

# The American Presbyterian.

John A. Weir

18 July 67

New Series, Vol. IV, No. 23.

Genesee Evangelist, No. 1098.

PHILADELPHIA, THURSDAY, JUNE 6, 1867.

## American Presbyterian.

THURSDAY, JUNE 9, 1867.

### EDITORIAL NOTES ON THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

Rochester May 26th, 1867.

In discussing the personnel of the Assembly, we may not omit mention of probably the oldest member, and one distinguished by service for the Master no less than by years and grey hairs. I refer to "Father Wisner," as he is familiarly called, now 85 years of age, and yet in possession of all his faculties and able to make an admirable address, and mingle effectively in the discussions of the body. His position many years ago, as pastor of the Church within which the Assembly is now meeting, adds great interest to his presence. Around him are the ample fruits of his faithful labors and of counsels, which more than a whole generation ago, anticipated by their wisdom and liberality the schemes of the present. The members of the Assembly take pleasure in recognizing the claims of an old age so honorable, and "Father Wisner" adds to their claims by the modesty of his bearing through the entire business of the Assembly. His own son, Rev. W. C. Wisner, D. D., of Lockport, Pa., is with him as a member of the body, and by his good sense and pithy, brief speeches, and by his admirable report as Chairman of the Publication Committee, has maintained the family reputation and given fresh proof of his value as a member of our deliberative bodies. His somewhat blunt, but really kind and judicious opposition to the proposal to telegraph our entire special report on Reunion, to Cincinnati, brought down the house.

Among other noticeable names, are Dr. Seward, of Yonkers, who made a handsome speech commendatory of the issues of the Publication Committee, particularly the Tracts and Bowen's Meditations; Dr. Lyon, of Erie, Chairman on Church Polity; W. Henry McGiffert, of Detroit, who pleaded urgently, in the name of his Presbytery, for the recognition of Kolapoor Mission; Dr. Glover, of Jacksonville, who struggled hard to stave off the appeal case against his Synod, and who afterwards managed the defense; Rev. J. H. Towbridge, of Chicago Presbytery, who spoke briefly and to the point, his co-presbyter, Prof. Swing, lately of the other branch, not being heard at all, we believe; Thomas Marshall from the outposts of our Church in Minnesota and the Northwest, who gave in the history of his own church, the best illustration of the admirable workings of church erection in a new country, that was heard on the floor of the General Assembly; Mr. Darrah, of Northern Missouri, a faithful, self-denying Home Missionary, who has fled from bushwhackers more than once, for his life, and who put the legal and common-sense aspect of the appeal case, as it first came before the body, in the most acute and telling shape, by far, of any of the speakers. From Washoe Territory, comes a former President of Liberia, and a well-known Colonization leader, John B. Pinney, L.L.D. Tennessee has four noble representatives on the ground, including an elder of the honored name of Blackburn.

Among the young ministry known to our readers, not already mentioned, are Niles of York, Earle of Catsaugua, and Kimball of Leroy. The colored portion of our Church have no representatives, although the floor of the Assembly has more than once been gladly yielded to the popular brother from Charleston, Rev. E. J. Adams. The Germans are represented by Rev. J. U. Guenther, of Newark. Among the Elders, we should not overlook Hon. John Hill, of New Jersey, who takes the place of the intolerable secessionist, A. J. Rogers, in the present Congress, from that State, nor Frederick Starr Esq., from this city—the first, heard occasionally, and with pleasure, the latter, doubtless under the burden of his recent bereavement, not opening his lips, until the last day of the session. There are two Elders of the name and style of "Hon. Henry W. Williams," both, we believe, Judges; one from Wellsborough Presbytery and one from Pittsburgh. The latter, however, very opportunely, has for one of his *differentia*, the very tangible appendage of L. L. D., which must be admitted by the stoutest opponents of titles, to be useful in this case, at least. The tall and easily distin-

guishable Hon. Peter Odlin, comes from Dayton, Ohio. Among the few Elders inclined to imitate the ministers in their talking propensities, is Royal E. Barber from Chicago Presbytery, who talks well, and is heard with interest. D. W. Ingersoll, of St. Paul's, Minnesota, is also heard frequently and with interest. Though using a crutch, and though of considerable weight, he has made the great journey from his remote home and has well filled his seat in the Assembly, and his place in Committee.

