

minister's fatherly pastoral visits that the most permanent results are realized.

Mr. Marsh was a pronounced open communionist, and would never conceal (though he never offensively obtruded) his views, nor sacrifice his principles to the demands of expediency. No doubt this fact stood in the way of his personal advancement. "Had he remained in England," remarked a well-known literary lady, "he would doubtless have filled some of the most important pastorates in his native land." But he came to Canada at a time when regularism was extreme and intolerant. He earnestly wished to co-operate with his Baptist brethren—he saw no bar to his being permitted to do so; but his advances were repelled, concessions were demanded which his conscience would not permit; so he remained out in the cold. It was not only the exclusiveness manifested and which he could not understand, but the bitterness of spirit with which he was repelled, that left a wound not easily healed. But these were days of narrowness and intolerance, as a rule, on ecclesiastical and dogmatic questions. The intolerance that ruined the Baptist College in Montreal, that somewhat later threatened the Grande Ligne Mission, was laid with heavy hand upon our brother. Had a more conciliatory, and, we think, Christian policy of forbearance been pursued, as ultimately in the case of the Grande Ligne Mission, the results would have been different, and the end attained without the sacrifice of principle.

No doubt that Mr. Marsh's loose views on the communion question gave him access in many a quarter from which, as a strict communion Baptist, he would have been by prejudices excluded. The sphere of his deeply spiritual influence and of his clear evangelical teachings was thus possibly widened. But in denominational upbuilding and extension he never could have met with much success in such a stronghold of religious conservatism as Quebec. One thing is assured to all who knew him, that he always acted conscientiously and according to the light he had, no matter what the loss likely to follow. Was he a loser in the long run? By no means. He commanded the profound respect even of those who differed from him. He never was able to save from, or even to live on, his salary; yet he and