

THE VANGUARD.

OCTOBER, 1894.

THE PLEBISCITE IN NOVA SCOTIA.

The Sons of Temperance in Nova Scotia claim that they originated the movement for a plebiscite on prohibition in Canada. They base this claim on the action of their Grand Division at the annual session held in Halifax in November, 1887. On recommendation of the Committee on the State of the Order it was resolved: "That the executive of this Grand Division be empowered to communicate with the executives of other Grand Divisions of the Dominion, and ask for concerted action in an appeal to the Government and Parliament of the Dominion for the passage of an Act, at an early date, providing for submitting, within the borders of Canada, the question of prohibition of the liquor traffic to a 'Yes' or 'No' vote of the electorate of the whole Dominion."

This is claimed to be the beginning of what is now so well known as the Prohibition Plebiscite movement. Though it may not be easy to trace the connection between that action and the plebiscite as so far realized, there can be no doubt that the seed then sown amidst opposition and fears has already borne abundant fruit, but which is, we trust, only the first-fruits of the grand harvest to be

gathered in when prohibition shall have become a living reality.

The intention, as the resolution shows, was to have the vote taken under the direction of the Dominion Government. Efforts were made to carry out this intention, but without success, until in 1892 the action of temperance workers in Manitoba gave a new turn to the movement in having the vote taken by provinces. It was not, however, until after P. E. Island and Ontario had both followed the example of Manitoba that Nova Scotia came into line on this new plan.

At the quarterly session of Grand Division, held in Lunenburg in August, 1893, it was agreed to petition the Provincial Government and Legislature to pass an Act for the taking of a plebiscite on the question of prohibition in connection with the general election to be held in 1894. As a result very largely signed petitions were presented, an Act was passed in accordance with their prayer, and the vote on prohibition was taken on the 15th of March, 1894. The time for work was short, for very soon after the legislature was prorogued, the House was dissolved, and the election brought on in about a month. But the time was well utilized. A provincial convention was held in Halifax as soon as possible, followed by various County and District conventions, and the whole province was well organized. The W. C. T. U. did excellent work in circulating literature, and in otherwise helping to make the campaign a success. Many meetings were held, and it is safe to say, that never before did the great question of Prohibition get such an airing in Nova Scotia. In many places the candidates at their meetings explained how the vote was to be taken. The presiding officer at each polling booth was required to tender to every voter a prohibition ballot, so that if he did not want to vote he had to decline the ballot.

One feature of the campaign is to be noted, the liquor party made no attempt to hold meetings to advocate their cause in public, and even through the press did but little, though doubtless they did all they could privately. The views of one Ontario clergyman figured in the anti-prohibition literature of the campaign. A three column article by Rev. R. H. Dixon of Hamilton was inserted in one of our papers at advertising rates by those interested in the liquor traffic, thus furnishing an illustration of the eagerness with which the liquor party lays hold of any utterances of clergymen in favor of moderate drinking, and gives them undue prominence as upholding the saloon and bar-room with their varied accessories of evil—an interpretation which the writers or speakers do not wish their words to bear. Such utterances, however, are sure to be eagerly caught up, and unfairly used by those favoring the liquor traffic, thus placing their authors in a wrong light before the public. Such facts should lead men to weigh very carefully any words they may speak or write on the anti-side of the Prohibition question.

As full figures of the vote were given in the VANGUARD for May it is unnecessary to repeat them here, but a few general remarks may be in place,

(1) It is not probable that any party or policy has ever been sustained by such a large vote in the history of the province.

(2) The vote of 12,355 against Prohibition represents nearly the full strength of the anti-prohibition sentiment of the province, and that is only a little more than one-seventh of the electorate. But, even if we should include 10,711 who voted for candidates, but not on Prohibition, and that is conceding a good deal, we have only 23,066, or a little over one-fourth of those whose names are on the voters' lists.

(3) On the other hand the 43,756 who voted for Prohibition represent only a part of the Prohibition sentiment. Behind these are nearly all the women of the Province, about equal in number to the whole electorate. Then again there are the large number of young people, many of whom are amongst the most active temperance workers, and, still further, we may well count in the thousands of boys and girls who are being educated in the principles of Temperance, and who are sound prohibitionists. Thus it can be seen that the number of those in favor of Prohibition is very large in proportion to the whole population.

(4) The total number of qualified voters is just about one-fifth of the population, and as has been noted those who voted against Prohibition, and those who voted for candidates but not for prohibition, were only a little more than one-fourth of the electorate, therefore the full strength of the anti-Prohibition sentiment is just about one-fourth of one-fifth or about one-twentieth of the population. Let us, however, drop one-fifth for those who are too young to have an intelligent opinion on the subject, and we still have left only ONE-SIXTEENTH who favor the continuance of the liquor traffic, we believe, therefore, that it is safe to say that, after leaving off one-fifth of the population as too young to be counted, Prohibition sentiment stands to the sentiment in favor of the liquor traffic, in Nova Scotia as SIXTEEN to ONE. No doubt the same calculations will apply to the other provinces that have voted on the question. The proportion for Ontario is a little smaller.

(5) In dealing with a great moral question like Prohibition the opinion of the vast majority of the population, including women and young people who have no votes, deserves consideration, for they are as deeply interested in the matter as are any of the electorate, and in very many cases the women and children are the greatest sufferers from

the liquor traffic, and have the best reason to cry out for Prohibition.

