

A STATEMENT

OF WHAT LED TO

A Separation from Natural History Hall, Montreal.

IN June or July, 1884, Mr. Mace came to Montreal to preach the gospel. He was warmly received, and all had hearty fellowship with him in the work. Lord A. P. Cecil joined him, and was also warmly welcomed. They had not labored together very long, however, before it was observed that while Mace was attracting people, Cecil was driving them away. The preaching of the latter was characterized by denunciation. His doctrine, also, was very peculiar. As a sample of it, the following may suffice: "His giving you life does not deliver you from the sentence of death." When John v. 24 was quoted against this, he maintained that to be the second communication of life—not new birth. To a brother who asked him about it he replied, "God is with me, and you must take care not to fight against God."

Soon after this, he went to the Plainfield meeting, accompanied by John Lawrence. They arrived on Lord's day morning, just as the meeting for the breaking of bread began. Cecil spoke against something which was destroying the foundations, and continued this line of things

throughout the remainder of the meetings. After the general meeting, many brethren remained to take up the subject with Mr. Grant, who read a large portion of his tract, "Life in Christ, and Sealing with the Spirit," then in manuscript. Cecil desired to prevent its publication, but a very decided expression in favor of its publication was given by the meeting. Cecil replied, "If it is, it will cause a breach of fellowship with brethren, and I will resist it with all the energy I am capable of." He returned to Montreal, and, assisted by Mr. Mace, began a course of action perfectly consistent with the above threat. He availed himself of all the meetings of the assembly for pressing his own views and attacking the teaching of Mr. Grant.

One Lord's day morning he spoke of brethren "needing strength to put out false doctrine brought in by the devil." About this time he met a brother on the street, and gave him a first admonition as a heretic. Mace also, soon after, passed the same brother without salutation or recognition; and afterward, when asked why he did so, replied, "Because of the brother's agreement with F. W. G.," although, be it noted, this brother had never, during all these weeks of trial and sorrow, said one word on these subjects in the meetings.

Letters from England, and the supposed weight of opinion of the English brethren, were largely used by Cecil and others. Several brethren pleaded with Cecil, desiring that at least they might be allowed to have the meetings for breaking of bread and prayer in peace; but every entreaty was ignored, and each appeal seemed to make him more determined. At the very commencement of the meeting, one Lord's day morning, he spoke of

the "apostles' doctrine, fellowship, breaking of bread, and prayers," and intimated that as there was not continuance in the apostles' doctrine, there could not be fellowship, breaking of bread, and prayers with those who had departed from it. After the breaking of bread, a brother spoke from 1 Thess. v. 20, 21, exhorting to test by the Word all teaching, as the only way of profiting by the true, and detecting and refusing the false. Mr. Baynes followed, and told the saints "not to believe they were all competent to understand the Scriptures; nothing but the self-conceit of a man could make him say such a thing." And further, he stated that "J. N. D. had refused the hand to F. W. G. because of his views."

On the following Wednesday evening Bro. H. Hammond said, "We have been listening to one side of the question for a long time. I would like to hear what brethren who differ have to say. Opportunity for this purpose should be given." It was agreed that the following day (being a holiday) should be devoted to this purpose. Three meetings were held. Lyman and James stated their views on the subjects in question; Cecil, Mace, and Baynes replying.

Bro. H. Turner exhorted to the endeavor to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, and deprecated the evident tendency toward division on the part of Lord Cecil and others.

The same week, the following letter came from our brother F. W. Grant, addressed to the gathering, through Mr. Geo. Smith:—

PLAINFIELD, Nov. 7th, 1884.

Beloved Brethren,—

Having heard, from a source outside of Montreal, that the matter of some recent doctrinal difficulties

was being continually brought up, in the way of warning and appeal, in your public meetings, and being myself the one very especially aimed at as connected with the doctrines in question in all this, I trust to be in grace accorded the privilege of addressing a few, and only a few, words to you by letter—my only way.

