THE PRESBYTERIAN.

VOL. VI.....No. 1. } PHILADELPHIA, THURSDAY, JANUARY 7, 1836. {WHOLE No. 256.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY MORNING BY
WILLIAM S. MARTIEN,
No. 9 GEORGE STREET.
[*George street runs from Sixth to Seventh, between Chestnut and Walnut, opposite Independence Square.*]

TERMS—$2 50 if paid in advance; or
$3 00 payable within six months.

A liberal discount to Agents who become responsible:

No subscription received for a less term than *one year*. All subscribers who do not give express notice to the contrary, before the expiration of their respective years, will be considered as wishing to continue their subscription, and the paper will be sent to them accordingly. No paper discontinued until all arrearages are paid, except at the discretion of the publisher.

Notices of removals, orders for discontinuance, and Communications must be post paid. Small Notes of solvent Banks received in payment at par from distant subscribers.

Rates of Advertising.—For 15 lines, first insertion 50 cents; each repetition of do. 25 cents. Payment for advertisements to be made in advance.

Reported for the New York Observer.

SYNOD OF PHILADELPHIA.

CASE OF REV. ALBERT BARNES, CONTINUED.

After a recess, Synod met and resumed its judicial capacity.

Mr. GRANT, moderator of the Assembly's Second Presbytery of Philadelphia, reported that the Presbytery had met at his call, and had, after having considered the resolution of Synod, requested him to state the result. And in doing so, said Mr, G., suffer me to say that whatever the Presbytery may have deemed it our duty to decide, nothing is farther from our intention than to manifest any thing like disrespect to the authority of the Synod, or the persons of those who compose it: and had we been privileged, this morning, to speak for ourselves, we should have made this very apparent. We do not deny the present jurisdiction of this Synod over us. All we insist upon is the constitutional right of being free from that jurisdiction previously to the 28th day of October, up to which day we were subject to another body, and all our acts liable to its review and control. We have carefully, and we trust prayerfully also, considered the matter, and I am directed to hand in this minute, as expressing the issue of our deliberations:

"*Whereas* the Synod have not considered, and acted on, our *plea in bar*, presented to them this morning; nor suffered us to be heard in explanation or support of this plea; but have excluded us from the house, and ordered us, forthwith, to lay our records in the case of Mr. Barnes before the Synod—therefore

Resolved, That the Presbytery respectfully refer the Synod to that plea, and decline the presentation of our records to them,—the Synod of Philadelphia being, in our judgment, not authorised by the General Assembly, to take cognizance of the doings of this Presbytery, prior to the 28th of October, instant. Moreover, the Presbytery respectfully represent to the Synod, that Dr. Junkin had no instructions or pledge from us, in relation to the body to which he should appeal."

A true extract from the minutes of Presbytery.
GEO. DUFFIELD, Clerk.

York, Oct. 30, 1835.

Mr. R. BRECKINRIDGE. I move you that this paper be inserted on the minutes of Synod. Ordered.

Dr. JUNKIN. I have in my hands an official paper from the stated clerk of that Presbytery, which with the leave of Synod I will read.

Dr. McDOWELL. Before we hear Dr. Junkin, I would say that I hope we shall hear the Presbytery also.

Dr. JUNKIN. I hold two letters, one official, and the other I should denominate semi-official, from which it will appear that when this order was entered on the Presbytery's minutes, the thought of resisting your jurisdiction had not yet arisen in their minds.

Philadelphia, Oct. 13, 1835.

Rev. Geo. Junkin, D.D.

Dear Brother—In accordance with the annexed resolution of Presbytery, I have to request that you will cause to be deposited in my hands the written testimony, on your part, in the case of Mr. Barnes,—the charges I already have. As the meeting of Synod approaches, it is desirable that you furnish it forthwith, that I may be enabled to send to Synod all the documents in the case. With the best wishes for your happiness and usefulness, &c. I remain yours in the gospel,
THOMAS EUSTACE.

Extract from the minutes of the Second Presbytery of Philadelphia, in Session July 10, 1835.

"Resolved, That the written charges and testimony of Dr. Junkin, and the written defence of Mr. Barnes, be preserved on the files of this Presbytery." Attest.
THOMAS EUSTACE.
Stated Clerk of the Second Presbytery of Philadelphia.

In addition, I can prove, on oath, that the Moderator of the Presbytery announced publicly, that it was understood, that the question of the jurisdiction of Synod was not to be permitted to bar my rights as appellant, in the trial of my appeal.

On motion it was resolved to hear Mr. Eustace in explanation.

Mr. EUSTACE. There is a distinction to be taken between my acts as an individual and as the clerk of my Presbytery. I have been grieved to hear the liberties which have been taken through a disregard of this distinction. I have been arraigned for acts done by me merely as the official organ of the Presbytery, as though they had been my private individual acts. I have a strong reason for wishing that matters were situated differently from what they are, and that this Synod did possess the power of reviewing the doings of our Presbytery during the past year: but I did not think they had that right, and therefore I did not take those measures which I should in other circumstances. In the paper just read by Dr. Junkin, where it speaks of an appeal "to Synod," there is not a word to designate to which of the two Synods the appeal was taken; and it was my duty to request of him the copy to which my letters refer.

Mr. R. BRECKINRIDGE. I wish to ask of Mr. Eustace, not as clerk of Presbytery, but as a Christian man, whether in speaking of "the Synod," he did not understand and mean the Synod of Philadelphia?

Mr. EUSTACE. As an officer of that Presbytery I made all the necessary preparations for issuing the appeal.

Dr. McDOWELL. Was it by direction of the Presbytery that he wrote this letter to Dr. Junkin?

Mr. EUSTACE made some reply to this inquiry, which the Reporter could not hear. (Mr. E. sat at a distance, and was at no time distinctly heard at the Reporter's table: whence it may happen that his replies have been imperfectly given.)

Dr. JUNKIN. Had Mr. Eustace instructions from the Presbytery to furnish the necessary documents to this Synod?

Mr. EUSTACE. (after a pause.) I believe that I can say literally that I had no such instructions.

Mr. R. BRECKINRIDGE. Literally! he can say "literally?" why! did we ask him if he could say figuratively?

Dr. ELY, The Presbytery did not, at the time of passing its sentence of acquittal, know certainly that Dr. Junkin would appeal; and when he sent his notice of appeal, the Presbytery was not in session to give such order.

MODERATOR. What is the date of Dr. Junkin's appeal?

Dr. JUNKIN. July the 17th, 1835.

Dr. ELY. It was sent to the Moderator, but the Presbytery was not in session, and it could not foreknow to which body the appeal would be made.

Mr. R. BRECKINRIDGE. Does Dr. Ely honestly declare that he did not believe and know that it was to this Synod Dr. Junkin's appeal was taken?

Dr. ELY. I had to be sure my own thoughts about it: but if he had appealed to the man in the moon, we had nothing to do with it, and could not have known beforehand that he would have looked so high.

[Here there was much sensation in the Synod, and for a time there was so much conversation and such a confusion of sounds, that nothing could be heard with sufficient accuracy to be truly reported.]

MODERATOR. I can testify that the appeal was put into the hands of the Moderator of the Presbytery within ten days after its meeting in July. There must have been an intervening meeting of the Presbytery.

Mr. WINCHESTER. What is the date of the extract from the minutes read by Dr. Junkin?

Mr. DUFFIELD. The true history of the matter is this: The Presbytery adjourned before any final sentence was given in the case: I don't know exactly how long before, but Dr. Junkin was assured that no advantage should be taken of his absence, should he not be present when the sentence was given, but that information should be sent to him as soon as possible, by transmitting a certified copy of the act of Presbytery to his agent. The Presbytery then met, and agreed upon its sentence, a copy of which was according to promise, forthwith delivered to Dr. Junkin's agent. For myself, the first time I saw the sentence, was when I read it in the Presbyterian, and the document now in the hands of the Synod was taken from the copy furnished to the editor of that newspaper. Mr. Boardman, the clerk, had the papers from which to make a minute, but he was sick, and his family in affliction, and the whole lay in a state of some confusion. The stated clerk finding this to be the state of things—* *

Mr. R. BRECKINRIDGE here interposed with great warmth. I will not stand by and hear an absent man censured in this manner, while he has no opportunity to defend himself. I am well acquainted with that very estimable young brother, and I know his scrupulous attention to his official duties of every kind—I will not hear his character attacked in this style.

Mr. DUFFIELD. I have not censured brother Boardman in the slightest degree; I stated that he had been sick, and his family in a state of affliction. Was this any censure? All I meant to say, and I say so still, with entire regard for brother Boardman, was that if there is any disorder in these records (and I do not know that there is any,) brother Boardman and not the stated clerk, Mr. Eustace, is answerable for it. I heard the latter say that there was a gap in the minutes, and that he had written to Dr. Junkin requesting him to furnish a copy of some of the papers. I know that brother Boardman was ill—I sympathize in his affliction as much as any one—and it was in consequence of this that he was unable. as I understood to complete the minutes.

MODERATOR. If I had thought that what Mr. Duffield said implicated the character of brother Boardman, I should have stopped him.

Mr. R. BRECKINRIDGE. It does implicate it. They first hide their records, then they throw the blame on the state of the records, and next they throw it on an absent sick man, and then they say that they charge no man.

Dr. ELY here asked permission to explain which was loudly objected to.

Mr. GILBERT. If it is in order to make a man implicate himself, it must be in order to hear a man in explanation and defence.

Mr. DUFFIELD said something on the point of order.

Mr. GILBERT asked for the reading of the order (in relation to who shall be permitted to speak, &c.;) and it was read accordingly.

