

as the chastisement of the rod of correction. But the essential difference between discipline and chastisement for offences committed is understood by all. In the latter case the act of forgiveness absolutely ends all chastisement, but even tearful pleading on the part of the child does not necessarily end the discipline, seeing its continuance in spite of the pain connected therewith is essential for the future well-being of the one undergoing it.

Hence it can readily be seen that chastisement, when it means punishment for wrong-doing, ceases at once when the wrong is put away by repentance and forgiveness; but when it means discipline as a source of improvement for the forgiven child of God, it does not disturb the relations of loving complacency between us and our Heavenly Parent. "Now no chastisement (of this latter sort) seemeth to be joyous but grievous; nevertheless, afterward, it yieldeth the peaceable fruits of righteousness to them that are exercised thereby"

WHAT A CHANGE!

"The doctrine of Christian perfection, attainable in an instant by a simple act of faith, was made prominent in Methodist congregations in 1762, and ever after it was the chief topic of Mr. Wesley's ministry and that of his itinerant preachers."—*Extract from Tyerman's Life of Wesley.*

He would be a bold man who would write thus concerning Wesleyan itinerant preachers of to-day, and say that generally in Methodist pulpits the doctrine of Christian perfection is the chief topic. Such a statement would simply cause a startled smile from ministers and members of all shades of opinion.

That a remarkable change has come over the Methodist pulpits generally in this respect is so manifest that it needs but be stated to secure universal acceptance.

Is the change for the better? On every hand it is admitted that it is not. We do not assert that there is a unanimous admission to this effect, but we

do unhesitatingly state that there is a very general verdict of this kind.

In every generation, whilst this change was being made apparent, authoritative statements were put on record by the representative men of Methodism to this effect, and no one in open conference or in editorial chair called them in question; and even to-day, Presidents of Conference and Bishops, in representative gatherings, when they make similar statements, find them unopposed or accepted by silent consent.

True it is that in this present generation the opponents of the doctrine are making themselves felt in the use of more than covert teachings in obscure pulpits, and are voiced by bishops and editors in divers places. But this fact, in view of the continued protest against the gradual tendency to make this doctrine less and less conspicuous from the days of Wesley till now, has but little significance further than to make more manifest the pronounced change which has taken place.

The fact, then, of the change must be, is admitted generally, also the fact of the conspicuous absence of what John Wesley called the "*Methodist testimony*," from the Churches which he founded, must be frankly acknowledged.

He would be a reckless man who would undertake to prove that one in ten, on an average, of Methodist ministers, were known to possess this definite experience, or testified distinctively to it, either in Canada, England or the United States; or further, that it was not exceptional to find a Church where even one was a clear, definite witness of this grace.

True it is, that the number of witnesses to this experience is considerably greater to-day in Canada, than it was ten years ago. Nevertheless, after grouping together all who make any pretensions to claim this blessing as a present definite possession, without staying to weed out from the number all those whose profession and lives do not harmonize, it cannot but be admitted that even then the number would fall very far short of a tenth of the whole membership.

From all of which it follows either