

attention, may be fairly accepted by scientific men; but where large classes of facts are wholly at variance with an hypothesis, it would be a departure from scientific methods to adopt such an hypothesis.

I may also say that there are many missing links which evolution has not discovered; which we know do not exist; which an exact science would lead us to expect, in order to bridge over the immense chasm, which divides the human race, from all the animal kingdom below them. I do not propose to search for hypogriphs and calibans; I propose rather to consider certain scientific hypotheses, which, in the minds of the unscientific followers of scientific men, are regarded as conclusively establishing the proposition that life is a property of matter, from its lowest to its highest form, and does not much differ from the phenomenon of crystallization in the mineral kingdom. Inferences have been drawn from the doctrine of evolution, which eliminate the soul from man, and the Creator from the universe.

I am not going to discuss, at this moment, the question whether or not the creation of the organic world is direct or derivative. The question of a Creator or no Creator, is not involved in the question as to the method of Divine operation; nor can we decide *a priori* how the work of creation is, or has been, carried on. The method of creation is a question which science may or may not solve, but which so far, from my point of view, it has not solved—at all events, I do not see that its deductions, as presented in evolution, are at all conclusive in favor of the theory of derivative creation.

All science consists of two elements, facts and inferences—observation and reasoning on the facts observed.

The tendency, of late, has been to extend the domain of science into regions which lie wholly beyond its own domain. But such regions

science cannot expect to hold. They must be surrendered whenever its right of dominion is, in such regions, fairly contested.

Some people see in the material world about them, and in the phenomena which it presents, a sufficient cause for all that is. They observe a certain uniformity in the operations of nature, in modes of existence, and in the sequences which they denominate, laws of nature, and they think a personal Creator unnecessary. To them, a belief in uniformity is exclusive of a belief in a Creator. There are others who admit that a Creator is necessary, at the beginning of things, to establish certain laws for the regulation of matter in time and space; to endow it with certain properties, amongst which are organic life, growth, and appetency, and this being done, He has no need to give to his work, either supervision or care; and that, for all purposes of science, He has practically withdrawn himself from the universe.

Let me say that science knows nothing of the eternity of matter, or of the eternity of natural laws. Let me suppose for a moment,—it is possible in supposition, and is not at all an improbable hypothesis,—that the material of our globe was, at one time, diffused throughout space; that it possessed, as it now possesses, the property of attraction; the whole mass would, of course, move to a common centre. But in conception, we may go back to a time when matter came into existence, for we cannot conceive of its existing from eternity in a nebulous state. It is impossible to conceive, along with the notion of eternal existence, a time when the material of our globe began to consolidate, and to pass through these various revolutions which geology discloses. When we examine the crusts of the earth, we find written upon stratum after stratum, in indelible characters, the beginning, the duration, and the end of successive ages, each of