

ment: and it is a great mistake in the upper ranks, to suppose that courtesy and forms of civility are less regarded by the lower classes than by themselves. In fact some etiquettes are much more binding on the lower classes than among their superiors; and in no case is the tyranny of fashion more palpable than in the regulations of drinking. That workman, therefore, who refuses to join a temperance society, on the ground that he can either drink or not as he pleases, is under the greatest mistake; he supposes himself a free agent, but he is not so. The most pitiful tippler that crawls the streets can force that man to drink, not, doubtless, by pouring liquor down his throat, but by assailing him on some of the foregoing etiquettes and customs, when, so far from being free, he will prove himself a slave to the most servile principles of imitation and conformity; and it seems now generally allowed, that the influence of these rules and customs, more than any physical craving causes intemperance.

When a gentleman asks a labourer, servant or mechanic to join a temperance society, he, in his ignorance, believes that he merely requires this individual to give up whiskey; but he, in fact, asks him to go in the face of usages which are in general exceedingly difficult to break through; for the new temperance member must not only refrain from his usual beverage, but in the course of a week has perhaps to reverse many rules and customs of drinking, while the said gentleman, by continuing his own wine courtesies, maintains the very system which the working man finds difficulty in combating.

It seems absolutely necessary that ladies and gentlemen should give up the complimentary use of liquors themselves, if they would see the country reclaimed from intemperance. Louis XIV had the sagacity to perceive the link between the complimentary use of strong drink and national inebriation, for he banished health drinking from his court. It is a pity that the dictate of the general assembly of Scottish divines was not followed, whose wisdom led them to enact a similar regulation, which is now not only obsolete, but considered impertinent and useless.

Original Articles.

The traffic in ardent spirit is immoral, except for medicinal, manufacturing and chemical purposes.

"Most of the powerful vegetable poisons, such as henbane, hemlock, thorn-apple, prussic acid, foxglove, poison sumack, &c., have an effect on the animal system,

scarcely to be distinguished from that of morphia and nicotin, or opium and tobacco. The operation of alcohol is also very similar. These poisons produce nausea, vertigo, vomiting, exhalation of spirits for a time, and subsequent stupor, and even total insensibility; and so does alcohol.

They impair the organs of digestion, and may bring on fatuity, palsy, delirium or apoplexy; and so may alcohol. These effects usually follow in a slight degree from spirit, because the alcohol is so much diluted. Even spirit of proof contains but 50 parts of alcohol in 100, yet seven drams introduced into the stomach of a rabbit, produced death in an hour and a quarter; and six drams proved fatal to a robust dog in three and a half hours; nor are the cases rare in which alcohol thus diluted, has proved fatal to men. Now all the virulent poisons if mixed with other substances, so as to be less concentrated, may be used for a long time, even habitually, without seeming to produce any very injurious effect. A horse may take a dram of arsenic daily, and continue to thrive; and a very small quantity seems not to affect a man.

"On every organ they touch" says an eminent physician, Ebenezer Alden, M.D. of Massachusetts, "ardent spirits operate as a poison. To a man in health, there is no such thing as a temperate use of spirits. In any quantity they are an enemy to the human constitution; their influence upon the physical organs is unfavourable to health and life. They produce weakness, not strength; sickness, not health; death, not life."

"Does a healthy labouring man need alcohol? No more than he needs arsenic, corrosive sublimate or opium."

"Sir Astley Cooper, of England, states that spirits and poisons are synonymous terms; and Dr. D. Drake, of Ohio, speaks of them as a deadly poison. He says, "Ardent spirits are a great quickener and disturber of the animal system; a warm and irritating poison; in moderate doses imparting an unnatural excitement; in excessive draughts suddenly extinguishing life; thus resembling in their effects a number of deleterious substances, such as stramonium, hemlock, prussic acid and opium, which we label as poisons."

"In the bill of mortality of the city of New York, it is stated that seventy-six were killed by intemperance the last year."

"The College of Physicians in Philadelphia, after a careful examination, have given it as their opinion that seven hundred deaths were occasioned by intemperance in that city; and the physicians of Annapolis have given it as their opinion, that half the men over eighteen years of age who died in one year in that city, were killed in the same way.

"The subscribers physicians of Boston having been requested by the directors of the Boston society for the promotion of temperance to give their opinion in regard to the effects of ardent spirits, hereby declare it to be their opinion that men's health are never benefited by the use of ardent spirits; that on the contrary, the use of them is a frequent cause of disease and death, and often renders such diseases as arise from other causes, more difficult of cure, and more fatal in their termination.

Similar declarations have been subscribed and published by more than three thousand physicians in Great Britain and the United States.

These facts then are distinctly made out. 1st. Alcohol, and of course the liquor of which it constitutes a large portion, is a poison. 2d. Death in countless instances and in horrid forms is the consequence of its use. 3d. The dealer knows these results.

Yet in full view of these facts he persists in the trade. On the rigid principles of law and justice then, he is accessory to these deaths, says Hawkins, in his plea of the crown, "If a man does an act, of which the probable consequence may be, and eventually is death; such killing may be murder, although no murder may be primarily intended. And when the dealer does such an act, of which the probable consequence may be, and eventually is death, such killing may be murder, though no murder was primarily intended."

Suppose a merchant of our city has ordered a large quantity of flour: when it arrives he ascertains that a quantity of arsenic has been mingled with it. In some of the barrels there is very little, perhaps not enough to destroy life; in others, there is sufficient to ensure certain death to consumers.

The trader does not know the particular individuals who will be killed by the use of the flour; he does not know but some of it will be used by the bookbinders for paste, in which case the poison will hurt no one; but he does not know, that it he sells that flour indiscriminately, many will die in consequence. He hesitates; if he sells it, he becomes accessory to murder. If he does not sell it, perhaps he will be ruined, his family will suffer, and he may become a bankrupt. He does not wish to kill any one, but he does wish for the money consequent on the sale. He does sell it; twenty or a hundred persons die in consequence.

Is that right or wrong? Is that transaction moral, or immoral? Is the immorality of it lessened by the fact that the merchant who perpetrates so foul a deed is a gen-