

# Conservative Protestantism and the Modernist Challenge in Vancouver, 1917-1927

ROBERT K. BURKINSHAW

The decade of 1917-27 was one of intense and widespread Protestant upheaval in urban British Columbia, most notably in Vancouver. The upheaval was a local manifestation of the North America-wide modernist/fundamentalist controversy which dominated much Protestant life in the decade. Events in British Columbia lacked some of the sensationalism of those in the United States and differed significantly in some important respects. The upheaval was important, however, in laying significant components of the institutional foundation of a vibrant evangelical/fundamentalist community in the province. This community expanded rapidly in succeeding decades and by the 1960s had developed into the largest active wing of Protestantism in the province. By 1981 it claimed double the weekly attendance of mainline Protestantism. In the process it had become proportionately stronger in British Columbia than in almost all other provinces in Canada, a significant development in a province known more for its secularity than its religiosity.<sup>1</sup> These religious developments acquired political significance after 1950, in that evangelicalism became one of the bases of support of the Social Credit Party.<sup>2</sup>

The conservative reaction in British Columbia against liberalism in mainline Protestantism expressed itself in several and varied forms between 1917 and 1927. The major catalytic event, the large-scale French E. Oliver evangelistic campaign in Vancouver in 1917, will be studied here. The Oliver meetings took on the appearance of massive protest rallies against religious modernism and sparked greatly increased polarization within Protestantism, resulting in denominational divisions and ongoing conservative institutional development.

<sup>1</sup> Tables indicating the numerical strength of conservative Protestantism in British Columbia can be found in Robert K. Burkinshaw, "Strangers and Pilgrims in Lotus Land: Conservative Protestantism in British Columbia, 1917-1981" (Ph.D. thesis, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, 1989), 308-14.

<sup>2</sup> See, for example, Walter E. Ellis, "Some Aspects of Religion in British Columbia Politics" (M.A. thesis, University of British Columbia, 1956), 83, 203-04, and Appendix VI.

This study has two purposes. One is simply to describe events surrounding the Oliver campaign in Vancouver and its aftermath, which are virtually unknown to historians. The second purpose is to analyze the factors contributing to the extent and intensity of the reaction to liberalism ignited by the campaign.

Some definitions are in order. Theological liberalism, or modernism, grew out of and responded to the nineteenth-century milieu of rationalism, romanticism, and progressivism. Liberals tended to accept the concept of evolutionary development and lauded progress in the cultural realm, believing that God was continually revealing His nature through the historical development of human civilization.<sup>3</sup> They thus welcomed most scientific and intellectual changes in the early part of the twentieth century and strove to adapt religious beliefs to modern culture. Their goal, according to historian Robert Handy, was to find a "way of restating the historic, Christ-centred faith of Protestantism in terms that would be understandable to persons familiar with modern concepts of scientific, evolutionary, and historical thinking." Some liberals went further and were so confident in scientific methods that "they felt secure in turning from the stress on revelation and the supernatural that had long marked Protestant piety and theology."<sup>4</sup>

By World War I, liberals had come to comprise much of the educational and ecclesiastical leadership in the major Protestant denominations in North America. This liberalism was not a monolithic movement, and its proponents varied widely in the amount of theological accommodation they were prepared to accept. In Canada, much of the liberal leadership was relatively moderate, at least compared to the more radical approaches advocated elsewhere, especially in German universities.<sup>5</sup>

Despite the relative moderation of much of Canadian theological liberalism, conservatives feared that the liberal restatement of Christianity amounted to no less than the abandonment of it. They believed that tra-

<sup>3</sup> See A. B. McKillop, *A Disciplined Intelligence: Critical Inquiry and Canadian Thought in the Victorian Era* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1979), 181-95; and William R. Hutchison, *The Modernist Impulse in American Protestantism* (New York: Oxford, 1976), 79.

<sup>4</sup> R. T. Handy, *A History of the Churches in the United States and Canada* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), 381-82.

<sup>5</sup> Examples of the more radical approach in Canada include John Watson of Queen's University and the Epworth League's Institutes of Old and New Testament Literature and History. George C. Workman appears to have occupied a position between that of the radicals and that of the moderates. See John S. Moir, *A History of Biblical Studies in Canada: A Sense of Proportion*, Society of Biblical Literature, no. 7 (Chico, Calif.: Scholar's Press, 1982), and McKillop, *A Disciplined Intelligence*.

ditional beliefs such as the unique, divine authority of the Bible and the supremacy of individual salvation were endangered by the new approach. Many thus threw themselves into battle to defend their understanding of the evangelical Protestant doctrines, values, and emphases which had previously prevailed in most of North America.

Conservative Protestantism, like its liberal counterpart, was not a monolithic movement. Many diverse streams of nineteenth-century evangelicalism resisted the turn-of-the-century changes in doctrine and practice. The most militant in their opposition to liberalism came to be called "fundamentalists" because of their stress on the "fundamentals of the faith." Others continued to emphasize traditionally understood doctrines, personal evangelism, and religious experience, but the terms "conservative Protestant" or "evangelical" are more appropriate than the term "fundamentalist" for them. They shared the same basic beliefs of the fundamentalists but lacked the militancy of doctrinal defence common to fundamentalists.<sup>6</sup>

In a somewhat ironic twist, many conservatives adopted innovations in doctrine and practice in order to augment their defence against liberalism. Dispensationalist views of "end times" and Pentecostal practices and beliefs are two examples of such innovations. Dispensationalism, which stressed a highly literalistic view of scriptures and an exceedingly pessimistic view of modern society, had developed in mid-nineteenth-century Britain. It had become popular in some, but not all, conservative circles in North America by the turn of the century. Part of its appeal lay in its doctrine of the inevitable decline of Christendom in the "last days." This helped explain to many beleaguered and bewildered conservatives the "apostacy" rampant since the widespread adoption of liberal theology.<sup>7</sup> Twentieth-century Pentecostalism's stress on the supernatural works of the Holy Spirit, including "speaking in tongues" and miracles, was also somewhat innovative. It appealed to some conservatives because they saw it as a powerful, contemporary refutation of modern skepticism concerning the supernatural events recorded in the Bible. However, despite a diversity of innovations, such groups were conservative in the sense that they sought to retain many evangelical doctrines and practices they felt were negatively affected by modern developments in religion.

