

stances should they be taken, and in what quantity? And, gentlemen, let me say that, upon the advice we give, depends in a great measure the good we can accomplish. With regard to the first question we may answer that he who eats well and sleeps well does not require alcoholic drinks; that the great majority of persons are better without them; that most of the alcohol consumed is worse than useless, the evils consequent on its abuse certainly preponderating over the benefits derived from them." These statements are undeniably correct, because alcohol is a fluid as foreign to the human economy as any that can be named. Even if it were proved that it does undergo in a limited degree an ill-defined process of digestion, even if it were shown to be partially burned up in the tissues of the body, its deleterious effects upon the liver, heart, and nervous system generally are too palpable to be overlooked. If, then, it is not right (in a physiological sense) to drink one drop of alcohol, is not the taking of that drop the *abuse*? If the conclusions of Dr. Carpenter be true (and I have yet to read a refutation of them), that "in the average man the habitual use of alcoholic liquors in moderate or even small quantities is not merely unnecessary for the maintenance of bodily and mental vigor, but is even unfavorable to the permanent enjoyment of health," and that "the effect of the habit is not merely to induce certain predispositions to disease by its own agency, but also to favor almost any of those which may already exist in a latent form," the inference surely is inevitable, that the abuse of claret, port and sherry begins with the first teaspoonful, and not with the fourth glass as Dr. Bayard would have it. This contention is so important, Dr. Bayard places so much value upon the definition of *use* and *abuse*, and refers to them so frequently, that I must emphasize and try to elucidate it. We cannot flirt with physical sins any more than we can with moral misdemeanors; if it be wrong to steal, the embezzlement of 50,000 dollars does not extenuate a petty theft of five cents. It does not justify it, even if it were shown that the greater stealing had caused much destitution and distress, while the five cents had not been missed.

If, to pursue the argument, alcohol has no *locus Standi* in the healthy human economy it is no excuse whatever for drinking a daily glass of beer or wine to say that a dozen glasses of gin per diem will probably sooner or later produce cirrhosis of the liver. Nor does the attempt to illustrate the

other aspect of the case make Dr. Bayard's idea less absurd. If it be illegal to explode fire crackers within the city limits, surely the illegality begins with the explosion of the first cracker, not after the firing of the third package! Judged by his own statements (and Dr. Bayard has certainly reflected the latest *dicta* of these sciences) both physiology and hygiene sternly forbid any kind of vinous or spirituous drinking in any condition of health.

To many minds conclusions arrived at in this way would be all sufficient. The use of alcohol in health (it would appear to them) is simply a scientific problem to be solved (if solvable at all) by the physical sciences, by chemistry, physiology and hygiene, within whose province it rightly lies; and when their combined fiat goes forth to prohibit its use in health the demonstration is complete. And for my own part I am free to confess that I consider it quite possible that a certain indifference to what may be styled the sentimental, conservative and expedient aspects of the temperance question must greatly hinder an appreciation of the effect which they may have on those who are not willing to abide by the decision of science. Laboring under this probable disadvantage I proceed to consider arguments drawn from these other classes.

As an example of the sentimental argument, Dr. Bayard, quite seriously I presume, says: "the remark is often made that the world would be better without alcoholic drinks than with them, that the evil counterbalances any good that may be derived from them. The answer to this is that every nation has its stimulant of some kind, that kind Providence has permitted the *use* of them, and that if they are abused evil consequences follow." And again: "But as I have said before alcoholic drinks have been given to man, and he will continue to use them." Now let it be noted that the answer to the allegation is not an attempt to show that the world would not be better without alcohol, or that more evil than good has *not* resulted from the use of alcoholic beverages, but merely two assertions are made: (1) that every nation employs stimulants of some kind; and (2) that kind Providence has permitted the *use* of them. With every desire to give these assertions all their possible force I am obliged to acknowledge that I fail to see how they have any bearing whatever on the question at issue. The fact that all nations are addicted to stimulants in some form clearly proves (on Dr. Bayard's own showing) that all nations are