

to the principle of selections, and the main features of this selection, the Minister of Education is sustained by the representatives of the Congregational, Methodist, Episcopal, and Presbyterian Churches.

It is scarcely necessary, therefore, to say that the Scripture Readings were not selected by Archbishop Lynch, nor under his direction. The draft seems to have been sent to him in common with all the gentlemen composing this large committee above referred to, and the Archbishop suggested the harmless, if unnecessary, change of "which" into "who" in the Lord's prayer; further than this the hand of the Archbishop was not applied.

Have those who assert that selections acceptable to the Church of Rome have been made ever examined the book? Have they any conception of the consequences of what they are saying? Are they prepared to admit that selections embracing a considerable part of both Testaments, and regarded, presumably, by the able men who gave the final revision as exhibiting fairly the teachings of the Bible, are an inadequate basis for Protestantism? If the Archbishop of Toronto entirely approves of the selections I am delighted to hear it; for in them I can find every doctrine of my faith distinctly exhibited.

It was further alleged, if my memory serves me, that selections were made which should not give offence to Agnostics; but it will hardly be expected that I should refute this absurd proposition.

An able journal in this city, which cannot be suspected of undue partiality towards the Minister, was pleased to say, "The Minister of Education is to be congratulated upon having adopted for use in the Common Schools a series of readings from the Old and New Testaments, together with a brief form of prayer. . . The work has been prepared with the greatest care, and cannot fail to commend itself to parents."*—(*The Mail*.)

My object in writing this letter, as already said, is not to defend selections of Scripture for use in schools, nor to endorse in every particular the compilation in question, but to express my sincere condemnation of all attempts to discredit Mr. Ross by misrepresenting facts which are well known to many ministers and laymen in all the Churches. I would equally bear testimony on behalf of the opponents of the Ontario Government should their action have been in question. No Government can complain of fair and honest criticism, however searching; but when public men strive to do right, and to follow the best sentiment of the community in its most authentic expression (as Mr. Ross has done in the matter of this book), they are entitled, I think, to expect that those who have prompted their action, and as it were pushed them forward, shall not without emphatic protest allow that action to become the ground of party attack.

WM. CAVEN.

Toronto, 26th Nov.

From Dr. Dewart.

SIR,—As many incorrect and misleading statements have been published and circulated respecting the "Scripture Readings" issued by the Education Department of Ontario, a brief presentation of the main facts in the history of the matter, and of the reasons which justify such selections, will be only an act of justice to the representatives of the Protestant Churches, who approved of this way of providing Scriptural readings in the Public Schools. It has been alleged in various forms that these "Scripture Readings" were the scheme or work of Archbishop Lynch, and that their use is equivalent to a rejection of the Bible, which, it is said, has been dishonored and dethroned by this volume. As one of the Protestant Ministers who approved of the publication of such a volume, and who took part in the preparation and revision of these "Scripture Readings," I feel bound, on behalf of myself and the