

Correspondence.

For the Christian Messenger.

TEMPERANCE.

Misapprehension.

MESSRS. EDITORS—

Considerate persons are aware that misapprehension is very common, and that it does much harm. The cause of Temperance has evidently suffered greatly from it. Of this a lamentable illustration is furnished by the case of Messrs. Gough and Lees. It therefore behoves all the friends of Temperance to guard against this prolific source of evil. If any instance of it occur, it should be removed as soon as may be, by a friendly explanation.

These thoughts have been elicited by the perusal of an article on "The Prohibitory Law," (C. M., Aug. 18th) from the pen of my esteemed brother Foshay. He surely does not intend to misrepresent me; and yet he speaks of me as "the former unflinching advocate of the prohibitory policy." I beg to assure him that I am as "unflinching an advocate of the prohibitory policy" as ever. I never saw the need of such a law more clearly, nor felt more ardently desirous of its speedy establishment.—Was Havelock, I ask, any less loyal than formerly, less valiant, or less ardent in his desires to afford immediate relief to the brave English and his noble band in the Residency at Lucknow, when he prudently fell back upon Cawnpore till he could obtain reinforcements sufficient to enable him to accomplish his purpose? Had he injudiciously rushed forward in an unprepared state, the consequences would have been disastrous in the extreme.

I never said, nor intimated, "That the time has not come for such a law in the British Provinces." We ought to have had it years ago. Being put upon self-defence, I do not hesitate to maintain, that it would now have been in successful operation in this Province, if all its professed friends had pursued the same course that I have. Brother F. can not deny the patent fact, that many Temperance or Total Abstinence Societies have become extinct through apathy and neglect; but, if I mistake not, no such case has ever occurred in any of my fields of labour, in which I have always established or fostered these Societies during nearly twenty-nine years past. No other consideration could ever induce me to vote at an Election; but zeal for the Temperance Reform prompted me to do so, and thereby subject myself to much ill-will and obloquy. Unlike many whose inconsistent conduct has proved ruinous to the cause, while I continued to give my suffrage, I gave it invariably to the avowed patrons of total abstinence. I did not, however, wish them to give us a prohibitory liquor law till they were satisfied it would be retained and carried into effect. Moreover, I have ascertained, that it is of little use to send advocates of Temperance to the House, if they are resolved to uphold any leader who has always been opposed to prohibition, and to the cause of Temperance in every form.

Any one who reads brother Foshay's communication without comparing it with mine, may be naturally led to conclude, that I dissuade people from making efforts to obtain a prohibitory liquor law. But all who impartially and understandingly examine mine, (C. M., July 23th,) will see that I urge the immediate adoption of united and energetic measures preparatory to this end. I conscientiously believe this to be the only way by which we can succeed.—It is useless to "call upon Hercules" till we "put our own shoulders to the wheels." We must keep them there.

My esteemed brother evidently labours under a strange misapprehension with reference to the law in New Brunswick. That it did good during its short continuance, where he resided, and in some other localities, I gladly believe, but, according to the concurrent testimony of both friends and foes, that it was not "generally carried out" is no "mistake." Whatever he may imagine to have been its cause, the stubborn fact is undeniable, that the law was very soon repealed, and that by the voice of the people, who thereby sustained the act of the Governor. This clearly demonstrated that there was not a sufficient number of men in the Province thoroughly imbued with the principles of Temperance and prohibition, to retain the law; and consequently that it was enacted prematurely.

I have no need, however, to refute my dear brother's arguments, or to show the inaccuracy of his statements; for he has himself done it most effectually. In his fourth paragraph he tells us, "The reason that the English Official gave for

this stretch of power, was the necessity of repealing the law in question." At the commencement of his next paragraph he says, "The Temperance people thinking that their cause was safe, did not make the necessary effort to return sound Temperance men."—Is it possible? Can it be imagined for a moment the real "Temperance people" of New Brunswick are so incautious, and so indifferent to the cause? If so, by his own shewing, they must have been quite unprepared for working such a law. The fact, however, as is well known, is, being aware that this was the one "question," and that "their cause was not safe," they made a noble and earnest effort—all honor to them—"to return sound Temperance men. But there were such multitudes of anti-prohibitionists, so "many of them in authority," so much prejudice and misrepresentation, and so many untoward political influences at work, that they were beaten. (Substantially these facts were stated, without contradiction, before the Association at Sackville, in July, 1856. It is doubtless in the recollection of many, that I then recommended to the friends of the cause in New Brunswick precisely the same that I now recommend in Nova Scotia.) When the new House met, the law was repealed by an overwhelming majority. This I deeply regret; but it is a matter of historic record, that is not to be denied.

