

American Presbyterian.

THURSDAY, JUNE 11, 1868.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

[CONTINUED FROM INSIDE.]

so justly eulogized here by our venerable father and brother, Dr. Skinner, the Old School majority adopted the following resolution respecting those doctrinal statements:

Resolved, That duly certified copies of this paper be sent to the respective Presbyteries to which the signers of the protest belong, calling their attention to developments of theological views contained in it, and enjoining on them to inquire into the soundness of the faith of those who have ventured to make so strange avowals as some of these are."

I have not heard that any of our Presbyteries ever called the protestors to account in obedience to the injunctions of this resolution. Perhaps it might be well for this Assembly to inquire into the matter, seeing all the unrepented acts of the Old School majorities have now been discovered to be laws of our Church.

I will only add in this connection that the well known doctrine of our Church on the right of examination, or the principle involved in this alleged right, was declared by our Assembly in 1840, as follows: (Digest, p. 134-4.) "Our Constitution requires that no member of the Presbyterian Church shall be thus disfranchised without a regular trial and conviction" &c. I am aware that some of our Presbyteries have been tempted to save themselves trouble by refusing to receive ministers having valid letters from co-ordinate Presbyteries. But I have yet to learn that the occasional breach of a law, proves that the law does not exist—or that it has been any real necessity for such innovation in the system. I have had a pastoral experience of twenty-six years in the West, and have never yet found our constitution insufficient for the protection of a Presbytery.

I have, Mr. Moderator, said this much, on this question, not because I expect to change the minds of brethren here present, but because I wish to be on record as protesting against what I deem a false and injurious principle, and because I do not wish to be understood as standing where I do on this subject without some show of rational conviction. If I am to be a Presbyterian, I must be such on principle and in consistency with the essential principles of the system. If I were a Congregationalist I would try to be self-consistent on that ground.

Now, Mr. Moderator, it only remains that I should say a few words in conclusion. I said two days ago that I could vote to approve the report before us, with the exception of the 10th article. Subsequent events have revived my solicitude respecting the question, What sort of ecclesiastical administration are we to have if the re-union shall be effected? I do not forget the monstrous assumptions of 1837 that were reaffirmed by the other Assembly two years ago at St. Louis. I have been reminded, too, of the spirit that so needlessly drove out the fathers of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, and that revealed itself in the domination of an overbearing majority backed by metropolitan wealth and combinations in 1837 and 1838. All that is past I can freely forgive. But having no jealousy of particular men, I confess I distrust human nature under temptation, and armed with the power of a system containing few checks and balances; and many a question has been suggested which it would be agreeable to be able to repress and banish from thought; but unwelcome reflections have their uses. It may be that not a few are asking, Is it so that by some mysterious contagion, an approximation to re-union has diffused among us the same spirit that has elsewhere so often trodden with iron hoof upon feeble minorities? Or is there some vice in our system that makes prosperity peculiarly dangerous, and opens the door for a terrible centralization of power in the hands of a few? Or is there some hidden virus in the very doctrine of organic union, in the broad view of it, that is now advocated among Christian people, to the disparagement of primitive simplicity, and the revival among Churches, as well as individuals, of the old question, who shall be the greatest in the kingdom? You may crucify these reflections, and bury them now, but I tell you they will rise again after three days.

Shall I speak as a fool when I say that we who have dared to express some dissent from the judgment of the great majority of our brethren, as to the particular plan of union now before us, have tried to do something in a feeble way for the love of our Zion, and have made many and painful sacrifices for the defence of her interests in days when one man could turn the scale in favor of the continued existence of our dear Church in a vast section of the country? Does any one know where originated the movement for the readjustment of our Home Missionary policy, that has, in a few years, carried up our annual contributions to this cause, from \$31,000 to \$130,000 or \$150,000, and that has been life from the dead to our denomination, in spite of all the powers that were encountered by the early advocates of the new policy? Has it been suspected whence came the scheme for a broader and more generous policy in our Church Extension enterprise, by which an annual loan and donation of \$5,000 or \$4,000 a year has given way for the donation and distribution of \$40,000? Are not the head, the heart, and the unconquered members all needful in the body? And is it well for us to boast ourselves against the members, as if there could be no sincerity or true devotion to Christ and His kingdom, but in one definite line of conviction and action?

