

deeper down than any civil enactments—license or prohibition—lie the drinking usages. Everything is superficial and transient that does not touch them. No grog-seller opens a saloon with the malicious intent to kill people; he does it simply to make money by ministering to appetite, and by supplying the demands of the grog-drinkers. The customers who support the dram-shop are just as criminal as the heartless creature who “runs” the dram-shop. The most effectual way to break down the liquor traffic is to get away its customers, and just here lies the wisdom of establishing “coffee-taverns” and kindred institutions, as they are now doing in Great Britain. But it is as true as gravitation that if any large number of people are determined to have intoxicants, they will get them, even if prohibitory laws were piled as high as the Pyramids. They will get their liquor either by trampling down righteous law, as they do now in Leavenworth, or by forming clubs and drinking in private quarters, as is often done in Maine. To attempt to dam up a torrent at its mouth, and to neglect its fountain-head, is sheer insanity. The fountain-head of drunkenness is not the dram-shop, even with all its villainous temptations; the fountain-head is the drinking usages which create and maintain the dram-shop. This is an axiom—but one that is strangely overlooked. Righteous laws of suppression are essential in their place; but the only permanent cure for dram-selling is to break upon the demand, and to dissuade people from wishing to buy and to drink. Right here comes in the tremendous responsibility of the churches and the pulpits, and all parents, and all who have a grain of influence, to do their utmost to destroy the drinking usages, and to keep others from even wishing to go to a dram-shop. Heinous as is the sin of the liquor-seller, we deliberately affirm before God that every Christian who abets the drinking customs is actually and morally a partner in the business; he sustains the customs which sustain the traffic? I am sick and weary of hearing the incessant denunciations of dram-dens, and the incessant clamour for “law, law, law,” from those who are shirking their personal duty in moral suasions, and are relegating a great vital reform to political law-makers and policemen. Miles deeper down than the most stringent prohibitory statute, lies the inner statute of personal conscience, which prohibits the buying or the using intoxicants. To neglect the latter and employ only or even mainly the former, is to throw a dam of rushes across Niagara.

2. Now as to facts which sustain this. Thirty-three years ago I had the editorial charge of a prohibition journal, and in 1853 stood with my noble old friend Neal Dow before the Legislature of New York, pleading for a prohibitory law. We gained it; and during the single year of its existence (1855) it accomplished admirable results in all those localities where a sound temperance public sentiment enforced it. In New York city complaints against rum-sellers were piled up in the courts, but not one solitary rum-den was shut up. We had prohibition in the statute-books, and free rum in New York; the overwhelming demand for strong drink crushed a righteous law to atoms. The drinking usages of 200,000 people or more swept the board. In Kansas, three years ago, constitutional prohibition was enacted by the narrow majority of 7,000 votes. To-day it closes up the dram-dens in all those counties in which a sound moral sentiment has broken up the drink usages. All honor to those who do their duty! But in Leavenworth 166 haunts of drunkenness are wide open, and the Constitution is trampled in the dust. So is it trampled down in twenty-five counties out of eighty-one. In the city of Portland, Me., the home of the heroic old father of prohibition, there were over 2,000 arrests last year for drunkenness; those drunkards got their drink somewhere. In Bangor liquor-dens were opened a year or two ago most shamelessly, and because the drinking usages elected magistrates who winked at the violations of the law. I could give similar facts from the prohibitory State of Vermont. Shall the suppressive laws of these three States be repealed? A thousand times “No!” But unless moral influences, steadily plied, keep down the drinking usages, the statutes of prohibition will be ropes of straw, in many places, to save men from the deadly bottle. You cannot put parchments as deep down as men put their principles and their practices.

