

# TEMPERANCE ADVOCATE,

DEVOTED TO TEMPERANCE, EDUCATION, AGRICULTURE & NEWS.

**PLEDGE.**--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 discountenance their use throughout the community.

VOL. XIX.]

MONTREAL, DECEMBER 15, 1853.

[No. 24.

## Truth needs no Apology.

Certain actions are so indelibly stamped vicious by mankind that it would be an insult to common sense to argue that they are so. Yet such actions are daily performed by men who theoretically admit them to be wrong. Sometimes they are performed from motives of self-interest; but, mostly, without any assignable motive whatever. We know this well; but we seldom stop to argue or demonstrate that lying, stealing, slandering, and lewd behaviour are wrong in the abstract—we are content to show them to be wrong in the concrete. This is not because we feel incompetent to the task, but from a consciousness that man's moral sense intuitively revolts at such practices.

There are also other practices permitted in society that are equally wrong with the above; but which, from conventionalities and fashion, have obtained a fictitious respectability that prevents unbiassed judgment being pronounced upon them. Society can execrate the pickpocket and the highwayman, while heaping flattery and adulation upon men who have robbed the widow, the fatherless, and the poverty-stricken masses by the tricks of trade, or under the sanction of the bankrupt laws. Our calm judgment pronounces this wrong; but we want moral courage to speak our convictions; or, perhaps, we want the powers of logic sufficient to convince the world that it is so.

No man of ordinary reflection can calmly sit down to an investigation of the evils caused by intoxicating drinks, without feeling convinced of their dread malignity. But the people either do not think upon this subject, or wilfully practice that which is wrong: for we know they still follow the drinking practices.

Reflection requires aids—facts may become cognisant to some that are hidden from others; and, therefore, before judging others, we must be aware of the light within their reach. Now, for the last sixteen years, the platform to an unprecedented, and the press to a considerable extent—say nothing of facts palpable to the experience of every one—have accumulated overpowering evidence in support of Teetotalism. Science, philosophy, and religion have combined in their attestation of the evils of intoxicating drinks, and the completeness of the abstinence principle as a remedy. Therefore, light is within the reach of all. In answer to all this, we hear ever sounding in our ears, especially from the religious portion of society, a cry, which is not, as might be expected, "Light! give us more light;" but as, if in possession of all the former information, they cry out, "Be charitable." Charity, most undoubtedly, is a noble virtue; but it must not be confounded with cowardice. Christ was charitable toward the Pharisees when he told them they were the blind leaders of the blind, as well as when he told the woman taken in adultery, "Neither do I condemn thee: go thy way, and sin no more."

What is implied in this cry for charity? It is sheer cowardice that will neither meet facts nor practice principles? When we tell a man who takes intoxicating drink,

that we believe he is wrong, he will, instead of showing he is right, tell us that such strong statements will damage our cause—will prevent people from joining our movement. Now, what business has he to take such interest in a principle that he will not adopt? It ought to be gratifying to him, as a conscientious man, to know that our advocates damage our cause. He must believe the movement to be either right or wrong. If right, he is bound to join it; if wrong, he must not blame what injures it. If he was a conscientious Catholic, would he not be glad if the preaching of the Protestants was calculated rather to deter than to invite converts? So much, then, for his consistency, if he looks upon teetotalism merely as an opinion. But as we believe its importance to consist in practice, we invite him to look at his inconsistency in another light. Would he not be glad if he knew that liars made falsehood so odious that they prevented any one following their example? He would; for every one feels glad to see practices at variance with their principles made despicable. Therefore, we again ask why this whining solicitude about the damage we do our cause, by boldly calling stupidity and trifling ignorance by their proper names? Is it a miserable subterfuge to draw attention from the facts of the case to problematical difficulties? It seems so; but nothing shall prevent us from weighing our opponents' conduct in the balance of common sense, and fearlessly stating the consequences.

Certain vices, we have said, are so notoriously wrong, that it is needless to argue that they are so. We may safely take them as standards in discussing what is wrong. We shall endeavor to bring the drinking of intoxicating drinks, as a beverage, down to this standard.

"Lying is wrong," says the man of truth. "Prove it," says the liar.

"Drinking intoxicating drinks, as a beverage, is wrong," says the teetotaler. "Prove it," says the drinker.

Assertions are hazarded by one party; proof is demanded by the other.

The man of truth fancies his case so clear, that he feels secure of speedily converting the liar; but if we for a moment imagine his opponent to be as well versed in logical tactics, as a modern moderate drinker, we shall find it not such an easy matter.

The man of truth says, "Scripture pronounces lying to be wrong." "Only under certain circumstances," says his opponent; and he quotes the substitution of Jacob for Esau, the case of Rachel and her father's household gods.

The man of truth sets about the proper exposition of the texts. His opponent tells him that he will not have man's interpretation of the Bible, and gravely quotes from Revelation, showing the evils that will assuredly follow the adding or taking from that blessed book.

The man of truth, feeling indignant at such prostitution of Scripture, tells his opponent that he is disingenuous. The