Mr. McCALLA. The order declares that the members of the 2d Presbytery are not to speak, save to give information in relation to the judgment passed. The Synod have asked for no such information, save once in the case of Mr. Eustace; and I am opposed to the liberty's being granted. We asked for those documents which were necessary in order to enlighten our judgment in the case submitted, by appeal to our decision: these they refused, and now they hang on our flanks, and spend the time of the Synod in telling us long stories without any meaning: and when pressed to the real points in dispute, they go round and round them, but take care never to touch one of them. I am against the continuation of such treatment. I hope the leave asked will not be granted.

The MODERATOR said that it was his opinion, that to give Mr. Eustace permission to speak would not be in order.

Mr. R. BRECKINRIDGE now moved the following preamble and resolutions:

Whereas the 3d section and 16th sub-section of the 7th chapter of the Book of Discipline confers on the Synod the power to *censure*, according to circumstances, any judicatory that shall neglect to send us authentic records of any trial in which an appeal is taken; And whereas the (Assembly's) Second Presbytery of Philadelphia has not only neglected but refused, by a minute this day laid on the table of Synod to produce the record in case of Mr. Barnes and Dr. Junkin, which is an appeal, regularly taken, and prosecuted, although it is admitted by the Stated Clerk of said Presbytery that the said records are present, and in possession of said Presbytery; And whereas, that refusal is aggravated in its injustice, by the fact that the members of that Presbytery itself prevented the appellant from appealing directly to the General Assembly, as was his declared desire, and this at a period when there was, and could be, no Synod to which he could appeal but this Synod, because the Assembly had ordered the dissolution of the Synod of Delaware before the next stated meeting to which that Synod stood adjourned; and there is no provision known to us for any *pro re nata* meeting of any Synod.

And whereas, this Synod has passed a special order directing said Presbytery to produce the record necessary in the case on trial—which order the Presbytery explicitly refuses to obey: Now, therefore, be it Resolved, that, in the judgment of this Synod, the conduct of the (Assembly's) Second Presbytery of Philadelphia, in all the premises, is *obstinate, vexatious, unjust, uncandid, contumacious*, and grossly disorderly.

And whereas, the (Assembly's) Second Presbytery of Philadelphia has suppressed the records in the case in which Dr. Junkin has appealed to this Synod from the decision of that Presbytery in the case of Mr. Barnes: And whereas this Synod has used, without success, such means as seemed proper, to obtain possession of said records as proof in the case:

And whereas, it is known to the Synod, that the copies of all the proceedings and proof in the case are, from other sources, accessible to it; And whereas the original parties have been asked, and declared their readiness for trial; and it does not appear to Synod that the cause of the appellee would be prejudiced by the conduct of said Presbytery, in suppressing the records, as stated above, contrary to the order of Synod and the wish of the appellant; And whereas, the cause of truth, and the glory of God, do, in the judgment of this Synod, require it to make still farther efforts to issue his case: Therefore Resolved, that Synod will proceed to hear and dispose of the appeal now pending.

Mr. Blythe called for a division of the question on these resolutions, and wished the paper read and considered by paragraphs.

Dr. McDowell. I perceive in that paper one principle which, while it does not strengthen the document at all, may, I think, lead us into difficulties. I mean that which relates to the doctrine that a Synod consisting of three Presbyteries cannot try an appeal taken from an act of one of them. I could wish that that part was stricken out.

The paper was now again read, by paragraphs, for consideration. The first clause hsving been read as follows:

"Whereas the 3d section and 16th sub-section of the Book of Discipline confers on this Synod the power to censure, according to circumstances, any judicatory that shall neglect to send up authentic records of any trial in which an appeal is taken."

and the question being on its adoption,

Mr. Gilbert said, he should not argue the question, but it was certain that the clause here referred to did not settle this case at all, unless it be assumed that this Synod has jurisdiction in the case; to assume which is begging the question to be proved. If the appellant has appealed to a body not having jurisdiction in the case, the Presbytery, certainly, is not bound to send up its records. If a minister appeals to the Pope, must the Presbytery send its documents to Rome! or be censured, if it refuses?

Moderator. It has been decided that this Synod has jurisdiction in the case: that point cannot be again drawn into question.

The clause was then agreed to.

The second clause was then read as follows:

"And whereas the (Assembly's) Second Presbytery of Philadelphia has not only neglected, but refused, by a minute this day laid on the table of Synod, to produce the record in the case of Mr. Barnes and Dr. Junkin, which is an appeal regularly taken and prosecuted; although it is not alleged that the said record is not present and in possession of said Presbytery."

This clause was also agreed to.

The third clause was then read:

"And whereas that refusal is aggravated in its injustice by the fact that the Presbytery itself prevented the appellant from appealing directly to the General Assembly, as was his declared desire; and this at a period when there was, and could be, no Synod to which he could appeal but this Synod."

Mr Barnes. I am very confident the Presbytery never did what is there alleged. Dr. Junkin and I had a conversation on the subject, before the decision of the Presbytery, in which I told him that it was not certain that there would be the necessity for any appeal; but that if there was, I should proceed in a regular manner as became a Presbyterian.

Dr. Junkin. In one sense it is true that my notice of appeal was given in before the decision of the Presbytery was declared; that is, before the committee appointed to put the judgment of the Presbytery into a written form, had done so. But the votes of the Presbytery had been taken and had negatived the prosecution. I had a conversation with the Moderator of Presbytery, and told him, that if Mr. Barnes would consent, I was desirous of going at once to the Assembly. I believed there was no danger that the Assembly would remand the case to the Synod. But when I stated in open court my intention of appealing, there was a distinct acquiescence on the part of the Presbytery that I should take my appeal to the Synod of Philadelphia. Mr. Grant, I am confident will tell you so now.

Mr. Phelps. From the language of this part of the paper it would seem that there is an intention of casting on co-presbyters, who are absent, and out of court, an imputation of duplicity unworthy of the ministerial character. When Dr. Junkin was up on a former occasion, he said he could appeal for the correctness of his statement to all the members of the Presbytery, who would justify the correctness of his statement. To this appeal, the members of Presbytery, although they were forbidden to open their mouths, expressed their dissent by shaking their heads, and yet now the fact is assumed as not to be disputed, and they are forbidden all opportunity of reply. Is this fair dealing? The assent of some individuals is a different thing from the declared assent of the whole Presbytery. Private conversation is one thing, and an official act is another. It is unnecessary and improper to implicate men in this manner whose lips are sealed. I do think, indeed, that it would be a wiser course in the Presbytery, to give up the records, and not to insist upon the legal right of withholding them: but the Presbytery have considered the case, and come to an opposite conclusion. I am however, opposed to the adoption of the clause now under discussion.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Many of the arguments which have been used in that paper are wholly out of place. What if it should be proved that the Presbytery once thought it would be regular for Dr. Junkin to appeal to this Synod, does that prove that they must of necessity think so now, when, on examination, they find there is no law for it? The Presbytery's consent, admitting it to have been given, does not give this Synod a constitutional jurisdiction over their acts. So that this aggravation of their offences may as well be left out.

Mr. McCALLA called for the reading of the clause again: and it was read. I don't see, said he, any thing so very furious in that. An article is read: Mr Barnes objects to the statement: Dr. Junkin answers him: and it is then said that there is great injustice, because Mr. Barnes cannot deny it. Is it to be expected, when this Presbytery refuses to come before us in a legitimate manner, that they shall afterwards be allowed to come in by a side door, and take up all the time in speaking, and debating every point that may arise? Sir, no historian will ever condemn such an article as this. If these gentlemen want to come into court, the constitution tells them where they may come and how: but if they want to jump in at the window, it is for us to say whether we will permit it to be done. I am against it.

[Mr. PHELPS here made some remarks, which the reporter was prevented from hearing. He gathered the substance to be, that if Dr. Junkin was allowed to make statements of fact, the Presbytery sltould have an opportunity of reply.]

Mr. BARNES. I do not wish to take up the time, or to embarrass the Synod. I wish that the history of facts received by the Synod should be a true history: and it is a truth that the 2d Presbytery, as a Presbytery, took no order as to what body was to be appealed to. In March, the Presbytery did decide that the appeal was not to go up to the Assembly at that time; but in June, it was agreed that it should go up regularly. I never objected to its going to the Assembly. It was nothing to me. But if you adopt that clause of the proposed preamble, you will put yourselves, as to a matter of fact, in direct collision with the Presbytery.

Mr. R. BRECKINRIDGE. I am willing to meet the difficulty, by altering the phraseology, and instead of saying, "the Presbytery itself prevented, &c." to say, "members of the Presbytery." This will remove the objection, since I perceive they hinge their objection on the ground that the act was not official.

Mr. STEELE wished this alteration to be made. I can confirm the statement of Mr. Barnes, that there was no direct presbyterial action had upon it. I was present at the time, and remember well what passed. The Moderator of the Presbytery observed, that he hoped the brethren would acquiesce and allow the case to go up to the Assembly, that the question might be decided by the voice of the whole church; but if they refused, if the Synod should be put out of the House, then the voice of the whole church would not be heard. At first there seemed to be an assent to this; afterward, however, there were one or two members of the Presbytery who expressed dissent. That the Synod of Philadelphia, and not the Synod of Delaware, was meant, I have no doubt. I tried all I could to get Dr. Junkin to appeal to the Synod of Delaware, but I could not succeed.

Dr. M'Dowell. I move you that we refer this whole subject to a committee: but I wish, by way of preface to that motion, to offer a few remarks. My object is that a committee be appointed to prepare a minute to go upon our records.

Mr. R. J. BRECKINRIDGE here interposed with warmth, protesting against having a resolution of this kind thrown directly across the path of the judicatory when it was proceeding in the discussion of the paper before it.

MODERATOR. If the motion is to commit, it is in order.

