

and frequently 3,000 persons have listened to the Gospel from his lips. He has been worked almost to death, and a pity it is that some real help has not been afforded to this devoted man. * * * * *

"On the whole, then, the work in Ireland is a good work. Chapels and churches in every direction are requiring enlargement.

For the Christian Messenger.

Coming out !!

DEAR SIR,—

A meeting was held at Pietou on the 5th inst., to commemorate the establishment of the Reformation in Scotland. All right. They have had noble meetings for the same purpose at Edinburgh, and they are about to found a Protestant Institute "for the training of students in the distinctive principles of Popery and Protestantism." All right, again.

But some strange assertions were ventured at the Pietou celebration, at which, by the way, James Forman, Esq. of Halifax, presided. The Rev. Mr. Hunter, of Halifax, is said to have spoken to the following effect:—"There must be no more tampering on the part of Government. We must demand the repeal of the Emancipation Act, not because we would deprive any man of his rights (!), but because they do not content themselves with this. They are an alien people under the sway of an Italian priest. Let them do as other foreigners in our midst. War is to be feared, but there is something worse. I would rather meet it than take the Papal combination of errors, or destroy our liberties."

Comment is unnecessary. Is not this coming out, with a vengeance? The Protestant Alliance men are continually declaring that they have no political aims; and yet here is their Halifax champion attempting to bully the government, and demanding the repeal of the Emancipation Act, though at the risk of civil war!

Sir—this pseudo-Protestantism must be denounced and exposed. Mr. Hunter's speech is intensely Popish. It breathes the spirit of the "man of sin." It shows that he would fight for religion with carnal weapons, and place fetters on others in the name of abused freedom.

These things retard the progress of true Protestant Union. For my own part, I am an ultra Protestant. I reject bishops, councils, synods, all of them. I think with Milton (and Mr. Hunter's tirade confirms me in it) that, "new Presbyter is but old Priest writ large." There are many varieties of Popery, but the Popery of Protestantism is the worst of all.

Yours truly,
OCT. 20, 1860. TYNDALE.

For the Christian Messenger.

The Christian Sabbath.

DEAR BROTHER,

I observe certain communications in the *Acadian Recorder*, signed "J. R. Lithgow," in which the writer labours to show that "there is now no divinely instituted Sabbath-day," and that consequently all manner of work may be done on the first day of the week, unless indeed the laws of the land interfere, and forbid the enjoyment of "the liberty which Christ has given." He admits that the first Christians were "accustomed" to hold religious assemblies "sometime" on the first day of the week, and commonly in the evening. But that, though a good custom, was not an act of obedience to a divine law, there being no such law. All men may, according to Mr. J. R. Lithgow, work every day in the year, without sinning against God; and Christians may satisfy their consciences by attending an evening meeting once a week.

I propose to send you a few thoughts on this subject as soon as I am released from some special public engagements. Meanwhile I cannot refrain from expressing at once my deep regret that sentiments so demoralising in their tendency should meet with an advocate who professes regard for the laws of God. There is laxity enough already in this province; but if Mr. Lithgow's views were to prevail extensively, Nova Scotia would soon fall into the state of the European continent—with this insignificant difference, that there business and pleasure occupy the after part of the Lord's-day, religious meetings being held by a few persons in the morning, while here we should have business and pleasure all the day, and here and there a gathering for religious purposes in the evening. May God keep us from it!

Matthew Henry has well observed that "the stream of religion will flow deeper or shallower according as the Sabbath banks are kept up or neglected."

Yours truly,
J. M. CRAMP.
Acadia College, Oct. 18, 1860.

Christian Messenger.

HALIFAX, OCTOBER 24, 1860.

Temperance.

THE PROHIBITION OF THE LICENSE LAW.

THE Laws for licensing the sale of intoxicating liquors which have hitherto been enacted, have professedly been for the purpose of restricting the sale, and preventing a free trade in those destructive beverages. They have, however, generally proved a pretext for a legal process with all the chances in favor of those charged with breaking the law, and altogether inefficient for preventing the illegal sale. Whilst these laws have pretended to protect the legal trader, and place the power of restricting in the hands of the justices of the peace, and allow them to decide whether certain localities should have a temple of Bacchus set up in their midst or not; they have in reality afforded protection to certain parties who illegally pander to the vitiated appetites of the lowest portion of the people.

The License law passed in 1858, and now in force, however, appears to be of a somewhat different character, and it would seem more nearly what it professes to be than any of its predecessors. It is substantially, we believe, a favourable opportunity for the people to prohibit the sale of those deleterious compounds, strangely called by some "good creatures of God."

