

nor, because they are good, have the pleasures of heaven; they have animal enjoyment and animal suffering, and it would not be difficult for me to believe that they die like animals, going down to dust and nothingness. They have not cultivated the spiritual nature of them, and it dies down to the roots. Those who suffer here are the men who sin, but have *life* in them, a moral sense, a consciousness of God and responsibility. *Life* enjoys; life is capable of suffering; not so death; the dead feel not; they are not ashamed; they are not afraid; they have no hope and no God, and God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.

I believe, then, that God holds man as accountable for his actions—that He loves him and helps him to redeem his life from destruction—that a man may be born again—even in the last hour of his life upon earth, but that it does not cancel the past, nor ward off retribution—that although God the Son has ransomed man, and God the Father forgives, that man must pay the penalty for his wrong doing, and every man will receive the reward of his right doing and just thinking. Now, it seems to me that in this I have an intelligent theory of life—a plain and simple science of religion. I cannot take the orthodox view of these things—that notion, that a man by conversion breaks with all his evil past, and may go from the home of the miser, or the slough of the drunkard, or the scaffold of the murderer, right to a place called heaven and eternal joy, is one that I cannot accept. It is against my reason—it is against my judgment—it is opposed to my every sense of right, and it is opposed to the whole tenor of Scripture teaching. It puts a premium upon sin—it encourages a continuance in vice, for as only a few men believe that death will find them suddenly, they can put off the hour of conversion and restraint until the lapse of time warns them to prepare for heaven. But, then, neither can I accept the opposite of that,—Ingersollism, Atheism. I can find in that no encouragement for self-repression and the culture of unselfish goodness. The morning has left me—the heat of the day went soon, and the twilight is here, and night is coming on—night, and not a star; no flowers grow on the graves of my loves; I have done good, and got no thanks, and never shall hear of it again; I have done evil, but what does it matter? All things are going the same way—and I rake the dying embers of my fire together and sit and shiver and wait for the night that is coming on. No, I cannot accept that—my reason is against it—my heart is against it—human experience is against it—all those diagrams of fire that gleam and burn in the deeps of heaven are against it—every flower that blooms in beauty, every warm breath of spring that sweeps across our fields, melting the snow and waking the life of the soil—all are against it.

I turn from those things to this, the infinite Fatherhood of God—that He helps us to repent and be converted—that Christ has redeemed us, and that faith in Him is the motive power to a good life—that conversion is the first step toward perfectness in the likeness of God—that sin is an awful thing which tracks a man through time, and it may be through eternity—so that no man shall think lightly of his crimes by imagining that by an act of the mind or the will he can for ever be rid of the consequences; but he may redeem his life, and master his passion, and live in faith for goodness, and dying, find a place of better circumstance, where he shall continue to work out the great problem of being in clearer light and riper wisdom. I offer you that—I appeal to your heart, to your head, to your instincts and your judgment. There is hope in this Gospel, and abundant life. Take it—take it for your individual life. It will give you a deep and wholesome dread of sin—you will see an eternal reason against the doing of it; but, when you have sinned, it will not smite you down to impotent despair; it will lift you up and bid you, weeping, trust in God; it will reveal a future in which wrong will be righted and justice done; it gives you a Redeemer and redemption, and a hope that nothing can quench. Take it for your business life; it will teach you to be just, to be honest, to speak truth and do it; it will not teach you that you may wrong your brother man and never see him again, nor hear of it more, except when you may happen to look over the battlements of heaven upon him writhing in hell; it will teach you that you will meet him again, and a just God will judge between you; it will give you consolation in the time of trouble; it will inspire you to do great work for men and God, for you will be sure that God knows His heroes and His saints. Is it reasonable? Does it lead to right issues? Is it against sin and for holiness? Does it open a pathway that slopes upward unto God? Does it teach you to dread sin and love the Saviour from it? Then take it now—and live it to-morrow, and through every succeeding to-morrow of life—and your life shall be greatened to the life of God, and when the fierce and stormful now is beaten out, you shall find the peace of God, which passeth understanding.

DOMESTIC ECONOMY.

