

THE TEMPERANCE REFORMATION NOT OPPOSED TO THE GOSPEL.

In a late number of the *Herald*, we reported the proceedings of a temperance meeting at Kingston, Jamaica, at which the principles of our society were advocated with much ability, we have now the satisfaction of transcribing a small part of an able article in the *West Indian*, of the 14th of June last, under the above head, and which will show that our cause is still supported with much zeal and efficiency in that part of the world.

After some introductory remarks as to the importance of proving to religious professors, that the temperance reformation is not in any way opposed to the principles of the gospel as inculcated in the New Testament;—the writer observes—

1.—It has been objected, that total abstinence is an *unwarrantable interference with the province of the gospel*, inasmuch as the gospel is the only remedy for moral evil. Now what is the fact? Has the gospel, in the sense in which the objector uses the term—the truths necessary for salvation, brought before the mind—either reclaimed the drunkard, or preserved the moderate drinker? To this question the testimonies of ministers give a decided negative.

The habits of the drunkard place him beyond the reach of the gospel. But truth cannot benefit unless it be heard, nor can it become effectual to salvation if it be not perceived by the understanding. By making a man sober he is certainly in a much better position to receive the grace of God than he, who, on account of his drunken habits, but seldom hears the truth, generally listens under the influence of alcohol, and drowns his occasional impressions in the intoxicating cup. This is plain from the well-ascertained fact, that thousands of drunkards, when emancipated from the bondage of intemperance, have been the partakers of that better "liberty wherewith Christ makes his people free."

But the objection under consideration proves too much. It assumes that the gospel must accomplish every physical and moral improvement that is desirable. In this light it lies equally against the anti-slavery society, and all human institutions. But who would be so irrational as to prefer the objection against such societies as these?

The fears of those who imagine that we make total abstinence in any sense, a substitute for the gospel, are entirely groundless. We do not propose to *convert* and *sanctify*—we use these terms in their theological acceptation—by total abstinence, but to *reclaim* and *preserve*. We hold, that, in regard to the intemperate, it is a physical remedy for a physical disease, and that, in respect to the moderate drinker, it removes a temptation that often proves to be the "offending eye," which the gospel requires us to "pluck out."

2.—It is further objected, that it requires a *self-denial*, which is opposed to the liberty allowed by the gospel.—But is not Christianity a system of self-denial? Is not the temperance pledge in accordance with the spirit of the apostle Paul's magnanimous avowal,—“If meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no meat while the world standeth, least I make my brother to offend?”—Surely the gospel can neither allow us liberty to place ourselves in circumstances of extreme temptation, nor to give the weight of our example in favour of a system which has filled the earth with vice, lamentation, and woe. To claim such a liberty for the gospel were to turn the grace of God into licentiousness.

We conclude with two quotations, which may be regarded as the true exponents of the opinions held by temperance advocates. The esteemed J. A. James, writes,—“Far from thinking this cause a sole means of converting the sinner from the error of his ways, we deem it to be only an auxiliary in the great cause of religious truth; it is intended not to supersede, but to make way for other means.” The writer of this essay expresses his own views in a remark made by the late J. J. Gurney, Esq.,—“In the temperance

movement I see nothing opposed to the gospel, but every thing that is in harmony with its divine operations.”

THE TEA DUTIES.

In the *Times* of Monday, Aug. 16, is an excellent article on the Reduction of Tea Duties. After remarking on the fiscal and commercial advantages, the writer remarks:—

“But there is another aspect under which the question presents itself, which renders it, perhaps, of still graver importance. A reduction in the tea duty, if it worked in the manner we suppose, would effect a great change for the better in the habits of every class of our population, by supplying them with a substitute for intoxicating liquors.

“It is impossible to overrate the importance of this consideration. The temperance movement in Ireland did not, unfortunately, produce permanent effects; but this was the natural result of the manner in which it was conducted. An appeal was made to the enthusiasm of an imaginative and excitable people. Now, great social changes, to be durable, should be based upon habit; that will be found in the end to be the only secure ground of reliance. Medals and pledges can never take the place of the natural wish to do the same thing to-morrow that we have done yesterday and to-day. Sumptuary laws have long since been abandoned, and the more politic legislation of modern times has admitted the principle, that the practice of the moral virtues should be rather encouraged than enjoined—rather suggested than enforced. All that we can do is, to place the great mass of the population under favourable conditions for contracting orderly and sober habits, the rest must be left to the innate workings of human nature, which would appear more prone to pass from evil to good than to fall from good to evil.

“When we come to examine the fearful records of crime, which the reports from the police offices and the assize towns furnish us with day by day, and month by month, in nine cases out of ten, it will be found, that intemperance has been the immediate cause of the deplorable transgressions against the laws of society which are there set forth. The gin-palace and the beer-shop are but the vestibules to the gaol and the convict hulk. Any measure, then, which would strike at the root of this evil, would be a thousand times more beneficial to the country in its indirect than in its direct effects. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, when considering even the fiscal effects of the removal of the duty upon tea, must be prepared to take into account the expenses incurred for the maintenance of the police offices where the drunkard is brought up for examination, of the gaol where he awaits his trial, of the poor-house where his wife and family must be supported by the country, of the asylum, the hulk, or the penal colony where he must end his days.”

LETTER FROM A GENTLEMAN RECENTLY FROM SCOTLAND, TO THE COR. SEC. A. T. U.

My dear sir,—Having recently arrived in this country, a friend in New York was kind enough to hand me some Temperance publications for perusal, at the same time specially calling my attention to a few sentences relative to Scotland, which appeared in the *Report of the Am. Temp. Union*, as given at p. 85 of your Journal for last June; on which, with your permission, I beg to make one or two elucidatory remarks.

In regard to the efforts of the clergymen in Scotland, much that is gratifying will no doubt be said ere long; meantime, instead of “60 ministers of the Relief Secession Church,” there would be a nearer approximation to the real state of the case in saying “150 ministers of the United Presbyterian Church,”—the Relief and United Secession Churches having in May last consummated the union which has for several