Mr. Moderator, I shall ask to be excused from voting on the question before us; not because I do not desire true Christian union, but because I am unable to say that I approve of the present Plan of Union. I know not why we cannot all love one another while profoundly penetrated by differing convictions. If confidence be the great duty of the hour, let it be extended in all directions, and let the weaker share in its benefits with the stronger; and let us all be ashamed if on confidence in Almighty God is not controlling enough and settled enough to keep us calm while the waters are troubled and some heavy shadows still linger on the bosom of the deep.

Rev. William T. Eva said he was proud to belong to a Presbytery at the head of which stood one whose name was glorious in the annals of the Church—Albert Barnes. He had come here only because Mr. Barnes had not been able to come. He agreed with Dr. Skinner as to the position of our Church on doctrine and the importance of Re-union. The whole question had now been discussed and every delegate present was ready to vote. He believed in union and desired it with all his heart. It would come sometime, because the hand of God was in it. The report of the Joint Committee was a noble document. He was sorry that Dr. Patterson had not been excused from voting on the question. He would suggest an amendment to the report of the special committee which would allow Dr. Patterson and those who agreed with him, to vote against the tenth article and yet not vote against the report as a whole. His amendment should be in the form of an additional resolution, to come after the resolution reported by the committee, as follows:

Resolved, That the vote be taken by yeas and nays, so that any person who may desire to do so may have the privilege of expressing his dissent from any one article of the terms of union; and that said dissent shall be entered as part of the record in the

minutes of the General Assembly, and that afterwards, the object being to secure unanimity, the vote to be taken on the question as a whole, *in voce*. He did not wonder that there was a want of confidence after the announcement made on Wednesday in regard to an Old School member of the Joint Committee.

Rev. Dr. Prentiss proceeded to speak on the general issue. Elder J. L. Ketchum, of Indianapolis, said he should be obliged to call the gentleman to order if he did not confine himself to the question before the Assembly, which was the resolution presented by Mr. Eva.

Dr. Prentiss continued in answer to some of the arguments of Dr. Patterson. A delegate again called him to order, as not confining himself to the question.

Dr. Prentiss continued: I move as an amendment to the amendment offered by Mr. Eva, that after the vote is taken any member of this Assembly who chooses to do so may sign a statement to this effect and that it be put on the record:

The undersigned members of the General Assembly sincerely desirous of securing the adoption of the report now before us as nearly unanimously as possible, respectfully ask that this statement be entered upon the records of this Assembly:

"1st. That by article 10 it is required to concede for the future a right which some do not believe has heretofore existed.

"2d. That some of us sincerely believe that no such right ought to be demanded, but that we make this concession as a sacrifice of our own views and preferences to the sacred and precious cause of Presbyterian union."

It seems to me that this covers the whole case; that it meets the views of every brother of this Assembly who dissents from the provision that any Presbytery may examine. Some think that there is no such right. They are willing to acknowledge the right only as a concession. Some believe that it ought not to be demanded. But we make it as a sacrifice to the sacred and precious cause of Presbyterian union. Now, sir, it seems to me that the Assembly should deem it proper to allow such a statement. It is not a protest. It is a frank statement of a concession. If the Assembly would allow such a simple, unvarnished statement to go on the record, signed by the parties, it seems to me that it would be adapted to secure that object.

Dr. Nelson asked if any names had already been signed to that document?

Dr. Prentiss replied that there were a number to whom it would be satisfactory. There were more, he thought, whom he had not the honor to consult. Among the signers were Drs. Nelson and Stillman, Mr. Lambert, Mr. Thatcher, Elder Yurann, Rev. Charles H. Marshall and E. Morris.

Rev. W. A. McCorkle, of Detroit, said that if this paper were adopted the Assembly would tie itself up and concede that for the future article 10 should be the rule of the Church. If that were the intent, he could not vote for it. If the Assembly would give him brother Eva's resolution he should most heartily vote for the basis after taking the vote as required in that resolution.

