

side-de-camp. He, proud of his present, was showing off on it gaily enough, when suddenly the French sounded a trumpet, and the horse, used to the call, carried the unwilling rider at full speed into the enemy's camp."—J. V.

The Cross;

HALIFAX, SATURDAY, AUGUST 25.

M. POWER, PRINTER.

TEMPERANCE.

In our last article on this subject, we gave a faint description of the beastly drunkard. We are told it was nauseous and revolting. Be it so. It was impossible to make it otherwise. Our object was to produce loathing and disgust. The filthy subject could not be treated of in an attractive form. Every thing, in the drunken maniac, is hideous and repulsive; and we could not, if we would, unite *beauty and the Beast*. When the pagans of ancient Greece wanted to inspire their children with horror for the vice of drunkenness, they intoxicated their slaves and then exhibited them in all their disgusting capers and drunken gyrations. We wanted to do the same, at least on paper, and by 'holding the mirror up to nature; to show vice its own image.' Let the drunkard study that picture, and contemplate himself in that mirror, and he must inevitably fall even in his own esteem.

There was a time, and not very remote, when a Drunkard was looked upon as a kind of Hero, a prince of good fellows, and when a man's merit was estimated not by his virtues, but by his brutalities; not by the capacity of his intellect, but of his swinish stomach. The Sot who could contain most liquid, was most highly prized by his drunken conferees. The scale of human merit might with equal justice be applied to the beer-barrel, or the hogshead. In those days, the principal functions of the host were to make his guests drink like fishes; to force the liquor down their throats; to impose nauseous penalties on abstinence; to look upon the possession of reason as a crime against society. If his friends tumbled from their seats, and rolled beneath the table, snorting, and grunting, and vomiting like beasts, his triumph was complete; he was a jovial, glorious fellow, and boasted of his victories before an admiring audience. Formerly, it was no disgrace to be a drunkard; a man did not lose caste in society for his alcoholic tendencies. In fact, the principles of morality were inverted; night was called day, and vice virtue. The most mischievous result of this state of things was, that public opinion, which ought to be the protection and encouragement of virtue, was enlisted on the side of vice. No man was ashamed of that for which he received the applause of his fellows. The abstemious man was sneered at as a chicken-hearted, pitiful wretch, devoid of all spirit; and what was worse he was set down as a miser whose contracted heart would not suffer him to expend a shilling. On the other hand, the brutal drunkard was exalted into the *beau ideal* of generosity and spirit. Ave; even when his maelstrom throat was swallowing down his houses, and lands and property, his wife's dowry, his chil-

den's inheritance, and his neighbour's goods, he was extolled as a fine off-hand-ed fellow, the prince of munificence. Thank God! there has been much correction here; morality has recovered its place, and brazen vice been thrust down from its usurped seat. Things are beginning to be called by their right names, and infamy is affixed to shameful deeds. It is no longer a glory to be drunk; there is neither pleasure, profit nor applause, in the vile habit. The drunkard is despised; he loses caste and credit; he is shunned by every one who respects himself. When a man is now seen once drunk, especially in public, he falls one hundred per cent; his reputation receives a deadly stab; the children laugh at him, the aged weep for him; the worldling shakes his head, and says he's 'a gone coon'; the merchant buttons his pockets, the shop-keeper locks up his goods; the creditor thinks of his lawyer, the mortgage-holder soliloquizes upon a foreclosure, the usurious shark grins with delight, and the auctioneer twirls his impatient hammer with a prophetic look of satisfaction. This is indeed a great and a just revolution in public opinion, and for this we have much reason to be grateful to the distinguished advocates of Temperance at home and abroad, foremost amongst whom, by universal consent, stands the far-famed Father Mathew. The salutary change which has come over public opinion respecting the vices of intemperance and swearing, especially amongst the intelligent classes, we have long considered to be the strongest proofs of the alleged superior enlightenment of the present age. It is not now fashionable either to drink or to swear. Erstwhile no one was a finished gentleman, unless he was a finished drunkard, and swore like a trooper. The toper will, nevertheless, still find some ignorant apologists. What more common than to hear, 'Oh! the poor fellow has only the one fault; the creature does no harm to any one but himself.' Only one fault! But that one is a monstrous fault, and the fruitful parent of many monsters. That one is incompatible with the justifying grace of God; that one renders all his former good works valueless as far as an eternal recompense is concerned. That one frequently causes the violation of all the commandments. For who most constantly breaks the great Commandment of loving God and his neighbour? Who curses, swears and blasphemes? Who takes the Holy names of God and the Redeemer in vain? Who profanes the sanctity of the Lord's day? Who dishonours, disobeys, and perhaps strikes his parents, and brings down their grey hairs to the grave in sorrow? Who robs, cheats and lies; who covets his neighbour's property and goods? Who hates, strikes and frequently kills his neighbour? Who seduces virtuous innocence, and brings maidenly modesty to shame and despair? Who wallows in the mire of filthy sensuality, and gloats over the charnel house of a foul imagination, and brings dishonour upon once virtuous and happy families?—Who, but the odious, the detestable, the accursed drunkard; and all, this with his one fault! Moses, in his zeal, broke all the commandments or Tables of the law when, in coming down from the mount where he conversed with

God, he found the people immersed in wickedness. 'They sat down to eat and drink, and they rose up to play.' They sat down to intemperance and gluttony, and they rose up to idolatry and vice. Even so, the drunkard. His one fault frequently leads to the commission of hundreds, and to the breaking of all the Commandments.

