

connexion with Mr. Christie's letter; and we take leave of him, thanking him for his kindly feelings towards us, and assuring him of our cordial esteem and confidence, notwithstanding what we deem an error of judgment on his part.

Toronto, 2nd, July 1845.

I take this opportunity of saying, that your Editor should know that by his unwarranted—uncharitable, and unchristian remarks upon the presence of some Rev. Gentlemen at a dinner lately given in this city, he has grievously wounded the feelings of several of our best temperance men.

Had he before publicly attacking the character of these conscientious and much loved men, taken the precaution of enquiring into the merits of the case, he would have learned that Dr. Burns very much regretted, that a dinner was arranged for on that occasion, because of the ill, but inevitable certainty, that wines and other liquors would be furnished. he would have learned that Dr. Burns' good opinion of the temperance movement has in no degree abated, but has so much increased as to beget a determination to connect himself with it, and give it the whole weight of his influence and talents,—he would have found that the Rev. Doctor came forward at our anniversary, gave us an elegant and impressive address,—promised his active and hearty co-operation, and at the close of the meeting, unsolicited, enrolled his name amongst the pledged teetotalers of Toronto.

He would have found that Mr. Lillie has no relish for a public dinner, with so called excellent wines at command, that he would have greatly preferred a breakfast or tea,—and he would have been informed that in joining a Temperance Society, neither Messrs. Harris, Rintoul, Lillie, nor Dr. Burns, conceived that they were pledging themselves to forego their own enlightened judgement, in favour of any one, no matter who, as to what would and what would not be their duty in special circumstances.

8th, July.

I commenced this note with the view of sending it down by Mr. Rattray Senior, but could not accomplish it. Since that time, the 1st July *Advocate* has come to hand, and I am surprised to mark the quiet manner in which the Editor records satisfaction at learning that Dr. Burns had joined the Society here, because, I had thought that from the last Editorial, the Editor had lost all confidence in the Doctor, as it was in reference to him he said:—“it was easier to see duty and talk about it, than to do it.”

It strikes me that the remarks about Mr. Lillie, by his attendance at the “induction dinner”—being disqualified from hereafter counselling his young brethren to avoid temptation &c. &c., were cruel in the last degree, and unjust as they were cruel; and altogether, it seems to me that it behoves the Editor “to confess” and that very humbly,—that in an unguarded moment, he uttered harsh and uncharitable things about men entitled to all confidence.

I know an Editor should have some liberty of choice and action, but the fair fame of Ministers of the Gospel should not be trifled with. And we should remember that though a wound may heal, the scar remains.

If I have written too strong forgive me, and believe me, yours truly,

A. CHRISTIE.

REMARKS.

That our article upon the Toronto induction dinner was either uncharitable or unchristian, we cannot admit, seeing that, as far as we knew ourselves every thing therein was dictated by love—love for truth in the first place, and love for the individuals concerned, in the second. If it was faithful it was also tender, and whilst it endeavoured to expose the injurious tendencies of an act,

it fully admitted the very excellent character and eminent services of the individuals participating in it.

That Dr. Burns has since joined the temperance society, is alike honourable to him, delightful to us, and we doubt not profitable to the temperance cause—but that it was natural to infer from his public dinner that he was about to join the temperance society—or that it was our duty to write to him for an explanation of his conduct and intentions we cannot admit. The act was publicly blazoned forth and as such became fairly open to the criticism of the only temperance paper in Canada. If it were the rule always to wait before commenting on any action until we saw what the parties would do next, we could never write nor speak at all. We must confess however, that had we known that Dr. Burns was about to join the temperance society, we would not have used the expressions quoted by Mr. Christie, universally applicable though they be.

We have not asked any one to forgo his own enlightened judgment, but we do ask that that judgment be enlightened. The judgment of the world up to 1828, condemned only excess in intoxicating drinks, but left the customs and practices which led to that excess untouched, the more enlightened judgment of temperance men from 1828 to 1834, condemned the use of ardent spirits and to a certain extent the drinking usages of society, but left in the system the roots of the cancer in the shape of wine, beer and cider, and prothe roots of bitterness they were! The still more enlightened judgment of Temperance Societies since 1834, has condemned the use as a beverage of all alcoholic drinks, and added that we should “in all suitable ways discountenance their use throughout the community.” Now in the mere matter of personally abstaining, teetotalers are as far advanced as they can be—but in the “all suitable ways,” there is room for indefinite progression. And it will, we think, be admitted that it is the special business of the *Temperance Advocate* to endeavour to advance in the good work.

Having so far replied to Mr. Christie's letter, we have something to say to him, and those who agree with him in this matter.

You rebuke us very sharply for what you call our unwarranted, uncharitable, and unchristian remarks upon the presence of some Rev. gentlemen at a public dinner, by which you say the feelings of some of the best temperance men have been grievously wounded; and Mr. Lillie hints that we have in so doing “supplied the enemies of the cause with materials for attack.” Now, as far back as the year 1835, and on several subsequent occasions, the unseemliness and injurious consequences of ministers attending public dinners, were at least as strongly exposed in the *Advocate*, with reference to some St. Andrew's dinners which took place in Montreal; and the *Christian Guardian* in an excellent article, which was copied into the *Advocate*, severely rebuked a minister who attended a similar dinner at Hamilton. All this time you were in frequent correspondence with the conductors of the *Advocate*, and yet you never in any way hinted that our remarks, or those of the *Christian Guardian*, which we copied, were “unwarranted, uncharitable, and unchristian.” How could you, we may well ask, see such sin resting upon us, your brethren, without faithfully warning us long before now? Or do you take the ground that the same thing was wrong in 1835, and right in 1845? Or are practices to be reprobated, if they take place in Montreal or Hamilton, which are to be lauded, or, at all events, winked at, if they occur in Toronto? Or is it that new light has broken in upon you since then? If so, we would gladly know the arguments which convinced you. Perhaps you will say that an induction dinner is a different thing from a St. Andrew's dinner—and we admit it has much more of a religious character—but the nearer we approach to religion, the further we should be from setting a bad example, and there,