The report on temperance presented to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, after briefly summing up the results of the plebiscite, says, upon the strength of reports received from all parts of the Dominion :

“The Prohibition sentiment which has slowly but steadily rolled up for years, and which is now rising with striking rapidity, is evidently gathering itself into a mighty torrent that cannot be much longer restrained but must carry away in its rush, like a Johnstown flood, those forces that vainly strive to hold it back, be they men or money, liquors or legislators, groggeries or governments, for God and the right must surely win the day. Look at our schools where our children are taught temperance ; look at the many juvenile societies where they are pledged against strong drink ; look at our Sabbath Schools where by lesson and pledge our children are led into the paths of sobriety as a Christian duty ; look at our Young People’s Christian Endeavor and kindred societies, and measure, if possible, the irresistible power of intelligent, healthful prohibition sentiment that is even now rising before us with a God-sent prophecy of the coming victory, ‘for God and home and native land.’ Will some still be skeptical? Ours must be the faith that works by love, and never ceases to hope while it works.”

Upper Stewiacke, N. S.

D. STILES FRASER.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRESS IN GREAT BRITAIN.

The controversy in Great Britain over the different legislative proposals for the control of the liquor traffic has directed attention to the progress made in temperance legislation during recent years. It has been shown that the United Kingdom Alliance offered very effective opposition to a number of measures which, if enacted, would have materially strengthened the liquor traffic. The Alliance also supported a number of restrictive legislative measures and made a specialty of urging legislation providing for local option. Since 1874 a Permissive Bill has been four times before the House of Commons, a Local Option resolution was defeated twice, but carried three times, a Scottish Local Veto Bill was read a second time, a Welsh Direct Veto Bill twice passed a second reading. Other measures which were carried into actual effect are detailed as follows:—

1877. Meldon's Irish Beerhouses Act was passed, closing 557 beerhouses in Dublin alone.

1878. Irish Sunday Closing Bill passed.

1879. Welsh Sunday Closing Bill passed.

1882. Ritchie's Beer Licenses Amendment Bill was passed, leading to 34 beer licenses being suppressed in one year at Over-Darwen alone.

1883. Payment of wages in public-houses was prohibited.

1887. Truck Act Amendment Bill was passed, prohibiting part payment of wages in drink.

1887. Scottish Early Closing Bill passed, resulting in closing every liquor shop at 10 p. m. in places with under 50,000 inhabitants.

1888. Liquor traffic prohibited among the North Sea Fishing Fleet.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

In the North American Review for October is an article by Archbishop John Ireland of St. Paul, Min., in which he discusses at some length the nature, meaning and probable effect of the recent action of Mgr. Francis Satolli, Apostolic delegate in confirming the action of the Bishop of Columbus. Details of the action were set out in the August VANGUARD. Bishop Ireland's article is valuable as showing the interpretation put by a leading Catholic Bishop upon the deliverances referred to. Most Reverend John Ireland stands deservedly high in the estimation of the Catholic community. He is a known friend of temperance in personal practice and legislative enactment. His clear statements are so forcible and of so much interest at the present time that we think it wise to reproduce them in full for the information of our readers. They are as follows:—

“However limited in their immediate application, decisions of high courts usually work out far-reaching results. They set forth the spirit of laws and institutions and establish a standard of action which provokes compliance. This is decidedly the fact in the ruling of ecclesiastical law, recently handed down by the appellate court of the apostolic delegate, Mgr. Francis Satolli, which sustains the edict of the Bishop of Columbus, excluding liquor-dealers from office, or even membership, in Catholic associations.

THE HISTORY OF THE CASE.

“Some months ago the Rt. Rev. John A. Watterson, Bishop of Columbus, published for his diocese the law that no existing Catholic society, or branch or division thereof, shall be allowed to have a liquor-dealer or a saloon-keeper at its head or among its officers ; and that no new Catholic society, or new branch of an old organization, shall be formed which would admit even to membership any person engaged, whether as principal or as agent, in the manufacture or sale of intoxicating liquors. A supplementary clause of the episcopal edict excludes from the sacraments of the church saloon-keepers who persist in selling liquor on Sundays, or otherwise conduct their business in an unlawful manner.

“From this law an appeal was taken by a society of the diocese of Columbus to the highest Catholic tribunal in the United States, that of the apostolic delegate, and in due time a decision was given sustaining the bishop in all points. ‘Those three things,’ writes Mgr. Satolli, ‘which are expressed in the letter of the right reverend bishop, have the approval, not only of Catholics, but of non-Catholics in your city ; not only being in harmony with the laws of the church, but also seasonable and necessary to the honor of the church, especially in Ohio. Therefore, those things which the right reverend bishop has commanded in his decree I approve, and I decide that they are to be observed. And if, perhaps, for the time being they seem to hurt the material interests of some, this will have to be patiently endured for the good of the many and the honor of the holy Catholic Church.’ The law of the bishop is affirmed, and the reasons of the law are accepted and approved by the delegate.

WHAT THE DECISION MEANS.