Dr. McDOWELL. That is my motion. I do deplore, and highly disapprove of the course taken by the Presbytery in relation to its records; I regret it deeply: I am persuaded that the effect will be to prejudice their cause, especially before the public. But, at the same time, I recollect that our proceedings in this matter are all to be reviewed and closely scrutinized by the General Assembly, and I wish that we may observe so much caution in every step we take, that no flaw shall be found in any part. There are a number of expressions and principles in the paper now before us, which we might look at very differently if we viewed them separately, dispassionately, and not in connection with this case. The paper contains the condemnation of a Presbytery, and that in very strong terms, and we are asked to adopt it while the Presbytery is not heard in its own defence! To this I am opposed. The moment you propose to inflict censure upon a Presbytery, the Presbytery possesses a right to be heard. The Assembly will not attend to the posture of circumstances, and will not distinguish, as some of us are disposed to do: they will only look at the fact that the Presbytery was condemned unheard, and the whole Assembly will cry out against you. Instead of adopting a paper like this, I hope we shall appoint a committee, who will draw up a temperate statement of facts, such an one as we shall hereafter be able to look at with pleasure; but this document contains language, and applies it to a court of the Lord's house, such as I never could adopt in reference to the worst enemy I have on earth. I trust that we shall look at the whole case temperately and coolly, and that before we attempt to censure a Presbytery, we shall at least allow them to be heard in their own defence; and that we shall not attempt to spread upon our records an *ex parte* statement of facts, such as the judicatory may deny. I think the wisest course will be to refer the matter to a committee, and in the meanwhile let Synod proceed with the trial.

Mr. McCALLA. The three arguments I have heard against the adoption of this paper are these: first, that the language is too severe: secondly, that the Presbytery is unheard: and lastly, that all the time we are discussing it we are putting off the trial of Mr. Barnes. Now, as to the severity of the language, I should like to hear the clause read once more.

Mr. R. BRECKINRIDGE read it again.

Mr. McCALLA. Very well: and now I should like to see how many men there are on this floor who are afraid to handle a contumacious Presbytery without gloves, and without a pound of butter in each hand.

Mr. R. BRECKINRIDGE. It is obvious to me, and must be to all, that in this thing we are to fight against time, as well as against supposed friends. I hope we shall be aware of this, and that the Synod will proceed with the business before it.

Mr. McCALLA. It is plain that this measure is intended to introduce Mr. Barnes' case without a lawful introduction. Our worst enemies could not have recommended a course more injurious. We read that the children of Israel were once commanded to make brick, and that to aggravate their hardships, their cruel task-masters would not allow them straw. And now it seems that we of this Synod are to be sent down into Egypt, and treated much in the same way. We are to go at Mr. Barnes' case without the necessary preliminary measures: and then we are to get ourselves kicked out of the Assembly. And as to condemning this Presbytery without their being heard, were they not invited to come in their proper place, and in the proper way? We opened the door, if they chose to walk in. I suppose it is not necessary to set a chair for them, while the whole Synod shall stand waiting, cap in hand. No, Sir; they have refused the jurisdiction of Synod, and the Synod can do its duty without them. When the time assigned by the constitution shall arrive, then let them be heard, and not before. I am opposed to the committment. A man who has lived through so many sessions and Presbyteries and Assemblies as many of us have, must know that if we will do our duty without the fear of man, there is a portion of our companions whom we must be willing to part with as soon as matters approach a crisis. It will always be so: it is human nature, at least it is the nature of some men. And, rely upon it, as soon as you approach the enemy near enough to see the whites of their eyes, you will always find these men very glad to jump behind a log.

Mr. ADAIR. Moderator, this paper, which some of the brethren want us to swallow entire, is altogether too hot, and too high seasoned for our palates. I hope we shall have something in its place from the elder members of this body, which shall be marked with more temper and moderation. Like a brother who lately addressed you, I also am very sorry that that Presbytery have acted as they have done. I wish to come at the cause of Mr. Barnes; because I earnestly desire that those who have received impressions injurious to him may have an opportunity to get these impressions corrected. His own cause requires this: and all those who profess to be his friends, instead of shunning should earnestly demand an instant investigation. I have used my personal influence to the utmost to prevail with the Presbytery to adopt a different course, but I regret to say that it has been in vain. I believe that in strictness, they certainly have a legal right to take the ground they have assumed; but I am just as fully persuaded that by assuming it they have prejudiced and injured their own cause.

The question was now put on Dr. McDowell's motion to commit: and it was negatived by a great majority.

The question then recurring on the adoption of the clause above stated.

Mr. GILBERT said that he greatly doubted the fact which the clause affirmed, viz. that either the members of the Second Presbytery, or the Presbytery as a body, prevented this case from going up to the Assembly.

Dr. McDOWELL. I wish to know whether such is the fact. If it be so, let the fact now be stated.

Mr. STEELE. I stated it to be a fact.

Mr. BARNES. I wish the paper which the Presbytery handed in on this subject to be read.

Mr. R. Breckinridge. The paper denies it, only in respect to the Presbytery as such.

Moderator. If the discussion proceeds, there must be a motion, either to adopt or to amend.

Mr. Steele here read a paper presented by the Moderator of the second Presbytery (who was forbidden by the rules of proceeding to speak in his own person.) It declared, in substance, that he, as an individual, had not been opposed to permitting the case to go to the Assembly, but had desired if it did go there, that the Synod should not be deprived of its vote: and that this opinion he had declared in the Presbytery, but not officially, as its Moderator.

Mr. R. Breckinridge. This reminds me of the case of a German Prince, who was also a bishop, and who, on receiving a blow remonstrated with horror: "What? do you dare to strike the Lord's anointed?" to whom his adversary replied, "I do not strike you as bishop, I strike you as Prince." So Mr. Grant being then Moderator of the Presbytery, and in the chair, made this declaration as Mr. Grant, but not as Moderator!

Mr. Pickands. I move you that this clause of the preamble be stricken out; and as it is due to the dignity of the house not to offer a motion without giving some reasons in support of it, I will offer a few words by way of explanation. I do not conceive that the statement in this clause is at all necessary to the strength of the representation. The document does not profess to state that this act was done by the Presbytery, but only by certain members of the Presbytery. It is stated as the act of the members in their private capacity; but as members they are not here allowed to deny it: they shake their heads but must not speak. In the meanwhile we have no evidence to prove the assertion. The statement by Mr. Steele does not show it. Mr. Steele, indeed, tells you that the Moderator assented, but that there was no Presbyterial action in regard to the matter, and that though the Moderator's opinion did seem for a time, generally to prevail, yet that afterwards there were some of the members who objected, and expressed an opposite opinion. And would it not be a marvellous thing if such a man as Dr. Junkin had been *hindered* by an expression of the Moderator's opinion, from taking his appeal to a court which was regularly open to him? I repeat, that we have no one particle of evidence that the members of that Presbytery, as individuals, or that the Presbytery, as a body, ever did hinder Dr. Junkin from carrying his appeal into any judicatory he should think fit: nor did they, so far as appears, throw the smallest bar in his way. I desire the clause stricken out, because it is not historically true, and I am sure that the mover of it never would wish to spread on the minutes of this Synod a statement which is not correct in fact. The clause alleges an aggravation in the offence of the Presbytery of which we have no proof.

The question being put on striking out, it was negatived.

The reading of the paper was then resumed as follows:

"And this at a period when there was and could be no Synod to which he could appeal but this Synod."

Mr. Gilbert. Is that a fact?

Dr. Junkin. I asked if I could appeal to the Synod of Delaware, and the members all said, "No, you cannot; there is no such synod."

The reading then again proceeded.

"First, Because the Assembly had ordered the dissolution of the Synod of Delaware, before the next stated meeting to which that synod stood adjourned; and there is no provision known to us for any *pro re nata* meeting of any Synod."

Dr. McDowell. I think this clause had better be stricken out. The point referred to is not settled; there is no use in such a statement; it will only involve us in difficulties.

Mr. Gilbert. In the nineteenth chapter of our book of Church Government, there is a general provision which admits of the calling of *any* judicatory by the moderator *pro re nata*; and it may apply, for aught that appears, as well to a synod as to a presbytery.

Dr. Cuyler. If that construction is good, then the clause will apply equally to the moderator of the General Assembly also.

Mr. Campbell. I move you that this portion of the preamble be stricken out. I admit that the construction mentioned by brother Gilbert is construction only; and I should not be very strenuous in insisting upon it; though I do not see but what the rule will apply as fairly in this case as in any other. The constitution does not say "Presbytery," but it says "judicatory:" and that term will as well include a synod as a presbytery.

Dr. J. Breckinridge. I do hope that inasmuch as the first clause is strong enough, the second will be stricken out. The Synod of Delaware could not meet unless called *pro re nata*; and the letter of the clerk which has been read was evidently written in full view of the fact that the adjourned meeting of that Synod would be superseded by a previous meeting of this body. But why should we discuss this, when the other clause is sufficient?

Dr. Cathcart. It is a very doubtful point whether a moderator of this synod can or cannot call a *pro re nata* meeting of synod: and why should we commit ourselves on such a question? It has been sent down to the presbyteries for decision, and they will decide it. As to what brother Cuyler said about the rules including the moderator of an assembly, as much as the moderator of a synod, he overlooks a great and obvious difference between them: the synod is a *permanent* body, the assembly is not. The synod continues, and may be called together if need be; but when the assembly adjourns, it is gone: it is out of existence: there is no assembly to be called, and no moderator to call it.

The question was now put on striking out the clause, and decided in the negative.

The reading of the document then proceeded.

