

And he adds: "Judging from my observation, lager beer is quite as likely to generate murders and crime as the stronger liquors."

Judge Pitman, of Massachusetts, in his admirable work, "Alcohol and the State,"—a book crowded with startling facts,—reviewing the Beer legislation in that State, gives many instances of the increase of crime after the beer vendors and their sympathizers had succeeded in exempting beer from the operation of the law prohibiting the sale of intoxicants. A noticeable instance is thus cited by him: "In New Bedford, the records of the police court prove, that in 1872 after eight months of free beer, there was, as compared with 1871, a year of strict prohibition, an increase of sixty eight per cent. in the aggregate crime, and of over one hundred and twenty per cent. in cases of drunkenness." He cites the District Attorney of Worcester County, to this effect: "The testimony in our criminal courts is to the effect that a majority of crimes there investigated are committed under the influence of beer or a stronger liquor sold under cover of the beer traffic." And he asks us to "weigh well the pregnant suggestion made by the District Attorney of Essex: 'I am inclined to believe that beer not only creates an appetite for something stronger, but that its immediate influence and effect upon crime is more dangerous to the community than the stronger liquors in this way: the excessive use of the stronger drinks is liable to make men drunk and helpless, unable to do much harm, while beer excites men to acts of violence, desperation and crime.'" More recently the *Congregationalist*, published in Boston, has said:

"We know a man who for twelve years has never used any liquor save beer. He comes home from his elegant store, behind his handsome pair of horses, and make his home a terror. He runs after his wife with an axe, and makes a beast of himself in a thousand ways." It also adds: "We know another man who uses only beer who has beaten his wife so as to make her helpless for days, was dead drunk on beer when the neighbors helped bury his infant son, and has repeatedly knocked down and beaten his girl of eight and boy of five."

A New Jersey, and a Chicago brewer, each declare, on leaving the business, that it is iniquitous. Says the former:

"Three years ago I stopped drinking any kind of beer or liquor, and have not tasted a drop since. Lately I began to think that it was inconsistent for me to make for others what I deemed hurtful to myself. When I finally came to the conclusion that my business was wrong, and that to continue it would simply be to outrage my conscience, I promptly resolved to stop, and I have done it. I suppose that a good many Germans will take offence at what I have done, and I am very sorry. The brewers, too, will be offended; but, once convinced, as I am, that intemperance is the great curse of the world, I shall never have anything to do again with beer-making. Since getting out of the traffic, I have felt like a new man—as though a load had been lifted from my conscience."

And the other, Mr. William Lill, at a meeting held in Chicago, announced his purpose neither to rebuild, nor own another brewery, saying:

"It was a business that demoralized both master and man. He had found it impossible to keep sober men on his premises. It was a manufactory of drunkards in constant operation; and the curse began in the brewery itself, where every man was a beer-barrel in the morning and a barrel of beer at night. He would have no more of it. He would be content to make less money in some other way."

"At this point an old acquaintance in the audience called out, 'Lill, what are we to do for that excellent ale of yours?' Mr. Lill answered, 'Do without, and be the better for it.'"

The citation of similar evidence might be continued at length. It seems to me to be overwhelming and unanswerable proof that fermented beverages are not what the advocates of their use assure us, healthful drinks which ought to be exempted from prohibitory action; but that they are beverages demonstrably containing the seeds of violence and crime.

III. Equally fatal are the physical effects of fermented drinks as manifest in disease and premature death. The evidence which I present you on this branch of the subject is not made up by temperance men, seeking to bolster up a philanthropic theory; but chiefly by business men, watching for gain, and impatient of whatever interferences with their pecuniary profits. I allude to the managers of Life Insurance Companies, who have no sentiment whatever in the matter, but deal with the question purely on business principles; and from these exclusively economic considerations they warn the public against the dangers and increased death-rate involved in beer-drinking. *The Pacific Medical Journal* published not long since, an article strongly condemnatory of the custom of beer-drinking. This article the Home Life Insurance Company of New York, has deemed it desirable to reprint for more general distribution. Attention is called in it to the fact that "the fashion of the present day in the United States sets strongly toward the substitution of beer for other stimulating liquors;" a fact which "is one of great magnitude and deserves the attention of medical men as well as that of the moralist." Dr. Astley Cooper's testimony, based on his experience in Guy's Hospital, London, is given, that "the beer drinkers from the London breweries, though presenting the appearance of rugged health, were the most incapable of all classes to resist disease; that trifling injuries among them were liable to lead to the most serious consequences; and that so prone were they to succumb to disease that they would sometimes die from gangrene in wounds as trifling as the scratch of a pin." The article concludes by saying of the proposed encouragement of the beer traffic that it is "cause for apprehension and alarm that just as public opinion, professional and unprofessional, is uniting all over the world in the condemnation of the common use of ardent spirits, the portals of danger and death are opening wide in another direction."

