

Toll
11011
1199 x

4234 35-

“ WHY I AM A METHODIST.”

REPLY TO LAYMAN'S LETTERS.

NO. 1.

To the Editor of the Standard.

DEAR SIR,—Just three months ago to-day I wrote you a letter under the heading, “Why I am a Methodist,” pointing out a few of the many inaccurate statements made in a pamphlet by a “Churchman” reviewing a tract entitled as above. I was led to do so by the following reasons: About a year previously a series of fifteen letters appeared in the *Pembroke STANDARD* with the heading, “Why I am a Methodist,” and the signature of “Churchman.” So far as I am aware no one thought it worth while to take any notice of them. After the lapse of some months, however, they were dished up again, a little additional spice being thrown in, and presented to us in pamphlet form. But the “pamphlet” like the letters, seemed to be ignored. Its High Church friends, however, were deterained it should be seen, even if not read, and so, where they could not sell it they presented it, and I found it in many Methodist homes, where it had been placed by the High Church party of the English Church, and sometimes with the modest (?) request that *ten cents* be paid for it! But I never found anyone who had found it sufficiently interesting to read it through. Then, an editorial appeared in the *STANDARD* stating that it did not speak well for the non-episcopal churches that none

of their clergy had answered the pamphlet, besides a little squib from its admirers every now and then. Shortly after, some one, whether friend or foe I know not, sent me a copy, bearing the *Pembroke* postmark. I took it as a sort of challenge to reply to it, either by one who thought I could and wished I would, or, by one who imagined it to be unanswerable. So I concluded to write one letter, to show that the pamphlet could very easily be answered by anyone who saw fit to do so. At once “Churchman” alias “Layman” flew to the rescue of his offspring, but its pretty, smooth features had been sadly disfigured, and the ugly scars still remain.

I referred to the name of his pamphlet, “Methodism versus the Church,” and showed that, according to his view, Methodism does not constitute a church at all, while the Church of England is not only a church but *the only church*. In his reply he denies this claim, and intimates that the Church consists of “Roman, Eastern and Anglican,” and that the English church is only an “integral part of God's church!” This is poor patching and the thing still has an ugly look about it. He might as well have left it as it was.

Layman in his reply speaks of Methodist having made an “attack” on the church, although in a postscript to

1886