

## REMARKS.

We deem it only due to all parties concerned to make a few concluding remarks concerning the appellants in their present attitude as adherents in the Presbyterian Church.

It would be reasonable to ask the question, Why don't they leave altogether the services of this Church and unite with some other branch of the Christian Church more in harmony with their views of doctrine?

Now they frankly admit that this would be the proper, the honorable course to adopt, did they fully acquiesce in the findings of the Assembly as true to facts in their case.

But in spite of this decision, and in spite of all the arguments used by members of the different courts, they are still unshaken in their belief that they are substantially in accord with the doctrines of the Presbyterian Church.

Dr. Ure struck the true note in the following words: "He had, however, a very deep impression that these dear brethren and sisters were very much more closely allied to them in sentiment at the bottom, if they could only get at the bottom of each other's minds in regard to these matters."

Yes, but can this note of harmony really be found? Well, they are prepared to wait in the firm belief that it will be found.

They can account largely for the vote of the Assembly by the mutual misunderstandings concerning the nature of sin.

The apparent lack of frankness, as evinced in our unwillingness to give Yes or No answers to searching questions concerning this intricate subject, was wholly interpreted against them.

The fact that their questioners had no difficulty in giving such answers themselves, must have seemed proof positive to some minds that there was something wrong.

Now this seeming want of frankness can be accounted for in two ways. In the first place, they had no clearly defined opinions concerning the line of demarcation between actual transgression—that which needs definite confession and forgiveness ere there can be peace with God and genuine hope of heaven—and that which, whether under the name of inbred sin, original sin, or sins of ignorance, does not call for definite confession or distinct acts of pardon, whatever may be believed or not believed concerning generalized confession or acknowledgment before God. Now, no man with any pretensions to ordinary wisdom is prepared to give Yes or No answers concerning any subject about which he has no clearly defined conviction or knowledge.

In the second place, they are well apprised of the fact that one of the generally understood differences between the teaching of Calvinism and Arminianism is concerning this very thing. Many holiness teachers of the Arminian class lay great stress on inbred sin as some entity that is taken out of the believer when entirely