And secondly, because even if an appeal had been taken to the Synod of Delaware and a *pro re nata* meeting had been lawfully called, there is great reason to doubt whether according to our constitution that Synod could have tried the case while two presbyteries only could sit as judges. The synod having but three, and one of them being excluded, as the court appealed from.

Mr. *Wynkoop.* I move you that this clause be stricken out.

Mr. *Breckinridge.* The brother will observe that the clause does not state it as a thing certain, that such a synod could not try the appeal; but only speaks of this as a thing extremely doubtful. The Presbytery which tried the cause must be excluded, of course: there then remain only two presbyteries to decide the case; and, according to our book, two presbyteries do not constitute a synod. The book expressly declares that three presbyteries are requisite to constitute a synod, and that there cannot even be a quorum to do business unless the three presbyteries are represented. It is therefore to my mind infinitely clear that the Synod of Delaware could not have tried the appeal even if it had gone there. Yet, out of deference to an opposite opinion expressed by some brethren, I have only said "that there is great reason to doubt" on this point. I hope the clause may be retained, because, as far as it goes, it strengthens our reasons for passing censure on the presbytery. I hope this case will be sufficient to show the folly of attempting to draw up a paper which shall gather in the opinions of every individual who may happen to take general views of the same kind.

Mr. Grier. I hope that the clause will not be stricken out. It doos appear strange to me that where language has been adopted with the express view to conciliation, all the brethren who are on one side shall insist on giving it their own construction.

Dr. McDowell. I call the attention of Synod to our form of government. Chapter 10. Sec. 1st. This section shows how many Presbyteries are necessary to constitute a Synod; and it does require three Presbyteries for that purpose. But then, in the fourth section it expressly declares that a Synod "shall have power to receive and issue appeals." I know that in the second section there is something said about a quorum: but to make the book consistent with itself, [and that is a sound principle in constructing laws] we must suppose that the Presbytery appealed from may constitute a part of the quorum, though not of the court. The book, at all events, does declare that three Presbyteries are a Synod, and that snch Synod can issue appeals. Why, sir, in the early history of our church, the most of our synods were in this situation: they consisted but of three presbyteries; and yet they did try appeals: it must have been by two presbyteries sitting on the act of the third. I want the document strengthened, not weakened; and I want it to appear in such a form that the Assembly shall not find fault with us.

Dr. Cathcart. Under our old constitution, even if thirty members were present they constituted no quorum unless they came from three different Presbyteries. We had frequently to wait for days together before we could do business: and sometimes we had to break up and go home. The Synod died, and had to be resuscitated again by the General Assembly. The question was even raised in the Assembly whether it was any longer a Synod or not. Our Synods had none of them scarcely more than three Presbyteries. Do brethren suppose the Assembly could mean that such a body could not issue an appeal? Do they suppose they were worse than common idiots? Why shall we commit ourselves by stating in the face of the Assembly what they know not to be the fact?

Mr. Musgrave. I am in favour of striking out A Synod surely, be it smaller or larger, must possess the right of issuing appeals, and if there are but three Presbyteries it is of necessity that two of them may sit in judgment upon the acts of the third. And unless you omit a point which is so doubtful, you will embarrass the passage of this paper, and detach from it many who approve of its general principles, and who would otherwise vote for it. If you keep this clause, there are some who will be bound in conscience to vote against it. There is no strong necessity for retaining it; and why should we throw difficulties in our own way?

Dr. Cuyler. I concur in the same views which have been expressed by those who oppose this clause. Our Book must be interpreted in consistency with itself, and as this is, to say the least, a very doubtful and disputable position, it will be best to give it up.

Mr. R. Breckinridge. Well; if that is the general wish, I will not insist.

The question being now put on the motion to strike out, it was carried; and the clause was stricken out accordingly.

The reading of the paper was resumed.

"And whereas this Synod has passed a special order directing said Presbytery to produce the Record necessary in the case on trial;—which order the Presbytery explicitly refuses to obey; now, therefore be it

Resolved, That, in the judgment of this Synod, the conduct of the (Assembly's) Second Presbytery of Philadelphia in all the premises is *obstinate, vexatious, unjust, uncandid, contumacious*, and *grossly disorderly*.

Dr. McDOWELL. I move you that all of these epithets save the word "disorderly," be stricken out.

Mr. R. BRECKINRIDGE. Let us have the question on each word separately.

The question was accordingly put, on each of the above words, *seriatim*, and the motion to strike out was voted down by acclamation. And the paper, thus far, was adopted by a great majority.

The reading was then resumed.

"*Resolved*, farther, that before the adjournment of this Synod, such other and final order as may seem necessary be taken in this case."

Dr. J. BRECKINRIDGE. Why is any farther order necessary?

Mr. M'KINLEY. I see no need of any thing further.

Dr. J. BRECKINRIDGE. It may not be necessary to do more, and why then pledge ourselves to do more? I hope it will not be pressed.

Mr. R. BRECKINRIDGE. I consent to withdraw it.

The clause was accordingly withdrawn.

The second paragraph of the paper was then read.

"And whereas the (Assembly's) Second Presbytery of Philadelphia has suppressed the record in the case in which Dr. Junkin has appealed to the Synod from the decision of the Presbytery in the case of Mr. Barnes; and whereas, this Synod has used, without success, such means as seemed proper to obtain possession of said records, as proof in the case; and whereas, it is known to Synod that true copies of all the proceedings and proof in the case are from other sources accessible to it:"

Mr. R. BRECKINRIDGE. I do not know this personally: but I believe we have proof that such is the case.

Mr. STEELE. There is present a true copy of the judgment given by the Presbytery, duly certified: and a copy of all the testimony adduced by Dr. Junkin before the Presbytery is also here; but not of all the proceedings.

Dr. JUNKIN. I have a copy of the sentence, duly certified: and a copy of the testimony, being the very same identical paper which I used before the Presbytery. This I can prove by parole evidence.

Mr. R. BRECKINRIDGE. I have altered the phraseology so as to include only the sentence and the evidence.

The reading again proceeded:

"And whereas the original parties have been asked, and have declared their readiness for trial; and it does not appear to Synod that the cause of the appellee would be prejudiced by the conduct of said Presbytery in suppressing the records, as stated above, contrary to the order of Synod, and the wish of the appellant,"

Mr. MUSGRAVE. I would ask whether Mr. Barnes is *now* ready for trial, after his Presbytery have refused to furnish these documents?

Mr. R. BRECKINRIDGE. The clause goes on his own admission.

"And whereas the cause of truth, and the glory of God, do, in the judgment of this Synod, require it to make still farther efforts to issue this case; therefore

Resolved, That Synod will now proceed TO HEAR AND DISPOSE OF THE APPEAL *now pending*.

The question being put on the adoption of these several clauses, and then of the whole paper, as amended, it was carried. So the preamble and resolutions were adopted.

MODERATOR. The Synod having resolved to issue the appeal, it remains that we now proceed in the several steps of the proceeding according to the directions of the Book of Discipline, which I will now read.

Chap. 7. sec. 3. sub. sec. 8. In taking up an appeal, after ascertaining that the appellant on his part, has conducted it regularly, the *first* step shall be to read the sentence appealed from; *secondly*, to read the reasons which were assigned by the appellant for his appeal, and which are on record; *thirdly*, to read the whole record of the proceedings of the inferior judicatory in the case, including all the testimony, and the reasons of their decision: *fourthly*, to hear the original parties; *fifthly*, to hear any of the members of the inferior judicatory, in explanation of the grounds of their decision, or of their dissent from it.

The first step is, to read the sentence appealed from. That sentence will now be read: and, during the reading, I hope that the utmost order, silence, and attention will be observed.

Mr. McCALLA. Before we proceed, I move you that one of the members engage in prayer for the Divine direction and aid. It was agreed to.

The Moderator then called upon Dr. Cuyler, who made solemn prayer to God.

The sentence of the Presbytery was then read.

Synod then took a recess until 7 o'clock.

Synod having met after recess, the Moderator said that the next step would be to hear the reasons of the appellant for his appeal, as the same were on record.

The reasons of appeal were thereupon read.

MODERATOR. The third step is to read, the whole of the proceedings and the testimony including the reasons of the decision as set forth by the Presbytery.

Mr. R. BRECKINRIDGE. I move that the Clerk enter upon the minutes of Synod the reason why the "whole proceedings" were not read. This was agreed to: and the following minute, being drawn up by Mr. R. Breckinridge, was adopted, viz.

"That the *whole proceedings* of the court below, which ought orderly to be now read, are not read, for the reason, that the Second Presbytery of Philadelphia, in defiance of the order of Synod, without objection by the appellee, has refused to produce the record."

Mr. R. BRECKINRIDGE said, that this minute was necessary, because advantage might hereafter be taken to say that the appellee objected to the doings of his Presbytery in withholding the records: and therefore the Synod should be certain whether he does object or not.

Mr. BARNES. That much states the historical fact.

Dr. JUNKIN. I have two or three letters which I intend to read. One is my letter to the Presbytery. It forms a part of what should have come from the Presbytery as the history of the proceedings. I intend to read it as such. Is this the proper time?

Mr. GILBERT. Was the letter read in the Presbytery?

Dr. JUNKIN. That is a question which I think I should not answer. I think that it ought to be answered either by the Presbytery or by Mr. Barnes.

Mr. BARNES. I cannot tell, until I hear the letter read. I cannot certify to the paper, as I am neither Moderator nor Clerk of the Presbytery,

Dr. JUNKIN. The letter of which I have here the copy, is the original letter addressed by me to the Presbytery, stating the charges I intended to bring against Mr. Barnes.

Mr. Morss. We must first know what we are going to prove, and then march up to the point at once. I do not, myself, yet know whether Mr. Barnes is on trial before us, or whether it is the Presbytery we are to try. I want clearly to understand what is the business we have to do.

