

encumber the present argument. We are now only contending for the 'abstract principle,' that the question of expediency may rise so high on account of the fearful consequences that it involves, that the violation of that expediency may be in the very last degree *eruel* and *wicked*. If the utter ruin of a million of souls for time and for eternity be not a sufficient amount of evil to render it so, then suppose it to ruin ten millions of souls; and if ten millions of ruined souls be not mischief enough to bring it under this condemnation, suppose it to ruin one hundred millions. There surely is a supposable amount of misery and mischief at which expediency as a *moral rule of duty*, may involve such awful consequences that the violation of it shall be extremely wicked; and thus the obligation of Expediency and the obligation of moral duty becomes the same, the motives of conduct in both cases the same, the awful sanction of God the same, and the fanciful distinction between them 'a distinction without a difference.'

"We have here supposed an extreme amount of this distinction, and to prove that the principle on which it is founded is essentially false. For the truth or falsehood of any principle can only be detected by going the whole length of the principle, and following it out to its ultimate consequences. But the real Christian does not demand that the question of Expediency on any given case of conscience, shall rise to such a frightful magnitude as is here supposed, in order that he may feel it to be a deep and solemn moral obligation, and his bounden rule of duty. For *Christian Expediency* is a high and holy standard, and in weighing the question of duty in any proposed case, a *tender conscience* holds the scales, that conscience which above all things God loves; while *Love, Charity, and Mercy* argue the case, and heaven-born, Self-denial for another's good, after the pattern of Christ, makes duty easy, and esteem, all motives of personal ease or indulgence as lighter than the dust of the balance. Thus the holy self-denying Paul did not require the carnage of a world, or even the ten thousandth part of the misery and crime, of the present day, resulting from intoxicating drinks, to constitute the question one of *bounden duty and deep moral obligation*. For he accounted a single soul so precious that he declared he would eat no meat while the world endured, and that it was good not to touch wine, provided by such means a single brother stumbled, or was offended, or was made weak.

"Is it not evident that in the bosom of the Apostle Paul (and in every bosom filled by the constraining love of Christ,) *Christian Expediency and moral duty rest upon the same sanction and are carried into practice for the same motives*, and that when once the question of expediency in any given case is *prayerfully decided*, all further distinction is a 'distinction without a difference.'"—*Bristol Temperance Herald*.

#### CIVIL WAR IN ENGLAND.

While we were in England, we spent much of our time and strength in sowing the seeds of civil war. We saw a power there which was treading on the necks of thousands and millions, and wringing out the life-blood of some of the best of her sons. We saw an attempt making to impose upon the public credulity, and to make the people believe that, while it was wrenching fifty millions sterling from them annually, and sending sixty thousand to an untimely grave, it was yet England's great benefactor; that in the duties on all its nostrums, and for the license for doing all the mischief it did, it paid into the national treasury more than enough to support the whole police, army and navy, besides administering most abundantly to the wants and comforts of men.\*

\* Victuallers pay to Government yearly for their licenses, their fees, and the duties on spirits sold by them, the immense sum of £1,000,000. The cost of the British army yearly, is £3,000,000;

We thereupon, at a meeting in Exeter Hall, proposed that a monument should be erected for it in Hyde Park, as the benefactor of England. But this did not suit; it was called abuse. We then thought best to attempt to rouse a spirit of revolt, and kindle up a burning indignation in the public mind, for what it was doing. The people had long bewailed the consequences of this scorching heat, and had endeavoured to pluck the brands from the burning. But the tyranny remained almost untouched. The men on the bloody throne were, in many cases, good men, pious men, and could do no harm; and must remain respected. What if they are? we said. Their business is bad; is horrid; binding, in the most galling chains, sixty thousand captives. Denounce their tyranny. Stop their traffic. Down with their palaces. THE SUPPLY, we said, CREATED THE DEMAND. While you have your breweries, your distilleries, your ale-houses, and gin-shops, licensed by government, you will have your thousands and hundreds of thousands of drunkards. No matter who is at the head; stir up a civil war; fight the spirit trade, and the wine trade, and the beer trade, and the license system, and then you will do something. And when we told of our successful battles in America—how in Massachusetts and New York we had nearly dethroned the tyrant, we were received with shouts and applause. We are pleased to see by recent English papers, that our advice has been taken, and that the war has commenced, and is already spirited and successful. The following article is from the *Temperance Advocate*:—

#### CRUSADE AGAINST THE TRAFFIC.

Is the supply of strong drink created by the demand for it, or the demand by the supply? The former has been generally held by English Temperance Reformers, and the latter by the Americans. And it becomes a serious question, how far these views have led to the marked difference in our relative success. We confess we are converts to their views, and are generally mistaken in "the signs of the times," if the late interview which our teetotalers had with the Americans at and during the sittings of the World's Convention, has not produced similar results in the minds of others. Hence a Crusade against the Traffic has already commenced, in a new form, with singular success, in Edinburgh and Bolton, which we hope will be vigorously followed up in other places.

No doubt many of our friends feel peculiarly sensitive on this subject, as well as those who are interested in the traffic; but after having carefully considered the remarks of the *Chronicle*, and those of the *Scottish Temperance Review*, of this month, we think with the latter, that, as

"Temperance Reformers, we are bound to seek the removal of everything that tends to extend the sin of intemperance, or that assumes the character of an obstacle to our progress. Every public-house tends to promote tippling habits in the locality in which it is situated, and acts as a temptation to those who have been induced to abandon such habits. It works against us in two ways, and falls legitimately within the circle of obstacles, which we must spare no efforts to remove. The reduction of the public-houses must be attended with a lessening of the evil, and a consequent improved public sentiment, and, therefore, it is evidently an object worthy of being aimed at. While, then, we hail reduction, let us aim at extermination. In doing so, we infringe on no man's liberty. The highest degree of freedom is always consistent with the greatest amount of

that of the navy, £5,000,000; the cost of the metropolitan police force, £500,000; and that of the rural police throughout the kingdom, £750,000; making a total of £10,750,000. Thus, then it appears that the publicans of London pay to government more than it costs to support the army, navy, and the whole of the police force established throughout the kingdom.—*Douglas Jerrold's Weekly Newspaper*.