“The law as made by Bishop Watterson and ratified by the delegate is confined to the diocese of Columbus. At

the same time a notable victory over the saloon has been won for the whole United States. It is plain that, if other bishops issue like laws for their respective territories, their action will be sustained by the higher powers. Whatever may be done within other jurisdictions, whether bishops consider the saloon power already so sufficiently curbed in their dioceses as to render further restrictive measures unnecessary, or whether this power is so reckless that prudence counsels more cautious methods of attack, the American saloon is branded with the disfavor of the church. Henceforth Catholic public opinion frowns upon the saloon and the saloon-keeper; saloon-keeping is a disreputable business, and the saloon-keeper, however correctly he conducts his particular saloon, still, because of the general malodorousness of the business in which he is engaged, must not, and will not, be permitted to appear in any capacity as a representative of the church or as a prominent Catholic; he must and will be kept aloof from all places of honor and distinction in the church.

A DOOMED INSTITUTION.

"The action of Bishop Watterson and of Monsignor Satolli makes no general law for the church in America, but it forms Catholic public opinion for the whole country, and public opinion is often more potent than law. As to its effects, the saloon in Ohio is much the same as the saloon throughout the United States; the opprobrium which it incurs in Ohio deservedly falls on it in other states, whether this opprobrium is there crystallized or not into a law; the hands which in Ohio drive the saloon into obloquy practically mete out to it the same penalty throughout the country. Whoever understands the force of religious public opinion among Catholics will easily read the signs of the times, and perceive that among the Catholics of America the saloon is a doomed institution;

saloon-keeping is a disgraced business, from which Catholic instinct will shrink.

GREAT PROGRESS MADE.

“The American saloon has of late fared ill at the hands of the Catholic Church. In 1884, the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, the decrees of which were approved by his Holiness Pope Leo XIII., bids Catholics who may be engaged in saloon-keeping to leave this business and ‘choose, if they at all can, some other more decent method of making a livelihood.’ Now comes the decision of Bishop Watterson and Mgr. Satolli, telling saloon-keepers that Catholic societies cannot afford to tolerate their presence. Things have moved far since the days when saloon-keepers acted as if they were leaders and princes of the people.

“No small share of opposition has in certain quarters been manifested to the decision of Mgr. Satolli, and considerable efforts have been made to distort its meaning and minimize its influence. This was naturally, to be expected, and one need hardly take pains to give reply. The decision will, of its own momentum, work out its results; time will justify its wisdom and secure for its illustrious author the grateful blessings of religion and of society.

A BAD INTERPRETATION.

“One view taken by the opponents of the decision should, perhaps, be noticed on account of the notoriety which it has received through certain classes of newspapers. The real point in the letter of Mgr. Satolli is, we are told, the refusal to set aside an order promulgated by a bishop; the delegate simply declines to nullify a regulation prescribed by the Bishop of Columbus for his own diocese; and, hence, nothing can be deduced from the words of the decision which would bear unfavorably upon the saloon. An interpretation of this kind betrays ignorance, not only of the meaning of a decision of an appellate court, but even

of the very words in which the decision is couched. No appellate court worthy of the name, not, surely, that of Mgr. Satolli, sustains the decision of a lower court merely on the ground of giving the latter comfort and support ; it sustains the decision on the sole ground that the reasons alleged for it are of sufficient weight and cogency. In upholding Bishop Watterson's decree, Mgr. Satolli necessarily judges, with him, that the saloon in America is a nuisance so baneful and malodorous that the church, for her own honor and in pursuance of her mission to propagate good morals and to save souls, must make plain her disapproval of it. Moreover, Mgr. Satolli makes use of words which leave no doubt as to his own mind on the subject. He says :—

“ ‘ Those three things expressed in the letter of the right reverend bishop have the approval, not only of Catholics, but of non-Catholics in your city ; not only being in harmony with the laws of the church, but also seasonable and necessary to the honor of the church, especially in Ohio.’ ”

“ The delegate is a man who thinks with judgment, and writes in terse, clear language, his meaning stands in need of no commentary.

SALOON KEEPING IS BAD.

“ The Bishop of Columbus does not refuse to saloon-keepers or liquor dealers, as such, the sacraments of the church. The refusal of sacraments is one of the last penalties inflicted by the church upon her members. The threat of this penalty is seldom made to classes of men ; it is reserved, rather, for the individual, in retribution of his own personal acts. In the tribunal of penance the saloon-keeper is held responsible for what he personally does, and not for what his class do ; outside this tribunal, in foro externo, he may more easily be made to suffer from the shame which belongs to his fellows. Catholic theology does not teach that saloon-keeping is, in itself, a sin. If

the saloon-keeper happens to be the ideal one—never selling to men who are likely to become intoxicated, never selling to minors in violation of the law of the land, never opening his saloon on Sunday, never voluntarily allowing around his counter blasphemy or obscene language, never turning his saloon into a den of unjust and injurious political machinations, in a word, observing in his business the whole moral law, divine and civil—he may be absolved and admitted to communion. Further than this the bishop does not let him pass. Saloon-keeping, as a rule, the bishop decides, is practically bad, and productive of many evils ; over it hangs a heavy cloud of social and religious disgrace ; even the ideal saloon-keeper cannot rid himself of its shame, and upon him, as upon his whole class, the church frowns in anger and sorrow, and amid Catholic gatherings and Catholic works she bids him retire to corners of silence and obscurity.

IT IS RESPONSIBLE.

“In all that is being said the American saloon alone is considered. We are not now dealing with the saloon or its substitutes in other countries, where matters may be better or worse and requiring a different treatment.

