



Temperance Department.

GIVE WINE TO GUESTS?

In a letter to the *Midland Temperance Chronicle* for November, Mr. S. C. Hall says:—

"I have had so many warnings against the use of alcohol, in any shape, that I claim little credit—no credit, indeed—for being what thank God! I am—a total abstainer.

"But I did, I confess, require some degree of moral courage—stern resolution, in fact—to do what I have but lately done: resolve that, if I do not myself drink wine, no guest of mine shall drink it in my house. It was my custom to place wine on my table: not to give it nor withhold it: to teach both by precept and example that I consider wine, under any and all circumstances dangerous and pernicious: perilously influencing character, health, morals, life! It was but natural to feel that, in giving to friends what I knew was calculated to be hurtful to body, mind, and soul, I was guilty of a palpably wrong act; the poison I would not myself take I not only let them take, but gave it to them to take; yet although I knew what the consequence must be, and the consequence might be, I deliberately committed an act of the wrong of which I could not for a moment doubt.

"What excuse have I to offer to God and to man?

"Simply this excuse: the custom that guides and in a degree rules those who live in society demands that certain acts shall be done; at one time it demanded it, nowadays it only requires that things hurtful shall be taken into the system with the consent of, or directly contrary to, the wish of the person subjected to the deleterious influence.

"If a host insisted that one of his guests should eat a veal outlet, having been first told that veal was food he disliked, and could not digest, what would be said of a man rude enough and cruel enough to press him to eat that which he was assured would be inimical to his health, and so unfit him for a duty he was bound to discharge? The host who did so would surely never again have that man under his roof.

"So I took thought.

"Surely, if I avoided giving to a friend the meat that I knew would make him ill, was I not bound to act on the same principle as regards the drink I gave him? Would it be less a breach of hospitality in the one case than in the other?

"Nay, if I called to mind that on many occasions I had seen a guest leave my table with bleared eyes, tottering steps, stammering speech, and could not hide from myself conviction that a headache in the morning would be one inevitable result—perhaps the smallest—unfitting him for the requisite or needful labor of the day, could I satisfy my own conscience while trying to persuade myself that the evil was the consequence, not of what he had eaten, but what he had drunk at my festive board—an evil that could not have chanced if I had been as resolute to refuse him liquid poison as I would have been to have kept from him a food that I knew was certain to make him bodily, and so mentally ill?

"So I took thought.

"I am 'flying in the face of God' if I do this thing. I fail in my duty to Him, and I do the opposite of duty to my neighbor if I place in his way that which can do him no good, and may do him much mischief.

"I am now taking a common-sense view of the subject: I know there is a much higher view to be taken of it, as well as a much lower. The higher is, that he is guilty of sin who tempts his brother to do which he himself believes to be wrong. The lower is, that he thus wastes the money—even if he only wastes it—that might be employed in relieving want, in lessening misery, nay, in ministering to the rational enjoyments of his own home, and augmenting the happiness of all who are brought with in the sphere of his influence.

"So I took thought.

"Clearly, I see and know my duty. It is this: if I abstain myself, and teach that wine, even in moderation, is an evil and, in excess, a curse, that no man is so good a man after he has taken much or little as he was before he had taken either, how dare I place before him that which he cannot take without more or less risk of injury to body, mind, and soul!

"So I took thought.

"Acquaintances may drop off: friends surely will not; such of them as are conscientious will have remarked the inconsistency between my precepts and my practice. Drink either is or is not the evil. I have said it is an evil. Is my belief sincere belief? They will at least respect my conviction if they find it is

conviction: those who 'drop off' prove themselves to be such 'friends' as can well be spared: I lose the good opinion, the good feeling of no single person whose good opinion and good feeling are worth an effort to conciliate and keep.

"So I took thought.

"It chanced that while my mind was not thoroughly resolved as to the course I should pursue, I dined with a noble Lord (as I give my own name I see no reason why I should withhold his) the Marquis of Townshend. There was no wine on the table or on the sideboard; and not long afterwards I met John Bright M.P., at the American Minister's. Talking over the matter, he said to me that he never, as long as he could recollect, had had a decanter or a wine-glass in his house.

"So I took thought.

"If men in rank so far above mine, who are more in 'society' than I am, and much more often than I do, have guests at their tables—if such men act upon so good, and wise, and merciful, and truly hospitable, a principle, why cannot I do likewise?

"So I took thought.

"And I have done it. With all my heart and soul, I wish I had done it long ago. But it is never too late to mend. As long as I live, by God's help, I will never drink wine or any alcoholic drink myself, and I will never give it to any guest in my house, or sanction it being taken by any person on whom my advice and warning may have influence.

"My example may do much to lessen the effect of a terrible curse. I have written a great deal in that hope, but I believe until now I have never written with a 'clean breast,' for I felt there was something to do that I ought to do, and had not done; that, in a word I was unfaithful to myself.

