

his owner prefers, he gets an order from an alcalde to imprison him. When addressing his master, or one of the wealthy citizens, a peon takes off his hat, and speaks as respectfully as an American would do before a court of justice.

There is, however, one great difference between Mexican and American slavery. In the United States the slavery of the parent descends upon his children. It is not so in Mexico. The child is not enslaved because his parents were, nor is he bound to pay their debts.

The labour required of the peons is not usually severe. At every rancho and hacienda there is a large number of them, in proportion to the work that is to be done. One-fourth of the same number of Americans would do the same amount of labour. Their real wants in this climate are so few, and the labour required of them, is so light, and their love of independence is so limited, that most of them seem to care very little whether they are free-men or peons.

So far as I have observed, this system of peonage is confined to the Mexican Indians. I have never seen a Spaniard, or one deep in that blood, who was a peon.

There are two races in Mexico—the Spaniards and their descendants, and the original Mexican Indians. Negroes are very rarely met with. The Mexican Indians constitute at least nine-tenths of the whole population in this part of Mexico, and I am told the proportion is equally large throughout the nation.

The Mexican Indians are a dark olive, and similar in colour to the Indians in the United States. The Spaniards are *brunettes*, and have dark complexions for white men; and the mestizos are of all intervening shades between the two.

There is a marked distinction between the races in another respect. The Spaniards are looked upon as the superior race by the Indians themselves. They overran and enslaved the country, and from the time of Cortez, they had held all the important civil and military offices, with very few exceptions. The Spaniards and mestizos are the landholders, merchants and educated men; the Mexican Indians are their peons.

The Mexican Indians often dislike the Spaniards, but they dare not show it. They feel they are an inferior race, and submit. The history of the country shows that cruel and barbarous outbreaks have been made by the Mexican race to overwhelm and exterminate the Spaniards, but they have always eventuated in the ascendancy of the Spaniards. For when the Mexicans seemed to triumph, some renegade Spaniard, or mestizo, who had joined them, obtained and held the power of government.

In this classification, it is understood that the Camanches, Lipans, Arapahoes, and other Indian tribes, are not included. These are called *wild* Indians, and, although reveling in the utmost barbarism, they are superior to the Mexican Indians as soldiers.

DO YOU KNOW THE LORD.

Some years ago, a Missionary was travelling on one of the Mountains in Switzerland, when he met a country man in a dangerous part of the Road, on the brink of a precipice. Laying his hand upon his shoulder, he said expressively,—“Do you know the Lord?” The peasant looked astonished, hesitated a little, and then, without saying a word, passed on. About a year afterward, the same Missionary was preaching at no great distance from this place, and when the service was finished and the people dismissed, one man remained, who thus addressed the Preacher;—“Do you recollect me, Sir?”—“No, I do not.”—“Do you remember meeting a man in the mountain, about a year ago, and asking him if he knew the Lord?”—“I do recollect that,” said the Minister. “Then” said the other, “I am that man. When you put the question, I was surprised and nonplussed: but as I passed alone, I thought of it, and felt it one I ought to be able to answer. Yet I could not answer it to my own satisfaction. I searched the Scriptures with deep anxiety to know him with whom I have to do: And now, Sir, I hope I can answer your question, and truly say,—I do know the Lord.”

My Dear Reader! allow me to ask you, Do you know the Lord? You may be able to answer the Question in the Catechism, what is God? and yet you may not know the Lord. Be sure that you know him, for Jesus Christ is about to be “revealed from Heaven, to take vengeance on them that know not God.” Can you venture on that vengeance? Again, he him-

self says,—“This is life eternal, to know the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent.” Can you afford to despise and reject “life eternal?” If not, then remember—

If you know the Lord, you love him. “He that loveth not, knoweth not God, for God is Love.” You trust him. “They that know thy name will put their trust in thee.” You obey him: for if any “say he knoweth God, and keepeth not his commandments, he is a liar.” Be assured then, that if you do not now so know him as to love, and trust, and serve him supremely, he will say to you ere long,—“Depart from me, I know you not, ye workers of iniquity.”

What must I know of him, Do you ask? Ans. That God is Love, seeing he so loved you that He gave his only begotten Son, that you might be invited to believe in his atoning sacrifice, and so be preserved from perishing in your sins, and be enriched with everlasting life. If you believe yourself perishing in your sins, and preserved from perishing by the suffering of Christ for you, you will be able to say truly,—“I love him (supremely), because he first loved me, and gave his Son for me.” I trust his grace and truth for all. I present myself to him, a living, willing sacrifice, as purchased with the blood of his Son.”

Such do know the Lord, and enjoy eternal life.

DYSPEPSIA.

(From the *Montreal Witness*.)

Knowing your philanthropy, I conceive I need to make no apology for introducing to your notice, some observations on a malady which effects mankind too generally to be so much trifled with as it is—I mean—Indigestion; and trusting they, with a quotation on *Dyspepsia* from an eminent author, will find a place in the “*Witness*,” I will proceed.

Having suffered much and long from dyspepsia, I can sympathize with the many who are affected with it; and whose minds are constantly on the rack for some cure, and their pains increased by inadequate remedies. I understand that bran mixed into a piece of dough, and formed by the baker from the batch, into a loaf, is made and used as a common remedy. I have tried this, but found it was but a dry morsel, and did not answer my purpose, I still wanted something more glutinous. I had recourse to oatmeal, and ultimately to barley-meal, country-made, both of which I used, and do use regularly in diet, and having found and proved them so beneficial to me, changing my turns, which used to be from six to eight and ten days, to every day or every other day; I can confidently recommend them to such sufferers, if made and used in the following manner, viz:—oatmeal in bannocks as thick nearly as the little finger, made and kneaded with lard, grease, or butter; the former is the best, done smartly on a hot oven or griddle, well browned on both sides, but wet in the centre or heart of the cake; they will break easily like Scotch short-bread, and melt down when soaked in tea or coffee. The barley-meal bannocks made about the same thickness or a little more, with good yeast, saleratus or fresh butter-milk, not browned, nor quickly done, but moist, and to be kept moist and soft; both kinds to be made use of to breakfast and tea, with a small portion of bread if wished for. All the while bearing in mind, that it is also obligatory on those who would be well, to attend to the following extracts. Yours, &c.

F.

Extract from the celebrated Dr. Abercromby's Treatise on Diseases of the Stomach, &c. &c. Section III.—Dyspepsia.

I. It appears that the muscular action of the stomach is both more vigorous and more extensive when its contents are in small quantities, than when it is much distended; and if we suppose the fluids of the stomach to be secreted in nearly a uniform quantity, their action must also be greatly regulated by the quantity of matter which they have to act upon; hence the indispensable importance in dyspeptic cases of restricting the food to such a quantity as the stomach shall be found capable of digesting in a healthy manner.

This is unquestionably the first and great principle in the treatment of indigestion; and without invariable attention to it, no other means will be of the smallest avail.

II. It appears that various articles of food are of various degrees of solubility in the stomach. When therefore digestion is apt to be easily impaired, it will be of great importance not only to avoid articles which are of difficult solution, but also to avoid mixing various articles which are of different degrees of solubility. Attention to this rule will probably favour, in a great measure, the process of chimification going on in a regular and healthy manner, by avoiding a state in which the solution of one article may be more advanced than that of another. The articles of most easy solution appear to be solid (not fat) animal food, and white fish, both plainly dressed; vegetables are less soluble;