

sion as quite sufficient to convince his friend that the conclusions in the work are not sound. Expression of such an opinion may satisfy a man who accepts with childlike faith the opinions of his monitor, but it will not satisfy an intelligent man who is capable of forming an independent opinion. If a professional gentleman can give no better reason why he does not believe a scientific opinion than the simple statement that he does not agree with it, and because it does not accord with previous teaching, it may be taken as evidence that he can give no reason for the rejection of the scientific ideas expounded in this essay.

I have no fear that this work will suffer in the estimation of the reading public through an exhaustive criticism of it by any professor of a college, publicly given above his own name, even though he should animadvert on the line of argument and the conclusions given in it with the same unsparing hand that I have criticised the theories which some of them have adopted. The most that I might fear from any of them is the disparaging remark, that the work was not worthy of their attention; though the subject is worthy of the attention of the most learned gentleman. Even Bob Ingersol attacked the truth and inspiration of the Mosaic account of the Deluge. He made light of it in his lectures, because, as he says, the idea is not in conformity with science. I will send Col. Robert G. Ingersol a copy of this work, and if he is the genius that many persons think he is, he will reply to it. But he too, like other popular persons, may say that he does not think the work worth replying to. I would have reason to think in regard to those learned and popular men who might use that remark about any of my writings, that the works were too far above, instead of beneath, their notice. I take it as evidence that the arguments I have given are unanswerable by them. Surely, when such very distinguished noblemen as the Earl of Dufferin, the Marquis of Lorne, and the Marquis of Lansdowne, have been pleased to honor the author of this work with letters containing expressions of thanks for his writings, it would seem hardly in keeping with the idea that the author has no merit as a writer. But some are apt to think that these expressions of thanks from Governors are given merely as acts of courtesy. Surely, no one should suppose that a Governor would thank an author for a work that was not worth the attention of any *learned* gentleman. But the following extracts of letters imply more than an act of courtesy merely. Surely, the most capable finance minister who ever managed the finances of Canada, the present Lieut.-Governor of New Brunswick, Sir Leonard Tilley, ought to be

capable of judging whether a thing has merit or not.

The following is an extract from a letter from this distinguished statesman:

[Copy.] OTTAWA, 2nd Feb., 1880.

DEAR SIR:—Many thanks for your interesting letter of the 24th Jan. I shall take an early opportunity to read it again, etc.

S. L. TILLEY.

To J. W. Crouter, Esq.

Surely, a letter worthy of re-perusal, is worthy of attention.

The letter of which the following is a copy ought to be considered as more than an expression of an act of courtesy:

[Copy.] OTTAWA, 26th March, 1888.

DEAR SIR:—I am directed by Sir John Macdonald to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of 22nd March, 1888, on the subject of the Inland Fisheries of the Dominion, and to say that he has transferred the same to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, with the request that he will give your remarks his best consideration.

I am, dear sir, yours truly,

JOSEPH POPE.

To J. W. Crouter, Esq.

Surely, remarks which the most capable statesman in Canada deemed worthy of the consideration of another cabinet minister, should be considered worthy of the attention of a college professor.

It is not from a spirit of ostentation that I have had the letters from statesmen inserted in this pamphlet, but for the following reason: During the last five years I have claimed that I had new theories on Creation and the Deluge, which are in harmony with the literal reading of the Bible account. I have stated to many persons that I had these new scientific theories. I have frequently been asked if I had submitted my views on these subjects to a professor of a college. I have answered that I had sent pamphlets containing some of my new scientific ideas to different professors, but they did not seem to pay any attention to them. Then these parties would sting me with these words, viz., that perhaps the professors did not think my work was worthy of their notice. They did not conclude, as I did, that the said professors could not controvert the new scientific dogma.

It would be an unseemly thing for any theological professor to state that there was nothing new in this work. If the theologians knew that, on scientific principles, a deluge lasting less than a year covered the whole earth, and then to cater to the opinions of popular scientists have accepted and taught that the Noachean deluge was a partial one, which submerged a limited portion of the