“The American saloon is responsible for the awful intemperance which desolates the land, and which is the physical and moral plague of our time. The drink which intoxicates is dealt out in the saloon, and there temptations to use it are multiplied through conscious and deliberate plannings. Let us waste no words on the saloon in se, on the possible or ideal saloon ; when this is discovered, and is something more than a rare exception, it will be time to discuss it. The saloon of to-day trades in and battens upon intemperance, and all the dire evils which accompany or follow from intemperance are to be laid at its door.

NO OTHER COURSE OPEN.

“What can the Catholic Church do, if she is loyal to her professed principles, but raise her hand in opposition to the American saloon, and put herself on clear record as its antagonist ?

“The Catholic Church does not assert that the moderate and legitimate use of intoxicating drinks is a moral evil or sin. Neither does she assert that the manufacture and the sale of intoxicating liquors are of themselves moral evils or sins. All this is clear and undoubted. But there are other and important aspects of her teaching and practice which the Catholic Church will not, and cannot, have us overlook. In her eyes intemperance is a sin, heinous and soul-wrecking, whose victims shall not possess the kingdom of heaven. The Catholic Church renounces her own life and principles when she ceases to combat with all her might intemperance, its causes and alliances. The American saloon is her foe ; between her and the saloon there can be no truce.

“In the convictions of the American people, and as a plain matter of fact, the American saloon is a personification of the vilest elements in our modern civilization. It means, in menace and in actual work, death to virtue, to piety of soul, to peace of family, to the material, moral and intellectual welfare of the people, to the free institutions of the republic. The church that would prove herself to the country as Christ’s must speak out boldly against the saloon ; her sentinels must neither sleep on her watch-towers nor lack the courage of the battlefield.

A SPECIAL OBJECTION ON THE CHURCH.

“The peculiar circumstances into which the Catholic Church in America has been thrown creates a special obligation for her to make the country understand that she is opposed to the saloon. The anomaly exists that with the

principles and traditions of temperance and self-denial which we have noted in her, the accusation has been made against the Catholic Church in America that she is lenient toward intemperance and courts alliance with the saloon. Nor is the accusation devoid of all apparent grounds.

“A large proportion of the intemperate and of the liquor-dealers and saloon-keepers of the country profess membership in the Catholic Church. This lamentable fact has its explanation. The Catholic Church has a numerous membership among the poorer classes of the population. The servant and the laborer, the occupants of the tenement house and the cheap hotel, are very often Catholics. They are immigrants from foreign countries where poverty was their portion, and they do not accumulate wealth immediately on reaching our shores. The church is not ashamed to own them; it is a divine mark of Christ's church to preach the Gospel to the poor. Yet it is plain their lot subjects them to temptations and to intemperance. Fatigue of body, loneliness of heart, pains of poverty, lead one to use the bowl, which will drown sorrow and give momentary surcease from the hardships of toil. The aids to sobriety, which are lent by cultured thought, cheerful hearths, elevating companionship—although even these do not keep off intemperance—are not the belongings of the poor. The sole club-room open to them is the saloon. No wonder they frequently drink and drink to excess.

“When the poor man, who has his own dreams of independence, seeks to go “into business,” one sort of business is within his reach, the saloon. But little capital is needed for the enterprise, and that is willingly loaned to him by the brewer, the distiller, or the ward politician, each of whom will gain in money or votes, a hundredfold for the investment. Some consideration is due also to the previous conditions and social habits of immigrants, and we must

judge them somewhat from the standpoint of their own history and ideas. Catholic emigrants come from Ireland or from countries of southern and central Europe. Irishmen bring with them a natural temperament and customs begotten of ages of political thralldom, which incline them to the use of strong drinks and saloon-keeping, but for all this the church, assuredly, can be made to bear no responsibility.

"Immigrants from the continent of Europe had been drinking beer and wine as Americans drink tea and coffee; they had lived amid beer-gardens and cafes, which, to say the least, are very different from our saloon. Arriving in America they demand beer and wine, alongside of which they find in our saloons the more baneful alcoholic potions. Some among them will minister to the tastes of the others, and a substitute for the beer-garden and the cafe is opened, which from the influence of environment rapidly puts on all the aspects of the full-fledged American saloon. Immigrants and their immediate descendants grow slowly into our American ideas, and with difficulty understand the trend of public opinion, or perceive the evil workings of our American saloon.

THE CHURCH HAS SUFFERED.

"We shall not deny that, as the natural result of these facts and conditions, the church suffered. Saloon-keepers made themselves the centres of groups of their countrymen, whom they guided in the novel road of American politics, and whom they sought to guide, also, in religious affairs. They were officials in church societies, marshals in church processions, chairmen in church meetings. They contributed liberally—as a matter of business—to church works, and paid rent for prominent pews. The public opinion of Catholics towards intemperance and the saloon was to a degree perverted, and things were done and allowed which

appear at first sight inexplicable to persons not conversant with American ideas and practices. At times clergymen feared to offend the potent saloon-keeper; they softened the tone of denunciation when treating of intemperance; if total abstinence was mentioned, emphasis was laid on the peril of running into the Manichean heresy—that liquor in itself is morally bad. At church fairs and picnics liquor was sold; religious societies at their annual outings kept their own bar and paid high tribute to it; at certain church fairs punch-bowls were voted to the most popular saloon-keepers; Catholic papers admitted into their advertising columns paid notices of saloons and liquor stores, and, in one instance, a brewery invaded the grounds of a monastery. What was all this but an encouragement to patronize the saloon? And the saloon was patronized with a vengeance, and intemperance among Catholics was growing apace.

