

use of ardent spirits. And instead of giving a soft appeal to their enemy, commending certain excellencies he was supposed to possess, and the propriety and perhaps profit of a moderate intercourse with him, instead of all this, they have just shut the door in his face. The fact is, these islanders are not guilty of such folly as to let a venomous serpent creep about their dwelling, while they amuse themselves and their children with admiring his bright scales and sparkling eyes, in the soothing assurance that if they did not make too free with him he would do them no injury. They leave this kind of wisdom to the enlightened of other parts of the earth, while, like beings of reason and common sense, they forbid the serpent all access to their dwellings. They have found out their foe, and in the true use of the judgment with which they are endowed, treat the foe according to his character. —*Boston Recorder.*

We cannot help remarking on the above extract, that the example of these Islanders, who are just emerging from a state of barbarism, is one which more enlightened nations would do well to follow. They found that the intoxicating drinks with which they were so liberally supplied by the merchants of England and America, were producing the most deplorable consequences in their once happy island. They remembered the time when they lived without rum; they could, therefore, judge whether it would be better to use it, or to live without it still; and, finding that it had produced nothing but evil, they unanimously resolved to banish it for ever from their shores; why does not Lower Canada come to the same determination? It is not because rum is doing less mischief in the Province, but because the minds of its inhabitants are more prejudiced in its favour, and having been so long accustomed to use it, they cannot judge impartially respecting the consequences of abstinence, nor conceive the happiness they would enjoy if they would exclude it totally from the country.

Original Articles.

Abstinence, a Scriptural means of doing good.

(Concluded from our last.)

In our last paper on this subject we showed the abstinence enjoined by the Apostle Paul, upon the churches of Rome and Corinth, had for its object the prevention of

sin; and we thence argued that, as Temperance Societies practise abstinence with the same view, they can plead apostolical authority in vindication of the soundness of their principles. As we conceive this point is of great importance in the question, we beg leave to offer the following remarks, to show how fully the abstinence which is practised by Temperance Societies, corresponds in principle with that enjoined by the Apostle:—

First, The use of those things from which the Apostle abstained, was lawful in itself. The Apostle admits that these Christians had a "liberty" to use them, but exhorts them to give it up, lest it should prove a stumbling-block to others. Indeed, the language of the Apostle, "It is good neither to eat flesh, &c." would be reduced to an absurdity on the opposite opinion. Temperance Societies admit the same thing respecting the use of intoxicating liquors. This furnishes an answer to an objection which we sometimes hear—if the use of intoxicating drinks is lawful in itself, why am I required to abstain? The same objection might have been made against the Apostle.

Second, The Apostle and those whom he more immediately addresses in the verses under consideration, could use those things without sin, so far as they themselves were concerned. They "had knowledge," and could, therefore, avoid the errors which some of their more ignorant brethren committed in the indiscriminate use of food; their abstinence was not practised with the view of obtaining any personal benefit. We admit the same thing, substantially respecting the moderate, who constitute the great majority of the members of our Associations. It is true, that even the moderate will derive great personal benefit by returning to what Dr. Gregory called "the sole primitive and main natural drink" of man, but as this benefit is not moral, but physical, we consider this, therefore, another point of coincidence.—This furnishes an answer to another objection which is frequently made; I can use these drinks moderately, why then should I abstain? The same objection might have been made against the Apostle.

Third, The conduct of the primitive Christians in using those things referred to, became sinful only so far as it operated as an example upon others, which, from a deficiency in knowledge, they were not able to follow with safety. A "weak brother was emboldened" to use the same things, but as his conscience scrupled about the propriety of doing so, he thereby became guilty of sin—he was acting in opposition to his conscience. This is another point of coincidence between the principles of Temperance Societies and the abstinence enjoined by the

Apostle. Though many are able to use intoxicating drinks with perfect moderation, and therefore commit no evil, so far as they themselves are concerned, yet others, in attempting to follow their example, *do commit sin*, and that of a very aggravated nature. We consider it the duty of all to give no *occasion* to this sin; but, so long as they countenance the drinking usages that produced it, they give *direct occasion* to it, and act in direct opposition to this rule of the Apostle.

Should any person object, that there is not a coincidence or parallelism in this case, because the sin in the one case arose from scruples of conscience respecting the propriety of using the prohibited diet, but that no person can have such scruples of conscience respecting the use of intoxicating drink, we admit in reply the truth of the objection, respecting all the prohibited articles except "wine." There is no evidence that any person had scruples of conscience respecting the propriety of using it—the thing seems impossible. It could cause another to stumble *only by its intoxicating qualities*. This was the cause of its prohibition, and the rule must apply to all drinks which possess the same qualities, and produce the same effects. Moreover, though wine had not been mentioned it would be wrong to limit the rule of the Apostle to "things sacrificed to idols," or meats forbidden by the law of Moses; the only things respecting which scruples of conscience could exist—it is expressly extended to "*any thing*" which, however, harmless in itself, might yet produce sin in other men. Besides, in laying down this rule, the Apostle seems to lay little stress on the particular way in which the sin in question was brought about; it was sufficient for him to know that sin was committed, and that it could be prevented by abstinence. We contend, therefore, that there is a complete coincidence between the abstinence practised by Temperance Societies, and that which was enjoined by the Apostle, in their motives, nature, and ends.

Fourth, It deserves particular notice that the sin committed by the use of those things prohibited by the Apostle, arose from the *ignorance* of those who sinned. This furnishes us with a very satisfactory answer to an objection which some shallow opponents of Temperance Societies have presented. Affecting superior attachment to the gospel, and a sort of ludicrous fear that the interests of Evangelical religion should be injured by the "Infidel" measures of Temperance Societies, they have declaimed as follows: "Put down sin by abstinence! that is not the Scriptural way—preach the gospel—illuminate men's minds, and convince them