

Montreal committed p. 10, as this  
tract shows. See letter of the Continental  
brethren, dated April, 1885.



## NARRATIVE OF FACTS.



*Livingston*  
please return this all to 725  
Geo. VanderMeulen Sr

~~Montreal Committee~~

*Re: J. K.* Grand Rapids

*Mich.*

~~Geo. VanderMeulen Sr~~

# NARRATIVE OF FACTS

*WHICH LED TO THE REJECTION OF  
MR. F. W. GRANT BY THE  
MONTREAL ASSEMBLY.*

---

It is felt, in issuing the solemn declaration that F. W. G. is no longer in fellowship with the saints gathered to the name of the Lord Jesus, that the enquiry will arise in many minds as to the details which have led to this decision; they will be found in what follows, which it is hoped will be prayerfully read and weighed as in the Lord's presence.

It was in September, 1883, now about fifteen months since, that F. W. G.'s tract "*Life and the Spirit*" came out, which was sent to a number of "labouring brethren," many of whom rejected its teaching, some writing to the author saying so, and warning him of the sorrow likely to ensue if persisted in. He was also personally entreated, A. P. C. visiting him as early as the beginning of May, 1884. Our brother C. Wolston, in a very long letter, dated July 6th, to bro. P. Loizeaux, says, "now, as to the views themselves, while he held them privately, or at least, only let them out occasionally to individuals, they might be borne with, and every effort made to deliver him personally from them, but when in spite of repeated warnings and remonstrances he promulgates them in print and sends them far and wide, and chal-

lenges their acceptance by God's saints, as views to be received as His truth for His church, it is another question entirely, it becomes a heresy and he a heretic, —he gathers a party around himself by these views, and makes division or heresy in the Church of God."

At the Plainfield Meeting in the beginning of August, 1884, the subject came up at the end of the conference, when F.W.G. read from the manuscript part of his book, now known as "Life in Christ and Sealing with the Spirit," which is substantially the same as the first, but more detailed and pronounced, with free criticisms of others, notably of beloved J.N.D. he was then told that if this pamphlet were published, it would cause a breach of fellowship with his brethren, when he publicly avowed that whatever the consequences, publish it he would. In September, shortly after the above meeting, A.P.C. and A. Mace renewed Gospel preaching in Montreal, which had begun early in July, where the Lord had been, and was still, evidently blessing souls through the Word. At some of these meetings things were said affecting the doctrines in question, (as John and Paul's Gospel fully preached must do), some thereby taking offence—especially J. James—these subsequently remained away from both lectures and preachings. At intervals, about this time, A.P.C. lectured on such subjects as "Calling and justification," "New birth and Eternal life; the Christian's standing in Christ," to meet F.W.G.'s doctrines, which were now spread openly through his new *Tract* being thrown in amongst the saints at Montreal.

In the beginning of November, Mr. Lyman, one of Mr.G.'s chief supporters, came to the city. On Wednes-

day, Nov. 5th, after a prayer-meeting, A.P.C., who had spoken on 1 Tim. i., was told that he and A. M. had come to Montreal professedly to preach the Gospel, but really to oppose F.W. G.'s teaching, and that they had had enough of his side of the question, and it was time the other was heard; thus manifestly, already, had a party been formed.

Three meetings followed the next day. J. James and E. S. Lyman and others advocating the views of F.W. Grant; A. P. Cecil, W. C. Baynes and A. Mace replying.

Soon after this came a letter, addressed to the Assembly, through G. Smith, from F.W. G., in which he stated:—

“Let me remind beloved brethren that our brother J.N.D., to whom under God we owe so much, was perfectly conscious of the difference of view existing, which came up again and again in gatherings at Guelph and elsewhere years ago, yet remained to the last in love and fellowship with those who differed from him. Let me remind you that our brother A.P.C. differs both from J.A.F. and Mr. Darby himself in what is in fact the main foundation of his own view, viz., the double communication of life.”

Both these assertions, to say the least, were inaccurate; as to the first, it was known that J.N.D. was so indignant at some remarks of F.W.G. at the Croydon Meeting that J. Dunlop besought him to see him and speak to him after the meeting. As to the latter, a tract was already in circulation made up of extracts

from Vol. 31 of "Collected Writings," shewing that these brethren were in harmony on this point.\*

His letter with this Tract enclosed was consequently returned. The brother who wrote stating on his own behalf, that he feared there were fundamental points in question, specially as to Old Testament saints being "in the Son" and that he feared division also.

