; and dying men and women have bequeathed money to those Boards in trust. Shall we break our faith? Need we fear because the beginning is small in this new scheme? No—for look at the increase in the disbursements of our present Boards. Here is a Board of Publication that has this year distributed \$91,000, and yet the beginning of that Board was the transmission of \$100 each to Drs. Alexander and Miller, by a gentleman, asking one to write a tract on Justification, and the other on Presbyterianism. Such will be the increase of this Board if it is established. He loathed this constant irritation of our public officers. He would say, as Burke said of the British ministry, “if you will call these men up, and try and

execute them," the matter will at least be dignified; but as for this constant, underhand, stealthy stabbing of them, his soul loathed it. He hoped the House would listen to a full discussion of this important subject. "It is for the interest of the republic that there should be an end of strife." Let brethren say what their views are, and let us settle this question. With respect to the brethren about Philadelphia, who sympathize with certain persons opposed to the Boards so far as to vote with them, he would predict that the time would come when they and their concerns would go by the board. If Philadelphia turns against the Boards, the Church will turn against Philadelphia. He would say that the worthy and modest Secretary of the Board of Missions, who is here, is not opposed to separating the Church Extension work entirely from that Board. He mentioned this to show, that though the Board of Education seemed determined to throw its influence against a Board of Church Extension, the Board of Missions was not disposed to do so. It is remarkable too, that these brethren who are most zealous in pulling down, are very much at fault when it comes to building up. What do they propose? A Committee to go out every year, instead of a Board, and the Secretary to be elected by the Assembly. As to the election of a Secretary by the Assembly, there would be great difficulties. Suppose, for instance, that the Secretary of that Board should be taken from this world, and this Assembly should elect a successor. Suppose the person elected should decline, then your Board is without a Secretary for twelve months. The same thing might be repeated the next year, until five years would sometimes elapse before a Secretary could be secured.

As to the expense, that would be the same for a Board as for a Committee. Room-rent, salary, &c., would be the same, unless you get an inferior man; and on that principle you might be like the Irishman who got a stove which saved half the wood, and resolved to get two, that he might save all. Neither the word "Committee," nor "Board," is in the Scriptures; and if brethren insist on the *jus divinum* he did not know where they would get their authority, unless from that text, "The thing that thou hast received, that commit thou to faithful men." With the exception too, of the difficulty of break-

ing up a Board in a single year, as stated this morning, a Board and Committee are the same. And is the Church, by a vote, ready virtually to vote down Boards, when they have done so much for us? A New-school man, who started to St. Louis the other day, said he was for going into the lumber business too; it had so enriched the Old-school, and made them such a magnificent Church. The very things the New-school men fought against in 1837 and '38, they were now running after with all their might. We cannot abandon the Boards. We have need too, of a permanent organization for the West and Southwest, and not a mere temporary committee. Pittsburgh was once in the West; afterwards Cincinnati; then Louisville; and still later, St. Louis; but the centre of the United States is four hundred and sixty-nine miles further West. There are eight hundred miles of the most fertile land in the world west of the Mississippi yet to be occupied. We must have men who will, year after year, study this field. Moreover, who would accept a Secretaryship of a Committee for a single year? Our Presbyterian people love stability. But a sub-committee of the Board of Domestic Missions is proposed. This is an *imperium in imperio*—looking to Philadelphia for support, not of the Board of Missions, but under it. The Secretary of the Board of Missions is entirely willing that this work shall be taken out of her hands. It is said that by not organizing another Board, we shall get rid of another collection. But would it not be as annoying to give a collection to a Committee, as to a fifth Board? He wished it to be understood too, that if we are going on to make war on Boards, we must carry out the principle, and kill the Boards of our Theological Seminaries also.

As to the divine right of Presbyterianism, he believed the office of Presbyter was the highest in the Scriptures, and that ruling elders and deacons were of divine origin; but he did not believe that the word of God made a Committee a thing of divine or apostolic authority, any more than a Board. There was one thing in Presbyterianism which certainly is of divine right, viz., that the strong shall help the weak. Suppose you hand this matter over to the Synods; we shall have some of the Synods helping themselves, and not sending fifty cents a year

to help others. There is still another point in the divine right of Presbyterianism, "Remember the words of the Lord Jesus Christ, how he said, It is more blessed to give than to receive." He had not the slightest objection to the strict construction of the Constitution. The ground that the Assembly has no right to appoint Boards, is precisely the same taken by the New-school men in the Assembly of 1836, at Pittsburgh. If the Assembly is not to sit all the year round, it must appoint some party to do its work. What an area we have for church building! The State of Texas has territory enough to make forty-five such states as Massachusetts, and the State of California would make forty-five such States as New Hampshire. He was not usually in favour of summoning dead friends as arguments; but when he remembered how that noble man, John Breckinridge, fought and laboured for these Boards, he was astonished at some things he now heard and saw. If the spirit of that gifted man could now come back, and see us Old-school people striving to pull down these Boards, what would he think of us? Those who once laboured with us, might weep to see us endeavouring to overthrow what had been gained with so much difficulty, and at such sacrifices.

The Rev. Dr. Smith—This is a question of form, and the matter will doubtless be brought up again; yet why not proceed at once with the discussion? If we wish this manner and form, why not at once make it so? Still the main issues are really now before us under the motion to recommit. There are two chief considerations. I leave out altogether the place. One respects the making this matter of equal importance with the subjects of Missions and Education. The other respects the name. True, a name seems to be nothing, and yet you see that men feel there is a difference. Even Dr. Plumer has intimated that a *Committee* is *not* the same thing as a Board. Now he wished to know what there is in a Board of more dignity than in a Committee. Why make this distinction? Why offer such ground for cavil? He cared not himself which name you take, if no difference is intended. But when the ground is openly taken that there is a difference, he must resist the change. This is the way to open the door for giving colour to the arguments of those whom we have called cavillers; and in