<sup>6</sup> See George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth Century Evangelicalism, 1870-1925* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), 4.

<sup>7</sup> See Timothy P. Weber, *Living in the Shadow of the Second Coming* (Grand Rapids: Academic Books, 1983), and Ernest R. Sandeen, *The Roots of Fundamentalism*, 59-80.

*French E. Oliver Evangelistic Campaign, 1917*

Until 1917 conservatives and liberals generally co-existed quietly, if not comfortably, within British Columbia's mainline Protestant denominations — Anglican, Methodist, Presbyterian, and Baptist. Only several thousand conservatives belonged to exclusively conservative groups such as Plymouth Brethren, Salvation Army, and Pentecostal. This situation was greatly altered by the French E. Oliver evangelistic campaign of 1917 in Vancouver. The evangelist's attacks on religious liberalism before crowds of thousands, and the ensuing press and pulpit controversy, brought the theological issue to the attention of the public. As a result, polarization within the Protestant community was greatly increased and conservatives began the process of laying the institutional foundations of a Protestantism outside of the mainline denominations.

Oliver's nine-week Vancouver campaign ran from 20 May to 22 July 1917 and his seven-week Victoria campaign from 1 October to 20 November of the same year. A Presbyterian minister associated with the Bible Institute of Los Angeles, he and his team of associates came to Vancouver under the sponsorship of the Vancouver Evangelistic Movement (VEM), an interdenominational group of city businessmen, professionals, and clergymen. Oliver had previously sought to secure the sponsorship of the General Ministerial Association of Vancouver, but that body had decided against inviting him because of his clearly stated opposition to any taint of modernism. The conservative VEM was then formed to organize a large-scale evangelistic campaign with the purpose of countering the growing secularism of the city and the liberal theology in the churches. A handbill was widely distributed to invite the support of those who supported the statement of faith which was prominently printed on the document. The conservative nature of the statement was clearly indicated by the opening declaration that "We believe that the Bible is the Word and the Revelation of God and therefore our only authority" and by the nine other items of traditional evangelical belief listed.<sup>8</sup>

The organizing committee raised in advance all the required finances and constructed a temporary wooden "tabernacle" capable of seating 5,000 people. The unusual-looking structure covered the sloping piece of ground between Hastings and Pender streets known as the old courthouse site.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Rev. A. E. Cooke, letter to the editor, *Vancouver Daily World*, 14 July 1917, 11; and Vancouver Evangelistic Movement, "A Statement of Christian Faith" (handbill, 1917, in A. E. Ellis papers).

<sup>9</sup> *Vancouver Daily Province*, 21 May 1917, 15.

Despite the ministerial association's opposition to Oliver's coming and his blunt announcement on the opening night that he intended "not to use a feather duster in defense of the faith and in criticism of higher criticism,"<sup>10</sup> no public controversy broke out during the first six weeks of the crusade. The extensive newspaper coverage instead stressed Oliver's handsome appearance and eloquence and the attentiveness and size of the crowds, which averaged several thousand on week nights and completely filled the tabernacle on weekends. Also featured in reports was the singing of Oliver's associate, J. R. Hemminger, and that of the mass choir, which swelled to nearly 1,000 members from forty city churches on the weekends.

The uneasy silence between Oliver and his critics was broken by a letter to the editor of the *Vancouver World* from a New Westminster woman taking issue with his vivid portrayal of a literal hell.<sup>11</sup> Oliver defended his views from the platform and launched a frontal assault on "sickly sentimentalism" and liberalism. During an address on "The Bible and Science," he described the liberal practitioners of the modern method of biblical studies known as higher criticism as "dishonest," "pegged-legged infidels," "scholastic infidels," "theological degenerates," and "ecclesiastical buzzards."<sup>12</sup> Such were the focus of his wrath because, he argued, they were involved in "direct efforts . . . to lead men and women away from the direct authority of the Bible." Oliver claimed that he, on the other hand, "preached the same gospel [and] . . . the same hell as John Wesley preached in his day . . . the same Christ, the same atonement, the same virgin birth of Christ as was preached by Whiteld [*sic*], Moody, Knox, Calvin and Paul and Peter and James and John and Christ."<sup>13</sup>

Feeling directly attacked in the charges, several prominent city ministers came out into the open with their criticisms of Oliver. The ensuing exchange quickly developed into a full-blown controversy described in a local newspaper as "the biggest sensation of recent years in Vancouver religious circles."<sup>14</sup>

Oliver's critics included some of the city's more prominent ministers. Among them were A. E. Cooke, president of the ministerial association and minister of the large First Congregational Church; Dr. John McKay, principal of the Presbyterian theological college, Westminster Hall; and Dr. Ernest Thomas, minister of the largest Methodist church in the prov-

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>11</sup> Agnes Wiggin, letter to the editor, *Vancouver Daily World*, 30 June 1917, 14.

<sup>12</sup> *Vancouver Daily World*, 7 July 1917, 3; and 14 July 1917, 11.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 11 July 1917, 9.

<sup>14</sup> *Vancouver Daily Province*, 10 July 1917, 8.

ince, Wesley. Joining them in opposition were numerous other Vancouver ministers. The widely reported sermons and statements against Oliver focused on his “narrow and intense literalism,” his pessimism regarding the usefulness of social reform, his “caricatures” of modern thought and the largely lay, rather than clerical, backing of his campaign.<sup>15</sup> The provincial Methodist conference issued a statement, obviously aimed at Oliver, condemning any “movement cloaked in the name of evangelism which was carried on in hostility to social reform, religious education and modern scholarship.”<sup>16</sup>

The evangelist was not without prominent defenders, however. Dr. J. L. Campbell of First Baptist, the province’s largest Baptist church, declared to the applause of 5,000 at the evangelist’s “tabernacle” that “any theology not 1900 years old is not good.”<sup>17</sup> Reportedly, fifteen of the nineteen Baptist ministers in the city were “in full accord with the movement.”<sup>18</sup> Dr. W. J. Sipprell of Mount Pleasant Methodist Church, which rivalled Wesley Church in size, appeared on Oliver’s platform to give a “strong voice of support” for the campaign.<sup>19</sup> “Professor” Edward Odlum, manager of Clapp, Anderson and Odlum, insurance agents, and one of the VEM committee members, made a public offer of \$1,000 a year for five years to Oliver to carry on his work in Canada.<sup>20</sup>

Buoyed by the size of the crowds attending each evening and the growing numbers of responses to his invitations for conversion, Oliver assented to requests that he continue the campaign one week longer than its originally scheduled eight-week duration. The debate continued for a further week after that in the letters column of the *Daily World* until the editor announced that no more letters on the topic would be published.<sup>21</sup>

The controversy did not end, however. Instead, growing polarization between liberals and conservatives in Vancouver continued to develop as large numbers of conservatives were galvanized into taking specific action against the “dangers” of liberalism. The fact that most of the major conservative institutional developments in the city over the next decade had some significant links to the 1917 campaign indicates the evangelist’s suc-

<sup>15</sup> *Vancouver Daily World*, 9 July 1917, 7; 14 July 1917, 11; 18 July 1917, 11; and 16 July 1917, 7; *Vancouver Daily Province*, 13 July 1917, 9.

