

ference in God's treatment of good and bad, but in the strongest terms we say the reverse of this. But we *do* say that we believe God will finally change all the bad into good; bring them unto obedience to Himself; restore them to holiness, and *thus* to happiness.

It is here that we part company with our brethren of other Churches. This is the point at issue between us and them. Again I ask you not to mistake that point. There is no question as to the tendency, or the evil consequences, of bad, unfaithful living.

The question is—whether God's loving-kindness is over all his works, and whether his mercy endures for ever. The Catholic says that the bliss of Heaven is only for those who die in the bosom of the Roman Church; the Calvinist, that it is for a number "so certain and definite, that it cannot be either increased or diminished—chosen by God before the foundation of the world was laid," and that "the rest of mankind God was pleased to pass by, and to ordain to dishonor and wrath;" the Methodist, that Heaven is freely offered to all, but some failing to comply with the conditions, will perish everlastingly; the Universalist, agreeing with the Methodist that God has provided Heaven for all his children, goes further by affirming that all will finally comply with the conditions, and experience its joys. I proceed to indicate the grounds upon which this faith rests. As Christians we base it upon the revelation of the nature of God, contained in the Christian Scriptures, and in finding out what that revelation is, we acknowledge no other authority than the reason the good God has given us. Is this "German Rationalism?" In one sense it is, for it is the rationalism of which the great German, Luther, was the fearless champion. We make Reason the interpreter of God's word—are we to understand that any Protestant Christians acknowledge another? I confess my inability to comprehend the mental state of the man who stands before his fellows and *reasons* against the use of Reason in matters of Religion.

The bare fact of a Revelation, implies both a Revealer, and those capable of understanding what is revealed. And surely the capacity to understand involves the right to examine, and decide what the teaching of the Revelation is. Universalists claim to be loyal to this principle. Affirming that the Christian Scriptures "contain a revelation of the character of God, and of the duty, interest, and final destination of mankind," they hold it man's duty to find out, through reason, what that revelation is. Now, is there any need for me to prove, on the authority of the Scriptures, that God is Love, or that he loves mankind with an affection so deep and pure, that we cannot even measure its extent or its endurance? Men sneer at us for insisting upon this, but certainly it is the testi-