

"If Socrates died the death of a philosopher, Jesus died the death of a God." Our Agnostic is reported as making such statements as these. Christ had taught some doctrines that were in direct antagonism to the natural feelings and best instincts of the human race. He had failed to encourage intellectual inquiries or to stimulate independent investigation. Poverty, slavery, and intellectual degradation were the great evils of the early ages, but Christ never did anything to remove them. Neither had Christ inculcated peace and happiness. On the contrary he had even offered a premium to a man to run away from his wife and to forsake his children." The staple of this Agnostic's repeated talks, as reported, was made up of such unsupported statements and pitiful perversions. When the chief officer of the infidel corps in Canada speaks thus, what may we expect from the rank and file? They who plume themselves on their benevolence and virtue, and pose as Humanitarians should be the very last to slander the character of one in whom, on the testimony even of many hostile witnesses benevolence and virtue were incarnated; whose entire life was consecrated to the cause of truth and righteousness, and who went about continually doing good. But in spite of such efforts to traduce, most of us will continue to peruse with deepest interest the incidents of the Great Biography, and while not passing by on the other side the expressive portraits of the "cloud of witnesses" will continue reverentially to pause in front of the full size figure and exquisite vignettes of the "Witness nobler still." What the notorious Earl of Rochester said of the Holy Book applies equally to the Holy One. When asked, after his remarkable conversion, to explain his bitter enmity and that of others like minded: "A bad heart, a bad heart," exclaimed he, "is the great objection to the Holy Book." Like the antiquated flirt who, in a passion, broke her mirror because it revealed too fully and faithfully her multiplying wrinkles. Aristides had his enemies just because all men spoke well of him. Yet more so is it with Jesus Christ the Righteous.

This Agnostic missionary went on to say that: "there was not one single doctrine of Christianity that was any good, that he could not show had been taught long before Christianity was first proclaimed." He, however, took good care not to attempt showing it. He knew very well that he could not make the attempt without appealing to those very Books which it is his calling to deride and deny, or to other Books not having a title of the same historical testimony in their favour. From his Agnostic standpoint too, what credence can he attach to doctrines "taught long before Christianity was first proclaimed?" What credibility, on his premises, can be attached to documents so far