<sup>16</sup> *Vancouver Daily World*, 16 July 1917, 7.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 7 July 1917, 7.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 23 July 1917, 6.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 13 July 1917, 18.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 19 July 1917, 7.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 28 July 1917, 10.

cess in “exposing” modernism in religion and awakening conservative resistance to it.

Oliver’s Vancouver campaign and the accompanying uproar was explainable in social and economic terms, according to Dr. Ernest Thomas, minister of Wesley Church and strong exponent of the social gospel. It was supported by the city’s élite “who resist the application of [the] Christian life to finance and commerce and industrial organization.” It was an attempt “to dominate the pulpits of Vancouver by brow-beating and high finance. . . .” Thomas rejoiced that the attempt was repulsed and “once and for all Vancouver has chosen its path of advance and insists on the Christian pulpit being free to speak the great word of social justice. . . .”<sup>22</sup>

Research in other cities of North America also frequently points to a social and economic base to the modernist/fundamentalist controversy. However, such work usually reverses the explanation given by Thomas, arguing that fundamentalism was largely a reaction of the lower socio-economic levels of society against the liberal theological direction taken by the social and economic élites.<sup>23</sup> Several historians argue that the economically and socially comfortable would have been less inclined to protest modern trends than would those who were in some sense marginalized.<sup>24</sup>

An analysis of the limited evidence available suggests that neither socio-economic thesis can satisfactorily explain the Vancouver controversy. Oliver did hold a luncheon for businessmen in the city but also held one of his “men only” Sunday afternoon rallies for labouring men.<sup>25</sup> An observer of another of his Sunday afternoon audiences of several thousand men was impressed that it was “representative of the city’s innumerable [*sic*] interests. . . .”<sup>26</sup>

The membership of the sponsoring Vancouver Evangelistic Movement’s central committee appeared to belong in the broad category known as “middle class.” Of ten identifiable men, four were from the business community, including an accountant of a lumber firm, a salesman for a logging

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 16 July 1917, 7.

<sup>23</sup> Several of the best-known representations of this view are found in: H. Richard Niebuhr, *The Social Sources of Denominationalism* (Cleveland: The World Publishing Co., 1929); Stewart G. Cole, *History of Fundamentalism* (New York: Richard R. Smith, 1931); and Richard Hofstadter, *The Paranoid Style in American Politics and Other Essays* (New York: Random House, 1963).

<sup>24</sup> George Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 199-205, argues a modified form of this view, based partly on Walter E. Ellis, “Social and Religious Factors in the Fundamentalist-Modernist Schism among Baptists in North America, 1895-1934” (Ph.D. thesis, University of Pittsburgh, 1974).

<sup>25</sup> *Vancouver Daily World*, 11 July 1917, 9; and 30 June 1917, 14.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 16 July 1917, 6.

equipment firm, the manager/owner of an insurance agency, and the owner and operator of a box manufacturing plant. Two other members, an osteopath and a physician's radiographer, were in the medical profession and four worked full-time in religious institutions: an Anglican rector, the financial secretary of the YMCA, the local director of the China Inland Mission, and a professor at Latimer Hall, the evangelical Anglican theological college.<sup>27</sup>

Churches in support of and in opposition to the campaign were to be found in all the socio-economic areas of the city. Support was very strong from churches in the working- and middle-class Mount Pleasant district (Methodist, Baptist, and Plymouth Brethren), but it also came from the more fashionable First Baptist Church located downtown. In working-class East and South Vancouver, support came from several Baptist and Anglican churches. Opposition was not restricted to the prestigious downtown churches but was unanimous among the Methodist and Presbyterian ministers in the working-class east side.

Because the foregoing evidence suggests than no clearly identifiable socio-economic lines of cleavage can account for the magnitude of the uproar surrounding the Oliver campaign, other factors need to be considered.

The campaign's timing in relation to other events occurring in the province and the world was significant in at least two ways. First, recent political events in the province and the churches' extraordinary involvement in them appear to be closely related to the response generated by Oliver. Several years earlier, in response to reports of widespread corruption in the Conservative provincial government of Richard McBride, the Ministerial Union of the Lower Mainland of British Columbia had launched its own investigation. The resulting pamphlet, *The Crisis in British Columbia: An Appeal for Investigation*, published in April of 1915, lambasted the government for its complicity in the alienation of much of the province's resources and public land by "greedy speculators." Its publication and the province-wide speaking tour undertaken by Rev. A. E. Cooke on behalf of the ministerial association created something of a political sensation.<sup>28</sup> In the election of the following year, these charges of corruption and the

<sup>27</sup> Vancouver Evangelistic Movement (handbill, 1917); and *Henderson's Vancouver City Directory* (Vancouver: Henderson Directory Ltd., 1917 and 1918).

<sup>28</sup> Greater Vancouver Ministerial Association, *Minutes*, 19 April 1915 and 10 May 1915; Ministerial Union of the Lower Mainland of B.C., *The Crisis in B.C.: An Appeal for Investigation* (Vancouver: Sunset Presses, 1915); and Shirley Tillotson, "Politics and Moral Principles: Rev. A. E. Cooke and the Social Gospel, Vancouver, 1913-24" (undergraduate class paper, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, 1984, copy in United Church Archives, Vancouver School of Theology, Vancouver).



prohibition referendum dominated the campaign, united most of the Protestant churches in opposition to McBride, and helped sweep the Liberals, under H. C. Brewster, to power.

