

winter? Consolidation cannot "aggravate the evils" at present existing, if it does not lessen them.

There is no question connected with our Church that demands more earnest, prayerful consideration than this college question. May God direct to such conclusions as will most promote His glory and further the interests of our Church! J. LEISHMAN
Monro, Angus, Aug. 20, 1885.

CHURCH AND STATE

(Continued.)

MR. EDITOR, But while I point out these instances of men well known in the literary world who have been benefited by the moderate use of alcoholic beverages, I might point to others who, if they have not all been pretty free drinkers, were not "temperance" men. Bismarck, Moltke, Pitt, Sheridan, Fox, Moore, Rogers, Curran, Scott, Haslitt, Sydney Smith, Dickens, Byron, Charles Lamb, Goldsmith, Goethe, John Stuart Mill and a host of others. Yet it would be very foolish to lay down a rule for human-kind on the personal experience of these men. It would be equally foolish to prohibit the drinking of coffee, because in Henri Murger's case it brought on delirium, and in Balzac's shortened his life; or tobacco, because M. Jules Noriac came to grief by it; or tea, because Dr. Anstie asserts that excessive doses of it produce "theine" poisoning and an obstinate kind of dyspepsia. The question must be settled by the personal experience of the individual, for "what is one man's food is another man's poison." Bayard Taylor smoked, but did not snuff, Niebuhr snuffed, but did not smoke. Carlyle lived to a great age and smoked to excess. Victor Hugo lived to a great age and did not smoke. You will find people who cannot use milk, tea, coffee, pork, apples, eggs or porridge, and some, who do, cannot use them prepared in the same way as others use them, and some, less exacting, who are somewhat indifferent to the preparation, but feel that they cannot live without them. The same remarks are applicable to all kinds of beverages. Sir Henry Thompson, who is very largely quoted by the "temperance" people, says: "The more I see of life the more I see that we cannot lay down rigid dogmas for everybody," and in a recent article in one of the English magazines he asserted that more disease was caused throughout the civilized world by excessive eating than by excessive drinking.

Now, while I take it for granted that every sane adult can tell by personal experience whether alcoholic beverages act as a poison, I am not unwilling to examine the results of the experiments of physiologists. It is claimed that because M.M. Lallemand, Perrin and Duroy asserted that alcohol passes off from the body in perspiration, etc., in an unchanged state after being ingested, that it is therefore not a food but a poison. It is well to state that M. Baudot arrived at a different conclusion and that Dupre, Anstie, Thudichum and Schulinus agree with him "that the chief portion of alcohol ingested undergoes consumption in the body." But the French physiologists only discovered the presence of alcohol by the use of chromic acid, which is affected by the minutest quantity, and the same result was obtained in experimenting on a teetotaller. A layman who understands that nearly everything in nature produces alcohol would draw the conclusion that the human frame produces it, and that the French observers were not justified by their meagre results in declaring that alcohol is not a food.

But I think the absurdity of Lallemand's contention was very nicely met by Dr. Dupre, who said: "Assuming for the sake of argument that all the alcohol is eliminated and that such elimination takes ten days, it would follow that if a certain quantity of alcohol be taken daily, the amount eliminated would increase from day to day until, from the tenth day onward, the quantity eliminated daily would equal the daily consumption; in other words, the quantities which would be eliminated, if this theory were correct, might be measured by ounces instead of by grains, and even the most ordinary processes of analysis could not fail to yield considerable quantities of alcohol." It is now very generally conceded that alcohol is an alimentary substance and this is proved by the fact that the majority use it as an article of diet.

I might quote at great length from Drs. Anstie, Pavy, Kidd, Brudenell-Carter, Sir James Paget and others, as to its usefulness in moderation. They do not refer to pure alcohol, which is only used for chemical purposes, but to alcohol in combination. Proof

spirit consists of forty-nine parts alcohol and fifty-one water. Common whiskey is about twenty-five degrees under proof, and is used with about twice or three times its quantity of water, so that whiskey and water is far from being alcohol. The nutritive properties of beer, which is a good stomachic and tonic and calculated to promote digestion, are due to the extractive matter, consisting principally of carbo-hydrates, which it contains. Hoffman's, Kaiser's and Balling's analyses show that good beers contain nearly twice as much malt extract as alcohol. So that in considering alcoholic beverages we must not consider the independent effect of alcohol, but the ingredients of the liquid amalgamated and blended as a whole. Pavy, who is a high authority, says that "even made-up wine may in the course of time lose much of its pernicious nature and become passable by acquiring an amalgamated condition." This brings me to the consideration of adulterated and fortified wines which are said to be made with the use of bone-charcoal, tartar and lead. Redding, who is the best authority on the manufacture and commercial value of wines, says that charcoal is only used in cleansing casks tainted with sulphur, and that its use cannot do any harm, that lead sinks to the bottom of the cask and tartar to the side of it. But very few wines are adulterated, there being no object to adulterate them, as there is nothing cheaper than the pure juice of the grape. Redding states that wines seized in France as bad, by the Council of Health, and analyzed, have never shown the presence of lead. From 1770 down to 1825, not one instance had occurred in the analysis of wines which were brought to Paris of this intermixture, upon the authority of M. Cadet Gassicourt, whose duty it was to examine them. And I remember that a few years ago samples of whiskey were taken from the lowest dens in Toronto, the analyst declaring none of them adulterated. We have the authority of Hon. David A. Wells, concerning the United States, that previous to the high taxation on liquors, caused by the war, there was not much adulteration, because there was nothing cheaper than the crude proof spirit itself.