Moderator. Synod is issuing an appeal.

Mr. Morss. Does the appeal refer to a decision of the Presbytery? and are we trying them? or are we trying Mr. Barnes?

Mr. Pickands. Brother Morss is one of the judges here, and has a right to know.

Moderator. The business before the Synod is to take up an appeal and issue it.

Mr. McCalla. Brethren should withhold such questions. We know our A. B. C.

Dr. McDowell. Does this min

Mr. Barnes did not object to the Presbytery's withholding the documents.

Mr. R. Breckinridge. That is the meaning, and the whole meaning.

Mr. Carothers. As one of the judges in this case I object to the principle of that minute. I am not very conversant in the modes of proceeding in ecclesiastical courts: but this involves a great principle, in respect to which my understanding is directly at variance with this minute. We are here calling in a party to say that he will not in future object to the record on which we are proceeding. I never will consent to put the trial on any such grounds. It is utterly contrary to all correct principles, that an accused party shall be called upon to admit the correctness of our record, or else he must give up his constitutional right of hereafter objecting to the mode in which his trial has been conducted. I admit that in civil suits, plea may be put in which admit, by implication, the regularity of all prior proceedings. But in a criminal process we are to proceed as in a court of criminal jurisdiction; and it is highly improper for the court to make a record, and then to attempt to establish its correctness by calling on the accused to admit or deny it: you have no right to call upon him to admit or deny any thing in the matter, but simply to say whether he is guilty or not guilty. He is entitled to object to every thing that is objectionable in the mode of conducting his trial. It is his constitutional right. But that minute assumes a fact from the silence of the accused. To this I object.

[From the distant position of Mr. Carothers, he was but imperfectly heard by the Reporter.]

Mr. R. Breckinridge. If the fact were as that brother supposes it to be, his argument would be unanswerable. But it is not so. We certainly have the right to make a record of the fact of what the accused does. We are not calling upon him either to admit or to deny any thing. It was incumbent on us to state the attitude Mr. Barnes holds in regard to the contested evidence withheld by the Presbytery. He is a member of that Presbytery, and a party in this trial. He stood silently by, and saw his Presbytery contumaciously suppress the proof necessary to the trial; when, had he but expressed such a wish, the testimony would have been produced. We are now going on the next best testimony within our reach: and he may object to this, because the records of the Presbytery are the best evidence in the case. To guard against this, we now enter the fact upon our record that he did not object to the suppression of those records by his Presbytery. If Mr. Barnes will say that he objects to it, or that he attempted to prevent it, I will erase it in a moment. God forbid, I should enter upon record what is not true. I desire to use, in this case, the utmost gentleness and candour.

Mr. Campbell. Make an epitome of this argument, and see how it looks. If Mr. Barnes does not say that his Presbytery did wrong, we will go on to violate the Constitution, by trying him without that proof which the Constitution requires. Such an argument sounds strange:—and from such a quarter. The Constitution requires that the whole proceedings below, with all the evidence, shall be read before we proceed. Hear it.

[See the extract from Book of Discipline quoted just above.]

Mr. R. Breckinridge. The only reason I have showed why we proceed without this, is, that the Synod have not resolved that they will proceed without it.

Mr. Campbell. Then it seems we may violate the Constitution provided Mr. Barnes will not blame the doings of his Presbytery. He must take sides, it appears, against his brethren; then we will not proceed: but if he will not do this, then it is a good reason why we shall go on! Can any thing on earth be more supremely ridiculous?

Mr. Musgrave. Cannot we divide the question? Is it not enough to say, what precedes this, without saying a word about Mr. Barnes? I move to strike out that part.

Mr. Gibson. Mr. Barnes did admit that the minute contained a true record of the historical fact.

Mr. Barnes. The Synod has a right to make any record on its minutes which it pleases. I shall not contest that right: nor have I objected to the minute proposed. You have not called upon me to do so: nor could you lawfully do so: and the Synod I believe so understood the matter. And so far as Synod know, that may be the reason why I did not object. But will it not appear that the Synod felt embarrassed and wished to bring me in, in the unhappy relation in which I stand; in contrariety to all delicacy?

Mr. R. Breckinridge. I am willing to go on and state all that is true. I think the clause should not be stricken out. Mr. Barnes stands here in a double attitude; he is both a party, and a Presbyter. And though we have no right to ask him whether he objects to the doings of his Presbytery or not, we have a right to state facts, to fortify the correctness of our course, before a future tribunal, which is to pass judgment upon it.

Dr. Green. I hope the clause will not be stricken out. We have, I think, sufficient indications to warn us to be on our guard against every exception which it shall be possible to take. Rely upon it, every exception that can be taken will be taken in the higher court. Now as this is the mere statement of an historical truth, and as it may meet an exception, I hope it will not be stricken out.

Mr. Gilbert. Does the minute relate to the past only? or also to the future? As to the past, it states what is true; but not what may be true in future.

Mr. Barnes. If you will add that the Synod did not ask me whether I objected or no, the minute will then state the whole truth.

Dr. McDowell. Would it not be better to waive all this, till we see what evidence we have?

Mr. R. Breckinridge. The Moderator stated that this was the proper place.

Mr. Musgrave. Is it not enough that no objection appears? This leaves the case just as it ought to be. It leaves it entirely open. It places us on equal terms with Mr. Barnes before the Assembly. If he objects there, we can say, why did you not object in the court below? Then both will stand upon an equality. But if we shall now attempt to take the advantage of him by saying that he made no objection to the acts of his Presbytery, when he was not in circumstances to say either yea or nay, we shall not appear well before those who are to judge us. As judges we had better omit what may appear like a wish to take advantage of the situation of the accused.

Mr. R. Breckinridge. I think not. There is a brother, who is a lawyer of distinction (Mr. Carothers) thinks it important that this should be stricken out; but I say that it is important it should be kept in.

Mr. Carothers. I do not take either side in the matter. I am not an advocate or a party, but a Judge.

Mr. R. Breckinridge. I am not a party either, but am a Judge too: yet my understanding is not a mere *tabula rasa*; I have an opinion. He admits that if the clause is put in, it will prejudice one side. I say that if it is left out it will injure the other. I consider it very important that it should be retained: it may influence the whole decision. Mr. Barnes is not required to say any thing. He stands nakedly before us with a verdict in his face: but he also stands here a Presbyter: and it is proper that our record should show that as a Presbyter he did not object to the withholding of these records.

Mr. McCalla. There are two parties in this matter. Mr. Barnes has spoken what is condemnatory of the Synod, and the Synod have done the same with respect to him.

Mr. Barnes. I do not know when I have so spoken. I should be glad to hear when it was.

Mr. M'Calla. Then I am mistaken. But did not Mr. Barnes say that to enter such a record would be to do an act of injustice to him?

Moderator. No: he said it would be recording what was historical truth.

Mr. M'Calla. Well: I will leave off stating what Mr. Barnes said till I can *hear* better. It is obvious that there are two different and opposite objects desired in this house. There is a portion of the members of this Synod who wish that this prosecution may be dropped; or that if it is not, it may fail. And there is another and a larger portion who desire that we should go on to issue this appeal. Now here is a document brought before us which may be instrumental in issuing it, shall we reject it, or adopt it?

Now supposing a vessel was bound for a certain port, and fitting out for her voyage: a portion of her owners are opposed to the voyage, and had rather the vessel went to the bottom of the ocean, than to her destined haven. These men, if, while the ship is fitting for sea, they can take out of her some bolt or fastening, or screw, or plank, and thus cause her to leak and to founder, will take pains to do it. I have so often seen a course like this that I am used to it. But another part of her owners are determined she shall make the voyage, and these will insist that every bolt, and knee, and plank, and screw, and fastening of every kind, that may secure her safety, shall be supplied in a proper manner. And if any part of her tackel, apparel or furniture has been stolen away and secreted, they will do what in them lies to get it back or to replace it. For myself I had rather go to the bottom among the sharks, than have on me the guilt of purloining so much as a marlingspike belonging to the good ship. Why, I ask should we omit this paragraph, if it will, or may, do any thing toward conducting the Synod to the end we have in view? Mr. Barnes does not say that it states what is untrue, or that it is unjust to state it:—yet we are urged to drop it. We are to be kinder to Mr. Barnes than Mr. Barnes is to himself. Let us not forget that a British officer has said that the losing of a single screw caused the defeat at New Orleans. And are we going to give up any of the fastenings of our ship? I trust not.

Dr. Cathcart. I thought we were sitting here as judges, and not pleading the cause. Let us first have all the evidence before us, and we can listen to the pleadings afterward.

Dr. J. Breckinridge. It is certainly very important that in this case (a case for our conducting of which we are to give an account on earth as well as in heaven,) every one should be satisfied, if possible. A portion of very important evidence is withheld from the Synod. Mr. Barnes is standing in very peculiar circumstances, as interested in the absent evidence: and so is Dr. Junkin: and so is the Synod.

[Dr. Junkin, interposing. *All* the evidence is here, and can be proved to be the original testimony produced and read before the Presbytery.]

