

ada Holiness Association meetings which it has been our privilege to attend is "walk in the Spirit." True, as the organization is a non-sectarian organization, there may be amongst the members those who are guilty of the offence of holding different beliefs, but we have yet to learn that this is a crime. In what organization under the sun are the members a unit in their opinions? Then, if difference of opinion be permitted in every organization in Christendom, why single out the C. H. A. for attack?

We give one more quotation from Moshien: "On one hand the Socinians deny the influence of the Divine Spirit and power upon the minds of men; and on the other they acknowledge that no mortal has such an empire over himself as to be able to suppress or extinguish his sinful propensities and corrupt desires." This Socinianism will be admitted as unlike C. H. A. teaching.

Then there is the Palagian heresy. This is one that is being revamped and foisted upon a long-suffering generation as C. H. A. doctrine.

Here are a few of the premises of the Pelagians.

1. The nature of man was uninjured by the fall.

2. Our natural powers are fully competent to render complete obedience to the law.

3. This obedience is rendered without any supernatural influence of the Holy Spirit.

The above extracts from Palagianism are from Chas. Hodge volume 3. Moshien adds, regarding this heresy, that "men are capable of repentance and amendment, and of arriving at the highest degree of purity and virtue by the use of their natural faculties and powers—that they have no need of the internal succor of the Divine Spirit." Then Moshien further adds "the opinions of this sect have been misrepresented by its enemies upon several occasions." "Such," he says, "is usually the fate of all parties in religious controversies," and he charges a number of chroniclers of this religious movement with not "treating the movement with a sufficient degree of impartiality."

Where C. H. A. belief and practice are adjudged heretical, will history record that critics and representatives of existing sects have treated it with impartiality?

However, we boldly challenge the critics to point out any heresy in any age since Pentecost that bears the slightest resemblance to this movement.

H. DICKENSON.

THE KESWICK CONVENTION.

IT was our privilege to attend throughout the convention held by these brethren in our city a few weeks since, and as on all sides we have heard their work spoken of as spiritual above the ordinary, we feel it a pleasant task to frame this article, and so wish them God speed. Indeed never before have we heard from the modern Evangelist so much that was sensible and soul inspiring, and as we listened to their recount of personal dealings with God as He had from time to time honored their faith, we were glad to rise to our feet in response, as glad the convention had come to the city.

We have been asked repeatedly if they were not much the same, or in harmony with the C. H. A., or is there some difference, and so reply: The difference between the Keswick brethren and the C. H. A. is as wide as that between the Jew and the early Christian, for while the Jew recognized the written law as final authority on all matters, the early Christians recognized Christ as their law, so the Keswick brethren simply add the New Testament to the Old and make that the man of their counsel as their settlement of perfection and other doctrinal points amply showed. While the true representative of the C. H. A. absolutely and always takes the Holy Spirit to be his guide ultimate, even to the setting