THE CHURCH IS ON RECORD.

“The Catholic Church in America was compelled, for her own honor and in loyalty to her mission, to set herself right before the country on the saloon question. She did so energetically in the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, she has done so no less energetically this present year through the Bishop of Columbus and the apostolic delegate. The mind of the church is manifest. Individual Catholics, Catholic societies, may follow the church, or they may adhere to their own counsels and oppose her. But from the doings of such as these the church will fear no reproach; she stands on record as the determined foe of the American saloon.”

† JOHN IRELAND.

WHAT ALCOHOL IS AND DOES.

At the last annual meeting of the British National Temperance League held in London, an address was delivered by Sir Benjamin Ward Richardson, in which he referred to the position he had taken on the temperance question some twenty-five years ago, and unhesitatingly declared his continued allegiance to the principles then stated. Occupying the high position he does in his profession Sir Benjamin's utterances come with unusual authority and this forcible speech is well worthy of regard as a weighty scientific opinion. It was made in the following words:—

“MY LORD-BISHOP, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,—One of our great masters, Sir Francis Bacon, says: ‘The past deserves that men should stand upon it awhile to see which way they should go, but when they have made up their minds they should hesitate no longer, but proceed with cheerfulness.’ Well, I have just discovered, with much anxiety as to the flight of time, that it is twenty-five years since I delivered my first lecture of a physiological kind on the foundations of total abstinence. I feel, therefore, that the moment has arrived when I ought to stand for a brief period on the past to see which way I should continue to go. I have thought it wise to consider whether, with a maturer judgment, there is anything I would like to recall, anything I would like to withdraw from the past on this subject before I proceed further.

“In those first days after long deliberation, carried out during a time when I was not a practical total abstainer, I

had come to certain conclusions, based entirely on experimental research, and in the very first lecture I delivered, published in the *Medical Times* in 1869, I had shown that ethylic or common alcohol, however administered, produced, like chloroform, four distinct degrees or stages; the first a stage of simple exhilaration, the second of excitement, the third of rambling insensibility, and the fourth of unconsciousness, with entire prostration of the body—a stage, really, of suspended life, so near to death that if sufficient consciousness or power existed to enable the affected person to take more of the poisonous substance, death would be the inevitable consequence. I had shown that the duration of these stages was modified in degree by mode of administration, and that whether recovery occurred in an hour or in a day the stages were always present, except when the quantity administered at once was so great that life itself was at once extinguished.

“I had shown also that these symptoms were producible by alcohol, not only in men, but in the lower animals, so that from the beginning to the end of the chapter it was quite clear that a chemical fluid, unnatural to the body and producing no forms of natural phenomena, was presented in alcohol; that in very truth alcohol was a foreign substance, in so far as life was concerned, and that it could not be separated from other chemical substances that were capable of causing new and unnatural acts, physical and mental. I have observed that the temperature of warmth of the animal body was modified by the presence in it of alcohol; that a general warmth or flush in the first stages of its action was followed by a general and long persistent coldness; that when the action of alcohol was pushed to the fullest extent, a very long time elapsed, though no more were taken, before the respiration, the circulation, and the power of the voluntary muscles came back to their natural

standards; that during the periods when the body was under the full influence of alcohol there was a great change in all the tissues and organs of the body, that the blood was thinner; that the blood-vessels, especially in the brain, were injected; that the process of oxidation in the body generally was reduced; that the blood corpuscles which carry the oxygen of the air into it, and the carbonic acid which has been made by oxidation out of the body, were much modified in their life-giving quality; and that these changes if often repeated lead inevitably to fixed and organic changes, or in other words, to inevitable organic disease. In the close of the lecture I used the following terms:—

‘Speaking honestly, I cannot, by any argument yet presented to me, admit alcohol through any gate that might distinguish it as apart from other chemical bodies. I can no more accept it as food than I can chloroform, or ether, or methylal. That alcohol produces a temporary excitement is true, but as its general action is quickly to reduce animal heat I cannot see how it can supply animal force. I see clearly how it reduces animal power, and can show a reason for using it in order to stop physical pain, or to stupefy mental pain; but that it gives strength, that it supplies material for construction of tissues, or throws force into tissues supplied by other material—must be an error as solemn as it is widespread.

‘The true character of alcohol is that it is an agreeable temporary shroud. The savage, with the mansions of his soul unfurnished, buries his restless energy under its shadow. The civilized man, overburdened with mental labor or with engrossing care, seeks the same shade; but it is a shade after all in which, in exact proportion as he seeks it, the seeker retires from perfect natural life. To resort for force to alcohol is, to my mind, equivalent to the act of searching for the sun in subterranean gloom, until all is night.

‘As yet alcohol, the most commonly summoned of accredited remedies, has never been properly tested to meet human diseases. I mean by this that it has never been tested as alcohol of a given chemical composition, of a given purity, and in given measures. Wines, beers and spirits are anything—compounds of alcohols, and compounds of alcohols with ethers and other foreign substances. It is time, therefore, now for the learned to learn the positive meaning of

one of their most potent instruments in the position I have placed it, even though their prejudices in regard to it are, as mine, by moderate habit, but confessed inconsistency, in its favor.'

