

going on. I denied that it was an assembly-meeting, but he still contended that when an acknowledged teacher was exercising his gift, this was an assembly-meeting. Others declared why they could not attend his lectures. I spoke of Smith's letter to me, assured them I had not come to Montreal to teach doctrines of mine, but simply and really to seek to prevent division; and urged Holden's teaching in his "Eternal Life" to be clearly the same as what was condemned in me. Cecil replied that Holden was young in the truth when his book was written, and I was not.

Finally, we asked for meetings to see where the heresy was, and they at last consented to meet in the hall the next week. Accordingly we met Monday, Tuesday, Friday, and the following Tuesday, again to consider this. I do not dwell upon the meetings. The doctrines have been treated sufficiently elsewhere. But in the course of them, extracts from Holden, Patterson, and J. B. S., to show that prominent doctrines objected to were held singly by each of these, were read and urged against division. They said that was not Scripture, which of course we knew, and that we had to prove our doctrines to be scriptural, which we denied, contending *they* had to prove that they were heretical. Then A. P. C. denied that they meant doctrinal heresy, but making a party. I asked where the party had sprung up, or how I had made it. The answer was, by putting forth the doctrines. But what need to discuss the doctrines, then? and why speak of fundamental