"I know this is an admission of culpable weakness. I can but repeat, with all my heart, that I deeply lament I did not do so long ago what I do now—solemnly, and with prayer to God for strength, resolve that I will never again, so long as I live, place the temptation of wine within reach of a guest in my house. It is hardly necessary to say that this resolution has given intense happiness to my wife, who earnestly approves of and upholds it. But she was a temperance advocate before I was. Nearly fifty years ago she wrote the little tract, 'The Drunkard's Bible,' and the Visit to Father Matthew, at Cork, in 1840, in our joint work, 'Ireland: its Scenery and Character,' is mainly her writing. We are 'as one' in this, as, thank God, we have been in so many lesser matters."

RIGHTS OF SMOKERS.

"This is a free country, and have I not a right to smoke if I want to?"

Yes, Mr. Smoker, this is a free country, and other people have rights as well as you, and so you have not a right to annoy others unnecessarily. You may have a right to smoke, according to your definition.

We do not believe you have a right to smoke, for we believe that it is wrong to smoke, and no man has a right to do wrong.

"Do thyself no harm," is an important precept in moral science, and no man can habitually imbibe the poisonous fumes of tobacco without harm. Therefore, if we observe the moral law we have not a right to smoke.

But we know you will smoke; so, assuming that, we wish kindly to point out to you some things you have no right to do.

First, you have no right to smoke in your own home or any home where there are women and children.

The lady of the house may very generously inform you that the smoke is not disagreeable to her but that does not make it right for you to smoke in her presence. Tobacco contains an active poison, and there are particles of this poison floated off in the smoke, to be breathed by the inmates of the home.

You will agree with me that it would not be right for you to bring arsenic in the house, and allow women and children to be poisoned by the fumes. The same principles apply to the poison of tobacco. We have seen cases reported by physicians, where delicate children have died from the tobacco poison floating in the air of the home.

If you will poison yourself, you have no right to poison the air for others.

Besides this, if your boys survive the poisoning when they are babes, and grow up, they will become so saturated with tobacco that they will be likely grow up smokers. You have no right thus to perpetuate a bad habit.

On the same principle you have no right to smoke in stores or public offices, or any other room into which women and children are likely to come. Neither have you a right to saturate your breath or your garments with tobacco smoke, and then go to your home or into a public assembly. If you must smoke, you should change your garments and sweeten your breath before you go into society.

Men recognize this principle on the cars, and

smoke in the smoking-car. Why not always regard it in society?

But you say, If I cannot smoke in the house you will not allow me the right of smoking on the street. Yes, if you will go into a street where no one else will go. But if you smoke on the street corners, or walk along the sidewalk puffing your cigar, there are hundreds of others whose business requires them to walk there too. Some of these are nauseated with tobacco, and others will inhale the poisonous smoke and be injured by it.

Besides this, the effect of loading the air with smoke and yourself setting the example which in the home would tend to make your own boys smokers, on the streets will make your neighbors' boys smokers. We would say, then, that, consistently with the rights of others, you have no right to smoke on the public streets.

But do you ask. Where shall I smoke? We answer, if you will smoke, go into the fields by yourself, or else have a room into which none but smokers will have occasion to go, have it in the attic, if possible, so that the poison may be dissipated, and not injure others. Have a cap and coat to put on while smoking, so as not to saturate the clothes which you wear in the company of others. In this way you can "enjoy" your pipe, and not infringe upon the rights of others.

Smokers have rights which we are glad to respect, and others have a right to walk the streets, or enter stores or public places, or to sit down in our homes, without having the air poisoned by tobacco.—*The Informer.*

HIDE ME FROM PAPA.

"Please take me home with you and hide me so papa can't find me."

The speaker of the above touching words was a little child just two years of age. She was endowed with unusual sprightliness and loveliness both of person and disposition.

We had been visiting her mother, and on leaving, had taken the dear little one to ride a short distance.

We said, "Now, Mary, kiss us goodbye; it is too cold to take you any farther." The little darling looked up with the most piteous expression, and clinging to me, said in her baby words, "O Lenny, please take me home with you and hide me, so papa can't find me."

O darling, precious Mary, how my heart ached for you as I pressed you to my bosom! What visions of sorrow and cruelty your words call up! How terrible it seemed that one so young and innocent should know so much of fear!

As I rode homewards, the thought would again and again recur to me. Oh, that all who have helped in any way to make her father a drunkard, could have seen those baby hands raised in entreaty, and her lips quivering with suppressed emotion.

