

use of it, then I must decide for myself whether it is right to use it or not. It is a question which no man can decide for me, and which depends on whether most good will result from using or not using the thing in question—a point often exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, with any confidence to decide. This is the very principle which Paul so strenuously asserted. While he said it was wrong to eat meat with offence (*i. e.* so as to cause others to sin), he said also, 'Let not him which eateth not, judge him that eateth. Who art thou that judgest another man's servant ; to his own master he standeth or falleth. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks, and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks.'"

Dr. Kennedy writes : "*Expediency never can be the ground of any general and peremptory rule of duty as to any specific thing.* The general principle is plain and admitted, but the application varies with every man's circumstances, and must be left to each man's conscience. All those general declarations, therefore, of the duty of total abstinence from the use of intoxicating drinks, if they do not rest on the false doctrine, that such is in its own nature sinful, have no foundation at all. *Expediency can only sustain the declaration that the use is wrong in certain circumstances ;* for if it is wrong under all circumstances, it is wrong in its own nature. Brethren evidently deceive themselves. They say they take the ground of expediency, and then proceed to make declarations and lay down rules which can have no other foundation than the inherent evil nature of the thing denounced. Would Paul have laid down the general proposition that eating meat offered to idols was 'an offence' which should exclude a man from the communion of the church. Does he not say the very reverse, and forbid our making the use or disuse of anything indifferent in its own nature a condition of Christian communion?" A man is at liberty to abstain if he sees cause for doing so, but he has no right to set up a morality that Christ has not sanctioned, or to make attempts to impose such morality on others either by ecclesiastical or civil law.