But the party who cry most bitterly against adulteration are in favour of high taxation which leads to it, and are ominously silent about the demand, which meets with a ready supply, for ground spices, ground coffees, cream of tartar, vinegar, baking-powders, teas and many other articles of commerce more or less adulterated in our midst, and which are consumed in much larger quantities than adulterated wines. Members of the American Pharmaceutical Association declared before the United States Commission of 1865 that in consequence of the high price, caused by taxation, there was a marked tendency throughout the country on the part of physicians and others "to keep down the price to the consumer of many official preparations, which absolutely required the use of alcohol, by putting them up at less than their proper official strength; thus inflicting a sanitary injury upon the whole community" but especially the sick. High taxation of alcoholic liquors in the United States has induced an increased consumption of opium and other drugs as a substitute for spirits. Morphia is used chiefly by women because it does not affect the breath and can be concealed about the person. I have been informed by physicians of the highest standing in Canada that they have noticed the same results here. The increase in the consumption of opium in the United States has been enormous. In 1860 the United States imported 119,525 lbs crude opium, and in 1880, 243,211 lbs; in 1871 they imported 12,554 lbs for smoking purposes, and in 1883, 298,153 lbs. A great many people in the United States carry hypodermic needles for personal use. It is folly to ignore the fact that every nation uses stimulants of some kind, and where creed and religion interpose, it is always a vile decoction or a drug. Can those nations of the East who are forbidden by creed and custom teach us morality? They are not true to their own creed. The Brahmins and Turks drink intoxicating liquors in secret. In India they drink horrible mixtures called arrack and koumiss and other native drinks, and indulge in eating and smoking opium, bhang-consuming and betel-chewing. All the great nations, Assyria, Greece, Rome, Persia, England and her colonies, United States, France, Germany and all modern Europe, have used alcohol as a diet, and those nations that have not used it are not as cleanly, long-lived, or vigorous, and can teach us nothing in arts, war, civilization or science.

Individual tastes show a wide diversity in the demand for stimulants. Kant used tea and tobacco, Professor Dawkins, quinine, Darwin, snuff, Edison, tobacco-chewing, Haeckel, coffee, Francillon and Mark Twain, tobacco-smoking and Goethe, wine.

The Church, therefore, in undertaking to solve nice questions in social ethics and political economy is re-introducing a plurality of offices long since discarded. In 1817 a majority of Presbyterians of the Established Church decided against all species of pluralities, and they were accordingly abolished. This action was not simply a declaration that a clergyman cannot properly attend to his parish and to the duties of a professor in some university. It was a declaration that a clergyman who attends to his parish can find no time for the "receiving of prize-money and of money granted to soldiers' wives, and numberless things of this sort, which harassed a clergyman and cut up his time intolerably, which totally secularized him and converted him from a dispenser of the bread of life into a mere dispenser of human benefits." When Dr. Chalmers went to Glasgow he found the people thronging about him and welcoming him, but he soon perceived it was because of his influence in the distribution of charities. He says: "I soon made the people understand that I only dealt in one article, that of Christian instruction," and nevertheless he afterwards found the cordiality of the people enhanced. It was thought that if the Church is to confront the erudition of academic men and compel reverence from the most enlightened or even meet the pretensions of superstition its ministers must devote time to the legitimate recommendations for this purpose. Non-pluralism has been the policy of the Church ever since. The clergy of the Presbyterian Church in Canada in supporting the Scott Act have roamed very far from the pulpit, and will have to acknowledge defeat or continue a protracted and distracting fight over political, social, domestic, economic, physiological and Scriptural questions. It seems to me they are gratuitously taking an unnecessary burden upon themselves, and that if they have time for such disputations the duties of a clergyman must be light indeed.

Even now we find the claim advanced that the intellectual difference between the pastor and his flock has so greatly decreased since Apostolic days that Congregationalism may be the result. And the ill-advised crusades of the clergy are pointed to as a matter of policy because they feel their influence declining and their position insecure.

It might well be asked if the pastor puts his hand on the household and partially governs private affairs, what warrant is there that he will not ultimately endeavour to override the conscientious opinions of the head of the house and try to rule the home? Dr. Chalmers, in his correspondence with Lord Aberdeen, condemned his Bill because it did not give effect to the conscientious dissent of the people, on the ground of the simple fact of that dissent and irrespective of reasons. But the men amongst us, who claim to be acting according to the traditions of the Church, disregard the conscientious dissent of many notwithstanding that it is upheld with valid argument. This is virtually providing against the fallibility of man by providing an infallible law made by man! It is also a declaration that the majority are infallible. But, according to the belief of Presbyterians, man is fallible, and the majority is made up of men. We therefore come to the absurd result that the infallible majority is made up of a number of fallibles.

I might, in answer to the assertion that the Scott Act dispute is not a political question, remind you that the same claim was made by the deputies of the Established Church when they consulted Lord John Russell, but who, nevertheless, intrigued with the leaders of both parties. Opposed as those men were to mixing politics and religion, they found themselves compelled by the situation to run from one party to the other. And the "temperance" people in Canada, while disclaiming politics, are doing the same thing to-day.

I suppose a professor of theology may gain fleeting popularity and perhaps find some solace in the applause of ecclesiastics by referring to a respectable class as "Tom, Dick, Harry and every saloon-keeper and grog-shop keeper"; but it is not unlikely he would have carried more weight with Christian people could he have shown a precedent for his abuse in the language of Christ or His Apostles. What would be thought of these very men who are so much revile