Politics and social reform had thus been an important focus of Protestant church life for several years. There is no evidence to suggest that conservative Protestants were totally opposed to the reform movement. Indeed, indications are that they gave strong support both to prohibition and to the new Baptist premier, Brewster.<sup>29</sup> For example, Rev. Gabriel Maguire, who later became a leader of conservative Baptists in Vancouver, played a leading role in the prohibition campaign.<sup>30</sup> In the summer of 1916, vast prohibition rallies attracting 7,000 in Victoria and 11,500 in Vancouver (“the largest audience ever assembled under one roof in the Dominion of Canada”) featured the American fundamentalist preacher, Billy Sunday.<sup>31</sup> On 1 October 1917, the first day of Oliver’s campaign in Victoria and the first day of province-wide prohibition, the evangelist and his audience enthusiastically greeted the end of the days of the saloon keeper.<sup>32</sup>

Despite such evidence of sympathy with aspects of the reform movement, conservative Protestants had very different priorities from those of the social gospellers. While the social gospellers spoke of the need for “social regeneration,” conservatives saw strict limits to the usefulness of the reform of society compared to the all-important work of individual conversion. Oliver declared that the “noble work of saving souls” was a greater fulfilment of religious duty than were “social service methods” which could not “save man.”<sup>33</sup> A common element of all the ministerial condemnation of Oliver’s preaching was his lack of sympathy for social reform.

Indeed, the “soul-winning” versus “social regeneration” tension between conservatives and liberals figured at least as largely in the division over the Oliver campaign as did the issues surrounding the accuracy and authority of the Bible. It almost appeared that effectiveness in the conversion of individuals was the criterion by which a theology should be tested. According to Dr. J. L. Campbell of First Baptist Church, Vancouver, the reason “any theology not 1900 years old is not good” was that the “only way to win souls was to bring them to the old and only gospel in the

<sup>29</sup> John B. Richards, *Baptists in British Columbia: A Struggle to Maintain ‘Sectarianism’* (Vancouver: Northwest Baptist Theological College and Seminary, 1977), 64.

<sup>30</sup> Gordon H. Pousett, “A History of the Convention of Baptist Churches of British Columbia” (M.Th. thesis, Vancouver School of Theology, Vancouver, 1982), 117-18.

<sup>31</sup> *Victoria Daily Times*, 10 Aug. 1916, 16; and *Vancouver Daily World*, 11 Aug. 1916, 8.

<sup>32</sup> *Victoria Daily Times*, 1 Oct. 1917, 8.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, 2 Oct. 1917, 7, and 30 Oct. 1917, 11.

Blessed Book.”<sup>34</sup> Oliver pointed to the nearly 2,000 converts gained in the first six weeks of preaching in Vancouver as proof of his claim that the traditional message was more relevant and effective to modern man than that preached by many liberal ministers in the city.<sup>35</sup>

Near the close of the Vancouver campaign, Broadway West Baptist Church in Kitsilano passed a motion of support for Oliver which showed how closely related were its members’ concepts of biblical authority and traditional evangelism. The congregation expressed the hope that the evangelist would hold similar campaigns in other Canadian cities in order

to stem the tide of infidelity that under the guise of modern scholarship is undermining the faith of the people in the Divine inspiration and authority of the Blessed Bible, including its clear and definite teaching on the foundation truth of our eternal salvation.<sup>36</sup>

Several days later an Oliver supporter explained in a letter to the editor why he felt it had been necessary to organize the campaign despite the ministerial association’s opposition:

The need of “regeneration” or better still the old-fashioned term, “conversion,” was seldom heard. . . . Very few urged the people with all the powers at their command “Be ye reconciled to God.” Therefore it was time for the rank and file to move.<sup>37</sup>

Thus, the impact of the Oliver campaign can be explained in large part as a reaction against a “social gospel” emphasis which had been particularly dominant in the province in the previous two years. Conservative Protestants were not opposed to at least some of the reforms sought but were afraid that the emphasis on social activism would totally eclipse what they still believed to be the true mission of the church and the best long-term solution to social problems, the conversion of the individual.

A second factor related to the timing of the campaign must be considered if one is to understand Oliver’s effectiveness in polarizing the Protestant community into two camps. Its setting in the latter part of World War I, as the propaganda war against Germany was reaching new heights, helped shape the response. Against the backdrop of wartime tensions and passions, the modernist-fundamentalist controversy reached a peak of new intensity across North America. Liberal theologians at the University of Chicago began accusing American dispensationalist conservatives of receiving Ger-

<sup>34</sup> *Vancouver Daily World*, 7 July 1917, 3.

<sup>35</sup> *Vancouver Daily Province*, 7 July 1917, 10.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 16 July 1917, 20.

<sup>37</sup> F. Berry, letter to the editor, *Vancouver Daily World*, 19 July 1917, 6.

man funding because they did not share their own idealistic, crusading spirit against Germany. Their argument followed the lines that the pessimism of many premillennialists regarding the future of the world and the value of social reform led them to a lack of patriotism and fervour for the war effort.<sup>38</sup>

While it did take many premillennialist conservatives some time to develop a great enthusiasm for the war effort, they were easily able to refute the charges of receiving money from German sources. Instead, they countered that a strong link existed between liberalism's assault on traditional Christianity and the decline of morals in Germany. Some of the earliest and strongest statements of this view came from W. H. Griffith Thomas of the evangelical Anglican Wycliffe College in Toronto. He argued that higher biblical criticism, which had originated in Germany and was most advanced there, had been influential long enough in that country for the results to be clearly evident. It had weakened Christian morality to the extent that German militarism, with its reported atrocities, could develop unhindered by the voice of the church. Increasingly conservatives followed Thomas's lead and came to view "corrupt German Biblical scholarship" and the evolutionary "might is right" philosophy as responsible for "German barbarism." They thus threw themselves into the fight against religious liberalism with a passion akin to the fight against Germany.<sup>39</sup>

Similar views were circulating in British Columbia in 1917 and without question greatly increased theological tensions. Early in his Vancouver campaign Oliver had to lay to rest rumours that he and his team had come to Canada to spread pro-German propaganda.<sup>40</sup> Soon, however, he and his supporters were able to gain considerable ground over their opponents by utilizing their own and the public's intense anti-German sentiments. His sermons were generously sprinkled with patriotic, anti-German comments that usually drew applause from his audiences. In fact, so well-known were his views of the war that he was singled out for criticism at an anti-conscription rally in Vancouver.<sup>41</sup>