Of titles, we count ten D. D.'s, two L. L. D.'s, four Hon.'s and seven M. D.'s,—not a very liberal amount.

Doubtful whether we shall find space in our columns for any but the regular proceedings, we take this opportunity to speak of some of the meetings held in connection with the Assembly. The Elders held one of their most successful conventions on Friday evening. The large lecture room of the church was thronged, and many stood around doors and passages, and many went away unable to gain admittance. Mr. Ingersoll of St. Paul presided, and Elder Huntington of Rochester, acted as Secretary. The evening passed rapidly away in earnest addresses, prayers and hymns. Stephen Torrey of this State, and Amos Davis, an exceedingly plain but sterling man, from St. Joseph Presbytery, Indiana, gave practical illustrations of the value of a faithful Eldership in Home Missionary efforts. Stirring addresses were also made by William H. Jessup, Esq., Hon. Peter Odlin, of Ohio, and a physician from Central New York, who spoke especially of the great good which faithful, sympathizing Elders could do at the sick-bed. A Committee of five was appointed to nominate a permanent Committee of the Eldership, so as to secure the greatest possible amount of profit from these annual Conferences at the General Assembly.

On Tuesday evening, May 21st, a joint meeting in the interest of Home Missions, Church Erection and Education was held. Judge Williams of Pittsburg was in the chair, and made the opening address; he said wherever our people are we need churches, and wherever we have churches we need an educated ministry. Therefore these three causes go together. Secretary Mills spoke of the regular logical system which pervaded the arrangements of the Presbyterian Church for the work of converting the world. The world is to be saved by preaching; not by rites or ordinances. We therefore need preachers of the gospel. Next follows the Missionary Society to send the preachers abroad. The minister being obtained, he next needs a place to preach. He bespoke the prayers of the Assembly for the raising up of ministers.

Dr. Cuyler, of Brooklyn, spoke in his inimitable way upon church erection. He said there are no classes for whom I would sooner take off my hat than for a wounded soldier and for a Western Missionary. The soldier was willing to make himself a target to the enemy, but he wants his country to give him the musket, the tent and the rations. So the Home Missionaries have a right to ask a house to live in, a house to preach in, and something to keep soul and body together. If he will give himself, it is a small thing for us to give him the church in which he can preach the Gospel.

The speaker congratulated himself that he has built two churches, one in Trenton, and one in Brooklyn, two memorials when the dust of death shall cover me. Home Missions and Church Erection are kindred causes. What God hath joined together let not the General Assembly put asunder. There is the West; as Webster said of Massachusetts, there she is, look at her. And there, where we get our moderator, on the banks of the Mississippi, is probably the site of the future capital of our country, and there, at some future day, the United Presbyterian Church shall meet in one General Assembly, possibly some black moderator shall preside over its deliberations, and some short, fat man, clad from head to foot in furs, shall represent Mr. Seward's newly acquired possessions of Sitka and Alaska.

Other addresses of great interest and power were made by Rev. E. B. Walsworth, of California, Dr. Robinson, of Brooklyn, Rev. H. Johnson, of Pittsburgh, Dr. Nelson the Moderator.

On Wednesday evening there was a meeting of thrilling interest, also, in behalf of

Foreign Missions. T. P. Handy, of Cleveland presided. Dr. Nelson said that he did not believe that the mighty West can be evangelized and saved, unless they take a deep and lively interest in the salvation of all the world. If our Church should withdraw her sympathy and co-operation for the world's salvation, it will shrivel and blight her piety. Those whose hearts go forth for the salvation of all, are those who do most for those around them. Those who sent bread to Ireland were not those who suffered their neighbors to starve. Dr. Cuyler said that the largest giver in his church was a servant girl. The concluding address was made by the venerable Dr. Jonas King of Greece.

A meeting was also held on Friday evening on behalf of the American and Foreign Christian Union.

These meetings were largely attended, were well managed, and may be regarded as a series of highly successful anniversaries of the great causes of Christian beneficence and Church action there represented.

