

dence, which is a symptom of insanity ;—a fool because he antagonizes a universal intuition ;—a fool because he makes himself responsible for proving a universal negative. It treats of *Sin*, another fact, attested by judges and juries and police,—a palpable fact of which criminal legislation and schemes of benevolence and the whole tragedy of human life is just so much demonstration. It tells of a *Saviour* an historical fact, a fact attested not only by history but by the experience of all who have come under the proper influence of the Gospel. The same may be said of the whole range of Theological material. Perhapses and guesses and working hypotheses enter no more into the essential notion of Theology than into any other science. Further, the facts of Theology have been tested as the materials of no other science have been. They have borne the white heat of controversy a thousand times. They have emerged, living and real, from a thousand battle-fields. Piety has been tested as nothing else in the world ever has been. It has stood the test. It has borne the severest strain that could be put upon it. Men, neither fanatics nor fools, have given their blood in attestation of *their* belief in the verities of religion. Men of biggest brain and purest heart have engaged in the work of systematizing the materials of Theology and in deducing inferences from them. It is, therefore, an established science ; and I ask again, why has it been excluded from the Pan-Scientific Council? Is it because the numerous religious sects would make trouble in that great council of learning? How then do they harmonize and keep in order the numerous sects of Science? for such there are. Who does not know that, even among Canadian geologists there are sects, tenacious as to their theories and “energetic” in their enunciation, for example, with reference to the age and character and limits of the “Quebec group?” Yet no one has dreamed of excluding Geology from the Pantheon of Science. Who is ignorant of the fact that there are immense areas of debatable ground in Chemistry, Botany, Zoology, Astronomy, Physiology and particularly Biology? Is there no priesthood among Scientists? no carnal ambition? no visibility of depravity?

We should all be pleased to learn that the exclusion of Theology is due, neither to ignorance nor arrogance on the part of the sages, but we should mightily desire to know what the precise reason for its exclusion is. Meantime our position is that, by no fair means can Theology be separated from any adequate, clear, definite conception of Science. Friend and foe are invited to examine this position at their leisure.

The author of this article, the Rev. George Dunlop Bayne, B.A., was born near Ottawa, on the 25th of February, 1856, of Scottish parents. Before entering McGill University, Mr. Bayne studied in private for four or five years