[The hour of twelve having arrived, there were cries of "Question! Question!"]

Rev. Mr. Eva said he could not vote for the amendment to the amendment, because it, in express terms, conceded the right which he did not believe existed. The effect would be to tie up the united Church to this practical point. The amendment which he proposed obviated both these difficulties.

Rev. Geo. Duffield, Jr., said he believed that Dr. Prentiss, in offering his resolution, was truly actuated by a desire to secure harmony and unanimity, if possible. If he would allow those who could not concede that right, except in the united Church if it saw fit to declare it, who felt that they must go back to their Presbyteries and there settle the question untrammelled—if he would allow them to vote under Mr. Eva's resolution, they would be satisfied.

Elder Elisha Taylor, of Detroit, moved to suspend the orders for the purpose of taking up a proposition to vote upon the tenth article alone. Agreed to. Mr. Taylor then moved that when the Assembly proceeded to vote on the Basis of Union that they first vote upon the tenth article by yeas and nays, and then upon the basis as a whole.

Rev. C. F. Macey, of Batavia, N. Y., moved to amend by substituting Mr. Eva's resolution.

Mr. Taylor accepted the amendment.

Hon. William E. Dodge asked the gentleman, as a lawyer, if this would not be entering on the record the Assembly's disapproval in advance? Would not the final action have the same effect as voting *aye* on a question on which many had perhaps before voted *no*?

Mr. Taylor explained that it was possible that he, as a legislator, would like the general effect of a law and should be anxious to vote for it. But he might see reason to object to a particular section. Yet, as he was in favor of the bill as a whole, he should only desire to record his vote against that particular section and on its final passage, vote for the bill as a whole.

Mr. Dodge asked if he understood the gentleman to mean that he committed himself for the sake of union, and virtually said—Gentlemen, you have heard my objection, and understanding my objection to the tenth article, I do vote *aye* on the final report?

Voices: Of course.

Mr. Taylor said that Mr. Dodge's vote and his had nothing to do with the adoption of this report. At home there was a feeling against this tenth article. Hence he wished a full expression of dissent therefrom. But as an elder and member of this Church, he thought the article was right, and he should vote for it. [Applause.] He hoped that every Presbyter would be brought to vote for it.

Rev. Dr. Prentiss proposed another solution of this question. Before proceeding to vote, let the roll be called, and when every member have the privilege of expressing his dissent from any article.

Rev. W. A. McCorkle, of Detroit, said they were not going to take any rule of proceeding from Congress in this Assembly. If they were not to be free here he did not want to vote. He was not clear that when this came up in the Presbytery he should vote against this article. But he could not vote for it now. He was, however, not afraid of the Basis of Union. He was not afraid of Dr. Hodge, or of any of his Old School brethren. But he did not want to be asked to vote for a thing as true, when he did not believe it was true.

Dr. Prentiss asked if he was willing to vote for the Basis in this form: "Aye, notwithstanding my objection to the tenth article?"

Mr. McCorkle replied that Mr. Eva's resolution suited him better. He was not sure that the Presbyteries would adopt this basis. [Voices: "O yes!"] He was not at all sure. He could not himself vote for it; yet he did want to send it down to the Presbyteries. He did not wish to vote in such a way as would look as if he were against re-union.

Rev. Alexander Porter, of Iowa, asked what would be the effect of the vote against this amendment? Would it vitiate the whole vote?

The hour of half-past twelve having arrived, the hour of adjournment was postponed until one o'clock.

Rev. John De Witt, of Irvington, N. Y., said that the communion of the Lord's Supper would be celebrated at three o'clock. He thought this vexed question should be settled before uniting in commemorating this last supper of the Lord with his disciples. If this could not be done before the adjournment of the morning session, he should make a motion to postpone the communion services.

After some further discussion, Rev. Joseph D. Krum, of Seneca Falls, N. Y., said there was a way to stop this unnecessary debate, and that was by calling the previous question.

