

recognizes failure as final. The same secret is just as valuable for the individual life. If a man fails in his first speech through inadequate preparation, that is no reason why he should remain forever silent, but it is a reason why he should make better preparation next time. The young Disraeli gained more than he lost by being laughed down in the House of

Commons: a man less wise than he would have lost all by never opening his mouth again. And so, in all the phases of human action, wherever failure occurs, a cause for such failure exists. The cause can be found if it is one which falls within the range of human experience, and when it is found, it can generally be removed. —*Sunday School Times*.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE BOOK AND THE SCHOOL.

To the Editor of THE MONTHLY:

SIR,—The interesting letter on "An Experiment in Religious Instruction," which appeared in the March MONTHLY, has stirred me up to state some views and ask some questions that have been much in my thoughts for a good while.

The "Experiment" is well enough for the present necessity, and seems to have succeeded in a way; but why should there be need of such an experiment, and why should the Bible, of all books, in a Province where "Christianity is recognized by common consent as an essential element of education" (Regulations Ed. Dep. Sec. 7, 1878) be under any ban? Why should Christian ministers have to consult and combine and petition for time and leave to teach the fundamental truths of Christianity in the Public School? Why should the last half-hour of the whole week be thought long enough time to explain and apply the truths of the extracts from the latest expurgated edition of the Bible read by the teacher to the fagged out, restless children in the last five minutes of each school day?

It were better that the Bible should be decently dismissed from the school altogether than that it should be thus crowded into a corner. How

can children be expected to revere the Book which is of so much less account than the grammar or the arithmetic? Are they likely to give much heed to what they are taught of its truth when they know before hand that "it doesn't count"; that though they could "pass" on any part of it, it wouldn't help them with their examinations? How much weight will they attach to the admonitions and exhortations of a teacher who is not permitted even to explain a word of the manual of morals from which he is required to read them a lesson each day, whether they understand it or not? What must be the frame of mind of an earnest, intelligent, self-respecting, Christian teacher, as he stands aside, at the stern command of the law, to allow another to take his proper place and do his legitimate work?

And why should there be such difficulties about teaching the Bible in our schools? If we were heathen, one could understand it, though even the heathen in many places now wish to have their children taught the Bible, and send them by preference to Mission Schools with that object. Or if we were generally infidel or agnostic, the opposition to the Bible would be intelligible. But surely we are still a Christian people. Is the fear that the teacher might give sectarian bias to the child? It is not