

struggle for existence, and that those who survive do so at the expense of weaker competitors. To speak candidly, I do not see how, in teaching children, we can make anything of the conception of the Divine interest in sparrows unless we make our appeal conclusively to emotion, and discourage to the utmost all reflection upon the facts of the case. Then with regard to God giving his Son, I would ask with all seriousness what order of truths this belongs to? Is it a truth of history? If so, what degree of certainty attaches to it as such? Is it as certain as that Cæsar was assassinated, or that Alexander overthrew the Persian Empire? Supposing it to be a tolerably well attested fact of history, what blame will be incurred by one who, being a little more exacting on the score of evidence than the majority of people, finds himself unable to believe it on the evidence offered? The Rev. Mr. Macdonnell says that the teacher who ignores this truth in his teaching "makes a grievous mistake." If the teacher is to teach it, how are the scholars to receive it? In silence and submission or in a spirit of reflection and enquiry? Will the teacher be prepared to explain just what believing on the Son means, and how such belief saves people from perishing, and what perishing means, and what eternal life means? I do not see why a thoughtful pupil should not be at liberty to ask, in a respectful manner, any questions whatever bearing on the subject; nor do I see why, in the event of his asking such questions, he should be obliged to be satisfied with any answers that did not come home to his intelligence. If the teacher were explaining the movements of the earth, a scholar would be highly approved for showing his interest in the subject by asking questions. Nothing, indeed, is more helpful to a teacher who has any real knowledge to con-

vay to his scholars than to have questions asked in regard to those points which his explanations have not made quite clear. Why should it be otherwise in the case supposed? But if we imagine a conversation opened such as continually takes place in school upon other topics of study, what view of "belief on the Son" is the teacher going to take? To believe *on* a person is not a usual phrase in English outside of the Bible, and a teacher might be asked in the first place to explain the use of the preposition. This point passed, there would be the much more important one as to whether belief on the Son meant acceptance of his teaching or faith in "the Atonement." To many good Christians the doctrine of the Atonement, as generally presented in past times, is highly repugnant. They would not wish their children taught that, because Jesus bore a certain weight of anguish, physical and mental, God the Father was able to see his way to forgiving his earthly children their sins against His law. Some of my readers will remember the strong language of reprobation applied by the Rev. F. W. Robertson to this theory, which, however, is still largely entertained in the Christian world. Mr. Moody is a teacher very highly thought of by the Christian millions. He has given his views of faith on Christ in his famous sermon on "The Blood," and I don't think he would give a rush for faith that merely meant acceptance of, and devotion to, a certain type of character. Let us, therefore, understand one another. When the Rev. Mr. Macdonnell says that the teacher makes a grievous mistake who in the moral training of children ignores the doctrine of salvation through faith in Christ, does *he* want the teacher to take his stand with Mr. Moody on "the blood," or has he a different idea in view? I think I am entitled