

the part of the person so criticized, or his friends, to rectify misrepresentations, or errors in facts.

That the writer of the hostile critique is the author of "Love Enthroned," and the editor is the President of one of the leading holiness associations of the United States, naturally awakens the greater surprise.

In Canada we do not hesitate to apply strong language to such tactics, when practised by the most pronounced political papers. We sympathise with our readers when forced to answer the question, Must we call that right and proper, when done in the name of religion, which we call wrong when done in the name of party politics?

However, it is not our design here to more than draw the reader's attention to the circumstances of the case, and then present the letter which was published in *The Witness* by Dr. Steele, at the urgent request of Rev. Wm. McDonald, and then our reply, which was denied admission to the same paper. The reason we deem it needful to publish this correspondence, is that these two influential men in the religious world have publicly brought their great personal influence to bear upon our work with hostile intent. Conscious that we are seriously misrepresented and misunderstood by the writers themselves, and denied all opportunity to set ourselves right through the same channel of reaching the public, we find it necessary to adopt this course, in the interests, not only of our own personal work, but also of the work of the Association, which suffers by this unexpected attack on its usefulness.

DANGER AHEAD.

BY DANIEL STEELE, D.D.

MR. EDITOR,—At your urgent request I put on record my impressions of the state of the movement for the promotion of holiness among a section of our brethren in the Dominion of Canada. In August I attended a meeting in Wesley Park, on the Canadian side of Niagara Falls. The meeting was a union of the New Jersey brethren, under the lead of Rev. J. R.

Daniels, now President of the Wesley Park Association, and the Canadian brethren led by Rev. N. Burns, editor of *THE EXPOSITOR OF HOLINESS*. These brethren presided over the meetings on alternate days. The preaching was earnest, instructive, and edifying, and the social meetings lively and interesting, though the audiences were small. But we were pained to find that there was a lack of harmony between the two sections in respect to the doctrines taught. The Canadian leader seemed to be far in advance of the American and of John Wesley, in respect to the leadings of the Holy Spirit, affirming that the truly sanctified soul would be unerring in judgment so long as he was led by the Spirit. He publicly rebuked those who consult the godly judgment of their brethren on doubtful questions of duty, and said, "Why don't they go to God?" In his theory of holiness, there is no room for errors, ignorances, inadvertences, and infirmities. The guidance of the Spirit banishes these. One hour each morning this teacher employed in elucidating this doctrine.

On the morning in which I attended, he began his address by referring to an incident in his own personal experience. Several years before, while principal of a seminary, the Holy Ghost told him that on the next meeting of the Quarterly Conference, or official board, he must vote against the return of an excellent and devoted pastor, for a third year. He was surprised to receive this message from the Spirit, and made objection that the church was satisfied, that the pastor had rendered faithful service, that there was a unanimous call for his return, and that he himself, in opposing it, would be a minority of one. He persisted in following his own judgment in this case, till he had passed into a state of great darkness, as a consequence to his disobedience to the Spirit, out of which he did not emerge till he had fully obeyed.

The natural effect of such teaching was reflected in the testimonies which followed. One testified that at a certain point in her spiritual life "the Holy Spirit convicted her of the sin of idolizing the Bible, and He took away from