

“Do not say, ‘I sell by the large quantity—I have no tippers about me—and, therefore, I am not guilty!’ You are the chief man in this business—the others are only subalterns. You are the ‘poisoner’s general,’ of whom Mr. Wesley speaks, who murder your fellow-citizens by wholesale. But for the retailers to do your drudgery, you would have nothing to do. While you stand at the bulk-head, and open the flood-gates, they, from this river of fire, draw off the small rivulets, and direct them all over the land, to blight every hope, and burn up every green thing. The greater your share in the traffic, the greater is your guilt. There is no avoiding this conclusion. The same reasoning will also apply to the manufacturer. If any man has priority of claim to a share in this work of death, it is the manufacturer. The church must free herself from this whole business. It is all a sinful work, with which Christians should have nothing to do, only to drive it from the sacred enclosures of the church, and, if possible, from the earth.”

Law of Providence.

We are firm believers in what may be called the law of Providence: by this we mean a change of circumstances; or a condition of things which renders it impossible for a man to pursue a course with respectability and impunity to-day, which he could have pursued with respectability and safety in by-gone days. This law operates in a thousand cases where there is no express positive statute forbidding an act in itself morally wrong. Once, a good man could have many wives. It interfered neither with his respectability, usefulness or piety, nor did it at all lead to a forfeiture of that divine influence which a good man needs to uphold and preserve him. But changes of human society and developments of the law of right, have placed bigamy among the worst of crimes. A good man could not now have two or more wives, without not only incurring human penalties, but forfeiting all claim to the character of a religious and moral man, and being debarred all intercourse with heaven. A few years since, the manufacture, sale and use of intoxicating drinks, were all viewed as perfectly consistent with strict philanthropy, patriotism, morality and piety. The best of ministers and Christians drank wine and brandy, and though it did them a physical injury (for how could it be otherwise), yet it was no disparagement to their moral and religious standing, nor perhaps did it incur a forfeiture of divine influence. But *tempora mutantur*. There is a new law of Providence in this matter. Such, using wine or brandy in health, are doing something which the public mind condemns; are going against the known interests of the church and the world; are withstanding a great and blessed moral enterprise; are exposing themselves to the worst of evils; are putting it out of their power either to aid a cause connected with all of man’s interests, or to hold communion with Heaven in relation to it; and, under such circumstances, they may say what they please about their Bible right to drink wine and strong drink, and there being no sin in the act, they are fighting against a law of Providence, and there is no good reason to believe that a man who does this, can do it, and have religious enjoyment and religious prosperity, or can do it and be safe. The Most High will not stand surety for him. He cannot expect to prosper. He may laugh and trifle over his cups, and boast of his freedom and independence, but soon he will lose the respect and confidence of his Christian brethren, and the respect of the world around him; he will throw himself into the company of those who drink and flout at moral reforms; poverty will appear in his public performances if he is a minister of the Gospel, his worldly affairs will wane, and it will be in no way surprising if, ere long, the drunkards thirst be fastened upon him. We believe the subject is worthy the attention of some who have hitherto been influenced by none of the

considerations which have been pressed upon them: by the friends of temperance.—*American Temperance Journal*.

NOTES OF A TRAVELLER.

When in London lately, attending the Anti-Slavery and Peace Conventions, I had the pleasure of being introduced to a number of American tee-totalers, and was delighted to hear from them good tidings of the great progress of temperance in the United States. Their zeal, in advocating the cause of temperance and universal liberty, warmed my heart, and encouraged me to double my diligence in endeavouring to rescue men from the drunkard’s fate. At a meeting of the National Temperance Society, held in the Crown and Anchor on June 21, I took tea with a number of distinguished friends of the cause, and heard interesting addresses from the Rev. Dr. Ritchie of Edinburgh, the Rev. Mr. Clark from Africa, Mr. S. P. Andrews of Texas, the Rev. Amos Phelps of Boston, Mr. L. Tappan of New York, Mr. H. C. Howell of Pittsburgh, Mr. Levatt, Joseph Sturge, Esq., and J. S. Buckingham. The Rev. Mr. Clark said he had tried tee-totalism in Scotland, England, North and South America, the West Indies and Africa, and had always found it conduce to his health, his peace, his comfort, and his usefulness. In Africa, he had recovered from two attacks of fever, without using medicine, in consequence of abstaining from intoxicating liquors—and far more quickly than others had done.—Among several motions adopted was one proposed by J. S. Buckingham, Esq.—“That this meeting entirely agrees in the sentiment expressed by Sir Robert Peel, that whilst we condemn the use and culture of opium abroad, we tolerate an equally destructive poison at home.” The Rev. Amos Phelps said that the ministers of religion and the physicians of the United States, had taken up a noble and honourable position in respect to temperance. He was sorry that the ministers of the gospel in this country had not done the same. He was surprised and hurt in this country to find, on coming into the vestry, after preaching in England, that the first question asked was, “will you take a glass of wine?” How could they expect to put down the ginshop while they suffered wine in the vestry? The “short-pledge” abstainers got a deserved cut from Mr. Phelps, but Mr. Howell rebuked their inconsistency with greater severity. He said he had frequently been offered wine since his return to England by persons calling themselves tee-totalers. Such conduct was most inconsistent. In the United States they must go to the devil to be tempted, but in England temptation assailed them on every hand. Mr. Levatt compared the apathy exhibited by the ministers of the gospel in England to the sufferings of the drunken poor, with the apathy exhibited by the ministers in his own country to the sufferings of the slave. He had that day received a letter from Jamaica stating that rum was destroying the emancipated people there, and that the ministers of the gospel were setting their faces against tee-totalism and denouncing its principles as those of infidelity. In the United States there were many counties in which no intoxicating liquors were permitted to be sold, so that if a man wanted to purchase intoxicating drinks he must go a distance of forty miles. Many other things were said that both edified and cheered me, but the above may suffice as a sample. I hope some of these American gentlemen will visit Scotland and give us a rousing.—*Correspondent of Scottish Temperance Journal*.

PROGRESS OF THE CAUSE.

THE BISHOP OF NORWICH AND FATHER MATHEW.—Father Mathew administered the pledge in Norwich, on Thursday: and in the evening there was a tea-festival, at which about 2000 persons were present. Mr. J. J. Gurney, the well-known Quaker, presided; Mrs. Opie was also among the guests; and after some