"These were the words of 1869; and now that a quarter of a century has elapsed since they were written and spoken, I stand on the past, and without prejudice, without indifference, but with observation and research maintained up to the present moment, I do not see a single reason for changing one idea or one word. I have, however, something to add. As the reading given above expresses, I spoke in 1869 on experiment without personal experience. I came to my conclusions while alcohol was still used by me as a beverage, but since then it has not been so used. Experiment led me to personal experience. If experiment were right, then my own personal experience must be wrong, and vice versa. I therefore logically submitted to the process of testing total abstinence on myself, and, without prejudice or indifference, I have been led by what I may call personal experiment, to confirm the past on the present, and after twenty-five years have come to the distinct conclusion, unhesitatingly and undoubtedly expressed, that by abstinence I have lost nothing, retained everything, and gained much.

"In abstinence I have found strength, steadiness, equality of action, freedom from excitement, endurance. In plain words, practice has sustained theory, and experience experiment. If I had never quitted the experimental field during the quarter of a century, if I had been ever re-experimenting and inventing research, I could not have proved so well the truth of the first issues as I have proved by my own personal knowledge the effects of abstinence on my own organization. So, standing on the past, I see still the way I ought to go is the way of total abstinence, and, proceeding with cheerfulness and with greater confidence

than ever, I invite all persons of doubtful minds to join me in companionship.

“One word more and I have done. I was brought up professionally from a very early age—from my first age, I had almost said—to look on things medical as part of my daily life, and I had learned nothing more decisively than this: that alcohol was at least a necessary instrument of the physician, a means of cure, a certain remedy in disease, if it had no other virtue. When the vital fire was high I was taught to use it. When the vital powers were perverted or irregular I was taught to use it. When the vital forces were low I was especially taught to use it. It was adduced as a remedy that lessened fever, steadied irregularities, sustained and maintained strength, and quickened circulation. Contradictory as these statements might seem to be, they were like the laws of the Medes and Persians to the student and young practitioner of medicine in my first days, and so strongly were they imprinted on my mind that when I had overcome the physiological difficulties I continued for some time to apply what I had originally learned to the treatment of disease, using alcohol as, at least, an exceptional remedy. Gradually it dawned upon me that the error here might be just as great as the error relating to health and alcohol. I began thereupon a new investigation. I proceeded, step by step, to lay aside alcohol as a remedy, and when the practice of the London Temperance Hospital was opened to me I obtained a field such as I never had before for scientific observation, with the result that 700 acute cases of disease have there come under my care, diseases of the most varied kinds and acutest in character, all of which have been treated systematically without any recourse to alcohol or to anything that may be called a substitute for it.

“The experience has exceeded every expectation that would have occurred to me twenty-five years ago. It gives

me no more trouble or anxiety now to treat the most serious diseases without alcohol than ever it did with it. Recoveries from severest diseases are as good, if not better, under this method than under the old one, and convalescence is unquestionably advanced. The truth, in short, holds good all through, that that which is best in health is best also in disease, and if it were in the power of anyone to say to me, I remove from your reach alcohol as a medicine, I should answer, There is not a medicine that you can remove from me with greater impunity.

“This, my Lord Bishop, is the latest message I, as a physical inquirer into the effects of alcohol, have to deliver, and I trust it may be as effective as the first I delivered in the name and on behalf of that absolute temperance which this National Temperance League exists to promote and maintain.”

THE OPIUM TRAFFIC.

A Royal Commission appointed by the British Government is now making an extensive inquiry into the opium traffic question. This traffic is looked upon by philanthropists generally as a disgrace to Great Britain, and the Commission has received a memorial regarding it from British missionaries in China of twenty-five or more years' standing, the clear statements of which ought to have some weight.

Great Britain insists upon China's being open to the opium trade. She forces China to furnish a market for the lethal drug, for the benefit of the Indian opium producer. The financial gain to British India is no doubt very great, but it ought not to be allowed to blind the eyes of legislators to the terrible infamy of forcing on another nation such a curse as is the opium trade in China. If, however, Christian governments will legalize and foster the liquor traffic, notwithstanding the fearful evils it inflicts upon British subjects, we can hardly wonder that they will treat other nations as they have been treating China. The memorial of the missionaries referred to is as follows:—

We, the undersigned British missionaries, representing different societies laboring in nearly every province of China, and having all of us had for many years abundant opportunities of observing the effects of opium-smoking upon the Chinese people, beg to lay before the Royal Commission on Opium the following statement of facts in reference to this question.

(1) We believe it to be a fact, established beyond possibility of reasonable doubt, that the consumption of opium in China is exerting a distinctly deteriorating effect upon the Chinese people, physically, socially and morally. Statements to this effect have been repeatedly made in blue books and other official documents, on the authority of British officials of high standing, and they are entirely corroborated by our own personal observation. The Protestant missionary body in China has twice, by its representatives assembled in conference, and including men of various nationalities and of many different churches, unanimously passed resolutions condemning emphatically the use of opium by the Chinese for other than medicinal purposes, and deploring the connection of Great Britain with the opium trade. [See "The Records of the Missionary Conference, held at Shanghai," 1877, and ditto, 1890.]