Thursday, Nov. 13th, Mr. G. arrived in Montreal—uninvited by the Assembly—the following evening, whilst a lecture was being given in the Room where the Assembly meet, as announced the previous Lord's day, he held a meeting in the house of one of his supporters, as also the following Lord's day when the gospel was being preached. This had been previously done by his partisans on nights of the gospel. On Saturday, the 15th, he said at a brothers' meeting, he would hold to his book though we were broken to pieces, and yet he had come to Montreal to make peace and avert division! It was then arranged that the Assembly should come together on Monday, to look into the Word as to these matters.

That night, November 17th, as also Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday was devoted to Old Testament saints being "in the Son." During the early stage of

---

\* Failing to produce honestly disagreement between them on this doctrine of "quickening and quickening together with Christ," he has not hesitated in a recent Tract—satirical beneath notice—to cast suspicion on the Editor of this Vol. by stating in fact, "I must until I have more knowledge refuse to regard them as really his (J. N. D.'s) own," for the very obvious reason that "they are in plain contradiction to numerous passages" not "of his other writings" but to those of one who, unable to support an untruthful assertion, denies the authenticity of the writer—now departed!

the enquiry, but little was done beyond F. W. G. availing himself of the opportunity of a sharp and lengthy criticism of A. P. C.'s "*Sequel*." Here it may be said, the speaker seemed thoroughly at home, displaying great energy throughout the address, making much of a somewhat ill-expressed statement of his opponent's as to "new birth into the kingdom being the highest blessing of Judaism," the writer meaning that "the kingdom" was that and not "new birth into it," as was being debated.\* All this, however, was felt to be irrelevant and a loss of time, for we had not come to defend one writer against another, but to learn what *God* had said as to the question before us. Further patience was still called for ere this was granted, for some more human compositions were to

\* In a recent tract on "the doctrine of double quickening" (page 2, line 7 from bottom), notwithstanding this correction given F. W. G. in the open Assembly meeting, he has not hesitated to state, in remarking on A. P. C.'s "Remarks," etc., and quoting as from him: "New birth was the highest blessing of Judaism (page 2), and although connected with the present dispensation, (page 4) it is in contrast with eternal life, which replaces it in the believer." (Page 3.)

Now here he has not only knowingly perverted the writer's meaning, in stating that he says, (page 2, "Remarks,") that new birth was the highest blessing of Judaism, but he makes a positive false statement, asserting, that the writer says in his tract, that "eternal life replaces new birth, as the highest blessing of Judaism." Page 4 of A. P. C.'s tract is quoted from, where the writer says, that "new birth is brought into the present dispensation," and transposed to page 3, where the writer says, that "eternal life replaces as a present thing, the highest blessing promised to Judaism," (F. W. G. carefully leaving out the word "promised," which shows the writer's meaning,) to make it appear, as if he wrote, that "eternal life replaced new birth," and that too in this dispensation, which is a positive false assertion and never said.

be read to us in the form of extracts from "Eternal Life," by R. H., "Lessons for the Wilderness," by F. G. P., and "Voice to the Faithful," by J. B. S., all of which, it was argued, agreed in some parts with what was now being disputed, and it would become the chief objectors to put heretical teachers right at home ere coming so far away on that mission.

This also was entirely beside the mark, and looked like evading the real point at issue, which was "were Old Testament saints 'in the Son,' and did the Word of God teach it?" At last it came out that the doctrine was not to be found in the Old Testament and useless therefore to look for it there, but it was plainly taught in the New Testament by implication. What other life could there be?

The answer was that to be "in Him" then, was to be in Deity, for He had not yet become incarnate and with the Father and Spirit remained in immutable Godhead. Moreover that "in the Son" took in oneness with Him, as well as life and nature, and for this the Corn of Wheat must fall into the ground and die or abide alone—redemption be accomplished and with that the Holy Ghost would be given, putting us into the Son and He in us according to John xiv. 20; once and again we were assured that the saints of old, ourselves also, were in Deity—the disciples too before the cross and that "ye in me and I in you" was as true before atonement was made and the gift of the Spirit as after, the only difference being, that then they would know it. In vain we urged it was *not* Deity simply and only, but that we were in Him who unites Godhead and manhood—two natures—in one

blessed Person. "We are in Him that is true, even in His Son Jesus Christ," 1 John v. 20. This too, as being the portion of every quickened soul from the beginning of God's ways, was considered very serious doctrine, and was denounced by A.P.C. as false, who pressed that to be "in the Son" involved being "one Spirit with the Lord." F.W.G. denied it on the ground that he confounded "life" and "union" together. A.P.C. replied that J.N.D. quoted this very verse in the Synopsis when commenting on John xiv. 20. To our astonishment F.W.G. stood up and before the whole Assembly said: "Mr. Darby was not clear on union!" Thus the brother who has been most largely used in recovering this most blessed truth to the saints in these last days, the very ground on which thousands are gathered to-day as the result, is falsely and publicly accused, and that after his departure, of not being clear on union!! How truly he has forgotten, what he himself owes to him in the matter, and also the admonition of Heb. xiii. 7, 8, we leave our readers to judge.

