

A FEW
STRICTURES
UPON A VERY SINGULAR PRODUCTION
OF THE
REV. E. DENROCHE,
EPISCOPAL CLERGYMAN OF BROCKVILLE,
ENTITLED
'AN APOLOGY FOR THE DOCTRINE OF SCRIPTURAL TEMPERANCE,'
OR
THE CHURCH OF CHRIST THE TRUE TEMPERANCE SOCIETY.'
BY THE
REV. HENRY WILKINSON,
WESLEYAN MINISTER OF PRESCOTT.



'Behold ye trust in lying words that cannot profit.'
Bible.

'And do such things exist at the present period as Anti-
Temperance Clergymen?' !!!
S. M. Sargent, Esq.



BROCKVILLE:
PRINTED BY WILLIAM BUELL.
1840.

EXPLANATION.

The duties of my calling requiring my presence at Brockville a few days since, a friend put into my hand, a Sermon (so called) by the Rev. E. Denroche, Episcopal Clergyman of that town, which I attentively perused, I must confess, with mingled feelings of grief and disgust. It professes to be, 'An Apology for the doctrine of Scriptural Temperance, or the Church of Christ the true Temperance Society;' but is, in fact, (despite the Rev. Author's *laboured* disclaimer) a virtual 'Committal to Intemperance. And if I am not in error, is aptly illustrated by the following colloquy:—

Darby,—"I say, Paddy, that same drinkin's the ruination of auld Ireland, an' more nor that, I'll maintain—"

Paddy,—"Bad manners to yes—now hould yer tongue—Arrah! what'd ye be at, at all, at all, without the whiskey? What'd become of our Fairs, an' Patrums, an' our Wakes, an' our buryin's, without the drop?"

In my humble opinion, there are sentiments and statements in the '*Preach*' referred to, which require considerable *straitening*—and forasmuch as the Rev. Gentleman has honored his humble servant with a passing notice in *that same* production, a number of Reasons press upon me (with a force amounting nearly to Moral obligation) the onerous duty of offering a few *Strictures* upon it, by way of *Improvement*, to be presented to the '*Candid Public*,' as circumstances may authorize or dictate.

THE AUTHOR.

Prescott, May, 1840.

STRICTURES, &C.

TO THE CANDID PUBLIC,

Should an invading foreign foe madly dare to cross our frontier boundary and murder, maim, and plunder, and otherwise mal-treat our countrymen and friends, and attempt to drag others into hopeless captivity, what excitement and alarm would very properly obtain at once, throughout the whole community ! The fearful tidings would fly as on the wings of the wind ! Solemn assemblies would be promptly convened—Voluntary associations would be extensively formed—the entire mass of human intelligencies would be on the alert, and those persons who displayed the most honest zeal and made the greatest sacrifices would be justly esteemed as the *best friend of the country*.

Under such circumstances there would be little danger of incurring the charge of fanaticism or undue excitement. On the contrary, every person who should be found *unexcited* would be both considered and treated as *criminally* indifferent to the National weal, if not as very traitors in the Nation's bosom.

But comparatively how very trifling would be the amount of real evil resulting from any such invasion, when contrasted with the depredations committed on society by Alcoholic Drinks ! To you, I need not enter into the details. It is now admitted (what it would indeed be weakness to deny) that no War was ever waged, half so barbarous—so destructive of property, of morals, of liberty, of peace, of purity, of happiness, and of life,—none so extensive and unrelenting, as is the Alcoholic crusade. The Army is well nigh innumerable—its progress is marked with suffering, crime and blood, while desolation and death follow in its train. The subjects of its fearful but inhuman spoliations and butcheries are our own friends, kindred and fellow beings, and their interests personal, social, pecuniary and spiritual, present, future, and eternal ; while anguish and loss, trouble and disgrace, more or less, are inflicted upon all, at the same time. Is it then to be wondered at, if the *public* should become alarmed ? if they should concert mea-

sures for resisting to the utmost the potent foe? if they should associate together and resolve to dispute every inch of the enemy's progress, by every *lawful* means within their power? and if they should press upon all the duty of refraining from assisting the foe in any way; and of uniting heartily with them in effecting his utter dislodgment and overthrow? Assuredly such a course of conduct would be most reasonable—would be a necessary duty. Excitement there ought to be. And excitement must rise high indeed to be commensurate with the greatness of the evil. To effect any thing important, the *interest* taken must be deep and practical, as well as extensive. What then must be thought of persons who in full view of the dread and accumulated evils inflicted and inflicting on mankind by tyrant Alcohol, manifest no excitement, and take no proper interest in the general safety of those who are rather disposed to speak favorably of him and palliate his doings? Is it not fair to argue from these facts that they are in some degree under his influence? There is certainly much greater danger of being too much influenced by Wine and Strong Drink, than *against* them! The history of every contest proves that there has always been those who sided with the enemy; and during the progress of the Great Moral Enterprize which for twelve years past has been vigorously maintained in order to remove the awful curse of Intemperance from our world, its friends have never lacked for both masked and open enemies. In former years I recollect reading 'Reasons for not joining a Temperance Society, by a Clergyman. I have heard of another in the language of exultation boasting that himself and his flock had not joined themselves to a Temperance Society. (A fact no doubt quite easily proved.) I have also seen 'Lectures' by a modern Bishop, in which the Temperance Association comes in for its full share of *pious* opposition; for the Bishop assures all who have ears to hear it, upon the faith of his lawn sleeves, that the success of the Temperance Reformation, will be the triumph of Infidelity. And I had hardly recovered my wonted steadiness of nerves, after so alarming an announcement, when lo! another Revd., and of the same Anti-Temperance *clique* too, mounts the stage, and like an *honest* man, proclaims what he calls, 'the true state of the Temperance movement,' affirming unhesitatingly that 'it is at a stand,' it moveth not, and then with his next breath calls loudly upon his '*Christian* brethren' to help him 'drag the wheels,' and stop the motionless machine!! But the

enterprize has lived and prospered notwithstanding. These pleaders for Baal have, one after another, failed in their opposition, and so far as the subject of Temperance is concerned, have sunk into their deserved obscurity. In the glorious success of the onward movement, they have been well nigh forgotten, for

‘Lethæan gulfs receive them as they fall,
And dark oblivion soon dissolves them all.’

Even the famous Bull of Bishop Hopkins, sent forth to warn those of the *wickedness of their way*, who were, poor souls, in their ignorance and impiety, arduously pursuing their work of Mercy, by saving as many human beings as possible from the Maelstrom of Intemperance; even this proved an abortion, and having ‘descended to the tombs of the capulets,’ I began to indulge the fond hope, that the enterprize would in future be left to pursue its kind and active purposes, if unassisted, yet unmolested, by high toned Clergymen and professors of the Saviour’s Religion. But it was a delusive dream. Another minister and some of his flock are greatly, greatly disturbed at these ceaseless efforts against Intemperance. A ‘strong one’ has just sprung into the path, out of his thicket at Brockville. His weapons of war are fearfully displayed, and if the enterprize dares to proceed the result must be of a most shuddering character. This modern Samson, *blind* though he be, is making a most desperate effort to get hold of the pillars of the Temperance fabric; and should he in his gropings chance to find them, and his strength prove sufficient for the task, rather than not succeed he will perish with ourselves beneath its ruins. If any inquire ‘who is this deadly foe of the Temperance Society?’ Himself shall tell you in his ‘Sermon.’ He is a ‘Spiritual Councillor,’ a ‘Divinely commissioned Ambassador’ of Christ. But why is so *sacred*, so elevated a personage, so decidedly arrayed against so innocent, so useful and so *scriptural* a means of effecting great and unspeakable good? Is it because there is neither Selfishness nor drunkenness in the Parish of St. Peters or the world that he must needs fall foul of benevolence and sobriety? Or is it because ‘dancing’ and other ‘festivities’ are much in vogue in that parish, and as these ‘sports’ are usually in close alliance with the *use* of ‘Wine and Strong Drink,’ if not *dependant* thereon, therefore the Rev. Gentleman’s *conscience will not* allow him to administer any other than the ‘Sacramental Pledge? Or, has the encresing

splendour of the Temperance day, *made manifest* that St. Peter's incumbent and parishioners are not clear in this matter, and feeling like some of old when they said, 'Master, so saying thou reproachest us also,' their ire is excited against the light that renders it *uncomfortable* for a 'Minister of Christ to send a few bottles of Wine' to his parishioners upon the occasion of their marriage, &c. in order to a carouse or a modern 'merry making.' Be this as it may, enmity rankles in his breast, and certain *hateful* Pamphlets from 'Perth' and 'Prescott' having found their way into his Parish, and as it would seem 'touched him upon the raw,' the result is an 'Opposition' 'Sermon'; and as it frequently happens, 'like priest like pope,' so certain 'Church members and others,' earnestly 'request' that the 'Sermon on Christian Temperance,' be printed that the World may reap the benefit of their Pastor's Anti-Temperance labours. The 'Presbyterian (Kirk)' and 'Presbyterian (Wesleyan) ministers,' it seems have given huge offence; the latter by speaking against the 'great evil of Intemperance' and the former by condemning 'the customs, and practices through which that evil is caused.' My respected 'Kirk' friend requires no apology to be made for him, by me, and his sterling sentiments evidently only shine the brighter by the *rubbing* they have received in the 'Apology.' So far as I am concerned, certainly nothing was intended less, than to annoy a single individual in the congregation at St. Peters, when I wrote against Drunkenness. Really, it did not once occur to me that there *were intemperate persons* connected with that Assembly. However, the Sermon is in print! A Sermon against the Temperance effort!! And by a Clergyman!!! The production has been abruptly noticed by 'ACHISH,' who forming his own opinion of the author has chosen to employ the weapon usually last resorted to in reaching an erring opponent.

