

his experience of converting grace, can be treated as mere speculations without serious departure from his teaching, provided the facts he emphasizes are not denied. These essential facts are the witness of the Spirit to forgiveness and adoption, and the possibility of perpetuating that experience.

If only the followers of John Wesley, who succeed in illustrating by the year, that is, continuously, his description of justifying grace, are permitted to throw stones at us because of thus plainly stating our views on these matters, we could live in a glass house, and a very thin one at that, without apprehension, provided we except those who illustrate the walk in the Spirit. But these, we are assured, would have no desire to break our domicile, seeing they would be in like habitations.

We repeat the statement, then, that concerning the essential facts of experience, the foregoing statements are in perfect harmony with Wesley's teaching, but we differ in our teaching concerning the means made and provided for securing the continuance of justifying grace. We emphasize the walk in the Spirit as the one and only means to this end, whilst he did not fully emancipate himself from the legalistic teachings of the centuries before, but, to a certain extent, practised and taught, as if orthodoxy in doctrine and legalistic efforts were part of the means to be used to secure this end.

IS THIS OUT OF HARMONY WITH CALVINISTIC TEACHING?

We think not. Indeed that was our decided belief as we watched the course of the trial of the Galt friends, and we did not hesitate to put ourselves on record concerning this matter, maintaining that a false issue was then raised which vitiated the judgment finally delivered.

This issue was the doctrine of inbred sin, as taught by the modern holiness creed movement. And we are ready to excuse, to a great extent, the verdict rendered, because of the indefiniteness

of the answers and experiences of the accused when this subject was touched.

The fact is, the seven were not an unit in their views concerning the matter, and so hesitated in their answers, and even appeared somewhat misty in their references to this doctrine. Some of the number were not sure but that "yes" and "no" answers would compromise them in their profession of living in the enjoyment of the *constant* assurance of faith, seeing they entered into this knowledge or experience when using the nomenclature of the holiness creed movement.

This lack of transparent clearness of language on their part is the Church's justification for the verdict of suspension rendered.

As to the obligation of their Church to so have examined into the matter as to have found out the real state of the case, we do not here give our opinion.

But from our standpoint we maintain that so soon as the Presbyterian Church learns from positive, unequivocal testimony that the suspended ones repudiate all connection with the doctrines of inbred sin as held by the holiness creed movement, it will be in order for them to remove the sentence of suspension and admit that the misunderstanding connected therewith is an ample explanation of the attitude of both parties. Here is where we can see common ground for mutual concession and reconciliation.

The doctrine of the witness of the Spirit to forgiveness and adoption is clearly taught in that Church. Indeed, the late Mr. Cranston, father of the three suspended brothers, stood side by side with his pastor, Rev. Dr. Smith, in fighting out this battle about a score of years ago, and secured the recognition of this experience of the assurance of faith as a true Presbyterian doctrine.

All that his sons are contending for is the possibility of having this experience continually.

And, evidently, the one experience is the logical sequence of the other. For, if one may have this assurance for five minutes, it must be possible to have it for five years; and, conversely, if it is not possible to have it for five years,