

feeling and action. Between a parent and a child, in a natural point of view, the 'Jod of nature has not laid down a minute and varied list of duties, but he has implanted love, a reciprocity of affection, that love is a controlling and guiding power, and without which he could never perform his duty to his child, or the child to the parent. In nature God gives the principle. So in the gospel, in the religion of Christ the grand principle of action is love, love to God and love to man, this is the principle of spiritual life, which we had lost, and which the gospel seeks to restore. If this principle be received and acted upon, it will leave a spiritual child in little doubt as to his duty to his heavenly Father. Love is the fulfilling of the law, it is the principle of all relative duties; he that loveth God will love his brother also. Now look to the traffic in intoxicating drinks in reference to this law of love—the sum of the moral law requires to love God supremely, and to love our neighbour as ourselves; the sixth commandment says "thou shalt not kill." If it be true what has previously been stated, if only a *tenth* of it were true, but we have not dealt in superlatives, we have not exaggerated, truth may have suffered, but suffered in our impossibility to shew the extent and enormity of the evils of drinking; then the traffic is not only immoral, but a part of that immorality cannot be taken from Legislators and Magistrates who give license to kill and to destroy.

We are well aware that attempts have been made to prove that the Bible sanctions the use of intoxicating drinks, yet it has been clearly proven in the Essay, *Anti Bacchus*, that the wines of Scripture, which were allowed, were inferior and wholesome and unattended with the pernicious effects attributed to wines in Britain or America, and more especially spirituous liquors. The word of God has been canvassed, to find out arguments against the bright principle of total abstinence; but the effort is fruitless, "by their fruits ye shall know them." The blessings of abstinence when contrasted with the evils of moderation or excess plainly tell "which is on the Lord's side." Nor is it surprising that the sacred word has been advanced against the principle, when we consider that it was advanced by many in Britain, at one time, against slave emancipation, and is so still in parts of the United States, that it was raised against the discoveries of a Galileo and the truths of Astronomy, that it is raised by some against the inductions of Geologists; but these prejudices, that have their root in ignorance and custom, fade away before increasing light, so shall it be found in reference to the Temperance question; the Bible has never suffered from the lights of science, and surely it shall never suffer in its consistency and its divinity from the principles of intire abstinence from intoxicating and pernicious liquors. The Temperance Reformation exhibits a long train of its blessings, that it is not in opposition to the word of God, nay its chief lustre and dignity is the relation which it has in proving an instrument, auxiliary to the reception of its principles and the extension of its triumphs. Is not the system that licenses men to act in the manner they do, in supplying their fellow creatures with this destructive poison, based on a principle opposed to the principles of revealed truth; and yet such a system is acted on in civilized and Christian countries.

We have thus laid down and endeavoured to prove our Eight Propositions; some of them may be deemed rather strong and startling; but they are our sincere and enlightened conviction. The great point to be proved, is, are intoxicating drinks a benefit or an evil to the community; the strength of the argument rests in a great measure on this, and we have endeavoured to prove that in whatever point of view, or under whatever relations, to individuals and communities they are an evil, a decided, an incalculable evil, an evil counterbalanced by scarcely the shadow of good, that the

traffic in them is consequently wrong, and it is wrong that that traffic should be legalized. It may be said we have not tried to state their benefits, that they have surely some advantages; we hesitate not to advance all that can be said in their favour.

*Physically*, they may minister to the gratification of a sensual and diseased appetite, or medicinally they may in some cases be of temporary service.

*Intellectually*, they may brighten wit, and mislead the imagination.

*Socially*, they may add to the hilarity of convivial parties.

*Politically*, they may give a little augmentation to the revenue

*Morally*, they may—

*Religiously*, they may—

We are unable in all the circumference of our observation or reading, or in the resources of our conjecture, to supply the hiatus in the last two. In the four former we may put a feather's weight into the scale of good; but what is it to the accumulation of evil in the opposing scale; and while in the last two we have nothing to act as a counterpoise, we have an aggregate of evil of incalculable weight and enormity. We invite any impartial hand to try the balance for himself, so far as his own experience or observation enables him, and we will not feel dubious as to the result of the experiment.

It is abundantly apparent that the traffic, which is not only partially but *altogether* an evil, and that *continually*, ought not to have the sanction of legislation in any form. Nor is it enough to reply, that the object of legislation is to restrict the evil, if it be an evil, then under no pretext of restriction ought it to be licensed. The original intention of legislation in interfering with this traffic, we allow, might have been to prove a salutary check, not to their use but to their excess; but these times of ignorance are passing away, and the spell has been broken that bound the world so long under this great delusion. No pretext of restraining what is now seen to be *completely* an evil will enable a man or a body of men to give it legal authority, such an alliance is unnatural, impolitic and unwholy. It is the union of two agencies that should be seen either completely aloof, or in a state of opposition. We do not see why there should not be *licensed* brothels as well as licensed taverns, they are both evils, and if licensing under the pretence of restraining applies to the latter, it may be said equally to apply to the former; they are both destructive to the temporal and spiritual well being of man, they are both repugnant to the law of God, therefore no pretext can admit of their sanction by human law. Were the evil inflicted by the traffic merely of a political character, then we would not be so urgent, but when it intrudes on the sanctities of private and social life, yea and dares to cross the sacred fence that is thrown around the church, then is the unseemly character of its relation to law more apparent and odious. Let Legislators and Magistrates be assured that the ally whom they thus equip with the national banner is a dangerous one to themselves and the country; like the elephants that were taken of old to battle, and placed in the front of the army, but which often took alarm and turned on their own ranks behind them, trampling the soldiers under their feet, and creating more confusion and havoc than all the phalanx of the enemy, so the traffic thus legalized oft turns against themselves, and does more damage to the nation than could be produced by the invasion of an enemy.

But it might be enquired, what then is to be done? what is to be substituted in the room of the present system. Whether this question be answered or not, does not at all affect the validity of our former propositions. The *least* thing that could be asked of human law, would be, to stand aloof from the traffic altogether.