

ly not in a  
onal injury,  
the number  
I should he  
the benefit  
the society  
like office—  
of the fun-  
into his own  
ble position  
ie., A. B.

Temperance Lectures and in the ordinary conversation of members of the Temperance League.

In my first letter, I was careful to avoid any allusion to the Religious phantasies of these enthusiasts, because I am of opinion that in these days it would be well if Editors of newspapers placed as a motto over the columns devoted to Correspondence, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain"—but "Mic-Mac No. 8" has brought up the Athanasian creed of the Temperance League—concerning Total Abstinence—which faith except we believe no doubt, we shall be damned—and I will reply to this bullying system thus—

I believe in simple faith the Bible, every word of it.

I believe that God created the Earth, precisely in the way in which the creation is described in the 1st chapter of Genesis, and I believe that Christ turned water into wine, as recorded in the 2nd chapter of St. John.

To upset this simple faith, there is on the one hand a School of Science Geology, which armed by a series of deductive reasonings (so complete, that if reason alone is to guide the mind, they are undeniable,) seeks to convince me that the aqueous deposits prove that the Earth was not created in a day, and that in the verse "And the evening and the morning were the third day," the word "day" does not mean "day" at all, but a thousand years or something else. This I call Blasphemy.

On the other hand is a set of enthusiasts, whose only deductive reasoning consists of some disquisition as to whether the bottles in use among the Jews could hold fermented liquors. (I won't enter into the discussion—it is as plain as a pike-staff to one that any vessel which will hold water, will hold Brandy or Sherry, and in fact anything of the kind, especially if one takes care not to put new wine into old bottles)—and these enthusiasts beg us (even though their reasoning or whatever they call it, is not quite as complete as that of Geologists in their science!) to believe that Christ did not turn water into wine, but into grape juice or some other potion equally unlikely to make men of a joyful countenance at the marriage feast in Cana. And under this creed "Mic-Mac No. 8" has dared to invoke the High Majesty of God in censuring a respectable man not because he is "given to much wine" but because he is not a "Total Abstainer" and the most awful consequence of this is that if the Bible is true, if Christ did turn water into wine (and not into grape juice). He has by giving His sanction to the use of that to which when abused the Divine precept against doing aught "whereby a brother is made weak and stumbleth" may be applicable. He, Christ, has disobeyed that precept. I call this Blasphemy, and I consider this tampering with the word of God as a worse evil than Drunkenness.

"Mic-Mac No. 8" has also jumped at the conclusion that we are "ashamed or afraid" to confess that we feel no sin in drinking a glass of Beer or Sherry or Grog—because we object to being bullied and placed in awkward positions which "society demands should be avoided."

In my first letter I threw out a hint how Drunkenness might be put down in some degree without resorting to the means adopted by the Temperance League. I pointed out that the young men who should set the tone of society here are taken from School and thrown among a lower grade and that the only "play" open to them is to go and have a drink, like a cabman, at the Bar—and I might have gone further and said, that as parents are so eager that their children should become qualified for mercantile pursuits, that they feel really obliged to merchants who will take them at 15 or 16 years of age for nothing, to run errands, &c., it is almost necessary, (for running errands won't teach much business,) that they should go to Bar-rooms to learn a thing or two, and make themselves useful to their employers by odds and ends, of information picked up in these bar-rooms—and this is the only thing which saves them from the dullness which "all work and no play" would produce—and they soon find that the more they pick up useful bits of information at Bar-rooms, the more they are appreciated by their employers.

I complained that there was no Cricket ground in Halifax, no zeal for the Volunteer movement, and in fact no desire on the part of the parents to find out door amusements for the boys that they take from school and send off to learn business or to run errands—and "Mic-Mac No. 8" tells me that all has been done which his League have the power to do—viz : that they

have established a Division Room (I don't know the amusement referred to) a Reading Room as well stocked with Books as could be expected—and a Gymnasium for Total Abstinents only—and I should heartily wish him good speed in these undertakings, if he had not been intemperate enough to say that it is the example of us "moderate men" which prevents young men from joining the Division and being allowed to use the Gymnasium. Now I have no objection to offer to Total Abstinents if they choose to restrict the society of their children to that of people who have taken the Temperance Pledge—but my complaint that there is no "play"—provided for young Halifax—remains in statu quo."