Early in the campaign one of Oliver's staunchest supporters, Rev. J. L. Campbell of First Baptist Church, Vancouver, highlighted the "German connection" of liberal theology in a prominently advertised sermon revealingly entitled "German Infidelity and German Sympathizers." He charged that "nine-tenths" of the "false teaching" regarding the Bible originated

<sup>38</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 143-53.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>40</sup> *Vancouver Daily World*, 25 May 1917, 3.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, 12 July 1917, 9.

in Germany and had “destroyed” the Bible for the Germans. “Behold the land of Luther . . . now practically Bibleless and paganized, wallowing in degradation and bestiality.” He warned that such “pernicious” teachings had infiltrated and now threatened the English-speaking world. “A large placard with the word ‘Made in Germany’ printed upon it might be hung over the door of some of our colleges and seminaries and churches. . . . If [these teachings] could prevail among us a night of moral darkness and desolation such as we have never seen would envelop the land.”<sup>42</sup>

As criticism of Oliver’s theology began to mount in Vancouver, the evangelist slashed back with the charge that modernism was at the heart of Germany’s war effort. He claimed that “the crux of the whole matter was the effort of Germany to dislodge faith in God Almighty from the hearts of the people. . . . It all had a cumulative effect, a definite goal, to rob God of His Deity and to put in its place science and force, brute force at that. . . .”<sup>43</sup> Several days into the Victoria campaign he drew the connection between modern theology and the war again. “What makes me sickest is for preachers to swallow David Strauss and his war-soaked theology, the same German theology which forced war upon the world.”<sup>44</sup>

This attempt to link the object of one’s criticism with the German enemy was not unique to Oliver and his conservative allies. The Ministerial Union of the Lower Mainland’s previously described pamphlet, *The Crisis in British Columbia: An Appeal for Investigation* (1915), included the headings “Germans Capture Ocean Falls” and “How these Germans Dictate British Columbia Laws.”<sup>45</sup> The huge Vancouver and Victoria audiences attending the 1916 Prohibition rallies featuring Billy Sunday were whipped into a patriotic frenzy by the evangelist’s likening of the war against booze to the war against Germany.<sup>46</sup>

War-related events in the spring and summer of 1917 were particularly conducive to the creation of a furor by charges that liberalism was German-influenced. The tension surrounding the conscription crisis was at a fever pitch throughout the duration of Oliver’s stay in the province. Scrutiny of a number of sources, including the 1917 federal election results in Vancouver and Victoria, the war news coverage of major urban newspapers and the advertisements of sermon titles of Protestant ministers, both

<sup>42</sup> Ibid., 11 June 1917, 7.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid., 7 July 1917, 3.

<sup>44</sup> *Victoria Daily Times*, 1 Oct. 1917, 8.

<sup>45</sup> The Ministerial Union of the Lower Mainland of B.C., *The Crisis in B.C.*, 18-19.

<sup>46</sup> *Vancouver Daily Province*, 11 Aug. 1916, 8.

liberal and conservative, indicates that a large majority of the population was passionately in favour of conscription.<sup>47</sup> In this setting, it is not surprising that the theological controversy could erupt with new significance.

Wartime passions also help explain the continuation of religious polarization after the war ended. Public anti-German sentiments in British Columbia remained at a high pitch in the years after the war. As Charles W. Humphries has pointed out, public opinion was still so inflamed in 1920 that a Canadian history textbook was removed from the province's classrooms on the unsubstantiated charge that it, among other things, expressed pro-German sentiments.<sup>48</sup> The theological realm also continued to be affected by such sentiments after the war. Some conservatives, especially those embroiled in the Baptist controversy in Vancouver from 1919 onwards, continued to refer to the German origins of liberal teachings.

Finally, the Vancouver campaign was particularly effective in polarizing the city's Protestants and galvanizing the conservatives into ongoing opposition because of the nature and intensity of the opposition experienced. In addition to the two factors shared by both the Vancouver and Victoria campaigns related to timing — the strong social gospel focus of B.C. Protestants in the preceding two years and the intensity of suspicions in 1917 towards anything with a German connection — the Vancouver campaign experienced much more intense opposition from leading Protestant ministers than did its Victoria counterpart.

Plans for a four-week campaign in Victoria began to develop towards the end of the Vancouver campaign. As in Vancouver, the Victoria Ministerial Association voted not to sponsor Oliver. Instead, the Victoria Evangelistic Movement was formed to organize the campaign. Lumber from the Vancouver "Tabernacle" was shipped to the capital city and a temporary 3,000-seat structure was constructed at the corner of Cook and Pandora.<sup>49</sup> The Victoria campaign opened on 1 October and drew increasingly large and responsive crowds. Interest was deemed sufficient to prolong the campaign several times before bringing it to a close three weeks

<sup>47</sup> A reading of *Vancouver Daily World*, *Vancouver Daily Province*, *Victoria Daily Times*, and *Daily Colonist* indicates the depth of support for conscription in Vancouver and Victoria. The advertisements of Protestant ministers' sermon titles are especially revealing. The 1917 federal election resulted in massive majorities for the pro-conscription Unionist candidates in all three Vancouver ridings and the Victoria riding.

<sup>48</sup> Charles W. Humphries, "The Banning of a Book in British Columbia," *BC Studies* 1 (Winter 1968-69): 1-12.

<sup>49</sup> *Vancouver Daily World*, 30 July 1917, 2; and the Victoria Evangelistic Movement, "A Statement of Christian Faith" (handbill, 1917, in A. E. Ellis papers).

after the originally scheduled conclusion.<sup>50</sup> Significantly, however, the Victoria campaign did not provoke the same level of public controversy as did its Vancouver predecessor, despite Oliver's blunt and open attacks against modernism and the social gospel. Apart from frequent and extreme criticisms from Rev. Charles Croucher of the city's Congregationalist Church, no note of discord was noted in the newspapers.<sup>51</sup>