It is not in defense of myself, however, or of the doctrine, that I desire to say any thing. If this be of God, as I assuredly believe, it *will* meet opposition, (the truth always has,) even among the Lord's people, but He will care for it Himself. Let none fight against it who are not very clear as to what they are attacking. I have printed what I hold, pretty fully, and can leave it there. There was a foolish rumor that I was coming to Montreal to maintain my views. I have had no thought of it. When the gathering desires me to come, I am of course ready to show cause for all I hold; otherwise, the desire of my heart is, and the very purpose of my writing now, to urge that there be a quiet, godly treatment, without animosity or party-strife, of what affects the consciences of God's saints. Alas! what does all our talk of the practical unity of the Church amount to, if, after all, we can so easily forget how much we have in common, by the fierceness of our zeal for minor points?

Let me remind beloved brethren that our brother J. N. D., to whom under God we all owe so much, was perfectly conscious of the difference of view existing, which came up again and again at 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 also that our brother A. P. C. differs both from J. A. T. and Mr. Darby himself in what is, in fact, the main foundation of his own view, viz., the double communication of life to the soul. I have the copy of a letter from J. A. T. distinctly stating this, as far as he is concerned; and as to J. N. D., it is well known. But A. P. C. and J. A. T. both differ from J. N. D. as to the important point of the connection between new birth and justification, which his "Operations of the Spirit" and other papers plainly assert. I might mention other differences, which should give gentleness and forbearance in dealing with one another on such points. Surely we may maintain truth

with earnestness, and without compromise, and yet not depart from this. This is the only reason why I speak of these things. The constant and public pressing upon the saints, not only points in dispute, but extreme and mistaken views as to the consequences of these, even well-nigh to the open urging of division, where no fundamental point is in question, result in a mere intimidation of souls, injurious to the truth, whatever be the truth. Our consciences must be before God, not before one another, or we can receive nothing aright. This course may make partisans, not real adherents of the truth at all. For my own part, I have refused to use personal influence as to these matters, and have carefully avoided undue dwelling on a certain line of things. My preaching and teaching have been (with some additional clearness in some details perhaps) in general what they have ever been: with what I teach, my tracts included, I cheerfully take my stand. If I had sought smooth things for myself, I should have taken a different course; nor is the alienation of many of my brethren, which I have been made to feel, other than pain to me; yet go back I cannot, and the tender grace of Him I serve must and shall be my sufficiency. But it is for the truth's sake I ask beloved brethren in Montreal and elsewhere to look at all quietly, soberly, and before God, not suffering themselves either to be seduced or intimidated from any path in which the Good Shepherd's voice may lead. I thank God there can scarcely be a conceivable reason why any should follow me, nor need any think of me in the matter.

Pardon this brief line, beloved brethren, and believe me ever affectionately in our blessed Lord.

F. W. GRANT.

To brethren gathered to the Lord in Montreal.

Care of Geo. Smith.

The above letter was read at the brothers' meeting on the following Saturday night. A. P. C. denied that Mr. Darby continued with Mr. Grant in love and fellowship to the last, stating that he was ready to break with Mr.

Grant at one of the Croydon meetings because of these doctrines. He denied also what Mr. Grant said as to the view held by Mr. Darby on the subject of the double communication of life. A brother suggested returning the letter to Mr. Grant with Cecil's denial of his statements, which was done through G. Smith, who wrote Mr. Grant that "many brethren in Montreal, and in England also, think that there is fundamental error in your tract, and I fear there will be division." He also said, "Life in the Son for Old-Testament saints is false doctrine." Mr. Grant, feeling the difficulty of meeting by correspondence statements that were being made, came at once to Montreal, and was present at the brothers' meeting on Saturday night, November 15th. He told brethren he had come, not to advocate his doctrines, but to do what he could to avert division, which had been hinted at in Smith's letter. As regards what had been alleged by our brother Cecil as to Mr. Darby's attitude toward Mr. G. at Croydon, he gave proof of Mr. Darby's fellowship with himself and his brother to the end. As Mr. G. had expressed his willingness to satisfy every conscience, meetings were asked for to examine the doctrines to see if they were really cause for division.

