

## GOLDWIN SMITH

On the Effects of Prohibition in the United States and Canada.

The taste of fermented liquors, if not congenial, seems to be immemorial and almost universal. The traces of it are in all the mythologies—Hindoo, Hellenic, Roman and Scandinavian. Probably the use of such liquors is coeval with cookery, which also has been the source of much evil as well as of great pleasant mankind. It is very like that a great change in human diet, as well as in human beliefs and institutions, is coming; but it is not likely that this change will come suddenly, or that diet, being complex, will undergo a revolution in one of its elements without a corresponding revolution in the rest. Vegetarianism has many advocates, and there are symptoms of gradual progress in that direction since the days in which an Homeric hero devoured a whole joint of meat, and the birds sang of the work of the shambles with as much gusto as he sang of the harvest and the vintage. It is certain that the most potent diet to much most and are the worse for it, though it has not yet been proposed on that account to shut up the butcher shops and send the butchers jail. Fermented drinks may be dispensed, as necessary with them; a refined and intellectual world may be content to sustain its grosser part with bread, and water from the spring and our Christ was choicer may be remembered only as the habit of primeval savages with wonder and disgust. But in questions in diet, as I have already said, it is for medical science, not for the sentiment of the platform or for Methodist enthusiasm, to decide.

We have seen how in Vermont prohibitionism, exasperated by its inevitable failure, has heaped up penal enactments, and at last invaded the most sacred liberties of the citizen and the rights of his home. It is the tendency of all tyranny, whether it be that of a sultan, a crowd, a sect or a party of zealous, when it finds itself baffled, to pile on fresh severities instead of reconsidering the wisdom of its policy. Prohibitive legislation in Canada has not failed to betray the same arbitrary spirit. There is a clause in the Scott Act (Sec. 12) setting aside the common legal safeguard of innocence. It provides that it shall not be necessary for the informer to depose to the fact of the sale as within his own personal or certain knowledge, but the magistrate, or as soon as it appears to him that the circumstances of the evidence sufficiently establish the infraction of the law, shall put the defendant on his defence, and in default of his rebuttal of such evidence shall convict him accordingly,—convict him, in short, and send him to prison, on hearsay if, in the opinion of the magistrate, who may be a strong partisan, he fails to prove his innocence. There is a clause (122) requiring a man, when interrogated respecting previous convictions, to criminate himself, which seems to be intended for the very purpose of breeding mendacity. There is a clause (123) compelling husband and wife to give evidence against each other. When the wife is sent the husband to prison, who will the wedlock of that pair thereforth be? Which of the two is the greater sin, to refuse to give under the Scott Act or to break the marriage vow which binds husband and wife to cherish and protect each other? There is no appeal on the merits from the arbitrary decision of the magistrate, and zealous has not been ashamed to demand in the plaintiff terms the appointment of partners to the bench. It never occurs to them to consider whether intemperance itself is a worse vice than injustice.

The treatment of the hotel and tavern keepers has also been utterly iniquitous. These men having earned their bread by a trade which, when they entered it, was not only licensed by the State but deemed by everybody perfectly reputable; and,

therefore, when their trade is suddenly suppressed, they are apparently entitled to the same compensation which any other trade in the same circumstances would receive. But compensation is inconvenient and might be thought too good. It is necessary, therefore, to put the tavern-keeper out of the pale of justice, and to do so in the pulp and platform vice with each other in kindling popular passion against him. He is represented not only as the agent of a traffic which it is desirable to put an end to, but as a criminal, and the worst of criminals, as a poisoner and a murderer, "stepped to the elbow in the blood of civilization." Yet money made by the poison he sells is accepted even by the most scrupulous of the churches for its religious objects, while one church at least, which has synodically declared for total Prohibition, counts many dealers in liquor among its members.