reality to fasten on the Church a power outside of itself. He would sooner reject all our Boards. If, then, the words really mean the same, why argue for a change? and if not, then the whole matter is in a dangerous position. As to the intrinsic merits of the enterprise contemplated, there can be but one opinion; the only difference regards the *quo modo*. But he felt it his duty to present the view of his Presbytery. Our objections are, 1. We doubt very much, when the General Board or Committee is formed, whether it will be possible to bring before that Committee such grounds of action as shall enable them to act judiciously. To commission a minister for a certain field, and to build a church there, are two very different things. In one you can be easily and properly informed, though at a distance from the field; but not so in the other. Even a contiguous Presbytery may find it difficult to ascertain the necessity for having a house of worship erected. Even their recommendation then may be illusive. What different opinions are entertained respecting every railroad that is built as to the propriety of running in its present direction! Human nature is a very capricious thing; and we should be under the constant liability to make mistakes, and build when we ought not to build. Now suppose we commit the matter to *Synods*—mark, I do not say *Presbyteries*—for as to these the action would not be so generally judicious as the *Synods* would exercise. Now *Synods* would have the whole ground before them. Their area of supervision would be restricted. And if a *Synod* (like that of California) were weak, it could ask assistance from a neighbouring *Synod*. If the *Synods* should set the matter fairly before the *Presbyteries*, and ask from each such or such an amount of money, it would be supplied. By this plan we should avoid many expenses incidental to a Board, and which are necessary to set it a going. Many of our churches will be long in getting reached by the exhortations which will prove to them the necessity and dignity and importance of this enterprise. It will be long before our people will put the building up of brick and mortar on a level with the preaching of the gospel. If we appoint, then, such a Committee at St. Louis, let the matter still be attended to by the *Synods*, and let each of these *Synods* be directed to transmit to this committee their

surplus funds, to be used by this committee for the help of the feeble. Let us be careful how we proceed. I have no liking for the slow gait of the tortoise, any more than Dr. Plumer, and yet we know that sometimes the slow but steady tortoise at the last overcomes the nimble and careless hare.

Subsequently, when speaking of Mr. Pelan's proposition, Dr. Smith said:—The resolution now before us is the same as that rejected yesterday; or what is tantamount to the erection of a fifth Board. He could never see that a Board was so essentially different from a Committee. It had been strenuously maintained. But he could not think so. And in taking his position, he was obliged to take ground, as he before intimated, against his Presbytery. The only difference insisted upon, had been that a Board has powers beyond a Committee. Now, if it be intended by the present Committee to go beyond what it is appointed to do by the Assembly, he was opposed to it. He referred to the origin of the Boards of the Church. It had sprung from the custom of our old missionary associations, to assign the business to the hands of a Committee called a Board, from the use of the same term in civil life.

When the Assembly took up the subject, it adopted the same practice and nomenclature. At first the committees were yearly appointed. But in the time of our troubles it was deemed necessary, in order to save our plans of benevolence from destruction, to add this feature to make them more permanent. But he did not believe that our Assembly esteemed this an essential feature of their plan. Now, if this feature was necessary for the preservation of this committee, he would agree to it; but he did not conceive it to be, and as there was such a difference of opinion, he thought it unadvisable. Again, he believed that Corresponding Secretaries could as well be elected by the General Assembly as by the Board. He vindicated the patient faithfulness and laboriousness of the Boards of the Church. Their office was no sinecure. They spent hours of patient labour for the Church, and instead of being carped at, they deserved an annual vote of thanks from the Assembly. He was in favour, then, of having an annual committee, if we have a committee at all. His great object was,

not to build up Boards or to overthrow them. It was to build up the kingdom of Jesus Christ; and so long as our Boards did their work well, he always looked favourably on them.

The Rev. Mr. Coe—Resides in the Northwest, and was an eye-witness of the necessities of the case. He would make some remarks. 1. As to what they want; and 2. Why they want it. This is not a mere Northwestern measure. All the West and Southwest especially need the same relief. We want then a separate organization, such as shall draw out large and continued supplies to meet a large demand. We want only to be aided in part. We do not ask for the whole sum necessary for building. Often only a fourth part would be sufficient. We do not need splendid edifices. The Eastern brethren have a right to such, if they prefer them. Let them build them and glorify God. But we ask help to build plain structures, wherein to worship God. Why, then, do we want it? First—From the vastness of the field. In seven Synods of Iowa, Wisconsin, and three northern Presbyteries of Illinois, we have 350 organized churches. Here we need over a hundred houses, and, it is safe to say, that a hundred places more might easily be selected where they are necessary. We require then, this day, for this single field, \$30,000. Look, too, at the vast tide of emigration, and the progress of improvement, which demands energetic measures. The population that comes there often bring means with them, and demand and make improvements for themselves and families. There is St. Paul. Six years ago, it was a trading house; now it has over 6000 inhabitants, with churches and buildings that would not disgrace our Eastern cities. Look at our own progress as a Church. We have one hundred ministers, where, ten years ago, we had only nine, and nine Presbyteries where we had but one. In fact, no portion of our country is opening more rapidly than the Northwest. Different nations are gathering there. Norwegians, Hollanders, Swedes, are all here, and all need our help. He referred to his own church, which had begun in great feebleness, but received some assistance. It was then said, “We give you just two years to die in.” But what are the results? They had a beautiful building, an active church, and had given

more to Church Extension than they had ever received. He referred also to what the church at St. Paul was doing, showing the advantage of a building in making the church self-sustaining. Before the church was erected, hardly a hundred dollars could be obtained for the support of the ministry; but when the church was built, on the first day they were offered nine hundred dollars for the rent of the pews, and thus at once made the church self-sustaining. We have great difficulties. A main one is the want of the Presbyterian element to work upon. Another is the want of homogeneity in our population. In his own church he had Dutch, Scotch, Irish, Germans, Canadians, and a few representatives from every State in the Union. They had also all sorts of religions. Again, we have the liberality of others to contend with. We do not, indeed, object to this liberality. It is right. But we must keep pace with it, or we shall be outstripped. Ultraism also stands in our way, and error of doctrine. Yet it is true that the people prefer the preaching of sound doctrine when they can get it. We also are styled the pro-slavery Church; and this is used against us. We need aid to stem the tide of fanaticism and ultraism. The success, thus far, of those who have founded Presbyterianism there, should stimulate benevolence towards that field. One minister began his work there in such poverty, that he had not a change of clothes. Another aided in building the edifice with his own hands. And these were the beginnings of that spiritual edifice which is now growing into such beautiful proportions. Let us have all needful help.