, 'For *Ridicule* shall frequently prevail,
And cut the knot when graver reasons fail.'

Whether I shall succeed as well, or otherwise, I intend to adopt a different method in this humble Notice of the Sermon. I conceive, it contains positions, assertions, and insinuations, so unsound, so untrue and so unjust, and withal so misleading that a few sheets of paper *must* be occupied with *Strictures* thereon. In doing so I cannot but regret that Mr. D. has found it necessary or convenient, to connect with the Temperance question such an unceasing

jingle about the 'Church of Christ.' The friends of Intemperance do not so. They endeavour to avoid all Religious differences, and occupy the broad ground of General Benevolence in order to accomplish a universal benefit. If my remarks, should seem sometimes to bear hard on Mr. D's Church, the fault, if it be one, is purely his own. He has originated the necessity. And I shall have no pleasure in that portion of my task. As I do not intend to row with muffled oars, or handle his paragraphs with furred gloves, to please the fastidiousness of any, when the interests of bleeding truth calls for a hearty friend and a firm defence.

The 'Opposition' of Mr. D. to the Temperance Society, as it *originated* the sermon, and *adorns* every part of it, is the first item to be noticed. And as a severe crusade was intended, so it would seem in order to justify the attack, the usual method is resorted to. Accordingly the 'System' is ushered into the company of 'Heathen Error,' 'schism,' 'Heresy,' and 'Dæmons,' and as these are all feared and fearful evils, which it would be 'Sin' in the 'Church' to 'let alone; and as the *comrade* of such *vile things*, no matter *how* he got to be such, nor what his *real* character is, can be no better than they, therefore, 'non-opposition' to the Temperance Society, says Mr. D. is 'OUR SIN.' The character of the Society being thus summarily and logically settled, its desert is easily determined; it only remains then that the Brockville Champion for strong drink bring his 'jawbone' fairly to bear upon it, smite it 'hip and thigh,' and chase the curse out of the world. The 'Apology' is the mighty, the patriotic, and christian effort. The Church of Christ *sinning* by not opposing the Temperance Society! If Mr. D. means the Church of England, as is obvious, as he speaks of '*our sin*,' and the sins of the 'Church of Christ' as synonymous, then briefly he is *abusing* 'The Church.—Surely the *sin* of *non-opposition* to the Society has not latterly lain at Her door! But did Mr. D. ever attend a meeting of the Society? Did he ever examine its principles, save with the guiding 'bull' of Bishop H. before him? Did he ever condescend to notice the effects of its kindly operations on community, or a single family or individual? I suppose not: for in his estimation the Temperance Society is a most horrid monster when compared with the *trifling* concern of Intemperance. Hence 'opposition' to 'the error' is the 'sounder proof' the Church of England gives of her 'love of souls.' I hope, for her sake, this is gross slander. Genuine Apostles and Primitive Christians used to manifest

their 'love of souls' by rejoicing when good was done by any lawful instrumentality, and by being themselves '*ready*' to co-operate in '*every good word and work.*' But as if determined to fasten the sin of non-opposition upon his church, Mr. D. 'much questions,' the assertion that, 'the Society has met with opposition.' If our humble testimony is worth any thing, Mr. D. may rest assured that the statement is correct. If *he* has been sinfully sleeping at his post for twelve years while the *horrible* Temperance Society has been saving thousands of drunkards, and dispensing priceless personal, social and public blessings in every quarter of the globe; what he calls the 'true Church' has not. And I can assure him that he is even now but awkwardly brandishing the weapon, years ago wrested from an Episcopal Bishop, somewhere near the 'head quarters of American Unitarianism, Universalism and Atheism.'—The 'Reformation' has 'met with opposition' from *his* church, from Distillers and Venders of Alcoholic drinks, from those who love to 'tarry long at the Wine,' and a whole host of the '*baser sort*' throughout Society. But if Mr. D. is really sincere in conceiving the Association *sinful*, who can account for his conduct as a minister of the Gospel? Why has he allowed us to live in sin 'so long?' And why is he well nigh inclined to let us sin on still longer? He tells us, 'he would not have introduced the subject,' (though thousands are *sinfully* interested in it,) had it not been for the visits of the noted pamphlets before referred to. So then, if that *evil* had not happened—if the Pamphlets had not intruded—if the 'Kirk' and 'Wesleyan' had not rudely trodden upon a gouty member, and *profanely* hinted at the 'duty of every Christian,' with regard to the sin of Intemperance, the patrons of Temperance might continue to 'do evil,' to 'contemn the Holy Spirit,' and 'scandalize the Saviour,' until they had '*reaped corruption*' in the world of final reward! O consistency! thou art a jewel, but unfortunately we Clergymen are not all rich enough to possess thee! But why would not Mr. D. lift up his warning voice and give the Temperance Society timely notice of the 'errors of their way?' Is the secret here, that the Rector is a fatalist? He inquires very confidently, 'can the movements of the great Jehovah [be] accelerated by man's device?' And assures us that, neither 'Satan,' nor 'the drunkard led captive of Satan, shall hinder the work of God.' And yet strange as it may seem, the 'Anti-Christian' Temperance Reformation, which is *vastly* more *virulent*

than 'Satan' or Satan's pet, the 'drunkard,' is fraught with 'tremendous evil to the cause of Christ,' and greatly no doubt, 'counteracts Christ's revealed will and pleasure.' It is of consequence then Sin, not to oppose this Anti-Christian Temperance movement. As for 'Satan' and 'drunkards,' they can do no harm !

In my ignorance, however, (of course) I have been accustomed to think that 'Satan' was sometimes permitted to influence moral agents, and thereby, in an important sense, 'the work,' and frustrate the designs 'of God. For instance Adam's residence in Paradise, and *inspired* Paul's visits to Rome. I have also read of 'Satan's devices,' and of *men* whose 'words eat as a canker and overthrow the faith of some.' And I have been taught that these could instrumentally 'accelerate the movements of the great Jehovah' upon earth, by being 'co-workers together with him'—by being 'ready for every good work'—by letting their 'light shine before men'—by 'abstaining from [even] the appearance of evil,' and by imitating the blessed Saviour in self-denial and personal exertion and sacrifice for the sake of our fellow men.—For instance, the sobriety of a drunkard is *secured*, and his conversion to God in many cases greatly 'accelerated, when by means of the 'human device' of Temperance efforts he is persuaded to cease the evil of drinking Alcoholic poison. But if I should chance to be wrong in this matter, and the fatalism of Mr. D. to be *gospel*, 'it strikes me' that 'the great Jehovah' does not stand in need of his 'Herculean shoulders, to shove' Temperance Societies out his way ! Such, a '*human impetus*' 'to lever' the benevolent movements where the lovers of 'Wine and Strong Drink' would gladly locate it ! 'Alas, for such faithless expedients !' The *character* of such *Religious* 'opposition' can be fairly ascertained by any person who will be at the pains to consider that intemperance is a prevailing evil—at once a physical and moral disease—an individual bane, and a public curse ; that Alcohol is a poison, by means of which, a year or two since, one person in every twenty-six was converted into a confirmed drunkard ; nine-tenths of our world's pauperism is occasioned—four-fifths of all the cases of aggravated crime are brought about—and to which is owing three-fourths of all our litigation, and a full share of the multitude of lunatics upon earth—that this vile drug costs Ireland Ten, and the United Empire Fifty millions annually—that it fattens grave yards and peoples perdition with victims every day !! can language

be concocted into a form, to title, black enough, the dark, the deadning, the damning sin of Intemperance? And is there a Clergyman to be found, hardy enough, to become in fact, the 'Apologist' for this hydra monster! This great evil, the Temperance Society is struggling to lessen—to remove; already One Thousand drunkards have been saved, One Thousand of dealers in the poison have abandoned the trade of blood, One Thousand of abused and suffering families have found a bliss unknown and otherwise despaired of, and One Thousand have been thus prepared for, and have subsequently become truly religious; a reduction of Alcoholic drinks of one third has been effected, and most important changes have been realized throughout the various ramifications of Society—all of such a character as are found to be greatly beneficial, and powerfully tending to universal good. And is the *professing* individual to be found that can find the face to retain his profession and formally and openly oppose such an effort? It is even so. Read the 'Apology' I am noticing, and be convinced. But you will say, surely he has his reasons. He has, and you shall hear them. It is somewhat difficult to gather and present in form the Rev'd Gentleman's reasons for his 'opposition,' but I conceive the main pillars on which it rests as they are, rather confusedly, to be seen in his Sermon, are these:—Scriptural precept and example, the 'Spirit and motive' of the Divine Saviour. The foreknowledge of God. The doctrine of expediency unscriptural Temperance principles reflect on our Saviour. Temperance Arguments against drinks bear equally against Food and Raiment. The Church of England is the only true Temperance Society. Morality without Religion is worse than useless. Considerable misrepresentation. An important mis-statement, and finally, the Infidel character and rebellious tendency of the Temperance Association:

Mr. D. has selected as his subject the Marriage at 'Cana of Gallilee as the commencement and prime of his scriptural evidence in favour of the 'common' and 'sacred' use of Alcoholic drinks and in order to exhibit our Lord and Saviour as a shining example for all who desire so to use the precious commodity! I beg leave to repeat from the *offensive* 'Prescott' Temperance 'Address,' what Mr. D. has not attempted to *disprove*. that '*it cannot be proved that our Saviour countenanced the use of other than pure wine,*' or unalcoholic. It is very convenient to *assume* the contrary and argue accordingly, but such sermonizing will not en-

dure the ordeal. If it can be fairly proved, it should be ; if it cannot, the assumption is nothing worth. And as Mr. D. set out with the promise of 'a close adherence to the Word and Spirit of the Divine volume,' it is to be inferred that we have all the scriptural proof the question is capable of. Then my statement is confirmed. It is really amusing to see how little attention he pays either to the 'Word or Spirit of the Divine volume' in attempting to sustain a favorite position, in the Alcoholic character of the Wedding Wine. After such a promise of 'close adherence' &c. it is really too bad to hear him forthwith talk about *probabilities*, and directly to *contradict* the plain letter of the context before his eyes. He tells us there was 'probably dancing' at the Wedding feast. It may be a sufficient reply to say, from the perfect silence of the 'Word' on the subject, it is 'probable' there was *not* dancing of any kind there, and certainly not *such dancing* as his sermon will be understood in his parish to encourage, and as he is generally understood to be an advocate for. He next informs us that Jesus 'changed the water into wine,' not to supply the *actual wants* of his entertainers—no. He 'manifested forth his Glory' in that miracle, in order 'to minister to their innocent festivity,' in 'sports' and 'riddles, and in 'music' and 'dancing!' I turned to the passage when I cast my eyes upon this, and I certainly found no mention of such 'festivities' but I read 'And when they *wanted* Wine,' &c. Not an over 'close adherence' this Mr. D. If this is not 'wresting' scripture in order to find a gospel precedent for a modern carnal, frothing, tippling Wedding, then such a thing as 'wresting' a passage from its 'proper application' never occurred. And suppose I grant that by this miracle Christ 'taught his followers to the end of time that every *creature of God* is good,' nothing would be gained. It is yet to be *proved* that Alcohol is a *creature of God*. And if even this too were admitted the manner of its use is then to be determined. Fire is a *good creature of God* and yet it is not thought advisable to take it into our bosoms or our beds. And I am sure there are a great many *good creatures of God* that Mr. D. would hardly advise us to take *down our throats*! Or that he would affirm it sinful for us to 'refuse' to swallow! No proof then as yet is furnished of the Alcoholic character of the Wedding Wine, nor of the guilt of abstinence from intoxicating drinks. But we are told this was '*Good Wine*,' and therefore Alcoholic.— Mere assumption again. The term 'good' will not certify

that. Wine like cider may vary in quality according to the character of the fruit, the time of gathering it, and the care taken in obtaining it, as well as in manufacturing it into wine. And as the juice of the apple is known as cider, the moment it is pressed out, so is that of the grape, denominated Wine. And as all *real* wine is *derived* from Grapes, so the single passage Mr. D. quotes from Num. 6th chap. to prove that 'fresh juice was never 'accounted Wine in the Old Testament,' proves no such thing. So far from that being true, if he will turn to Hosea 3d chap. and 1st vs. he will find that even 'Grapes' themselves are termed 'Wine.' It is 'flagons of Wine' in the text and '*grapes*' in the margin. And *vice versa* our Saviour called Wine 'Fruit,' 'the fruit of the vine.' It is certainly far less 'probable' that our Lord would convert the Water into intoxicating Wine, than into what Mr. D. calls '*liquor of grapes*.' The latter is a natural substance, a wholesome nutritive beverage, while the former is an intoxicating agent, and as far as the Alcohol it contains is concerned, is wholly innutritive and poisonous. To change the water into this last description of drink, he must of *set purpose* have passed over the natural state of Grape juice, and fermented it, also, that it might possess intoxicating qualities! He that without evidence can believe this, let him do so. I seriously demur. As it relates to the *quantity*, if the whole of the water was 'changed into Wine' there was above one hundred gallons of the liquid. 'This is hardly 'probable.' It is most likely that the water was so changed no otherwise than as it was drawn out; and that it was new and unfermented wine. The *character* of the drink is certainly more important than the quantity; but assuredly there is nothing in the entire history of the event that even by 'probability' hints at the use of intoxicating drinks on that occasion. There is nothing of this in the sentence, 'when men have well drunk,' though some fancy they can find drunkenness here. Such persons are perfectly welcome to all the advantage they can gain with candid persons by intimating that the guests were already far gone towards intoxication, and that our Divine Saviour 'manifested forth his glory' by furnishing a punch-bowl of *better*, or stronger, or more Alcoholic wine, to prolong a drunken revel! Mr. D. makes a parade of the 'consequences' of this miracle. But a child can comprehend that these, whether we speak of his 'Supreme power,' 'his mission,' or the 'Faith of his newly gathered Apostles,' did not depend on the Alcoholic qualities of the converted

liquid. These important results were equally well secured by the miracle of transforming *water*, into the simple *juice of the grape*. I venture to repeat that it cannot be proved that our Saviour *made* intoxicating drink, and it is certainly rather a hopeless case to make out that he *used* any. Mr. D. seems to consider it so, and hence adduces only one instance of his using wine, and that was at the sacramental service. But on that occasion what he used sacramentally and consecrated to that ordinance, he calls the 'fruit of the vine,' which really sounds very much like Mr. D's '*liquor of grapes*.—Figuratively 'fruit' for the *juice of the fruit*.' In conclusion I aver that it *cannot* be proved that the Wedding Wine was other than the pure unfermented juice of the grape, and it may with safety be affirmed, the strong 'probability' is, it *was nothing more*. Finding nothing in this notable Miracle condemnatory of our position with regard to Alcoholic drinks, I will now follow him in a few more quotations from the New Testament. Having assured *himself* that the 'old wine' spoken of frequently in the Testament, 'possessed intoxicating qualities,' he then would fain establish the 'New' to be of the same character and thus secure his favorite position that all '*wine*' was alcoholic, and therefore the *water made wine*, was so, therefore Jesus made Alcohol. He quotes Acts 2d chap. vs. 15th, 'These men are filled with *new wine*.' On this verse Dr. A. Clarke, comments thus, 'Rather, sweet wine, for (the original cannot mean the *mustum* or *new wine*, as there could be none in Judea so early as Pentecost.' This disposes of that passage at a blow, and there is no doubt but the verses from Isaiah and Joel refer to the same kind of wine, '*new*' in a certain sense, but not the '*mustum* or *new wine*' which is only properly to be contrasted with the '*old*.' Hence *new wine* was to be put into new bottles, or elastic skins, because it had yet to *ferment*, and all know that prior to that process the juice of no fruit is Alcoholic. It is granted the Corinthians got drunk at the sacrament upon wine, but that is rather in favour of the Temperance Society. This was a horrible crime, and had they in imitation of the Lord and Saviour, used only the pure 'fruit of the vine,' no such disgraceful irregularities could have happened. And mark, no *approval* of their use of intoxicating drink can be referred to. I am now prepared to pursue Mr. D. to the Old Testament. To this he confidently refers, carefully reminding us at the outset 'that what is morally wrong *now* was so under the old dispensation,' and forthwith quotes

Deut. 14, 22—26. Num. 18, 27. Lev. 10, 9. I have not time or room to insert these passages; I wish I had; but you can refer to them. To save time and trouble, however, I grant that the use of 'Wine and Strong Drink,' was allowed to the Jews, and under certain restrictions to the Priests. But does it unavoidably follow that we are under *obligation*, or that it is proper to use them *now*, on that account. Is it a correct sentiment that any *particular course of conduct* enjoined upon, or permitted to the Jews is lawful and binding now for that reason? I trow our Anti-Temperance friends, are hardly prepared for the consequences of an affirmative. I will take a case of illustration out of Deut. 21st chap. and place it side by side with a case Mr. D. has selected from the same chapter, and on the above principle, we will see the result. He says, 'the injunction to use wine and strong drink 'before the Lord,' was given to a generation as prone to excess as the present race of men;' so much so, that in Deut. 21, 'an express provision' is made &c. for 'stoning a *drunkard*.' Well, what does that establish? Why, that it is *now right and duty* to use the same kind of drink that constituted him a drunkard and ignominiously shortened his days! Ah! well, read then vs. 15, 16 and 17, and observe, 'an express provision is made' for the distribution of the property between two sets of children born of Wives living conjointly with one husband. On the same principle, therefore, it is *now right and duty* to adopt the requisite measures by which two sets of children are produced, viz. every man should possess at least two wives! Would Mr. D. advise his parishioners to be true to this principle? I believe not. Would he have us share with Israel in the use of that 'meat' which, 'while it was yet in their mouths, the wrath of God came upon them and slew the fattest of them, and smote down the chosen men of Israel? Must we imitate them in their *exterminating Wars*? Should we use their liberty now as to putting away? Or because they were allowed to subject some of the Nations to involuntary servitude, is modern slavery therefore right and our bounden duty? Perhaps in Mr. D's estimation the Virginian Negro-Masters are free from the sin of reflecting on Jehovah by meddling with any 'merely human device,' such as *emancipation* efforts, or the *Colonization Society*, whereby the *oppressed might be free*!! What I infer is, that admitting the Jews had full permission from God to use 'wine and strong drink' as a beverage, as they had many other licenses, it does not follow that God ap-

proves of the 'Common' use of intoxicating drinks in the present day, and in our present circumstances.* If any ask 'in what does our difference of circumstances mainly consist?' I briefly answer,—First, Even Mr. D. is evidence that the immorality of the Jews was great, and was continually on the 'increase'—that the 'extent of drunkenness' among them was 'awful,' and that a 'woe' was pronounced against the evil, even when caused by *fermented* drinks only. But since the invention of the Satanic art of distillation, the evil has assumed a form much more frightful. It has threatened to swallow up whole nations; to undo the whole social fabric; and to sap the very foundations of both our liberties and religion. In view of the dangers, 'self love and social,' which are in fact the same united in uttering a loud and piercing cry, to awake *all* to the serious business of arresting the evil by every lawful means in their power. And surely any sacrifice required is cheaply made that may avert so tremendous a ruin. This is an important *difference*. Again,—It is a modern discovery that it is the same substance which intoxicates in fermented or distilled liquors. This is now an established fact in chemistry.—The friends of Temperance, justly alarmed for themselves, their friends, their country, and their species, reasonably concluded that a successful war could not be waged against Intemperance by attacking a few of its thousand forms and mixtures—that its cure under our circumstances demanded that Alcoholic drinks of every name and form be disused as a 'common' beverage. Here then is a motive for abstinence which a Jew could not be influenced by. *Distilled* liquors were then unknown; and the amount of evil resulting therefrom is incalculably greater than could result from the wine drinking of the Jews. A third item of *difference* is still more important. It must possess weight with the candid. I refer to the demonstrable fact that Over Nine-