Surely, surely the heart of the most hardened whiskey dealer would have been reached, and slumbering conscience have been awakened to a true sense of the terrible amount of wretchedness caused by the use of ardent spirits.—*Richmond Advocate.*

CHLORAL DRINKING. The drug called chloral hydrate, discovered by the eminent German chemist, Lieberich, some years ago, and which soon obtained a reputation as a substitute for opium in many cases, especially in *delirium tremens*, is rapidly becoming dangerous among victims of excitants and stimulates as alcohol itself. One person who became a "chloral drinker," as it is called, writes his experience to a medical journal as follows: "I am a man of sixty-four years of age and now sobbered down and respectable; but I have tried at one time and another all the narcotics and stimulates known except hashish, which I have never been able to obtain. In June, 1875, I thought chloral hydrate might be some thing nice. I took thirty grains of it in a tumblerful of water, which had a pleasing effect. I then took thirty grains more, which seemed to take away my memory. I followed it up for two days, every little while taking thirty grains largely diluted with water. During those days I swallowed three-fourths of an ounce of chloral hydrate. At last I could not hold any thing in my hands, which were partially paralyzed. I had to be assisted home, and I went to bed and slept most of the time for one day and two nights. I then went about my business, but of all the sufferings I have ever endured I think this was the worst. I was not free from pain a moment for thirty days. The pain was greater in my legs and knees. I would go to bed at night, get in an easy position, and lie perfectly still, and not stir in the least, and finally would go to sleep. The first thing on awaking were those dreadful pains. The sufferings resembled those of the opium eater when deprived of the drug. With one or two exceptions I cannot recall anything that happen-

ed during those two days I think that I had a narrow escape from death. I shall not take any more chloral hydrate."—*Morning Star.*

—A case which suggests reflections, by no means agreeable, occurred last week, in this city. A popular and eloquent minister was accused, before his congregation, of having drunk thirteen glasses of liquor, in public bar-rooms, in fourteen days, and did not deny the accusation, but defied anyone to say he had even seen him the worse of liquor. He also justified his drinking on three grounds: First, he was an Englishman, and accustomed to it; second, he was directed to use liquor by his physician; third, Dr. Crosby, both by word and deed, justified the use of liquors, and many other ministers used them. It is, unhappily, true that two of the most prominent clergymen in these two cities have taken pains to let it be known that they are opposed to total abstinence societies, and others (we know not how many), no way prominent, do not act on the total abstinence principle. So far as example is concerned, therefore, the accused minister's defense was valid: and none of his thirteen glasses were taken at the low dram-shops which Dr. Crosby condemns and tries to put down. We wish the respected brethren whose precept or example, or both, afford to many a justification for drinking, would reconsider their responsibility to God and man in face of this greatest snare and curse of society. The clergyman who was accused of drinking was acquitted by a great majority of his congregation of any wrong-doing, but resigned before the case could be carried into the church courts; and we trust he has since become a teetotaler, seeing that he was advertised to speak at a temperance meeting. May he prosper in his new departure!—*N. Y. Witness.*

—Every clergyman who puffs his cigar on the hotel piazza at a fashionable watering-place, in sight of the many careless pleasure-seekers there, lowers himself thereby, in the estimation of every irreligious tobacco-user who observes him, although he may flatter himself that he is gaining power for good over that class of persons by his indulgence, because, forsooth, he is patted on the back approvingly by other Christian smokers, who are glad to be countenanced by so distinguished a divine in their tobacco-using. Every Sabbath-school superintendent or teacher who smokes a cigar, or takes a glass of lager beer, or plays a game of billiards in the sight of his unconvinced scholars, thereby lessens the confidence of those scholars in his Christian character, and diminishes their respect for him as a man to be trusted and followed.—*Exchange.*

—The General Association of Congregational Ministers, at Gloversville, N. Y., recently adopted the following resolutions:—1. That the tobacco habit is an enormous evil; and that on account of its waste of money, positive injuries to health, and pernicious example to the young, Christians ought to abandon its use. 2. That this Association earnestly recommend to all our churches, immediate and thorough measures for instructing the people as to the manifold mischiefs flowing from the use of narcotic drugs as well as drinks; and that special efforts be made to guard children and youth from any and every use of tobacco.

—The following is an extract of a letter written by Major F. de Winton at Therapia on the 23rd Sept.:—"The accounts we receive of the state of the wounded in some of the towns near the centres of war are appalling. Fortunately for the Turkish soldier he is a teetotaler, and it is wonderful what wounds they can have, and how quickly the wounds heal. All the doctors agree in saying that it is entirely due to their temperate habits."

A GRAVEDIGGER'S TESTIMONY.—"What tools are oftenest used in digging graves?" asked a gentleman of an aged gravedigger. "Sir," replied the old sexton, "there are different ways, and I've seen people who dug graves most, if not all, of those ways; but, sir, if you look through even this quiet village, you will find that the commonest way of doing it is for people to dig their own graves, and that with gin, rum, brandy, and whiskey."

—The Mayor elect of Brooklyn, N. Y., proposes the city shall erect buildings where inebriates sent up to the jail and workhouse should be compelled to work to help bear the cost of their maintenance, so that it shall not fall solely on the community against whom they are offenders.

The Worcester (Mass.) firemen agreed to sign the pledge if the Women's Temperance Union would give them coffee at fires. The merchants contributed to a fund for the purpose, and now the brave firemen are supplied with the beverage that refreshes and warms their bodies, and keeps their heads cool.

—One Sunday recently a paper was read in the pulpits of the churches in Dundee, Scotland, urging the discontinuance of the practice of offering wine and spirits to those attending funerals.