Such meetings were held, and during their continuance the following points came out :—

Cecil.—"I'll bring out distinctly that the doctrine of Old-Testament saints having life in the Son is heresy. Life in the Son is not merely 'life and nature,' but oneness. Then Old-Testament saints must have been one with God. 'Except the corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone.' In order for the glory to come in, the corn of wheat must fall into the ground ; the fruit

is one with the corn, the corn of wheat is one with the stalk; out of that corn of wheat springs the fruit—the heavenly fruit. Old-Testament saints had not that place of oneness, and *union* if you like. He abode alone before the cross—He was absolutely alone. Old-Testament saints were like individual flowers planted in the ground, dependent on God; but after redemption, we are one with the corn of wheat. It is as become man, accomplishing redemption, and gone on high,—it is alone in that way that we can be said to be in the Son. If the Old-Testament saints were in the Son before He became man, they were one with God, and thus in the Deity.” (He had previously stated they became thus so many Gods, but now announced that he had modified it.)

F. W. G.—“There are three different things mixed up together. There is oneness in *being*,—this can only be between the Father and the Son; oneness in *life and nature*,—this is what makes us children of God; while *union* is still another thing. We are not one with the Son or the Father, but are united to the Man Christ Jesus. Our brother has carefully mixed up three things, which we can only correct by looking at our bibles.”

The next evening, Mr. Grant asked for the charges to be given and made good. He said, “It has been told us here that division must be. I did not come here to tell people what I believe, but to avert division if possible.” He asked for the charges in writing as they had previously promised to give them, but this was shirked. He wanted “to know the point that is dividing us,—what are the charges of heresy? All my concern is for the saints at Montreal, whether we can go on in peace and quietness.”

Mace said he could not go on in peace in the presence

of Mr. Grant's last book (referring to "Life in Christ, and Sealing with the Spirit.")

Cecil tried afresh to prove that "life in the Son" was oneness, and not merely "life and nature;" so that Old-Testament saints would be one with God. On this the changes were constantly rung.

Grant.—"What do you mean by oneness?"

Cecil.—"First, the corn of wheat is one with the fruit; second, the family, several persons, one in spirit, life, and nature; and third, the vine and the branches."

Grant.—"If we do not have terms defined, what are we to make of them? 'Oneness' is not a scriptural term. 'In the Son' and 'one with the Son' are not the same thing. 'In the Father' and 'one with the Father' are not the same thing. We *are* in the Son of God, and in the Father, and therefore in God; but we have not oneness with Deity. Therefore to have life in the Son is not oneness with Deity either for Old-Testament saints or New."

Cecil.—"Was the Son only Deity?"

Grant.—"John speaks of the *only begotten* Son, in the bosom of the Father; in Luke, He is the Son of man."

Cecil.—"I totally deny that in John 'Son of God' means simply Deity."

Grant.—"The gospel of John is the gospel of His deity,—the *only begotten*, not the *first-begotten*. The former is exclusive, and that is the force of 'the Son of God' all through John's gospel. When He says, 'in Us,' that is Deity.

Cecil.—"I will just show you the fallacy of what Mr. Grant has said. John xiv. is the glorified Man, not merely God: they were to believe in Him. "I am the way"—

*we cannot wonder at Stonyism Hence to Romanism
and to Transubstantiation. The source of error, may the Lord*

is that simply God. Why, if it mean simply His divine person, not one of us could ever have gone to the Father. Was He a divine phantom in the world? It is the Son become a man."

Grant.—"One with the Son of God as man would mean that we are one with man; but union is not in the gospel of John. John's doctrine is life,—eternal life."

Cecil.—"The Word was made flesh."

Mace.—"We are in the Son of God as the One who became a man and accomplished redemption."

Grant.—"All I can say is, there is very serious error, and defective doctrine. Union is not the same as being in the Son. When the Lord speaks of the corn of wheat, it is not union, but resurrection-life. Union is with the Lord as man, but we are partakers of divine life. In Him *was* life. He was always 'that eternal life which was with the Father,' etc. The new birth is degraded in Montreal: we are told that it was Judaism.* We are not one with God, but one in nature and life, blessed be His name."

At the next meeting, notwithstanding all the proof already given, of which only fragments are given here, it was said, "We want proof from the Word of God that Old-Testament saints were in the Son."

