

and families; and that the object of such advertisements is to induce readers to buy the liquors cannot be denied.

We shall now deal with the article itself. The Editor thus speaks:—

"The libel says, that Dr. Burns—'is only newly come from a country, where intoxicating drinks are regarded as necessities of life'; and therefore he is compared only to Naaman who went into the House of Rimmon, not to worship, but to bow down, while Mr. Lillie is a complete worshipper.

"We feel almost ashamed to waste words on the writer of such miserable trash. But we are aware that there is both the inclination and the power, to some extent, to inflict injury on those who will not bow down to the God of Tee-totalism."

We did not compare Dr. Burns to Naaman, who only bowed down in the House of Rimmon, and Mr. Lillie to a complete worshipper as the Editor of the *Banner* might, if not blinded by wrath, have seen at a glance; but compared tee-totalers who went to public dinners to acquiesce in toasts without drinking, to one who bows down in an idol temple, without worshipping.

We cannot but think that the Editor of the *Banner* must regret inserting the above paragraph, in which an unworthy design is attributed to temperance men generally, and evidently more particularly to the conductors of the *Advocate*. Of actions we may, nay, we ought to form an opinion, but not of motives? Of the character and tendency of writings, the Editor of the *Banner* has as good a right to judge, as we have of the character and tendency of public dinners—but he cannot, in the nature of the case, judge of the inclination that prompted these writings. We should have at least as good a right to say, that it is an inclination for strong drink, that induces our contemporary to laud public dinners and "excellent wines," as he has to attribute to us a desire to inflict injury in writing articles; but should we so far forget ourselves, would he not have good reason to complain? Would he not pour forth another column of violent abuse sprinkled even more profusely with such choice phrases as "Montreal libeller," &c.? Judge not that ye be not judged. Do to others as ye would that they should do to you.

As to "the power to inflict injury" complained of by the *Banner*, it does not lie in exposing the consequences of an injurious action, but in doing the action itself. It is the power which the truth has had at all times in bringing error to light; and to exclaim against it is to imitate the house-maid, who had no objection to dust, but complained bitterly of the sun for shewing it. Happy are we to find that public opinion in Canada will not altogether tamely tolerate public sacrifices to what has been too long the Moloch of our idolatry—intemperance—or what is the same thing to the customs and usages from which intemperance springs, as waters spring from a fountain.

We shudder at the use made above of the term God of Tee-totalism, satisfied, that the phrase if used at all, can be applied to no being but Him, who, by his spirit said,—"Wine is a mocker, strong drink is raging." "Look not on the wine when it is red." "It is good neither to eat flesh nor drink wine, nor anything by which thy brother is made to stumble;"—the Being who has raised up the Temperance Reformation as a mighty and much needed engine, to overthrow the great system of intemperance which has its roots so deeply fixed in the drinking usages of society.

We again quote from the *Banner*:

"The immediate occasion of this ebullition was a dinner, which it is usual for congregations to give to the Presbytery, on the induction of their minister. The practice is both natural and attended with benefit. Ministers come in from the country to attend to this important duty, often from distant places. They must dine somewhere, and there is great propriety that they should do so in company with the newly-appointed minister, and such

of the congregation as may attend. Such meetings, when conducted with decorum and Christian propriety, are not only lawful, but calculated to do good in bringing so many members of the same Church into harmonious and friendly intercourse."

We find it difficult to believe that the above paragraph comes from a sincere friend and well-wisher of Scotch Presbyterianism, for if there be a foul blot resting upon the history of that system, it is the practice lauded above. No custom has given a greater handle to the scoffer and the worldling, than that of ordaining and inducting ministers with a drinking feast. No practice has more grieved the truly pious. No practice is more directly opposite to that of the Apostolic Churches. (See their manner of ordaining in Acts xiii. 2, 3.) And we are happy to say, no custom is going more rapidly out of date in the Scotch Presbyterian Church, or at least that part of it called Free. If it be such a valuable custom, why is the Free Church giving it up? Observe, however, we say nothing against the dinner, it is only the intoxicating drinks, the toast-drinking, and the tavern to which we object.

We shall return again to this article, which is particularly rich in affording matter for commentary.

Since writing the above, an excellent friend has furnished us with a review of the *Banner's* article which will appear in preference to any thing that we could say, in our next.

We have also received, but too late for insertion in this number, communications from the Rev. Mr. Lillie and Mr. Christie, of Toronto, strongly condemning our article on the Induction dinner and exculpating the parties engaged in it. These strictures will appear in our next.

THE PIPE AND THE GOSPEL.

A Methodist Minister met a man who professed great love to the Gospel, and an anxious desire to see it spread and prevail in the world, that all might know the Lord. The desire was commended; and Mr. A. enquired of his friend how he loved the Gospel, and what evidence he gave of his anxiety to see it prevail? "A man who loves the gospel is always willing to support it," said Mr. A. "and no doubt that is the case with you." "It is," replied his friend. "Then what do you give to support the cause of God?" "I give sixpence a quarter for my ticket," said he. "Sixpence a quarter; that is two shillings a year. And what besides?" "I always give to the quarterly collections," replied the man. "How much do you give to the quarterly collections?" said the minister. "A penny a time, Sir," was the reply. "A penny—a time; that is fourpence in the year,—is there anything else?" "Yes," said he, "I always give to the Mission—to the sermon and the meeting." "That is very proper," said Mr. A., who had paper and pencil in his hand; "but what do you give at those services? For I wish to put down all you give to the cause of God." "A penny each time," said the man. "A penny each time; and those services come once a year: that is twopence a year, for the Missions. Is there anything else?" The reply was "No;" he knew of nothing else. The items were added up, when it was found that *two shillings and sixpence a year* was all that this individual gave to support the Gospel, although he professed to love it so dearly; and ever spoke of his desire to see it prosper in the world.

The conversation continued, and Mr. A. remarked, "You smoke tobacco, I see." "Yes, a little, Sir." "How much?"—"Sixpence a week I allow myself for it," said the man. "And sometimes more, I presume," rejoined his friend. "Not often, except I have to work all night, or something particular occurs, and then I allow myself another half ounce." "Well," said the minister, "you allow yourself sixpence a week for tobacco; that is your lowest calculation. There are fifty-two weeks in the year, consequently you expend twenty-six shillings per annum for this article alone. Now let us compare the two—the Gospel and the pipe—and we shall see which you love best. For the Gospel you give *two shillings and sixpence*, but for the pipe you give *one pound six shillings*. This shows which you love best; for you spend *ten times* as much for tobacco in one year, as you do