state of the Church, than to her state when they were originally written.

Those are the propositions we have reviewed: now for the application to your avowed practice about which you have no conscientious scruples.

1. The laws of Christ for the government of his Church were given by *inspiration*.

2. They were given to be observed by the members of the

Church—(true).

3. No subsequent book or books have been given by inspiration for the same purpose. (But one called the "Confession of Faith," without inspiration.)

4. The book the *Laws of Christ* is no less adapted to the present state of the Church, than to her state when they were

originally written.

While you have been standing in judgment upon the worshippers of God for dishonoring God's word, behold "THOUS ART THE MAN," who have subscribed a work of 465 pages purporting to give laws to the Church of Scotland! Now, provided that Church of Scotland is not the Church of Christ, you have a right to enact laws, or acquiesce in those already enacted, for its government. Otherwise not. "Who hath required this thing at your hand," to garble, disjoint, distract and derange, the word of inspiration, as though the learned councils of presumptuous men could amend either in matter or form, the complete work of the Holy Spirit.

The Psalms were given to the Jews:—the New Testament

was given to Christians.

We are no where told that all things proper to be sungwere given in the Psalms of David even to the Jews.

The Apostle says, "All things are given unto us that pertain to life and godliness," and, "I have not ceased to declare unto you the whole counsel of God."

The singing praises in worship is an exercise in which are

error may not prove fatal.

The governing of a Church is a matter in which an error

must prove fatal.

You decry the singing of hymns, though they be the doctrines of *inspiration*, conformed to the modern style of the imaguage.

Yet you solemnly set yourselves up to legislate for the "King