Haszard's Gazette,

FARMERS' JOURNAL, AND COMMERCIAL ADVERTISER.

Established 1823. Charlottetown, P. E. Island, Wednesday, March 21, 1855. New Series. No. 224

To the Editor of Haszard's Gazette.

Dear Sir :

"As the best men are sometimes in error on matters connected with the vital interests of mankind, you will oblige a constant reader and one who advocates the cause of Total abstinence on Gospel principles, by giving insertion, to the following able and judicious remarks by Archdeacon Jeffreys, a minister of the church of England.

The Presbyterian Church of Canada wrote a very affectionate letter of congratulation to the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, presenting them with two hundred and forty pounds sterling, as a testimony of their good will. In this letter they took occasion to set before them the vast amount of good that had been done, both in the United States and in British America, by the temperance movement, and the many blessings, both temporal and spiritual, that had resulted from it. They proved, by satisfactory statistics, that all this good had been done and that all these blessings had resulted from the spread of the principle of total abstinence from all intoxicating drinks—and earnestly and affectionately entreated their assistance in the cause. This letter gave occasion to several very able reports and important concessions, and half-movements, on the part of the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland.

Among these documents, it is especially to a late able, and in many respects valuable, report, read by Dr. M'Farlane before the General Assembly, that it is my present object to call the reader's attention. After enlarging with great ability upon the crime, domestic misery, and ruin produced in Scotland by intoxicating drinks, and after fully admitting the great good that has been done by the spread of teetotalism, the report evades coming to the *remedy*, and excuses the church from lending her support and assistance to the *only* measure that has ever yet availed to stop the desolating scourge, in the following memorable words:—

'As a Church, she cannot with propriety take any step, except on moral and scriptural grounds. She may frankly admit, as was done in a former report, that much good has been done by temperance societies; and, in so far as she can approve their proceedings, she may, with perfect good feeling, bid them God speed. But her own movement must be *only* such, as would admit of her prefixing to each injunction—" *Thus saith the Lord.*"'

Now it is amazing to me, how such great and good men as compose the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, should allow themselves to be the dupes of such a miserable fallacy as the above excuse contains.

I have said 'great and good men,' because (though an archdeacon of the Church of England) I hope I may be permitted to express my sincere and settled conviction, that they *are* great and good men, without giving offence to any.

But it is the more amazing to me how *such* men could take the most solemn, sacred, and awful words that can be uttered by the mouth of man—'*Thus saith the Lord*,' and make them the instruments of a fallacy.

For let us ask the question, What do these words mean in the *connection* and for the *purpose* for which they are here used? If they mean anything at all to the present purpose, they must mean—'that the Church cannot lend her countenance and assistance to the temperance movement, without *express* and *particular* directions from the word of God for this *particular mode* of christian benevolence.' This (I had almost said) senseless objection is nothing new to us; we have heard it again and again from *common minds*—'Show us a *command* in the *Bible* for your teetotal societies, and then we will join you.' I say, we have heard this objection again and again from *common minds;* but how *such* men as compose the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland could ever think of such an objection, or listen to it for one moment, is to me most amazing; I can only say, alas! for poor human nature, and the deceivableness of the human heart! In cases, where custom, or prejudice, or appetite are concerned, no wisdom, no talent, no *former* integrity, can with *certainty* secure it from becoming the dupe of a fallacy!

One would think that it would be enough to remind these good men, that *none* of the various modes of christian benevolence in the present day can claim the prefix, 'Thus saith the Lord,' in the *sense* in which they here demand it of our cause. They cannot show the *express* and *particular command* of God for Magdalen Hospitals, Church-Building Societies, Religious Tract Societies, or even for the Bible and Missionary Societies, in the sense in which it is here demanded for the Temperance Society. And we do not ask for their assistance, in any other sense than they already give it to these societies, viz., by becoming themselves members, and encouraging others to do the same by their example and influence, and by speaking the truth in love. We do not ask for an 'injunction,' in any compulsory sense of the word injunction; we do not ask, that it shall be made a constitution of church membership. We only ask their own *personal* self-denial and their hearty co-operation in this '*merciful*' enterprise—this labour of love. And we have *as* much warrant from scripture for *our* labour of love and mercy, as they have for any of the societies, to which they lend their countenance and support.

Indeed, if an *express* and *particular command* for any mode of benevolence be at all necessary to constitute christian obligation, I have no hesitation in asserting, that there are express and particular commands in scripture which approach much *more nearly* to a command to abstain from intoxicating drinks *in the present day*, in view of the crime and miseries they are *now* producing, than can be found for any other mode of christian benevolence now in operation in England. That warning of our Lord,' that is, because of the *traps*, *snares*, and *stumbling*-blocks that abound in this wicked world, and the direction which *immediately* follows—that if any earthly indulgence, or any earthly comfort, dear and necessary, and (*in its own nature*) as innocent, too, as the right hand or the right eye, and as truly a 'GOOD CREATURE OF GOD,' as these beautiful organs are, should, by some untoward combination of circumstances, become an offence and a stumbling-block to our country or 'the world,' we must part with it, though the separation cost us a pang like parting with the limbs of the body; and this under the severest penalty and most awful warning, three times pronounced, that ever came from the gentle Saviour's lips, of the 'worm that dieth not, and the fire that is not quenched.' Paul too comes *very near* to the principle of our society, with an 'express command,' when he commands us to abstain, from whatever is 'inexpedient, *every* thing by which a brother stumbleth or is offended, or is made weak, and declares, that it is good not to drink wine, or to do any thing in *any* 'causes our brother to offend;'—*nearer*, I suspect, than he does to, by far the greater part of, the societies now in existence.