Grant.—"Scripture shows that new birth is life in the Son. If Old-Testament saints were born again, then they had life in the Son."

Cecil.—"We receive the Son by the Holy Ghost bringing Him into us—that is eternal life."

* As a brother said in a recent letter, "With A. P. C., eternal life is a mere dispensational thing, in contrast with Judaism, instead of, as in Scripture, in contrast with perishing."

willing to be preserved

Grant.—"A Person dwelling in me is not our quickening—it is not a life of ours. Have we two lives—one, new birth; another, Christ dwelling in us?"

Cecil.—"Romans vii. 17 brings out new birth, but not Christ in us; but the Spirit brings Christ into me as eternal life: directly I receive eternal life, I get the Holy Ghost. That is the deliverance out of a merely born-again state. It is more abundant life by the Holy Ghost, not being born of God. John x. 10—"I am come that they might have life" is one life. The first life is at new birth; the more abundant life is received by the gospel."

The next meeting began by Mr. Baynes saying, "I suppose we may consider the idea of Old-Testament saints having life in the Son as withdrawn"!

Grant.—"No; the question depends upon what new birth is. If Old-Testament saints had new birth, they had eternal life and life in the Son; . . . but I feel, so far as all this goes, points are not met in this way; it is not for us to prove that it is not heresy,—they have to prove that it is. If the charges are dropped as charges, we can look at the truth together. God has been coming in to show us that there is nothing to divide about."

James.—"That Old-Testament saints had life in the Son is very simply taught in 1 John iii. The test of possessing it is righteousness and love. This Abel had, in contrast with Cain, for "no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him." The saints should read the chapter for themselves; it is there as plain as possible."

Cecil spoke at some length, to prove it was as Son of man we are in Him.

Grant.—"I feel we have a solemn subject before us."

To say He was Son of God *become* man is one thing, to say He is the Son of God *as* man is another. Would it be a wonder that the Son of God *as man* should come into the world? The astonishing thing is that the Son of *God* should come into the world."

Mr. Grant was asked if new birth was a greater thing than union. His reply was, "Being born of God *is* greater than union."

This was the last meeting that week. Mr. Grant left the city with our brother Lyman, having been invited to Ottawa, whither he was at once followed by Mr. Mace, who succeeded in getting a majority of the saints there to refuse him a hearing *in toto*, although many desired it.

At the Saturday night meeting here, we again pleaded with them to cease forcing their views upon us in the meetings for breaking of bread and prayer, but there was the opposite of yielding. Mr. Baynes characterized Mr. Grant's defense as "Jesuitical sophistry." A. P. C. accused James of making divisions and stopping the gospel. James, replying, drew attention to Cecil's course for the past three months, and to the charges of heresy made by him both publicly and privately, and asked him how he could expect our fellowship. As for the gospel, Mr. Mace and he had turned aside from it to make division. He also said he considered Cecil's teaching quite wrong, but respected his conscience, as no fundamental point was in question, and expected that he would respect the consciences of those who differed from him as to the double communication of life, and kindred views, which he was constantly pressing with great zeal in the meetings. He urged, too, the necessity of judging by the Word of God,

whether it be J. N. D., F. W. G., A. P. C., or any one else. Cecil went on accusing of false doctrine as to Old-Testament saints having life in the Son. Baynes asserted that no scripture had been produced for it, and it must be considered as not proved, as there was not a word of it from Genesis to Malachi. They renounced all responsibility of proving their own charges. Again Cecil denied that we have life in the Son in any other sense than in Him as man, having gone on high, and sent down the Holy Ghost,—making it the same as union.

We left with them the responsibility of further meetings, and left at a late hour. From the announcement on Lord's day morning following, it appeared they decided on a meeting for Tuesday evening.

