

secure a competent teacher. The majority propose that, while the religious teaching which they consider essential shall be given to their own children, the children of the other two families shall not be required "to read or study in or from any religious book, or to join in any exercise of devotion or religion objected to by their parents or guardians." Does that proposal offend Mr. Le Sueur's sense of justice? Suppose, farther, that there are two candidates for the position of teacher in this community, equally competent in other respects to fill the position, one of whom is capable of giving such religious instruction as the majority desire, while the other is not, will there be any hardship or injustice if the preference be given to the believing teacher? Is there any other way that will be just to the majority, unless each party be left to select its own teacher?

To the second question, viz.: "Shall the Bible be used in imparting religious instruction in Public Schools?" there is no doubt as to Mr. Le Sueur's reply, at least, if that instruction is to be given by the teachers. The general criticism I would offer on the part of Mr. Le Sueur's letter which deals with this question is, that he has quite needlessly conjured up some difficulties, and has assumed that teachers must have definite opinions on some matters which are treated as open questions amongst thoughtful Christians. Why, for example, should a special theory of "inspiration" be demanded of teachers when diverse views on this matter are tolerated in nearly all branches of the church? Why should Mr. Le Sueur assume that "evolution" is inconsistent with Christian faith? Of course no Christian man believes in evolution without an Evolver; but in evolution as God's plan of working not a few Christian men will be found ready to avow their belief.

Mr. Le Sueur takes exception more than once to an expression used by Dr. Sutherland about seeing "God's finger in the destinies of the nations" and hearing his "footfall in the march of the centuries." I see no objection to these metaphors, nor do I understand why Dr. Sutherland, in using these expressions, should be supposed to limit God's action to intervention in special cases, or to overlook "the action of moral laws." "You cannot escape," Mr. L. writes, "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." The phrase "action of moral laws" is meaningless unless there be a Lawgiver; he who points out the operation of moral laws is really showing "the finger of God," Who has established these laws and of Whose will they are the expression. I grant that the truly wise teacher will be "ever on the search for law," and will "from the rise and fall of nations deduce lessons profitable both for national and for individual guidance to-day." That is, to my mind, another way of saying that the teacher will try to make pupils see the hand of God in history—in the whole trend of human development, not merely in isolated events. And I think it likely that Dr. Sutherland meant as much as this.

Mr. Le Sueur objects to "any compulsory reticence"—concerning the Bible, I presume—in the schools. What he means has been more fully brought out in his letters on this subject to the *Mail*. He objects to reticence concerning the authorship, date of composition, etc., of the books of the Bible. So do I. He states that "the youth who reads Homer is taught that there are no