

The question then gets narrowed down to this very simple issue, "How far ought the word of God to be taken in framing the enactments of a country? And to say that it is merely whether or not the word of God should be formally recognized in the preamble of Bills as the basis of legislation is mere trifling. Lord Macaulay and Professor Young are fond of *three courses* (and wasn't that Sir Robert Peel's hobby, too?) So perhaps I might be permitted to follow; at however humble a distance, such illustrious examples.

I can conceive No. I. saying, every single ordinance and commandment in that book, which is not formally repealed in the same is binding on *every community* under the cope of heaven, and ought to form part of their civil enactments. Men have no right to pick and choose among the ordinances of God. "Thus saith the Lord," puts an end to discussion and selection.

No. II. would be rather staggered at it, and would demur. While he would be ready to oppose and condemn any law which was evidently contrary to the Word of God, he could not but feel that many of the requirements in that Word are between the individual and His God, and would involve formidable consequences if enforced by civil authority. We would not, therefore, have every thing punishable by law which is condemned as sin in the Scriptures, or every thing enjoined which is there laid down as individual duty. He is for the distinction being kept up of sin *as sin* against God, and sin *as crime* against the community. And the latter, he thinks, the only fit subject for human legislation.

No. III., on the other hand, holds that the Scriptures have nothing to do with human legislation; and that nothing should pass into law but what is agreeable to, and discoverable by, reason, unassisted by the light of revelation.

How many have you ever met with who agreed with No. III.? I have never, as yet, met *one*, though if I had, I do not think it would be a very formidable matter to supply him with difficulties by the score. It would be, for instance, a very difficult matter to settle what is *discoverable* by reason without revelation in any country where the Bible *may* have been known. Even in heathen Greece and Rome is any one *quite sure* that the legislators got *no* information from the Bible? And as to being in accordance with reason, the Christian believes that may be shown in reference to every part of his heavenly charter.

Leave this opinion, however, out of the question, as I am not aware of a single United Presbyterian holding it as stated, and let us pay our respects to No. I. Will our Free Church friends endorse that opinion? Will Dr. Bayne? Will Dr. Willis? Will Dr. Irving? I could scarcely believe they will. I understand, indeed, a certain Free Church Minister of some local standing has asserted once and again at public meetings, that the man who gathers sticks on the Sabbath day ought to be stoned *now* as under the old econ-