Rev. A. Porter continued with his remarks. He was in favor of the whole report.

Mr. Krum then called the previous question. Mr. Eva's resolution was then adopted, with modifications as suggested by Dr. Butler.

Elder William C. Foote, of Yonkers, N. Y., suggested that before proceeding to vote on the question now before the Assembly, the Throne of God might be implored for guidance. The Assembly adopted the suggestion and Mr. Foote offered a most impressive prayer.

Adoption of Joint Committee's Report. The roll was then called on the tenth article, there being 243 names on the roll.

Hon. Frederick H. Hastings, of Albany; Rev. Wm. With of Lancaster, N. Y.; Rev. Thomas Ralston Smith, D.D. of N. Y. City; Rev. Wm. T. Eva, of Philadelphia; Elder Samuel T. Bodine, of Philadelphia; Rev. Joseph Vance, of Erie; Rev. Frederick A. Noble, of Pittsburgh; Rev. Wm. A. McCorkle, of Detroit; Rev. Ira M. Weed, of Washtenaw, Mich.; Elder Daniel B. Green, of Washtenaw; Hon. Hiram L. Miller, of Saginaw, Mich.; Rev. Charles S. Adams, of Coldwater, Mich.; Elder Eli K. Miller, of Richland, Mich.; Rev. C. Solon Armstrong, of Lansing, Mich.; Rev. Henry B. Eldred, of Kinsman, Ohio; Rev. Warren Taylor, of Athens, Ohio; Rev. David E. Beach, of Granville, Ohio; Rev. Edward D. Morris, D.D., Walnut Hills, Ohio; Rev. A. Alexander Jimerson, of Hanging Rock, Ohio; Elder Matthew Newkirk, of Ohio; Elder Wm. H. Moore, of Cincinnati; Rev. Evan L. Davies, of Hamilton, Ohio; Rev. Charles H. Marshall, of Indianapolis; Rev. H. L. Little, of Bowling Green, Ind.; Rev. John B. Fowler, of Elkhart, Ind.; Elder Daniel S. Beaver, of Fort Wayne, Ind.; Rev. Geo. Duffield, Jr., of Galesburg, Ill.; Rev. George M. Jenks, of Apple River, Ill.; Rev. Robert W. Patterson, D.D., and Rev. Arthur Swazey, of Chicago; Rev. Henry A. Nelson, D.D. of St. Louis; Rev. Timothy Hill, of Kansas City, Mo.; Rev. John M. Brown, of Osage, Mo.; Elder John De Cune, of St. Joseph, Mo.; Elder Jason Yurann, of Kansas; Rev. Thomas Brown, of Kingston, Tenn.; and Elder Merrill N. Hutchinson, of New York—37, dissented from the tenth article.

Eli R. Miller, of Richland, Mich.; Rev. Henry A. Nelson, D.D. of St. Louis; Rev. Timothy Hill, of Kansas City, and Elder Jason Yurann, of Kansas—4—dissented from the second article also.

At one o'clock the Assembly proceeded to vote upon the report of the special committee approving the basis of union as reported by the Joint Committee.

Rev. Dr. R. W. Patterson, of Chicago; Elder Richard Edwards, of Pittsburgh; Rev. J. Ambrose Wight, of Bay City, Michigan; and Rev. Arthur Swazey, of Chicago, asked to be excused from voting on the adoption of the report as a whole. Granted.

The whole basis of union was then approved by a unanimous *in voce* vote, the delegates rising to their feet, singing:

"Praise God from whom all blessings flow."

Rev. Dr. E. B. Smith, of New York, moved that this action be communicated to the Old School Assembly at Albany by telegraph. Agreed to.

Hon. Wm. E. Dodge, offered the following: Resolved, 1. That the thanks of the General Assembly are due and are hereby tendered to the Directors of the Pennsylvania Central, Northern Central, and Hanover Branch and Gettysburg Railroads, through Samuel T. Bodine, Esq., one of the Directors of the Pennsylvania Central Railroad, and a member of this Body, for their signal generosity in placing at our disposal, without charge, their lines of railway, for the excursion to Gettysburg battle-ground.