It is but right to mention that Mr. G. limits "in the Son" to life and nature, but the very writer from whom he quotes approvingly here, says: "It is more than union though not the same thing, it is nature and life," and in his last edition of the Synopsis adds, "and position in it." This is a sample of the way he cites those whom he criticises; as elsewhere what J.N.D. brings out clearly as to the normal condition of saints in regard to justification, peace, and the possession of the Holy Ghost, is set off against his statements as to the condition souls are brought into through the cur-



rent teaching in Christendom, so as to involve him in apparent contradiction. (See pages 60 and 62 of F.W.G.'s late tract.)

—Whilst all agree that Old Testament saints were born of God, F.W.G. contends that they had "eternal life in the Son" in common with us; in fact, with him "new birth," "eternal life," "life in the Son," and "in the Son" mean the same (see page 14 of his tract), and so Mr. Holden, because he says O. T. saints had "eternal life," is made to teach the doctrine that they were "in the Son;" as Jno. xiv. 20. But far worse—in fact one of the saddest features in this controversy—the language of that departed servant, to whom under God we owe so much, is perverted, criticised, and when nothing else will do, denied to be his; here F.W.G. will have him to be in harmony with him, quoting in his letter of Dec. 19th, his remarks on the 1st Epistle of John, "There is no life belonging to the old man, it is a rejected thing, and there will not be two Adams in heaven. There is the Son, and those that have life in the Son." (This last sentence is put in italics.) "God began working out this at the fall, but the full truth of it was brought out when Christ was risen." And this is quoted to prove that J.N.D. teaches that Old Testament saints were "in the Son." Just as well might it be argued that redemption was accomplished directly after the fall, because the Lord said in John v., "My Father worketh hitherto and I work." Beginning to work out "life in the Son" does not mean that saints from the fall had it. On the contrary, J.N.D. says, "*the full truth of it was brought out when Christ was risen.*"

During the progress of these meetings part of John iii. was read, to show the difference between "new birth" and "eternal life," as revealed in Scripture, and it is with that we are concerned. Nicodemus is re-proved for not knowing of the former as being absolutely necessary for admission into the kingdom, (Ezekiel xxxvi. 24-28) viz., Israel's blessing in the latter day, that of which the prophets had so repeatedly spoken; "eternal life," however, is connected with the revelation of "heavenly things," which the Son had come to make known, and the portion of those who believed in the uplifted Son of Man, (v. 12-14). Was John v. 25 nothing *new*, where He says, "The hour is coming and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live?" Why "*the hour is coming and now is,*" if it were only a perpetuation of what had always been? as well might it be said that chapter iv. 23 was not exclusively connected with the dawn of another dispensation, where a parallel expression is used,—"*the hour cometh and now is* when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth;" had *He* been worshipped till now? nay, He had not been revealed. Jehovah was His declared name; Mount Gerizim and Jerusalem the rival places of worship, but now all would be changed. "In spirit and in truth" would be substituted for formality; the blessed name of Father for Jehovah; heaven and not earth, the place; but this "hour" of *worship* was no more novel than "the hour" of *quickening* in chapt. v., both began their history together with the coming of the Son from heaven. But we are not left in any wise to conjecture what "eternal life"

is, for the lips of the Blessed One Himself when opened in prayer to the Father assure us that " *This is* life eternal that they might know Thee (the Father) the only true God and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent ;" of course Old Testament saints knew neither the one nor the other, and yet we must believe they had it ! But how do you think, reader, this blessing peculiarly ours was made to be the portion of saints of old ? Why, by emphasizing the words "this is" as being in the present tense and so some other " knowledge " was this self-same " eternal life " to them ! This seemed to us not interpreting scripture but explaining it away.