* Mr. D. has a Note on the word *Sikera*, or strong drink, spoken of Deut. 14, 22. The word, says Dr. Clarke, comes from the Hebrew Shaker, to inebriate.—He adds, from Jerome, 'Any intoxicating liquor was so called, from whatever fruit it was made.' This sustains the sentiment conveyed in the Prescott Address, where it is called 'Strong Wine.' It was often wine drugged, and was designed to be used *Medicinally*. The learned Dr. from the Rabbins remarks, "The Jews put a grain of frankincense into a cup of Honey wine, for the victims to be crucified, to disturb their *Intellects*, and thus destroy sensibility, grounding it on Prov. 31, 6.—'Give Strong Drink to him that is ready to perish.' See another proof. 'Woe unto them that rise up early that they may follow *Strong Drink*, that continue until night, 'till *Wine* inflame them.'—Isa. 5, 11. *Wine* and *Strong Drink* here are synonymous terms

Tenths of the wine in 'common' use has *no juice of the grape in it*. It is manufactured out of *distilled* alcohol, sugar, cider, water, colouring matter, and various other ingredients to give it variety. Our Wines in general, therefore, are in fact *distilled* intoxicating drinks, under various names, disguised to be sure by admixtures with other substances. The 'common' use of *such wines*, of course gives universal license to use *all distilled* drinks, whether disguised or otherwise. Now such drinks are indeed a 'human device,' or if you please a diabolic invention; they are 'unauthorised' by Jehovah; were unknown to the Jews; and the effect of their use, involves a tale of untold horror.—Will any man hesitate now whether this *great difference of circumstances*, justifies us in refusing to imitate the drink-customs of the ancient Jews? I believe but few persons will be so disposed. But says Mr. D. our Saviour must have 'foreknown' that his 'miracle' at Cana of Galilee would be spoken of throughout the world, yet he performed it, and turned the 'water into wine.' Yes, and he also foreknew the use that some persons, 'wise in their own conceit' would strive to make of it, and yet he performed it. But until our opposition friends shall have *proved* that our Saviour ever *made or used* Alcoholic Wine, neither that 'miracle,' nor any other act of his life with regard to wine, will avail them in the least. If the wine made was not Alcoholic the difficulty has no existence. If they insist there *is* difficulty, then let us have the *proof*, as to the Character of the wine. The Temperance public will wait for this with anxiety. But Mr. D. adds, our Lord, must have *foreseen* the prevalence of intoxication down to our own day. Yet he 'countenanced the use of wine as a beverage: 'He foresaw the sin of the Corinthians who got drunk at the holy Communion, yet he consecrated wine to that ordinance.'* Here is *assumption* again. I ask proof that Jesus either 'countenanced' or 'consecrated' Alcoholic Wine. Here I might rest the answer. I will go farther however, and show the perfect fallacy of the *sentiment* conveyed. It is in substance that, our Lord approves of every particular practice or custom which he did not specifically con-

* Mr. D. assures us on page 17 of the 'Apology' that the Jews never accounted *fresh grape juice* as wine; in this place he takes it for granted that the '*fruit of the vine*,' which our Saviour consecrated to the Sacramental ordinance was 'accounted Wine.' To suit his purpose then *grape juice* was NOT, and to answer his end now, even *grape 'fruit'* IS Alcoholic Wine!! Such *thorough and consistent* argumentation is hardly capable of an 'exact parallel' Only *truth is immutable*.

man frame declare it to be a poison. All the Books on *Materia Medica* affirm the same. Ask the index for the word 'Alcohol' and you will be referred to the class of narcotic vegetable poison; and for results, ranked with henbane, hemlock, and deadly night shade. Will Mr. D. believe it is a poison, now? I suppose not, for

'A man convinced against his will
Is of the same opinion still.'

Such, however, is the fact, and hence while 'food' and 'dress' are absolutely *necessary*, and *moderation* in their use desirable, and most for our good; Alcoholic drinks are *unnecessary* and *injurious* and to abstain from them is our bounden duty inasmuch as both our own and our neighbors interest will be really advanced thereby.

Mr. D. is opposed to the Temperance Society because as he frequently asserts, 'the Church of Christ is the only true Temperance Society.' Knowing as we do the exclusive views of the Brockville Rector, I understand him as saying 'The Church of England is the only true Temperance Society.' I regret that I *must* so understand him. It plants thorns along my path, not so much to annoy *me* as them; though I must be the innocent cause of the uneasiness.—Delicacy, however, forbids me uttering even a tythe of the truth, though my delicate reference itself will no doubt be styled very 'shocking!' I will not enter into the question as to why the True Church (in fact) *is not* the True Temperance Society, nor put that *Church* to the torture, by asking how it came to pass that Intemperance has been on the increase for 1800 years, or *until* the Temperance Movement; or how it has happened that the *movement* has done more to check that vice within twelve years than the Church effected during any given period of her existence? These are all important queries; but my business is with the *Church of England*. This, the *only Temperance Society &c.*! This Church a Temperance Society! Pray who would have thought it? Where is the evidence? In its *Rules*? I know of nothing there but common place denunciations against drunkenness. The Bible, Law Books, and Sermons have always abounded with these, and with what effect as a general thing? With what effect in the Church of England? Comparatively none at all. In her 'Sacramental pledges' in which Mr. D. parables so ostentatiously? I know of nothing peculiar in these, over other Churches. Is it in the *Ministry*? I will *force* myself to be

kind here. I will only refer to the 'Sermon' in question. Read the 'Apology,' which I venture to predict not one of the Clergy of that Church will *oppose*, and my question is answered. Is it in the *membership*? Worse and worse. Look around. Inquire, What Church does that and that distiller belong to? That and that vender? that and that inebriate? There is in general but one answer. The fact is these classes of community cannot live in *other* Churches. They would not receive them, or long retain them if all else were right, simply because of their connection with and prominence in the *vile* practice or business! and yet Mr. D's Church is the only Temperance Society! Could I believe him sincere in his farrago about his Church being a *Temperance Society*, I should think in sober sadness it was quite time our Province had a Lunatic Assylum. A most unpleasant volume might be composed on this subject; if need require it may yet be forthcoming; but for the present the above may suffice. 'A word to the wise,' &c.

There is some strange and indigestible nonsense found on page 7, echoed on page 8, and re-echoed on page 22 of the 'Apology.' The substance of all, if we can understand him, is, that we cannot acceptably live soberly, or be really temperate in drinks, without being united to the COMMUNION OF SAINTS, to the Church of Christ, or his Church, which is the '*one* great and Divinely instituted Temperance Society.' If there is no other than this, alas for the world! O, my country! 'any thing short of this,' says he, 'is worse than useless,' &c. Any other Temperance 'springs not of faith' and is therefore 'sinful,' &c. It is 'merely changing from one form of iniquity to another' &c. What specimens of Wise and Charitable, not to say pious, instruction are these? Are we to understand then, that *labour* is worse than *idleness*, honesty than injustice, chastity than fornication, sobriety than drunkenness, &c. because a man is not a 'true Christian?' I admit the doctrine of the 13th Article of the Church of England to be sound, that 'Works done before the grace of Christ' &c. 'not springing from faith' &c. 'partake of the nature of sin;' but that is not Mr. D's doctrine. He not only asserts their sinfulness, but that they are '*worse* than useless;' that is in fact, *such* Works are Worse than the opposite sins! Cannot a man be a fair trader, generous to the poor, and an honest and Sober man *until* he is united to the 'COMMUNION OF SAINTS,' Mr. D's Church, or, I will add, really experience converting grace? Who in his senses will answer negatively? Better indeed,

far better to be so experienced—all *should* be so—but till then, or should that unfortunately NEVER occur, is not a Moral and Sober life most desirable? yea, most 'pleasing' to God? I know all ought to be 'in the faith;' that 'whether we eat or drink, or whatsoever we do, should be done to the glory of God;' but would Mr. D. have us turn suicides and starve ourselves to death, to avoid the *worse* sin of coming short of the glory of God in taking our 'daily bread?' I admit that as sinners we are '*shut up unto faith in Christ*' so completely that until we *savingly believe* in Christ all our works 'partake of the nature of sin;' but is it, on this account '*worse than useless*,' for heads of families to love each other, to provide for their family, to fear oaths, to live Soberly and to patronize the benevolent Associations of the age, because they have not yet so believed? That is very comfortable doctrine for the drunkards and drunkard makers, and other sinners in Brockville; but it is '*contrary to godliness*.' All agree that morality is not saving holiness, but it has been left for this 'Sermon' to teach that it is '*worse than useless*,' that is practically '*Worse*' than Immorality!! In a former case the author's motto is, 'Bad is the Best,' in this instance he adopts practically, the *worse the better*.

