

This is a solemn matter; an oath is not to be trifled with, even in law courts, and still less—if that be possible—in matters pertaining to the worship of Jehovah, “for the Lord will surely require it of thee”; His views of an oath, are evidently very different from the views of your Minister and Elders.

The Rev. D. Inglis and your Elders separately and each for himself, at his respective ordination, deliberately avowed (which avowing is a solemn oath in the sight of Jehovah, and of men, although not so recognized by law courts, and hence the breach thereof even should it be wilful and corrupt cannot be punished as perjury, such as wilful false swearing in law can be, and the person guilty thereof, justly rendered *infamous* for life) that he did own the purity of Worship then authorized and practised in the said Church, and also the Presbyterian Government and Discipline thereof; that he was persuaded the same were founded on the Word of God, and agreeable thereto; that he should firmly and constantly adhere to the same; that he should in his practice, conform himself to the said Worship, and submit to the said Discipline and Government, and never endeavour directly or indirectly the prejudice or subversion of the same; and that he should follow no divisive course from the then order of the Church. And I again plainly ask, has he and they, in the change they have made in the Worship, by standing and singing said psalms, as aforesaid explained, “firmly and constantly adhered” to the said Worship and Government; which they swore they felt persuaded were “founded on the Word of God, and agreeable thereto”? Have they “in their practice conformed themselves to the same”? Most assuredly not. Have not they “directly” not only “endeavoured” but succeeded in the “subversion of the same”? And have they not “followed a divisive course from the order in the Church” by such their said procedure? Most assuredly they have. And have they not thereby violated, broken, trampled upon, firstly, their positive oath to “adhere to and conform; and secondly, their negative oath, “not to endeavour the prejudice or subversion, and to follow no divisive course.” Most assuredly they have. And such violation has been calmly premeditated, and determinedly maintained, in the face of repeated remonstrance, and clear exposition thereof, thereby shewing clearly an utter disregard of their oath, and a setting at