

There was a wonderful service open from this Yearly Meeting to them at the present time. They were much in the position that this Yearly Meeting was a generation ago, waking up to a new consciousness of the demands of the service of Christ. He would that there were in that meeting some men or women possessed by the Lord Jesus, with lips touched with coals from off the altar, and in whom the ideal of sainthood burnt with a living fire. If such could go to those Friends they would find a true American welcome and a noble work to their hands. He did not think it would be wise for any Friends to go over there and attempt to correct their theological views; such would not be more valued than a corresponding visit from them to us would be. But as was said to him when he was there, we should send them evangelists—some one who would help them with their incipient adult schools, help their young people in the ministry of the gospel, into which they were learning to find their way; he believed that the service would bless both him who gave and him who took. He should be glad further if the meeting could feel it right to send a letter to these Friends on the same basis as those recently written to the Conservative bodies in America. It need not interfere with our ordinary correspondence or commit us to anything, but might be simply a letter of brotherly love and kindness, reaching across two generations of miserable alienation, a step towards bringing together brothers who should not be separated, who were more one in spirit than we had any conception of. Whittier was theirs, and by him they stood. He would that the controversial spirit of which we had seen so much might now have done its bad work, and that we might begin on a new and better era, in a more catholic spirit, with those who were serving the Lord Jesus Christ with us in singleness of heart.

The Clerk said the question of

writing a letter to these Friends was very carefully looked at in 1895, and it was then decided to write to the smaller bodies, but it was felt that the meeting had not a duty to these others.

Benjamin O'Brien thought it would be well if the matter could be looked at, and something drawn up. He had visited a meeting of these Friends in Philadelphia, and he saw nothing in it that London Yearly Meeting could take exception to. He wished that something could be drawn up.

J. B. Braithwaite hoped nothing of the kind would be done. The ground of separation in 1828 was on points of fundamental doctrine, and London Yearly Meeting was not prepared to give them up. Some of them must remember what their fathers had suffered in this respect, and he trusted that the meeting would stand fast in the liberty wherein Christ had made them free. The opening up of correspondence would mean reciprocity of visits, and they knew the uneasiness that was caused in this country by a visit of one of these Friends a few years ago. He trusted the meeting would not drift into a position that might be totally misunderstood. These things were no strangers to his mind; he had known them since he was young, and he had a very decided judgment that we must not go back on these points, but press forward in steadfast allegiance to Christ, in whom it pleased the Father that all fullness should dwell.

Charles Brady, while recognizing the value and interest of what John William Graham had said, did not think the time was yet for the Yearly Meeting to take any official step in the direction suggested.

Joseph Storrs Fry concurred, while not doubting the truth of what they had been told as to the personal character of these people; but the great question was that of fundamental truth, and from his own knowledge of the