The Sermon contains a few instances of Mis-representation of too gross a stamp to pass without 'Stricture.' I shall only notice three of the most glaring and unbearable character. 1. He instructs his readers that the Temperance advocates exalt the 'System' *above* the Gospel; for they 'supply to men a poor make shift morality *instead* of presenting to their acceptance the glorious Gospel of our 'Lord Jesus Christ.' 2. That the Temperance Reformation is not based upon *Religious* Principle; for 'God approves of no laws and pledges of morality not based upon Gospel principles,' and therefore 'recognizes no Temperate Society except his own Church.' 3. That owing to the operation of Temperance principles, 'Wine is withheld from the laity in the Sacrament' in Protestant Churches patronizing the Temperance Institution, for, inquires he very imposingly, 'are we in duty bound to adopt the tenet, not of Christ but of Papal Rome, that because of the liability of the abuse of Wine in the Lord's Supper, therefore the wine of which the Lord said, 'drink *ye* all of it,' is to be refused—to be withheld from the laity—the congregation of Christ's flock?' Did Mr. D. promise himself that a *Candid Public* had not sagacity enough to perceive that an assassins dagger was half concealed amid the folds of this sanctimonious Robe assu-

med for the occasion? Or did he suppose no one but himself cared for the honor of the Gospel, the integrity of Protestantism, or was actuated by Gospel principles? And could he imagine that such libels on the innocent and useful Temperance cause would escape uncanvassed? I can assure all concerned, that the institution has never been (save by its enemies for unworthy purposes) exalted *above* the Gospel, nor to an *equality* therewith; it never professed to be able to make men Christians,—to spiritualize men,—that honour belongeth alone to the ‘Gospel of the Grace of God;’ but it has humbly claimed to be an auxiliary among other auxiliaries in doing good, as the Tract and Sabbath School Societies, directing of course its energies in its own peculiar province against the particular, the prolific and the universally prevailing vice of Intemperance—to be an handmaid to Religion; and it has nobly proved its efficiency in that respect, as numerous living witnesses can testify. Its *operations* also prove its professions genuine when it claims to be based upon the broad principles of Christian charity and Philanthropy. It plants all its ‘levers’ on this strong foundation, and those ‘levers’ themselves are obtained from Scripture sentiments, precepts and examples, as well as from undeniable facts, from the well tested experiments of science, and candid observation as to the beneficial effects of the Society among men. It is easier to cavil at than disprove the facts that it has, greatly ‘tended to strengthen men’s resolutions to abstain from their sin of intoxication’—prevented the formation of intemperate habits—lessened the sum of human misery (through intoxicating drinks) upon a large scale—reduced the positive agencies for the promotion of Intemperance—removed serious obstacles out of the way of the Gospel, and certainly rendered the conversion to God, of many far more ‘probable’ unless we *obstinately* adopt the absurd conclusion that there is more hope of persons under the influence of intoxicating drinks, than of sober men. With regard to the last calumny I will merely say the implication is wholly unfounded, and if Mr. D. wishes to avoid being criminated on the charge of having ‘borne false witness against his neighbor’ he will haste to inform all whom he has instructed to the contrary, that though we believe it proper to obtain the purest wine we can, for that solemn and sacred service, the ‘Tenet’ he ascribes to us is no part, nor result of the principles of the Society—that wine of the best character we can get is ‘NEVER WITHHELD’ from the ‘flock of Christ.’ I

have no fear, however, that such misrepresentations will affect any thing important. The cause has now obtained a standing and a character that only *well substantiated truth* can injure, and that is a *rare* article in Anti-temperance publications. Perhaps this will painfully appear now I am about to notice a palpable *misstatement* contained in the 'Apology,' I confess I cannot frame an 'Apology' for not using a *stronger epithet* to designate it. I have only to say, I *will* not. On page 18, Mr. D. 'questions whether the Society has done good, even in the *very lowest sense* of the word,' in the the United States; and then immediately echoes the same sentiment with regard to 'similar societies in our Province.' Why is this called in question? O, 'the much vaunted *good* claimed to have been done by the system was contradicted, point blank, at the Saratoga Temperance Convention.' Indeed! well, now for the proof;—Why it was there declared 'Wine drinking is increasing in our country,'—'there is more wine drank now than ever, and the fact of the great increase of wine drinking is undeniable.' What we ardently wish we often credulously believe; and so on these sayings Mr. D. exultingly proclaims 'the much vaunted good' is a failure; for, 'since the formation of Temperance Societies in the United States, intoxication has *fearfully increased*!!'—Now, does the 'intelligence' from Saratoga (*four years old too*) even intimate that 'intoxication *has* (or even *had*) increased?' No such thing. The misstatement is a perfect *Creation*! Up to that time the Temperance war was only waged against *Ardent Spirits*; and in Convention the fact was developed, that while they had been thus engaged, '*Wine drinking had greatly increased*.' Who but the 'Apologist' would venture his reputation, by forthwith publishing to the world, on such a development, 'the good done is a failure, and intoxication has fearfully increased!' Is there no difference between an *increase of wine drinking* and an increase of intoxication on the whole? It was very convenient but is very discreditable to the Apologist, to overlook the glorious conquests gained in the only quarter in which any fighting had been done; and where some of the watchful heroes in the Moral conflict, directed the attention of the host to some new allies who are joining the enemy in another direction, to listen upon that simple fact, and thereon proclaim our defeat and discomfiture! The facts of the case are at hand. A successful war had been waged for 7 or 8 years against 'Ardent Spirits' only. A vast reduction in the use of the article, roused the cupidity of Alcohol dealers; and as Wine was not prohibited if they could but somehow fix *Ardent Spirits* into Wine, a march would be stolen on the Temperance movement, and the trade in the horrid poison might yet survive. The wily scheme was, however, detected; but not until the country was flooded with these Wines, which many drank who yet remained true to the old pledge. The utterances of the members of the Saratoga Convention are then easily accounted for, in this way; and the bold and 'unauthorised' inference of the 'Apologist' will force upon itself a name worthy of so forced a corollary. Does Mr. D. exult in the *difficulty* that is thus occasioned? He ought to know it is one that *was*—that conquest too is *now* substantially won. And with quite as much charity, patriotism, and Prudence, might an Israelite in Egypt, *opposed* to the deliverance of his people, rejoice in the additional misery, which through the cupidity of Pharaoh the Redeeming efforts of Jehovah for a time brought upon them.—Or the Apologist himself, exult in the increased sufferings of the Southern Slaves, which by reason of their task masters, the strong efforts of modern Abolitionists, for a season is the means of occasioning! The Convention in question originated the Total Pledge; for four years it has told astonishingly; and to comfort our opposing Church friends, I

have great pleasure in saying the prospects were never brighter than at present. The 'Apologist' next endeavors to fix the stain of Infidelity and Rebellion on the Temperance Society. Having christened the cause 'evil' and stated the efforts of its patrons to be at best but 'doing evil' that 'good might come' he insinuatingly asks, 'why is it that Infidels and open Blasphemers often gladly and even ostentatiously unite in this Moral work?' He proceeds to answer his own strange question, and tells us in substance that they 'join professing christians to make little of Christ, and prove human plans more effectual than Divine Grace.' This he attempts to prove by affirming that the Temperance Reform has flourished most in the New England States of America, known as the head quarters of American Unitarianism, Universalism, and Atheism.' It is nothing new for the Association to be slandered as infidel, political or Rebellious as the case happens and as will tell best in different localities. This wholesale slander is but an echo of that of Bishop Hopkins, already mentioned. Any thing is too good to say of an institution that renders it rather uncomfortable to keep up old customs, and 'tarry long at the wine,' or riot on the very vitals of the social good. Mr. D. seems to have borne the old adage in mind, 'throw dirt enough and some will stick.' But who are the 'Infidels' and 'open Blasphemers' who so espouse the cause and for *such* reasons? The cause knows nothing of them! The converse is most probably the fact. I appeal to all history whether such characters have been noted for Temperance or Intemperance—whether they have been on our side or on that of the Apologist? Did such Infidels as Paine, Rousseau, Diderot, &c. &c. ostentatiously unite in Moral works; or did they, like Mr. D., unite in the Immoral work of dram drinking themselves, and in using their influence in favor of the practice becoming universal? But from such vituperation, I make my appeal to facts, and with all possible kindness I now challenge the 'Apologist' to select any portion of Canada (where the state of things is knowable by all) and compare the Temperance and Anti-Temperance parties in the community, as to Moral and Christian character, and conduct. I will cheerfully risk the character of the cause on the result of such a comparison. I will even 'beard the lion in his den,' and name Brockville, or Perth, or Elizabethtown, or Prescott or any other section of the country he may choose. Does not every person, but himself, know, that the Society embraces as its members or friends, the great majority of the more actively christian, respectable, and consistently moral portion of the community in most localities in the land? so far, therefore, as Canada is by implication concerned, I utterly condemn any such insinuations, as wicked, baseless and visionary. I am no Apologist for the errors of the N. England states of America: however, they can well afford to 'endure hardness,' now they have so gloriously shaken off the heavy yoke of Alcohol. All that know the history of the New England Churches, know that they were most awfully scourged with the common curse Intemperance; that they could do nothing effectual to save and purify themselves so long as distillation, vending, and using intoxicating drinks, was generally countenanced; and that it was by means of the Association they were enabled to cast off the *loathsome incubus*. Will Mr. D. affect a smile and call a Society that can do this, 'infidel?' and assume (as usual) that the prosperity of the cause is a proof of the Infidel character of that 'region of country!' Let him rather look at home, and at his earliest convenience furnish us with similar and equally solid evidence of the authorodoxy of his Church, and his own heart, by staying the plague of Intemperance in his own congregation, as effectually *without* the Temperance Society, if he can! Let him bring his True Temperance Society with its

ample store of 'requisite provisions' of 'Baptism' 'Confirmation,' &c. &c. to bear on the evil, and if he succeed, the good deed shall be fairly acknowledged. The cases abound, I know, for I have lived in Brockville. The result will be anxiously watched for. Till something is done at home, by the Church, it will be quite too soon to boast of her powers in this respect. If the author of the 'Apology' will accomplish by his Church, in Canada, what the Temperance Society has done in New England, and elsewhere, as an humble auxiliary to the Church, I will begin to believe she is of some service in the Province; and be more than half converted to the opinion, that so far as the Church of God is concerned, the Temperance organization is not indispensably necessary in order to general sobriety.