At the beginning of the meeting on this Lord's day morning, Cecil prayed for "help to put out evil that had got in among us." After the breaking of bread, he spoke from Colossians, asserting that "the Church is in union with Christ, not by the Spirit, but by life," and denounced the doctrine of the Old-Testament saints having life in the Son.* James feeling it would be confusion to reply, but that Cecil's course and conduct justly deserved rebuke, rose and quietly walked out. At the close, A. P. C. said, "The Sunday-school is in the hands of those who hold false doctrine, and I press it upon parents if they will allow their children to come." After the meeting, Crain reproved Cecil for the course he was pursuing in trifling with and trampling upon the consciences of the saints. A. P. C. replied, "I pity you that you cannot see

* We may add here that our brother Cecil made it a point also at meetings for breaking of bread to bring such scriptures before us as "Warn the unruly" and "Whose mouths must be stopped."

the truth." About this time he distributed an anonymous letter, in his own handwriting, charging heresy against Mr. Grant and James.

At the meeting on Tuesday evening, A. P. C. read Romans vii. 1-viii. 1; Acts ii. 36-38, viii. 5-17, x. 1-6, xi. 13-15, x. 34-44; and spoke at length on these portions. Amid frequent interruptions and much confusion, some of Mr. Grant's remarks, at various times, were as follows:—

Grant.—"All Christians are addressed as having the Holy Ghost: there is no intermediate state allowed for in Romans. There may be a small interval between new birth and sealing, but it is not allowed for in Romans. Romans vii. is not proper Christian state, of course; but I do not teach that God puts any one under law now, it is the experience of one who is under law in his own conscience."

Mace.—"There is nothing about 'his own conscience' in Romans vii."

Grant (to Cecil).—"Your doctrine takes away the proper use of Romans vii. You say it is a person finding peace; so that when he has found it, the seventh of Romans goes. The consequence is, high-mindedness: the lesson is not learned."

Cecil.—"It is not only getting deliverance from the power of sin, but also justification from indwelling sin. The fullness of justification does not come out till Romans viii. I say positively, the man who has not learned the sentence of death in himself is not a Christian. The seventh of Romans is an unsaved man."

Mace.—"Is knowledge power? No; the Spirit is power. All the knowledge in the world would not set

free. It is the law of the Spirit that sets free. It is a solemn thing to reduce the Spirit to a nonentity, and yet Mr. Grant says people may have the Spirit and not have liberty. People *do get legal from bad teaching.*"

Grant.—"He has said knowledge is not power, and yet for want of knowledge they may not have power. He makes the truth of no consequence to begin with, and ends by making it of the greatest consequence. The Lord says, 'Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.'"

Mace.—"The Spirit is truth."

Grant.—"Nobody doubts that the Spirit of God is power, and not merely the truth in itself; but it is the truth that really practically frees. Why is it the truth is so elaborately given us? Why, because it is a question of truth in the power of the Holy Spirit. There is no good putting them in contrast. 'The Spirit is truth' means the witness is true, and not the truth, but the Spirit is truth. But the possession of the Spirit does not of itself give the truth; every where it insists upon the practical power of the truth."

Cecil then spoke with vehemence, insisting that there was no contradiction in J. N. D.'s tract on "Sealing," and accused Mr. Grant of quoting dishonestly from him in his pamphlet.

At the following Saturday night meeting, November 29, H. Hammond spoke of the Sunday-school, of which he had charge principally, and asked if brethren had fellowship with what A. P. C. had said the previous Lord's day, stating at the same time that no subject of difference had been introduced. He said he valued the fellowship

of brethren, and would like to know whether they sustained A. P. C. in this.

Baynes.—"The affair goes deeper than that, and since Tuesday, many of us feel that unless those tracts are withdrawn, there is nothing left for us but to protest, and it is our intention to do so."

Grant.—"I cannot withdraw my tracts."

Baynes.—"I suppose you will also give us the liberty to protest against them."

Grant.—"You must take it, my brother; it is not for me to give it. If it is fundamental error, then the assembly is to deal with it; if it is not, then the right of private judgment comes in."

Cecil.—"Grant is making a party by publishing his tract, and that is a heretic."

H. Hammond.—"Lord Cecil defines his own position exactly, as that is the course he is pursuing."

We pleaded further against the evident tendency to division. At this very time, the circular of the thirty-eight had already been prepared, signed, and printed without our knowledge, showing who had made a party; the rest of us being entirely ignored, and treated as already outside.

