

also that it operated in the same way in the days of Noah, and Lot, and in the days of the Apostle, as is evident from his frequent allusions to drunkenness in his epistles. Now, is Mr. M'G. able to show that there was some other way by which it led to sin—that the apostle alludes only to this other way; and that his injunction in this verse is so founded upon it that it would be *unscriptural* to explain it as having a reference to that which we have just pointed out? The conclusion appears to us altogether irresistible, that wine caused a brother to offend, because of its intoxicating quality, and to prevent this offence the early Christians were commanded to abstain from it; and, since it possesses the same quality at the present day, and produces *offence* also, it is the *duty of all Christians* to abstain from it still.

Mr. M'G. imagines he finds another objection in the difference of the objects contemplated by the abstinence which the Apostle enjoined, and that which is practised by Temperance Societies. The former regarded only "a brother," but the latter regards all men, whether members of the Church of Christ or not. This objection, however, is made with such evident insincerity on the part of Mr. M'G. that it deserves no reply. If he is sincere, let him abstain for the sake of a "brother"—he must know that it is causing thousands of brethren to offend—and when he gives us this proof of his sincerity we may then attempt to convince him that Christian benevolence proposes the good of *all men* as its object, and has nothing more than a *special* reference to "the household of faith."

In his second letter on this text Mr. M'G. makes the following admission, which is evidently fatal to his cause:—"All that can be drawn from (it) to favour the doctrine of 'expediency' as taught by my opponents is this: that every man is bound by a sense of his duty to God to abstain from giving, countenancing, or advising his neighbour to drink, whom he knows to be a drinker. *In the company of such* he is bound to abstain." Does Mr. M'Ginn then admit that he is bound to abstain when in the company of a drinker? We would then seriously ask him, if, by his speeches and letters, he has not done what is equivalent to drinking in the company of every *drinker* in Montreal—has he not given them reason to believe that they have his concurrence and approbation? If he refuses to drink in the drinker's company, what good would be gained by going into another room or another house to do so? The only way in which Mr. M'G. can effectually accomplish the object in view in this case, is to give the drinker to understand that he *never drinks*.

In his tenth letter, in which he professes to examine 1 Cor. 8. 16. we find the following declaration at the very commencement:—"I may remark that the Apostle seems to have been wholly ignorant of the *pledge*; in fact we read of no such thing in the Old or New Testament." We are surprised at this; the verse which Mr. M'G. was just about to "examine critically" contains a *pledge*, which was given by the apostle, evidently for the purpose of pointing out the rule of conduct to others—"If meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I may make my brother to offend." If Mr. M'G. will put *wine* instead of *flesh*, and make a corresponding change on the verb eat, he will have the pledge of Temperance Societies—if not in words, at least in meaning.

We have no inclination to follow Mr. M'G. any farther. We have defended, we trust to the satisfaction of our readers, the text which stands as a motto over this journal, against his misrepresentations, and as this was the main object we had in view from the first, we consider ourselves released from the disagreeable and we may add unnecessary task of proceeding farther with our review. We see much that is good in Mr. M'G.'s letters, but more that is evil,—they appear to us a remarkable confirmation of the old proverb respecting a *little learning*. We have never seen grosser misrepresentation; nor positive assertion, or raillery, more frequently given instead of argument. His presumption is amazing, when he imagines that his *sneer* is sufficient to put down Sir Astley Cooper, Orfila, Dr. Rush, and a multitude of medical and chemical authorities of the highest respectability, both in Europe and America, who assert that alcohol is a poison; and by all sensible men it will be treated with the ridicule and pity it deserves.

Mr. M'GINN.—We were very much surprised to see Mr. M'Ginn present himself at the last meeting of the Temperance Society as an advocate of *total abstinence*! We were still more surprised when we heard him declare that he had never spoken nor written against the *practice of total abstinence*—his opposition had been directed, he said, only against the *principles* of Temperance Societies. If Mr. M'Ginn has been always so friendly to the *practice*, it is a pity he did not declare it sooner. He has suffered the public to be under a great mistake—a mistake which we know has terminated fatally in the case of one man at least. If Mr. M'Ginn will appeal to those who heard his addresses or read his letters, we have little doubt he will find nine out of ten, who will tell him that they always considered him an