

perience. In it occur these words: "That I have often stumbled and slipped, and do yet come far short of a faultless life, I am only too painfully conscious."

Rev. D. Clark writes to Rev. J. E. Pepper, the then editor of *The Christian Standard*, the leading holiness weekly, as follows: "I want to thank thee for thy recent editorial on "Work," and for thy still more recent one on "Be Scriptural," which hit me a little; for I have *never* had enough of joy in the Lord to make me as strong as I should have been."

On this the editor makes the following remarks: "No doubt we can all confess—the writer of that editorial on "Be Scriptural" among the rest—that it hits us a little—some of us a great deal; for none of us have always had enough of joy in the Lord to make us as strong as we should have been."

To be what we should not be, is to be under condemnation, for how can God approve, *i.e.*, not condemn, when we are what we ought not to be in any direction. Hence the above experience is clearly not keeping converted, whatever else it may be.

But notice that the editor of what is accepted in the holiness movement as its chief weekly exponent, gives out this as the general, normal experience of all the representatives of that movement, whilst this characterization of all is accepted without protest from any. And why? Because it correctly portrays the teaching and experience of all.

Recently there was a controversy between Dr. Steele and the editor of *The Christian Witness*, on the subject of "fasting." At the conclusion of the controversy, Rev. Mr. McDonald put forth his personal experience concerning the matter, in which occur these words:

While we have always practised fasting, we confess that it has been more or less irregular, and so far as it has been so, we have suffered loss. But after a more careful examination of the subject than

we have ever before been inclined to give it, we have seen more clearly our duty, and resolutely determined to return to the old paths. On the whole we thank Dr. Steele and *Zion's Herald* for pressing us into this controversy. It has done us good, in that it has determined us to give ourself, with greater uniformity, not only to prayer, but to that too often neglected duty, *fasting*.—*The Witness*.

Notice that during all these years, whilst thus neglecting fasting and prayer, he was a public exponent of the holiness movement both by personal testimony and teaching. But now that he discovers that he had not fully measured up to duty, and also that he had not been *inclined* to squarely face its investigation, from the secret fear, possibly, that he would have to pray and fast more than he was inclined to do, he does not discount his former profession of holiness one iota.

Moreover, his contemporaries do not bring him to task concerning this glaring discrepancy between profession and practice. Why? Simply because it is tacitly understood that the teaching of this movement does not aim higher than such an experience, that is, it does not profess or teach the possibility of continuous conversion.

In harmony with this teaching, glaring acts of wrong-doing are winked at, which would really compromise the whole movement if its teaching and normal experience included righteous living such as must be where conversion is a continuous experience.

The editor of one holiness paper, in alluding to a kind of controversy between two other publications, draws a favorable contrast between his paper and the controversialists, announcing that it was his rule to criticise no one, and so he avoided all such controversies. Having thus given to the world his platform, he proceeded to break every plank in it by declaring that both parties in the controversy alluded to were led by