But all this is mere digression from our *main argument*, and even if I were wrong in my application of these particular texts, it does not in the least affect our position, because the demand made upon us, to show an express and *particular* command of God for our particular mode of christian benevolence is not tenable for a moment, and the *excuse* for not assisting us is a miserable fallacy. It arises entirely from overlooking the genius and spirit of the bible, and the plan upon which it is constructed. If every *case* of *conscience*, in which every individual can be placed in all the varied relations and circumstances of life, and in all the changes which succeeding generations may bring about,—if all the various modes of doing good, which christian benevolence has contrived, or may contrive to the end of the world, were *expressly* provided for in the bible, with the prefix—'Thus saith the Lord,'—the Encyclopædia Britannica would be a penny pamphlet, compared with the book that would require to be written. And how would the poor ever be able to purchase such a book (or rather such a vast library) as this would be? or who would find leisure to study it? But no! blessed be God! the blessed gospel is not a book of casuistry, nor a statute book of laws! I assert fearlessly, in the face of the whole christian world, that, if there are two things under the sun, utterly unlike one another, it is the blessed gospel, and a statute book of laws, or a ponderous tome of casuistry. The gospel lays down broad principles of action, supreme love to God, and love to man for the dear Saviour's sake, and leaves it to the 'honest heart' warmed by the love of Christ, to be the 'casuist,' in each particular case of conscience. As thus—A case of conscience occurs, in which I doubt, whether it be my duty to do or not to do, a particular action, or to give my support to a proposed scheme of christian benevolence. I turn over the word of God to learn my duty, and what do I find? Express directions for this particular case? Nothing of the kind! The first words I read are, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and soul, and mind, and strength, and thy neighbour as thyself!' Now how am I to apply this to the case now before me? It appears that the law of the New Testament is the law of *Love*. Then *Love* must be the lawyer to explain and apply it. There are many other lawyers that *pretend* to explain it. Selfishness thinks *he* can explain it,—Self-interest,—Carnal-ease and Indulgence,—Love of the world and its maxims—all these gentlemen are lawyers in their way, and *think* that they can explain it; but *they cannot! they cannot! Love* is the only lawyer that can explain the law of *Love*. They will only mystify the subject with quibbles, and exceptions, and objections, and difficulties, bringing one text of scripture to contradict another,—the Saviour against the Saviour, and Paul against Paul, in short, *any* subterfuge to evade self-denial. But they cannot understand (and how then can they explain?) the law of love! But if I knock at my own bosom, and find that *love* dwells there, then love can explain it to me in a moment. I have just read the two great commandments 'on which hang all the law and the prophets.' These my Saviour tells me, are my rule of duty in every case, that can possibly occur; and I want to know how to apply it in the case now before me. I take *love* for my interpreter and love immediately explains it to me thus—'Love worketh no ill to his neighbour, therefore love is the fulfilling of the law,'—not only no *intentional* ill, but no ill of *any* kind. Love would hate and abhor any indulgence to the flesh which was attended with danger and jeopardy to a brother's soul. Love says—'If meat or wine or any indulgence of mine make my brother to offend, I will eat no meat and drink no wine, while the world standeth lest I make my brother to offend., God forbid, that I should 'walk uncharitably and destroy with my meat or with my drink him for whom Christ died.'

Again the apostle Paul says to me, 'Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ;' and taking *love* for my interpreter, I understand it in a moment. I see in an instant how it bears upon the present case. And agreeably to this injunction, I long to 'bear the burden' of the broken-hearted wife and the famished children of the drunkard; I am ready and willing, at any sacrifice of my own indulgence, to bind up the broken heart and to restore the husband and the father. For this purpose, I am willing to 'bear the burden' of the poor drunkard himself. Therefore I go to him and say:—'Brother, I come to share thy burden, I come to take thee by the *hand*, and to lead thee in the path, the only path, which is safe for thee. Another path may be safe for me, but I want to lead thee in the path in which thou canst walk safely; I can do without the things which destroy thy body and ruin thy soul, and surely thou canst. We will try it together, my brother. For Christ laid down his life for *my* soul, and shall I not give up the pleasures of the intoxicating cup for thine?'

