

on this subject, as well as others treated of in his letters. I shall, however, offer a few remarks.

In your issue of May 11th Layman quotes Wesley as saying: 'By water then, the water of baptism, we are regenerated or born again.' I called this a 'garbled' extract, adding the qualifying phrase, 'if extract at all'—simply because I was not sure whether it was or was not. This stirs up Layman's wrath and he is neither 'courteous and mild'—nor even truthful.

By the way, Layman says I admitted he was 'courteous and mild.' Where? When? He cannot tell. He modestly (?) takes this unction to himself because I said, 'It is all very well to be mild and courteous, but not at the expense of truth,' having in my mind at the time a flattering notice of his pamphlet by one of its admirers, for however much courtesy he may profess or his friends profess for him, his writings show more need of than justification for such a claim.

But to return. Layman says: 'Their source being given, why did he not verify the quotation before making such a base insinuation?' He then adds: 'No; this was too manly a course for our Methodist minister to adopt. So he seeks to convey the impression that the extract is a forgery—*manufactured* to mislead.' Now, Mr. Editor, I wish to ask you and your intelligent and unprejudiced readers, where is there 'courtesy,' 'mildness' or even *truthfulness* in the foregoing fulminations of Layman! Because I did not choose to vouch for the accuracy of his alleged quotation he has no right to assert that I 'sought to convey the impression that it was a forgery.' I did not. He charges me with being 'unmanly' and with making a 'base insinuation'; and still, at the risk of his repeating the charge, I have to say that *he* has been 'un-

manly' and 'base' enough to 'seek to convey the impression' that in his letter to which I was replying, and which contained the quotation above referred to, the 'source' of said quotation was given; *but it is not*, else I would have 'verified' it. Let your readers turn to his letter in the STANDARD of May 11th, and, as Layman says, 'Look and see.' But if they look at it till they are blind they will not find the least indication of the 'source' of that extract. Now what are we to think, Mr. Editor, of one who will make such reckless and unfounded assertions, and by such means endeavour to prove to your readers that I acted a 'base' and 'unmanly' part? Such a man is not to be trusted, and your readers will certainly require him to 'verify' his statements in future before accepting them as the truth.

But though no such hint was given in the former letter Layman does intimate in this one that he was quoting from Wesley's 'Treatise on Baptism.' He then goes on and makes very elaborate quotations from this 'treatise,' which seem to establish his theory; still even in this 'treatise' it is admitted that while baptism is the ordinary means of Salvation 'to which God hath tied us,' yet 'he may not have tied himself.' Indeed it is acknowledged that 'where baptism cannot be had the case is different,' i.e., the person may be regenerated without baptism.

But it matters little what this treatise teaches or does not teach. In the first place it was written, not by John Wesley, but by his father, who was a rigid high church clergyman. In 1756, the date properly quoted by Layman, John Wesley did republish this treatise, and adopt it as his own—thus showing his veneration for his father and strong attachment to his mother church.