3. While we fight the dram-shop, let us fight still harder the principles, the habits, and the customs which demand and sustain it. My friend Dr. Crosby characteristically pronounces the liquor-sellers “disguised murderers.” But are not the liquor-buyers also undisguised suicides? Is not the man before the counter as guilty as the man behind the counter? I honor Dr. Crosby’s fearlessness; but when he has fought the drink devil as long as I have, he will discover that the only effectual way to finish dram-selling, high

or low, is to make a thorough end of the drinking usages—and that means total abstinence. Joseph Cook is perfectly consistent; for while he nobly holds up prohibition in the one hand, he holds up his masterly arguments for total abstinence from the drink customs in the other hand. No man can logically strike a liquor-seller while he is holding a wine-bottle in his own hands; he will cut his fingers.

4. Prevention is a still more pressing watchword for the hour than even prohibition. Without the first the second becomes inevitably a dead-letter; and dead laws, like other defunct carcasses, are inodorous and unwholesome. I rejoice that our efforts to put a temperance school-book into every public school in this Commonwealth have been successful; this looks towards saving the young, and is in the vital direction of prevention. To save a boy from drinking is to save a victim from the dram-shop.

5. The longer I labor in the temperance reform the less I care for names and the more for things—the less for the sentimental and the more for the practical. Up to this hour the only practicable and successful legislation against dram-shops is in the line of local suppression or prohibition. This allows the people of each locality to close up, by law, the grog-shops, and throws the responsibility back—where it belongs—on the moral sense of the community. Leavenworth and Bangor are evidences to prove that all which prohibition actually accomplishes is in this line. Where conscience breaks down liquor drinking, it is easy for courts and constables to break down liquor-selling. May God awake His Church to their share in both!

6. Finally, I reach out my hand to my Chicago brother for his manly and powerful plea for prohibition of moral slaughter-houses. But let him think twice before he says again that the “supreme business of the hour” is to crush the “dram shop.” A supreme duty is to crush the drinking usages which underlie, and create, and maintain the dram-shop. Righteous law let us strive for, pray for, work for, but if we put our main reliance for deliverance from the curse of alcohol upon the civil arm, we are doomed to certain, inevitable, and overwhelming disappointment. Deeper down than civil penalties lie the consciences and the customs; when they are reached, reform is permanent. God never means that His people shall shirk their duty of grappling with the hugest devil of the age, and turn it over to be dealt with mainly by the politician and the policeman. Death to the bottle is the only sure death to the dram-shop.—*New York Evangelist*.

### Scott Act News.

ST. THOMAS.—A large and enthusiastic meeting was held at St. Thomas last week in the Presbyterian Church in the interest of the Scott Act. Rev. Mr. Hutchinson occupied the chair. Rev. W. A. McKay, of Woodstock, advocated the side of prohibition; Capt. McBride defended the liquor traffic. Mr. McKay, amid great enthusiasm, replied in a courteous, but most effective manner. At the close a vote in favor of submitting the Act in the city was carried almost unanimously.

WESTMORELAND, N.B.—An election on a petition for the repeal of the Canada Temperance Act will be held in this county on the 14th August. It is hoped the result will be the same as has attended every effort so far made in the Maritime Provinces to repeal the Act, and our advices encourage us to expect that it will be so. The result of that election will not be without its influence on the struggle in Halton.—*Cuskert*.

HURON.—A Scott Act discussion took place at Goderich last week between Rev. C. R. Morrow, of Oxford, and Mr. George Moir, of Exeter. The chair was occupied by Mr. Thos. McGillicuddy. Mr. Morrow led in an able speech, in which he showed the evils of intemperance and the inability of license laws to adequately control it. Mr. Moir followed in a carefully prepared address calmly delivered, and made a very good presentation of his case. Mr. Morrow, in reply, made a splendid speech. He scored point after point amid loud applause, and closed a forcible and logical address by an eloquent appeal for the Scott Act and the home. He was enthusiastically applauded upon taking his seat, and upon a vote being called for, only one person voted against the Act. The meeting was a fitting close to the successful campaign in Huron of Mr. Morrow. His two weeks’ course of meetings has been all that the most enthusiastic supporters of the Act could desire.—*Globe*.