The amazingly rapid progress of the cause in England, Scotland, Wales and elsewhere, and especially in Ireland, disproves 'point blank' the heartless insinuation that it finds a congenial soil in unbelief and sin. It would seem that the 'Apologist' was not without a degree of *sickishness* on this score, in view of the 'astonishing' advance of the society in Ireland. But what is there so white that cannot be blackened? and when other means of attack cannot be found, the *motive* can always be assailed, especially in the absence of the 'charity that thinketh no evil,' where none appears. Ireland, the land of whiskey, of misery and of crime, that swallows annually 14 millions of gallons of Spirits at an expense that would furnish 2s. 8d. per week, to each pauper in that country—Ireland—whose every fourth shop was a spirit shop, and who was always drunk,—Ireland, the 'puzzle of puzzles' as to her pauperism, her diseases, her premature mortality, her assassin carnage, and her foul murders—Whiskey-ridden Ireland at length has opened her eyes to the Grand Cause of all her degradation and suffering. And her Priests, too, with all their influence, really seem determined that she shall hereafter be free from so debasing and damning a vice. Is there a creature on earth worthy the name of a christian, or a man, but rejoices at the news and is ready even on his 'knees' to return thanksgiving to God on Ireland's behalf? The originators of the printed Sermon are exceptions. And he who tells us five 'pages' forward, that he has 'nothing to do with the motives of Temperance persons'—that he 'believes they are influenced for the most part by the best intentions,' can find it in his heart to look coldly on his own country struggling to escape the fiery flood, and finding nothing else to fasten upon save *motive*, insinuatingly hints at 'Rebellion'! And for once we will condescend to present a semblance of support for his bolted intimations. He gives us what it is said a certain 'Priest' stated in 'Waterford,' viz. 'that if there had been a Temperance Society in 98, things would not have turned out as they did at Vinegar Hill,' &c. Admit this silly tale to be true, and what does it prove? And what does it amount to, with reference to the vast Moral Reform, so 'astonishingly on the advance?' Does that petty remark freeze quite up the fountain of brotherly affection in his heart? Would he on that account stay the further progress of sobriety as a plague, and blot out the sun of prosperity which is once more rising on his native land? Had he not better write forthwith to Lord Mountsindford, Professor Egar, Mr. Parke, and others who are aiding in the incipient Rebellion? Or to the Queen's Government and inform against all such traitorous co-operations! Were his 'brother Clergymen' who he informs us made such 'zealous exertions in the cause and in the same part of the country' too, though 'in vain' a mind for a bit of a Rebellion? For I am sure if they laboured in the Temperance cause there as the emigrated 'brother' does here, their failure can be satisfactorily accounted for without any reference to their *loyalty*! Is it rather

advisable to increase the 14 millions of gallons annually consumed to 20 that Paddy might be yet more drunken; be as contented as a powder barrel, and utterly incapacitated for Rebellion? Could it be that Mr. D. had in view the perpetuated *loyalty* of the *Provincials*, on the same principle, when he wrote his 'Apology' for the 'Common' use of 'Wine and Strong Drink'? If so, yet another 'Sermon' will be required based on Temperance principles, for the Government of the *Regular corps*; this, however, can yet be done, as there is quite an opening for a different discourse on the subject, and for 'sanction', &c. reference might be had to Scriptural characters, as John Baptist, Daniel, and Timothy. Seriously, whatever may be the future movements or political features of Ireland, or any other country under Heaven, surely it is the honest dictate of brotherly love of our species, and of our God to do all we can to effect her complete disenthralment from the Anaconda pressure of Spirituous Liquors; and to rejoice in knowing that her subjects are indeed Moral Agents, unmanacled in body and mind, capable of protecting themselves, of defending their country, and of loving and serving their God.

In thinking of an end to these Strictures, I ask your further indulgence while I notice three things more, only,

1. The Bible flatly contradicts the 'Apologist' when he says, 'the use of the creatures of God, (viz. Alcoholic drinks) exposes us to no necessity of sin.' I suppose this is contradicted when Inspiration condemns, not the use, or immoderate use of Wine and Strong Drink merely, but the *Drinks themselves*; thus 'Wine is a *mocker*.' Strong Drink is *Raging*. Can our opposition friends find 'exact parallel' scripture in favour of those articles? Again in Lev. 10, we find that the Lord by a 'Statute' prohibited '*forever*' the Aaronic priesthood from the use of 'Wine and Strong Drink' 'when they went into the tabernacle.' Why? Because Nadab and Abihu 'erred through wine' and when under its evil influence offered 'strange fire' before the Lord and died for their sin. The cure by way of preventive, which God ordained, was *Total Abstinence*. Mr. D. would say the use exposes to no necessity of sin, therefore in future use it only in moderation—but the 'Statute' of Heaven speaks *oraculary* and says, such is the nature of intoxicating drink, and such is the weakness of human nature, that the use of it exposes you to the necessity of sinning, therefore, in future, 'Do not drink Wine and Strong Drink,' &c. vs. 8. Facts are of every day occurrence too, that demonstrate the utter falsity of the sentiment. Thousands sin through drink as necessarily as the negro slave plants his master's corn; or the lover of 'Wine and Strong Drink' sometimes, *spews on all his glory*, or snores in the gutter.

2. It is not necessary to use 'Wine and Strong Drink' in order to avoid 'reflecting upon' or 'reviling' the Saviour. If Christ had ever by precept and example established their use as a duty, St. Paul seems to have totally forgotten it, when he said, 'it is good neither to eat flesh nor drink wine, or any thing' &c. *Any thing* will include 'Strong drink' of any name or any other offending article, I suppose, and so we see he could innocently be a tee-totaler. And Timothy seems to have been so inveterate a Water Drinker, that it required the authority of an Apostle to induce him to take a '*little Wine*' medicinally. 'Temperance Advocates' will prescribe just as St. Paul did, in cases of necessity, and the members surely can *innocently* do as Timothy did, accordingly let it quite alone, or take a little *medicinally*, so that if St. Paul and Timothy did right, we cannot be doing wrong. We are also informed that the early faithful and exiled Christians who fled to Arabia and Egypt for the sake of Christ 'drank Water only.' It never occurred to them that such a practice was a 'reflection' on their master and we are sure Jesus loved

demon, (for he foresaw and foreknew every thing) and *vice versa*. If this sentiment is to be adopted, the consequences are at hand. I will illustrate by mentioning a few. He did not condemn the corrupt and cruel administration of the Roman Government in Judea, of the gladiatorial combats, the public games, the races, and the theatrical exhibitions of the age, demoralizing and unchristian as they were ! Did he then approbate them ? With just as much reason might we agree, that the drinking customs of the age met his approval. If Mr. D. had not furnished us in his 'Sermon' ample proof of *incapacity* as a Commentator, as will yet more fully appear, one might wonder that a Collegiate Divine should look into his bible for specific directions as to the innocence or sinfulness of every particular practice. It was among the earliest lessons instilled into our mind, that the great object of Scripture was to inculcate great Moral Principles, leaving them to be applied to individuals according to their character and peculiar circumstances. Jesus and the Apostles did precisely so—they established general principles, but no more attacked every particular evil custom, than they established specifically every particular mode of doing good in all time to come. To be sure he *foresaw* the 'prevalence of Intemperance,' &c.; but it does not follow that he approbated it, because he did not specially speak against it ! Nor that he approbated the use of intoxicating drinks in all time to come because he 'changed Water into Wine,' even if it were alcoholic, which, however, we will believe *only*, when it is fairly *proved*. He *foresaw*, also, the 'sin of the Corinthians, &c. and yet he consecrated wine, &c. Yes, so he foresaw that Noah would get drunk on wine, yet without any recorded warning he allowed him to plant his vineyard ! He knew that 'Nadab and Abihu' when intoxicated would offer '*strange fire*' upon his altar and die ; yet he directed the priest to make an 'offering by *fire* unto the Lord' ! He knew that Adam would taste the forbidden fruit, yet he made that fruit the test of his allegiance ! The Saviour knew 'who should betray him,' yet he chose *that man* to be an Apostle ! And he knew that Mr. D. would employ his 'One Talent' very unworthily in opposing Temperance Societies, yet he committed it to him, and said, 'occupy till I come !' Certainly he knew too that the Temperance Society would exist in the present day and give His Apostle at Brockville a great deal of trouble, and yet he did nothing to prevent all this ! He foresaw Mr. D. himself

would be a 'Missionary,' and take some interest in the Sabbath School, and Bible Societies, and yet he has no where condemned the 'unauthorized' Missionary, Bible and Sabbath School operations nor their patrons; and that he would write an 'Apology,' yet seems to have paid no attention to it! Let us, on this subject hear no more about *fore-knowledge*.