Rev. Dr. Van Rensselaer said—Church Extension is an old Presbyterian scheme. So, indeed, have all the other schemes of Christian benevolence been. We had a mission among the Chickasaw Indians fifty years ago. At first this very Church Extension was derided, when proposed by us, by the very men who are now following our example. Let us not allow them to go beyond us. I am opposed to a new Board and a new Committee, and am rather for giving new energy to the old organization. We have had virtually the right plan in operation for the last eleven years. Let us bear in mind that, as to the thing itself, we are agreed; the only difference is as to the method of doing it. Our present plan should have new life put

into it. It is argued that it has done but little; but this does not prevent its being invigorated. So it was with the Board of Foreign Missions. For years it was inefficient; but at last it was vivified, and has become effective. The reason of the past inefficiency of the Committee of the Board, has been its location. Remove this to another field—say St. Louis—and it will be efficient. Dr. Van Rensselaer also recommended a simultaneous collection in all the churches, in behalf of the object. He objected strongly against a Committee of the Assembly, as now proposed. It would hamper all our Boards. It has been said that this would be merely temporary; but it will not be so. A Board would indeed be better than a Committee of the Assembly. But to a Board also there are two objections; one is, that in an already existing Committee of the Board is all that is necessary. 2. Because the cause is not sufficiently extensive to demand it, and it may excite opposition to all our Boards. The venerable Dr. Blythe, a pioneer, was opposed to this building of churches for others. He approved the plan of building for themselves, according to their ability, and improving the building as they grew and prospered. He repeated, that while he said not a word against church erection itself, he was opposed to both a Board and a Committee of the Assembly. He would abide by our old plan.

Many other brethren took part in the debate. Mr. Gladney urged the greater importance of sending out preachers than building houses.

Mr. S. R. Wilson declared himself opposed to all Boards. They were adopted, he said, by good men who were not yet fully freed from the Egyptian bondage of Congregationalism. He believed this work of Church Extension belonged to the missionary. He came from a city which contains at this day 200,000 inhabitants; and they had churches which some might object to on account of their costliness. But while there might be extravagance, yet this was a thing that could not be prevented; and, besides, those men who built these costly churches, were the very men who gave most to the destitute. Now, these churches had grown up from feeble beginnings;—first a log house, then a larger frame house, then a brick building, and so on, until the present point was attained. The

pioneer missionaries there had no idea of building first, and getting the people afterwards. He believed that this was the true plan. He was, therefore, opposed to any aid-scheme of the sort proposed. If we cannot succeed by our missionaries preaching the gospel, we cannot succeed with a Board or Committee located anywhere. Lastly, he thought that the true method was, to commit the whole matter to the Board of Domestic Missions; and let there issue thence some organized effort to gather contributions—an organization that shall reach in its influence, not our wealthy churches only, but all our churches, and especially the feeblest, so that every rill shall yield its quota, and swell the tide of energetic benevolence.

The Rev. Messrs. Robertson, McKee, Ewing, Candee, Steele, Krebs, Smith of Illinois, and others discussed the subject more or less at length. We cannot, however, find room for their remarks, as we are desirous of presenting at length the able speeches of Drs. Thornwell and Boardman, as far as they have been reported.

Dr. Thornwell said the representations made by the brethren of the Northwest had produced a deep impression on his mind. They had his warm sympathies. The time in this discussion had not been wasted; for the Assembly had been able thus to see the practical operation of our system in various parts. We thus feel that we are one. Indeed, during the discussion, he had even envied the opportunity of some of the brethren of the great Western field to do good. He wished it to be stated at the outset, that these brethren had his warm sympathies in their labours and their difficulties. This was necessary, in order that what he said might not be misunderstood. On the subject before the Assembly, there are two points to be considered. First, granting that there is a necessity of something being done, shall it be done by a Board? And next, shall any thing at all be done? And on this the whole merits of the case rest. First then, shall there be a Board or a Committee appointed? He was clearly of the opinion that there should not be a Board. He was not opposed to the end which our Boards are designed to achieve. Yet, as a true Presbyterian, believing that our system is of divine origin, he could not consent to anything extraneous to the system. Never, never would he, or

could he, as a Christian, object to the great work of evangelizing the world. But we may differ as to the plan. He wished to correct a mistake. The Assembly have noticed the great variety of opinions expressed here on this subject. A report is brought in recommending a Committee, and immediately a motion is made to recommit, with instructions to recommend a Board. Now, why is this? It had been said it was not on the grounds of the essential merits of the two plans, but because the establishment of a Committee is a point on which those may rally who are opposed to all Boards, and as affording an opening wedge whereby at last to kill all the Boards.

Dr. Plumer rose to explain. His position was simply that those who opposed all Boards would vote for a Committee; and what he said had been sustained by the actual result.

Dr. Thornwell—The drift of the remark is the same, and he could not see why the vote for a Committee should be construed into an aim to overthrow the existing Boards of the Church. There is another mistake. He thought the friends of the measure should have rejoiced at the offer of a Committee of the Assembly, for in this way the disputed subject would have come before the Church, and the decision by the voice of the Church, between a Committee of the Board and a Committee of the Assembly, would have determined the triumph or defeat of the friends or opponents of Boards.

He was opposed to Boards. 1. Because the Church is made of God, the great organ for carrying forward the operations of Christ's kingdom. This needs no argument. It was this principle which had been urged against voluntary societies. Now shall we go back to this? What is a Board? It is not a Committee appointed by the Assembly. This is shown by the very opposition of the Board's friends to a Committee. The word refers literally to those who sit around a table, and it implies a power in certain persons to do of themselves a certain work of the Church. In them the General Assembly erects another power between itself and its work. It is the Assembly's vicar. The existing Boards have done indeed great good; he did not deny this. They were used originally to rouse and give form to the true spirit of activity, at a time when the feelings of the Church, as to her duty, were dormant. They were, at the time,

immensely important, but they have now accomplished their work, and may be laid aside for us to act in the proper organic way. It may be said, "*quod facit per alium facit per se.*" The Assembly does what the Board does. But so may this be said, if the Assembly should appoint as its agent the American Board of Foreign Missions.

