

take the liberty of rejecting the balance, whether you call it religious or otherwise. The danger of the position is pointedly expressed by a well-known author as follows:—

“A Bible held to be vaguely true in matters of faith and life, but without specification of what these are or any sure rule to ascertain them, could never be an authoritative standard at all; but men would be driven out of Scripture altogether on to the quicksands of mere human opinion, along with avowed rationalists.”

And again:—

“This, then, is what this theory would lead to. It would take away that Word of God on which earnest, believing men from the days of Moses until now have amid the watery waste of human opinion placed their faith as on an everlasting rock, and looking around from that Divine foundation upon the transitoriness and uncertainty of all human thought . . . in the language of ancient prophecy have said, ‘All flesh is as grass and all the glory of man as the flower of the grass. The grass withereth and the flower thereof falleth away, but the Word of the Lord endureth forever.’ They dare to assert that this Eternal Rock is largely sand . . . while they . . . fail to tell which is rock and which is sand.”

NO DENIAL FROM PROFESSOR MATTHEWS.

No denial of the utterance of these views in his lectures, or that he holds these views, or any undertaking that he will desist from inculcating them, has ever been given to the Senate, and the Committee brought no statement of any denial having been made before the Committee, except in the following guarded language:—

Page 4 of report:—

“In answer to the inquiries of the Committee, Mr. Williams stated that the lectures were verbatim, so far as they went, but that of course they did not contain all that the Professor had said in the class, nevertheless they faithfully mirrored the Professor.

“Professor Matthews, however, on being questioned, stated that they did not correctly mirror his teaching, that they bore