Mr. D. seems to lay some stress upon the 'practice of his (Christ's) servants and the sanction of the Saviour in the days of his flesh,' respecting the 'common and social' use of 'Wine and Strong Drink.' To shorten my task, I will at once state that *Jesus and the Apostles generally in their intercourse with mankind, conformed to the customs, opinions, and prejudices of the age, as far as they could without sacrificing great principles of truth and duty.*—Thus St Paul says, 'unto the Jews I become as a Jew' &c. 1 Cor. 9, 19—22, under the influence of this sentiment we see him so far conform to the ritual of the law as to take upon him the vow of a Nazarite, and attend to all the prescribed solemnities. And on another occasion, in order to soften Jewish prejudices, and gain access to their minds, he yielded to them so far as to circumcise Timothy, his 'son in the Gospel,' because 'his father was a Greek.' And of our Saviour it is written, 'Even Christ pleased not himself.' Rom. 15, 3. In the exercise of this self-denying spirit he frequently accepted invitations to entertainments at places not of the highest repute as to Temperance. Surely no one will assume that he *approved* of their *customs* of 'eating and drinking' fully, or argue from the bare fact of his presence at them that he gave a universal 'sanction' to such entertainments! or infer that such apparent 'sanction' and the corresponding 'practice' of some of his Inspired 'servants' are to be regarded as establishing the unvarying rule of conduct proper to mankind in all time to come, Such a conclusion would be worthy of a fanatic or a madman only. This may be made to appear with clearness. For instance the 'practice' of John, and Jesus, and the course of conduct their examples 'sanctioned' are direct opposites. 'John came neither eating nor drinking; ; the Saviour came doing both. Mr. D. may consider John, as he terms us, a 'gloomy religionist,' but Jesus *approved* him. And ancient Pharisaic doctors might denominate Jesus, a 'gluttonous man and a Wine bibber, but we know the 'Lamb of God' was 'free from sin;' and we know too, that he earned this reproach by sacrificing even his good name to do 'truth.

licans and sinners' good. In the *conduct* of Jesus and his forerunner we perceive a design to benefit the Jews to the utmost, and leave them perfectly without excuse. When they were 'piped' to, they would not 'dance;' and when they were 'mourned' for, they would not 'lament.' John had a 'devil' in their estimation, and Jesus was a 'friend of sinners.' Surely all must see in these cases, contrasted, the principle of conformity to existing customs carried out, as far as it could be, innocently, in order to 'save the more.' If Mr. D. will adopt the opposite *sentiment*, let him prove true thereto, and follow out the 'practice' of Christ, and his 'servants' fully; let him imitate John Baptist in his *approved* abstemiousness as well as those whom Jesus 'sanctioned' in what Mr. D. calls 'seasonable mirth and innocent festivity.' Let him imitate St. Paul, and submit to the solemnities of the Nazaritish vow—and Jesus, when he allowed himself to be *led about* and tempted of the Devil forty days, or when he '*sat down*' to preach his sermon; and as Christ fed the people with 'barley loaves' and 'fish' let him live on *barley bread* and the meat that hath *scales*. These things *have* the Divine 'Sanction,' and a stickler for such a precedent in so equivocal an item as *intoxicating drinks*, will render himself suspected if he hesitate in these *palpable* cases. If the 'practice of his servants' cannot innocently be varied from, let him carefully 'break bread' *every* 'first day of the week' and let that bread be '*unleavened*' cakes. In attending to all these duties he will be following the 'practice of Christ's servants' and be able to refer to *authority* as 'sanctioning' his conduct; while for such things as 'sending a few bottles of Wine' in order to a 'merry making,' for which nevertheless he pleads, we know of no 'sanction' higher than enslaving custom; and must consider it a 'faithless expedient,' calculated to promote the '*laughter of fools*' rather than of '*joy in the Holy Ghost*.'

Mr. D. next proceeds to attack the doctrine of 'Expediency' as the friends of Temperance have for expediency's sake denominated the important principle under the influence of which christians feel it to be their duty to avoid or abstain from *lawful* indulgencies *for the good of others*.—He says the Apostle 'Paul was no admirer of such expediency.' Let us see. According to this Commentator, the spirit of self-denial and christian Philanthropy, which sometimes flamed so high in the Apostle's bosom, as to render him willing to be 'accursed for his kinsman's sake,' is cooled down to this temperature. 'The meats and wines offered

to idols have suffered nothing by that ; they are still pure in themselves and if I chose to do so, could partake of them innocently ; it would be 'lawful,' or I have a *right* to do so if I please, but if my partaking of them will make my brother to offend, I will never taste that identical meat and wine, for there is wine enough and meat enough to be had that has not been so offered, and *no thanks to the weak brother !* Further, Mr. D. thinks it would be unsafe to go because if the '*strong are to bear the infirmities of the weak,*' by 'giving up lawful things' instead of '*pleasing themselves*' 'the power' would soon be 'wrested from Apostolic hands.' And it would never do to lose the 'power' of mingling 'wine and strong drink.' For the honour of our holy religion and the sake of the Apostle I devoutly hope such a sentiment is not contained in the Bible as that sermon attributes to St. Paul. The passages referred to in the sermon are three. I shall quote them in order and give you the Comment (in brief) of Dr. A. Clarke on each, before I add any remarks of my own. See Rom. 14, 21. 'It is good neither to eat flesh,' &c. The Doctor says, 'the spirit and self-denying principles of the Gospel teach us, that we should not only avoid every thing in eating and drinking which may be an occasion of offence or apostacy to our brethren, but even to lay down our lives for them should it be necessary.' I will only add the word 'good' means right, proper, duty, &c. and the phrase 'any thing' goes a little farther than the identical meats and wines offered to idols, for no reference is made to idols in this whole Epistle.—The subject is *giving offence.* Taken together they teach us that a universal principle is laid down by the Apostle, designed to come into operation whenever our appetites and passions clash with the real interests of our fellow beings ; and as Dr. Clarke shews, extends not merely to the foregoing of certain 'meats' or 'wines' (provided I can have plenty of other that is quite as good,) but to the '*life*' itself which we should be willing to 'lay down' for the brethren.' Also in 1st Cor. 6, 12. 'All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient.' The Dr. remarks, 'Allowing that they are lawful, or that there is no law against them, yet they are not expedient ; *there is no necessity for them.*' I echo the last sentiment with reference to *intoxicating drinks*, 'there is no necessity for them.' Therefore, though in the abstract the use of them is right, abstinence from them for good purposes is laudable duty. See also, 1st Cor. 8, 13. 'Wherefore if meat make my brother to offend, &c.

The Dr. observes, 'Rather than give any occasion to a christian to sin against Christ and so to harden his conscience that he should return to idolatry and perish, I would not only abstain from meats offered to idols, but I would eat no flesh (and drink no wine, Rom. 14, 21,) should I exist throughout the whole course of time, but live on herbs &c. Is not this the 'proper application' of these passages; most in accordance with the spirit and genius of 'pure religion,' of St. Paul, and especially of him, who though 'he was rich yet for our sakes became poor, that we might be made rich?' Is not any other 'application' of them forced? and is not the meaning put upon the Apostles Words in the 'sermon' a libel on the Christian Benevolence of the self denying Apostles? I will not say there are not even professing Ministers of Christ, whose self-denial could not be screwed up a jot higher than Mr. D's Comment, but such should not force St. Paul to fit their iron bed stand. Like his Master, the Apostle's expansive, burning charity spurns such sordid limits, and soaring above all selfishness and indifference, pants to do and suffer 'any thing' necessary for the salvation of lost men. I cannot but think most seriously that with such views of scripture, Mr. D. would prove an *incubus* rather than otherwise should he ever profess friendship for the Temperance Society. Suppose the Rector should meet one of his parishioners, literally 'stumbling' through 'strong drink,' who, as politely as the nature of the case would admit of, should invite his Rector to 'countenance' the 'common' use of [intoxicating] wine or strong drink, by taking a 'horn' with him; I fancy I hear this kind of a reply,—'It is lawful, and I have a right to drink with you if I chose to do so; but in this public place, and especially as you are intoxicated, it is not *expedient*, as it might encourage others, and still more *stumble* you, I will therefore abstain from tasting the contents of *that* 'identical' jug, as I have several well primed decanters at home!?' What miracles of conversion from drunkenness such a shining example of disinterested benevolence would accomplish! Such christian heroism is sufficient to entitle its possessor to immediate Cannonization! But to be serious, I am willing to rest our cause on this ground, the scriptural doctrine of expediency. The sum of all amounts to this—rather than *offend*, St. Paul would abandon the use of '*any thing*' not essential to existence and duty. Now the '*offensive*' character of intoxicating drinks is palpable. The reason for abstinence then is very strong and it comes immediately

home to every heart. With *less cause* St. Paul would cheerfully renounce the 'common' use of things (as flesh) confessedly useful; with *greater cause* we are required to yield what we no more need while in health, than we need prussic acid or laudanum. Our duty is then both plain and easy; and christian patriotism and benevolence require that we honestly discharge it.

