

## CANADA TEMPERANCE ADVOCATE.

"It is good neither to eat flesh, nor drink wine, nor do any thing by which thy brother is made to stumble, or to fall, or is weakened."—Rom. xiv. 21—*Metcalf's Translation.*

## PLEDGE OF THE MONTREAL TEMPERANCE SOCIETY.

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED, DO AGREE, THAT WE WILL NOT USE INTOXICATING LIQUORS AS A BEVERAGE, NOR TRAFFIC IN THEM; THAT WE WILL NOT PROVIDE THEM AS AN ARTICLE OF ENTERTAINMENT, NOR FOR PERSONS IN OUR EMPLOYMENT; AND THAT IN ALL SUITABLE WAYS WE WILL DISCOURTEGE THEIR USE THROUGHOUT THE COMMUNITY.

MONTREAL, SEPTEMBER 15, 1843.

## Tracts for the Times.—No. VII.

ST. PAUL.—A TOTAL ABSTINENCE MAN.

[The following is from a gentleman of standing, connected with the church of England. We entreat the ministers and members of that community to consider it.—Ed.]

There are many sincere Christians who have peculiar scruples about the propriety of signing a total abstinence pledge, and who think that by so doing they would barter away their Christian liberty; to this class of persons I would respectfully address myself and beg them to reflect upon the matter which I will now endeavour to place before them.

My object, then, is to prove that St. PAUL was a Total Abstinence man in principle—He was as all know, a very conscientious man, and one whose chief object was to follow the footsteps of his Divine Master in doing good. This ardent desire therefore of saving souls, led him to lose no opportunity, and neglect no means by which to accomplish his purpose. Fearing then lest the weak consciences of some of the Christian believers should be an occasion of sin to them, he writes in a very clear and lucid manner concerning the subject of meats offered to idols, and proves to them conclusively, that the eating of such meat was no sin itself considered; but lest the weak brother should fall into sin through the influence of example, he closes with these words; "wherefore, if meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend." My object in quoting these words is to prove the regard which the *Apostle at least* had, for the consequences which might flow from his example: and, also, to shew his Christian principle of abstinence from what might be considered an article very necessary to support life "lest," how truly he here displays the royal law of love, "lest I make my brother to offend." 1 Cor. viii. 13.

How often is it now heard from the lips of professing Christians. "I cannot sacrifice my Christian liberty at the shrine of the worldly, unchristian spirit of Temperance Societies: if drunkards do but follow my example, and take only one glass they will be in no danger." Ah sir, do you not see that in this respect you do not follow the example of PAUL; and that while you thus parley with wine, the poor spirit-drinker is swept down the raging current with irresistible fury; having this to console him "Mr. — is a good Christian and drinks wine, so I may drink rum." I cannot afford wine, and it makes little difference in the end." I think that the text above quoted does all for the temperance cause which its best friends could wish, the analogy is complete. Moreover to those who say that the system of pledging is obnoxious, we may refer to this illustrious instance of St. PAUL, for what let me ask is this but a pledge, and a very solemn one too, with his own signature attached, (for if he did not write the whole epistle he at least signed the salutation with his own hand) if this is not satisfactory as a pledge, I do not know what can be. I would not here imply that PAUL refrained his appetite for ever after, or that he even did then, but that if meat should offend his brother he would cease from its use. This then is all we ask of

professing Christians; let them adopt the Scripture rule and if they cannot conscientiously sign the Total Abstinence pledge, let them adopt the pledge of St. PAUL, and make it their own: and as the circumstances are now changed, and wine occupies to our weaker brother the place of idol's meat, let them change the phrase and insert "wine" where St. PAUL uses "meat." If they will do this we will not find fault with them even should they not join the total abstinence society. We do not despair of their being total abstinence men should they adopt the above pledge, for constituted as society now is, they will find almost daily occasions for self-denial. But the analogy between these cases is not after all unsupported by other testimony from St. PAUL. In Romans xiv. 21, he says, "It is good neither to eat flesh nor to drink wine, &c. &c." Here we have abundant proof that it is not a perversion of Scripture to say that St. PAUL's pledge may mean wine, and not only so but I think this passage puts to flight the objection which has been raised against total abstinence pledges as being a worldly means of accomplishing good. Any one can see that wine is as great a stumbling-block in our day, as meat offered in sacrifice was in PAUL's. I will not pursue this train of thought any further, as those to whose attention I would wish to recommend the above mentioned text, are no doubt all well capable of deducing their own conclusions from the premises.

If any one should feel convinced that in his case total abstinence would become a duty, and feels unwilling to sign a pledge, he will at least be bold enough to acknowledge publicly his strict adherence to St. PAUL's pledge. Methinks were all Christians, Clergymen and Laymen, to adopt St. PAUL's language and apply it to his case, a vast impetus would be given to the Temperance Cause. I do not say that PAUL was altogether a total abstinence man in practice, for we have no evidence either way, save what I have quoted; but then mark, I think we are justified in saying, that were he now alive he would be a whole souled total abstinence man.

Rawdon,

## Tracts for the Times.—No. VIII.

INTEMPERANCE A NATIONAL EVIL.

We are wont to take too contracted a view of the evils of drunkenness. We view it as an individual thing. We look upon the drunkard as an object of pity, as an enemy to himself, and a source of sorrow to his family. Very good; he is all this, yea, much more. The half is not yet told. If the toper were only an enemy to himself, if he were a mere suicide, he might blout, stagger and die—a premature grave would hide his loathsomeness from the world, and society would still flourish. If he were even the cause of wretchedness to his family, the friendly hand of charity might interpose, and in some slight degree avert the ills of poverty. The kindly voice of sympathy might administer consolation to their wounded spirits, society might still be vigorous. But this is not the fact. Drunkenness is indeed a national calamity. Its influence is not limited to the domestic circle, nor neighbourhood, nor town. It is the country's curse. Were then but one principle to actuate the citizen, (were he dead, all other emotions), and that principle patriotism; it should be among his most prominent endeavours to further the cause of temperance. In the first place, the disease is infectious. The children, in the simplicity of youth, when they behold the father familiar with the intoxicating bowl, him to whom they are taught by natural affection and the custom of society, to regard as their pattern, they will think it an innocent thing, despite the warnings of the wise. They will first learn not to detect, then to love the poison, and, at last, to follow with filial zeal, the father's example, through all the varied miseries of a drunkard's life, down to a drunkard's grave. Here it is seen, one drunken father is a corrupt fountain, whence issue streams, which multiply from genera