That may be very true: yet we have not the official evidence, as such, from the Presbytery. And though we may have what some may deem an equivalent, yet if we could get the evidence through the regular channels, it would certainly be far better. There then could be no possible ground of complaint. I make this remark because brother Campbell seems to impeach the propriety of our course in proceeding to trial without the evidence which is withheld. Here we are in a dilemma, we are waterlogged on either hand. If we listen to the arguments of brethren it will be impossible for the Synod to go on: we must either refer the case, or let it die. Now, in the absence of the regular documentary evidence, even supposing that Dr. Junkin can get that which, in fact, is equally good, yet we want to put matters in such a position that we may be able to show that we have done every thing justly, and that all the injustice in the case lies with the Presbytery. One of the facts in the case is, that Mr. Barnes did not object to the absence of the documents. It may be said by some that had they been produced, the effect would have been in his favour:—if so, why did he not call for them? But, by his silence, he says, in effect, that he does not complain of the absence of the official evidence in his trial. I am astonished that a lawyer should say that making such a record is taking an advantage of the accused, where it simply states a fact in the history of the proceedings of this body. Supposing it to be a piece of true history, because we wish to do justice with delicacy and with kindness, we wish the history of the step in our proceedings to be correctly and faithfully recorded. When Mr. Eustace had been called upon and had explained, and when Mr. Duffield and he wished afterward to speak, we arrested their statements. This I regretted: and I still regret it, because I think they might have been better satisfied had they been permitted to proceed. Yet if brother Barnes will show how the entering up of such a record will injure him, I may be induced to examine the question again.

Mr. Landis. Does not Mr. Breckinridge by this minute intend to prevent Mr. Barnes from objecting to the absence of this evidence hereafter?

Mr. R. Breckinridge. My object is to prevent hereafter an unfair advantage from being taken of the Synod.

Mr. Barnes. I do not, by my silence, intend to admit the regularity of the proceedings of the Synod. The time is not yet come for me to object: and in the meanwhile I hope no such construction will be put upon my silence.

The question being now taken on striking out the minute as drawn up by Mr. R. Breckinridge, it was lost.

The question then recurring on its adoption, Dr. M'Dowell inquired whether the Synod was not making an incorrect statement when they said that they had the proceedings in the case?

Mr. R. Breckinridge. That was modified. The minute was then adopted.

ADDRESS

OF THE

REV. GARDINER SPRING, D. D.

Delivered in the Brick Church in Beekman street, New York, on Sabbath morning, December 20th, 1835, upon the occasion of the great conflagration in the city of New-York, on Wednesday night and Thursday morning preceding.

I rise before you, this morning, my friends, affected by the providence that has reduced the fairest portion of our city to ashes, and oppressed by the responsibility of addressing you, in some sort, as the afflicting occurrence demands. The pride of our city is laid low. The lambent flame has passed over it, and consumed the treasures of every land and every sea, every clime and every port. Its dwellings and its warehouses, its public institutions and its places of commercial resort,—nay, its very streets are a mass of smoking ruins. Enterprise and effort are discouraged; confidence between man and man is reduced to a state of painful uncertainty; and what is to be on the morrow, no human wisdom can foretell. The earnings of twenty years have been swept away; the rich are made poor; and the man who but yesterday could survey his hundreds of thousands, to-day, has not where to lay his head. Nor has the scourge been arrested even at the sanctuary. For while *we* are met here to-day in the house of God, one of our holy tribes weeps over the ashes of her altar.

What shall I say? The voice said, cry, and I said, what shall I cry? All flesh is grass, and all the goodliness thereof is as the flower of the field. The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: because the breath of the Lord bloweth upon it: surely the people is grass. The grass withereth, the flower fadeth; but the word of our God shall stand forever. Far be from us the infidel impression, that the God of heaven has not exercised a particular providence in this desolation. It is not by general laws simply that he governs the affairs of men; his almighty and invisible hand directs and gives energy to those laws and moves and guides every event both great and small. There is no room for fate, or chance, or contingency, in a world where he sitteth all in all. Casualty is a word known only by poetic licence, or in the creed of an atheist. On any other night of the year, the raging flame might probably have been arrested in its progress; but he who balances the clouds and has his way in the whirlwind, disappointed and disconcerted the schemes of men, so that their hands could not perform their enterprise. He giveth snow like wool; he scattereth the hoar frost like ashes; he casteth forth his ice like morsels; and who can stand before his cold? Shall a trumpet be blown in the city and the people not be afraid? Shall there be evil in the city and the Lord hath not done it? I am the Lord, says he, and there is none else; there is no God beside me. I form the light and create darkness; I make peace and create evil. I the Lord do all these things. I would not be without the consolation of knowing that his hand is in this thing. He made nothing in vain, and he governs nothing in vain. God is on the throne. The Lord God omnipotent reigneth, and let the earth rejoice! It is in the light of this truth that we see light in this dark providence, and have comfort and peace, though the earth be removed and the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea.

Righteous art thou, O Lord, when I plead with thee; yet let me talk with thee of thy judgments. Wherefore hath the Lord covered the daughter of Zion with a cloud in his anger, and cast down from Heaven unto earth the beauty of Israel, and remembered not his footstool in the day of his anger?—Wherefore hath he swallowed up the habitations of Jacob, and hath not pitied; and thrown down in his anger the strong hold of the daughter of Judah? It may be humbling, but it is profitable for us to observe the analogy between the peculiarity of our sin, and the peculiarity of our punishment. He whose eyes are upon the ways of men, has by this event discovered to us and to the world the crying sin of our metropolis, the crying sin of our churches, the crying sin of Christian men. So clearly is it brought to light, that we are laid under the necessity of acknowledging the hand of God. And, my brethren, what is it? Can there be but one answer? You anticipate I am sure, when I say it is the love of money. It is the absorbing desire to become rich. It is the indefatigable, unrelaxed effort to lay up treasures on the earth. This is our prominent character at home and abroad. Good men seem to have but little compunction for this spirit, though it stands out in bold relief before the world. But has not a conviction of this truth flashed upon their minds from the occurrences of the past week? I have no doubt it has, and has led them to confess the sin before God. Our growing wealth has been our snare; and we have seen the proud Babel, like the gourd of the prophet, come up in a night, and wither in a night. And can the voice of this providence be misinterpreted? Does it not say to us, you have thought too much of earth; you have set your affections too much on earth; you have pursued earth too eagerly; you have gloried in earth; and that though it makes you neither holy, nor happy, and can last but a little while? Is not the allegation true, and must we not plead guilty to the charge? Where is there a community whose attention is more absorbed, and whose mind is more engrossed on earth than our own? Good men scarcely know to what extent their hearts have been swallowed up in this all-ingulphing vortex. By day and by night, at home and abroad, their minds have been perpetually recurring to their plans of gain and worldly aggrandizement; nor have they been always diverted from them even at the calls of piety and devotion. There are not a few in our community who have developed mind and talent enough in the pursuit of wealth, to have governed an empire, or to have traversed the most extensive fields of learning and science. They ponder the signs of the times;—they watch the winds and the waves;—they investigate the policy of governments, and scrutinize the genius, disposition, and character of men for one great object and one alone. They lay themselves out to be rich. They study to be rich. No class of men are more industrious, more patient in toil, more perseveringly laborious from week to week, and from one year's end to the other, than the mercantile community of our own city. So far as my observation has been extended, it is a rare thing to find merchants at leisure. Their pleasure, their domestic comforts, their honour, their health, and *their life*, I have not unfrequently seen consecrated to gain. Their fixed and steady attention, and their strong and ardent affections have concentrated here. And the consequence is, they have been greatly prospered and have become rich. Multitudes of young men who came into this city when the speaker came into it, with nothing but good character and industry, have become men of princely fortune. And they have *gloried* in their wealth. From their unexampled prosperity, our city had become a proud city, and cherished a haughty sense of her superiority. We felt that we were the first, the great city, and that every other part of the land was necessarily tributary *to us*. We thought less of God. We were a *self-sufficient* people, and felt that we had both secured and could perpetuate our prosperity by our own exertions and enterprize. The wise man gloried in his wisdom, and the mighty man gloried in his might, and the rich man gloried in his riches. This was the general feeling and spirit; and that though all our prosperity had come from God; though his favour had made us rich; though his hand covered the hills with cattle, and the valleys with corn, and his winds and waves had wafted to our shores the wealth of both the spheres; and though the continuance of our prosperity was dependent on that same almighty benevolent Being who gave them at first. And it is for these things that God has a controversy with us. We have deserved this desolating judgment. Well might he say, *Shall I not visit for these things?*

Beloved friends, we have appreciated this world too highly. God has told us so in his word and we would not believe him. and now he comes to tell us in another way, and with an emphasis that sinks terror into our souls, and will not be soon forgotten. The chief end of man is to glorify God, and enjoy him for ever, and not to get wealth. The Saviour requires us to seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, at the same time promising us that he himself would be responsible for our earthly wants, and that the things that are necessary and on the whole desirable for us shall be added unto us. He has said that the Lord God will be a sun and a shield; that he would give grace and glory; and that no good thing would be withheld from them that walk uprightly. And every other object of supreme pursuit falls far below the dignity of man's nature, and the elevated destination of his existence. Men are the offspring of God, formed in the image of their Maker. They are born for immortality, and have an existence within them that will never die. They are the favoured objects of the divine care and goodness, and mercy; and God has done more for them than he has done for any other creatures in the universe. For man he made, and upholds, and governs the world. For man he devised and revealed the wonderful method of redemption. For man he gave his Son to die, the just for the unjust, that he might bring them unto God. Man he made to be holy, and to advance in light, holiness and joy beyond measure and without end. And may men so disregard the just principles of their nature, and the great objects of their existence, and the law and mercy of Heaven, as to love and serve the creature more than the Creator, who is God over all, blessed forever? How ineffably unwise such a choice! How infatuated must be such a mind. Ah! "what shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" Give him the world; give it *all* to him, and what is he the better, or the happier, if he lose his own soul? Fill his coffers with gold and silver; store his treasury with diamonds and sapphires; replenish his granaries with the corn of Egypt; crowd his ware-houses with spices, and silks, tapestry, and cloth, and fur, and sable, and jewelry; and his cellars with choice wines; beautify his garden with trees and plants, and flowers; furnish his table and equipage with all that clime and country can yield, and judgment and taste can select; and, then contemplate him as a stranger to the Living God—as a despiser of the great salvation, as a lost and ruined man, as lost and undone, forever, as losing his soul in the grief, and shame, and anguish, and torment, and flames of Hell? What has he gained? The rich man who was "clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day,—died, and was buried; and in Hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torment, and saw Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water and cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame!"

