

MR. GRUBB'S EXPERIENCE.

£1,000 SAVED.

At a temperance meeting in the Trades Hall, Glasgow, in the course of a long address Mr. Jonathan Grubb said of temperance men:

They were often misunderstood, and he had sometimes been asked, "With all your efforts, how many drunkards have you reclaimed?" They would reclaim every drunkard this night if it were in their power, and they ought not to omit every effort to compass the desired end. But that was all dealing with consequences. This was not the main object. The main object was to alter the customs which produced the drunkard. Let them undoubtedly strike a blow at the cause, while for the present they dealt to the best of their ability with the effects. If they could reclaim every drunkard, it was no remedy, for a fresh crop would arise; but let them divide society into two classes—total abstainers and drunkards. They had a remedy very quickly. The present drunkards would soon be gone or converted, and there could be no other supply. Therefore, if they could get rid of the moderate drinking their success would soon arrive. Their warfare was not against drunkards, it was against the drink which made the drunkards. They mourn over the drunkard, and sympathize with him, for his appetite was all but uncontrollable, and they who felt themselves very strong, ought not to be above bearing the infirmities of the weak. Our blessed Lord did not please Himself, but served; therefore, following His example, they who were strong should help to bear the infirmities of the weak. With himself it was a religious concern. He had been an abstainer for more than 30 years, with the exception of once or twice when his medical man, under a great mistake, ordered him stimulants, but he made a greater mistake, in taking them. He did not become an abstainer for his own sake; he did so for the sake of others. He had at one time a man who was such a drunkard that he said to him, he must either quit his service or become an abstainer. The man replied that he worked very hard, and needed something. His master had it upon his table, and if it was necessary for his master, it was also necessary for him. The speaker thought himself to be very strong, but he was not bearing the infirmities of the weak. He felt in fact that he was in the position of the man who, while in a glass house, threw stones, and he thought it better to get out of the glass house and so become a total abstainer. That took place 31 years ago. He thanked God that He had made that man the instrument of bringing him to his senses.

When he was about to be married his wife made a bargain with him before they were united, "May it be a teetotal house?" He answered "Yes, if we can do it." She quietly said, "Let us try." He had seen wondrous things done by that little word *try*. They had been married for 31 years and had had a large family. They had not tempted their servants, or anyone. If they knew what he knew of domestic servants, and the numbers who fell through drink, they would see it was indeed an evil thing to place that stumbling-block in their way. He and his wife had never yielded visitors. He would tell them how he had yielded to the doctor's orders. They said he must have bitter ale to build him up. He reluctantly yielded, and soon saw, coming through his garden, a square basket with bottles stuck in it. It looked uglier to him than it had ever done before. He felt very reluctant to obey the injunction of the doctor, although he had been taught that to take something was a good thing by his dear father and mother, who were God-fearing people, and who, he believed, had gone to heaven. Well, the old taste revived, and the ale seemed very reviving, but week after week he got no benefit, and he felt that he was going to be like one of those peculiar persons that could not get on without what they called "support." He felt he could not travel and take a drop in every house, as he was sure he would be building up Satan's kingdom with one hand while trying to pull it down with the other. He said, "Lord, deliver me from this thing." Since that prayer he had not let a single drop enter his mouth. (Hear) In fact, he abandoned it when he thought it the most necessary. In six weeks after he had completely abandoned it he was perfectly well. The Lord had condescended to hear his prayer, and had restored his strength. That was ten years ago, and here he was, at the age of 67 years, able, through the mercy of his Heavenly Father, to get through his labor, mental and physical, every day of his life without the drink. In his domestic life, his abstinence had been next to his religion the greatest blessing to his family. When they had visitors, they forgot there was such a thing as drink. He had three sons seeking their livelihood in the world, and all were teetotalers like himself. If one of his sons had fallen through drink, and he had set the example, he did not know he would have been able to lift up his head or open his mouth as a minister of the Gospel, the remembrance of it would have had such a

discouraging effect upon his mind. He had been calculating what there would have been spent in his establishment if they had followed the practice of moderate drinking, and he had computed that the amount would be as high as one thousand pounds.