Tuesday, Nov. 25th, was the last night of these unhappy debates ; Rom. vii. was read and " sealing " was touched upon ; it was maintained that the scriptural teaching of the chapter from v. 7 was that of a soul truly born of God but neither " sealed " nor " in Christ, " but under law, to which he has not gone back but from which he has never been delivered, in contradistinction to the views of F. W. G. that he is " sealed, " in Christ, learning how to abide in Him, and to be holy and fruitful ; we utterly refused as God's description of a christian, one who is wretched, under law and the dominion of sin, and especially, as the very chapter from which it is sought to be proved, asserts the opposite on the face of it, by plainly telling us that a woman could not have two husbands at the same time—law and Christ: death is that alone by which the bond with the first can be broken ere we can be to Him who is raised from the dead, to bring forth fruit to God ; in the acceptance of His death by faith, who bore the curse in fullest judgment and perfect

grace, this has been effected, so that having died with Him out of that state we are delivered from it once and for ever, and service now, and never before, becomes the happy result of such a deliverance.

No one denies that souls, through the current unchristian teaching of the day may become legal, and pass through some such experience though indwelt by the Spirit, but the true force and interpretation of the chapter is entirely different as must be clear to any simple soul if he compares it with Galatians v. 17, where although the flesh is in us, and lusts against the Spirit, nevertheless we do not do the *bad* things that we should—the power being there in the Holy Ghost to prevent its acting, whereas in Rom. vii., though the will is *on the side of right and good*, how to *perform* that which is *good* he finds not, and the *evil* he hates *he does*; utter helplessness marks him, for he is lacking in what is the great characteristic of power—the possession of the Spirit of God. Compare the Scriptures and see if they are not two exactly opposite states with corresponding opposite results.

If also the "first and second part of Romans are plainly continuous," as F.W.G. teaches, the experience of chapt. vii. must follow on chapt. vi., so that though having died to sin and been made free from it, and it no longer has "dominion over you for you are not under the law but under grace," (vi. 7, 14,) you are afterwards put back under law and the dominion of sin to learn how to abide in Christ, for fruitfulness and holiness. This was taken exception to, as not being the writer's meaning, and no wonder, so glaring as it is: nevertheless let his own words speak and see if he is misrepresen-

ted: "The first and second part of Romans are thus plainly continuous, and it is not contrary to this that in chapt. vii. neither Christ nor the Spirit is mentioned until the question of deliverance comes in." \*

As to "sealing," he says in page 6, "It is not in contention that quickening and sealing are entirely distinct things, nor even whether they are distinct in *time*: they surely are. As so often stated, it is the sinner who is quickened, the believer who is sealed. Moreover the interval might be, as we see in the Acts it has been, one of some duration, although the cases in the Acts have really no representative in the present day." So far there is no objection, except as to the last clause and there we say, "why not? Is the only historical account of the Church of God we have merely to tell us what happened then?" A contrary statement meets us now at p. 25, where we find that "all Christ's people are recipients of the Spirit and there is practically no middle class that have not yet received it," and again (p. 27) "Thus the one born of God can never be in the flesh; and thus we obtain additional confirmation of the truth of our interpretation of Rom. viii. 9: If you are not in the Spirit you are in the flesh, this must be taken in the largest sense, you are not His at all."

These extracts were read and the impossibility of making consistency of them pointed out, when F. W. G. told the reader of them that he would not "bandy words with him." First, there is an interval of some duration, as in Acts, between life and sealing (p.6), then there are none who have not been sealed (p. 25), finally, if they are not indwelt by the Spirit they do

\* See Page 68, "Life in Christ and Sealing with the Spirit."

not in any wise belong to Christ, (p. 27.) It is easily seen why "the cases in the Acts" were unsuitable as representatives of this teaching, for according to these two last extracts, the Samaritan Converts, Saul, Cornelius, and the disciples at Ephesus, (chapt. viii, ix, x., xix.,) were all unconverted men during the delay!

Scripture surely teaches that there is an interval—long or short—during which the soul learns to take its place in repentance and self-distrust before God, and so welcomes the "gospel of our salvation" that "Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures, was buried and rose again the third day according to the scriptures," and is immediately sealed with the Holy Ghost. (1 Cor. xv. 1-4 and Eph. i. 13.)

Moreover, if "new birth" takes us out of the flesh, "and if we are not in the Spirit we are in the flesh," (p. 27), that same act of quickening puts us "into the Spirit," unless there is some third place that is neither of these; thus then what does the Holy Ghost do when He comes into us? practically—if this teaching be received—nothing, for consistently with this it is affirmed elsewhere "you may have the Spirit and be in bondage, not cry Abba, Father, not know that you are in the Son and He in you." In contrast with all this, how plain and unmistakable is the scripture doctrine, "Ye are not in the flesh but in the Spirit, if so be the Spirit of God *dwell* in you." Rom. viii. 9.