But there are two other questions involved—1. Can the Assembly transfer its duties to another body? No—no man can tell the ground on which such transfer can be made. 2. It involves the whole question, as to the degree in which the Church possesses discretionary power. Some maintain that the Church has attained her maturity; that God has proposed only certain ends and left the means of attaining them to her own wisdom. She is simply a confidential agent of her Master. He says to her, You are no longer under Jewish bondage. You are in your maturity; use your light, and your decisions, as to the means, will be approved. He did not believe at all, in this wide discretionary power. The Church's duty is simply to do her Master's will, and that will is plainly laid down as to all particulars. The Church has no such discretionary power. There are indeed circumstances which she must regard; but even in these her path is determined by the rules laid down for her. We cannot, then, transfer our obligations as an Assembly to any other power.

Again: The Boards form a separating wall between the Church and her benevolent operations. Our system is one which supposes an interest in the Church's work to be felt in her every part. Everything that obstructs this flow of sympathy is to be discarded. How much more would every portion of the Church, every Synod, and every Presbytery, feel a hearty sympathy in these works of benevolence, if all were committed immediately to the Assembly? That is the heart and centre of the system, and the zeal here kindled passes out to the extremities of the whole body, and makes the whole body one in sympathy, and energy, and aim. Set aside then, this intermediate barrier.

But again: Do they not hinder the equal working of our system? Centralization of power is as much to be dreaded in Church as in State. How wrong then to centralize it in the

noblest work which the Church fulfils! Make the Committee as large as you please, and the power still concentrates towards a small centre. Is this consistent with our belief as to the parity of the ministry? The whole plan is unnatural; and had not these Boards been in time past the points around which Christian energy at first was rallied, our system would have thrown them off before. Again; we do not need them. Grant that none of the faults he had attributed to them were incidental to them. Still, we do not need them. In appointing Professors, even in appointing a pastor to a field, the matter is never left to a Board; and yet here are far more serious interests thus entrusted. All this shows that these are something extraneous to, and useless in our system. But it may be asked, Dispense with a Board, and what shall we do? The question is a serious one. He could not sympathize with the ridicule cast upon the building up of brick and mortar. How wonderfully had God, for years, been preparing houses for the apostles to preach in? These were the synagogues. It is then an important subsidiary work to the preaching of the gospel. Especially in the inclement Northwest, there seems to be an absolute necessity for such a work. Still, they are wrong in trying to get up a separate organization. For other Christians look at the preaching of the gospel as the great matter, and it will be destructive to separate this matter from the missionary work. Make it a matter of mere architecture, and you kill it. The matter belongs to the Board of Missions, whose object is to see that the gospel is preached, and to see that *all* things necessary to that work are supplied. He thought the remedy was simple. There might be difficulties; but so there were in anything. His remedy was to move the Board of Domestic Missions from Philadelphia to the West. Some thought the contributions of the East would be thus cut off. He could not think so. On the contrary, many would feel that an advantage to the missionary work had been gained, and would give even more joyfully than ever. What the Presbyterian Church most needs is confidence in its own system. He believed in the *jus divinum* of Presbyterianism. We have resources in our system unparalleled, for acting upon this great country. Check then the system of inorganic action, and for-

ward every effort towards vital organic action, and this will carry us forward in a career of triumph.

The Rev. Dr. Boardman said, there is an interest involved in this debate of as much greater importance than the cause of Church Extension, as four Boards are superior to one. A new theory of the Church has been virtually propounded in several of our judicatories, and some of our periodicals; and he thought it was high time the Presbyterian Church should understand where and what she is. If it be true that ecclesiastical Boards are in contravention of our Church polity, even though they were adopted in the time of a great conflict, the Church could not have been justified in resorting to them. To those gentlemen who now resist ecclesiastical Boards, he would say, "You had no right to rally under that banner for the mere purpose of defeating another party." No: the principle adopted, which has brought this Church to a pitch of prosperity, which has been attained in no other Church on which the sun shines, is not in contravention of our ecclesiastical polity, nor of the teachings of the Scriptures. He was heartily glad this question had come up. This discussion has grown out of that elaborate and eloquent speech to which we listened this morning, (Dr. Thornwell's), which lacked but one element. It was a chain, polished and bright, but not fastened at either end—not to the word of God on the one hand, nor to the Church on the other. He had listened to that speech, as to the beautiful and ingenious speculations of the great statesman of South Carolina. The doctrine of that speech was, that the principle of ecclesiastical Boards impeaches the organic structure of the Church of Christ; that she cannot, in any sense, delegate her work, but must literally do it herself. Knowing to whom he was listening, Dr. Boardman had waited in vain for the authority for these positions. Not one word had he heard, either from the Scriptures, or from our own Constitution. We may respect mere opinions from high sources; but in matters of such import as this, we must have something more than opinions.

In conceding the right of the Assembly to appoint a Committee, as the gentleman had done, the whole question had been given up. One party contends, indeed, that a Committee

differs essentially from a Board. But what is a Board? Suppose we determine, for the coming twelve months, to conduct our missionary operations by a Committee, can it not be so arranged that there shall be four classes, one to go out every three months; and would not that be a Board, and just as much a Board as if the classes went out in four successive years? If it be said that a Committee must not overrun a following Assembly, he would reply that the Committee on Psalmody, as well as others, had been in existence for years.

Again: a Committee will not at all answer the exigencies of the theory propounded by the gentleman from South Carolina. That theory is, that the Church herself must do her work *directly* and *immediately*. But does she do this when acting through a committee? No, sir. It is then the Church "acting by vicar"—acting according to the principle so much maligned here by a few. And must not a committee appoint its Secretary and its agents to carry out its trusts? Why, if this theory be taken literally, this work can only be done by the General Assembly itself, perambulating the whole Church. You must set the churches themselves to itinerating, or you cannot elude the point that it is done "by vicar."

