

REMARKS.

1st.—Mr. HOLLAND thinks that the document referred to, was transmitted to us by a friend," and that we designate it "a statistical curiosity;" whereas, both are the remarks of the Scottish *Border Watch*," as may be seen by reference to the article. The acting editor of the *Advocate* is alone responsible for transferring the article headed "Methodism in Britain and America," from that paper to the "*Advocate*," and for the remarks respecting alcoholic wine which follow it.

2nd.—Mr. HOLLAND seems to think that the quotation and remarks in question are made for the purpose of injuring Methodism, or have that tendency—but the most cursory glance will shew that there is no comparison drawn between Methodists and other denominations—but between one section of the great Methodist Church pursuing one line of policy towards the Temperance Reformation, and another section of the same Church pursuing a different line of policy. Nothing, as far as Methodism is concerned, could be less invidious.

3rd.—Mr. HOLLAND considers the remarks about making alcoholic wine, a test of communion, to be particularly directed against his church; whereas it is most expressly stated in two places of the article, that almost all other churches concur in this practice: so that in point of fact, the remarks are, and were intended to be, general. We are not at all satisfied with the logic which Mr. HOLLAND attributes to us, and therefore recapitulate the substance of what we did say on this head, especially as it was in order to bring out this argument that the whole article was inserted. The following is the argument we used:—If it be a rule that fermented or alcoholic wine must be used in the administration of the Sacrament, then it follows that all who refuse to use alcoholic drinks must be excluded from the Communion, thus establishing the partaking of alcohol as a test of church membership.

4th.—Mr. HOLLAND accuses the conductors of the *Advocate* of reflecting on Wesleyan Methodists formerly, and says that they are singled out for intemperate remarks—an imputation which we most pointedly and positively disclaim. The most disagreeable part of our duty, as Temperance Journalists, has been to point out and deplore the inconsistencies of professing Christians, countenancing the causes of intemperance and opposing the Temperance Reformation; and in the discharge of this duty, we have had occasion to notice the conduct of almost all denominations. We do not think that more has been said about British Wesleyans than some other denominations, the difference is, that others are either acquiesced in the justice of our remarks or been less sensitive. But even were it the case, that the Methodist Church has been more frequently referred to, the reason would be obvious—namely, because its founders having, as Mr. HOLLAND justly remarks, incorporated temperance principles in the rules which are still recognized by it, more is expected from it than from other churches; and when this expectation is disappointed, as we think Mr. HOLLAND must confess it is, in the case of British Wesleyans, in Britain more sorrow is felt.

5th.—With respect to the most serious charge brought by Mr. HOLLAND, that, namely, of falsehood, as regards the resolutions alleged to have been passed by the British Wesleyan Conference, we must say it takes us quite by surprise. First, because we never could have dreamed of any one deliberately coming resolutions and publicly attributing them to a body that never had passed them, and still less could we have expected to find such in the Scottish *Border Watch*, which is one of the most respectably and conscientiously conducted religious papers with which we are acquainted. And second, because, when the writer of this article

was in Britain, a few years ago, the subject of these resolutions was a common topic of conversation and regret amongst temperance men; and it was currently reported that the resolution to shut all churches against Temperance meetings had led to great dissensions in several places, and particularly in Cornwall, where a large proportion of the Methodist Society were teetotalers. So that if there be no foundation for attributing these resolutions to the British Wesleyan Church, then not only does the *Temperance Advocate* and the Scottish *Border Watch*, but a host of other parties owe a very humble and ample apology to that church. We have not access to the proceedings of the Conference, but we send this number to the Scottish *Border Watch*, calling on it to justify the statements which appeared in it; and in the meantime, if any minister of the British Wesleyan Methodist Church will state, that the resolutions in question, or some of similar import, have not been adopted and acted upon by the British Wesleyan body at all, we will make any apology that can reasonably be required. The question is not so much whether they are recorded in the minutes, but whether they were adopted and acted upon.

6th.—We at once admit, regret, and apologize for copying the error in numbers, and think the author of the article is much to blame for his inaccuracy; and had we had the slightest suspicion of there being an error of any kind in the article, we would not have inserted it.

We cannot conclude without expressing great satisfaction, in learning that there are neither sellers nor drinkers of ardent spirits in the British Wesleyan Methodist Church of this city. We wish all the other churches could say as much.

The Revival of Temperance.

The title of this article may surprise some; but why so? "The revival of temperance! Has the cause of temperance been in a languishing state? Does it need resuscitation? Is the term *revival* applicable to it?" Be not surprised gentle reader; we shall state nothing but what is true. Every thing that is valuable and useful may, from various circumstances, decline and retrograde; and then under different circumstances improve and advance; hence every one is familiar with the phrases, "the revival of literature," "the revival of religion," &c. And why should the term not be applied to temperance? Has there not been a criminal and sad apathy among the professed friends of this noble and benevolent enterprise? Is it not capable of advancement and extension? Does it not need renewed and augmented zeal to accomplish its benign purposes? To these and similar queries we think every honest and impartial friend of temperance must answer in the affirmative.

The desirableness of such a revival as will give an impetus to the cause, and accelerate its progress, all will admit who are from principle enlisted in the temperance reformation. It has been tried under every clime, and in all possible diversity of circumstances, and in almost every case the proof of its safety and utility has gathered strength. It has been resisted by many of all ranks in life, whose taste, or interest, or compliance with custom were at stake, and who under the influence of obvious ignorance and prejudice, combined with the previous causes, have done what they could directly or indirectly to impede its progress, and hinder its glorious achievement; but in spite of all opposing influences from the resistance of enemies, and the apathy of friends, it has under the smiles of heaven, accomplished a great work and diffused countless blessings that will descend to the latest generation. It has not only secured an almost innumerable number of pledged friends to the principle of absti-