

echoing from end to end:—*Wine is a mocker, strong drink is raging, and whoso is deceived thereby is not wise. If sinners entice thee, consent thou not. Wo unto them that rise up early in the morning, that they may follow strong drink!*

Questions are asked at one end of the gallery, and answered at the other. *Who hath woe? They that tarry long at the wine.*

Who hath sorrow? They that tarry long at the wine. Who hath contentions? They that go to seek for mixed wine. Who hath wounds without cause? They that go to seek for mixed wine.

Even his own thoughts echo along, and their answers in return. "If I do not return to my liquor trade, how can I support my family?" *Trust in the Lord, and verily thou shalt be fed.*

"But I want to increase in riches as well as my neighbours." *He that is greedy of gain, troubleth his own house.*

"But the temperance people have not sustained me as I hoped." *The hypocrite's hope shall perish.*

"What shall I do? I can not live so." *Fearfulness hath surprised the hypocrites.*

"I profess to be a Christian." *Wo unto you, hypocrites.*

"But I desire the salvation of my fellow men."—*No drunkard shall inherit eternal life.*

Amazed beyond measure at these things, he knew not what to do, nor which way to turn. It was his conscience speaking, and his memory echoing back the truths of the Bible. At length he hit upon a plan, by which he thought that he could silence the tongues of those Bibles. He resolved to go to the Secretary who gave him the order, and pay the full price for the Bibles, knowing that then he could do as he pleased with them, and put them where they could not rebuke him so sternly at every corner. But the Secretary would not take the pay; and how he reconciled the matter between his conscience, rum-selling and the Bible, we never knew. But if he did return to his old business again, we think there will yet be a more dreadful sound in his ears, and hereafter a most awful account to render, when he shall be judged according to the deeds done here in this body.

F. J.

THE MORAL OBLIGATION OF TOTAL ABSTINENCE

Prize Essay lately Published in London.

BY EVAR JONES.

PART THE THIRD

Continued.

The law of our nature requires us to love our whole being: by the grand law of the universe, we are required to love the social body, and the whole fraternity of men in a similar manner;—the good of the brotherhood of man is not promoted by what is unnecessary for the individual members of the community.—Intoxicating drinks are quite unnecessary, and not only so, but they are positively injurious, as they tend to diminish the vigour of body and mind; to do away with industry and destroy morality, without which no Society can long prosper;—they expose us to heavy expenditure in the shape of taxes for the support of paupers, lunatics, and criminals, and subject us to calamitous losses in an indirect way, and that for the benefit of a small class, by whose success the whole community is made to suffer.—These are positions well established by experience, observation, and history, and which prove to a demonstration that the manufacture, sale, and use of intoxicating drinks are morally wrong, because they are inimical to the public good and that they ought, therefore, to be forthwith abandoned.

In order to promote the general good:

First, Men are bound not to expose others to danger by

self-indulgence, especially with regard to actions which are of doubtful authority

In reference to the latter part of this provision, a principle has been laid down by the Apostle Paul which is of vital importance.—"He that doubteth is damned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith, for whatsoever is not of faith is sin." Rom. xiv. 23. We have proved already, on the ground adopted by some of the opponents of Total Abstinence, that the lawfulness of using intoxicating drinks has been left by Scripture an open question, to be decided on moral grounds. They tell us, with an air of triumph, that we cannot produce a positive precept against their use. To cut the matter short, we admit this, and in our turn ask them, if they can produce a positive precept in favour of their use as common beverages? Of course we are met with ominous silence—very expressive and decisive. By common consent, then, the question in debate must be brought to the test of Scripture—"By your fruits shall ye know them;" and we must enter upon the investigation in the spirit of the holy injunctions that require us to do all things to the glory of God, to love our neighbours as ourselves, and to do unto others as we would be done unto. Now, if we enter on this investigation in the spirit we have mentioned, our first duty will be to give a candid consideration to the reasons in favour of Total Abstinence. This is evident if we consider the following positions: (1) Drunkenness is a great crime against God, and is a source of great misery to man. (2) It is our duty to seek the glory of God and the happiness of man, and consequently it is our duty to abstain from what detracts from the former, and what produces the latter. (3) Drunkenness is the result of natural causes—causes which we have the requisite power to remove—since men are not born drunk, and do not become so by any physical or moral necessity. (4) As drunkenness is the result of natural causes, the removal of the causes will be certain to prevent the results. (5) As it is within our power to remove the causes, it follows on scriptural principles that we ought to do so; and if we do not, we transgress the law of God which requires us to do good to all men;—"Therefore will I him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin." Now, as we are bound to consult the well-being of others, it follows that we ought to give a candid hearing to every proposal which tends to promote human happiness.

Would that this plain and easy method to settle moral questions had been taken, and were now taken in respect to Total Abstinence! But instead of attentively considering what may be advanced in favour of the system, men propose objections to the plan, and think themselves at liberty to dispose of it altogether, because they fancy that some objection may be urged against it. This certainly is a very strange way of proceeding, and one, which if adopted with regard to other moral questions, would very soon leave us "without hope and without God in the world." We may not be prepared to give a satisfactory answer to every question that may be raised, or to solve every difficulty that may be started in regard to Total Abstinence,—such for instance, as the nature of the wines mentioned in Scripture—the miracle of Cana in Galilee—and the absence of positive precepts against the manufacture and use of the drinks in question, but inability to do this, and indeed much more than this, will deprive the system we propose of exalted merits. In our opinion, we can adduce very many cogent and powerful arguments against the assertions of opposite parties in regard to all these subjects, but they may fail to give universal or even general satisfaction. Let it be so; this fact should induce any to close his ear, and steel his heart against appeal for the adoption of Total Abstinence. Our case may be so strong as to deserve the approval of all, notwithstanding our inability to clear up every difficulty, by which it may be surrounded. Such is the case with many questions of fact in natural history, and hence we need not wonder that it should be thus in morals. For instance, it is well known that