On Saturday, Nov. 22, Mr. G. and Mr. Lyman went to Ottawa; on Lord's day towards the close of the meeting a local brother proposed, strongly supported by Mr. L., that Mr. G. should be permitted to make his defence—he having been charged with

heresy—and that the Assembly should come together in the afternoon, as Mr. G.'s visit was but brief: this proposition was instantly rejected as the enquiry was still going on at Montreal, the introduction, too, of the subject there so abruptly and uncalled for was strongly condemned. This failing, a brother announced a meeting in his house for the afternoon, at which Mr. Grant would be present, and any who wished could see him; another meeting was held at this brother's in the evening during the preaching of the gospel in fellowship with the Assembly a few doors higher up.

On this same day, at Montreal, after the breaking of bread, A.P.C. spoke on Colossians to edification and blessing, as many testify. During his remarks J. James, who has throughout been the prominent local leader in this division, walked out of the meeting, and when remonstrated with for such disorderly conduct at a brothers' meeting, called the admonition "twaddle;" how fully this kind of conduct is in keeping with his whole course, a letter, dated Dec. 18, will show, in which abuse and misrepresentation abound, concluding with, "As for Montreal, I doubt not it is the *deliverance* we have *been praying for for more than ten years.*" This same person tells us "that in the very endeavour to keep the unity of the Spirit he is *forced* into a place of separation," (see Circular, Craig street, Dec. 19); these statements, too, written within 24 hours of each other, should be seriously weighed by all, for they are those of one of the chief agitators in the present trouble; how earnestly he has laboured to secure the answer to those many years of prayer, his unwearied endeavours of the past few

months, and his present position will tell; as to being "*forced*" into what has been so anxiously desired and so eagerly grasped, we must leave our brethren to judge; the painful part is that he is not alone, but has succeeded in carrying with him about a dozen quite young men, besides others, two of which only can be called elder brethren.

On Tuesday, Nov. 25th, Mr. G. and Mr. L. returned to Montreal, on which night the discussion closed, to which previous allusion has been made: Wednesday was a prayer-meeting; on Thursday many of those who were standing for the truth believed it right, in view of all that had passed, to issue a protest rejecting F.W.G. as a teacher, according to Rom. xvi. 16, 17, on account of his doctrines, now so earnestly advocated, and which were causing division in our midst, viz.:

1st. That "Old Testament saints are 'in the Son,' by virtue of being quickened with the life that is in Him;" p. 13, 14, there being no proof from Scripture that eternal life in the Son, (John xvii. 3), was given at all in the Old Testament, He being then in the Elohim, not yet manifested, though in Himself He was ever, the eternal life with the Father, as all receive. Moreover, "in the Son" is shewn from John x. 30-38, to signify oneness, it being there oneness between the Father and the Son, and in John xii. 24, xiv. 20, xvii. 20, 21, as regards us, to mean oneness with Him in spirit, life and nature, and involving union, which could not be for any till redemption was accomplished, figured by the fruit of the corn of wheat, one with it—the children of one family, one with the Son, He being their one life, before God and the Father, and He one life in them, making them one family before the world.

2nd. Mr. Grant teaches, Page 6, line 20, "It is maintained in this paper that our place in Christ is the inseparable



accompaniment of eternal life in the believer, and his therefore from the first moment of quickening ; " consequently the believer is born at once into eternal life in Christ. Then Mr. Grant says, Page 26, line 21, "As to sealing with the Spirit, the doctrine here maintained is, that in Scripture it is connected with the faith and confession of Christ risen and glorified, rather than with appropriating faith in His blessed work." This not only puts a slight on the atoning work of Christ, but shows that the moment we are born again into eternal life in Christ, we are sealed with the Spirit ; there is, therefore, no interval of time between new birth and sealing, which he shews there is, in other parts of his book. (See p. 6.) Either then repentance must precede new birth, or else come after sealing, which is a totally unscriptural thought. See Acts ii. 37, 38 ; iii. 19.

3rd. Mr. Grant asserts, Page 8, line 12, that Romans vii. is the experience of a saint, already a Christian, already justified, already sealed (compare page 56, line 12 from bottom) seeking holiness, power over sin and fruit for God. (See also Page 67, line 15-23.)

4th. Mr. Grant practically denies the normal condition of a Christian, by a reasoning away of Scripture to mean exactly the opposite of what it says, Pages 60-62, in stating in fact, that a Christian may be justified and not know it, may have peace and not know it, may have the Holy Ghost and yet be in bondage. Compare Romans v. 1 ; 2 Cor. iii. 17 ; John xiv. 17 ; John xiv. 20.

