

made by such a school-boy contention. A worthy member of Presbytery claimed that the scourge of small cords with which our Saviour drove the traders out of the temple constituted a case of divine smiting, forgetting that the so-called cords were soft bruised rushes used for litter, and that they were gentle persuaders to animals, not to men. Finally, the last speech, to which I was precluded from replying, consisted of a string of texts largely from the Old Testament, which, while setting forth God as a smiter, did not in the least invalidate the argument of Job and my New Testament quotations. That our God is a consuming fire I never called in question, and many other texts quoted simply confirmed my contentions instead of disproving them. It is not my business to indicate the unnamed agency by which judgments in old time were wrought, so long as I have proof positive in Scripture that physical calamity in this life pertains to the world of evil.

It is contended that the language of the Kingston lecture is in part very strong and to certain minds offensive. The term offensive is a very relative one, as we know that one man's meat is another's poison. Doubtless many have heard far more offensive language from the ordinary pulpit, from which they could not escape, while to be offended with the lecture's style involved the voluntary purchase and reading of it. If the offensiveness of the Kingston lecture be one tithe as bad as that of the unjust, slanderous, abusive and cruel things spoken and written about its author, I should be exceedingly sorry. But it is not.

When a great truth has been suffered to fall into abeyance it needs a trumpet tone to rouse the world to consider it. Such a great truth is this, that Jesus Christ is the revelation of the Father. I honour my Father, said Christ, and ye do dishonour me. My work has been Christ's work, the vindication of the Father's character, an attempt to put into practice the first petition of the Lord's Prayer,