During the last few weeks before the division, we found on arrival at the Saturday night meeting, on one occasion, that they had already met an hour before the usual time of meeting; and there was every indication of the same kind of thing the last time we attended that meeting.

The following Wednesday evening prayer-meeting, H. Hammond and James had prayed, when Cecil read from 2 Chron. vii. and 1 Cor. v., denouncing their praying as hypocrisy because they did not turn from their evil asso-

A Mac in 1935 or 36 at London. When asked as to his exception. replied don't ask me. The Lords is in the matter out a battle

ciation, and charged F. W. G. with being a leader of a party (he being present) and us with following him, when H. Hammond and his wife went out. Cecil went on to speak of putting out the evil—he did not say “person,” but “thing,” and about twenty brethren and sisters immediately rose and left the room. E. S. Lyman remained and expostulated. Baynes replied, justifying Cecil, and Lyman came out.

The following Saturday evening, we found they had held a private meeting (one of the two referred to), and had decided to call an assembly-meeting for Wednesday evening (setting aside the prayer-meeting), “to consider the state of the assembly.” Cecil at the same time declaring that those who went out of the prayer-meeting should be rebuked as disorderly, and not be allowed to take part in meetings for discipline.

About this time, one of the brethren who had signed their circular rejecting Mr. Grant as a teacher called on James to explain his position. He admitted that the leaders were bent on putting F. W. G. out, but on account of some not wishing to go to such a length, the circular was adopted as a compromise; he further stated that, while there were many things in the circular he strongly objected to, there were thirty names on it when it was brought to him to sign, and he concluded to sign it. About the same time, he expressed himself in a letter to another brother as “willing to go on in fellowship with Mr. Grant, his doctrines, and his followers.”

Our circular of December 3d was issued, to show that the circular of the thirty-eight was not from the assembly.

On Wednesday evening, December 10th, the assembly was called upon to send a paper to Mr. Grant (who had

left the city) requiring him to withdraw his tract, and to rebuke H. Hammond, Lyman, Crain, Trenholme, and James, as well as Mr. Grant, for disorderly conduct in having left the meeting the week before when Cecil was speaking. But the assembly did not adopt the rebuke, nor administer it, it being felt by a large number that rebuke was called for in an opposite direction.

We protested that the paper proposed to be sent to Mr. Grant did not express the mind of the assembly, but only of certain brethren. Cecil urged it was "the mind of the elder brethren, to which the rest should submit." We called the attention of the saints to this officialism and assumption of authority to which they wished to attach the name of the assembly. We told them they were at liberty, of course, to send any paper they pleased as individuals, but not as from the assembly. We also called attention to the fact that the first and most important doctrine in their charges against Mr. Grant was held by Mr. Darby; that some of us had learned it through his ministry; that we held it as the truth of God, and could not give it up without having a scriptural reason for doing so, which, so far, they had failed to give; that they ought not to expect us to give up our consciences, and to ask us to do so is only trampling upon them. A. P. C. replied that the brother making the above statement was "telling a falsehood. Mr. Darby never taught any such thing." Mr. Crain then quoted Mr. Darby where he says, "Here is the Son and those who have *life* in the Son. *This* God began working out in the fall, but the full *truth* of *it* came out when Christ was raised from the dead." An effort was then made by Cecil to silence us, as being under discipline, and therefore disqualified to take part in the

discipline of the assembly. We did not acknowledge the authority assumed, and took part in the discussion to the end, when Mr. Baynes read the paper again, and asked the assembly to say if it should go as from the assembly and as its voice. Many said, "Yes," and many said, "No." Cecil immediately prayed, asking the Lord to ratify what the assembly had done.

Some of them took the paper to Mr. Grant at Ottawa ; and having found him at the house of our brother Duffett, wanted to see him alone, to deliver him a letter from the assembly at Montreal. He refused a private meeting, and asked from what assembly at Montreal. "Those gathered to the Lord's name there," they said. "Including James and Lyman and Hammond?" he asked. "We do not accept the principle of unanimity," Mace said. He repeated his question. "Of course," said Mace, "your party did not agree." He then refused their letter, and said, "When a faction usurps the name of the assembly, no words are too strong to express my contempt for its action."

