

like that. For he subscribes to the truism of St. John, "As He is so are we in this world" (1 John iv. 17). Moreover, to the extent it does not truly represent the words of Jesus, to that extent it is faulty, and to be rejected. This is all we wish to say concerning the spirit of this editorial.

But concerning some of the statements it contains we will write a few sentences.

In the first place, the readers of the *Guardian* have naturally presumed that Dr. Steele wrote this letter at the urgent request of the editor of *Guardian*, and for the *Guardian*. We suspect that this was not the case, as the letter appeared first in the *Christian Witness*. Now, if we are correct that it is simply a clipping from the *Witness*, then it is scarcely fair to Dr. Steele or others that they should be put in a false position before the public.

Again, he is in error concerning "*the Rev. Nelson Burns, and his disciples.*" Such disciples have no existence outside of the realm of imagination.

"Indeed we are persuaded that the number that accepts the theory of personal infallibility in judgment, with which Mr. Burns' name is associated, is very small."

Yes, and we suspect that it is even smaller than he thinks, for we have not met with one who teaches such a doctrine, but we do meet, from time to time, some who come close on the border line of illustrating it. When a minister, worshipping in the same church, and occasionally partaking of the sacrament with a brother minister, sees a hostile criticism of that brother in print, and does not wait to see if there is to be a reply to it, or does not take the trouble to travel the few rods between their private residences to ascertain his side of the story, but relying on his judgment, formed, necessarily, on one-sided evidence, publishes that critique, and accompanies it with the above comments, we would ask, if that is not acting out infallibility, what, in the name of common-sense is? Verily, if the editor of the *Guardian* can, at any time, convict us of such a specimen of practical belief in the infallibility of one's judgment as the legitimate outcome of any of our teachings, we certainly will feel

that it is high time to halt and go back to the first principles of the doctrine of Christ. Even the Romans, heathen though they were, enunciated the rule that it was not lawful to condemn a man until he was brought face to face with his accuser, and permitted to answer for himself against the charges made against him. (See Acts xxv. 16.)

But it can now be said that our reply to Dr. Steele was admitted to the columns of the *Guardian*. Yes, we are thankful to say it was, and to that extent there is a pleasing contrast between the *Christian Witness* and the *Christian Guardian*, for in the one case it was excluded altogether, whilst in the other case, after a delay of one week, it was published. The one editor is a professor of holiness, the other is a professed seeker of that experience, and yet, judged by their practice, we think the general verdict will be concerning the editor of the *Guardian*, "justified rather than the other."

But we have reason to think that strict justice was not meted out to us by our Canadian *confrère*. It will be noticed that the attack on us had the honor of a place in the editorial columns. Now, we think that we had the copy of our reply in the editor's sanctum in time for insertion in the same place as the letter of Dr. Steele appeared, although not in time for the correspondence columns; and we maintain that justice demanded that our letter, especially when it could not be printed elsewhere, should share equally with our opponent's letter.

It was no slight aggravation of this unprovoked, personal attack on us, that Dr. Dewart should subject us unnecessarily to the ordeal of sustaining the burden of his denunciations for an additional week, without the slight alleviation which our reply might afford, or even a short explanation as to the reason of our reply not appearing in his next issue. Is that doing to another as he would be done by, or in harmony with the royal command?

All we will say here concerning the allusions to doctrine in this editorial, is that we apprehend, from their wording, that, like many others, he is simply fighting men of straw of his own or others' creation. We emphasize the statement, we are as Arminian, as Wesleyan, and