If we would have happy homes we must have healthy families. One delicate, pining little one is enough to make a whole household uncomfortable and to cause its mother untold misery and anxiety. It is generally allowed that Montreal is a very unhealthy city, and that its infant mortality is very large. No doubt this is greatly owing to our bad drainage, lack of proper

sanitary laws, and the culpable carelessness of all classes as to propagating infectious diseases. And yet, with all these disadvantages, we feel assured that many sweet little lives might be saved, and much baby suffering spared if the children were properly fed and sensibly cared for. "That does not apply to my baby," exclaims some young mother; "he has a most careful nurse, and I am generally present when he is being fed; and yet he is sick half the time and I never get a night's sleep with him." Let us ask this mother what food does she give to her baby, and she will probably tell us, "Oh, we give him all sorts of things,—bread and milk, corn-starch, sago, or biscuit ground fine and boiled in milk." Now we have consulted many doctors as to baby food, and the invariable answer is that until eight or nine months old milk is the only food fit for a baby's stomach. Mother's milk, if possible, is of course best, but when the mother cannot wholly sustain the child, then we must give it what comes nearest to mother's milk, and we all know that that is cow's milk. But some ignorant old nurse will tell the mother that the two milks will not agree, and despite the doctor's assurance that they will certainly agree better than any other admixture, she will take the advice of the nurse, or some other ignorant adviser, and the baby will be fed on all sorts of boiled foods, generally starchy compounds wholly unfitted for a baby's digestion. In these days when knowledge lies around us on every side, and even our family papers bring us most valuable information on every subject under the sun, it seems almost impossible to believe that so many ladies of ordinary education and intelligence, should know so little of the commonest laws of life and health. Surely every woman who rules a household and rears a family should know the different properties and effects of the foods that are daily set upon her table, and should also understand the requirements of the human body at every stage of its development. A woman who knows the various elements and compounds of the body, and understands the processes through which all foods must pass in their digestion and assimilation with the human system, would never dream of giving her child starchy, or solid foods, well knowing that an infant is unable to digest these foods without great pain and with little profit, since no blood will be made by food that is not properly digested. We find that no food which we eat can be made into blood unless it will mix with water, and we know that starch won't mix or dissolve in water unless it almost boils; now the water in our bodies is only warm—about 98°—when in health, but the saliva in our mouths can change starch into sugar, and sugar will mix and dissolve in water, after which it will assimilate and nourish the blood. But infants have no saliva until they begin to cut some teeth, and very little of the digestive juices come from the pancreas, or bowels, of an infant; therefore if we give it bread or any vegetable food, as there are no teeth to masticate it, and no saliva to turn the starch into sugar, the poor little stomach must churn the bread about for a long time in order to break it into small pieces so that it may pass through to the bowels; here again it will find no juice to digest it, and all these organs will have worked in vain, because the bread or starch will not have been digested. The poor child will have suffered agony for nothing, as no blood will have been made to nourish it. A mother who knows even this much of physiology and chemistry will never give her child anything but milk until it begins teething. It is said that some prepared foods are composed of the exact ingredients of mother's milk, and it is urged in their favour that it is almost impossible to procure good milk in cities. We have always found it possible to get good milk in Montreal; but if one cannot be sure about it, the best way is to consult the family physician; if he says that Nestle's or any other food is quite as nourishing and as easily digested as milk, then it may safely be used.

Unfortunately this matter of feeding the babies is the one point on which mothers are apt to disregard the advice of their doctors, and the doctors know this very well, but also know that it is useless to argue the point with most mothers. If the baby cries they fancy the easiest way to stop his mouth is to put something into it, and probably that will quiet him for a time; but poor baby must suffer for it by and by. We often wonder how it is that the many young mothers of the present day who must certainly have studied physiology, chemistry, and hygiene during their school courses, should yet seem to have so little idea of the application of their knowledge to common life. This is a branch of domestic economy which should be carefully taught to every girl in school; but if it could be taught in connection with practical training in cooking, it would be likely to make a more lasting impression, and would be more easily and thoroughly understood. Of course the physiology of the body and the elements and compounds of which it is formed should first be studied, and this subject can be simplified and made interesting to even quite young girls.

In future papers we shall endeavour to give such information on this important subject as our limited space will admit. Meanwhile, if any should feel disposed to question our authority as to milk being the best thing for the babies, we shall reply, as did a good Montreal doctor to a lady who insisted that her baby would starve on milk, "But, my dear lady," said he, "don't you think that God knows best? If bread or beefsteak, or corn-starch, were the best thing for baby, that is what you would have had to give him; but, since mothers are given nothing but milk, then they may be quite sure that milk is the best thing." Surely, if we believe in a Providence that rules over all