But where is your authority for a Committee? He would not allow these brethren to stop short of their own principles. If you say, show us your authority for a Board, I say, show us your authority for a Committee. There is the Bible; give us the law and the testimony. Why, the very Constitution of the Church carries with it the power to carry out the ends for which it is designed, the identical things which her Founder has designed as objects of her institution. When you call upon the friends of the Boards to give a scriptural warrant for such organizations, we reply further, that we call upon you to show us scriptural warrant for your Theological Seminaries; for a minister occupying the post of an editor, or a professor's chair. It is not enough that you say their Presbyteries have permitted them to do it. Where did the Presbytery get its authority? We do not intend, when brethren begin to call for scriptural authority, that they should stop with the Boards. He apprehended that when that principle was applied to its full extent, it would upset something else than the Boards; it would turn a

great many gentlemen out of their places, and occasion such a running to and fro as has not often been seen. But, sir, who can fail to see the fallacy of all this? We have not yet returned to the Levitical code. We yet breathe the free, generous evangelical spirit of the New Testament. The whole theory of these gentlemen is at variance with what I regard the spirit of the gospel on this subject—a spirit which allows the work of Christ to be done as the hearts of Christ's people in their various circumstances may dictate. No man can show that the Church has the power to carry on her work, without assuming that the Church has certain powers to do her work which are not distinctly enunciated in the New Testament.

We are told, however, that this is a dangerous power; that the Boards are something growing up outside of the Church. No one could complain of the manner in which this subject has been brought up by that distinguished gentleman who has spoken here to-day; but there *is* reason to complain of the manner in which efforts have been made to spread the impression that the Boards were antagonistic to the Church, and to complain of the coarseness and vulgarity which has been displayed in some quarters.

So much is said as to the danger of centralization, and especially in Philadelphia, that, perhaps, some men or women, (with deference) think of Philadelphia as they think of a masked battery, or a covered mine, which may explode and blow everything to pieces. He would admit that there is power where there is a Board. But what will you do? Will you garotte gentlemen, because God has given them superior talents? Will you refrain from establishing a Theological Seminary at Danville, because the moment you put distinguished men there, you have made a point for centralization? Shall such a church as this, pervaded with such intelligence, yield to such miserable prejudices, and thus paralyze the implements you yourselves have formed?

These Boards are not powers outside the Church. They are the hands of the Church; they are appointed by the Church: they report to you; and you know they would not dare to go contrary to your will. No, sir, these Boards are a part of the Church, and to charge the contrary, is a false issue. If the

fundamental principles of the Boards are unsound, let this be shown.

He must say something about Philadelphia. This Church Extension scheme is not a Philadelphia scheme, as intimated by this writer. He himself had voted against it in the Assembly where it was adopted; and he doubted whether a single Philadelphia man had been in favour of it. The venerable Dr. Hoge of Ohio was the father of the scheme, and entitled to its glory or its shame. Philadelphia does not wish a fifth Board to be located there, if established. Dr. Boardman said he was in favour of a Committee to be located at St. Louis, under the Board of Missions, and their flings at Philadelphia were unjust and ungenerous. Philadelphia can take care of herself. She has nothing to ask. So far as she is connected with you, you have made her such. You have held your meetings there; you placed your Boards there. For the most part, Philadelphia ministers know but little more of what is done in the Boards, except in that they may be connected with. He learned most of what he knew about their action from the newspapers. Philadelphia pastors had too much to do in their own proper business, to be meddling with what did not belong to them.

He saw time was becoming increasingly precious, and members were anxious to return home. He reminded the members, however, of the resolution of the last Assembly. Some may object to this discussion of the abstract principle respecting our Boards. But the times demand it. It is discussed elsewhere, and doubts are engendered in the minds of our people by such efforts, as to the validity and scriptural soundness of our Church operations. We would again remind the Assembly how this principle was ramified through all our operations in the Church. But to come to the particular point at issue here. He thought the opposition manifested was an injustice to those who were pioneers in the preaching of the gospel. Why send men to make bricks, and not supply straw? It is unfair. It was unjust to draw a conclusion also against this scheme from the success of some who had, with great self-denial, succeeded in past time in building churches without aid. Had they been helped, they would have succeeded sooner. It is a poor policy to continue the plan. This plan had been published as a North-

west scheme. It is not so. We must go where the people go: and when the Southwest needed help, there would be as ready a response to them as to the Northwest. He would remind the South that the Northwest had always stood by them in their troubles. Away with this sectional spirit. It is the glory of the Presbyterian Church that it belongs to the whole country. Church Extension had now been before the public for eleven years. Many had aided it. It has received a cordial approval. Some propose to leave it to individual support. This is going back into Egypt. This will necessarily involve a fruitless waste of money. Adopt it, and at once there is a tide of men setting towards the same place, each to urge his own church's claim. What is the result? Often they do not pay their own expenses. He had himself supplied a number of ministers with money to return home. Adopt this method, and these applications would be in number as five to one, compared with other applications. Adopt this plan, and not a Sabbath will pass without an application to build, or to save a church from the hammer. Again: These plans are often very crude and ill-formed. He stated the case of one agent who had made collections for a church, and appropriated the money to himself. How are we always to know the men applying; or, if we know them, how are we to know whether the intentions are feasible? The result of all this is to discourage our people from giving. Again: Some say, leave the matter then to Presbyteries and Synods. But what will be the result? Say to them, Supply your own wants, and then give your surplus to aid the feeble ones, and what will be the result? Why, a very pleasant one for the strong Synods, but a very meagre one for the weaker. We are too selfish, and the result will be that the plan will fail. Another plan is to propose a distinct organization. This was Dr. Hoge's plan. Some propose a new Board; and others a Committee, subject to the Board of Missions. He was opposed to a new Board. It would involve more expense, and, besides, some concession is due to those who are in the opposition. It would also be a weapon in the hands of the opposers of Boards to strike at the present organization. The very best friends of Boards, too, are decidedly opposed to the formation of a fifth Board at this time. An independent Com-

mittee of the Assembly is the last plan—located at St. Louis. He believed this the true one. Some wished this to be under the Board of Domestic Missions, and spoke of church erection as a necessary part of the same work. But he thought that this would be only to cripple operations. Two such important features could not be attended to by the same head. Besides, a Western Committee, independent of the Board of Missions, and located at St. Louis, would secure the hearty co-operation of the West itself, and, indeed, he believed, of all parties. In conclusion, he deprecated the disturbance of our existing plans. The proverb, "Let well enough alone," is a wise one. All plans may have errors; but with all that may be said against our plan of Boards, it has proved to be the plan which has best fulfilled the mission of the Church in its present circumstances. And when a Church presents such an aspect of unity and progress as our own does in this country, it is the height of imprudence to disturb the peaceful working of the machinery. He hoped, therefore, that the opposing brethren may find the sentiment of the Church so strongly in favour of our present system as to waive the enforcement of their peculiar views. He admitted the abilities and excellent qualities of these brethren, but believed they were in a very small minority.

