

Professor Chas. T. Jackson, M.D., formerly Prof. of Chemistry at Harvard, said that "alcohol and all alcoholic liquors act as foods" and in reply to the question whether the question of alcohol acting as food was unresolved? answered, "I do not consider it unresolved. It is not so considered by scientific men generally. There may be some doubts raised by some persons; but I think that the opinion of scientific men generally is the same on that point."

Dr. Anstie, the celebrated physiologist and writer, and late Prof. of Toxicology at Westminster Hospital, in his classical work on "Stimulant Narcotics" gives undoubted proof that alcohol should be classed as food. Dr. Pavy, in his recent work on "Food and Dietetics," after lengthy references to Anstie and Dupre, says, "From a review of the evidence as it at present stands, it may reasonably be inferred that there is sufficient before us to justify the conclusion that the main portion of alcohol ingested becomes destroyed within the system; and, if this be the case, it may be fairly assumed that the destruction is attended with oxidation, and a corresponding liberation of force."

But, to close the question of the "food" value of alcohol, let me refer you to the "Manual of Dietetics" just issued from the press, and from the pen of J. Milner Fothergill, M.D., of Edinburgh: "These last, and their names are both numerous and weighty, hold that alcohol is largely burnt in the body by oxidation, and is therefore a 'fuel-food.' Personally, after very considerable attention to the subject, I must say that I am among those who hold 'that the chief portion of the alcohol ingested undergoes consumption in the body.'" It is therefore, according to the latest authority on dietetics, to be classed with the starches and fats. And here I would like to draw the attention of this audience to the fact that, from the time of Anstie down to the present, no authority on dietetics has questioned the above.

So much for its being a food. Yet many of our opponents say, "It can not be food, for it is eliminated from the body unchanged." I need only say in reply, that the authorities just quoted are more recent than the three French chemists whose erroneous conclusion embraced in the foregoing has long since been repudiated. Even Dr. Richardson has the common honesty to give that argument up. In his Cantor Lectures he admits the fact that alcohol is decomposed in the body; nay, more, that it may be and is manufactured in the body. "In plain words Dr. Dupre's discovery suggests that no man can be in strict scientific sense, a non-alcoholic, inasmuch as, will he nill he, he brews in his own economy, a 'wee drap.' It is an innocent brew certainly; but it is brewed, and the most ardent abstainer must excuse it. 'Argal, he that is not guilty of his own death shorteneth not his own life.' The fault, if it be one, rests with Nature who, according to our poor estimates, is no more faultless than the rest of her sex."

Another favourite assertion of the teetotallers is that "because alcohol is poisonous in excessive quantities, it must of necessity be injurious in small doses." It would fare ill with humanity if this logic were sound, for it can readily be shown that there is nothing in the nature of an alimentary principle which is not injurious in excessive quantities. Salt, an article indispensable to the sustenance of life, is, when taken in excess a virulent poison. Orfila mentions several cases of death by its agency. Vinegar, mustard, pepper, tea, coffee, all contain principles which, taken in excess, are poisonous, and if the above logic were sound their use would be highly reprehensible.

But this is my opinion, you say. It is the opinion of the vast majority of physiologists and chemists. It is the opinion of Brunton, Anstie, Dupre, Thudichum, Pavy, Moleschott, King Chambers, and the many other authorities I have already quoted. Let us hear the Queen's physician on this point, Sir James Paget, Bart., F.R.C.S., D.C.L., L.L.D., F.R.S.:—"Then we have some deductions from physiological observations which are supposed to indicate a mischief in even habitual moderation. But some of these are really such that, if in the place of 'alcohol' we were to read 'common salt,' we should be led to conclude, if it were not for the experience to the contrary, that we are destroying ourselves by the daily excessive use of a material