The Home Insurance Company is not alone in sounding the alarm. Says Col. Jacob L. Greene, President of the Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance Company:

"I protest against the notion so prevalent and so industriously urged that beer is harmless, and a desirable substitute for the more concentrated liquors. What beer may be, and what it may do in other countries and climates, I do not know from observation. That in this country and climate its use is an evil only less than the use of whiskey, if less on the whole, and that its effect is only longer delayed, not so immediately and obviously bad, its incidents not so repulsive, so destructive in the end, I have seen abundant proof. In one of our largest cities, containing a great population of beer-drinkers, I had occasion to note the deaths among a large group of persons whose habits, in their own eyes and in those of their friends and physicians, were temperate, but they were habitual users of beer. When the observation began, they were, upon the average, something under middle age, and they were, of course, selected lives. For two or three years there was nothing very remarkable to be noted among this group. Presently death began to strike it; and, until it had dwindled to a fraction of its original proportions, the mortality in it was astounding in extent, and still more remarkable in the manifest identity of cause and mode. There was no mistaking it, the history was almost invariable. Robust, apparent health, full muscles, a fair outside, increasing weight, florid faces; then a touch of cold, or a sniff of malaria, and instantly some acute disease, with almost invariably typhoid symptoms, was in violent action, and ten days or less ended it. It was as if the system had been kept fair outside while within it was eaten to a shred, and at the first touch of disease there was utter collapse, every fibre was poisoned and weak. And this, in its main features, varying of course in degree, has been my observation of beer-drinking everywhere. It is peculiarly deceptive at first; it is thoroughly destructive at the last."

With him agrees the President of the Connecticut General Life Insurance Company, Thos. W. Russell: "I have no doubt the results are correctly stated by Col. Greene. Pneumonia, typhoid fever, inflammation of the brain, of the bowels, etc., are not unfrequently given as the cause of death, when it should be truthfully added directly induced by the use of such beverages."

Also Geo. C. Ripley, President of the Home Life Insurance Company: "Our experience as a rule, confirms that of Col. Greene. It indicates that malt liquors used habitually, even through moderately, cause an increase of mortality."

The President of the United States Life Insurance Company, T. H. Brosman, says: "Our experience has been very much more limited than the experience of the Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance Company, but so far as it has gone, and to the extent of our own powers of observation, whether speaking officially or personally, we believe that Col. Greene's views represent the facts. There are, of course, cases where persons are advised to take and are benefited by taking malt liquors daily. But when persons are addicted to the habitual use of ale or beer daily, it would be hard to define the limits within which they could be called moderate drinkers. The ability to attend to business is not a test to be relied on."

J. B. Temple, President of the Southern Mutual Life Insurance Company, Ky., says: "I cannot say that I have such wide experience as Col. Greene's, but I do not doubt the correctness of his conclusions. In the case of moderate drinking either of malt or spirituous liquors, there is small hope that the habitual drinker will remain a moderate one."

A. G. Bullock, President of the State Mutual Life Insurance Company, says: "I have not examined the subject as thoroughly as Col. Greene, and cannot answer, therefore, with as much confidence from personal knowledge. But generally, I will answer, my experience confirms that narrated by him. My experience is that the habitual use of beer, ale, etc., even by moderate drinkers, increases mortality."

Stephen Ball, Secretary of the Hartford Life and Annuity Insurance Company, says: "From our general observations, we should take it for granted that a careful examination of our mortality experience would not fail to confirm the experience of Col. Greene."

Samuel C. Huey, President of the Pennsylvania Mutual Life Insurance Company, says: "My experience confirms to a great degree the experience of Col. Greene. I consider that malt liquors taken habitually by a moderate drinker, tend to increase mortality."

J. H. Nitchin, Secretary of the National Life Insurance Company, U. S. of A., says: "In general our experience justifies the conclusion expressed by Col. Greene." And Chas. Dewey, President of the same Company, says: "Our experience confirms that of Col. Greene, of the Connecticut Mutual Life. Mortality, in our opinion, is increased by the habitual use of malt liquors, beer, ale, etc."

Recently the following statement has been going the rounds of the public press:

"A short time ago one of the largest and most conservative life insurance companies withdrew from business in Indiana on the discovery that the deaths in that State exceeded the tables of mortality. The president of the company proceeded to make a detailed investigation, and in his report he asserts that beer-drinking was carried to great excess in three or four counties, and that in those is where the unexpected loss of life occurred."

There is, I repeat, no sentiment in these statements. They are in the interest of, and prompted by, the most cold-blooded calculations of pecuniary gain.

What they thus testify, the medical profession throughout the civilized world declares to be true. Notably pertinent in this direction is the recently published testimony of the physicians and surgeons of Toledo, Ohio. Says one of their number, Dr. S. H. Burgen:

"I think beer kills quicker than any other kind of liquor. My attention was first called to the insidious effects of beer-drinking years ago, when I began examining