Lord Cecil also served a printed copy of the letter sent to Mr. Grant upon the brethren named to be admonished.

On Saturday night, December 12th, at the brothers' meeting, there was much prayer on the part of the brethren who opposed the action against Mr. Grant. In spite of renewed expostulations and protests, they manifested a determination to proceed to division, so that we could only again look to the Lord to preserve His people elsewhere, and to keep us faithful to His Word and name. At this meeting, Cecil renewed his charge of falsehood against Bro. Crain, who rose, saying, "Brethren, I desire to read a few extracts which I have taken from J. N. D.,"

which he proceeded to do. Cecil asked for one of the extracts to be repeated, and when it was read the second time, replied, "Oh, well, 'eternal life' and 'life in the Son' are two different things. 'Life in the Son' is life and nature and place and oneness, involving union, which 'eternal life' is not."

On Lord's day, Mr. Baynes called a meeting for the following Wednesday, December 17th, to receive Mr. Grant's answer, and consider what the assembly should do as to it. At the opening of this meeting, Mr. Baynes read a paper containing the letter sent to Mr. Grant, the reply of those who took it to him, and a declaration of his being no longer in fellowship; so that it was not a paper drawn up as the result of this meeting, but one brought to it—in fact, a verdict imposed. James then rose and said, "I have several letters from other gatherings, in reply to the circular of the thirty-eight, which will help the saints to a godly judgment in the matter," but he was peremptorily refused a hearing by Mr. Baynes. Lyman then spoke, and showed that the letters were important, and might assist us to a godly judgment; but Mr. Baynes said the subject of the paper in his hand must be settled first. Crain was also silenced, as not being a local brother, while Mr. Leslie of Toronto was allowed to speak at length on their side. Lyman pointed out that it was agreed by all parties that no fundamental point was in question, (Cecil himself had previously admitted that the doctrines in question did not come under assembly discipline,) and he did not see why they should go on and act in putting away without any reason. H. Turner asked why they were putting away Mr. Grant: if it was for the doctrine, many others held the same, and why not put

them away too? Mr. Baynes replied, "He is a heretic," and again appealed to brethren to act, but there was no power; not one of the saints spoke in favor of putting away—some who even signed their circular were opposed to it. Then Cecil got up, and asked the saints if they were prepared to give up the doctrine of "life in the Son" as the special portion of the saints now in contrast with Old-Testament saints. He also asked if they were prepared to accept the doctrine of Romans vii. being the experience of a sealed man already justified, and thus deny the normal condition of a Christian. He also charged Mr. Grant with slighting the atonement, and declared that quickening is the sovereign act of God apart from faith and repentance or any thing else; that these both must come between quickening and salvation by the gospel. Crain asked him if the freshly quickened soul was not under the shelter and value of the precious blood of Christ, but he would not answer.* Mr. Baynes then re-read the paper, and said that if it was not the Lord's will, he hoped He would stop his mouth,—that if this assembly were thinking to act contrary to His mind, he hoped He would blow upon it. Innes asked as to a party assuming to act as the assembly. Mr. Baynes replied, "We do not recognize the principle of unanimity as necessary to assembly-action." It was insisted on that it was perfectly right and scriptural to act against the consciences of those who objected,—that "the many" could act for and as the assembly (quoting 2 Cor. ii. 6). Crain told them that "the many" was the body as such. They denied it, refusing distinctly the principle of the assembly acting as

*A. P. C. has since denied to three brethren at LaChute that a soul merely born again is sheltered by the blood.