We do not want a selfish and isolated liberty. Milton himself did not want a selfish and isolated liberty; at least, he deliberately sacrificed his right rather than to decline to serve the State. But after all this struggling against the paternal despotism of kings and popes, we do not want an unreasonable measure of freedom and self-revelment. We want it to be understood, as the general rule, that

All restraint Except what wisdom lays on evil man is evil.

In cases of extremity, such as war or plague, we are, of course, ready for strong measures, provided they are effectual. Not only war or plague, but any peril of such a kind that the State alone can deal with, warrants the intervention of the State. Nobody would desire to act arbitrary and pedantic bounds to the common action of the community for the preservation of the whole. It might be necessary, and therefore, lawful to close the taverns of the nation, where the nation becomes the hopeless slave of drunkenness, as it might be necessary and, therefore, lawful to close the railways of the nation were becoming the hopeless slaves of turf gambling. But, in an ordinary way, we submit that whether in the hands of kings or monarchs, political power is a trust held for definite purposes which do not include interference with your neighbor's diet or any of his personal habits any more than they include limitations of his industry or the constitution of his property. The prohibitionist thinks that by doing a little injustice he can do a great deal of good, and so, probably, have thought all tyrants who were not absolutely insane.

## USES OF ALCOHOL.

A Celebrated English Physician on its Place in Medicine.

To those good people, and there are many of them, who believe that alcohol in any and every shape and under every and all circumstances is a harmful, we would commend an article by the celebrated English physician, Dr. Mortimer Granville, in the last issue of the *Liberty Review* in which he says:

"Let me give you an example of the way in which alcohol plays its part as a potent aid in the remedy of disease, the *modus operandi* in that now prevalent disorder which is grotesquely intempered influenza. The leading feature of this is paralysis in depression. I first made its acquaintance, objectively, in 1848, and have studied it pretty closely in its more recent manifestations, in the light of better science than was available at that time. The net results of the inquiry may be briefly epitomized as follows: When the poison—whatever it be, probably a 'microbe'—invades the organism, it acts on the nerves-centers, and (as Bence Jones says) 'owing to the paralyzing action it exerts on the vaso motor system, a dilatation of

the vessels and especially of the cutaneous vessels, occurs, and consequently there is an increased loss of heat.' The total result is a diminution of the temperature of the body, which has been actually proved to take place. Unfortunately, in this case, the proof is found in the collapse and death of the patient unless the physician at the bedside has the courage to administer sufficiently large doses of alcohol, in which case he is rescued from the abyss of prostration into which he is sinking. If at this juncture, instead of giving alcohol—e.g., brandy or champagne—the attendant gives anti-pyrene, about the anti-pyretic effect of which, I presume, there is no lacking, the sufferer succumbs. It is the disease, in this instance, that is the 'paralyzer,' and alcohol the restorer of energy. The high temperature of influenza is a bogus 'fever,' produced precisely as Bunge says alcohol produces heat. The temperature of the blood, in health, is 102.2 degrees Fahrenheit, some physiologists put it as high as 102.5 degrees Fahrenheit. In some of the best vessels—e.g., the large arteries issuing from the liver—it is at times 104; but the mean of the whole may be taken at 102.2 to 103. It is easy to see how a sudden rush of this hot blood to the mucous membrane and the skin—that is to say, the internal and external surfaces of the body—within reach of the clinical thermometer must be misleading. A very slight rise in the actual temperature of the blood itself—such as is likely to occur in any disturbance of the normal life—will easily give a reading of 104 to 105, or even occasionally a higher one. If being taken for a genuine heating of the blood—such as takes place in influenza, or in fever, the administration of one of those remedies which used to be called antipyretic, and now is called anti-pyretic, may prove disastrous. Yet in this very condition, when a depressant would be mischievous, alcohol acts as a revivifying agent! What are we to conclude? Who is right—the teetotal fanatic who, physiologist though he may be, tells us that alcohol wastes the heat and energy of the body; or the bed-side practitioner, who knows, by glad experience of its efficacy, that this much-maligned alcohol is a genuine and potent stimulant and restorer of the system? The answer lies from theory—of the sort we have been examining, a superstructure of bewildering hypotheses, which are neither reasonable in themselves nor hold together—to the practical common sense of the community of those who have had to fight the duel with death by many a bedside at the closest quarters. I am neither ashamed, nor in the least degree unwilling, to confess that I prescribe alcohol largely and confidently, though never recklessly or without a prescription. And if any one were to ask which drug in the whole list of known remedies would I be most reluctant to surrender, I should say alcohol; and with that and a very sparse number and kind of supply of other known weapons of our warfare, I would be prepared to encounter the enemy in any of his Protean guises and developments. If alcohol were simply a nerve-center paralyzer, nitrate of amyl or nitroglycerine, the most powerful of vessel dilators, could take its place; but who of the multitude of common-sense practitioners would be prepared to accept either or both of these as substitutes for the much-abused alcohol?"

