

that the Society of Friends had but one fundamental article of faith. This was incorrect. He would refer again to Sewel's History for evidence of his assertion. It was true he said that Christ was the foundation of our faith but not any principle called Christ --for what was this principle? Some called it Reason, and some by other names. He reprobated the Epistle because nothing was said in it concerning the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ. He concluded his remarks by portraying the experience of those who were careful to be in the true faith.

Hugh Balderston observed that if a reference were made to the records of the Y.M. at the time the proposition concerning delegates was before it, he thought the judgment ~~that judgment~~ of the meeting would be found recorded in favour of the proposition.

In reply to the accusations of Gerard T. Hopkins and others (for to Thomas Evans' speech there was no reply) that the representatives had transcended their powers,--it was argued that they had the power to originate any business which they thought ought to claim the consideration of the meeting though they had received no instructions. In the present case they had deliberated and made a report upon the subject committed to their charge. After this they had produced the Epistle which stood in the light of a new subject.

Thomas Ellicott was not satisfied with the Epistle. He doubted not the right of the representatives to produce it but he did not see the propriety of adopting it. He hoped at least that it would be left for consideration until another sitting.

A considerable number of friends approved of the Epistle, but as some were dissatisfied it was not decided upon at this sitting.

Before the closing minute was read Roger Brooke observed that he as one of the representatives was willing to submit to any judgment the meeting might come to on right principles, the representa-

tives were not anxious for the meeting to adopt this Epistle unless it should be thought proper. He had been desirous not to speak on this subject, and he felt thankful he had held his peace so long, but when he heard Ministers and Elders pretend to deny the power of the representatives to originate business in the meeting he could be silent no longer. They tried to bring the Discipline to their aid and made of it a nose of wax which they could twist any way to suit themselves. So long as they could make it bear against others they were very strenuous in its support, but so soon as any of its injunctions touched themselves they were fruitful in interpretations by which to avoid their influence.

Thomas Wetherald as a representative united with the sentiments of Roger Brooke in regard to the Epistle and hoped the meeting would seriously consider the subject. When we should assemble the next morning he hoped friends would give their judgment without fear of threats from any authority.

4th day morning.
Gerard T. Hopkins--

opened the meeting with the following observations.

"From the manner in which the business of the last sitting was closed the opening of the present one must necessarily appear to every exercised, concerned mind to be accompanied by considerations of the deepest interest. It is a privilege,--a precious privilege, which belongs to any individual to express those feelings which may accompany the mind having their origin in that which is concerned. We all I trust feel one common interest in the welfare of religious society. We must all acknowledge that in a correct view the work is not our own.

In entertaining the idea that we are the churches in a collective capacity we are bound to consider that we are called upon to do the Lord's work. ~~and with a view of this kind * * * we can have no point to carry.~~ Every feeling heart must be united in one concern that we may do the Lord's work and not our own. And in order to this it becomes essential that we be influenced, that we be actuated, by him and him alone. I have remembered very precious in taking my seat in the present assembly the statement recorded in Sacred Writ, which as it has opened on my mind so it has influenced and enlarged my heart. It is a statement in reference to Ezra, formerly when he was passing from the court of Ahasuerus where he and many others were in captivity. He was passing from the court of this Prince to Jerusalem clothed