

of men so carried away with the superior importance of the spiritual life as to be unmindful of the claims of this fearfully and wonderfully constructed temple we call the human body. Some have even claimed to derive sanction for such views from the religion of Jesus Christ. But where, it may be asked, in the teachings of the Son of God are men taught to ignore the body or the present life? Surely not in His precepts, for He taught men that their bodies were temples of the Holy Ghost, constantly guarded by Divine Providence, and hence worthy of the best human attention. Surely in Christ's miracles He does not ignore the body or the natural life, for He heals it of every malady, and thus earns for himself the title of the Great Physician. Indeed, one distinguishing feature of Christ's teaching is its perfect adaptability to the physical relationships of life as well as to the spiritual, so that His followers have promise of the present life as well as that to come. So high is the estimate Christianity puts on the physical nature and the present life, that wherever it obtains, the various sciences that cluster around the human body rise up spontaneously into importance and dignity. Contrast, if you will, the medical science of the Indians or the Chinese with the progressive, critical, and far-reaching medical sciences of Christian lands.

The point I wish to make clear is this: Christianity is eminently practical, and its precepts should be applied to the body as well as to the soul, to the present life as well as to the future, and hence sanitary science and sanitary reform have special claims upon all Christian people, deserving not merely their endorsement and sympathy, but their active co-operation. And that there is urgent need of active and general co-operation in the great work on the part of all good citizens, who can doubt? The people perish to-day as of old for lack of knowledge. Men sicken and suffer and die all around us, not because the course of nature is complete, but because they know not the laws of their own being—the very A B C of practical education. Men die, not because of old age, but because they know not how to escape the shafts of death shot at them out of impure air, or the poison of impure food or drink, and because they know not when sick how to apply the simple and effectual remedies of nature about them. Knowledge costs both time and money; ignorance costs both time and money and life itself.

Who can contemplate the constant ravages of disease in the destruction of the physical powers, the blighting of promising lives, the blasting of human hopes, and reflect that in the vast majority of cases these ravages are preventible and unnecessary, without an earnest desire to combat and destroy it? The evidence of the urgent need of this movement in the way of sanitary reform is patent to the sense of sight and the sense of smell on every hand, while the fearful destruction of life wrought by zymotic diseases is well known to all who have investigated. Now, to whom are we to look as the leaders of this sanitary reform—as the educators of the people in sanitary science? What class of society is best calculated to arrest and fix public attention upon the great evils being suffered at present, and to banish the dense ignorance on matters of health and disease that prevails so alarmingly in society? Our minds naturally turn to the physician, whose whole life is supposed to be devoted to scientific research and conflict with disease and death. He, from his very position among men, is the natural instructor of society on sanitary matters. From his knowledge and experience, from his wide range of acquaintance and influence, from his direct intercourse with the sick and suffering, he derives invaluable opportunities of imparting that instruction with which the health and happiness of the people are so intimately associated. And there can be no question that society in general experiences the benefit of a great deal of private and gratuitous instruction that aids ma-

terially in keeping down the ravages of zymotic diseases and increasing the average of public health. But while giving physicians their due credit, it may justly be doubted if they can ever be the chief, much less the sole agents, in this work of sanitary education and reform. Some of their number are as little interested in matters regarding public health as those who know less of the sufferings and needs of society. Many of the most talented are worn out with professional duties, and all of them from the very exigencies of the case have to restrict their work chiefly to the healing of the sick, and leave the work of instruction and warning of the masses to other hands. The minister of the Gospel, as the follower of Him who went about doing good to the bodies as well as the souls of men, ought to accomplish much in the education of the public on matters of health and good living. Too often the teaching of the pulpit has been largely occupied with controverted points of theology to the neglect of practical teaching regarding the every day life. Could not many a sermon on disputed points of doctrine, alike above both preacher and people, be omitted with advantage in favor of instruction on the practical Christianity of better living? Ministers themselves are partially responsible for the idea which is altogether too prevalent that religion consists in church attendance, song, prayer, and collections. People should be taught that to live according to the laws of God written within us, to enjoy good health and promote it, to have a healthful home and preserve it such—that these are an important part of religion. Men ought to be taught by the pulpit that he who knowingly violates the laws of nature is a sinner in need of Divine pardon. They must come to understand—and I think it the business of the pulpit to cause them to understand—that the laws of nature written on their being are the laws of God, and just as binding on the heart and conscience as if written on the inspired page. I would not secularize the pulpit—I would not detract one iota from the amount of teaching on matters purely spiritual, yet I would vote heartily for the introduction of plain and pointed application of Gospel truth to the every day life of the people—even if some powerful and eloquent and ponderous and learned discourses on controversial theology had to be omitted. Yet ministers, with their multiplied labours, can be helpers only and not leaders in this work of sanitary reform. To whom then can we look as the principal agents in this work? Our answer is to the teachers of our youth. They deal with the most important class to reach. Instruction imparted by them in the Public Schools would have a whole lifetime in which to bring forth its fruits. What then, it may be asked, can the Public Schools do for the public health?

1. The Public Schools of our land ought to be utilized to the promotion of greater physical vigor among the youth of both sexes. A robust constitution easily throws off ordinary attacks of disease which cause the weak and frail to succumb. What is required first of all in the battle with disease and death is a higher type of physical manhood. This, it appears to me, is best secured by instruction and training in the schools. And for this purpose I would devote a fixed part of school hours daily. An hour of physical exercise directed by a skilful teacher who knows how to make it at once enjoyable and beneficial would only increase the zest and ability of the pupils for intellectual pursuits. Let it not be imagined for a moment that the ordinary voluntary school sports will answer this purpose of physical development. The boys who take the rough and hearty exercise at school are as a rule the ones who need it least; the weak-chested, flabby-muscled lads are the ones who lounge about with marbles and other profitless games. These are the very ones who need most the stir and excitement of more daring sports. If a lad comes to school physically weak, the course of instruction and training laid out for him should aim at giving him