BOARDS OF HEALTH AND INTEMPERANCE.

PROF. MILO P. JEWETT, LL.D., OF MILWAUKEE.

Our Boards ought to shut up at once and forever all places where ardent spirits are sold as a beverage. These tipping-shops are the occasion, if not the origin and cause, of nine-tenths of all the drunkenness that afflicts our country. They are the generators and propagators of idiocy, insanity, disease, and death, and ought to be instantly suppressed.

Of course, this measure would encounter the most determined opposition. The manufacturers and vendors of intoxicating drinks, with a host of patrons, dependents, and flatterers, and with an enormous capital at their command, will denounce every attempt to abate these most outrageous of all nuisances as an attack on the rights of property, an invasion of personal liberty. "Personal liberty leagues" would be formed, and organized resistance to the sanitary police would stop short of nothing but mob violence in their hostility to the proposed action.

But these Boards, composed of intelligent, honorable, and public-spirited citizens, actuated by nothing but a disinterested concern for the public good, should not be intimidated by the threats of a class of men who are governed solely by self-interest; who enrich themselves by bringing others to poverty; who flourish most when most they scatter abroad firebrands, arrows, and death. In the case under consideration, the Boards have only to exercise their power as they are accustomed to use it, where the danger is less imminent and appalling. The cholera breaks out in some of our cities. Hundreds of homeless, penniless denizens are struck down. The hospitals are not contain them. The Health Board cannot on any public hall, warehouse, or church, and fills them with patients. A quarter of the city is crowded with dense masses of human beings, packed in underground cellars, reeking in the morning for breath in the fetid atmosphere, and hundreds. Here the plague originates, and from this focus of contagion is spreading throughout the city. By a summary process the Board of Health removes the wretched inmates, tears down the infected tenements, or applies the torch and burns up whole blocks. Suppose, instead of the 3,000 pest-houses in Philadelphia, which are dealing out "dead poison," there were 8,000 butchering shops, each sold pork charged with trichina, and that thousands of citizens, under the pretence of a morbid appetite, purchased and ate the diseased meat, and multitudes were dying from this cause, would the Philadelphia Board hesitate to abolish these pest-houses? But in all these cases the property-holders would remonstrate; the dealers in trichina spiralis would be furious in their denunciation of this arbitrary interference with vested rights, this destruction of a most respectable business protected by law. The reply is at hand: The safety of the State is the supreme law. So in regard to intemperance: Let its manifold and monstrous evils once firmly possess the public mind, and the conservators of public health would be able to enforce the most stringent requisitions.

Ardent spirits should be put on the shelf of the druggist, and sold by him as other dangerous drugs are sold, on the order of a physician, for medicinal purposes only, and to responsible persons.

As a substitute for dram-shops, "Holly Tree" houses should be established, where nutritious and palatable food, with tea and coffee, should be supplied at cheap rates.

Boards of Health should urge on physicians the greatest care in prescribing alcoholic compounds. The medical faculty are not agreed as to the expediency of using alcohol in medicines. It would be out of place, perhaps, to discuss the subject in this paper, but it is pertinent to quote the opinions of some high authorities who support the negative of the question:

The eminent physician and physiologist, Dr. Carpenter, declares: "Nothing in the annals of quackery can be more truly empirical than the mode in which fermented liquors are directed or permitted to be taken by a large proportion of medical practitioners." In 1804, Dr. Higginbottom, the venerable surgeon of Nottingham, England, published the following: "For about thirty years I have not once prescribed alcohol as a medicine. I should consider myself criminal if I again recommend alcohol, either as food or medicine. During my long practice I have not known or seen a single disease cured by alcohol; on the contrary, it is the most fertile producer of disease." In December, 1871, nearly three

hundred of the most eminent members of the faculty in London, headed by Dr. Burrows, president of the Royal College of Surgeons, subscribed the subjoined medical declaration: "As it is believed that the inconsiderate prescription of large quantities of alcoholic liquors by medical men for their patients has given rise in many instances to the formation of intemperate habits, the undersigned, while unable to abandon the use of alcohol in the treatment of certain cases of disease, are yet of opinion that no medical practitioner should prescribe it without a sense of grave responsibility. They believe that alcohol, in whatever form, should be prescribed with as much care as any powerful drug, and that the directions for its use should be so framed as not to be interpreted as a sanction for excess, or necessarily for the continuance of its use when the occasion is past."

These citations sufficiently fortify the position that our sanitary boards should endeavor to secure on the part of medical men a greater degree of caution, in view of the danger of stimulating to frenzy an appetite which the prescription may create, or which the patient may have previously acquired.—*Standard*.

THE ECONOMIC ASPECT—FARMERS AND THE LIQUOR-TRAFFIC.

An English correspondent of the *Christian News* calls attention to, and gives an extract from, a work entitled "British Farming," from which we quote:

It is, however, in the production of malt liquor and ardent spirits, and in the fattening of live-stock, that our barley crops are chiefly consumed. We have no doubt that it would be better for the whole community if this grain were more largely used in the form of *beef* or *whiskey*. It has been customary for farmers to look upon distillation as beneficial to them, from the ready market which it affords for barley, and more especially for the lighter qualities of this and other grain crops. But this is a very short-sighted view of the matter, for a careful calculation shows that, when the farmer spends a shilling in the dram-shop, he gets more than a penny of it goes, for the distiller produces (barley) from which *gin* or *whiskey* is made; whereas when he spends the same sum with the butcher or baker, nearly the whole amount goes for the raw material, and only a fraction for the tradesman's profit. And not only so, but the man who spends his wages upon strong drink, is *not* only directly, but indirectly, his own enemy, for he wastes his food or clothing; so that, *besides* the moral and social bearing of the question, it can abundantly be shown that *whiskey* or *beer* is the very worst form for the farmer in which his grain can be consumed. Were the £50,000,000 at present annually spent in Great Britain upon ardent spirits (not to speak of *beer*) employed in purchasing bread, meat, dairy produce, vegetables, woollen and linen clothing, *farmers* would, on the one hand, be relieved from oppressive rates, and, on the other, have such an increased demand for their staple products as would far more than compensate for the closing of what is at present the chief outlet for their barley.

We commend the above to the thoughtful consideration of these farmers in this country—we could wish there were none such—who are either indifferent or opposed to the temperance reform, lest it should interfere with the sale of their corn or rye, which is now so largely consumed by distillers.—*Advocate*.

THE FAILURE IN MASSACHUSETTS.

BY MRS. SUSAN E. GRAVES.

Governor Gaston, of Massachusetts, in his message to the Legislature of his State, makes the assertion that the prohibitory law, which has, with various amendments, been upon the statute books of that Commonwealth for some score of years, has proved a failure.

With all due deference to His Excellency, I beg leave to state that I know better! Residing in the Old Bay State for quite a length of time, and being actively and earnestly engaged in the cause of temperance, speaking frequently from the platform, and assiduously engaged in the minor spheres of action in this work, as well as being a member of several temperance organizations, and in constant contact with many leading persons deeply interested in the morals of that State, I feel as competent to speak upon this issue as even Governor Gaston. That gentleman was elected as an exponent of the license party—a party in a large minority in that State, but who, by clap-trap cries of various kinds, one of which was that the truly Christian Governor Talbot was a rigid, overbearing, religious fanatic, managed to unseat that great and good man, and to elect a Legislature whom they hope will march under their banner of "Free Rum!"