(2) It is a fact, which cannot be reasonably disputed, that the conscience of the Chinese people as a whole is distinctly opposed to the opium habit. It is continually classed, in common conversation and in books, with fornication and gambling. Sir Rutherford Alcock, some time Her Majesty's Minister in China, when examined before a Committee of the House of Commons, spoke of the universality of the belief among the Chinese that, whenever a man takes to smoking opium, it will probably be the impoverishment and ruin of his family—a popular feeling which is universal both amongst those who are addicted to it, who always consider themselves as moral criminals, and amongst those who abstain from it. [See Report, East India Finance, 1871 (363), page 275, 5,738.] We ourselves have never met with Chinamen who defended the practice as morally harmless, but we have heard it unsparingly condemned by the Chinese, times without number. The missions with which we are respectively associated invariably refuse to admit opium-smokers to church membership, but in so doing they are only acting in accordance with the general sentiment of the Chinese, Christian and non-Christian alike, which always stigmatizes the habit of opium-smoking as vicious.

(3) It is a fact that the opium trade, though now no longer contraband, is highly injurious not only to China, but

also to the fair name of Great Britain. The past history and the present enormous extent of the opium trade with India produces, as we can testify from personal experience, suspicion and dislike in the minds of the Chinese people towards foreigners in general. On the other hand, the attitude of hostility towards opium which foreign missionaries are known to maintain, is approved and duly appreciated by the Chinese of all classes, as we have often found in intercourse with the people.

(4) It is an indisputable fact that the opium imported from India is neither required for medicinal purposes in China nor generally used for those purposes, and hence we regard the importation as being wholly prejudicial to the well-being of the Chinese people.

In view of the facts the undersigned venture respectfully to express the earnest hope that the Royal Commissioners will embody in their report a united recommendation to Her Majesty that the Indian Government should immediately restrict the Indian production of opium to the supply of what is needed for medicinal purposes in India and elsewhere. With our long and sad experience of the injurious effects of opium consumption on the Chinese people, we cannot but feel the gravest apprehensions as to what the effects of the opium habit in other lands are likely to be. We are quite aware that some medical and other testimony has been given in India, designed to show that the consumption of opium by the people of India is not accompanied with the same disastrous consequences that we have all witnessed for ourselves in China, but we are glad to know that strong testimony has also been given in India of a contrary kind, for we are of opinion that a longer and wider range of experience will certainly show that opium is as injurious to all other races as it has proved to be to the Chinese. Opium is rightly classed in England amongst dangerous poisons, and is so regarded in other countries, and we cannot believe that what is a dangerous poison to the greater part of the human race, acts only as a harmless stimulant on other parts of the race. We are convinced that if ever the day should come when opium is as widely consumed in India as it is now in China, the result will be as lamentable there as we know it to be here.

In submitting this memorial, which we believe expresses the opinion of nearly every Protestant missionary in China, without distinction of nation or church, and of the whole native Protestant Christian community, consisting now of several tens of thousands of persons, we beg to say we are actuated by feelings of deepest loyalty to Her Majesty the Empress of India, and by the most profound desire for the truest welfare of her Indian dominions, not less than by the desire to see the curse of opium removed from China. We hold as beyond all doubt the conviction that thrones and dominions are established by righteousness, and that any source of revenue, however large, that is morally indefensible, tends only in the end to the weakening of the Empire, and the impoverishment of its resources.

J. S. Burdon, Bishop of Victoria, Hong-Kong; G. E. Moule, Bishop of the Church of England in Mid-China; Wm. Muirhead, Chairman London Missionary Society, Shanghai; J. Chalmers, London Missionary Society, Hong-Kong; Hudson Taylor, Director, China Inland Mission; Griffith John, Chairman London Missionary Society, Hankow; J. Maggowan, London Missionary Society, Amoy; H. L. Mackenzie, Presbyterian Church of England Mission, Swatow; Arthur E. Moule, Archdeacon at Shanghai; David Hill, Wesleyan Missionary Society, Chairman of the Wuchang District; Evan Bryant, London Missionary Society, Peking; G. Owen, London Missionary Society, Peking; James Saddler, London Missionary Society, and pastor of Union Church, Amoy; J. W. Stevenson, China Inland Mission, Shanghai.

We certify that the above signatures have all been authorized by the persons whose names are given, and that the authorizations are in our possession, Alfred Foster, London Mission, Hankow; A. Hudson Broomhall, China Inland Mission, Hankow; Gilbert G. Warren, Wesleyan Mission, Hankow. Hankow, 17th April, 1894.

ALCOHOL IN SURGERY.

A recent issue of the *Medical Pioneer* contained an important article on the use of alcohol in the surgical treatment of the future. The writer was Dr. Victor Horsley, F.R.C.S., and the article is well worthy of consideration in connection with the important deliverances of Sir Benjamin Ward Richardson and Dr. Norman Kerr in last month's *VANGUARD*. The principal statements of the article mentioned are as follows:—

“Although everyone must feel great hesitation in attempting to forecast what is likely to be the kind of use of any given drug in surgery in future years, still it is easy to see in the case of alcohol what at least are the circumstances under which it will not be employed. Certainly in one great direction already the question is so plainly decided that hesitation in attempting to exercise provision is rendered still less hazardous. The employment of alcohol in surgery has passed through several phases of very notable interest, and to accurately estimate its utility one must regard it as being used (1) in narcotism or anæsthesia, (2) in diet, and (3) as a stimulant.