Whereas in Vancouver prominent ministers attacked the evangelist publicly, key ministers in Victoria either supported the campaign or were silent. Dr. H. N. Maclean, minister of St. Paul's Presbyterian Church and president of the Victoria Ministerial Association until 1917, Rev. A. De B. Owen of the historic Reformed Episcopal Church, and Rev. J. G. Inkster of First Presbyterian Church were actively supportive. Several Baptist and Methodist churches also identified themselves with the campaign.<sup>52</sup> While this widespread, respectable support was evidently not enough to sway the decision of the Victoria Ministerial Association, it may have inhibited criticism against the campaign of the type levelled in Vancouver. It appears likely that some Victoria ministers were also influenced not to come out publicly against Oliver by their observation of the experience in Vancouver, where the controversy served largely to publicize and add fuel to the campaign against liberalism. In addition, as the criticisms of Croucher, the only outspoken opponent in Victoria, were extremely radical and caustic, other, more moderate, liberal ministers may have been reluctant to make public any negative comments regarding Oliver in order to avoid too close an identification with Croucher's extremism.<sup>53</sup>

Consequently, an important ingredient for a polarized atmosphere — significant opposition — was present in Vancouver but was largely lacking in Victoria. The sustained public opposition of leading members of the Protestant community in Vancouver led many conservatives in that city to a heightened distrust of, and alienation from, the leadership of the main-line denominations. It contributed to the development of a "siege mental-

<sup>50</sup> Both the *Victoria Daily Times* and *Daily Colonist* gave the campaign fairly extensive coverage, especially in the opening three weeks (1-21 October) and the closing week (13-20 November).

<sup>51</sup> *Victoria Daily Times*, 1 Oct. 1917, 8, and 15 Oct. 1917, 8.

<sup>52</sup> Victoria Evangelistic Movement (handbill, 1917); and *Victoria Daily Times*, 10 Sept. 1917, 16; 15 Oct. 1917, 15; 16 Oct. 1917, 13; 20 Oct. 1917, 15; and 22 Oct. 1917, 8.

<sup>53</sup> For example, Croucher was reported as arguing from his pulpit that a person's beliefs did not matter at all in Christianity, that a person may believe nothing about Christ and yet still be a Christian. He depicted the preaching and doctrines of revivalism as being out of date and relics from the medieval period. *Victoria Daily Times*, 1 Oct. 1917, 8, and 15 Oct. 1917, 7.

ity” among Vancouver conservatives which stimulated them to erect barriers against the further inroads of liberalism.<sup>54</sup> It is not surprising, then, that Vancouver was the centre of most of the ongoing conservative activity in the province aimed at opposing and creating alternatives to liberalism in the major Protestant denominations.

*Developments in the Decade After French E. Oliver*

In the aftermath of the Oliver campaigns, British Columbia’s conservative evangelicals, especially in Vancouver, began laying the institutional foundations of their own separate version of Protestantism. In addition to several smaller conservative groups such as the Salvation Army and the Plymouth Brethren already in existence by 1917, three discernible, though not always separate, conservative strands emerged after 1917: (1) “mainline” conservatives; (2) “separatist” Baptists; and (3) Pentecostals. The first two groups began developing in the immediate aftermath of the Oliver campaigns and the third began growing rapidly about six years later, largely in response to the ongoing tensions.

The “mainline” conservatives were the most inclusive evangelicals and, unlike the separatist Baptists and the Pentecostals, did not form any new denominations but remained within the mainline Anglican, Presbyterian, Methodist, and Baptist denominations. Most of them were of “respectable” British upbringing and belonged to the middle classes.<sup>55</sup> Led by Walter Ellis, the cultured, educated Anglican professor-turned-Presbyterian minister and Bible school principal, these evangelicals eschewed what they regarded as the divisiveness and narrowness of many other conservatives.<sup>56</sup> Yet they themselves were, in many senses, “practical sectarians” because they did experience a sense of alienation from much of the leadership and program of their denominations. They expressed that alienation through the formation of a network of separate institutions which provided what they felt was lacking in, or was negatively affected by, the liberal approach of the mainline denominations.

The most significant of these institutions was the Vancouver Bible Train-

<sup>54</sup> George Marsden describes this “siege mentality” most helpfully, using words such as “alienation,” “militant defense,” and “ideological ghetto wall.” See his *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 200-04.

<sup>55</sup> For example, an analysis of the membership of Fairview Presbyterian Church, an important centre of much of the mainline conservative activity, indicates that two-thirds of the members were businessmen, managers, professionals, or other white-collar workers. For more detail, see Burkinshaw, “Strangers and Pilgrims,” Appendix A.

<sup>56</sup> For further discussion of Ellis and his emphases, see *ibid.*, 108-21.

ing School (VBTS), established in 1918, the first of many Bible institutes in western Canada. Informal classes which led to its founding began in the fall of 1917, only shortly after the conclusion of the Oliver campaign. The school had the dual purpose of providing biblical instruction for the many new converts from the recent evangelistic campaign and of training lay leaders as local church workers and as foreign, city, and rural missionaries. As liberal mainline Protestant seminaries came under increasing suspicion, some evangelicals chose VBTS for all or most of their ministerial education.

Located in its own quarters at West 10th and Fir by 1923, the school did not grow as large as several Bible schools on the prairies eventually did. Combined full- and part-time enrolments of VBTS only infrequently surpassed one hundred, but it played a significant role as the "regional coordinating centre" of the province's conservative Protestants, especially those belonging to mainline denominations.<sup>57</sup> Between 1918 and 1953 it provided over 150 graduates as full-time workers for foreign missions and local evangelical organizations and churches.<sup>58</sup> In addition, the school sponsored many conferences for local conservatives; its principal, Walter Ellis, gave weekly public lectures for well over one hundred Sunday school teachers from a wide cross-section of city churches; and it was looked to by other evangelical agencies for leadership, inspiration, and trained workers.<sup>59</sup>

Other organizations in the network established by mainline conservatives in Vancouver engaged in a variety of foreign and home mission work. These included: the China Inland Mission's regional headquarters, established by VEM members in 1917, to provide housing and training for the hundreds of conservative missionaries enroute to China via Vancouver each year;<sup>60</sup> the Girls' Corner Club, beginning after the Oliver campaign to continue the evangelistic outreach to young women working in downtown Vancouver; the Shantyman's Christian Association, expanding from eastern Canada in 1919 with the help of members of the VEM

<sup>57</sup> The term "regional coordinating centre" originates with Joel Carpenter, "Fundamentalist Institutions and the Rise of Evangelical Protestantism, 1929-1942," *Church History* (March 1980), 67.

<sup>58</sup> Mrs. A. E. Ellis to Mr. G. Carlson, 10 Jan. 1964 (copy in Ellis papers).