2. That we hereby express our thankful acknowledgments to J. N. DeBerry, Esq., Superintendent of the Northern Central Railroad, for the accommodations of travel, by means of which our comfort and safety were secured.

3. That we beg to assure the good citizens of Gettysburg that we shall ever gratefully remember their bountiful entertainment, and the generous hospitality of those who provided it.

4. That we hereby express to His Excellency, John W. Geary, Governor of Pennsylvania, our grateful appreciation of his kindness in accompanying us, and the pleasure we had in hearing his graphic narrative of the conflict in which he bore a part, so eminent and honorable.

5. That we hereby record on the minutes of the Assembly our gratitude to our Heavenly Father, that in his care of us during the journey was such that no one event occurred to mar the pleasure afforded by the excursion.

6. That in view of all which, yesterday, we saw and heard, it is both our duty and privilege ever to render devout thanksgiving to Almighty God, who inspired our soldiers with valor and imbued their leaders with wisdom so discerning, and crowned their arms with such signal triumph in that crisis of the war, when the life of the Government seemed dependent on the result of the battle of Gettysburg.

The resolutions were unanimously adopted. The Assembly then, at half-past one o'clock, adjourned until three o'clock.

FRIDAY AFTERNOON, MAY 29. After the commemoration of the Lord's Supper. The report of the Standing Committee on Church Extension was read by Rev. A. Swazey and docketed. The Committee on Mileage made a very favorable report. They had received over \$8,000 and had paid all bills of delegates in full, except those from California, which were referred to a special Committee.

Rev. Leon Pilatte, of Paris, a delegate from the World's Evangelical Alliance, was introduced and addressed the Assembly briefly.

Rev. Dr. Nelson offered a resolution providing for the appointment of a committee of three to nominate a committee of five to act in conjunction with a similar Committee of the Old School Assembly, if such be appointed, in re-arranging the boundaries between the various Synods under the terms of re-union, which was adopted. The committee will be announced to-day.

The Committee on Devotional Exercises reported appointments for the following Sabbath.

In the evening a delightful reception and entertainment, prepared by the ladies of the First Church, was held at the Governor's mansion.

SATURDAY MORNING, MAY 30. Rev. T. J. Duryea, D.D., led the usual morning hour's devotional exercises. Rev. Dr. A. Wood, of Geneva, spoke in feeling and eloquent terms of the martyred dead on whose graves the chaplets and memorial offerings of loyal hearts were about to be laid. Rev. George Duffield, Jr., led in a most earnest prayer given our soldiers courage and strength to conquer for right, and justice, and for human liberty.

At half-past nine resumed business. The Moderator announced Rev. Dr. H. A. Nelson, Rev. Dr. J. G. Butler, and Hon. Wm. E. Dodge, as a Committee of three to nominate a Committee of five to act in conjunction with a similar Committee of the Old School Assembly, if such should be appointed, for the readjustment of the boundaries of Synods and Presbyteries under the terms of re-union.

The General Assembly had received a communication to the Moderator which should have been read yesterday, and which was as follows:

Rev. Dr. J. F. Stearns, Dear Sir: By virtue of a resolution passed at a meeting of the "Grand Army of the Republic" of this city, a cordial invitation is extended through you to the Rev. Gentlemen of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States to participate in the decoration of the graves of deceased soldiers and sailors on the 30th inst.

It is earnestly desired that you meet with us and

assist by your presence in the prosecution of this work.

Yours with respect, JAC. MEESE, Post Adjutant.

Rev. Huntington Lyman, of Marathon, New York, then offered the following: The General Assembly now in session at Harrisburg accept the invitation extended to them to participate in the honors this day to be paid to our brave defenders and heroes, and to the blessing of Him in whom dwells so much fullness that He can repair the losses so apparently irreparable; and that a Committee of four be appointed to represent us on that occasion.

The proposition was adopted. The Moderator appointed on the said Committee the Rev. J. T. Duryea, D.D., of Brooklyn, N. Y., Rev. Samuel W. Fisher, D. D., of Utica, N. Y., Rev. W. A. McCorkle, of Detroit, Hon. Wm. E. Dodge, of New York.

