

may have something to learn in this connection. In the opinion of the Baptists we have a great deal to learn. Methodists and Presbyterians think we have learned enough.

And yet it is problematical whether we could satisfy the latter on this "baptism" any more than upon the "Divinity" question. Suppose we should say that the "ordinance" of baptism was non-essential. Then we would become unorthodox or heretical in the estimation of all. That is, to believe in baptism in some form, is, in the estimation of all, essential to being a Christian.

But suppose we should say that we were unable to settle the conflicting testimony as to the necessity of baptism by water, and claim that many of the passages pertaining thereto if "spiritually discerned" referred not to "water baptism," but to the baptism by the Holy Ghost. Then what would become of our orthodoxy? Would we then be ruled out of the synagogue?

In this "immaculate conception" matter, which is the only question that is up as far as we are concerned, we solemnly stated to the "court" of our church, before which we were recently summoned, that if they would pronounce that belief in the "immaculate conception" was essential to membership in the Presbyterian church, we would solve any difficulty they might have as to whether they should retain us on the rolls of their church or not, in a very few seconds. We would have withdrawn.

Had they the courage of their convictions? As for that, we have no concern. All that concerns us is, that proceedings were *apparently* dropped, and our name left on the rolls. We know little of the whys and wherefores, and care less. We give them the liberty that we take. Their action amounts, however, to relegating the "immaculate conception" to the realm of non-essentials. Their action proclaims to the world that it is not essential to Presbyterian church membership, at least, that the "immaculate conception" should be considered a bulwark of Christianity.

And Dr. McMullen, the Moderator of the Church Court, before which we were formal-

ly summoned by the following letter: "The session wish to confer with you both in regard to your prolonged absence from the Lord's table, and also to the views contained in an article professedly written by you and published in the EXPOSITOR OF HOLINESS," may safely be trusted as a representative of orthodoxy. He has held the highest offices in the gift of his church.

But of course the question may come up again, and it may be said, your thus writing may have a tendency to provoke further action.

Quite so, but to frankly state facts can injure no one. And as far as we are concerned we have no personal ends to serve. "The way, the truth and the life," must continue to occupy a foremost place with us, let the consequences be what they may.

In doing the will of the Father, consequences must always take a secondary place. The will must be done at all hazards.

We expect to be found continuing to exalt the "humanity of Christ," till the truth is believed that he "became flesh, "bone of our bone," and "dwelt amongst us." We further expect to continue exalting the glorious privilege of man to live "even as he lived"—"As he is, so are we in this world."

We expect to continue going into all the world and preaching the gospel of our "joint heirship with Christ" to all the "inheritance of God."

And we further expect to continue preaching our full claims to full brotherhood with Jesus.

We expect to be found pressing upon the attention of men this fact that as God expects us to be "perfect as he is perfect," there is no other way than Christ's way in which this perfection can be attained, obtained or retained.

"Neither is there any other name under heaven, that is given among men, whereby we must be saved," "In none other is there salvation."

We therefore can exalt Jesus, but it must not be in any way that will violate either our conscience, our common sense, or our