

almost up to the time of the next annual convention, we importuned God that he would permit us to retire from the leadership of the Association, in order that some less radical person—one less objectionable to the members—might take our place. But the clear, unmistakable reply to our request was, that we represented the principle of Divine selection, and therefore must cease our prayers in that direction. Whereupon we gave up all personal preference in the matter and simply went on illustrating Divine guidance.

Henceforth we realized that all in the Association who opposed us as leader were opposing Divine selection, i.e., Divine guidance. As Christ was Divine guidance in tangible, come-at-able form, to be accepted or rejected by those to whom he came, so we as leader were to the members of the Association. They who opposed, or questioned in their hearts, our fitness for the position, were to that extent disloyal to Divine guidance, disloyal to the Master who had called and appointed us.

Many were the battles in the Association concerning this matter—battles which we took part in chiefly as an on-looker or as concerned for those who were, in their opposition to us personally, shutting up this kingdom of Divine guidance against themselves; and as a consequence many who were once enthusiastic members of the Association, from time to time left, and are still open and pronounced in their antagonism to us.

But on the other hand others learned, like us, to take this matter to God for absolute and final settlement, when he confirmed to them his revelations to us.

At the first Brantford convention, when the vote for us as President was announced as practically unanimous, a member of the Association started the

Doxology, when it was promptly and joyously sung by the Association. To us this was a song of triumph over the fact that the long opposition against this gospel of Divine selection had come to an end, and so we joined in the chorus of thanksgiving over this fact, not as scoring a personal victory.

And so the battle in the Association between legalism and spirituality went on, until now at length spirituality has captured the situation. This fact is now so self-evident that when, at the last convention, Rev. T. S. Linscott maintained that Divine guidance was not being taught in the Association after the best pattern and sketched a better way for its promulgation, he fully realized that he stood almost alone in such criticism, and frankly admitted the fact to the audience.

It is a fact worthy of note, that this same party was the one who, at the first camp-meeting, undertook to introduce into the Association the extreme holiness teaching concerning dress and the wearing of gold. Mr. Linscott tried then, and honestly tried, to commit the Association to the adoption of these legalistic views, whilst Mr. Sherlock tried to commit the EXPOSITOR to the same teaching. And, we maintain, that success on their part then would not have been more fatal to the movement within the Association than success in their efforts at the last convention. Nor do we think they were less sincere then than now.

Now, in thus writing about individual opposition to myself as President of the C. H. A., we fully subscribe to the fact that all who wished to have the Association conducted after the pattern of American holiness associations showed wisdom and common sense in objecting to our leadership, seeing we represented something entirely different from that movement.

Rev. Henry Manning, one of the Vice-