Rev. Dr. Thornwell rose with great reluctance; but the thorough canvass of his argument made yesterday rendered it necessary. He had no hesitation in engaging in the discussion, or to hear the views of others. If he knew himself, he had but one desire, and that was to know what was the will of God. He believed the discussion had been, thus far, so conducted as eventually to produce good. He was sorry for some things that had occurred; but he believed that the ridicule that had been thrown upon some expressions had been done in levity, rather than contempt. He also would have banished from this discussion what had been printed or rumoured elsewhere. One man at least had been placed in an invidious position. He would never regard otherwise than with reverence and respect, the man who had been the author of the Act and Testimony, and who had, under God, been the means of our deliverance. It was some such unfortunate allusion which alone had marred the Christian and manly argument of his opponent. He would now

proceed to the subject itself. The speech which followed his own, reminded him of the ancient contest between Æschines and Demosthenes. All, in reading those speeches, must be satisfied that Demosthenes gained his point, not by argument, but by popular appeal, and by throwing dust into the eyes. There is this difference, however—that Demosthenes addressed Athenian heathen, but Dr. Plumer had addressed a Presbyterian Christian Assembly. Demosthenes had gained his point, Dr. Plumer had not. As to the argument itself, it had brought up side issues, and did not meet his position. For example, Dr. Thornwell had distinctly admitted that God was pleased with building of houses for worship, and yet Dr. Plumer had argued as if he had opposed it. There is, however, this difference between the case of the temple and that of our churches: the former was a house for God, the latter was one for ourselves. When it was said of Christ, “The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up,” this was said as to the temple, and not of the synagogue.

Another error was the assignment of false causes. Dr. Plumer had spoken of the increase of the Board of Publication; and our increase has been great, though, indeed, less than it ought to be. But what is the cause of this increase? Are the Boards the cause? If this is so, then why was it that some other Boards were cast aside as the instrumentalities of the Church? The increase of benevolence is not owing to the form of these instrumentalities. It was the increase of light upon the duty and privileges of the Church that had been its cause. He would state also some facts illustrative of some of his positions. The principle on which we cast off voluntary societies was *not* that the Church had a right to appoint Boards, but that the Church, in her organic capacity, had a right to conduct the cause of missions. It was for *this* principle we cast off all voluntary societies. The Board question was *not* under debate. It was a question which lay back of this. It was, then, unfair to misrepresent the position of those who opposed Boards, as if they had assailed the principle which gave us our present standing as a Church. He was not to be frightened from his position. He held a great principle, which he believed to be founded in Scripture; and while he would sit at the feet of these breth-

ren, when they held forth great Scripture principles, he could not submit to him when that brother so adroitly evaded the real issue, as he had done in this case. He admired the openness and frankness of Dr. Boardman, but he had misstated the case. He had said that if we resist the principle of Boards, we must oppose all our present Boards. Now, this was a false inference. He believed that the Scriptures laid down a form, but also that the spirit was to be preferred to the form; and he would willingly sacrifice the latter to the former—just as in a similar case Christ had said, “I prefer mercy to sacrifice.” He believed our Church, for example, of divine appointment, and yet he would willingly worship with other evangelical denominations. He adhered to this principle so strongly, that, had no Boards at all existed, he would willingly have contributed to those of other denominations in existence. The spiritual obligation overrides all mere form. On this ground he had contributed, and would always contribute to our Boards:

Another mistake he would correct. Rev. Dr. Boardman had attempted to reduce his argument to an absurdity. Let us, he had said, adopt Dr. Thornwell’s principle, and we must do nothing at all for which we have not a definite rule. He saw no *reductio ad absurdum* here. He admitted the inference, for he stood firm upon the absolute sufficiency of the Scripture for faith and practice, and in everything he was directed by it, rejecting philosophy, expediency, and all worldly wisdom. He came now to the application, and he wished the Assembly to bear in mind the distinction between things commanded and things allowed—Christian doctrine and Christian liberty. Now, he maintained, that the Church of God has no power but what is ministerial. He denied that she was left at all to her own wisdom as a rule and guide. Dr. Boardman denies this; but it is the very doctrine of our Book. It was the doctrine of the Puritans. It was on this ground that they resisted liturgies, and rites, and commandments of men, urged on the principle of expediency. He did not argue this before, for he supposed it admitted. Now, the Church has power to appoint officers, because this is supposed in the obligation to do the work. If she, then, has the power to appoint a Board, it must be shown that she cannot possibly do this work herself.

Look, then, at the workings of the Boards themselves. They meet and appoint an Executive Committee and a Corresponding Secretary. Now, is this beyond the power of the General Assembly? Can they not appoint them? Some ask the difference between a Board and a Committee. The difference is plain. A Committee is a body to whom something is committed, whereas, a Board is a body with power to make committees, and thus do the work which it is the Assembly's duty to do. It is, then, unnecessary, and interrupts the healthful action of the Assembly. The objection, then, is not in the name, but in the difference of work performed by a Committee and a Board; and this is producing an evil which is extending to the very extremities of our land. He thought also that he could show distinctly that if this principle of the self-sufficiency of the Church be admitted, it could be proved that an outward revelation itself is unnecessary. A power equal to guide her own steps, was a power equal to enlighten her in the knowledge of divine things. This, however, he could not enlarge upon. He insisted upon the language used by our Moderator at the beginning of the Assembly, to resist innovations. Before closing, he would say a word upon the attempt to associate his positions with those of South Carolina politicians. It was a painful insinuation to him. He uttered a high eulogium upon the late Mr. Calhoun; but, said Dr. Thornwell, in all his great political views I was constrained to differ from him. As to one thing, however, he was glad; he was glad to be called an abstractionist. The abstractionist stands on principle, and it was one of the most eloquent passages of that great man's life, worthy of a great statesman, worthy of Calhoun himself, when he defended himself as an abstractionist. He could not be frightened by epithets. He had but one single rule, which was to preserve a conscience void of offence towards God and towards man, and to abide strictly by the principles of the word of God.