The following article relating to one of the provisions of the said License law, contributed to the *Abstainer* by a gentleman of our acquaintance, we commend to our readers as worthy of their serious attention. This feature of the law appears to have escaped the attention of Temperance men. A prosecution or two under it, would be a salutary caution to those accustomed to take the money of the poor drunkard, and give him in return for it what proves to be new fuel to feed the flame which is already consuming him, body, soul, and substance:—

"If the husband, wife, parent, child, brother or sister, guardian or creditor of any person addicted to the intemperate use of intoxicating liquors, or any justice of the peace or overseer of the poor residing within the poor district wherein such intemperate person resides, shall give notice in writing to any person engaged in the sale of intoxicating liquors, that such person is addicted to the intemperate use of intoxicating liquors, it shall not thereafter be lawful under any pretence whatever for the person receiving such notice, by himself, his servants or agents, directly or indirectly, to sell or give any intoxicating liquors to such intemperate person to be used on the premises, or in any quantity less than ten gallons to be delivered and removed from the premises at one time. Any person knowingly violating the provisions of this Section, upon proof of the truth of the statement contained in such notice, shall be liable to a fine of not more than five pounds for a first offence, and a fine of not less than five pounds nor more than ten pounds, and imprisonment for a period of not more than thirty days, as the court or justices may direct for a second or subsequent offence."—*Revised Statutes*, page 76, sec. 31.

The most diabolical feature of the liquor traffic is the fact that there is no man so hopelessly and helplessly degraded with intemperate habits that he cannot get liquor, and no man can make himself so wretchedly drunk, that he cannot get another glass. There are very few rum-sellers who will refuse another glass to any man who can walk or crawl to the bar and lay down his three coppers. He may be pre-eminently the village drunkard; his wife and children may be starving at home; it may be all but certain that that glass will plunge him into *delirium tremens* or send him home to ill use, with a madman's fury, his unoffending family. If he has got three coppers he will get a glass at almost any rum-shop in the country. This is a well known fact. We will not stop to remark upon the nature of a traffic which degrades the vendor to such a pitch as to render him insensible to the meanness and cowardice of stooping for a few halfpence to minister to the raging appetite of the habitual drunkard. To carry off to a hungry wild beast were an occupation so superior that a man habitually engaged in the latter might well consider it a disgrace to him to sell rum to a drunkard—and even, as we have known to be the case, to hold the rum to his mouth when he was too drunk to take it without assistance! Our nature revolts from such meanness. Let us pass from it to consider the remedy.

Before the passing in 1858 of the clause of the license law above extracted, a liquor-seller might lawfully have done all that we have described. There was no protection whatever for the poor drunkard. Relatives disgraced and stung to madness, starving wives and children, the conservator of the peace who saw the laws outraged by the drunkard from day to day, the creditor who saw his property going to the rum-shop to feed another's mad appetite, and the overseer of the poor who either saw the victim gradually being reduced to be a parish pauper, or who was obliged to feed his family at the public expense while the rum-seller pocketed his earnings—all these might demonstrate, but they could do nothing to stop the evil. They had to stand by and see the victim poisoned, cursed,

ruined inch by inch, in soul, body and estate, and however dear he might be to some loving relatives—however useful to the community, their hands were tied. To every remonstrance the rum-seller answered by producing his license giving him authority to sell to whom he pleased and when he pleased and as much as he pleased!

Thanks be to God, this is no longer; the clause in the law provides a remedy! It is probably the most just, necessary, and wholesome enactment in our statute book, and yet we lament, and are ashamed to confess, that although it has been in force for nearly three years, it has remained a dead letter on our statute book.

At this hour, in almost every town, village and hamlet in the province, there are many unfortunate creatures who require the protection which this humane law provides. Yet no hand is raised to save them. Hundreds of these victims have passed into eternity since this law was passed, and thousands more have sunk still deeper in pollution without a single effective step being taken that we are aware of, "to rescue them from the remorseless fangs of the rum-seller!"

We believe that this is, in a great measure, the result of ignorance of the law. In no other way can we account for it. To enforce this law will not only be an act of the most blessed humanity to the poor drunkards and their friends, but it will tend materially to promote the cause of temperance generally. It will diminish largely the profits of the traffic, it will promote peace and virtue, and it will give the public confidence in our principles, by shewing them that we really feel compassion for the drunkard and indignation against his destroyers. *It will show that we are in earnest; and until we convince the public that we are prepared to put in operation the restrictive measures we already have, it is stark folly for us to ask or to suppose that the Legislature will grant additional restrictions.*

Cant.

It is often the case that when men speak on religious subjects and the concerns of the soul and eternity, they adopt a tone of voice and form of language of quite a different character from that they are in the habit of using in their ordinary intercourse. It is supposed by some that unless they adopt certain conventional religious phrases in common use, they fail to convey their thoughts in suitable language, whereas it is frequently the very reverse. The exhortations given at a prayer-meeting often fail to affect the hearers, and the prayer to enlist their sympathy and concurrence, from the fact of their consisting of expressions peculiar only to such addresses.

We would not have the language of God's Word modified to satisfy any fastidious or corrupt taste, nor would we object to suitable language as a vehicle of thought merely to avoid the censure of the ungodly; but when forms of phraseology are adopted which veil the thought intended to be conveyed, they hide the truth and prevent it from taking effect on those who do not appreciate the force or value of such terms. Let things be called by their right names and we shall find the world will give more attention to eternal realities than where forms of expression are adopted in reference to religion, simply because they are different from those which they are accustomed to use in reference to other things.