This protest was read Lord's day, Nov. 30, after which Mr. G. said he felt "unworthy of the honour conferred upon him in being permitted to suffer for Christ and the truth, for truth he was assured it was and would stand by his book word by word !"

Mr. James gave out afterwards there would be a meeting at his house that night, it being now manifest that all fellowship in the Gospel was at an end ; announcing other meetings for F.W.G.

On Wednesday, Dec. 3rd, at a prayer-meeting A.P.C. spoke, after two or three had prayed, of the necessity of not only confessing sin, but of forsaking it, basing his exhortation on 2 Chron. vii 14, 15, and 1 Cor. i. 10, etc.; whilst he was speaking, H. Hammond, J. James, F.W.G., Crain and E. S. Lyman, and several sisters walked out, interrupting the meeting. This withdrawal from the prayer-meeting, according to their own words, taken from their circular of Dec. 19th, was made "quietly and deliberately," showing their previous determination, if there was any witness to the truth by A.P.C. to do so, as Mr. James had done previously. We would mention that the scriptures were spoken on quietly and deliberately, and applied generally, and to the conscience. But the truth pressed of "the necessity of forsaking such sins as sectarianism and what caused division," was too much for the consciences of those who could affect with humility to bow and confess sin, with the determination all the while not to forsake it, and such prayers were said "to be hypocrisy," in a general way. "The constant course of procedure that had been grieving and trying us for many weeks," was simply the bearing the testimony of grace for the maintenance of the truth, which otherwise would have been taken away from us!

On the Friday or Saturday after, Mr. Grant left the town, visiting Lachute, Cumberland, Ottawa and Carleton Place.

The following Lord's day a meeting of the Assembly was called for Wednesday, the 10th Dec., when it was proposed that, "It being now manifest that the protest

of Brethren of the 29th November, against the doctrines of Mr. F. W. Grant, as brought out in his late publication, "Life in Christ and Sealing with the Spirit," has failed to produce any retractation, but that on the contrary, Mr. Grant is still maintaining the attitude he assumed when the protest was read, i. e., that he would hold to every word he had therein written; and, as this admonition had failed to check the determined course of schism, he is still adopting, the Assembly gathered to the Name of the Lord in Montreal believe the time has come when the only course left is to obey the command of the Apostle given in Titus iii. 10: "A man that is an heretic after the first and second admonition reject."

"Before, however, finally rejecting him, and remembering the long-suffering and grace of our Lord, and His patience towards us, thinking, too, of the solemn effect everywhere, an act of discipline would cause to the Saints, the Assembly gathered to the name of the Lord in Montreal do here give him this last admonition, in which he is exhorted to think of the glory of the Lord, and of His love to his people, as the good and great Shepherd, who are now so divided on account of this unhappy tract, spread in their midst: he is earnestly exhorted therefore, and admonished to withdraw this tract, and to cease spreading the evil views mentioned in the protest.

"The Assembly also do most solemnly admonish Mr. F. W. Grant, together with Mr. John James, Dr. E. Trenholme, Mr. Henry Hammond, Mr. Lyman and Mr. Crain, for disorderly conduct, in turning their backs upon the Lord, and His Assembly, gathered to

His Name for prayer and exhortation, on Wednesday evening, the 3rd December, in leaving the Room when the word of God was being spoken upon. 1 Cor. xiv. 40. 1 Thess. v. 14.

Signed on behalf of the Assembly,

W. C. BAYNES.

J. O. ROBINSON.

G. SMITH."

(Several of Mr. Grant's supporters dissented.)

This was taken to Ottawa, where Mr. Grant was on the 12th December, and given to him by Brethren J. O. Robinson and George Smith, accompanied by our Brother Alfred Mace, and the following is their Report:—

OTTAWA, 12th December, 1884.

At the close of the Assembly meeting held in Montreal on the 10th instant, it was suggested that two Brethren should wait upon Mr. F. W. Grant, and submit to him the foregoing Admonition.

