

ference of the great Methodist church of Canada be said to have dealt out the justice that Jesus would have meted out to Rev. A. Truax had he controlled the deliberations of that recent assembly? Did the examining Committee, and the prosecuting Committee, and the Conference itself exercise just that mercy that Jesus would have exercised had Rev. Mr. Truax been brought before him for trial and judgment?

Could it by any possibility be said that the "quality of mercy was not strained" on Mr. Truax's case?

In the secret Councils of the Scribes, Pharisees and hypocrites of the Methodist church (always provided that it contains such) when they came together in the secret caucuses and councils and deliberations, did they do much praying? They charge Mr. Truax with doing too little.

And after Jesus' denunciations of the Scribes and Pharisees when they "began to press upon him vehemently," was there an analogy or did history repeat itself when the Scribes and Pharisees of the Niagara Methodist Conference pressed upon Mr. Truax vehemently with their questions?

Could the scene have been photographed, would there have been much difference between the scene at St Catharines and in Wesley's palace there, and Pontius Pilate's palace where Jesus was tried? And when the Rev. A. Truax was led up to the house of that Chief inquisitor in Tilsonburg, Rev. J. Cooley, was there any similarity between this scene and that other scene where they led Jesus away to the house of one Caiaphas, the high Priest?

In this scene who is it that is playing the role of "Judas" for the Methodists?

As I saw and heard the chief prosecutor, Rev. J. H. Cooley, laud Rev. Mr. Truax's piety to the skies in his closing speech, by word of mouth, while the scintillation of his eye savored of the dead men's bones within, I could not help having the ancient scene in which Judas figured brought prominently before my mind.

And if these things be true who is going

to take the place of Jesus Christ in this generation for purposes of denunciation?

Are we, his professed followers, going to sit meekly by and see truth and honor and justice dragged into the dust? Yes, if that be according to the mind and word of God.

But we know no law in this matter except the law of the spirit of life which was in Christ Jesus. At his bidding we are prepared to go forth or to meekly endure, to let alone, or imitate the Lord Jesus in his denunciations of those who practised not what they preached, or at his bidding to hold our peace. "Vengeance is mine, saith the Lord, I will repay." I would rather be amongst the 16 who kept their hands off Mr. Truax than amongst the 62 who condemned him. And to be consistent must not the 62 proceed against the 16? Is not the receiver as bad as the thief? Are the 16 not "accessory after the fact," to use a legal phrase? If Mr. Truax has committed a "felony" against the Methodist Church are the 16 not to be adjudged guilty of "compounding" the same? What have Drs. Williamson and Sutherland, ex-presidents of Conference, to say in their defence? What have Revs. Colling and Mitchell, ex-secretaries of Conference, to say for not keeping themselves above the semblance of suspicion in this important matter?

H. DICKENSON.

ALL.

ONE of the things most emphasized by the representation of a now passing away type of theology was that "all" who came to the Lord Jesus Christ for life could have the same without money and without price.

"Whosoever" has had the changes rung upon it till it was almost worn threadbare.

God's plan of salvation was for "all" who would take advantage of it.

And any modern ideas that would interfere with this orthodox presentation of gos-