A judicious and intelligent brother, whose long continued connexion with public business in St. John qualifies him to give an accurate judgment on this subject, lately remarked to me, of his own accord, that it would not do to introduce a prohibitory liquor law, unless there were a large majority in favour of it; and that the attempt to do so in New Brunswick when the people were not prepared for it, had done much harm to the cause. This is obviously the common sense and correct view of the matter.

A shrewd Legislator in Nova Scotia, avowedly opposed to the law, observed to me, several years since, that he supposed they must give it to the people, to let them see that they could not carry it out. His policy evidently was, to let it be passed prematurely, in order that it might be frustrated. Doubtless many of its opposers would rejoice to see it passed at once.

That zealous partisans should endeavor to make capital out of this question is not at all strange. But that intelligent and well-informed men, who are under no such influence, can fail to perceive the moral certainty that, under the circumstances known to exist at present, with so few staunch and consistent friends, and so many determined and powerful enemies, a similar measure in Nova Scotia, if carried, would soon share the same fate as that in New Brunswick, is to me a matter of astonishment. It must, in my opinion, result from misapprehension. My mind, however, is deliberately made up, that nothing which any man may think, say, write, or do, shall divert me from the diligent and persevering employment of those means which appear to me best adapted to secure, as speedily as possible, the attainment of that important object, which is very dear to my heart, namely, the permanent establishment of a prohibitory liquor law in my beloved native Province.

Yours in gospel bonds,

CHARLES TUPPER.

Aylesford, Sept. 8th, 1858.

For the Christian Messenger.

"The Present Truth."

A Sermon preached at the opening of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Nova Scotia, June, 16th, 1858; by REV. GEORGE PATTERSON.

To the sincere christian a knowledge of the "truth as it is in Jesus" cannot but be esteemed of great importance.

Nothing that the Bible teaches can be looked upon as a "non-essential." In proportion, too, as the christian apprehends the truth, he loves it, and is by his knowledge of it, the better fitted, the more thoroughly furnished for his work in whatever department of the vineyard he may labor.

Both for the "defence and confirmation of the gospel" should every christian seek a knowledge of the whole truth of God, as revealed in his word.

Various are the ways in which the "Truth" is attacked—watchful must be the servant of the Lord, to give warning when he spies, brought in by designing or mistaken men, errors that endanger the peace of Zion, and the souls of men.

Some errors are very specious. They have, so to speak, the phraseology of the Bible and christianity—terms the same as those which are accounted evangelical; but in the system of

those who use this christian phraseology the terms become quite a different thing and convey quite different ideas.

Hence the importance to the minister of the gospel of the careful study of the truth, as revealed in the Bible, and a knowledge of the mode by which the truth is being assailed.

He therefore who spies these errors, unmasks them, and brings out the truth clear and divested of the false glosses of men, is a benefactor to his fellow-men. He saw the sword coming, he gave the timely warning, and thus delivered his soul—he is set for both the "defence and confirmation" of the gospel.

To this work the author of the above sermon has felt himself and his brethren, like men of "Issachar," called to defend important truths, which he considers of late being assailed, either by the revival of old errors, or the assumption of new ones.

It is by no means my intention to review this sermon, but simply to notice one point in it; that many of the errors which he has noticed do exist, I have no doubt, but that he discovers danger, and cries out an alarm where no danger exists, is, I think, quite easy to show.

I refer to the dangerous tendencies he discovers in the sentiments held by Baptists.

The truths he feels himself called to defend, and to which he invites his "Brethren and Fathers," against their corresponding errors, are five. The first is the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures,—the second, the doctrine of the Trinity,—third, the doctrines [doctrines?] of sovereign grace,—fourth, Protestantism,—fifth, the spirituality of the church.

Under the first head he brings out the error of the Baptists—not indeed in the practice of an ordinance in its mode and subjects, differing, as it is sometimes represented, from the Presbyterian brethren in mere externals, but as sapping the foundation, as poisoning the very fountains of life; for those who deny the Old Testament to be any part of the standard of divine truth, attack by this the whole revelation of God.

The author's words are, "In particular, the christian public was not long since shocked by the open avowal on the part of Dr. Wayland, that he did not regard the Old Testament as any part of the standard of divine truth. Those who have come in contact with the Baptists in this province, must have observed a tendency to the same view, and will not be surprised at the open avowal of it by one of the most eminent men that body has produced."

The charge brought against Dr. Wayland, the late President of Brown University, is of a serious nature, if true. If Dr. Wayland has made such a bold statement as that attributed to him by the author, it deserves to be rebuked. Against it, whether made by Dr. W., or any other Baptist, however "eminent," or by all other Baptists, I would enter my caveat, and, clasping the sacred treasure, prefer to be alone with it, than without it, or ignoring its authority, be surrounded by all my brethren.

But has Dr. W. made the "open avowal" with which he is charged? Where is it to be found? The author gives us no information on this point. He refers to none of Dr. W's published sentiments in proof. Neither do I believe he can. Nay, more, I believe, and know that Dr. W. holds as firmly to the contrary truth, as does the author who lays the charge against him. Read Dr. W's language and there seems to be no reason for thinking that he holds the sentiment.

