

We want the editor to take up our cause. We want the minister to take up our cause. We want the mother to open the books of Science and Scripture to her children.

Can we do nothing? Look at Tweed a few years ago in New York. He was counted the luckiest man in New York, and everybody who was destitute of principle envied him. But there came a day when Tweed was marched to jail, and though Tweed was no worse a man than before, men saw that that blessed old cat-o'-nine-tails known as the law had got hold of him. So we want this Tweed No. 1 (the liquor traffic) to be taken hold of and transformed into Tweed No. 2.

The poet has said that the hand that rocks the cradle moves the world. But it isn't true, for mankind doesn't stay in the cradle. It comes out of the cradle—out of the home—to see and feel the corruption of the world, and the snares of the grog shop.

America is a great country for protection—I therefore ask if something cannot be done to protect the home. We have protection for industries, subsidies for railroads and steamships—but, while protecting so much besides, we have neglected to protect the home.

Far away in my old home in Evanston is the face of one whose heart never failed me yet. The face of that mother who to-night looks with blurred eyes over the map to see where Denver is, where she knows her daughter is to speak to-night.

But in how many homes has the light gone out because the pledged protector of the home spends his time and money in the saloons.

What is the strongest point in the liquor traffic? Has it brains? Not a thimble-full. Has it any heart? Not a particle. What is the secret of its influence? Why, everybody says, "We guess it's the money." Now, nothing is so cowardly as capital, and if you make it uncomfortable for capital in one channel it will seek out others. We want to make the liquor dealers so uncomfortable that they will put their money into something else.

But I am asked right here, does prohibition prohibit? I answer it by another. Does license regulate? Does it regulate in Chicago, where the Sunday carnival and Sunday murder have become a national disgrace? I might also ask, Does civilization civilize, or does Christianity christianize? and you will answer at once, of course they do. But why do you have your church in one corner, your school in another, your home over across the way, and right in the midst of these a saloon? "Oh! saloons. We don't hanker after them, but the average public sentiment seems to require them." But I ask, what public sentiment is it? Is it the sentiment of the church? The answer will be, No—the church is largely made up of women. Is it the public sentiment of the home? No—the public sentiment of mothers and sisters is against the saloons. Then when we come to the great mass of humanity they will say there are two things that support the liquor traffic—appetite and avarice. But somehow through all these ages of wine drinking and liquor drinking there are classes who have not gained the appetite for drinking. These are the women. What has made this so? Why, it is the instinct of a weaker sex physically—we have held to self-preservation. We have run away from the demon on the same principle that the small boy on the play-ground runs away from the big bully. What can we do about it? Why, we find in the great world of politics the side always wins which has the most votes. If you can get your son to go to the ballot box and vote for prohibition, wouldn't it be better if you could add your vote to his, and his sister's vote to that?—*Queen Bee.*

### ALCOHOL AS A REMEDY.

I do not intend to deny that the use of mild alcoholic tonics, as a substitute for the frightful remedies of the mediæval Sangrados, is a decided improvement, but, still it is only a lesser evil, a first step as a progressive reform. Alcohol lingers in our hospitals as slavery lingers in the West Indies, as the witchcraft delusion lingers in South Europe. Has alcohol any remedial value whatever? Let us consider the matter from a purely empirical standpoint. Does alcohol protect from malarial fevers? It is a well-known fact that the human organism cannot support two diseases at the same time. Rheumatism can be temporary, producing an artificial inflammation; a headache yields to a severe toothache. For the same reason the *alcohol-fever* affords a temporary protection from other febrile symptoms—i. e., a man might fortify his system against chills and ague by keeping himself constantly under the stimulating influence of alcohol. But

sooner or later stimulation is followed by depression, and during that reaction the other fever gets a chance, and rarely misses it. The history of epidemics proves that pyretic diseases are from *eight to twelve* times more destructive among dram-drinkers than among the temperate class; rich or poor, young or old, abstainers are *only contesimated* by diseases that decimate drunkards. On no other point is the testimony of physicians of all schools, all times, and all countries, more consistent and unanimous.

Is alcohol a peptic stimulant? No more than Glauber's-salt or castor-oil. The system hastens to rid itself of the noxious substance, the bowels are thrown into a state of morbid activity only to relax into a morbid inactivity. The effect of every laxative is followed by a stringent reaction, and the habitual use of peptic stimulants leads to a chronic constipation which yields only to purgatives of the most virulent kind.

Does alcohol impart strength? Does it benefit the exhausted system? If a worn out horse drops on the highway, we can rouse it by sticking a knife into its ribs, but, after staggering ahead for a couple of minutes, it will drop again, and the second *deliquium* will be worse than the first by just as much as the brutal stimulus has still further exhausted the little remaining strength. In the same way precisely alcohol rallies the exhausted energies of the human body. The prostrate vitality rises against the foe, and labors with restless energy till the poison is expelled. Then comes the reaction, and, before the patient can recover, his organism has to do double work. Nature has to overcome both the original cause of the disease and the effect of the stimulant.—*Popular Science Monthly.*

### NEW DEVELOPMENTS ON THE LAGER BEER QUESTION.

It has long been a favorite argument with quite a portion of thinking men, that the evils of intemperance may be greatly reduced by the use of ale and wines in the places of stronger drinks; and so they have advocated the granting of licenses to ale and wine houses as a temperance measure. The argument seemed plausible, at a casual glance, because these drinks do not make men furious, even when drunk by them; and thus less of abuse to families would occur, and less of violent crimes be produced.

The customary attempt to refute this argument, lay in an effort to show, that while these lighter drinks do not make men so brutal as stronger ones, still they directly form the appetite for stimulants, and in the end, lead to the use of the stronger. It was contended that ale and beer saloons are the recruiting stations of drunkenness, and, therefore to be prohibited as a precautionary measure. And there is force in this refutation of the argument for their being fostered, or even permitted. But a stronger refutation has lately been brought forward; and that too, not by professed temperance advocates, but by shrewd business men. It has been revealed by a careful collection of statistics of the death rate as shown by life insurance companies. These statistics show that the death rate is greater among ale and wine drinkers than it is among whisky drinkers, and some companies are said to be already refusing to insure the life of ale and wine drinkers at ordinary rates. If insured at all, they must be classed as extra hazardous, and pay rates accordingly. This is a new phase of the question, and will require all the genius of the advocates of these drinks to successfully meet it.

While the comparison lay between the brutalizing effects and violent results of whisky drinking, and the milder stupidity and obesity of ale and beer drinking, the choice seemed to turn toward the latter, and many people were influenced thereby; but now the question turns on the death rate. Can we justly accept as a choice of evils that which kills the more men? Or, if one prefers to put it correctly, is it wise and humane to choose that which is most potent in killing men rather than that which is most potent in brutalizing men? Nay, rather, is it wise or humane to favor either? The one brutalizes many and kills some, and the other stupefies some and kills many. Is there not, therefore, in the interest of humanity abundant reason why we should put away both?

The best authorities on the question assert that the habitual and excessive consumption of lager beer—the drink now so strongly advocated by some—has the especial effect of making the flesh flabby and loose upon the bone, the stomach abnormally dilated, and the resisting power against disease very small. A man in this condition does not need a very severe attack of disease to break him down altogether. They also assert that lager beer has a very stupefying effect upon the brain, not unlike that produced by opium, though milder. It also tends directly to cause induration of the liver, and