

badly afflicted with a mal-hygienic practice, which it behooves them to get rid of as soon as possible. In view of Dr. Bayard's previous admission as to the baneful effects of stimulants, his *answer* rather confirms than disproves the statement to which it is intended to serve as a reply. It seems evident that, if it be wrong to lie as well as wrong to drink, it is just as little justification for the former sin to say that men have been liars since the days of Adam as it justifies drinking to say that they have been drunkards since the time of Noah.

The second section of the answer, although frequently thrust forward as a reason why drinking habits should be tolerated, has, even less cogency than the first part. If it be stated that Providence really does approve of and sanction the employment of alcohol in health I should neither agree nor disagree with the statement, for I do not know anything about it; but if He does approve of its use there can be no shadow of doubt but that He sanctions (on Dr. Bayard's own showing) the employment of a very bad thing, and that the sooner He puts His veto on it the sooner will He deserve the adjective with which Dr. Bayard qualifies His name.

However, while we avoid, as out of place here the theological question, and all it involves, as to whether the use of wine is advocated in the Bible,* something may be said relative to the statement that "alcoholic drinks have been given to man." Presuming that Dr. Bayard refers to the usual form in which this excuse for drinking is put, viz., that alcohol forms part of the materials necessary to man, is "one of God's creatures" to use the common expression, and consequently man is allowed its use—starting out with this premise, and admitting for the moment that, in consequence of this donation on the part of the Almighty, man has a right to *drink* it, an extension of this latter conclusion to other "gifts of God" will show its absurdity.

The kernels of the peach, the cherry laurel, etc.,

* Lees' "Text-Book" (page 116) has the following: "Among *certain* facts, these may be affirmed:—1. That the Bible nowhere *condemns* abstinence from strong drinks. 2. That the Bible nowhere associates *God's blessing* with the use of strong drinks. 3. That the Bible, in various ways, *commends* abstinence from strong drinks. 4. That the Bible, in various and emphatic methods, exhibits the *manifold evils* of strong drinks. 5. That the Bible is the first book that proclaimed abstinence to be the *cure* for drunkenness. 6. That the great principle of the Bible—*philanthropy*—enforces the practice of abstinence.

yield on distillation a liquid largely made up of hydrocyanic acid. It is very likely that the acid forms spontaneously in these and other vegetable products. Alcohol, on the other hand, is never found as a natural product in healthy vegetable tissues. The decomposition of saccharine solutions, as a result of a presence of the *torula cerevisiae*, is the method of obtaining it that most nearly approaches a natural process. The gift argument probably applies, as a consequence, with greater force to the employment of prussic acid as a drink than to alcoholic mixtures! If some rare plant were discovered in the centre of the African continent capable of secreting wine in the same way the cocoa-nut supplies milk, or the "traveller's friend" furnishes water, I doubt not but that it would be served up as a strong confirmation of the assertion that a beneficent Creator approves of its use as a beverage, else why did He prepare it?

If, instead of containing petroleum, limestone pockets were found to be filled with gin, would not both moderate and immoderate drinkers be pleased to thank a far-seeing Providence for the wise provision thus made for His thirsty children of coming generations?

But though the products of the *laurus cerasus* and the coal measures are not alcoholic, they are yet "gifts of God" in the same sense that wine is; and the man who sees fit to use as a drink either bitter almond oil or unrefined coal oil may properly do so, for have they not been given to him?

It would be taking up too much room to consider in its entirety the question whether every nation is of necessity wedded to stimulants that will compare in their effects with alcohol, but this may be said with confidence—even if such were proven to be the case it is no argument in favor of the use of those stimulants—none whatever.

But even a superficial view of the assertion will show it to be altogether too sweeping. What stimulant, what national stimulant, do the Mohammedans make use of that will bear comparison with alcohol? What means the significant phrase employed by these people when one of their number has got drunk on the forbidden juice of the grape, "He has left Mohammed and gone to Jesus"?

To name almost every nation that has succumbed to the two most potent factors in Anglo-Saxon domination, viz., "hell and bayonets," is simply the bringing to mind millions who have