<sup>59</sup> For further description of this and other related institutions see Burkinshaw, "Strangers and Pilgrims," 122-31.

<sup>60</sup> Interviews with Mr. L. Street, Vancouver, 9 Feb. 1982, and Mrs. A. E. Ellis, Vancouver, 12 Jan. 1982; Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 97; Sandeen, *Roots of Fundamentalism*, 250; J. Hudson Taylor, *A Retrospect* (Philadelphia: The China Inland Mission, c. 1910), inside cover.



to work with loggers, fishermen, and miners in outlying areas of the province; the British Columbia Evangelical Mission, organized in 1923 by supporters of Oliver to begin churches and Sunday schools in the outlying areas of Greater Vancouver and the Fraser Valley; and the Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship, founded in 1925 at the University of British Columbia as an alternative to the liberal Student Christian Movement.<sup>61</sup> Several of these organizations survived and expanded over the decades and provided an institutional basis for a continuing conservative element within the mainline Protestant denominations.

Also in the aftermath of the Oliver campaign, Greater Vancouver's 10,000 Baptists suffered increasing disunity. The tension culminated in 1925 in the first formal schism in Baptist ranks in North America over the modernist/fundamentalist issue.<sup>62</sup> The schism, led by militant conservatives, was a more radical reaction to liberalism than were the actions taken by the mainline conservatives. The separatist Baptists were also different from the mainline conservatives in that a larger proportion of them belonged to the working class. Instead of the west side Vancouver focus of the mainline conservatives, the majority of Baptists separating were located in East Vancouver and in the mill towns on the north shore of the Fraser River.<sup>63</sup> Yet, in both groups, the majority of the leadership was British-born.<sup>64</sup>

The concerns of the conservative Baptists centred chiefly around allegations of liberal teaching in Brandon College, the Baptists' liberal arts

<sup>61</sup> Interviews with Mr. Harold Davies, Burnaby, 20 March 1984, and Mr. Stanley Gear, Vancouver, 29 Nov. 1983; Douglas C. Percy, *Men with the Heart of a Viking* (Beaverlodge, Alta.: Horizon House Publishers, 1973), 49; David Phillips, "The History of the Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship in Western Canada" (M.C.S. thesis, Regent College, Vancouver, 1976).

<sup>62</sup> The schism is described in Gordon H. Pousett, "The History of the Regular Baptists of British Columbia" (B.D. thesis, McMaster University, Hamilton, 1956); Gordon H. Pousett, "A History of the Convention of Baptist Churches of British Columbia" (M.Th. thesis, Vancouver School of Theology, Vancouver, 1982); and John B. Richards, "Baptists in British Columbia: A Struggle to Maintain 'Sectarianism'" (M.A. thesis, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, 1964). Richards's thesis was published in 1977, with the same title and no alterations to the text, by Northwest Baptist Theological College and Seminary.

<sup>63</sup> In 1927 over 80 percent of the separatist Baptist membership in Vancouver belonged to churches east of Cambie Street, while 80 percent of those remaining in the old convention belonged to churches west of Cambie Street. An analysis of a fairly typical separating church on the east side of Vancouver, Ruth Morton Memorial Baptist Church, reveals that two-thirds of the members belonged to blue-collar occupation groups while only one-third were white-collar workers. For more detail see Burkinshaw, "Strangers and Pilgrims," Appendix B.

<sup>64</sup> Robert Burkinshaw, "American Influences on Canadian Evangelicalism: Greater Vancouver as a Test Case" (B.A. honours essay, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, 1980).

and theology school located in Brandon, Manitoba. Following some localized divisions in Vancouver beginning in 1917, more widespread complaints began surfacing in 1919. In all of the Baptist Union of Western Canada, these allegations found the most receptive ears among Vancouver Baptists, undoubtedly because of the polarization of opinion resulting from the Oliver campaign. The evangelist had singled out for attack the University of Chicago, centre of Baptist liberalism and radicalism in North America, labelling its graduates "pegged-legged infidels." Because of Brandon College's well-known reliance on the divinity school of the University of Chicago for the advanced training of its theological faculty, conservative Baptists in Vancouver were well prepared to listen to criticisms of the college.<sup>65</sup>

After several years of pamphlet warfare, committee investigation, and tense convention meetings, the more militant Baptist conservatives were unable to convince the moderate conservative majority in the provincial convention to join them in eradicating liberalism from the college. Unwilling to support a theologically mixed denomination, they formed a separate organization in 1925 which formally organized as a new denomination in 1927 when it became clear the old denomination was planning to oust the churches involved.

The highest proportion of separating churches and members was in Greater Vancouver. By 1928, half of the Baptist congregations in the Vancouver area, fourteen of twenty-eight with 1,200 of 3,200 baptized adult members, had separated. The Vancouver membership comprised two-thirds of the provincial total of 1,840 in the new, separating Convention of Regular Baptists in British Columbia.<sup>66</sup> Significant province-wide growth of the new denomination did not take place until after 1945, but by 1960 it had more congregations than did the old denomination, and by 1980 these were regularly attracting more people to weekly services than were the churches of the original Baptist denomination.

The ongoing religious polarization following 1917 also contributed significantly to dramatic Pentecostal expansion in the Vancouver area from 1923 onwards. Until that time Pentecostalism, with its strong emphasis on the role of experience and the supernatural in religion, had made very little headway in British Columbia. Its growth in the province had lagged far behind that in Manitoba and Ontario, for example, where relatively large

<sup>65</sup> *Vancouver Daily World*, 7 July 1917, 3-4; and Hutchison, *The Modernist Impulse*, 115, 213-15.

<sup>66</sup> Pousett, "The History of the Regular Baptists," table I, 151. Membership figures cited are about one-third of the census figures, mainly because children and large numbers of adult adherents are not considered members in Baptist churches.

numbers of "holiness" groups existed by the turn of the century. Such groups, largely stemming from nineteenth-century revivalistic Methodism, stressed cataclysmic religious experiences of a type that had prepared a segment of the population for Pentecostalism's emphases. British Columbia lacked significant numbers of "holiness" churches but, after 1917, did experience significant and widespread division between liberalism and conservatism which also proved conducive to the reception of Pentecostalism.

