

bility in regard to Church government, the best centre for Christian Union. What is meant by the allegation that Dr Thomas's doctrines are at variance with the history and theology of the Methodist Church? Does the Methodist Church, by its formularies, bind its members to a belief in the Inspiration of the Scriptures, according to the narrow construction which seems to be cherished by the Rock River Conference, or does it simply affirm that "Scripture contains all things necessary to salvation?" Does it assert that the punishment inflicted by Divine Justice for a finite fault will be infinite, or is that merely a private interpretation of Scripture impressed as a popular belief on the minds of Methodists by a pulpit rhetoric of terror? As to the "history" of the Methodist Church, it has, no doubt, run parallel to that of the other Churches. All the Churches, in the time of Wesley, adhered to forms of belief to which, since the floodgates of new knowledge, scientific, historical and critical, have been opened, no man of competent learning can adhere without doing despite to the light which is in him, and which, it is to be presumed, comes from the universal source of light. The Churches have to look in the face the question whether that which reason by conscientious effort has discovered, does or does not emanate from the Author of Truth. If it does, they have to accept it, even though it may not square with their formularies and the past history of their doctrine. If it does not, they have to show us on what, if not on reason, the Evidences of Christianity rest. The Methodist Church itself is little more than a century old, and, on its first appearance, it shocked the orthodoxy of that day as much as anything propounded by Dr Thomas can shock the orthodoxy of ours. Everyone now heaps censures on the purblind prelates of a hidebound Establishment, who were unable to recognise the new spiritual birth, and whose narrowness deprived their Church of Wesley. But may not the members of the Rock River Conference be doing the same thing under different intellectual conditions and with a change of name? May not this which they are striving to crush or to cast out be another new