

persuade himself that the committee did him an injustice in finding his teachings contrary to Methodist doctrine, unless he has lost the power of discerning between things which differ. Why, even the Rev. A. J. Bray, who has endorsed his "catholicity," showing thereby that he is as heterodox as Mr. Roy himself, admits that this pamphlet is "a very strong attack on the so-called orthodoxy of the evangelical Churches"; and that from their standpoint the Methodists could not have done otherwise. Did Mr. Roy, then, really expect that any Church under heaven would treat teaching, which it firmly believed to be false and dangerous, just as if it were thought true and wholesome? Did he for one moment dream that the Methodist Church was ready to accept the signal of any impulsive sciolist, to "right-about-face," and keep step with his erratic movements? If so, it compels us to place a low estimate upon his sagacity.

Mr. Roy has imitated the practice of boys who throw stones behind them to help them in jumping. His communication in the *Witness* was feeble, ungenerous, and unfair. He flings unwarranted aspersions on the character of Methodist ministers, who have for years treated his erratic notions with brotherly forbearance. He complains that he was not tried in some other way than according to the discipline and usage of the Methodist Church. He unjustifiably intimates that the Methodists place erroneous opinions on the same level of condemnation with gross crimes—because the trial of both is conducted in the same manner. He actually complains because his indirect, evasive, and disingenuous method of assaulting the Bible and the doctrines of Christianity, did not shield him from the condemnation of the committee! In this last complaint he unconsciously reveals that he intentionally adopted this "masked battery" style of attack, with the foolish fancy that he would have the gratification of making a damaging