Bills and Overtures. Rev. Dr. H. B. Smith, of New York, from the Committee on Bills and Overtures, presented a paper in reference to the Lyons Female College of Iowa, with the resolution of the Committee recommending the said College to all the friends of education and religion. Adopted.

Also, a communication to the Assembly from a Convention recently held in Pittsburgh, having for its object opposition to secret societies and the support of the temperance cause, transmitting the credentials of the Rev. Dr. John Marsh, of Brooklyn, as a delegate to the General Assembly. The Committee recommended that Dr. Marsh be heard in behalf of the Convention. Adopted.

Also, a memorial from the Union Presbytery of Tennessee, asking the sympathy and co-operation of the General Assembly for Maryville College, in that State. This institution had been tried and found faithful in the midst of the divisions and calamities of the years of conflict just passed. It had been established for fifty years and had sent forth one hundred and twenty ministers. The Committee recommended the college to liberal aid. Adopted.

Memorial to Congress. Rev. Frederick A. Noble, of Pittsburgh, Chairman of the Special Committee to whom was referred the duty of preparing a memorial to Congress on the subject of the application of the criminal laws of the United States to the Indians within our States and Territories, and the appointment and support of officers to enforce such laws at all settlements and forts where the Indians come in contact with the white population, reported a memorial in substance, as follows, which is to be signed by the Moderator and the Stated Clerk of the Assembly, and forwarded through the hands of Rev. Dr. Williamson, to the Committee on Indian Affairs in the United States Senate and House of Representatives:

It sets forth the impossibility of justice being done to criminals or procured by injured persons within the bounds of the jurisdiction of Indian Chiefs, and suggests the following remedies for this state of things: (1) The subjecting of the Indians to the criminal laws of the United States and of the States or Territories. (2) The placing of the particular reservation in suitable places among the Indian population. The reasons assigned for this proposed action are: (1) The inherent justice and scripturalness of the measure. (2) Its accordance with the equality of all men before the law. (3) Its tendency to prevent wars and remove temptations to corruption. (4) It will facilitate the spread of the Gospel (5) and their civilization. It concludes by speaking emphatically of our failure hitherto to act on high principles in our treatment of this people. The report was adopted.

Place of Next Meeting. Hon. Wm. E. Dodge invited the Assembly to come to New York and occupy the church of the Covenant, over which the Rev. Dr. Prentiss presides as pastor.

Rev. Charles C. Wallace, of the Presbytery of Sierra Nevada, invited the Assembly to meet, in San Francisco, California.

Mr. Dodge suggested that it would be appropriate to wait till the completion of the Pacific Railroad before taking into consideration the invitation of Mr. Wallace. The review of the past year gives ample occasion for fervent thanksgiving, and at the same time for deep sorrow that the Permanent Committee have not been able to secure the men and money necessary adequately to occupy the fields that are so rapidly opening. The main interest of the report turns upon the work among the Freedmen. The Standing Committee recommended that the Permanent Committee be authorized to employ an assistant Secretary—a layman being suggested—for this work. Special collections are also recommended for this object. Allusion is made to the state of Dr. Kendall's health, impaired by his intense application to the arduous duties of his office, and requiring a respite which he is now enjoying. Dr. Hatfield ably discharges his duties as Corresponding Secretary in his absence. They recommend that the Assembly approve the action of the Permanent Committee, in thus relieving Secretary Kendall, that they offer fervent prayer to God for the blessing that has attended the Secretary's important labors during the last seven years, and fervently pray that God will be with him and keep him in health wherever he goes, and will bring him again to his land. The terms of service of Rev. Drs. Prentiss, Hastings, and Ralston Smith, and Messrs. Lane and Alkman having expired, they recommended that the Assembly be asked to re-appoint them. They have been made vacant by resignation, they recommended that Rev. Edward W. French, and Rev. John DeWitt, be appointed to fill their unexpired terms.

