

clearly that there is a vast logical distinction between the *how* and the *why* of a process. In other words, they have come to recognize the fact that such words as "law" and "force," "struggle" and "survival," afford no real explanation either of origin, or of progressive and orderly upward development; that intelligence and power and will are just as necessary to explain the creation of a world or a man by a process of gradual development as by a process of direct creation. The theologians, on their part, have also come to perceive that even were the theory of evolution capable of demonstrative proof it would simply establish the fact that the *modus operandi* of the Divine Architect of the Universe differed in some respects from their previous vague notions. It is certainly hard to see why the conception of a progressive development of the world and its inhabitants, by means of the operation during countless ages of some mysterious force or tendency working out with infinite patience, yet with unerring precision, all the grand results which find their culmination in the human intellect as it exists to-day, should be thought less honouring to the Creative Intelligence than the conception of a series of definite acts or interpositions. The latter, as Professor Drummond very clearly points out in his first lecture, seems to imply that the Creator was personally present, if we may so express ourselves, only occasionally in the creative process, which must have been largely given over to the operation of unintelligent laws and forces; the former postulates his immanence in the movement at every stage of its progress.

On the other hand, it can hardly be denied that if either human intuition or human reason counts for anything, the instinctive repugnance which is almost universally felt to the development theory as conceived and expounded by its scientific advocates constitutes a serious objection to that theory. This sentiment, let us hasten to add, cannot be despised by thoughtful evolutionists, seeing that it will be even harder to account for its origin on evolutionary principles than on any other. The present moment, when even former enthusiastic disciples of evolution are constrained to admit the utter insufficiency of the theory as an *explanation* of the "causes of things," and when something in the nature of a truce has been tacitly agreed on between the contending philosophies, would be a favourable moment for some competent authority, of judicial temper, to take stock of the situation and put down plainly in black and white just what has and what has not been proved. This is, to a certain extent, what Professor Drummond has been doing with much ability. But unfortunately he has not rested there, but has gone on to "take a side" in a very pronounced manner. Taking the facts of embryology, as he has stated them, and assuming, as we no doubt may safely

do, that the facts of natural history coincide very closely with them, may we not venture to ask whether what has been proved and all that has been proved is not simply that the phenomena of animal and human life, before and after birth, show a wonderfully concatenated series of formations, reaching in a continuous and unbroken progression—always excepting the impassable chasm which still yawns between the highest brute mind and the lowest human intellect—from the lowest organism to the most perfect and wonderfully made human frame? If, now, it could be shown that it is impossible to account for this marvellous series of facts on any other hypothesis than that of evolution, the case for the evolutionists might be considered proved. But if we assume the direct superintendence and energy of a creative Intelligence, working with a view, among other objects, to the greatest possible variety, can we conceive of such an intelligence effecting its ends otherwise than in accordance with a plan of minute variations such as would lead to exactly the same results, which are by evolutionists attributed to development through struggle and survival of the fittest? In a word, do not the scientific facts fit the one theory just as well as the other?

THE COMING LIBERAL CONVENTION.

It is safe to assume that as the day for the assembling of the great Liberal Convention draws nigh, the leaders of that party, and indeed of both parties, feel not a little perturbation. The future history of Canada, especially its political history, may be seriously affected by the success or failure of that Convention. Its success in constructing a platform upon which the great body of those who are known as "Liberals" could take their stand, in all parts of the Dominion, would, it is not unlikely, presage the downfall of the Government and the triumph of the Opposition at the next general election, if not sooner. The struggle would from the date of the Convention be that of a united Opposition against a divided Government—a complete reversal of the situation as it has been at the last two or three general elections.

When we attempt to balance the probabilities in favour of and against such a consolidation of the Liberal forces, we are almost forced to conclude that the latter preponderate. In the first place, Canadian Liberals have always been a rather heterogeneous mass. The Liberalism of the Maritime Provinces is quite a different commodity from that of Ontario, while that of Quebec is, in some respects, distinct from either. Then, again, individuality, which Sir John Macdonald managed to hold so successfully in check in the Conservative ranks, through a long series of years, has always been at a premium among Liberals. There is that in the system which stimulates it. It would be a wonder, indeed, and

might well be dreaded by the Government party as an omen of defeat, should Mr. Laurier and his lieutenants succeed in so far restraining the forces of both individualism and sectionalism among their followers as to effect an agreement upon certain strong and definite lines of policy. Of course there are not wanting great inducements which can be brought to bear to this end. The long sojourn of the party in the cold shades of opposition suggests very strong reasons why all should go up to the Convention in a conciliatory and self-denying spirit. But then the ruling passion is always liable to assert itself even at the most critical moment.

Passing by those questions of policy, which, however important in themselves, may be set aside for the present as secondary, such as those relating to the Senate, the Provincial subsidies, etc., there remain two great issues upon which unanimity will be absolutely essential to any prospect of success. These are, of course, the Tariff policy and the Manitoba school question. In regard to the former, even the variety and diversity of the cries which have from time to time been taken up by the leaders of the Opposition, which variety and diversity have furnished the supporters of the National Policy with opportunities for effective rejoinder of which they have not failed to avail themselves, do not seem to us by any means so contradictory or so hard to reconcile as they are often represented to be especially now that "commercial union," with all that it implies, has passed into the background. All the remaining proposals look in the same direction, viz., that of tariff reduction and the abolition of protection for protection's sake. Within these broad lines there is room for minor divergencies. The crucial question of reciprocity, as involving more or less of discrimination against the Mother Country, may, for aught that appears, be kept in the background only to come up when the framing of a treaty becomes a living issue. This it can hardly become until it has been seen what the special session of the American Congress may bring forth. We may assume, then, that the Convention should find no great difficulty in reaching substantial agreement and a fixed policy on the tariff question. The leaders must be sadly wanting in tact, or their followers must be singularly intractable, if a union cannot be made so far as is necessary for an attack in solid column, which is all that is required for the present.

But when we come to the other burning question which must be faced we can see no such way out for the party. How to make of one mind French Catholic and English or Scotch Protestant; how to make a Tarte and a Greenway see eye to eye; how to steer safely between the jutting rock and the engulfing whirlpool; how to bring fire and water into a working union, this is a problem indeed. And it is a problem which will have to be solved, or, so far as an on-