Governor Gaston is a man of much talent, education and experience, and he knows as well as I do, that the great, sound heart of the people of his State beats responsive to the onward march of temperance and morality,

and that in so far as he may act in opposition to that sentiment, his future, as a public and honored man, is sealed, and we opine that in this matter, he will tread "gingerly," and that it will be by excessive pressure of the money-bought influence of the liquor traffic that he will, if he dare, act at all, though I believe that he dare not so act.

Travel through the many thriving towns, villages and hamlets of that fair State, and note in how few of them are to be found the open rumshop and the reeling drunkard, and tell me that the prohibitory law has been of none effect! The Governor *knows* better. In twenty years—and there has been a vast increase in population during that time—the State has been completely revolutionized as regards the temperance cause. Then, the liquor-dealer was considered fully the equal, if not the superior of his townsmen. Then the village landlord, whose principal profit was from the sale of rum, aspired to and held many of the prominent positions of his town. How stands the case to-day? In the estimation of his fellow-citizens is his position a high or low one? The Governor *knows*! With the exception of a few blear-eyed followers, none so poor as to do the rumseller reverence. I know whereof I speak, and I speak warmly, because I *do* know. A failure for twenty years! He or she who has watched or studied the effect of the prohibitory law in Massachusetts, knows that the statement is *false*, knows that the reverse has been the case, knows that the tide of temperance has been an ever on-growing one, knows that in no State in our confederation have such rapid and giant strides been made in the cause of morality and truth as in the grand Old Bay State.—*N. Y. Witness*, January, 1875.

WHY DON'T YOU PRAY?—The Congregationalist of Boston has the following editorial item: "Said a lady the other day to some visiting friends for a few weeks: 'Don't you pray for the temperance cause either on Sunday nor on week days, neither in the pulpit nor out of it, do I hear that great cause remembered in prayer.' And her question, we are afraid, might be asked with the same reason in many of our churches. A cause so identified with good order and the temporal, spiritual, and eternal interests of the family and the entire community, has too strong claims to be forgotten, and certainly no week ought to pass when the great issues involved in the temperance question are not remembered in prayer in the pulpit as well as the prayer-meeting."

—The managers of the Lake Shore Railway have issued an order declaring that in future the company will not retain in their employ men in the habit of using intoxicating liquor as a beverage, and that the frequenting of places where the same is retailed will be considered *prima facie* evidence of its use and discharge will follow. This is a most commendable step. Where the lives of so many individuals are involved, as in the case of nearly all railroad employees, to say nothing of the property interests involved, it is perfectly right to require strict sobriety on the part of the men employed, and that ensured by requiring total abstinence from intoxicating drinks.—*Standard*.

—In Brooklyn, where the work of Christian Temperance Reform has effected such wonderful results the past year, an advance step has been taken in the formation of the "Temperance Brotherhood of Christian Churches," which will supplement the efforts of the ladies and others engaged in the suppression of intemperance and its resulting evils. Hon. B. E. Hale was chosen President, Rev. Dr. Cuyler and W. R. Davis Vice-Presidents, with an Executive Committee from the churches of the different denominations.

—A respected military correspondent, in India, in a communication received this week, says:—"You will be glad to learn that the movement is spreading in the Indian Army. The returns for last month show about 5,500 abstaining soldiers, besides women and children, and the general committee of about 50 officers and clergymen. Our numbers have been steadily increasing every month since the re-formation of the Association in June, 1873, and we now probably muster an army of 6,000 registered teetotalers."—*League Journal*.

—Over a hundred ministers of Liverpool of all denominations, recently met to consider the appalling prevalence of drunkenness, crime, and death in that city. They appointed April 30 as a day of humiliation and special prayer for the deliverance of the nation from the curse of intemperance, and called on all Christians to unite in endeavoring to secure reduced numbers of public and beer houses, entire Sunday closing and shortened hours of sale.

—Under the present stringent license law in Delaware, the number of places licensed to sell intoxicating liquors has been cut down from about 400 to 130.

—In Winconsin, a Women's Temperance Alliance was organized last month.