

shall be faith before God and not by his own works. When a Protestant champion was called upon to defend that doctrine it was principally upon the Epistle to the Romans that he relied for his arguments. What had become of the Epistle to the Romans in these selections? Just a few sentences at the end were given. The parts treating of justification by faith, its result in a pure and active Christian life, from the beginning to the fifteenth chapter, were cut clean out. Another great difference between the Roman Catholic Church and the Protestant was that the latter believed that with the English people public worship should be celebrated in the English tongue, and with the French people in the French: in a word, that every people should have the liberty to worship God publicly in the language they spoke and understood. Protestants held it to be absurd and subversive of the first principles of intelligent worship that any man should be forced to worship God in a language of which he knew not a single word. When they referred to the New Testament for light on this subject there was one chapter which stood out in bold relief, namely, the 14th chapter of 1st Corinthians. The Apostle argued the question at length and came to this conclusion: "Yet in the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding that by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue." This was a crushing argument against the Latin Mass celebrated before English, Irish, Scotch, French and Germans who did not understand Latin. The 13th chapter was devoted to the great subject of charity, and this was put in the selections. The 15th chapter was devoted to the subject of the Resurrection, and this was also put in. But the 14th chapter, which was devoted to the recommendation to worship God in one's own tongue, was cut out. There was another great subject in dispute between Protestants and the Romish Church, and he mentioned it in all love and without bitterness. In the communion the devout Roman Catholic believed that he received the true body and blood of the Saviour as a true propitiatory sacrifice. He had no hesitation in saying that this sacrifice was finished first and forever when the Saviour offered himself up for us, and could not be repeated. It happened there was an Epistle in the Bible upon which that whole argument rested. Protestants found an answerable argument for their belief on this point in the 8th, 9th and 10th chapters of Hebrews. He need scarcely say that these chapters were left out of the selections. There was not one word given from which an idea could be got of the argument. It was all eliminated and extracted from the Holy Bible, and their children would never hear it in the Schools. The foundation for their faith was to be found in these great pages of Hebrews and Corinthians. There was another matter, and that of the greatest importance, and this was the form of God's revelation, because upon this everything rested. If God had made no revelation to them or to him, it was useless

for him to make that address that evening. Protestants believed in the efficacy of the Scriptures as God's revelation for their salvation. The Roman Catholics did not believe this. When any Protestant Christian sought to confirm himself in this belief, there was one matter upon which he particularly relied, and this was the 16th verse of the third chapter of the Second Epistle to Timothy, in which St. Paul says:—

"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

Was this in the selections which their children would read in the Public Schools? Not at all. They might turn over the pages looking for it in vain within the two covers of the book which was to take the place of the Bible, and in which their children were to be educated for time and eternity. These were plain assertions. He maintained, in the first place, that the book was hard to obtain and was not a public book, and could not be bought with honest money; and secondly, that it was characterized by a process of elimination which had cut out the foundation stones of their faith.

THE ROSS BIBLE IS A GARBLED BOOK.

THERE were sentences in the book which were not in the Bible. One line and a half proceeding from the pen of a private individual had been incorporated with the Word of the living God. This was a serious thing to say, and no man would say it unless he could prove it. Take the 39th chapter of Genesis. They would find the greatest difficulty in turning to it in the selections, because the whole order of things was put upside down. Even a man thoroughly familiar with his Bible would find the greatest difficulty in identifying any passage of Scripture in these readings. The arrangement of chapters and verses had been abolished. The incident related in the 39th chapter of Genesis was treated in the 17th lesson in the selections. They read of Joseph in Potiphar's house, and how Joseph was in great favor with his master, and how his master left all that he had in Joseph's hands, and that Joseph was a goodly person and well favored. Then followed ten verses in the English Bible, which he believed the Spirit indited and caused to be written for men's instruction, and which we were to "mark, read, learn and inwardly digest." The collect he had quoted was written by Archbishop Cranmer by the very hand which he thrust into the fire when he became a martyr for the truth of the living God. The same power which to-day expelled the Bible from the schools caused him to be burned. If there was any chapter which God caused to be written for the learning of young people, he believed it was this chapter in Genesis. It showed a young man just entering into life the terrible temptation which he might have to wrestle with, and to administer which even a woman might be used as the tempter, and the

story was told to encourage and strengthen him by the example of one who like himself was young, and yet strong to overcome temptation, and found a way to evade the snare in which a beautiful woman sought to entangle him. Let no man with mock modesty dare to attempt to cast contempt upon this magnificent story. Were they to entertain the idea that any man who presumed to teach a Bible class week after week should presume to throw contempt upon the Word of God? How was the story told in the selections?

"And he left all that he had in Joseph's hand, and he knew not aught he had save the bread which he did eat. And Joseph was a goodly person and well favored. After these things his master's wife falsely accused Joseph to her husband, saying the Hebrew servant which thou hast brought unto us came in unto me to mock me."

The whole point of the charge was carefully left out. The whole lesson sought to be taught was thus vitiated, and he said that this was a garbled and corrupt reading. He could give instances where verses were cut out in the middle simply because a word was used which every medical man used to his patients in these days. This parade of mock modesty as an excuse for mutilating the Word of God was painful in the extreme. It took the whole point out of Joseph's story. A child might believe that Joseph was sent to prison simply because Potiphar's wife falsely accused him. The reading did not show the terrible temptation which overtook him, and how nobly he resisted and overcame it. The story of David was treated in the same manner. The story of David's sin in the matter of Bathsheba, and his punishment and repentance, was most touchingly and effectively related in the Bible. But to take away the record of his sin was to make the whole book unintelligible. And yet this was what had been done.

A WORD TO A REBELLIOUS CHURCHMAN.

THE gentleman who had assailed him, said Canon Dumoulin, and whom he supposed he was right in calling a Churchman, though a rebellious one, had made his objection to this omission the ground for ridiculing him, and had made him the victim of his personal abuse—the stock-in-trade of the gentleman in question—because he had deplored the absence of these extracts from the readings. He had not deplored their absence, but had pointed them out as instances of garbling the Bible. The same gentleman had asked at the meeting, Saturday night, if his hearers would like to have a lump of a boy of sixteen sitting beside their daughters while the story of Potiphar's wife was being read. If his assailer would turn to the Book of Common Prayer he would find that on the third Sunday in Lent, the very chapter for lamenting the omission of which he had been attacked was ordered to be read. He would ask the gentlemen to turn again to his Prayer Book. He might not be accustomed to use it, but he would ask him to use it now. If he referred to the calendar