

opposed, or neglected, the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel; but success in this important concern will not prove that a minister is altogether right in his sentiments or conduct. The differences which subsist among pious and successful ministers of different persuasions must convince us, that errors to a certain degree are not inconsistent with success. Yet we should always keep in mind, that a *wilful neglect* of any Divine command can admit no apology. We must not argue, that, because our obedience is strict in matters of great concern, we may allow ourselves to depart from the Gospel rule in matters of inferior moment. We should always keep in mind the declaration of our Saviour when comparing the tithing of mint, anise, and cummin, with the weightier matters of the law; "These ought ye to have done, and not to leave the others undone." We may not be aware of the injury which religion, in a course of time, may sustain, by a departure from that order in the Church, which Divine authority has established: nor are we allowed to weigh the consequences of disobedience, with the view to satisfy ourselves in the neglect of any divine command.

One general command respecting Church government is, "Let all things be done decently and in order;" and if success is to be considered universally as a proof of right conduct, then no one was ever instrumental in turning a sinner from the error of his way, who, in that part of his conduct which proved beneficial, was guilty of a breach of this command. I will not at present consider what decency and order require, but will, in this argument, leave every one to his own judgment. I will only appeal to the conscience of every reader, whether he is persuaded, that the spiritual good above-mentioned was never effected by a *y* one, while departing from such conduct as decency and order required.

Again; the same conduct may do good in one respect, and mischief in another. If we are to regu-