

is dashed over the awful verge, and is swallowed up in the foaming whirlpool beneath. Or, does he not know that many of those young Scotchmen, who come from year to year to Canada, with the fairest prospects, and yet in a short time exhibit a total wreck in consequence of intemperance, owe their melancholy end, in some measure at least, to ST. ANDREW'S celebrations? For, it cannot be denied, that the example which is there set before them, by their countrymen in Canada, supplies, at least, one of the auxiliary influences that impel them to destruction. Such being the case, we must lift our voice against these anniversaries as hitherto conducted, however powerful the influence by which they may be supported. And when we find ministers of the gospel actively countenancing such a custom—a custom which, every year, sends hundreds of Scotchmen throughout the British North American Provinces, reeling to their homes in a state of intoxication, on the thirtieth day of November; and sends many, more or less directly, to the drunkard's grave, and the drunkard's doom, they must not expect that they shall escape the censure which they deserve. Our duty as professed Advocates of Temperance, calls on us to expose their conduct; and reason, and religion, and common humanity are all so clearly on our side, that we have no doubt an impartial public will easily discern the difference between this, and a malignant attack upon personal character, such as "TEMPERANCE" would ascribe to us. With one of the clergymen in question we have the honor of an acquaintance; we have always respected him for his talents, and more than respected him for his warm, and liberal, and generous feelings; and we are confident that he would be the first to repudiate the base imputation which we are now combating.

Perhaps we have dwelt longer on this than was necessary; we shall now proceed therefore to make some remarks on the remainder of "TEMPERANCE'S" letter. But that remainder is contained within very narrow limits; for after throwing aside all that contains personal abuse, only a few sentences are left for consideration. Moreover these few sentences furnish another happy evidence of this writer's imbecility. For, while he endeavours to put together an argument against us, it so happens that he stumbles on those very matters which supply us with an unanswerable argument against himself. He hints that there is a manifest inconsistency between our "enmity against public dinners, and our professed friendship to, and open encouragement of, public Soirees, and other Teetotal parties." We are obliged to him for mentioning Soirees in this connection; he thereby furnishes us with a horn to use against himself. We must complain, however, that he does not represent our sentiments with perfect fairness on this point. We are not the "professed friends" of Soirees, but of Temperance Soirees only! We suspect the name which he assumes in this letter is not so familiar to him as it ought to be, else he would not have forgotten to insert it here. But the difference between a Temperance Soiree, and such a bacchanalian feast as ST. ANDREW'S dinner generally is, is so great, that we can perceive no inconsistency between our friendship to the one, and enmity to the other. Why does not the ST. ANDREW'S Society celebrate its anniversary by such a Soiree? To say the least of it, it would be as honourable to the Saint as the other system, as favourable to national reminiscences, and to sociality and true friendship; while it would not be the means of making one man's brains muddy, or opening his lips in blasphemy, or begetting or strengthening a desire for strong drink, or sending him home in a state of partial or complete inebriation, nor would it have a sting in the conscience next morning. Why then should it not be preferred? Will not "TEMPERANCE" urge it? We

fear not. We fear that the very charm of ST. ANDREW'S day consists in the banquet of wine and whiskey toddy with which it is concluded. We fear, if it were divested of these attractions, the members of the Society would suspect it had become like a bottle of some excellent liquor from which the alcoholic spirit has evaporated—perfectly stale.

"TEMPERANCE" next affects to sigh over the "sad declensions" of many of the "reformed drunkards" of Montreal, and he even charges the Temperance Society with "double guilt" in having first deluded them with *teetotalism*, and then, we suppose, left them to fall by it. But again, he kindly gives us the hint which leads most effectually to his own refutation. For it appears from his own admission that many drunkards have been at least temporarily reformed by embracing teetotalism, and no person will deny that even such a reformation redounds to the praise rather than the disgrace of the principle. But it is a most unwarrantable turning of things upside down, to throw the blame of their subsequent fall upon the principle of the Society, or those who advocate it. We deeply lament, that many members of the Society have fallen from their resolutions (of their "vows" we know nothing), but who is to be blamed for this? We reply, "TEMPERANCE" and those who act with him! Yes, upon their heads the guilt chiefly lies. The Society persuaded those men, with great difficulty, to adopt the rule of abstinence; and when they did so, they were reformed. But "TEMPERANCE" and his friends gathered around them, and urged them to return to their former practise—they ridiculed their abstinence—they even stigmatised it as impiety—they presented temptation after temptation—they reasoned, they reviled, they threatened, they entreated; and is it surprising that after all this assiduity, aided moreover by the relaxed state of morals which war always introduces, they should have succeeded, to a lamentable extent! But how palpably absurd is it to charge the Society, or its principles, with such a result! We repeat it, it rests with "TEMPERANCE" AND HIS FRIENDS. They taught the drunkard, both by precept and example, to return to his indulgence,—they practised upon him the fatal "delusion," that he might do so, and yet be safe. But they have little cause to be proud of their victory. They have gained nothing from it but *guilt*, and truly it is "double guilt"! the guilt of having driven those men back, who had nearly escaped from the miseries of drunkenness!

Every candid person will at once see, that the defection of these men reflects no dishonour upon the principle of total abstinence; on the contrary it tends to recommend it. For so long as these men abode by that principle, they were safe, and they no sooner departed from it than they fell. Does not this confirm and vindicate the rule of abstinence? Does it not instruct every drunkard to adopt it, and teach "TEMPERANCE" and all who oppose it, that they are rendering themselves accessory to the present and future ruin of the hapless drunkard?

— ■ —  
DON'T BE SO SEVERE.—This is an advice which many friends have been giving us, actuated we would hope by the best motives; and they have urged it by the very cogent considerations that we would only procure enemies to ourselves, and mar the good cause for whose defence we are set. Now, highly as we regard the kindness and wisdom of these friends, we must dissent from them completely in this matter. If our language be occasionally severe, as some people pretend, it is only because it possesses truth; for if it wanted this quality, no effort of ours could rescue it from the most contemptible weakness. But if we have truth to declare, far be