

example should not be without value. Even in the stress of battle an oath never polluted his lips. His speech was pure up to the standard of maidenly chastity. Mr. Pierpont, the American Minister to Great Britain in 1877, tells of one occasion when he and General Grant dined at the house of a distinguished politician. The subject of religion in some way was introduced and one man resent treated it with mockery. Grant showed his feelings by abstaining from all further conversation with the man and on leaving said to the ambassador, "the conversation of that man so shocked me, that I could not talk or enjoy the dinner." On the general's staff during the war, in one of his campaigns, was a rough and ready fighter, full of strange oaths and stranger vulgarities. One evening, in the presence of Grant and several brother officers, he opened the conversation in some such way as this, "I have got a mighty good thing to tell you. It would hardly do to repeat, of course, in the presence of ladies." "Well," said the General interrupting him in his firm but quiet way, "allow me to suggest then that it might be advisable to omit it in the presence of gentlemen." Need I add to this well timed rebuke, that profanity has no possible justification. No man worthy of the name ought to indulge in it. It indicates an unclean and sensual nature, where the spirit of God cannot dwell. It debases and degrades manhood. The presence of unclean lips in society—or those who curse their fellows in the holy name of the Divine being—is an immeasurable evil. No condemnation is too great for such a vice, no punishment too swift or severe.