I venture to throw out another hint. I hear that it is intended to build a new leading hotel in Halifax—the arrangements of which are to offer accommodation to its guests in the shape of a choice between the English and the American systems—and I venture to call attention to the fact that no even second class hotel keeper in England would condescend to have a Bar-room where men could go in and call for a drink, attached to their premises, and I am inclined to think that if this new hotel were to set the example of dispensing with that low accessory, it would not only answer the purpose as far as paying goes, for certainly the lady portion of the travelling community would appreciate it, but it would also do much to put a stop to the low habit in fashion here—and in fact over the greater part of this Continent—and would in some measure, I think, put down drunkenness.

I dare say if you were to get all the salt out of the sea you could kill all the sharks—and I daresay if you could get rid of intoxicating liquors altogether you could get rid of all Drunkards—but I want to see men who are opposed to the evil of Drunkenness take up some less Quixotic or less offensive mode of doing what they can to destroy it.

Yours faithfully,  
EAGLE EYE.

P. S.—On reading over my letter I became anxious lest I should be thought to imply that the deductive reasonings of Geologists necessarily call for a disbelief in the account of the creation. The writer has before him a private letter from one of the leaders of the science, the well-known Professor Wilson, and the opinion of such an authority is a sufficient answer to such a theory, and I quote from this letter.

"To one who is not fully master of the true bearing of the scientific evidence the subject must be full of perplexities, whereas there are many christian men, profoundly conversant with the whole scientific bearings of the question, who find their faith in the great truths of the Bible in no degree shaken by all the modern disclosures which Sir Charles Lyell, Huxley, and others are now discussing, with an obvious inclination to adopt extreme and novel views."

### Extracts.

#### THE THEOLOGY OF DANCING.

The *Saturday Review* is of opinion that many highly religious persons have agreed to interpret all Scriptural denunciations of worldliness, as exclusively directed against "dancing and going to the play." Then follow these remarks:—

Taken together, these two vices form a complete and most convenient scapegoat. If you can but abstain from these, your reputation as an Evangelical Christian will henceforth be placed beyond the reach of question. Provided only that you are sufficiently strict and censorious about amusements, you may be as worldly-minded as you like in every other occupation of life. Still there are a good many people to whom this doctrine causes a great deal of discomfort. They believe, after a fashion, in the religious theory which it symbolizes, and they do not like to run directly counter to it in practice. They are a kind of proselytes of the gate, and though they may fall somewhat short of the approved pharisaical standard, they can hardly be happy while they are doing so. It is not the theatrical half of the prohibition which gives them most trouble. To go to the play must always be something of an undertaking; it requires a good deal of arrangement beforehand, and you cannot well be entrapped into it without your own knowledge. A masterly inaction may be said to be all that is required to keep anybody out of the theatre. But with dancing the case is different, and the force of this distinction is felt most keenly just about Christ

of moderate  
fine, or even  
an article on  
r and his fol-  
ly "obstruct-  
—and I wrote  
uncommented on  
me and the  
ith all habi-  
either the peo-  
ice or to that  
loubtedly the  
ly and as in-  
me and the  
appearing in  
tainers under  
upon us mo-  
uns to the De-  
will say) and

good enough  
an evening  
y scenes, and  
le—partly be-  
tion that I am  
dows or down  
ently civil in-  
whose talk the  
ugh to "hope  
erance at all,"  
ning to stomp  
rance League  
ness which is

ag "Mic-Mac  
to me "some  
at home and  
for your son,  
ll die a drunk-  
hope no one  
r, and let me  
is matter over  
rts, I dare say

the opinion of  
cause they are  
funds and are  
the right un-  
their numbers.  
a private par-  
my discussion  
when the St.  
al of harmless  
means of in-  
sive to those  
ve my "eye"

ust follow my  
going to speak  
located both a