

"The meeting is for work, not work for the meeting. It is a duty to take strength from the meeting, but it is also a duty to give strength to it."

Mary Travilla opened the discussion: I feel that the paper has been so full of suggestions, it needs but few words from me. If there is one plea that is dear to my heart, it is that the Young Friends of our Society give forth what is dear to them, and give it forth with all the fearlessness of conviction.

Ever since we can remember we have been counselled to "mind the light," until, as one young Friend expressed, she was tired of hearing it, but she surely could not have felt what she should or she never could have said it, although, at first, it had very little meaning for us, it has grown in importance until it has led us into new practical labors. The young will be called into new paths of life, into new services. If we feel that some of the old customs must step aside "where the spirit of God is there is liberty." It will not lead us all in the same direction, and if any believe us to be following a false light they must see by our actions and judge by our fruits. Let us spread the truth according to our own convictions, and let results take care of themselves. A general discussion of the foregoing papers was participated in by E. H. Magill, Swarthmore College; George T. Powell, New York; Allan Flitcraft, Philadelphia; Dr. O. Edward, Janney, Baltimore; and Elizabeth Lloyd, of Philadelphia. Abram Robinson, of Trenton, said he thought the paper by Jessie Holmes echoed the sentiments of the young people. Robert S. Haviland said when he was young he was taught to be seen and not heard, but this is a new era, and our older friends are beginning to know it. Howard M. Jenkins asked us not to be too critical. We too often do injustice to some very sweet speakers who speak under obstacles. It is the duty of some to vocalize the truth in the ministry, but there is also a class whose duty it is to make a practical application of these truths.

CHRISTIANITY.

As an interested observer of the progress and tendencies of our race, how fast it goes and whitherward, I have paid some attention to the religious movement. I find that the organs of all denominations, except the Catholics, express apprehensions of danger ahead and in view, and that some produce startling statistics showing what a very small proportion of the population of Christian countries ever attend religious worship at all, and how very small of those who so attend is the proportion of men. And the result of my reading and meditation on the subject is that the so-called Christianity of our age is doomed to early extinction, but also that this phase of Christianity is not the Christianity which Jesus taught. Archdeacon Farrar, a very eminent English churchman, says that after the first century the doctrines of Christ were buried under mountains of error and corruption, and that his conscience revolts against much that is taught as part of the gospel of salvation. [I quote from memory.] And St. George Mivart, a prominent scientist, and claiming to be a good Catholic, lately drew upon himself the censure of his bishops by declaring that he would rather be an atheist and believe in no God at all than in one who would punish people for not believing things of which they had never heard. His bishop, the Bishop of Nottingham, in opposition to this said that his church held that no human being could be saved unless he had received Christian baptism. My own conclusion is that many of the doctrines held by all Christian churches (so far I know of no exceptions) are so opposed to our advanced ideas, right and justice, that men would rather believe in no God at all than believe in one of whom such things are told. This feeling is certainly spreading. I know of but one sect that can, if any can, resist this tendency. I need not say I mean the Friends, and they, unfortunately, while