such. Crain also warned them that if they acted, they would put themselves off the ground of the Church. Brothers Lyman, Crain, Ross, Rogers, Henry and Albert Hammond, Blatchly, Miller, Trenholme, Holland, Innes, H. Turner, James, and others spoke against the action, only one or two besides the three leaders speaking in favor of it. It became more than evident that assembly-action for putting Mr. Grant away was not to be obtained; but Mr. Baynes then read the paper a third time, and appealed to them again, and those who favored it were asked to stand up; about one third did so, and Mr. Grant was then declared to be no longer in fellowship. James asked if they considered this action final. Mr. F. Hart said, "The assembly has acted, and Mr. Grant has been put out," and read a portion of Matthew xviii. Ross said he would rather stand alone the rest of his days than have any part in such action. H. Hammond said, "I believe the time has come for us to separate from this evil." Mr. Baynes replied, "You may do as you please." James now attempted to show from Scripture why he dissented from the action, but Cecil rose and opposed his speaking, threatening to withdraw if disorderly brethren were allowed to speak. Those who dissented from this course were then asked to meet in the Craig-Street room the following evening. Mr. Baynes at once replied, "And those in favor of it will meet at my house to-morrow evening to record their decision;" adding, "we have forty-seven names ready to sign it," which Cecil corrected to forty-five, and expected to get two more.

Thus was division consummated, and the consciences of over forty saints trampled upon. Many deplored the action who still continued going to the old room. Many of us

felt that, whatever our future course might be, we would have to go on alone with God rather than at a table now so characterized by sectarianism and clerical assumption. We could own it no longer as the Lord's table, it was in the possession of a party which had refused a faithful and godly brother on purely sectarian ground, and had, for a long time past, utterly ignored the protests of those who, for age, length of time at the Lord's table, as well as being those who principally took part in the meetings, they were especially responsible to listen to.

The next evening, about forty brethren and sisters met in the Craig-Street room. The meeting was occupied with humiliation, prayer, confession, and conference. All were of one mind that we could no longer own the table at Natural History Hall as the Lord's. We felt it was our duty not to allow the breaking of bread to lapse for a single Lord's day. Still Mr. Grant, who was present, having returned to Montreal that day, on his way to Plainfield, counseled those who had any doubt as to it, and who could not do it in faith, to wait,—he could not say go back to Natural History Hall, that would be counseling association with evil. He referred to Judges vii. 3, and sought to press upon the saints their *individual* responsibility in regard to this solemn and important step.

None, however, drew back. We felt the issue was a simple one, and our consciences were clear before God that in breaking bread together we were simply continuing the Lord's table in separation from evil and in obedience to the word in 2 Timothy ii. 19-21.* Accordingly,

* The stand taken by Natural History Hall being manifestly a permanent one, and Mr. Grant being received at Plainfield the following Lord's day as usual, the division was complete, and the issue before all assemblies irrespective of Craig Street.

the following Lord's day we broke bread in the room on Craig Street temporarily, and are now meeting at 49 Cathedral Street. Our action has been very generally recognized throughout the United States and in many places in Canada. In a few places there has been division, and some have had afresh to go forth.

JNO. JAMES.

C. CRAIN.

E. S. LYMAN.

JOSEPH ROSS.

E. H. TRENHOLME.

H. HAMMOND.

Montreal, Feb. 20th, 1885.

P. S.—A statement is being circulated every where that Mr. Grant, during the meetings at Montreal, taught that “in the Son” means “in Deity,” and that both Old-Testament saints and ourselves were in Deity. This is not true. Mr. Grant not only did not teach it, but denounced it as blasphemy, not only in the meetings, but in a letter which was printed while the meetings were going on.

Another statement circulated is that Mr. Grant taught at the same meetings that in John's gospel the title “Son of God” was Deity—and only Deity, but that the latter statement was withdrawn under pressure. As to this, we quote a few lines from a letter of Mr. Grant's written at the time.

“On Friday, almost the whole evening was taken up with an attempt to prove that ‘in the Son’ meant in the Son as man, as Luke i. and the second psalm. For this, they brought forward

John i. 33, 34, 49; v. 26; ix. 35; xi. 27; Colossians i. 13! I urged that in John, when the Son was mentioned, it was always true Deity—the *only* (not *First*) begotten, and that this was what faith saw ever, as in chap. i. 14. I went through all the scripture quoted, and gave proof as to all. The effect was marked; not the less that Mace got up to try and persuade people that what I had said was that in John's gospel the Lord was not looked at as man at all."

We may add that Mr. Grant corrected Mr. Mace's misapprehension, but withdrew nothing of what he had said.

E. S. LYMAN.
C. CRAIN.