In presenting the views of Baptists, in reference to the mode and subjects of baptism, Dr. W. opposes the new Testament, as the only rule of faith and practice, against all traditions of men and decrees of councils. Some "writers in commenting on these remarks," says Dr. W., "have thought it their duty to state that the author denies the divine inspiration of the Old Testament. To such an imputation he does not think himself called on to reply, &c." (Principles and practices of Baptists—pg. 92, note.)

From the language of the whole note I am compelled to believe, and shall be, until I see proof to the contrary, that the charge is incorrect, and bears too striking a contrast to "the present truth."

With reference to the "Baptists in this province," the charge is a stale slander, not originating with Mr. P., but dug up out of the mine of slander, one often brought, both by the designing and the ignorant.

To use the language of Dr. W., I do not feel that we are "called on" to make any formal reply, or to enter upon any statement and proof of the sentiments of the divine inspiration of the whole word of God, both Old and New Testaments. These are too well known. Thousands upon thousands of dollars have been, and are now

being expended by them upon the elucidation of God's word, and bringing out the divine originals of these books, with the "least possible indefiniteness or obscurity."

The author of the sermon under review, seems to utter things under a chafed mind, he appears disturbed; and does not stop to weigh or sift his first thoughts. This spirit seems manifest in the special notice he has given of the sentiments, which, though untruthfully, he has assigned to the "Baptists."

Not only is faithfulness required in the man who opposes error, and stands for the defence of the gospel, but it should be done in the "love of the truth." The sermon is said to be published by "request." I do not know by whom, but in the name of candor itself, I would request that a sermon on "The Present Truth" should never be stained with false imputations. The sermon is sold, I believe, for four pence half-penny. Dear at that.

For the Christian Messenger.

Colportage in Sweden.

MESSRS. EDITORS,—

At the meeting of Convention in Yarmouth it was resolved to attempt sustaining a Colporteur in Sweden for a year. Certain sums were forwarded to Bro. Armstrong, as Chairman of the Foreign Mission Board, and to me, as Secretary, to be devoted to this object, provided the amount necessary was made up; but if not, to be given to another. That which was sent to me conditionally, has been handed over to Brother Armstrong, to be appropriated in accordance with the direction of the anonymous donor; and a like sum, not so limited, has been forwarded by him to me.

The few contributions we were at liberty to devote in aid of the American Baptist Publication Society, to assist in supporting Colporteurs in Sweden, have been forwarded to Rev. D. C. Haynes, an Agent of that Society, by Rev. Dr. J. W. Parker. I submit a list as follows:—

Rev. S. T. Rand, 5s.
R. Cogswell, per do., 15s.
—Saunders, Yarmouth, 5s.
Rev. C. Tupper, 5s.
A Friend, per do., 5s.

£1 15 0

Yours as ever,

CHARLES TUPPER.

P. S.—I have received 20s. from Thomas Bew, of C. B., per Rev. J. Miller. As directed, I gladly forwarded 10s. to Brother Cunningham's widow, and 10s. for the Foreign Mission.

For the Christian Messenger.

Sociabilities at Truro.

MR. EDITOR,—

As you take so much delight in keeping your readers posted up in everything that exhibits man in his better feelings, and in his better nature, I send you a little item of intelligence for the pages of your excellent journal.

It relates to a Soiree lately held in this place, and got up by the ladies of a benevolent society connected with the Baptist Church in this village. The object was to furnish the Chapel with an organ,—the means employed were such as are customary at such meetings—first, tea, with its accompaniments; second, speeches, with their accompaniments. Both were worthy of the object and the occasion.

The tables were tastefully provided with all the delicacies which the ladies of Truro know so well how to prepare. Such were the splendor and attractiveness displayed, that one was tempted to wish he could transport himself at his pleasure from one table to another, so as to show his appreciation of all. This he would, perhaps, have attempted, had it not been for the insurmountable obstacle found in one of the fashions of modern society, which leaves so little space in the world for half the race.—The gentle, yielding obstructives! One scarcely knows whether to wish that the reign of crinoline, &c., was at an end or not—so very accommodating and considerate is the sex. But for fear that this should be regarded as a digression I proceed.

There were, as has been hinted at, and as is usual on such occasions, some speeches, and these, too, were worthy of notice. One of the speakers was the Rev. Professor Smith, of the new Presbyterian Seminary, just opened in the village. His two principal topics were, honorable mention of the virtues of the ladies, and a liberal and generous allusion to the important part the Baptists had played in the history of the world. To appreciate the former your readers should, perhaps, be reminded that the Professor is a bachelor, of some sixty years.—In connexion with the latter, the speaker referred, in the most handsome and christian man-