

the halls of the academy, would have built for themselves a pyramid, durable as time. A few years since, these men were miserable inebriates, poor and almost friendless, tortured by remorse, and suffering, at times, all the horrors of *delirium tremens*. Now, how changed! The head is clear, the heart light, and the voice of more than one of them is often heard in Temperance meetings rousing the inert, stimulating the active, and pouring horrible truth upon the head of the retailer. To pass from our own State, there is John Hawkins, whose history is familiar to all; and there too, is John B. Gough, whose eloquence has electrified the hearts of thousands, and Kellogg, from the far West, who is said to be unrivalled in his way, and hundreds more, once drunkards, but now redeemed! There is the Hon. G. S. Catlin of Connecticut, a gentleman and a scholar, who not many years ago, forsook the wife of his youth, and became a vagabond upon the face of the earth, wandered to the Empire city—became a singer—sang songs to a drunken rabble for liquor—slept on the docks and in cellars, and lived by chance. But mark the change! A few years after this, we find him a reformed man, a lawyer of extensive practice, and then, the Representatives of his native State—"the land of steady habits"—in the Congress of the United States.

There was the Hon. Mr. Atwell of Rhode Island, now deceased; a man of superior scholarship, and an eloquent debater, whose habits of intemperance at one time, were such, that his wife, though her attachment to him was strong as woman's love, was obliged to separate herself from his companionship—who went a voluntary exile from society to the Asylum at Providence, that he might be removed from temptation, and subsequently reformed—who became, through the intercession of mutual friends, reconciled to his wife—was elected to the most distinguished office in his native State, and, at the time of his death, was the most prominent member of the Democratic party in Rhode Island. We might swell the list to hundreds, and, were our information sufficiently extensive, no doubt, to thousands, who, gifted with noble talents, misdirected and obscured by intemperance, have been saved as by fire, and are now among the brightest ornaments of society. But besides this exhumed and buried talent, behold the vast amount of dormant intellect that has been called into exercise, by the reformation of these once infatuated men. A father has thrown the bowl aside—the son becomes an active working temperance man—publicly advocates the cause, and is one of its firmest supporters; or, a son has been plucked, as a "brand from the burning," and the father throws all his influence on the side of temperance, and seals his fidelity with his dying testimony in its behalf. By speaking on this subject, too, men have learned to speak on other subjects, and, in this way, vast accessions have been made to the empire of mind.—Intellect has not only been redeemed, but quickened and set in motion, until the world feels its power as it was never felt before.—*S. C. Temp. Advocate.*

THE TRUE POSITION OF CHRISTIAN EXPEDIENCY AS A RULE OF DUTY.

We copy the following excellent remarks from the *Bombay Temperance Advocate* of September last, which we consider calculated to render our cause good service in this country. Our esteemed contemporary does not, however, appear to be aware of the exact state of the question with us; for although it may be true, as he asserts, that in the disputes about *Christian Expediency* there is a "distinction without a difference," yet there is a wide difference between the views of some of our friends. Whilst some contend that the use of intoxicating drinks is, *per se*, a sin in all cases and under all circumstances, and that all who have used such drinks in every age of the world have sinned in so doing; others consider that the immorality of using them depends

on attendant circumstances,—the former taking what they choose to term the high ground of principle, whilst they regard the latter as acting on the low ground of expediency. We however hope the following remarks will suffice to show that in this country at least, the disuse of intoxicating drinks is a duty on the ground of *Christian Expediency*, and that no motive to action can be higher than that which rests on such expediency.

We suggest to our friends the propriety of always prefixing the word *Christian* to *Expediency*; the term will then stand distinguished from that of *Expediency* in the low sense in which it is often used, and which has led to much of the misunderstanding complained of.

"In several numbers of the '*Christian Witness*,' and the '*Teetotal Times*,' which we have received by the last Mails from England," observes our Bombay contemporary, "it appears that a warm controversy has arisen among the friends of Teetotalism on the grounds of '*Christian Expediency*.'" One party has warmly maintained that *Expediency* is the only unquestionable ground, the only ground that cannot be disputed, and therefore the only useful practical ground on which Teetotalism can be best advocated. The other party has as warmly maintained that "*Expediency*" is too low a motive, and that the sacred claims of *duty* and moral obligation are the motives to be urged, if we wish to produce any powerful or permanent effect.

"Now it appears to us that both parties in this dispute have stumbled upon the fallacy of '*distinctio sine differentia*,' (a distinction without a difference) for the whole controversy takes for granted that there is an essential difference between the obligation of '*Christian Expediency*,' and that obligation of '*moral right* and *wrong*?' which we term *duty*, and that the former is, in its own nature, a lower obligation, and a far inferior motive to the latter. Now this is a grievous fallacy, and an entire misunderstanding of the nature of *Christian Expediency*, and of the true position of the question.

"The only difference between *Christian Expediency* and *moral right* and *wrong* is, that expediency is an '*accident*' depending upon time, place, and circumstances, so that what is expedient in one age of the world may be inexpedient in another; whereas *moral right* and *wrong* being an '*essential*' and inseparable quality, is immutably and eternally the same. But here all distinction ends as a practical rule of duty at once and for ever. For when once the question of '*Expediency*' is settled in any given case, settled in *sincerity*, (not what the world calls *sincerity*, but in real *Christian sincerity*) with the '*single heart*' and the '*single eye*,' then it becomes a rule of duty, as deep, solemn, sacred, and binding, as any rule of duty between man and God. For what is it which renders a thing, or a course of action, inexpedient? Plainly the evil, moral and physical, which it is bringing on mankind, and its consequent inconsistency with the glory of God. Now it is quite conceivable that a thing may be so murderously inexpedient on account of the slaughter of human life, the wreck of human happiness, and the ruin of human souls, which it occasions, that the use of it, in defiance of such inexpediency as this, may be selfish, barbarous, and cruel, utterly contrary to the glory of God, and inconsistent with the command Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself, and therefore wicked, extremely wicked.

"But here we wish it to be distinctly understood, that we are only contending for the principle in the abstract without applying to any particular case. Whether the evils resulting from the use of intoxicating drinks in the present day, whether the deluge of human tears, and the mass of human misery and crime, the ruin of millions both for time and for eternity resulting from the moderate and immoderate use of intoxicating drinks, constitute an amount of evil sufficiently great to bring it under this category is a question for each individual to decide. We decline giving any opinion here on this particular question, because it would needlessly