The spectacular healing and evangelistic campaigns in Vancouver and Victoria of Dr. Charles S. Price in 1923 were the catalyst to the Pentecostal growth in the two cities, particularly in Vancouver. For a three-week period, crowds of up to 10,000 packed the city's arena to hear him, and, on several occasions, an estimated 5,000 could not gain entry into the crowded building. The English-born evangelist, most recently from California, preached a message which combined old-fashioned evangelism and faith healing. Very large numbers responded to his calls for conversion and many incidents of miraculous healings were widely reported. Intense public controversy, which attracted considerable front-page newspaper coverage, soon developed regarding Price's beliefs and practices and, after Price had left the city, the General Ministerial Association of Vancouver struck a committee to investigate the claims of healing.<sup>67</sup>

Many issues were involved in the controversy surrounding Price, but a major line of division was drawn between those tending to liberal theology and those of a more conservative persuasion. Not all the opponents of Price can be identified as liberals, nor were all those supporting him clearly identified as conservatives. However, it is significant that the opposition included noted liberal spokesmen, such as Rev. A. E. Cooke, who had led the opposition against Oliver in 1917 and chaired the Price investigating committee in 1923. That committee displayed the influence of the rationalistic thinking characteristic of modernism in its negative conclusion regarding the claims of healing. It stated that medical science had discovered the laws necessary for the treatment of physical disorders and rejected the seeking of other cures. There are indications that some liberals were afraid that the Price campaign would lead to a resurgence of theological conservatism in the province as the Oliver campaign had done six years previously. In a telling comment, one critic of Price made much of the fact that some of the

<sup>67</sup> *Vancouver Daily Province* and *Vancouver Daily World*, 7 May to 28 May 1923, contain extensive descriptions of the meetings. A copy of both the *Report of a Clerical, Medical and Educational Committee into the Results of a Campaign of Healing held in Vancouver, B.C. in May 1923* and *Price Investigating Committee Minority Report* are contained in the files of the General Ministerial Association of Vancouver in the United Church Archives, Vancouver School of Theology, Vancouver.

ministers who had been active in bringing him to Vancouver and Victoria had also been solidly supportive of the Oliver campaign.<sup>68</sup>

Supporters of Price included most of the conservative Baptist ministers who were at the time involved in the Brandon College dispute.<sup>69</sup> While supporters varied in their estimation of the laws of medical science, they agreed that such laws could at times be superseded and “supernatural” healings take place. Indeed, as conservatives locked in combat with liberalism, they were actively defending the accuracy of the biblical accounts of miraculous events, including healings. Some of them even viewed the numerous healings reported in the Price meetings as modern validation of the possibility of “supernatural” events as recorded in the Bible.<sup>70</sup>

Conservative solidarity on the issue was never complete, however, and confusion and division increasingly reigned in evangelical quarters over it. Some believed miraculous healings were indeed possible but gradually came to the conclusion that many of Price’s claims were fraudulent. Others did not doubt the possibility but reacted negatively to the methodology of Price and, especially, to “Pentecostal” practices such as speaking in tongues which were more prominent in his second campaign in Vancouver, held in the spring of 1924.<sup>71</sup>

The negative report brought in by the investigating committee’s majority and the cooling attitudes of many conservatives did not deter large numbers of Price’s converts and followers. Instead, they cited biases on the part of the committee members and a lack of tolerance among city ministers towards their new beliefs and demonstrative worship practices. By 1925, several thousand had left existing Protestant churches in Vancouver and formed eight new Pentecostal congregations, in addition to the one congregation and one downtown mission previously in existence.<sup>72</sup> Two of these were on the west side of the city but the rest, reflecting the largely but not exclusively working-class base of Pentecostalism, were in Mount

<sup>68</sup> *The Christian Guardian* XCIV.25 (20 June 1923): 4 and XCIV.28 (11 July 1923): 13.

<sup>69</sup> “Resolution re Meetings held by Dr. Chas. S. Price, in Vancouver, B.C. from 6 May to 21 May, inclusive; adopted at a regular meeting of the Baptist Ministerial Association of Greater Vancouver, held on 10 June 1923.” Reprinted in Charles S. Price, *The Great Physician* (Oakland: n.p., 1923), 79-80.

<sup>70</sup> Donald Klan, “Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada Church Growth in British Columbia from Origins Until 1953” (M.C.S. thesis, Regent College, Vancouver, 1979), 106-08.

<sup>71</sup> For an example of such a change in attitude towards Price see Burkinshaw, “Strangers and Pilgrims,” 157-59.

<sup>72</sup> Klan, “Pentecostal Church Growth,” 69-161, offers a thorough description of these developments.

Pleasant or the east side of the city.<sup>73</sup> Some of the new churches were small, but one frequently attracted well over a thousand to its services and several others had congregations numbering well into the hundreds. The 1931 census indicated that Pentecostalism in British Columbia had increased tenfold since 1921 and was largely concentrated in the Vancouver area. Continued rapid growth in succeeding decades led to proportionately more Pentecostals in the province than in any other province west of New Brunswick by 1951.<sup>74</sup>

Thus, by the mid-1920s three significant strands of conservative Protestantism — mainline, separatist Baptist, and Pentecostal — had become well established in British Columbia.<sup>75</sup> It could be argued, perhaps, and with some justification, that all three eventually would have developed in the province without the impetus resulting from the Oliver campaign. There is no question, however, that the bluntly anti-modernist evangelist and the combination of the timing and opposition in relation to his Vancouver meetings worked together to lend a sense of urgency to the conservative resistance to liberalism in the city. This mentality hastened their building of what have become increasingly significant institutional and denominational alternatives to the Protestant mainline denominations.

<sup>73</sup> Membership data on early Pentecostalism is almost non-existent, but an analysis of sixty-four members who left Ruth Morton Memorial Baptist Church for Pentecostal churches reveals a socio-economic base very similar to that of the separatist Baptists, with the exception that those leaving tended to be younger, more recent members of the Baptist church. See Burkinshaw, "Strangers and Pilgrims," 170-72 and Appendix C.

<sup>74</sup> 1951 *Census of Canada*, vol. 10, table 36.

<sup>75</sup> Since the late 1920s, other significant conservative Protestant groups also became established in the province. The largest of these were immigrant-based churches, most notably Mennonite and Christian Reformed, but, in addition, the Christian and Missionary Alliance and several smaller groups thrived among recent immigrants from the Canadian prairies.