But, 'he does no harm to any one but himself!' Does he not? Even if this were as true as it is false, is it not a great crime to injure himself? Is there not a natural and divine obligation to love ourselves? Does not Christ propose the love of ourselves as the standard and model by which we are bound to love our neighbour? How can we injure ourselves and love others? If we do harm to ourselves, what becomes of the standard by which we are to serve and do good to our neighbours? No; it is almost impossible for us to conceive how we can injure ourselves exclusively, without also injuring our neighbour. Then, the order of charity requires that in loving ourselves, we should give the preference to the superior part of our nature—that we should love the soul more than the body. But, the drunkard hates his soul, he murders it, he exposes it to everlasting perdition. It has been well asked, 'How can we love God whom we do not see, if we do not love our neighbour whom we see?' and we may add: How can we love our neighbour, if we be so cruel, so unnatural and so wicked, as not to love ourselves, our own immortal soul?

But it is false to say that the drunkard injures no one but himself. He injures God and man. He invades the rights of heaven, he usurps the privileges of the Deity. He unjustly sacrifices his health and his life, and his soul, all of which belonged to God and not to him. He perverts the order of creation; he degrades the humanity which was ennobled by Christ in the hypostatic union; he tramples upon the blood of the Redeemer, and makes void His great atonement. He contristates the spirit of God, transforming His living Temple into a receptacle of unclean Devils. The drunkard loses his time, squanders his property, mispends his talents, and thus he cannot do without injuring others. He injures his parents, or his wife, or his children, or his family, or his domestics, or his neighbours. He robs his family and society of the benefit of his edifying example, and of the good deeds which he was bound to perform, and the virtuous life which he was bound to lead, and he inflicts upon them the contagious curse of his scandalous example. But, we have no patience with this miserable sophistry. We defy the whole world to produce an instance of even one Drunkard who 'does no harm to any body but himself!'

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

A Presbyterian's third letter has been received. We are glad to hear that he is satisfied with our remarks on the last subject which he brought under our notice. The queries which he now addresses are contained in such a rambling, incoherent dissertation that we are forced to believe the writer has not studied any regular course of divinity or logic. We must therefore make one general reply to all that is

worthy of notice in his Epistle, as we think the insertion of the 'rudis, indigestaque moles' itself would be too much for the patience of our readers.

1. The Holy Scripture does not properly consist in the mere words of the sacred text, but in the real, accurate meaning of those words. Hence many who read the Bible are really ignorant of God's word, because they know not the meaning of what they read.

2. It is possible for one to learn the essential truths of Salvation, and to know what they have to believe and practice without ever reading one chapter of the Bible.

3. Nearly all the first converts to Christianity were established in the True Faith of Christ without reading the Bible, the whole of which was not then completed. They were converted by oral teaching and preaching as Christ commanded.

4. For nearly 1500 years the great majority of Christians in every country learned the doctrines of the Bible, not by reading the text itself, but from the instructions of their Pastors who being legitimately commissioned by the Church expounded the Scriptures to them.

5. Christ never wrote any of the Scriptures, never charged his Apostles to write them, never told them to convert the world by writing and circulating the Scriptures. His commission was: *Go teach all nations. Preach the Gospel to every creature.*

6. Since the Apostles' time, no Christian nation was ever converted by merely reading the Holy Scriptures.

7. A Presbyterian mistakes our doctrine of Tradition. Any fact or doctrine may be handed down or delivered either in writing or by speech. Thus there is written Tradition, and Unwritten tradition—the written word of God, and the unwritten word, both certain, both divine and equally worthy of respect.

8. God's revelation consists of the written and the unwritten word—those two venerable Traditions. When any of the inspired prophets spoke to any one, or issued a command in God's name, their words were of equal authority with their writings or traditional signs.

9. The Catholic Church does not follow mere human Traditions. Her written and oral traditions are Divine, have come from God, and from those divinely commissioned by Him. She has therefore faithfully kept and venerated them.

10. It is certain that the Divine Unwritten word, or Tradition, existed before the written word and this is true both with respect to the Old Testament and the Scriptures of the New Law.

11. Therefore, under both covenants, God's revelation was made known to mankind, and he was truly adored and worshipped before his inspired word was written. Consequently the principle of Oral, or unwritten Tradition is not a new one.

We commend the above for the present to the very serious perusal of a Presbyterian. He will find in those few, plain propositions an answer to all his apparent difficulties.

A Teetotaler.—Before we dismiss the subject we may point out some of the mischiefs and ridicule to which this sacred cause has been exposed from the intemperance of Temperance advocates themselves. Their rabid cant, pharisaical hypocrisy and odious assurance have done more harm to the great cause than is generally imagined. The professed drunkard, as well as the impious scoffer glories at the exhibition of such puerile antics as those described by our correspondent. We do not however agree with him in one point, for we think there is an immense deal of hearty sincerity on the subject in this city, and that in other places there is much more humbug practised than in Halifax.

RT. REV. DR. DOLLARD.

The venerated Bishop of Fredericton, lately returned to St. John, N. B. after a visitation of his Diocese which lasted several weeks. During the last two years his Lordship confirmed Four thousand, four hundred and thirteen persons.