FORBES.—"The paper's full, sir." Editor (*in his rage*).—"As I expected, can't keep nothing about 'round this establishment!'"—*The Journalist*.

"How was the temperance lecture last night?" "Great! We were so delighted with it we took the lecturer around to the club afterwards and blew him off to a champagne supper."

## HEAVILY FINED

For Not Admitting a Constable in Plain Clothes to the Bar-room.

An important decision has been rendered by the London Police Magistrate. It was in the case of Morgan vs. Black, in which the latter is said to have "unlawfully and wilfully" interfered with a constable, Acting-Sergeant Morgan, in the discharge of assigned duty. James Black the defendant was fined \$50 or three months in jail.

The facts of the case are these. Morgan visited the London House at 11 o'clock on a recent Sunday morning. He was in plain clothes, and did not have a badge to distinguish him as a constable on duty. Morgan admitted in his evidence that "everything was right in the bar-room."

But he wanted to get into the bar, just the same. Black, who is employed by Mr. Humphidge, proprietor of the hotel, objected to admitting him.

Morgan stated, however, later on, that he did not know whether the occupants who were Black and the porter, knew him or not.

Mr. Love, Black's lawyer, said that it was clearly the right—the London duty—of Black to exclude Morgan from the bar-room as he did.

Morgan swore, when the evidence was being taken some weeks ago, that at the time Black pushed him back, he had not revealed his identity, and that, after this, he made no further attempt to go in: He then asked that Mr. Humphidge be brought in to identify him. This gentleman, though, did not know Morgan as a constable either. When Morgan told him who he was Mr. Humphidge invited him to enter the bar-room. This the latter would not do. Morgan admitted to Humphidge at the police-court afterwards that everything was right: "showing," Mr. Love stated, "that Morgan was aware that there was not the slightest necessity for his entrance into the bar-room."

The magistrate commended Mr. Love for his statement of his client's case, but thought the charge proven. Black was bailed out and an appeal will be made.

FORRESTER.—"What's the matter with Jones? He never speaks to a body now."

LANCETER.—"Of course not; their new build weighed 15 pounds."

SHINER.—"I am a trifle particular—I always pick my friends."

SHANK (*his creditor*).—"To the extent of a hundred or so?"—"Yes, as you would a chicken."

MRS. LEO says that she will not go into the lion's cage for her performance to-night.

MANAGER.—"Why not?"

RINGMASTER.—"She says that there is a mouse in the cage."

FELONY.—"What possessed you to tell Mrs. Hasleroff that she was giving you too big a piece of shortcake?"

MUDGE.—"I meant that it was too big for the number of berries."

"Is your son, who has gone to New York, a good worker?"

"Oh, yes; he is very industrious. Why, in the last letter he sent home he said that on arriving in New York he met a man who worked him for all he was worth, but his wages must have been poor, for he sent home for more money."



Palatable.

ont.

BOTTLES