

further express my astonishment at people appealing to the Directory, when, if they had read it, they would know that its order of worship is different from ours—that it prohibits private baptism—that it enjoins two chapters to be read at each meeting—that it [as well as Willison] enjoins the frequent celebration of the Lord's Supper—that ministers are forbidden to marry people without proclamation—that marriage is commanded to be solemnized in Church—and that prayer at funerals is forbidden, while an address to the living is enjoined. The memorialists' law is the Confession and the Directory, so far as they suit themselves.

The West Branch River John memorialists ransack the sepulchre, where good men's ashes peacefully repose, for testimony to help them, and quote the words of the dying, and the words of the dead. The words of a dying man on matters of conscience or experience are eminently worthy of credit; but I have yet to learn that his opinions upon disputed questions demanding calm and sustained thought are of equal weight with those of a man in health. Sincerity is one thing, and intelligence is another. As to Willison, he drags things into his exposition of the second commandment with which it has nothing to do, and which Hopkins—an abler expositor—does not mention; and if his exposition be correct, he could not heartily make use of some of the Psalms. The Saltsprings elders seem obscurely to hint at there having been some instrument of music in the ark of the covenant—a most novel discovery, and not at all in their favour, I should think!

Passages proving that men should praise God with their hearts and lips are nothing to the purpose, as everybody admits that; and I threw out suggestions with that object. As to "God's not being worshipped with men's hands," &c., any ordinary reader knows that the passage refers to images and offering up gifts to them. If they mean that men are not to use their hands in God's service under the direction of His Word, but that they are to serve God with their hearts, and themselves with their hands, they advocate a very convenient kind of religion, of which too many afford glaring examples. As to the old wives' machinery argument, are not our Churches built by machinery, our clothes made by machinery, our communion vessels and baptismal fonts made by machinery, our sacramental bread baked by machinery, our Bibles printed by machinery? and do not many of the memorialists read their Bibles by the aid of machines called spectacles? Don't we hoist a musical instrument, pitched at a certain note of the scale, upon the topmost pinnacle of our Churches? When the Rev. Dr. Anderson was forbidden an organ upon the plea of its being a machine, he very consistently asked how he was to officiate in his pulpit, as he could not see to read the Bible without a machine on his nose. If the Saltsprings elders will read the 13th chapter of 1st Corinthians, they will see that it would be easy to prove that they are a machine themselves—sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal; and yet they tell me that "they wish to come up to the sanctuary in unity and peace, in love and harmony!"

As to divisions, the most serious division in our Church at present is that a certain portion of it leave the support of its schemes to a few overburdened congregations. This is illustrated by the history of the Lay Association, the McGillivray monument, the Young Men's Scheme, and the College scheme. This is such a serious division, that if such lukewarm friends do not mind themselves they will find it to be a serious matter. The great innovation which is needed is an improved liberality to the schemes of the

Church on the part of very many of our congregations.

I am surprised that Highlanders object to the organ, alleging that it is "an instrument strange to our forefathers." As the bag-pipe has a wind receptacle, several pipes and a finger-board, it is precisely an organ. In fact the Highlanders are responsible altogether for the existence of such an instrument as an organ. It is an honor to them; for while the former, from its associations, is not to be thought of in public worship, the latter is adapted for nothing but slow and solemn music. The great organ which I heard in Rotterdam, Holland, consisting of 5,500 pipes, followed by a large congregation all singing, and in time and tune, constituting the finest congregational singing I ever heard in my life, was *du principe* nothing but a large bagpipe, with this difference—that its associations were all sacred.

What is the use of crying out "innovations" and appealing to the Fathers? Dr. Norman McLeod shewed the absurdity of this in his speech at last General Assembly. The Blessed Saviour, the Apostles and the Reformers were great innovators. The cry was raised in our Lord's time that he violated the traditions of the elders. Luther, Calvin, Knox and the Melvilles were great innovators. The Church must adapt itself to the wants of its time, and there will be great changes ere it becomes what it ought to be and what it will be. The outcry is thus not only irrational, but inconsistent. Yet the various improvements wrought in the Church since the Reformation have always met with the same cry on the part of those who think they honor their fathers' institutions by letting them perish for want of mending.

In the present case, the use of the term is an ungenerous misnomer. I have been particularly strict in adhering to church laws, which I found very much in abeyance when I came to this country. As the term "innovation" can be applied only to an act or a practice, and not to an opinion, it has no application to me. If elders are elected by the people and not by the kirk-session, that is an innovation. If a book of hymns not authorized by the Church is used in a Sabbath School, that is an innovation. Sabbath Schools, even, are an innovation. The use of Watt's version is an innovation. I am no innovator, as in my congregation the laws of the Church are strictly observed; but those who do these and other things I could mention are innovators. Those congregations among us who practice simultaneous communion are innovators. Not that I condemn all these things; for changes within the constitution are to be tested by the Word of God; but people should not stare at my "mote" and lose sight of "the beam in their own eye."

To mix up this matter with Presbyterianism is the result of ignorance or unfairness. With the exception of a nominal episcopacy in Norway, and the Church of England, all the Reformed Churches of Europe are Presbyterian, and yet use organs; and but for the Tudors, the Church of England would have been Presbyterian too. The Church of Scotland is the only exception in this respect. As to presbyterial government, in attachment to it as scriptural, defence of its scripturalness, and practical support of it by attendance at its courts and interest in their deliberations I can safely say that I will yield to none of the anti-instrumentalists. It is because I love Presbyterianism that I do not wish to see it subjected to disadvantage in certain quarters, and because a particular thing suits some people, injury done by making it suit all. My Presbyterianism rests upon the same foundation with all my religious opinions—the Word of God.

As to liturgies, I am thoroughly opposed to