Rev. Mr. Cole—He had nothing to do with the Board question. This has been discussed sufficiently. But there was a practical question before us, and it must be settled to-day, or it will be passed over to another year. The great question is, what is to be done in Church Extension? He spoke for those

who stood with him in the Northwest, and he claimed the privilege of expressing their views as to the mode of meeting the present want. Shall we then have an organization independent of the Board of Missions, or subject to it? They were all finally of opinion that it must be independent. His reasons were, 1. There is no reason for thus subjecting it to the Board of Missions. Is it merely to shed the lustre of its name over it? Of what avail would this be? 2. Again: Confidence must be gained for the plan. But what confidence can a merely nominal connection give? In reality, however, the object is, that the Board should have a control over the Committee at St. Louis. He had several objections to this connection. 1. There was no such relationship between Missions and Church Election, as to require their union. It is said that preaching prepares the way for churches. But if this argument be good, our Board of Education may be dispensed with, for here, also is a relationship existing. Again, 2. The work of Missions and this work are too large to be put together. The report of the Board testifies this. 3. The connection will merely impart a galvanic life for a moment, and not a continued principle of working life. Already this matter has been trifled with long enough, under a similar connection. A subordinate position will never answer to make the plan energetic. Besides, in such a subordinate position it will always be exceedingly difficult to get a prominent and suitable man to be Secretary, and this is the sort of men that it needs—men who will be heard, and will command an influence. We need such a man as our worthy Moderator, whose influence is everywhere felt and respected. If we have not such a man at the head of the scheme, we may as well give it up. It is this, and not the removal of the Committee to St. Louis, that will effect the object. And especially is the removal useless where the Committee is to be controlled at a distance from its own place—controlled in Philadelphia. He did not join in the cry against the brethren in Philadelphia. They had done their work well. But what they needed was not the removal of the place of the Committee, but their organization under a separate head. Let them have this, or else abandon the whole subject for the present. He must also protest against the cry that the East

would protect themselves against being assailed by a set of beggars. They were not beggars in seeking aid from the East, but sought only the advancement of the cause of Christ in that great field of toil and sacrifice.

Dr. Van Rensselaer would make a single explanation. He disclaimed the language that the East never would suffer themselves to be assailed by a set of beggars. He would never use such language respecting his brethren. All he said was, that there must be some system. And this, he believed, all the pastors at the East would say. All he wished was to do something efficient. If a Board was attainable, he would be willing to vote for it. But the great point was to do something. He also corrected the assertion that he was opposed to Boards. It was untrue. Never before, in the nine years of his Secretaryship, had his motives been thus assailed.

Dr. Plumer explained. He had never assailed his brother's motives. He had pronounced him magnanimous. His language was, that he could conceive of no object which could influence the present Boards in opposing this new Board, except it was to gain a wider field for themselves by killing off this. But his personal knowledge of his brother would keep him from attributing such a motive to him. He had the same confidence as ever in him.

We have thus presented our readers with the fullest report our limits would admit, of this interesting debate. It will be perceived that the objections urged against the adoption of the report of the Committee were very various. Some, though only a few, objected to the whole scheme, on the ground that no special effort was demanded; that the work of building churches should be left to the people concerned; that all the Church had to do in the premises, was to send out missionaries. This view is so utterly opposed to the unity of the Church and the brotherhood of Christians, and to the plainest principles of expediency, that it found little or no countenance. Others objected to the report, because, while admitting the importance of the object contemplated, they did not approve of any new organization for its accomplishment. Others, again, preferred a new Board to a Committee, while others were opposed to all Boards.

The objections against Boards, so far as we can gather them from the discussion, are of two kinds. First, those of principle; secondly, those of expediency. As to the former class, it was urged that the Church has no discretionary power, but is tied up to the prescriptions of the Scriptures, not only as to the objects at which she is to aim, but also, as to the means of attaining them; secondly, that the Church cannot delegate her powers; and thirdly, that the centralization of power inseparable from the operation of Boards, is inconsistent with the parity of the clergy. All these objections, as well as those founded on views of expediency, were so fully answered in the course of the discussion, that it is unnecessary to dwell longer on the subject. It may be assumed, that this whole matter is set at rest. The ablest men in the Church, who have ever expressed their disapprobation of Boards, have done their best in argument, and have utterly failed; failed, not from the want of strength, but from the inherent weakness of their cause. Even a giant's arm is unable to give momentum to a feather. Nay, the more vigorous the throw, the less in such a case is the effect. That the Church on the one hand, is not a mere voluntary association, without a divine charter or prescribed constitution, and on the other, that she is not a mummy, incapable of voluntary motion, is, if not self-evident, at least practically admitted. Certain things are prescribed, and certain others are matters of discretion. The Church is required to train, license and ordain ministers; but the way in which this training shall be conducted, is left to her discretion. She is required to take charge of the poor, and of the sick, but how this duty of her deaconship shall be performed is nowhere enjoined. She is commanded to send her ministers to the ends of the earth, but how they are to be sustained, is a matter left to her wisdom. What authority have we from texts of Scripture for the number of our Synods—or for any Synod at all as distinct from a general council? For a long time, no body intervened between our Presbyteries and the Supreme Court of the Church. It became expedient to resolve that Synod into several, and to appoint an Assembly. To deny any discretion to the Church, is to condemn two-thirds of all the prescriptions of our Book. This is so obvious, that we do not

think the reports can have put us into full possession of the sentiments of the brethren who apparently assume this ground. The broad middle ground between license on the one hand, and worse than Judaic bondage and formalism on the other, has been occupied by our Church from the beginning; and we have no fear that she will at this late day be driven from it. As to the Church's having discretionary power, there can be no doubt. The only question is, whether the appointment of Boards falls within the limits of her freedom of action. As to this point, it is enough to remark, that no one has produced a semblance of argument to prove them to be unscriptural, except that they are not prescribed—they are not the Church courts mentioned in Scripture. But this argument, as we have seen, has no force, except in the denial of all discretionary power, or that any body can be created by the Church which is not enjoined in the word of God. The Church in Geneva had no Synod; the Presbyterians in America had for years no Assembly; those of France unite several churches under one session—the churches of a city being under a body composed of ministers and elders. If the principle in question be correct, then there can be no standing committees; no boards of directors, no faculties of learning, appointed by the Church. It is in short, impossible that the principle in question can be carried out; and, therefore, impossible it should be true. The fact is, certain officers have been ordained of God, certain principles of organization and government have been prescribed, certain objects have been set before her, and the Church left to employ these officers, and act under these principles at her discretion. She may combine her officers into many courts, or few; into Committees, Boards, or Faculties, as the necessities of the case demands. On this principle, our own Church and every Church on earth has ever acted.