Accordingly Brothers Robinson and Smith proceeded to Ottawa, accompanied with Brother Mace, and waited upon our Brother Grant, at the house of Mr. Duffet. Several others being present, we suggested seeing Mr. Grant alone. Mr. Grant declined, and asked what our errand was. Mr. Mace replied, our Brother, (referring to J. O. R.) has a letter for you from the Assembly at Montreal, which was then delivered to Mr. Grant. Mr. Grant enquired if certain Brethren were included in it? Mr. Mace said they were present at the meeting, but that unanimity did not constitute Assembly action. Mr. Grant replied it was the act of a faction, and threw the letter on the settee. We submitted it as the act of the Assembly, and Mr. Mace said it was a solemn thing to treat it with contempt. Mr. Grant replied, "I do treat it with utter contempt."

After a pause we rose and left the house.

(Signed,)

J. O. ROBINSON,

G. SMITH."

Before we go further, we would say, in answer to those who deny that the acts of December 10th and 17th were those of the Assembly, that

1st of all, they were acts administered by the many. The saints were gathered to the name of the Lord. They had the presence of the Lord in the midst, and the authority of the Lord by his word so to act. At Corinth, the saints were at first nearly unanimous in keeping the evil doer inside. Paul was about the only one, and he at Ephesus, who judged he should be outside. (1 Cor. v.) When they submitted to the authority of the Apostle, it is never said that the Assembly *was* unanimous. But he was out by the judgment of the Lord and His word, and the infliction of the punishment by the many. (2 Cor. ii 6.)

2nd, The leaders of the opposing party were proved disorderly persons, and rebuked for it. Their voices were null and void in the government of the Assembly.

3rd, The majority of the rest were young men, 1 Pet. v. had been read on a Sunday previous, and on the night of December 10th, which was the voice of the Lord for the younger to submit themselves to the elder.

The following Wednesday the 17th the Assembly came together to know what answer Mr. G. had returned, the particulars being given, it was decided that the only course left was to declare him no longer in fellowship. At this meeting the same defiant attitude was maintained by the leaders, totally disregarding the fact that they themselves were at the same time under rebuke for disorder. At the close Mr. James said for himself and co-partisans that nothing

remained now but for them to separate ; they held a meeting the next day and issued their circular dated December 19th, to which F. W. G. adds a letter, in which he takes up the four heads of his doctrine on which the protest of the 38 brethren was based. As to the first : " Life in the Son ;" it has already been referred to on p. 8 ; in the second he charges us with false accusation. We have only to throw it back upon himself and add he has taken one of his own contradictory statements to prove we are false accusers. We here re-quote this paragraph from his book to show that the accusation is not false ! " Thus the one born of God can never be in the flesh and thus we obtain additional confirmation of the truth of our interpretation of Romans viii. 9. If you are not in the spirit, you are in the flesh ; you are none of His. This must be taken in the largest sense ; you are not His at all !" (p. 27, " Life in Christ and Sealing with the Spirit.")

As to the third point he maintains plainer than ever, that the man in the experience of Romans vii. is "sealed." As to the last, we answer, the normal condition of the christian is in question, as all the first quotations from scripture and J. N. D. [page 53, 54] show. Here again he would mislead the unwary by bringing J. N. D. to his side, though any honest reader who understands J. N. D. will see that he is there speaking of the abnormal condition souls are brought into through the false teaching current in christendom (pages 54,[bottom], 55 & 56.)

The independent table was set up Lord's day Dec. 21st, F. W. G. having counselled, " that if two of

them had faith, to do it ; and to those who were of a fearful heart (referring to Gideon) to go home ; he could not tell them to go to the Natural History Room, as that was no longer the Lord's table."

Ere announcing the decision of the 17th at the Lord's table, or to other assemblies, it was deemed advisable to communicate with Plainfield where Mr. G. resides, accordingly the following letter was sent :—

*To the Saints gathered to the name of the Lord Jesus at Plainfield.*

BELOVED BRETHREN,

I am requested by Brethren of the Assembly in Montreal, to forward the decision that was determined upon at their Meeting on Wednesday, 17th December, before declaring it at our meeting on the Lord's Day next, as it is felt that Mr. F. W. Grant being especially associated with the Gathering at Plainfield, it would be proper and according to the Word, to ask your consideration of the position in which we have been placed, and seek your fellowship in our action.

The Assembly here has been sadly broken up by the course Mr. Grant has taken in the publication of his tracts, and dissemination of his doctrines. It has assumed the distinctive marks the Scripture has defined as "causing division," contrary to the doctrines you have received,—and also as drawing away disciples after him, and thus as one who is termed in Titus a Heretic, or one who sets up his own opinions, and by that means forms parties in the Church that such should be rejected.

We are deeply impressed with the solemnity of the act we are called upon to take for the truth's sake, and are constrained to send you the judgment of the Assembly, which has only followed the two distinct admonitions we were instructed by the Word to give him, and which as you will see by the paper enclosed have been not only refused but treated with contempt.