Rev. F. A. Noble, of Pittsburgh, spoke at length in support of the Report—particularly that part relating to the Freedmen of the South. He referred first to the greatness of the field, and to its openness to this Church especially, which he was told by Southern men was the only one which could go freely among those people. He expressed the disappointment felt by many at the failure of this body to enter upon the work as inconsistent with its record. He compared the two churches of freedmen under the control of this body to the sixty which were under the care of the other Branch, whose record on this subject was too well known to be recalled now.

Mr. E. A. Lambert, of Brooklyn, warmly supported the report. Forty-eight churches, with a membership of 20,577, during the past year gave \$68,505 55 to this cause, being \$3 38 per member. One thousand five hundred and seventy-six other churches, with a membership of 140,982, had given only \$62,736 14, being only thirty-seven cents per member. Why this disparity? Seventy-six churches which contributed over \$8,000 for the year ending May, 1867, had not contributed a cent during the past year. The amount of contributions per member was one cent and six mills a week. Only one cent contributed every day by each member would amount in one year to \$600,000, or two-fifths more than was raised for all benevolent objects combined in 1867. The receipts over 1867 were \$5,780 53. The increase of contributions from churches was \$6,091 09. Increase from laequees, \$399 94. The amount contributed by Sabbath-schools was \$7,761 71, being an increase of \$8,721 94.

Rev. J. H. Walker, of Neena, Wisconsin, favored the part of the report which refers to the Freedmen.

There should be no more of the church's money squandered on agents that were not directly responsible to the church. Men and money were needed for the home missionary work. One reason why so few young men now entered the seminaries for the ministry was that ministers, especially missionaries, were poorly paid. They preferred serving the Lord as laymen, without subjecting themselves to the poverty of the ministry. Dr. Guthrie in a letter to the Free Church of Scotland had taken this view of the matter. He had said (quoting from Matthew Henry) that "a scandalous maintenance would make a scandalous ministry," and had added that "poverty in the manse would bring poverty in the pulpit."

Rev. J. M. Brown, of Missouri, said that in his Presbytery here were thirteen churches in a population of fifteen thousand scattered over an area of one hundred miles, in which there was not a mile of railroad.

Addresses were also made by Rev. Mr. Sheldon, of Kansas, and Rev. John Rankin of Cincinnati.

Delegate from the Lutheran Synod. The orders were suspended to receive the Rev. G. F. Stelling, corresponding delegate from the Lutheran National Synod, who said:

Mr. Moderator and Christian Brethren: I come here fresh from the meeting of the General Synod of the Lutheran Church in the United States. At this meeting, which closed its sessions a few days ago in this city, I was honored with the commission of bearing to you its fraternal greetings. I could not have been chosen to discharge a more pleasing duty. And I perform it the more cheerfully to-day, for the reason that we were ourselves greeted by your own representative, who, in words most befitting, extended to us your heartfelt and Christian sympathies. Indeed, from the spirit of that delegate, and from the spirit of the opening discourse of your ex-moderator, and from the spirit of every prayer and address made in your hearing during the sessions of this Assembly, I am driven to conclude that old and exclusive, and bigoted must be the hearts that cannot fraternize and fellowship with you. Discarding the narrow dogma that the Lutheran Church is the Church, we recognize all other denominations of evangelical people as sister denominations, who, though distinct from us, are yet parts of that one true Church which our blessed Lord redeemed with His own precious blood. In the name of that General Synod, therefore, I greet you as brethren beloved in Christ, and express to you for its members and friends, its reciprocal regard and affection. Perhaps the largest and the happiest Lutheran Convention that ever assembled upon this continent, was that of which I have just spoken. We came together in peace—we transacted our work in peace—we parted in peace. To you this latter remark might appear strange. But had you felt, as did we, the fatigue of years of unhappy conflict, you would be able to understand it well. God forbid that I should add to your already too unpleasant tale of our family broils. I simply desire to state that the General Synod has at length been liberated from her last enemies. "They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would not doubt have continued with us; but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us." Within this same organized body there was one end with two opposite methods. Hence has come this division of Lutherans has been added to the several grand divisions that already existed in this country. Having thus failed to decide this controversy by the facts of history, by the logic of debate, by teachings of the Holy Scriptures even, the General Synod henceforth intends that these two methods shall establish their claims to true Lutheranism by their own respective practical working. The end we seek to accomplish is, the glory of God in the salvation of the world. Our President, upon taking the chair expressed this will when he said: "We have arrived at that period in the history of the Church, when it is definitely settled what we are to believe, and we can now turn our whole attention to this principal question: What is best adapted to the upholding of the Redeemer's kingdom?" The question is not now: What do we believe? Do we hold to the Augsburg Confession of Faith? but it is: How shall we best fulfill our mission as ministers of Christ? From this time forward, therefore, Mr. Moderator, we mean more diligently to do the work which the Great Master has assigned to us. We intend, as did the youthful Jesus, to go about our "Father's business." We are willing to have our method tried by what it can do for the kingdom of heaven. And I think I utter the sentiment of every friend of the General synod, when I say that, so far as we are concerned, we will fight it out on that line; if it takes us until the Millennium.