The principle that the Church cannot delegate her powers, so far as it is true, has no bearing on the question at issue. The Church cannot so delegate her powers as to divest herself of their exercise; she cannot delegate them to any not of her own body, or not subject to her control; she cannot delegate them to those who are by the word of God incapable of exercising them. Thus she cannot delegate her power to ordain or

administer discipline, to the civil magistrate. She cannot delegate any of her functions to Pagans or Musselmans. But does this prove that she may not delegate certain of her executive powers to a portion of her own members? May not a Presbytery appoint a committee of its own body to install a pastor? May not a Synod appoint committees to review the records of Presbyteries? What then is to hinder a Presbytery, Synod, or Assembly, to appoint a number of ministers and elders to conduct the business of missions, education, publication, or church erection? There is nothing in any of these departments of labour which ministers and elders may not lawfully perform, and nothing in the powers delegated which may not lawfully be imparted to them.

A distinction was attempted between a Board and a Committee. A Committee, it was stated, is a body appointed to do a certain work; whereas a Board is a body to appoint a Committee to do the work and to superintend them in their work. But this is a figment. The Boards of Directors of our Theological Seminaries exercise immediately the functions committed to them. And, on the other hand, executive committees (as the Board of Publication, for example) resolve themselves into subordinate committees, and appoint secretaries, treasurers, agents, &c. There is no ground in principle or in fact for this distinction. It is a matter of mere expediency and detail, whether the body appointed be small or large, whether it be called a Committee or a Board. The Church surely is not to be held back or embarrassed in her onward course by such cobwebs as these.

We rejoice in these discussions. They must produce not only unity of views, but harmony of feeling. The evident sincerity of all parties to this debate; the courtesy and candour, as well as the eminent ability which characterized the speeches of Dr. Thornwell, make it evident that there is no element at work in our Church which is likely to disturb its peace or impede its progress.

Death of Dr. Lindsley.

The sessions of the late Assembly were marked by an incident of a very solemn and affecting nature. The venerable

Philip Lindsley, D. D., one of the commissioners, was in his seat at the early meetings of the body, in his ordinary health. One morning it was announced he had been seized with apoplexy, and was in a dying condition. After lingering a few days, he departed this life, on the 25th of May. In early life we enjoyed the instructions of this venerable man, and having ever since been honoured with his friendship, we desire to render our humble tribute to his fidelity, ability, and learning. The Assembly manifested the liveliest sympathy in his sufferings, attended his funeral in a body, and on the motion of the Rev. Dr. Jacobus, adopted the following minute, as expressing their sense of his worth and of his eminent services.

“Dr. Jacobus, from the committee appointed in regard to the death of the Rev. Philip Lindsley, offered the following minute, which was adopted:

“*Whereas*, It has pleased the Great Head of the Church to remove from his seat in this Assembly, our reverend father and beloved co-Presbyter, the Rev. Philip Lindsley, D. D.;

“This Assembly would record with deep emotion, this dealing of Divine Providence toward this body, and pray that it may be blessed to our admonition and spiritual edification. ‘The fathers, where are they, and the prophets—do they live for ever?’

“Our honoured and endeared father died in the midst of his children, in the circle of his early friends and fellow-citizens, and in the arms of his beloved Church. He was called, as he could have wished—in the midst of active labour—found at his post, and faithful to the last. From serving this General Assembly he was transferred, as we trust, to his blessed seat in ‘the General Assembly and Church of the firstborn, whose names are written in heaven.’ The suddenness made it to him only the more of a translation. ‘He walked with God, and he was not, for God took him.’ Full of years and full of labours, the accomplished scholar—the successful Educator—the eminent Professor—the able Ruler—the sound Divine—the beloved Disciple; it was allowed him, according to the willingness which he expressed only a few moments before the fatal stroke, to die here and now, in this city of his early friendships, among his children and brethren in the Lord.

“We were privileged to take sweet counsel here with him; and his fraternal and faithful words, up to the last in this body, leave his memory fresh and fragrant, as is fit. It is the pleasure of this Assembly to attend his mortal remains to the tomb, in confidence of his happy transition and of his glorious resurrection. Like the great patriarch, ‘after he had served his generation by the will of God, he fell asleep.’

“*Resolved*, That this Assembly do tender to the bereaved widow and family of the deceased their Christian sympathies and earnest prayers, and that the Stated Clerk be requested to furnish them with a copy of this action.”

The Assembly was dissolved with the usual formalities, and another appointed to meet in the city of New York, on the third Thursday of May, 1856.

SHORT NOTICES.

1. *Internal Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels.* Part I. Remarks on Christianity and the Gospels, with particular reference to Strauss's Life of Jesus. Part II. Portions of an unfinished work. By Andrews Norton. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1855. pp. 309.
2. *A Translation of the Gospels, with Notes.* By Andrews Norton. Vol. I. The Text. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1855. pp. 443.
3. *A Translation of the Gospels, with Notes.* By Andrews Norton. Vol. II. Notes. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1855. pp. 565.

These volumes are so intimately related as to form one work. The first is an introduction to the translation, of which the notes contained in the third volume are intended as a justification. Professor Norton occupied an eminent position as a scholar and a divine, having no superior in the Unitarian community. He was distinguished not only for his learning and ability, but also for his firm faith in the supernatural origin of Christianity. He believed in miracles; he believed in an immediate revelation from God. He denied the sufficiency of human reason, and held that “the essential value of Christianity consists in its being a miraculous revelation of God,” and