

F. H. L. says these are tremendous charges ; so they are, and they are true, but he says that prizes are only the *secondary* cause of these evils. He says, "granting, as we must justly do, that a medal may have been a secondary cause of the unfaithfulness specified, it proves nothing whatever as to the propriety or impropriety of awarding prizes." He further says that "it was the lack of fundamental spiritual qualifications which was the primary and operating cause in producing such a barren tree." Now notice F. H. L. does not attempt to deny that the evils mentioned exist, certainly he cannot in the face of facts. But tacitly acknowledging them, he argues thus : "Lack of fundamental spiritual qualifications is the primary cause," (of the evils), medals, prizes, etc., are only the secondary (that is, the immediate) cause of the evils enumerated, therefore, that they are the secondary or immediate cause of these existing evils, proves nothing whatever as to the propriety or impropriety of awarding prizes.

Now, having carefully studied the whole tenor of his criticism, his illustrations, etc., I think I have correctly represented his reasoning, if not I wish to be corrected.

Let me illustrate his logic.

Man by nature is corrupt and sinful, and so not inclined to do what is right.

Whiskey, gambling, etc., are only the secondary or immediate cause of sin, etc., therefore, being only the secondary or immediate cause is no reason that they should be removed. In short, the fact that anything is a *temptation* to sin is no reason that it should be avoided or its use discontinued. Oh, no, the primary cause is in man himself, he has a depraved nature and so abuses these things.

Who will accept any such reasoning? Does the word of God warn us against temptation, or does it not? Are we to avoid not only *evil*, but the very *appearance* of evil? Judge for yourselves.

Now I am not going to take up any more space in referring to F. H. L.'s other criticisms. A coach-and-four can be readily driven through them all. From the beginning to the end his conclusions are illogical that a person almost wonders whether or not he is indulging in irony. I have no hesitation in stating that he has not refuted a single argument advanced against prizes. I ask you to read the arguments and the criticisms by both F. H. L. and O. P. Q. *seriatim*, and then judge for yourselves. The sarcastic and periphrastic style, as well as the bold assertions and pretensions of logical inferences, etc., make F. H. L.'s criticism dangerous to a certain class of readers, who may not take time to weigh statements and conclusions in an honest balance, they may at once conclude that surely there is something in this loud noise. The greatest sound, however, does not always contain the sweetest music, nor yet proceed from the most solid instrument. All I ask is, that F. H. L.'s criti-