

ter—you are to take it. The manual of history you use may not indicate just where God's finger is to be discerned in the destinies of nations; if so, upon *you* it devolves to supply the deficiency. You cannot escape by merely showing the action of moral laws—any sceptic could do that: what you have to do is to make plain when and where and how and why the Divine Being intervened to accomplish some special result, which, but for such intervention, would not have been accomplished. At least in no other way can I understand the Rev. Dr. Sutherland's requirement. The evolutionist can show how each departing age bequeaths to the next the most valuable results of its toil and experience; so that we who stand in "the foremost files of time" are, in a true sense, the heirs of all the past. But you must go beyond that, and exhibit a distinct Divine accompaniment to this natural process; otherwise you might as well be evolutionists yourselves. At every point you must be prepared to transcend the ascertained facts, and dogmatically affirm what the text books do not teach. You must, if necessary, go directly counter to the text books. Biologists to-day almost universally assume the truth of evolution, and so far negative the idea of intentional adaptation. You must assume that evolution is not true, and that, whatever is, was made just so for a very wise purpose. In other words, to please the Rev. Dr. Sutherland and those who think with him and want to think *for* you, you must go back to the point of view of the Bridge-water Treatises of fifty years ago, and completely ignore the views that are almost universally prevalent in the scientific world to-day. Now it does not seem that this is fair towards you in the least. I fail to see why, because you are Public or High School teachers in this intelligent Province, you should

be debarred from the best information or the most advanced views obtainable, in the present day, upon historical, scientific or philosophical matters.

But the question remains: Is the kind of instruction which the Rev. Dr. Sutherland prescribes absolutely necessary to the formation of sound character? I wish much that I possessed the experience that some of you must possess upon this point. I have had a little experience, however, and I have given the matter a great deal of thought; and the conclusion I have come to is that children can be quite as wholesomely brought up, to say the least, without a constant reference to the supernatural as with it. The name of God is one which a man of right feeling will always pronounce with reverence; but it is one thing to recognize or, in a manner, be conscious of, a Cause behind all other causes, and quite another to affirm, with the ancient Hebrews, that that Cause spoke to Moses on Sinai, and, with His own finger, engraved laws upon two tables of stone. It is one thing to feel that the true word and righteous deed have a warrant higher than human society can vouchsafe, and another to assume a familiarity with the ways and movements of Providence. To my mind, many parts of the Bible are by no means favourable to reverence, seeing that they bring down the Being represented as supreme to the level of a mere supernatural ally of the Hebrew people, helping them in their battles and sanctioning, on their part, the bitterest hatred and most sanguinary cruelty to other nations. Equally unfavourable to reverence, in my opinion, would be such references to supposed Divine action as Dr. Sutherland has in view when he talks of the necessity of seeing the "finger of God in the destinies of nations," and hearing His "footfall in the march