

abandoned their country, and fled to a savage wilderness, rather than abandon principles which they believed would conduce to the happiness of mankind.

Franklin was an ultraist. Even learned men amused themselves at his expense, and laughed at the idea of extracting lightning from the clouds, and regarded his experiments with a kite, as mere child's play.

Patrick Henry was an ultraist of the first water. His heart beat for freedom, and while others were fearful of offending the powers which governed this country, and talked about "going too fast and too far," he boldly avowed his determination to be free or to die.

Robert Fulton was an ultraist. He felt a conviction that the application of steam to propel vessels would be of immense benefit to mankind. To this *whim*, he sacrificed his property and even his reputation for wisdom and prudence; for at one time all persons regarded him as a visionary, as an ultraist, who saw things and results which others could not see; and his friends in vain urged him to quit these visionary pursuits, and turn his attention to other and more common place subjects.

John Howard was an ultraist. He had his hobby, and he rode it hard. He passed his whole life in endeavoring to persuade his fellow-men to be humane—to desist from punishing their fellow-beings for misfortune or to condemn them to dungeons and chains, through a fiend-like spirit of revenge. And his sanity was called in question—and he was laughed at for his pains.

Wilberforce was a distinguished ultraist.—He perceived at an early age the injustice and iniquities of the slave trade, and bent all his energies, for many years to annihilating the infamous traffic, and ameliorating the condition of the African race. But he was ridiculed and despised by the many—denounced as a fanatic and an ultraist—burnt in effigy, and insulted as he walked the streets, and threatened with assassination! In what estimation is his character held now?

The above men were all ultraists—and we could place before our readers a long list of names of ultraists, who are now eagerly pursuing, what they conceive to be most important objects—and whose conduct should entitle them at least to our respect—for their motives are undoubtedly pure—but it is unnecessary. Let us not despise these men because we cannot think precisely as they do, on subjects to which, perhaps, we have never directed particular attention.

We like ultraists. They should be treated with respect. They are *pioneers* in literature, science, morality and religion—without ultraists, the moral world would stand still—there would be no improvement—no one would step before his neighbour for the purpose of exploring unknown regions, or clearing a path which would lead to good. Let ultraist then be encouraged, instead of being despised and condemned. Let us examine their labors, listen to their arguments, and if we are convinced that they have struck out a right path, let us follow them, otherwise let us remain where we are. But let us not condemn those men, who are anxious to *press forward* in a good cause. On the contrary let us endeavor to surpass each other in efforts to improve and elevate the character of the humane race..

The Gospel Misplaced and Misapplied.

On a late visit made to one of our large Penitentiaries, the party, after having been shown the prisoners, were introduced into the store room, and among other things were shown the kind of bread used by them. The Chaplain, taking up a "bannock of barley meal," remarked, "here is their bread—good and wholesome it is; had these persons now in prison never seen barley in any other shape than this the one-half of them never would have been here." This remark led one of the visitors to think of the total abstinence society, and to ask the Chaplain's opinion of that institution. The reply was, that it was not the thing that was wanted, that it would do no permanent good, and that the gospel only could cure the evil. As this opinion is not a singular one we shall make it the subject of a few remarks.

When the gospel is brought forward in opposition to tee-totalism it simply means that if men were genuine Christians they would regulate their use of intoxicating drink so correctly that they would not require to abstain from it. Now, while we freely admit that if all were under the *full* influence of Christianity there would be no necessity for tee-total societies, we strongly protest against the soundness of this conclusion, and the use made of it in the present state of the world. Many good Christians may be so convinced

that alcoholic drink is injurious to them both physically and spiritually, that they may become abstainers, and many more may do so for the purpose of inducing others to discontinue it. We are no more obliged to use these drinks because God's ancient people did so than we are to rub our faces with oil or to wear long beards and the man or minister who thinks he adds to his orthodoxy by using them is under a miserable mistake. It is more easy to conceive a Millennium without them than one with them. When Satan is bound in the bottomless pit, sure we are the church of Christ will not shed a tear although he take alcohol with him. It has long "tormented them that dwell on the face of the earth," and its moral character would point out this place as its proper residence, and Satan as a befitting companion. We therefore demur at any statement that implies the necessity or propriety of all Christians continuing moderate drinkers, believing, as we do, that in general they would be healthier men and happier Christians by becoming total abstainers. We do not, however, pursue this view of the subject. The gospel is generally introduced by the enemies of our cause not merely as something superior to tee-totalism, which we readily grant, but as something the prospective influence of which renders the other altogether unnecessary if not absolutely improper, interfering as it does with what is deemed the peculiar province of religion, and doing part of its work without its sanction. To see the absurdity of this apparently pious objection let us look at it a little more closely.

If we take the prisoners of a Penitentiary, for instance, how few of them are converts to the faith of the gospel, and must we withhold from them the inculcation of moral duty and all arguments in favour of virtue addressed to their reason and conscience until they become Christians? Unless we regard their confinement merely as a punishment, why put them there at all, or use any means to make them better men? Where would be the harm of reminding these victims of alcohol of the evil they had done themselves their families, and the community in consequence of using these liquors, and persuading them to their entire disuse after they are again restored to liberty? In reaching the climax of moderate drinking, which has qualified them for a prison, who can compute the amount of contamination which their example has shed around them! Few drinkers indulge in the solitary glass. Drunkenness is indebted to social feelings and customs for three-fourths of its votaries. A full-grown drunkard, who has been at the business for thirty or forty years, might reckon his apprentices and journeymen by the score, verifying the statement of scripture that one sinner destroys much good, and yet all this evil must be allowed to go on undiminished till his conversion, if we adopt the principle of these opponents of total abstinence. The statement made by these men implies that all unregenerated men must be alike vicious: and were it acted on, no parent would teach his child to abstain from lying, swearing, stealing, &c., but would calmly wait till the heart was renewed by the Spirit of all grace through the belief of the truth. It is a strange way of honouring the gospel to allow rational beings to bring disease on themselves, and sin on their souls, when a little warning, instruction, and example might lead them to more becoming conduct.

The persons who use this argument should be able to show that the gospel is more likely to take effect on a tippler than a sober man, otherwise their logic goes for nothing, for it cannot be denied that the tee-totaller improves his worldly circumstances by his abstinence, and unless there is something on the other side, to counter balance this good, he is a gamer at the very outset. This they cannot do. The very opposite is the case, as might be argued in reason and proved by facts. The use of intoxicating drink, however moderately, never can advance the interests of the soul. It may be received with thanksgiving by those who know and obey the truth, but its tendency is neither to increase knowledge nor to promote obedience. The christian does not therefore need it for any spiritual purpose, and, viewed as a physical agent, we are ready to prove, by medical testimony, that in nine cases out of ten its effects are pernicious to a person in health. Tee-totalism, in the native influence either of its principles or practice, never can prevent a man from becoming religious—moderate drinking, as it is called, has sealed the ruin of millions who otherwise might have come to the knowledge of the truth and been saved eternally. Mr. Finney, the celebrated revivalist minister in America, in giving directions how to deal with careless sinners, says, in his lectures on revivals, "Be sure that the person is perfectly sober. It used to be more common than it is now for people to drink spirits every day and become more or less intoxicated. Precisely in proportion as they are so, they are rendered unfit to be approached on the subject of religion. If they have been drinking beer, or cider, or wine, so