The reception of the Delegates from the Irish and Scottish Churches was one of the great events of the session. It so happened that very few of the bodies with which we are in correspondence had sent their usual delegates. From the Assembly of the other branch we had but a single member, a layman residing in this city; all the others had failed—principal and alternate. From the United Presbyterians we had the well-known Pennsylvania legislator and unyielding friend of the Sabbath, Rev. R. Audley Brown, D.D., who represented his denomination ably and frankly, concealing nothing of its close communion and exclusive character; and many were the conscious nods and winks when our Moderator happily encircled him and his orthodox associates in the arms of a charity which included admission to the communion table; and foretold the time when we should all be "United Presbyterians" together. There was, late in the session, a delegate from the Reformed Dutch Church. Besides these there was not a delegate from a solitary affiliated body outside of New England; and from New England came only two. These unusual omissions, however, left all the more room for the novel and deeply interesting occasions, by which the remoter branches of the great Presbyterian family were first brought into formal relations with our own. We need not dwell upon the addresses, as they are given very fully in another part of the paper. It is beyond question, however, that our Irish brethren made the deepest impression for the fervor and naturalness of their eloquence, and by the close affinity which they, somehow, showed they felt with everything American. There was, we are bound to say, a little feeling of heaviness and inappropriateness, in regard to Mr. Wells' long explanation of Scottish Missionary work, deeply important and encouraging in every respect as that work was universally admitted to be, and ably as he presented it. Why might not the facts have been even more fully stated in a formal lecture, or in some printed form, instead of consuming the precious time of a Church-judiciary, crowded with business of the highest importance, in thus partially setting them forth? So argued some of the brethren; and yet it may be questioned if any more important subject, or one more worthy the attention of the brethren, was presented, than this fervid narrative of the Territorial system of Scottish Church Extension, from the lips of one who spoke from experience, gathered in the footsteps of Thomas Chalmers himself.

But we believe every member of the Assembly, lay and clerical, felt devoutly thankful to these brethren, particularly to Drs. Hall and Fairbairn, for the high ground they took in regard to the support of the ministry, and for the peculiarly forcible and novel manner in which they set forth its claims as a profession to adequate support. The intimate union which they pointed out between the prosperity, not only of the ministry, but also of the Presbyterian Church, and the support given to the ministry, must, we are sure, make a deep and salutary impression upon the churches before whom they appear, as advocates of the most undoubted impartiality. And on the whole, if these men gained new views of the grandeur of our country, and of the work before the churches of America, they certainly proved that the churches in their limited

territory had grasped great ideas of Christian activity and Christian beneficence at least in the Home Department of their work.

It may seem remarkable that the report of the Assembly's special committee on reunion was adopted unanimously and without debate; but when we consider the great liberality of the terms proposed, in which pretty much everything demanded by the principle of toleration is granted, and when we reflect that the action of this Assembly simply places the whole subject before the churches and the Presbyterian public for consideration without action during the coming year, all reason for surprise will disappear. The real ground of surprise is, that terms so liberal should have been agreed to by the O. S. portion of the joint committee; still greater will be the surprise and gratification if a decided majority of the ministry and people of the other branch shall be found giving them their hearty approval.

At all events, the vote for adopting the Special Committee's report approving the doings of the Joint Committee, was unanimous and hearty, though I must say I heard a more emphatic chorus of ayes during my experience at General Assemblies, on critical occasions. After the vote, one or two persons spoke, and a proposition was made to telegraph the entire report to the General Assembly at Cincinnati, particularly in order to correct, or neutralize misapprehensions which had arisen from a misprint in the Reunion Committee's Report, as it appeared in the secular papers. But the proposition was not entertained by the Assembly and was withdrawn by the mover. Up to this writing (Monday,) no word has been received here of the disposition made in Cincinnati, of the Joint Committee's Report.

### THE OLD SCHOOL ASSEMBLY.

We clip from the Press of this city, the following telegraphic report of the proceedings of the Assembly of the Other Branch on the two days when the question of Re-union was under discussion:—

Cincinnati, May 28.