On page 14, not too reverently towards our Saviour, nor with over much courtesy towards the Rev. T. C. Wilson of Perth, Mr. D. has chosen to put some of that gentleman's words, ('almost verbatim') into the mouth of 'Saul of Tarsus,' who is supposed to address them to Jesus, *offensively*, in order to exhibit the anti-christian sentiments and 'strains of the advocates of Temperance societies.' It is no doubt very *convenient* for Mr. D. to overlook the expediency character of some of our Saviour's movements—to forget the *difference* of circumstances, which has been above referred to, and to beg the question as he continually does, as to the *alcoholic* character of the wine our Saviour countenanced. And does not any candid mind perceive that John Baptist might be pitted against the Saviour, as well as many other good men whose approved conduct differed from his, on the same principle and with equal effect? After such usage of a respectable author and valuable Minister, Mr. D. could not complain should *severity* be used in shewing up his faulty sermon. I shall, however, *calmly* pursue my purpose unto the end. Allow me now, then, with no compunction of spirit, as to *reverence*, select ('almost verbatim') some sentences of the 'sermon' to be addressed to Satan, *pleasurable*, in order to exhibit the unity of sentiment, and the similarity of the 'strains' of *Anti-temperance* advocates with those of the Fallan Angel. I shall not employ a third (or *pious*) person; the 'Author shall speak for himself.—

"Thou enemy of all Righteousness,"

'It strikes me that our sin does not consist in an opposition to the [temperance] System, but in non-opposition;—in apparent apathy, and that we are culpable in having let the error alone so long. Hence the confusion, the darkness, the perfect ignorance of many professing christians touching *True Church of Christ principles*. God is [now] teaching her watchmen that the trumpet must no LONGER 'give an uncertain sound.' The avowed enemies of Christ and his gospel have often, and do still in many places patronise it (the T. Society) as making for their infidel principles. They view it [as] altogether Anti-Christian in its

tendency. [It is a] greivous error, [a] faithless expedient, a bastard morality. Unjust and ungenerous charges shall neither fright nor tempt me into countenancing or propagating a poor meagre make shift morality. [I assure thee that though] He [Christ] must have foreseen the sin of the Corinthians who got drunk 'at the Holy Communion,' He yet consecrated the application of [intoxicating] wine to that most solemn ordinance; [that] the injunction to use Wine and Strong Drink 'before the Lord' was given to a generation as prone to excess as the present race of men; and St. Paul himself, [though] he would abstain from such meat and wine as had been offered to idols lest the faith of some weak brethren might thereby be endangered, [could find] Wine enough, and meat enough, that had *not* been so offered, of which he might partake. [And] Our Lord taught his followers that every [alcoholic] creature of God is good and not to be refused. He came eating and drinking, [alcoholic wine.] He manifested forth his Glory, by changing water into [intoxicating] wine, not to supply the *actual wants* of his entertainers, but to minister to their innocent festivity in riddles, sports, and probably in dancing. Since the formation of Temperance Societies in the United States intoxication has fearfully increased!! There is no reason why we should suppose that similar societies in our Province should meet with more success. Suppose the assertion true that the Temperance Reformation has effected great good [that is] no certain proof of the soundness of the principles. If this [the good done] be the best proof I say, Bad is the Best. [I appeal to thee,] what infinitely greater good would have been by this time effected had the Missionaries of this moral excitement used the same energy and zeal, in compelling their sinful fellow men to come to the *one* great and Divinely Instituted Temperance Society, [the Church of England, where are no] pledges of sobriety [save] the *sacramental plèdge* and other means of *grace*. [I shall continue to exhort] my Brethren to give no helping hand to the meagre, ascetic Reformation [which like] Papal Rome withholds *wine* from the congregation of Christ's flock, and that has flourished most at the head quarters of American Unitarianism, Universalism and Atheism.

'Bravo,' said Satan, 'my Peers, that's the Clergyman for me.'

I will now proceed to notice a favorite remark of Mr. D. and other Anti-Temperance persons. It is said the *argu-*

ments of the Temperance advocates against drinks, bear equally against meats. Mr. D. has even the face to affirm that the one encourages drunkenness no more than the other does gluttony, and he in fact states the inference that the *use* of the one is no more to be opposed than the other. The whole of this is error of the grossest kind. First, suppose we admit that food 'encourages gluttony' as much as intoxicating drinks does drunkenness. What comparison is there between existing gluttony and existing Intemperance as to the evil effects produced! To ask the question is surely enough.

But second,—Admitting that evil effects connect themselves with the use of meats, inasmuch as eating food is essentially necessary to our existence and support, these must be born with or remedied by attention to the quality and quantity. The *use* of food cannot be *innocently* disused. A person that should starve himself to death voluntarily would be a suicide. Every body knows this. But will any person say the same of intoxicating drinks? Is it necessary to life, or even health? No; but the reverse.—What then becomes of Mr. D's 'exact parallel?' That any man capable of *reading* a Sermon should volunteer such a conclusion from conning the quotation he makes from my pamphlet, is without an 'exact parallel' within the circle of my observation!

But third,—I deny the truth of the assertion altogether, and ask for proof. In the meantime, I will remark, that a Christian actuated by the spirit of St. Paul, would cheerfully abstain even from any *particular kind of meat*, rather than be the means of ruining an immortal soul. But Mr. D. *knows* that no special general danger exists on that ground now. If he does, then he should act accordingly. But he does know that such danger exists by means of intoxicating drinks? It is too universally known that all Alcoholic drinks are, to persons in health, never useful, but always injurious. And 'shocking' as such 'observations' sound to ears polite, forasmuch as they are incontrovertibly true I must be allowed to repeat, that '*Alcohol is a poison.*' And Mr. D. should *not* forget that it devolves upon *him* to *prove* that the consecrated '*fruit of the vine*' was *alcoholic*, before he repeats his slanderous remarks about 'assailing the Saviour and the Sacrament.' Does Mr. D. seriously doubt whether Alcohol is a poison? Physicians, such as Rush, Hossack, Reese, and thousands more, will pronounce it poison. Its effects internally and externally, on the hu-

them and manifested himself to them and prolonged the lives of some of them above an hundred years. It is equally true, also, that thousands of Temperance members are *'his friends.'*

3. God has set his seal of approbation on Total Abstinence.

The Nazaritish vow included every description of those drinks which others were tolerated to use, even to 'vinegar of wine.' These were *total abstinence* men. Now when God wanted a man for any difficult and special service, he selected these very persons. Among these worthies, rank, Samson, Samuel, Daniel, and John Baptist. Jehovah, too, rebuked the Jews for tempting the Nazarites to drink. *'I raised up of your young men for Nazarites, but ye gave them wine to drink,' &c. 'Behold I am pressed under you,' &c.* Will Mr. D. imitate those 'rebuked' Jews and instil his 'Wine and Strong Drink' sentiments into the minds of the 'Students of Divinity' he speaks of? The history of the 'Resolution put into his hands by one' of them (with which history we happen to be familiar) would intimate the affirmative and also that *Lessons* on the *Temperance* subject are readily received and submissively attended to! It will be mere evasion for the 'Apologist' to repeat, with regard to the Nazaritish vow, what he says about the 'sin of shaving' &c. I argue not so loosely. The case proves all I quote it to prove, viz. that it is *not sinful*, but on the contrary *acceptable to God*, to abstain from particular drinks. The case of the Rechabites proves the same. But we are told in the Sermon, 'They were blessed because they had performed the commandment of their father.' Granted. And what was that Commandment? Hear it.—'Ye shall drink no Wine; ye, nor your sons forever.' Jer. 35, &c. And were they blessed in observing this Command? Then it was a *lawful* command. 'Children are to obey their parents in all things in the Lord.' The fathers enjoined then what was *right*, and they were *approved* in the persevering observance of the enjoined duty. Abstinence Rules, and Abstinence Practice are here seen to have the seal of Heaven's approbation stamped upon them; which we firmly believe is what cannot be as fairly shewn with regard to the common use of Alcoholic Drinks. If any think differently, the Records are at hand. *'To the Law and to the Testimony.'*

In Conclusion, I have not taken the trouble to pen the above Strictures because I feared the 'Sermon' in question would do much harm. No. It is morally impossible now, for such men as its Author to make their tiny weight perceptible, on the whole, against the cause. It will nevertheless do some harm. It will be *something* for some Spirit manufacturers, and dealers to ease their consciences with, when 'Truth' has made their business in blood, well nigh intolerable. And the *inebriate* of every grade will find in that 'Sermon' all he needs to encourage him to persevere on, despite the efforts of family and friends, to take his 'social' and 'common' glass, till the tale of woe is forever told. He will also find there *missiles* ready at hand, and prepared by a Clergyman, which when winged with an oath or two will defy comparison in the Province of Upper Canada. I know well who must bear the fearful responsibility. But it is painful to witness such things, and these 'Strictures' are written to correct the evil, as far as may be, and to shew to all that we understand our position, and our principles, and are able and determined to maintain them inviolate against *every sort of opposition*. I disclaim all unkind feeling towards the Writer or his Church; though I regard them both as 'committed' to the side of the Intemperate, as a part of the allied force against the temperance cause. There are honorable exceptions as to individuals, I am happy to acknowledge. I have no disposition for combat; but if such publications as the 'Apology' are thrown before the

public, that public *must* be better instructed at all hazards. If I know my own heart I take a part in the Temperance cause, not from fashion or from momentary excitement, but because I believe it to be a duty which I owe to God, and to the best interests of my fellow men. Apart from the Temperance Society I might be safe, and many individuals more, but unless the Society progresses, thousands on thousands will perish, and the cause of human happiness and of Religion, as well as the Glory of God, will be greatly retarded. In view of these important facts and influenced by these impressive sentiments, I make my humble appeal to one, to all, and affectionately ask them to consult their own hearts in SECRET PRAYER, and at the COMMUNION TABLE, and decide in view of the whole case whether they can do the *most good* by becoming consistent active members of the Temperance Society, or by standing aloof and it may be pleading for the *moderate use of the poison!* Let our position now be well understood. We press upon all, Abstinence from distilled liquors without exception, and Abstinence from Wine and Strong Beer as an habitual beverage, on the ground of expediency, moral influence, and as a preventive against the production of that artificial appetite for more and more still, which the daily use of these articles is at least quite apt to produce. I will only add 'we would hail' Mr. D. and his flock, and avail us of 'their help and labour of love' on right principles, in the good Temperance cause, 'with joyfulness.' Praying God to bless him, and to keep the public from imbibing his errors, and copying his example, so far as Wine and Strong Drink is concerned; and also to sanction this humble attempt to sustain *Truth*, I will now lay down my worn out pen—for a season.

FINIS.

NOTE.—The Author of the foregoing, from absence, has not had an opportunity of revising the Proofs. On looking over the first sheet since it was printed, a few slight errors have been discovered. One on the 7th Page, Top Line, needs more particularly to require notice, as the word "*Intemperance*" is erroneously printed in place of "*Temperance*."—Pa.