

minister of a Church a right to complain that he is persecuted, because he is not allowed the liberty to remain in a Church to oppose and denounce its doctrines and discipline ?

A man should not expect the benefit of a contract, after he has broken its conditions. This is not a demand for freedom, but for tyranny. It is a demand that when a minister drifts away from the faith of his Church, the Church should still be bound to endorse him, on pain of being denounced as a persecutor if it refuse. The cry of freedom in all such cases is really a false issue. The cant of liberalism is quite as despicable as the cant of "orthodoxy." "*The freedom which they seek is freedom to remain within the Church and labor for the subversion of her faith.* We cannot satisfy them except by saying that we have no definite beliefs, and that we hardly wish to have any; and that the liberty to indulge speculation in religion is of more importance than the attainment of that knowledge of the Father and of the Son, which the Saviour has declared to be 'life eternal.'" (Dr. CAVEN.) I do not say that a man should at once leave a Church with which he is not in all respects in perfect harmony. There may be expedient modifications, demanded by changes of circumstances, which it is the duty of wise men to promote. But there is a wide difference between loyal efforts from within to revise creeds, or modify rules, in a lawful manner, and the preposterous claim of one who maintains that the ministers of a Church should still be clothed with its sanction and authority, while they employ all their opportunities to overturn the faith and order they have solemnly vowed to uphold. The reform and progress that have taken place in the Methodist Church owe nothing to men like Mr. Roy. Real reform requires dispassionate judgment and a comprehensive estimate of the difficulties to be met, and of the best method of overcoming them—not the reckless impetuosity of ill-regulated impulse.