The order of the day being the consideration of the Committee on the Basis of Re-union, Dr. Smith, author of the Minority Report, moved its adoption, and thus got the floor. In a speech of an hour's length, he opposed showing any favor to the Basis of Union adopted by the Joint Committee of the two branches. He was in favor of re-union, but only on a sound and enduring basis. For one, he could never consent to a union on such a basis as this, and he misunderstood the attitude of his brethren if they could do it. Never would the Presbyterian Church consent to abjure all its convictions, and surrender every principle for which our fathers have been contending for thirty years—every principle on which division originally took place. Churches not presbyterially organized are not to be re-organized as Presbyterian churches. Ministers are to be received by presbyteries without examination. New School theological seminaries are not to be under the control of the united Church, and their professors will teach what theology they please. The thousand publications of the Old School Board are to be given into the hands of the New School men to be examined, and all objectionable ones to be thrown out, while only thirty books of the New School board are liable to the same action from the Old School Committee.

Dr. Breckinridge was opposed to both Reports—the union movement could not be put in any shape that would make it acceptable to him. The only way in which he was willing that the New School brethren should come in was through the presbyteries, as he and all others had come. The Constitution of the Church made no provision for receiving ministers and elders in a lump.

Hon. Samuel Galloway, an elder, replied in his inimitable way, showing the difference in the state of things from what they were thirty years ago. The world had progressed, and though Presbyterianism was the same, the men connected with the organization were more liberal and kindly disposed toward each other. He ridiculed the attempt to show any difference in faith or rules of practice between the two Schools, in such a way as to excite general laughter.

He was followed by Rev. Geo. Marshall, D.D., of Upper St. Clair, Pa., in favor of the majority report, sending the clauses down to the churches for discussion and amendment by overtone.

Elder H. K. Clark, of Detroit, the only man on the Joint Committee opposed to the Basis of Union, made a very ineffectual speech adverse to union.

Every manifestation in the body of the Assembly during the discussion was favorable to union.

Cincinnati, May 29.

After the usual devotional exercises the discussion of the reports on the question of re-union was resumed and continued all day. Finally it was brought to a close by a compromise effected between the parties claiming the floor. The proposition was made by Dr. Bredt, of Philadelphia, to Dr. Patterson, of Philadelphia Central Presbytery, that the opponents of re-union should withhold the delivery of their speeches on the subject, if the other side would do the same. This was finally agreed to.

The question then came up on the adoption of the Minority Report, which is in opposition to the Plan of Re-union.

It was moved to lay the motion to adopt on the table. On this the yeas and nays were called and ordered, and the vote resulted—yeas 138, nays 63.

The question was then on the adoption of the Majority Report, retreating the Basis of Re-union to

the churches, and a Joint Committee, for consideration till the next Assembly.

On motion of Dr. Bredt, the last resolution of the Report, requiring the Joint Committee to report to the next Assembly the amendments to the Church constitution, was struck out.

A resolution was offered by Dr. Patterson, instructing the Committee to endeavor to secure a more clear and definite statement of the doctrinal basis on which union shall take place, and another proposing a modification of the second article, so as to insure a thorough and speedy presbyterial organization of all the churches, were laid on the table.

On motion of Dr. Brownson, the following was adopted as additional to the majority report:—

Resolved, That in submitting the Report of the Committee on Re-union to the consideration of the churches, the Assembly is not called upon at this time to express either approbation or disapprobation of the Plan of Re-union presented by the Committee, in its details, but only to afford the Church a full opportunity to examine the subject in the light of all its advantages and difficulties, so that the Committee may have the benefit of any suggestion which may be offered before making a final report for the action of the next Assembly.

On motion, the moderator was authorized to fill the present virtual vacancy in the Joint Committee in the place of Dr. Krebs, which he did by appointing Dr. Rockwell.

The disposition (continues the report,) of the union question gives satisfaction to all—those unfavorable to union regarding Dr. Brownson's resolution as a concession that will enable them to overcome the popular tide in favor of union.

The names of the sixty-three who voted in the majority taken by Synods are as follows: Synod of Albany—Rev. B. H. Richardson, D. D., of the Presbytery of Londonderry.

Synod of Buffalo—Rev. J. Jones and Elder; D. C. McPherson in Presbytery of Genesee; Rev. J. a Cleland in Presbytery of Ogdensburg; and Elder G. Hubbell in Presbytery of Rochester.

Synod of New York—Rev. Y. A. Lewis and H. G. Hinsdale; Rev. D. N. Freeland in Presbytery of Hunsin and Rev. W. Morrison in the Missionary Pres. of Ningpo, China.