Again, I light upon that command of the loving, self-denying Paul—'We that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of them that are weak, and not to please ourselves;' and if I have any doubt or difficulty as to what it means in reference to the present case, love makes it as clear to me as daylight. I see at once, that the drunkard is a 'weak brother,' in a fearful sense of the term. I see that he cannot even approach the temptation, that he cannot 'look upon the wine when it is red,' without imminent danger of falling. I see that the example of moderation is a cruel example to *him*—and that the very *attempt* to follow it will ruin him both in body and soul,—that to him it is more dangerous than the example of the lost and degraded drunkard; for the one acts as a beacon, a fearful warning like a stranded vessel on the rocks, at which in his sober moments his soul shudders, whereas the other is a decoy which lures him to his ruin. I see that the drinking customs and courtesies of society are cruel customs to *him*; that by the whole system and trade, his path is infested with snares, and that, in every step he takes, there is a trap set for his soul. And shall I encourage this system, and multiply these snares and temptations, and destroy *my poor brother for the sake of a worthless indulgence?* I value my 'christian liberty! But love whispers in my ear, 'Use not your liberty for an occasion to the flesh,' (to pamper and gratify the appetite), but 'by love serve your poor brother.' 'Take heed, lest this liberty of thine become a stumbling-block to them that are weak, and through thy greater knowledge (or strength) thy weak brother perish, for whom Christ died.'

Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and soul, and thy neighbour as thyself!!! God well deserves our love; for He manifested his to us, when he gave his only-begotten Son that we might live through him. 'Herein is love, indeed, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.' 'Brethren, if God so loved us, we ought to love one another,' and if 'he laid down his life for us, we ought to lay down our lives,' (and much more a needless indulgence of the flesh) rather than endanger a brother's soul. Have we any measure of this love? If so, what are the practical evidences of it? Love does not show itself 'in word and in tongue, but in deed and in truth.' Love is not a thing that goes about talking and making fine professions. Love is a principle that rouses a man to action. And love does not deal out its services by stinted measure, ever considering how little it can possibly do, just to come within the terms of a bargain. Love does not require to be shown an express command of God—'Thus saith the Lord,' *binding* her *down* as by the terms of a *bond* to every individual act and labour of self-denying love. Love does not say with Shylock, 'It is not in the bond; show it me in the bond—I will have my bond.'—Love is a large, a noble, a generous passion. There is 'a length, a breadth, a depth, a height,' in love. But especially the very thought of the *Saviour* sets the whole soul of love on fire, and she does not, *cannot* seek to drive a *hard bargain*, and deal out a stinted measure of service in return for a Saviour's dying love. 'There is no express command for it in scripture!' Oh, the soul of love burns with indignation at the very thought of such a shift, such a subterfuge as this! She *cannot* plead such an excuse as this to avoid self-denial in HIS service who denied himself to the death for us. Nay, the greater the sacrifice, the more delighted love would be to lay it down at the foot of the cross without waiting for an express command. The language of love is—

'If I might make some reserve,
And duty did not *call*,
I love my Lord with such a love
That I would give him all.'

And so far from loving and cherishing any indulgence to the flesh that brought dishonour upon the cause of Christ, love would hate and abhor the sight of any indulgence that ruined the souls, for whom her own dear Saviour died.

Christ says 'If any man *love* me, he will keep my commandments.' In *enabling* us to keep the commands of Christ, love performs a *two-fold* office, that of an *interpreter* to *explain*, and a *motive* to *obey*. Nothing but the constraining love of Christ is a sufficiently powerful *motive* to induce us to obey the commands of Christ. But, in order to obey *any* command, we must at least *understand* it. Now the commands of Christ are founded upon the LAW OF LOVE, and no other lawyer but *love* ever can or will understand them, while the world endures. And if these good men who have given abundant proof that they *can* make sacrifices for the love of Christ, would only take love for their interpreter in *this* case, as they have done in many another, we should have them among our noblest supporters and our warmest friends.

A Bargain during a Battle—It is related, that during one of the obstinate naval engagements between the English and the Dutch, in the time of Cromwell, one of the English ships, to their great mortification, had expended all their ammunition. The Commander, well aware of the trafficking propensities of the Dutch, hoisted a flag of truce, and sent an officer on board the enemy's ship to purchase ammunition. The Dutch, who would never lose an opportunity to make a good bargain, without regard to friend or foe, after some negotiation, consented to supply their enemies with powder and ball, but taking advantage of their necessity, demanded an exorbitant price—which, of course, was paid after some grumbling by John Bull, who nevertheless, seemed duly sensible of the favor, and renewing the engagement with more fury than ever, returned the balls with such force and accuracy, that the Dutchman was soon placed *hors du combat*, and compelled to surrender!

Cadets for the Royal Navy from the Colonies.—We learn from the Halifax *Recorder*, that Despatches were laid before the Legislative Assembly of Nova Scotia on the 26th ult., from which it appeared, that Her Majesty had been pleased to confer upon Canada the privilege of nominating two young men, and New-Brunswick and Nova Scotia one each, as Cadets in the Royal Navy, and that Master Sydenham Howe, son of the Hon. Joseph Howe, had been appointed, on behalf of Nova Scotia.

The Garrison.—Instead of further reductions in the garrison of Halifax being contemplated, it is rumoured, that the number of military will shortly be augmented, to the full amount that can be provided with Barrack accommodation.—*Recorder*.