“1. As a narcotic and anæsthetic we are hardly likely to see such a mischievous agent employed again, as it used to be, as a stupefier to prevent the sense of pain under operation. Its present occurrence in the mixture known as A.C.E., i.e. alcohol, chloroform and ether, is avowedly due to the belief in its especial utility and efficiency as a cardiac

stimulant. We can postpone for a moment the discussion of its powers in this direction, and more especially as the tendency of present practice is to give up the A.C.E. mixture for pure ether or chloroform in preference to their combination.

“2. As an element in surgical dietary the rapid decrease in its use by operating surgeons shows most distinctly that in future it will have disappeared from the diet of patients submitted to operation. Perhaps this absence of alcohol as an article of diet is in actuality one of the greatest results of that inexpressibly great boon to humanity, antiseptic surgery; and for that reason since modern surgery is becoming more and more aseptic, so the supposed need for alcohol will in the future entirely vanish. We all can remember the period at which it was deemed necessary to give alcohol to every patient after a serious operation in order to encourage the flagging appetite, and to ‘brace up’ the enfeebled system, the fact being simply that the patient having a suppurating wound was so depressed by septic absorption as to require this artificial excitement of the stomach; whereas nowadays with a wound healing by the first or immediate intention the patient is, if anything, blessed with too good an appetite within a very brief period after the operation. Perhaps also the tendency which unquestionably exists of determining what special drugs act specifically on different organs may be confidently expected to result in the proper administration of suitable gastric stimulants rather than the old rule of thumb practice of giving some common form of alcoholic drink.

“3. The most important question connected with the employment of alcohol in the surgery of the future is undoubtedly its action as a cardiac stimulant. I am one of those who believe that the usefulness of this drug in this respect has been overrated, and from conversation with my

colleagues gather that this opinion is pretty general. A short time ago in severe operations it was the custom of not a few surgeons to give a small dose of alcohol a short time before a severe operation, on the supposition that the expected shock would be mitigated by the anticipated benefit to the heart.

“The whole tendency of modern research, however, goes to show that alcohol produces a paretic dilatation of the heart muscle. Perhaps a wider appreciation of this has led to the abandonment of the practice I refer to.

“The next point is the probable employment of alcohol as a diffusible stimulant during the operation. This is, I believe, the most difficult point of all upon which to express any opinion as to future conduct. Fortunately, the general recognition of the fact that much of the shock formerly seen during an operation is due to general cooling of the patient has led to the proper maintenance of the temperature of the body—a provision which will of necessity be greatly increased in the future, so that at least alcohol will be omitted from this point of view.

“As regards the use of alcohol to remove the danger of persistent shock after an operation it is well recognized that in many people the stage of depression follows so quickly the period of excitation as to make it a matter of practical disability to resort to this measure. The general tendency is certainly towards giving no alcohol whatever, but to trust to the employment of warmth, injections of beef tea, coffee, etc.

“And since this is the result of the last twenty years' work it is not unreasonable to suppose that it is a practice that will be more widely pursued in the future, to the further exclusion of alcohol.

“To sum up, therefore, in surgery at least there can be no doubt that alcohol will be used less and less often as a remedial agent, partly because scientific investigation has shown the causes of many of the evils it was imagined to counteract, and because, thanks to Sir Joseph Lister, those causes have been got rid of, but also because closer investigation of its effects on the body have exhibited its disadvantages in a stronger light. Such a prospect surely warrants us in feeling a certain sense of congratulation, since of all the drugs that we are acquainted with that has a general or social use as well as a professional one alcohol is the most prominent, and, for the matter of that, the most dangerous.”

GREAT BRITAIN'S DRINK BILL, 1893.

An estimate of the drink bill of Great Britain and Ireland for the years 1892-3 was embodied in the annual report of the United Kingdom Alliance, presented at the recent annual meeting. It was in these terms:—

The following is the national drink bill for the years 1892 and 1893:

Liquors Consumed.	Quantities Consumed (1893).	Retail Cost (1893).	Cost of Liquors Consumed in 1892.
	Gallons.		
British Spirits (20s. per gallon)	29,857,987	£29,857,987	£31,355,267
Foreign and Colonial Spirits (24s. per gallon)	7,869,836	9,443,803	9,776,627
Total Spirits...	37,727,823	39,301,790	41,131,894
Beer (1s. 6d. per gal.)	1,137,396,600	85,304,745	85,073,358
Wine (18s. per gal.)	14,164,771	12,748,294	13,161,010
British Wines, Cider,	15,000,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
etc. (estimated)	£138,854,829	£140,866,262

As the official estimate of the population of the United Kingdom for the middle of 1893 was 38,429,992, the expenditure per head on alcoholic liquors was £3 12s. 6d., or £18 1s. 3d. for each family of five persons. For 1892 the expenditure per head was £3 13s. 11d. and £18 9s. 7d.

per family. The highest point ever reached in this country by the expenditure on drink was in 1877. For that year the cost per head was £4 9s. and £22 5s. per family of five. Hence the improvement since that date is £3 15s. 6d. per family, or 15s. 1d. per head. Had the expenditure of 1893 been on the same scale as that of 1877 the drink bill of 1893 would have been £163,327,466, or £24,472,637 more than it actually was. To give an idea of what such a decrease in expenditure is, it may be stated that the gross value assessed to income tax for the year 1893 of quarries, mines, ironworks, gasworks, salt springs or works and alum works, waterworks, canals, etc., fishings and shootings, markets, tolls, etc., and cemeteries was £24,538,517.
