

Christians, mean, "for his own sake," and "for that of his neighbours"? If not, language has no meaning.

"To see the sophistry here concealed (he continues) it will be necessary to take the clause to pieces, and first, what is the "what" that is inconsistent? It is signing the temperance pledge; but to say that signing the temperance pledge is inconsistent, &c., is begging the question, and taking for proved the very thing for which proof is required." The "what" I must take leave to say, is what I have said it is—the signing the temperance pledge with the view of keeping himself temperate—and it is the "what" that A. has himself conceded, when he admitted that "a Christian should not join the Temperance Society, with a view to be kept temperate." If it be begging the question to assume as proved what my adversary concedes as true, then I have begged the question.

A. next proceeds to prove a negative—and a negative too, which contradicts his own previous admission. His admission is that "a Christian should not join a temperance society with a view to be kept temperate," because "he is pledged to God to remain temperate"—and yet he undertakes to prove, that it is not inconsistent with Christian profession to sign the temperance pledge. That is, it is not inconsistent in a Christian to do that which, as a Christian, he should not do! His first argument in support of this negative, goes, not to prove that it is not inconsistent with Christian profession to sign the temperance pledge for his own sake; but that it is inconsistent to sign "on his own account," because "he feels the necessity laid upon him of doing God's will, as contained in his word, which prohibits all excess, he is pledged to God." His next argument goes to prove, not that it is not inconsistent in him to join for the good of professing Christians (as he was bound to do) but for the sake of those "who are not pledged to God."—thus, in the first case, combatting his own proposition; and, in the latter case, combatting what is not asserted in the proposition which he is endeavouring to refute. But as some of his reasoning, in support of his negative proposition, may be supposed to bear upon my second proposition, that the Christian cannot consistently join the Temperance Society "with the view of keeping temperate those infidels or heathens who are likely to become intemperate," it may be proper to give some consideration. Infidels and heathens may be considered on the same footing with those "who are not pledged to God." And for the sake of those, we are told the Christian may do what it is improper for him to do for his own sake, because "the motive is different." A little further on it is acknowledged that "there is no motive to induce a Christian to join for himself." Now, if there be no motive in the one case, and a motive in the other, I confess I cannot perceive how the motives in the two cases can be different. But A is plain in telling us that the motive in the case of the man who is not pledged to God is "the preserving him from a vice to which his want of Christian principle exposed him." That is, the Christian is not to teach "Christian principles" to those who have it not, as the only efficacious preservative from temptation for them, but he is to teach them to pledge themselves to man, for that purpose. For, says A, "exhibiting the truths of the Gospel" to such men "is like throwing pearls to swine; their hearts are not able to receive them, and therefore humanly speaking, you preach in vain." So then, we are not to preach the Gospel to any but true Christians; and we are to offer the strongest and best motives for abstaining from vice to the true Christian only; but we are to offer the weakest and least efficacious to those who need the

stronger. In short, let the true Christian follow the Christian motive, but let the nominal Christian and the unbeliever follow any other motive that may be manufactured for them, it is good enough for them, I believe I need go no further on this part of the subject.

I shall not attempt to follow A through his remarks on what may be the possible consequences "following a Christian's signing a temperance pledge", but proceed to state some of the actual consequences that have followed, as detailed in the reports of temperance societies. First, a new symbol of a Christian ordinance has been authorized by temperance societies, by excluding the use of wine from the sacrament of the Lord's supper, thus abjuring, in the celebration of the most solemn ordinance of the Christian religion, not only as useless, but as pernicious what Christ himself ordained. Secondly, a new standard of church membership has been effected by temperance societies, by refusing to admit any who make even the most moderate use of ardent spirits. Thirdly, a new system of morals has been taught by temperance societies, by pronouncing the moderate use of ardent spirits, to be a soul destroying immorality. From the multitude of proofs I shall make only one quotation, from a report of the eighth ward temperance society of New York, "Four or five churches (in that one ward, it is boasted) have been induced to come up to the Gospel standard, of admitting no member guilty of the soul destroying immorality of using or vending alcoholic poison."

I shall close with the two following syllogisms: First, of the Anti-Christian nature of temperance societies. It is an essential doctrine of Christianity, that we are to seek the assistance of the holy spirit as the only means of preserving us from temptation. It is an essential article of temperance societies, that we adopt, for the same object, the temperance pledge—a pledge to man. This article is therefore essentially different from that doctrine.

Secondly, of the Anti-Christian legislation of temperance societies—God is the only legislator from whom moral laws can be derived.

God does not condemn, as an immorality, the moderate use of any article of meat or drink.

Temperance societies do condemn, as an immorality, the moderate use of ardent spirits.

Therefore temperance societies legislate in opposition to God.

Montreal 16th Sept. 1835.

Q. E. D.

REPLY TO Q. E. D.

When I wrote my first article in this discussion, it was without the least idea of its being published. My chief intent was to establish, satisfactorily to my own mind, that I, and consequently any other Christian, in joining the Temperance Society, acted in accordance with the precepts and spirit of the Gospel, or, at least, to make out a good reason, why a Christian should not suffer himself to be argued out of his good opinion of temperance efforts, by the plausible arguments of those who assert, that to sign the temperance pledge is to act in opposition to what christianity teaches.

As the comments on my rejoinder appear to me to have little bearing on the scope of my remarks, I shall not attempt to refute them, or to establish the justness

of own conclusions. The force of these comments may be judged of by the following: I am said to endeavour to prove a negative, which contradicts my own admission. Because 1st—I admitted that a christian should not join a Temperance Society with a view to be kept temperate himself; 2dly—I undertook to prove that it is not inconsistent with christian profession to sign the temperance pledge for the sake of one's neighbour. How these two propositions contradict each other, Q.E.D. must point out.

I shall confine my reply to a notice of the two syllogisms; which, I presume, are put forward as conclusive of the argument. I shall place the syllogisms and my answers in collocation.

REFUTATION.

This sentence contradicts itself, for the idea of assistance includes the exertions of him who is assisted. How then can the assistance be the only means? To bring it to accord with the doctrines of the Gospel, it should be expressed somewhat in the following manner:

ASSERTION.

1. It is an essential doctrine of christianity that we are to seek the assistance of the Holy Spirit, as the only means of preserving us from (in the time of) temptation.

2. It is an essential article of Temperance Societies that we adopt, for the same object, the temperance pledge—a pledge to man. This article is, therefore, essentially different from that doctrine.

Again:

God does not condemn, as an immorality, the moderate use of any article of meat or drink.

Temperance Societies do condemn, as an immorality, the moderate use of ardent spirits.

Therefore, Temperance Societies legislate in opposition to God.

1. It is an essential doctrine of christianity, that, while in the proper use of the necessary means, we should rest upon, and therefore should seek for the assistance of the Holy Spirit, to preserve us from falling in the time of temptation.

2. Now, Temperance Societies are an efficient means of promoting temperance; therefore Temperance Societies are, in accordance with the Gospel, different from that doctrine.

God does condemn, by his apostle, the moderate use of meat or wine; and consequently, any thing, however innocent in itself, which may cause our brother to offend.

Temperance Societies do condemn the moderate use of ardent spirits, as countenancing those who make an immoderate use of them.

Therefore, Temperance Societies legislate in conformity with God's word.

There appears to me great mistiness upon the subject of the pledge; which, indeed, seems at the bottom of all the objections against it. What is the pledge more than a promise: a promise, indeed, which will be considered by most people more binding than a common verbal pro-