And will this incessant solicitude, and this eager pursuit of the world, beloved hearers, assist you in taking care of your souls? Will it lead you to love God, confide in the Saviour, and take up your cross and follow him, who for your sakes became poor, that through his poverty you might become rich?—On the other hand, do you not find it a snare to the soul? Does it not encourage that pride of life, and that inordinate and unreasonable self-esteem, which excludes God from the heart? Does it not fortify that natural feeling of independence, which tempts the mind even to a haughty contempt of God? Does it not merge it in so many cares and perplexities, that your home is occupied, your attention wearied, and your body and mind so exhausted, that you have no place left for thoughts of God and eternity? Does not this strong attachment to earth lead you *to sin?* Does it not lead you to the omission of duties, which you would otherwise perform? Do you read your Bible as frequently, do you pray as often in your closet and in your family, and is your place as perpetually filled in the house of God, and at the weekly lecture and prayer-meeting, as it would be, but for the harassing avocations of the world? And even when you pray, and come to the house of God, and take your seat at the table of the Redeemer's love, do you enjoy as much of the divine presence, and have you such evidences of fellowship with your Saviour, as you would enjoy, if your minds were not so pre-occupied in the concerns of earth? Is not this worldly spirit blinding your mind, searing your conscience, and hardening your heart? Is it not making the way to heaven arduous and difficult, and so much so, that it is a very doubtful problem, whether some of you who have thought that you have set your faces thither, will ever reach that blessed abode? God has said, "they that will be rich fall into temptation, and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition;" and yet, you will be rich. God has said, "The love of money is the root of all evil, which, while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows;" and yet you will be rich. God has said, "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven;" and yet you will be rich.

God has told you that this world cannot make you happy;—and have none of you been slow of heart to believe his declarations? Well, hear him now. Look to the melancholy devastations of our once cheerful city, and say, what is there in the spirit of the world, and in its rapid gains, and in its richest promise, that can satisfy the soul? Where is the man whom the world ever made happy? What is it but a toy, fit for children to play with, compared with the good which God reveals in the gospel of his son? what is it, but the pleasure of sin for a season, the joy of the ungodly, the dream, the hallucination of a grovelling mind? There is a guide to happiness, but it is not the world. The world is an *ignis fatuus*, which moves unsteadily before the eye, and the very glare of which depends on a disordered mind. Certainly as men exist, will the world disappoint them. Yonder disastrous scene proclaims its vanity. "Lean not on earth," is the voice of this providence,

"——— Lean not on earth,
"'Twill pierce thee to the heart;
"A broken reed at best, but oft a spear,
"On whose sharp point peace bleeds and hope expires."

You cannot hold the world so fast, but the slightest touch can break the tenure. You cannot anchor it so safely, as to ride the slightest tempest. Human wisdom is not sufficiently fruitful in expedients to secure it against an evil day. Arms cannot defend it; power and vigilance cannot secure it; insurance cannot make it sure. It will deceive, while it lasts; and it lasts, as it were, but for an hour. The negligence of a moment exposes it beyond recovery; a breath of air prostrates it; a single spark melts it away. At any moment, by numberless means, and by means the most unlooked for, and the most distressing, it may go like the chaff of the summer threshing-floor. Who could have expected, at the going down of the sun last Wednesday evening the awful event we now deplore? Every heart was full of hope. Every family was full of peace: Every office was cheered in its enterprise: Every imagination was dreaming of extended prospects of unclouded prosperity: When that fatal spark kindled in youder chamber and communicated from dwelling to dwelling, till the richest portion of our city was enveloped in flames, the many walls of brick and stone, the pride of commerce and the labour of years were involved in ruin. We started from our slumbers to see the city in a blaze, and at morning dawn, to learn from the anguish of ten thousand hearts, that in one sad night, the bright prospects of our proud metropolis are vanished!

Will you, beloved friends, set your affections and hopes on earth; will you trust in the multitude of your riches, after such a scene as this? Will you say to the gold, thou art my trust, and to the most pure gold, thou art my confidence, in view of such instantaneous and wide-spread ruins as these?

Cardinal Wolsey, a celebrated favourite at the court of Henry VIII. and afterward the Lord Chancellor of England, and who subsequently incurred the displeasure of his capricious master, and was ultimately arrested on a charge of high treason, a few hours before his death exclaimed in accents of agony, "Had I served my God with the same zeal that I have served the King, he would not have forsaken me in this hour!" Had you, dear hearers, served God with *half* the zeal with which you have served the *world*, how different had been your losses and prospects at the present momeut! Had you given him the strong and ardent affections of your heart: had you given him the ardour and sensibility which you have given to the world, had he drawn forth those warm desires and that fire of zeal which have been nourished and invigorated by the world; you would never have been left comfortless. Believe me, there is a better portion for you, than all this world can give. God is the refuge and portion of the soul. He is an almighty, allwise, all gracious Spirit. He is every where present. He is the most lovely being in the universe. His favour is life, his frown is death. He can fill your hearts with joy and your lips with praise. He can refresh and cheer you, when you are weary and despanding. He can support and comfort you, when you are languishing and afflicted. He can feed and clothe you. He can guide you in this wayward world. He can forgive your sins; sanctify your hearts; lift upon you the light of his countenance, and make you more happy in his love, than ever you have been in the most cheerful days of your bright prosperity. And he will never fail.

His throne will stand; his laws will remain immutable; his Gospel liveth for ever; his covenant of mercy shall be sure, when the mountains depart, and the hills are removed; his love shall continue unchanged and unchanging, yesterday, to-day and for ever. When you lie a dying man, with all the wealth and splendours of earth withdrawn from your fading vision, the angel of peace shall hover over your pillow; his light shall dissipate your darkness; his strength shall be made perfect in your weakness; his "own soft hand" shall wipe away your tears; his unsleeping eye shall watch your sleeping dust as it reposes beneath the clods of the valley; and his well known voice shall wake you on the last great day to live, and rise and reign with him. And then the fires shall rage, and this vast world shall be lighted up in flames, and palaces and treasures shall crumble away, and the very elements melt with fervent heat; but God shall live, and your portion and refuge be secure.

O, then, acquaint yourselves with God. Acquaint yourselves with the Gospel of his Son. Confide in him. Rejoice in him. No matter how eagerly you seek these treasures. They are alike invaluable and imperishable. Moth and rust will not corrupt them: thieves will not break through and steal them: fires will not light on them, nor any heat; and the gracious assurance that makes them yours, the policy that guarantees them to you forever shall never wax old—shall never run out, nor run down. Dear brethren, I solicit from you, then, a sincere consecration of yourselves to God. I solicit for him a true heart and a devoted life. I solicit for him a renewed devotement of yourselves to him, in an everlasting covenant never to be revoked nor forgotten. I solicit for him more of your time, more of your talents, more of your influence, more of your prayers. I beseech you to resolve from this day, to live to him and not to yourselves. Whether you are left rich or poor, be the servants of God, and seek the interest of his kingdom above every other interest. Acknowledge him in all your ways, and look to him to form all your plans, guide all your steps and supply all your need. "Except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain who build it; except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh in vain."

You have no cause to be depressed by this providence. If God means to make you holy men, and save you, he will not suffer you to set your affections on the earth. He will visit your iniquity with a rod and your transgression with stripes; he will consume your idols before your eyes, and you shall see the smoke of them go up like the smoke of a great furnace; but his loving kindness he will not utterly take from you, nor suffer his faithfulness to fail. Many, if not all of you, can sing of mercies and of judgments, and your past history and your present hopes show that you have no less cause to praise him for his judgments than his mercies. You remember the wormwood and the gall; your soul hath them still in remembrance, and is humbled in you, therefore have you hope. When God frowns on your idols, therefore, do not complain. They are *but* idols, and were ensnaring your heart. When he sweeps away the wealth of this world, do not complain. It is nothing *but* the world, and was ensnaring your heart. Nothing shall harm you, if ye be followers of that which is good. The young ravens may cry and suffer hunger, but there shall be no want to them that fear God.

A FAREWELL MISSIONARY MEETING

Was held at the Presbyterian Church in Indianapolis, on Monday evening, Nov. 30th, being the evening previous to the departure of Mr. Thomas Brown, as a missionary printer, and Mrs. Julia A. Brown, as a teacher, for Lodiana, in Northern India, under the care of the Western Foreign Missionary Society. A large congregation assembled, composed of Christians of various denominations, other citizens, and many distinguished strangers. The feeling pervading the assemblage, and the whole exercises, were of deep and engrossing solemnity. *There* was one of the most promising young men of the place, with his esteemed wife, leaving associates, friends, fellow Christians, and native land; and devoting life and labour, unreservedly, to the extension of the blessings of the Gospel in India, and it could not be that any could attend such a parting unmoved.

Very appropriate addresses were delivered by Hon. Jesse L. Holman, Judge of the District Court, U. S., Jeremiah Sullivan, Esq. Rev. Messrs. Holliday and Richmond, by Mr. Brown, and by the Rev. James McKennon, the pastor of the church. Various missionary hymns were sung, and the exercises were closed with the hymn,

"Yes, my native land, I love thee!"

sung by the missionaries. The contribution in aid of the missionaries amounted to $164 57.

