

mean that the Spirit was to be our only ultimate Guide; that it is not safe to follow Him after this manner; that in so doing it is impossible to live a holy, righteous life; and finally, that holy, righteous living is the outcome of some other method. Then let such opponents formulate and illustrate such other method, and return our challenge for minute, honest inspection of their teaching and lives.

If we should object to such critics as these, we would be of all men most unreasonable. But if any other form of criticism is right and unobjectionable, judge all men.

EXTRAVAGANCES.

But it is asked, have not some of the members of this Association exhibited extravagant and questionable conduct, even whilst professing to obey the Holy Spirit?

This is true, and we by no means censure others for objecting to these things. But until anyone can point to a questionable act which has been *sanctioned* by the Association, either by deliberate vote or compromising silence, no one can fairly charge such conduct to the movement.

In all denominations, again and again, ministers have made merchandise of the membership in the name of superior piety, and even in the name of the holiness creed movement, but no one charges such conduct on the denomination, unless it should be sanctioned by the denomination.

And here, we remark, that many of the incidents criticised by onlookers were of the nature of extravagances, but the critics not only took in these incidents themselves, but also criticised the leaders of the movement because they did not at once put their hands on the individuals and regulate them after their, the critics, thought.

This was the real issue raised by thoughtful, honest onlookers, viz., criticism of the management of the movement. And this criticism was thought to be legitimate on their part. Its weakness, however, was that our position in the matter was not fully understood.

We had determined to carry out im-

plicitly the teaching of Christ concerning the Spirit's work. Hence we believed that the Holy Spirit Himself would regulate in the best way possible all such things, provided we gave Him full right of way in all our gatherings. But this involved the possibility of letting a matter alone for a time, even when the judgment of many might call for prompt action.

The result has, in every case, been most satisfactory to us who have been in the movement and have thus seen the end from the beginning.

It is true that, generally speaking, the parties who have been criticised by intelligent onlookers have, sooner or later, been weeded out of the movement, and we are glad for their sakes who stand responsible for such criticisms that it is so, seeing the events justify their criticisms to that extent. But we still maintain that if their advice concerning prompt action had been taken, it would have wrecked the whole movement. However, we cannot, for want of space, pursue this subject further, but trust we have made ourselves intelligible to all parties concerned, having helped to explain, without censure, the attitude, perhaps unwittingly, assumed by some good people to this movement.

AN EXPERIENCE OF THE TIMES OF THE WESLEYS.

It may awaken the desire of some, especially of Methodists, to know how an experience, such as that brought out in this pamphlet, would have been treated in the days of the Wesleys, and fortunately this legitimate curiosity can be gratified, for if anyone will turn to the *Arménian Magazine* of 1783, edited by John Wesley himself, he will find a similar Christian experience related by Mrs. E. Jackson, in a letter to Mr. Wesley. The following is the letter:

"April 19th, 1765.

"REV. AND DEAR SIR,—The goodness of God constrains me to let you know that He continues His favor. But I have been greatly exercised in the world, and hedged as with thorns on every side. O what is it to be prepared? For some months past I