When strong religious conviction takes possession of a sinner he speaks out his feelings in his own words, but if he tries to think of certain phrases to which he has not become familiar although they might be more expressive to some minds, yet he would fail to exhibit his sincerity as he might by employing the language of his own heart. In the time of a revival of religion its genuineness and depth may often be pretty correctly learned by ascertaining if the free unfettered expressions of every day life are adopted in carrying it out instead of the formal language too often used on such occasions. Many good Christian people are deterred from speaking on the subject of religion because they are unaccustomed to do so, and have not at hand the phraseology commonly in vogue. If a greater degree of "simplicity and godly sincerity" were to characterize our conversation with unbelievers, and our addresses to them, we might hope for more beneficial effects to follow. There is need of caution lest we make religion to consist of using its formalities, whether of language or of conduct, instead of the experience of its power and realities. We need more heart work in the service of our Master than shall we find mere readiness to speak of Him and shall count it our joy to see sinners confessing him before men, taking up their cross and following Him, so becoming active Christians rather than mere professors without life or energy.

We feel much obliged by the perusal of the Canadian papers sent us, but we fear the occupation of so large a portion of our pages with the proffered extracts, would not be deemed acceptable by a large number of our readers, whose wishes on such matters, we feel ourselves under obligation to consult.

THE CONFESSION OF THE MORNING CHRONICLE.

WE copy the following from our neighbor's sheet of Saturday last:—

"Manly, straightforward answers to two questions will satisfy us:—

"1st—Who were the Dissenters you said Earl Mulgrave invited to dine with the Prince?

"2nd—Was it not an *untruth* when you said—On the first day the Rev. Dr. Binney and the Rev. Mr. Murdoch were presented?"—*Christian Messenger*.

To the first question, we answer—We. To the second—The word *presented* is a typographical error—the manuscript was "*present*." But Mr. Murdoch, we subsequently heard, was present the second, not the first, day, as we supposed when we penned the paragraph—a matter of no moment whatever. The *Christian Messenger* is quite welcome to call it an *untruth*, if he feels the better for it. It shows his *manners*. Now, will he answer us two questions?

1st—Why should people be called Protestants who never protested?

2nd—By what authority does he assert that the *N. Y. Chronicle* mentions the word, "*Dissenter*," ironically in connection with the Canadian trouble?

If the writer had copied our first question honestly and fully, as it was given, it would have shewn his readers, that, instead of his "*We*" being a "manly, straightforward answer," it is a *poor, unmanly evasion*. Our question stood thus:—"1st. Who were the Dissenters you said Earl Mulgrave invited to dine with the Prince? Give their names, if you please." We challenge our contemporary to comply with the request in the clause which he omitted.

His attempt to answer the second question is as rich as that to the former is poor. It speaks for itself. He must have felt pretty badly when he wrote it. We would scorn to strike a man when he is down, we therefore leave him to the mercy of his friends.

In reply to his first question we simply copy a sentence or two from the *Messenger* of Sept. 19th:

"Now for the logic which you pronounce 'good.' Let us see if that will serve you. It will be seen we think that your learning, and logic, are both slams, like your nut. You think because there are Protestants and Catholics in Nova Scotia therefore there must also be Dissenters and—What? Fill up the blank in your next number if you please, Mr. M. C."

"The people here may be classified into Protestants and Catholics; but no such classification can be made in which Dissenters may form one class, for there are none to put into the other class."

In "the multitude of our engagements," as he remarked on Tuesday, the 16th inst., he must have overlooked these brief paragraphs. He has not yet filled up the blank. Why has he not? His second question may be answered by any one who exercises common sense when he reads. We are not surprised at his saying "we really fear people are getting tired of it," when they find *such* facts and arguments brought forward on this question as he brings. Our "*manners*"—calling things by their right names and questioning the application of terms used to sustain a State Church, in this free country,—may be inconvenient to him, but we cannot help it; he has only himself to thank for it.

Union Prayer Meetings.

We have been requested by the Rev. Archibald M. Morrison, of New York, to give insertion to the following Notice:

The Committee of Correspondence, appointed by the Second National Convention of Union Prayer Meetings, have embodied the Address, and other transactions of that Assembly, in a small pamphlet, which they desire to send to every Union Prayer Meeting, whether in our own, or in other countries.

All persons, either engaged or interested in Union Prayer Meetings, are hereby requested immediately to make themselves known to the Corresponding Secretary of the Convention, Rev. A. M. MORRISON, No. 124 Fulton Street, New York, with the number of copies of the pamphlet which they desire to distribute. The distribution is intended to be gratuitous; but if any should prefer to remit the extra cost of their orders, it will be at the rate of \$4 per hundred.

Correspondence and information from all Union Prayer Meetings are also most earnestly desired by the Committee, and will be returned with interest out of the general fund of information they hope in this way regularly to receive.

All communications may be addressed to the Corresponding Secretary, as above.

The brief letter by Rev. Dr. Cramp in another column was written we presume, before he had seen Mr. Lithgow's second letter. Dr. C. promises to notice the subject more at length at a future time, we therefore leave the matter in his hands. Mr. L.'s assumption of authority is in harmony with others who profess to be the keepers of men's consciences, and who appear to hold the sabbath question in like estimation.—Ed. C. M.