Synod of New Jersey—Elder G. H. Van Gelder in Pres. of Burlington; Rev. C. F. Worrell in Pres. of Monmouth; Rev. D. K. Freeman in Pres. of Newton; Rev. J. T. Duffield in Pres. of New Brunswick; Rev. D. Irving in Pres. of Passaic; Rev. J. S. Van Dyke in Pres. of Bergen; and Rev. R. H. Davis in Pres. of West Jersey.

Synod of Philadelphia—Revs. S. McNair and J. D. Smith in Pres. of Donegal; Rev. W. G. Gibson and Elder J. S. Gardner in Pres. of Huntington; Rev. S. A. Gayley in Pres. of New Castle; Elder A. Martien in Pres. of Philadelphia; Rev. R. M. Patterson and Elders J. Harvey and W. Main in Central Philadelphia Pres.; Rev. A. M. Woods in Philadelphia 2nd.

Synod of Baltimore—Rev. J. T. Smith and Elder T. Archer in Pres. of Carlisle; Rev. B. T. Jones in Pres. of Lewes.

Synod of Pittsburgh—none.  
Synod of Alleghany—none.  
Synod of Wheeling—none.  
Synod of Cincinnati—none.

Synod of Ohio—Rev. T. B. Van Eman in Pres. of Wooster.

Synod of Sandusky—Elder H. K. Clark in Pres. of Michigan.

Synod of Indiana—Rev. B. F. Wood and Elder J. Orchard in Pres. of Indianapolis; Elder A. B. McKee in Pres. of Vincennes.

Synod of Northern Indiana—Rev. G. Morrison in Pres. of Crawfordsville; Rev. W. B. Brown and Elder B. C. Marquis in Pres. of Fort Wayne.

Synod of Illinois—Rev. A. J. Clark and Elder C. Wakefield in Pres. of Bloomington; Rev. W. E. McLaren and Elder E. D. Rice in Pres. of Peoria.

Synod of Chicago—Rev. W. W. Moorehead in Pres. of Bureau; Elder C. A. Spring in Pres. of Chicago.

Synod of Wisconsin—Elder D. H. Tullis in Pres. of Danco; Rev. F. D. Young in Pres. of Milwaukee.

Synod of St. Paul—Elder J. D. Pollock, in Pres. of St. Paul.

Synod of Iowa—none.  
Synod of Southern Iowa—Rev. W. C. Craig, and Elder J. B. Pease, in Pres. of Iowa, Rev. J. W. Clark, in Pres. of Missouri River.

Synod of Kansas—Rev. Rev. G. Hickman, in Pres. of Highland.

Synod of Missouri—Rev. T. C. Barrett, in Pres. of Potosi, Rev. S. J. Nichols and Elder E. A. More, in Pres. of St. Louis.

Synod of Mississippi—none.  
Synod of Nashville—Rev. A. Vance in Pres. of Holston.

Synod of Kentucky—Rev. J. P. Hendricks in Pres. of Ebenezer, Rev. W. C. Matthews in Pres. of Loosville, Rev. J. Hawthorn in Pres. of Paducah, Rev. J. Matthews and Elder O. Beatty and Rev. R. J. Breckenridge and Elder H. Allen in Pres. of W. Lexington.

Synod of North Carolina—Rev. J. C. Stewart in Pres. of Concord.

The Synods of Pacific and Northern India were not represented in the Assembly.

N. B.—Dr. SAUNDERS, one of the Commissioners to the General Assembly at Cincinnati, informs us that when the final vote was taken not more than four or five voices were heard in the negative; of course Dr. Breckinridge's was one of them. We have seen by the Cincinnati papers, that our friend, Dr. Saunders, advocates increased domestic missionary operations from Alaska to Mexico, commensurate with other great movements of the time.

REV. JOHN CROWELL has received and accepted a unanimous call to the pastoral charge of the Church of Odessa. We congratulate the people of that long vacant charge on their choice, and cannot doubt under the care of so judicious, experienced, and able a pastor, they will, with the divine blessing, enter upon a career of great prosperity.

THE STATE Sabbath School Convention which met in this city last week, numbered over 700 Delegates and was a working body. \$2,500 was pledged for the expenses, and it was resolved to provide for a National Convention in 1869. The next State Convention meets in Pittsburg.