Desiring to hear from you before declaring it at the Lord's table and praying that the Lord may lead you to a righteous judgment in this matter.

I am your Brother in Christ Jesus,  
On behalf of the Assembly,  
W. C. BAYNES.

---

On the 21st December at the Lord's Table this was announced,—

"That the judgment of the Assembly, in reference to Brother Grant has been communicated to the Assembly at Plainfield, where Mr. Grant resides, to seek their fellowship in the action, and after hearing from them it will be generally announced."

After waiting a fortnight, the reply from Plainfield respecting our judgment was received, (two dissenting) The plea in their letter is, "that freedom of conscience must be allowed," that "the doctrines of Mr. G's Tract in nowise touch foundation truths," and "no brother is to be silenced unless the Person or work of our Lord Jesus Christ is in question," with the exhortation among others, "to endeavour to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace."

Now the ground of Mr. G's rejection was clearly stated to be that of a "heretic." Others have long since announced their belief that his teaching did "touch foundation truths" as to the subjective side of Christianity, and their writings are abroad As to "freedom of conscience," what of the consciences of hundreds of God's saints outraged by the dissemination of these doctrines? and where is this "freedom" to stop? The exhortation of Eph. iv. 3, "to endeavour to keep the unity of the Spirit



in the bond of peace" we believe has been carried out by the Montreal Assembly in acting in concert with the Spirit who wrote Titus iii. 10 but thoroughly set at nought by that of Plainfield in refusing their decision and so acting in independency. It was felt after the reading of their letter on Lord's day Jan. 4th that what was decided on Dec. 17th was with the Lord's approval and could not therefore be revoked; (no solid reason being given by the Plainfield Assembly for doing so), accordingly Mr. Grant and the seceders in Craig St. were announced as no longer in fellowship.

The facts having been stated we would remind our brethren of what has led to the humiliating end, which has not been reached. The strangest misconception seems to exist as to what the contention has been about, some reducing the whole question to one of "sealing" and others to that of "life." Briefly then let us give what Mr. G. teaches.

1. Old Testament Saints were "in the Son" and had "Eternal life in Him" in virtue of being born again. Page 13 & 14 of "Life in Christ and Sealing with the Spirit."

2. That when thus born we are at that moment forgiven, justified, no longer in the flesh, but in Christ, and dead to sin and the law, (pages 6 & 7.)

3. That this new birth gives us the full position of sons of God, and being sons we are sealed with the Holy Ghost, faith in Christ's work not being necessary to "sealing" (page 8 of "Life and the Spirit," and pages 29, 30 and 7 of "L. in Ch. & S. with the S")

4. That Rom. vii. is the experience of one who is

justified, in Christ, sealed, seeking to abide in Christ and to be fruitful and holy, page 8.

5. That souls may have peace and not know it, be justified and not know it, have the Holy Ghost and be in bondage, page 60 & 62.

Thus it is not one point or two, but a complete system of doctrine developed, affecting fundamentally the subjective side of Christianity; to these may be added his views published elsewhere on "Local Unity," now causing trouble at Toronto, and questionable teaching on "propitiation and substitution," also disturbing the minds of some; from the first he has been warned by gifted and godly brethren; this is met by a second edition of his former tract four or five times enlarged, which he would publish "whatever the consequences," and when out affirms publicly he will adhere to it "word by word" though "we are broken to pieces." The first book being in circulation upwards of a year, voices are raised against it, when a party is formed who challenge discussion, and finally Mr. G. himself comes to Montreal unasked; he holds private meetings, (though he affirmed he had come for peace,) goes to Ottawa to propagate his doctrines, and there does the same; at the end of the investigation in Montreal many brethren sign a paper rejecting Mr. G. as a teacher, when he says how honored he is "at being permitted to suffer for the truth and he will stand to his book word by word." He is admonished and this is treated with contempt. Thus throughout, every effort, warning, entreaty and remonstrance have failed to produce anything but firm resistance, and it was felt that responsibility to the Lord demand-

ed the solemn act of finally rejecting him, according to Titus iii. 10; "A heretic (that is one who sets up his own opinions, and by that means forms parties in the Church), after the first and second admonition reject."

The blessed Lord could say, "As I hear I judge, and my judgment is just, because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me." (John v. 30.) May the like grace be granted to His people.

(Signed on behalf of the Assembly.)

W. C. BAYNES.

GEO. SMITH.

J. O. ROBINSON.

F. HART.