On the day previous, (Sabbath) a farewell Sabbath School meeting was held by a union of the three Sabbath Schools, which was numerously attended; and the parting of Mr. Brown, who was reared a Sabbath school scholar and teacher, among us, was impressing and affecting. There was contributed by Sabbath schools of this place, $32 14, and committed to Mr. Brown, for the purpose of forming the first Sabbath school in Lodiana; to which it is expected contributions will be continued.—*Indiana Herald.*

From the New York Observer.

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

Philadelphia, Dec. 26, 1835.

Christian Brethren.—It is probably known to you that the last General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, in making its arrangements to fill the vacant professorships in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, implied a request that I would endeavour, during the present year, to raise the funds necessary to the full and permanent endowment of that venerable institution. The Board of Directory of the Seminary have since that time conferred upon me a *commission* to that effect. These facts, in connexion with the affecting appeal of the professors, herewith published, show the urgent necessity of an immediate effort to secure this important end.

In view of such an effort, a large number of the ministers and laymen of the Presbyterian churches in New York united in calling a public meeting on the 21st of the present month, to take this subject into consideration.

In the mean time, however, you were visited by that great public calamity, by which, in the adorable providence of God, the fairest portion of your city has been reduced to ashes; and it was at once resolved to abandon, for the present, all attempts at such a meeting, as alike untimely and ungenerous. And yet we rejoice to know that neither the resources nor the benevolence of New York can largely or long be affected even by such a disaster. While, therefore, we feel it to be due on all accounts, to delay this application until the citizens of New York shall say it is seasonable to make it, we beg your particular attention to the accompanying appeal, that you will carefully peruse it, and bear the important claims which it so unpretendingly urges, in kind remembrance. I only add that *no part* of the funds which I am attempting to secure for the Seminary is intended to be applied to my own support in that institution. I have, from the first, determined, that if the Presbyterian church do not without my agency, make the necessary provision, that fact alone will, with sufficient clearness, indicate the duty of declining a position which I never sought, and for which, whoever may think me greatly unfit, has long since been anticipated by your friend and servant,

John Breckinridge.

The professors of the Theological Seminary, at Princeton having been requested to prepare a brief statement of its present situation, and especially of its wants, and of the plans which have been formed for its future improvement, beg leave to make the following representation. This they do with the more readiness, because they are persuaded that, often and strongly as the necessities of the Institution have been exhibited, the public are still very imperfectly informed of its real situation.

Although this seminary has existed for more than *twenty-three years*, and has numbered among its pupils *between seven and eight hundred candidates for the ministry*, it has never received the pecuniary support, which its necessity urgently demanded, and which it was once hoped that the zeal of its *alumni* would alone have secured. Its whole existence has been a constant course of struggle with poverty, which weakened its energies; deprived it of many important advantages; and greatly diminished its capacity to benefit the church—to say nothing of impairing both the comfort and the usefulness of the professors. With these difficulties they have continued to struggle with patience and with hope; and cannot yet abandon the confidence that there are friends of the Seminary who will no longer withhold from it that aid which it most urgently needs, and which, if supplied, would enable it, under the divine blessing, much more extensively and effectually to promote the improvement of our rising ministry.

In the *first* place, it does not seem to be generally known, that the permanent funds of the Seminary, on the interest of which reliance is placed for the support of the professors, are still altogether inadequate. Accordingly, for the greater part of the last two years, there have not been means for the regular payment of their salaries, and they have been, on various occasions, reduced to inconvenient and mortifying straits in regard to the support of their families. Frequently as this humiliating fact has been referred to in the public papers and often as the donation of small sums to meet these distressing wants, has been acknowledged in the same channels of intelligence; it is confidently believed that the real state of this case is very imperfectly apprehended; and that if it were distinctly understood, the means of relief could not long be withheld.

The difficulty which has been stated presses heavily on the institution, even with its present number of professors. But the present number is not sufficient to secure all the advantages which ought to be sought in a Theological Seminary. Under this impression, the last General Assembly appointed two more professors, for the support of whom, it is indispensable that additional provision be made. Can it be that the friends of religion will any longer disregard the wants—not to say the claims—of an institution which has been for nearly a quarter of a century faithfully and patiently labouring in the great work of training a ministry for the Presbyterian church? May it not be hoped that the deficiency of support hitherto felt and lamented, has been owing to a want of acquaintance with the necessities of the Seminary, rather than to the want of a disposition to patronize it? May not the confident expectation be indulged, that when the object is distinctly presented, and the urgent necessity of the institution fully made known, there will be found among Presbyterians an amount of pious liberality and public spirit commensurate with the demand for its exercise?

But the adequate support of Professors is by no means the only object of vital importance, in planning the extension and improvements of the Seminary. The urgent demand for another edifice, for the accommodation of students; for a suitable building for the reception of a library; for the enlargement of the library itself, the smallness of which the Professors are compelled every day painfully to feel and lament; and for provision for diminishing the necessary expenses of the students—has been long and constantly felt by those who have had an opportunity of becoming intimately acquainted with our circumstances. The Professors are deeply persuaded that nothing more is necessary to convince every reflecting friend of the Seminary of the reality and urgency of these wants, and of their close connexion with the best interests of the institution, than a cursory inspection of our narrow means, and of the disadvantages which are thereby constantly imposed upon all our labours for the benefit of the youth committed to our care.

The senior Professors feel indeed that their advanced age, and a probability of their soon surrendering their offices to other hands, render their personal interests in a more ample patronage of the Seminary, much smaller than it once was. Yet they cannot but indulge the deepest solicitude for the prosperity, the enlargement, and the extensive usefulness of an institution, for the benefit of which they have so long laboured, and which they hope is destined to be a rich and permanent blessing to the church, long after their services and defects shall have been alike consigned to oblivion.

A. Alexander,
Samuel Miller,
C. Hodge.

Princeton, Dec. 12, 1835.

P. S. In addition to the wants of the Seminary above recited, the Professors would beg leave to add the urgent need of *more ground*, for the future erection of Professors' houses, and of such other buildings as may be indispensable to the enlarged usefulness and comfort of the institution.

For the Presbyterian.

"AT AND AFTER."

Mr. Editor,—In justice to a father in the church, through whose instrumentality, it has been asserted that the *trap* in the act of the last Assembly, was occasioned, let me state a fact. In the Synod of Philadelphia, Dr. Ely declared that in consequence of the insertion of the words "at and after," in the act of the Assembly, uniting the Synod of Delaware with that of Philadelphia; the latter Synod had no jurisdiction over the doings of the Presbyteries formerly attached to the Synod of Delaware, prior to the union.

Now, Sir, it is a fact that Dr. Ely drafted the minute of amalgamation himself, commencing it thus, "*Resolved*, That after the meeting of the Synod of Philadelphia, &c." As this language did not determine *how long after* the meeting of the Synod of Philadelphia, the union should take place, Dr. Miller moved to amend the minute by the insertion of the words "at and" between the words "that" and "after." Now, Mr. Editor, with what justice or truth can it be asserted that the amendment of Dr. Miller, occasioned the "*trap*," which Dr. Ely declared was *providential*. The minute, as it came from Dr. Ely's pen, surely gives no more jurisdiction to the Synod of Philadelphia, than it now possesses under the amendment. Besides, Dr. Ely declared that inasmuch as the act of the Assembly made no provision for transfer of the books and unfinished business of the late Synod of Delaware, the Synod of Philadelphia could lay no claim to them. But as Dr. Ely was the drafter of the minute, let him explain the reason why he omitted the insertion of such a provisionary clause. Did he intend thereby to "*trap*" the Synod of Philadelphia? The Assembly did not suspect a *trick* of this kind when he offered his minute for their adoption.

A MEMBER OF THE LAST ASSEMBLY.

For the Presbyterian.

CASE OF MR. MAGILL.

Mr. Editor.—I am induced, by an article in your paper of the 19th November, headed "Magill's Case," to offer you a few remarks in defence of a brother's character. You will please give a place to them if they appear conducive to the advancement of pure religion, and the establishment of the Orthodox Faith of our church.

For the advancement of that purity we need not exaggerated or uncandid statements of the opinions of those who differ from us; which error has I think been fallen into by your correspondent.

As regards the proceedings before the Presbytery, your correspondent I believe to be correct; but he should have added that every one thought, not only that "Presbytery did right," but that Mr. Magill had acted in a manner highly honourable, and with perfect openness and candour, and in Christian simplicity.

Injustice is done to Mr. Magill in classing him with Mr. Finney, whose extravagances I have often heard him reprobate, and therefore there must be "a difference" although their opinions may have been originally drawn from the same source.

Mr. Magill is a Taylorite as far as he understands the system. In regard to regeneration he says every sinner has physical ability to change his own heart, but that the influences of the Spirit are necessary, to change the will, before the sinner will repent and believe. On the subject of the atonement and justification he is also at variance with our Standards. He acknowledges a kind of depravity, but says "that, the only interest infants, dying in infancy, have in the atonement, is, the securing of their existence. Adam and Eve were preserved and had posterity, because of the promise of the Saviour; otherwise they would have been the first and last of their race; and this is the reason that infants will cast their crowns before him in heaven."

From a very intimate acquaintance with Mr. Magill, I believe that his "notions of morality" and his practical exhibition of it, would please the most Orthodox: yet he believes with his school, that "all sin is in intention," but not "that all virtue consists in expediency." If we of the old school deem his theology incorrect, he exhibits the holy walk and conversation of a consistent Christian, and although his friends deplore his heterodoxy, their hopes of his usefulness in the cause of Christ are *not* "utterly disappointed," for with his faithfulness and love to the Redeemer's cause, they confidently expect him to be an instrument of much good, *though* he cannot consistently enter the Presbyterian Church.

I am far from advocating the admission of nonconformists into our church; indeed it was with fervent gratitude that I witnessed the hand of