

rous. We suppose these reptiles, of some variety or other, are to be found in the meadows in all parts of the country, at this season of the year; and they are generally considered dangerous, and the more so if the attack is unexpected.

This is an ugly subject to write upon, and it is not improbable that some of our fair readers, of delicate nerves, will begin to tremble before they lay down this paper, and as soon as possible afterwards dream about snakes, and wake up in a fright. But if they do, the fault is not ours. There are serpents in existence, and they are dangerous, whether we say any thing about them or not; and persons who have a particle of wisdom will take care to shun the danger, when they are told of it in advance.

There's a serpent, now—all in a coil—it seems to be asleep and altogether harmless—but touch it at your peril, with any thing but a shillalah! Crush it instantly, or somebody will be bitten—poisoned—before the sun sets!—"But where is it? Don't you see it? Lay down your scythe, and go to that tall bunch of grass that has been left standing down there by the spring—see that ugly black jug—the poisonous serpent is in that jug, and ready to—(ugh! how shall we tell it?) ready to run down any one's throat that makes free with it! Crush that serpent, as you would copper head!

But there's another! Take care, madam, you are not out of danger. Your husband, your son, and your lover, Miss, may be bitten, and fatally bitten before you are aware—and you may be to blame, for the reptile is in your custody. "Where? not in the house is it? Do you say there's a serpent in the house?"—Yes it is. Go to your parlour—to your closet or sideboard, and there you'll find it. It may not appear venomous—you may have sported with it and have escaped thus far—but my word for it, the bite is poisonous. It has killed thousands. Of all venomous reptiles, the "worm of the still" is most to be dreaded. It has destroyed more lives, a hundred to one, than all other serpents put together. Crush it wherever you find it—in the meadow or the parlour. Have no parleying about it. While you hesitate, it may sting you. *Temperance Adv.*

Original Articles.

REPLY TO SOME 'REMARKS ON TEMPERANCE SOCIETIES.*

It is remarked, "I should concede, in regard to the individual Christian, that he is pledged to God to remain temperate,

and therefore need not, and perhaps should not join the Temperance Society, with a view to be kept temperate. But does this obligation to God in regard to self, permit the use of Temperance Societies in regard to those who are likely to become intemperate?" Here is the whole question in a nutshell. The Christian 'should not join the Temperance Society, with a view to be kept temperate.' This is conceded. The Christian clearly cannot consistently join with such a view, for if he do, he is thereby virtually acknowledging the superiority of the Temperance over the Christian pledge; and, consequently, cannot consider this last sufficient for him, so that, in this act, he forsakes his faith,—he shews he has not undoubting trust in the efficacy of the Christian motive.

But if it be improper for the Christian to join a Temperance Society for his own sake, may he not join for the sake of others, of 'those who are likely to become intemperate'? Who are they that 'are likely to become intemperate'? They must be either true Christians, or nominal Christians, or infidels, or heathens. It has been shewn that a christian should not join a Temperance society 'with a view to be kept temperate himself;' neither should he join with the view of keeping *other Christians* (whether real or nominal) temperate, because, what it is inconsistent with his Christian profession to do himself, it must be equally inconsistent for him to teach or induce others of the same profession to do.

Can he then join with the view of keeping temperate those infidels or heathens who 'are likely to become intemperate'? He cannot,—because the christian must think the christian pledge the best and most powerful; and, therefore, in fulfilling his duty 'to do all the good he can,' he must offer to the infidel and the heathen the best pledge, the christian pledge, and no other. The christian then should not join the Temperance society with the view of keeping temperate, himself, his christian brethren, or the infidel or heathen. With what view then can he join? With the view of reclaiming the drunkard? No.—Because, whatever may be the motives he may urge in his endeavours to reclaim him, if he succeed, he must, as a member of the Temperance society, offer the temperance pledge, 'with a view to keep him temperate;' thus virtually teaching him that this is a more efficacious safeguard than the christian pledge.

May the christian then join for the sake of his example? Surely not,—because if it be improper to join with the views above-mentioned, he sets a bad example in joining; an example which teaches his fellow creatures a false instead of a true standard.

He sets a much better example by refusing to join; because he thereby shews he has perfect confidence in the christian pledge. He thinks this sufficient for himself and all others.

But then it is urged, that professing christians are not all temperate,—granted—but why? because professing christians are not all true christians. Are all who sign the temperance pledge temperate men? no man can be so bold as to say so. All temperance members then are not temperate men; but all true christians are.

It appears then evident that the christian cannot consistently become a member of the Temperance society, either for his own sake, or for the sake of others.

• Q. E. D.

REJOINDER TO "REPLY TO SOME 'REMARKS ON TEMPERANCE SOCIETIES.'"

It having been 'conceded that a true christian need not, and, perhaps, should not join a temperance society with the view of being kept temperate, (it being perfectly useless, since he has a much higher motive than can be given him by a temperance society;) we need not say more in respect of the part of a Christian's duty that regards temperance. We must put out of view entirely any advantage to himself, since the supposition of his being a true christian presupposes a state, which would render joining the temperance society as a safeguard to himself, a perfect absurdity. We have only then to consider the propriety or the impropriety of his joining a temperance society with a view to the benefit of others.

The Reply states: 'Those who may be supposed likely to become intemperate are either true christians, nominal christians, or infidels. In regard to the first, we may leave them out, for no true christian can be intemperate; and, therefore, no christian will ever be called upon to join a temperance society with the view of keeping a brother christian temperate. There remain, therefore, two classes, the nominal christians and the infidels; but as a large number of nominal christians are as little affected by the truths of religion as professed infidels, it will be more to the purpose to divide those likely to become intemperate into those who have some fear of God and love to religion, and those who (practically at least) have neither.'

The Reply says: "Neither should he join with the view of keeping other christians, whether real or nominal, temperate," why? "Because what it is inconsistent with christian profession to do himself, it must be equally inconsistent for him to teach, or induce others of the same pro-

* Published in our number for July last.