But now, whilst these separating tendencies have been going on in the Lutheran Church, it affords us pleasure to know that uniting tendencies are going on in the Presbyterian Church. And since ours have finally ended in disruption, we pray that yours may ultimately terminate in union. When bodies cannot agree, it occurs to us they had better remain apart, when bodies may agree, they ought to come together. We have heard that some of our large minorities in the Synod are now in negotiation have declared, through their Joint Committee, that there is no longer any occasion for disagreement, and as a natural consequence, no longer any occasion for separation. Besides this declaration, there has gone up toward heaven, both from Harrisburg and from Albany, at the identical hour of the day, the voice of prayer—a voice formed by the blending of hundreds of voices—that He, who by His sacrifice broke down the middle wall of partition between Jew and Gentile; that He, who by His blood tore away the veil between God and man, will also remove whatever barriers may yet lift themselves up between you, and permit you at last to dwell together in one common fold. * * * Mr. Moderator, you will please excuse me. If I am troubled with union on the brain, then there are many of you that are afflicted with the same dilemma! Who knows what might not be the result of a coalition on the part of the Old and New School Assemblies? During our late political troubles many opposed the secession of the States on the ground that if that right were conceded to one it would necessarily concede it to all the rest. In such an event, the bond that held the States together would be but a rope of sand, since secession might go on to the breaking up of the entire government. Might not the same kind of an argument be used here, only in the opposite direction? The union of the Presbyterian Church might inaugurate the union of other Churches. May be the different families of the Methodists would catch the spirit; may be the Baptists would. May be that even we Lutherans, after a much shorter experience than thirty years, would follow the example, and forgetting differences that are merely non-essential, embrace each other once more as brothers of the same household of faith! Who knows whether this process would then stop even here? Might not still grander divisions of the Lord's hosts, now passing under different names, see clearly enough to lay aside distinctive and assume common denominations, thus breaking in upon the boundary of sect itself? The indications are that the enemies of an evangelical Christianity are training and mustering their forces for another determined onset upon the Church of Jesus Christ. The victories of the cross have not been peaceful hints; we can scarcely expect that its final victory will be. Perhaps since anti-Christ is concentrating, Christ may be going to concentrate. By having the organization of the Church simplified, the power of the Church may be magnified; and by having the power of the church magnified, the ultimate triumphs of the Church may be gloriously won. Let us, therefore, take unto ourselves the whole armor of God, that we may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand. May God bless you, my dear brethren, and crown your present deliberations with the fruits of abundant success. I am authorized to express the hope that the ecclesiastical correspondence between your Assembly and our General Synod will be continued. We shall be happy, sir, to hail a delegate at our next convention to be held in Cincinnati, in May, 1869.

The Moderator said: Allow me to express to you the deep interest which I know this Assembly have felt in the statements which you have made to us in regard to your honored Church; that we recognize and reciprocate the expressions of fraternal kindness and sympathy with the work before us, which you have been pleased to present. If you and I represent two