

how many drunkards they can recover, and how many moderate drinkers who are on the way to drunkenness, they can stop, so that they shall never plunge into the vortex which lies just before them, by advising them to drink a *little only*. Without pretending to the spirit of prophecy, one may say that they may just as wisely go to the sea side, and say to the flowing tide, "Hitherto shalt thou come and no farther." Success in this case will be physically impossible—in the other morally so.

But if I remember well, he thinks it proper for the drunkard to refrain entirely. This reminds me of a saying in Job, "Great men are not always wise." Nothing can be more unwise, or, to the poor drunkard, more unkind than to advise him to act thus, while others are encouraged to drink a little, and thus beset him constantly with snares and temptations. This is a poor way of bearing one another's burdens, and so fulfilling the law of Christ; a poor way of helping a wretched fellow-creature out of a horrible pit. Though he were pulled out, this conduct would soon plunge him in again, of which I could mention many instances.

The *Banner* justifies the use of wine at the Toronto dinner by referring to the quantity drank. This shows how little he has studied the subject of temperance, and that he has mistaken his proper work in writing on this subject. Had not you or any other as good a right to find fault with ministers using intoxicating drink, and thereby shewing such a dangerous example to others, as he had to laud their doing so, and hold it forth to the approbation and imitation of others. As to the quantity used: it is not *how much* they drank, but their honouring the custom, by drinking such drinks, and on such a solemn occasion, and thereby adding respectability in the eyes of others to a dangerous custom, in which the evil lies. Their putting the glass to their mouth, would do more to retard the cause of temperance, and promote intemperance, than fifty or a hundred wicked men drinking to beastly intoxication. Paul does not say that it is good not to eat much flesh, or drink much wine, or anything that may prove a stumbling block to a brother; he makes no account of the *quantity*. If a weak brother saw one strong in knowledge and faith eat what was offered to an idol, it did not lessen the evil though he ate *but little*.

But nothing in the *Banner* so much surprised me, as his saying that the spirit you breath as an Editor, "Is the very same spirit which produced monkery, fasting, stripes, &c." This assertion is too foolish to need a reply. It would hold forth Paul as the advocate of monkery, also for he carried notions of his self-denial for the good of others, as far as you have any thought of doing.

He thinks it a libel on the people of Scotland, to say that intoxicating drinks are regarded by them as necessities of life. I would be sorry to libel any people, and, being a Scotchman, it would be very unnatural in me to libel Scotland; yet I will say that there are two or three things which strongly tempt one to impute such an opinion to the people there.—1. The immense expense which they incur by the use of such drinks; 2. They know that a vast amount of good might be done to the bodies and souls of men by the time and money spent on these, if they were wisely applied; 3. They know that by the use of these drinks hundreds of thousands are kept from hearing the Gospel, and very many of those who do hear, are hardened against believing and obeying it, who, but for this snare, might repent and be saved; that these are a curse to themselves, their families, and society, and are lost for ever; 4. They know that these have been the fruits of the traffic in times past, and that without a miracle, a miracle which will never be wrought, these will be the fruits as long as it continues. And knowing this, are they so wicked and so cruel as to continue to

use an article leading to such fearful results in time and eternity, and at the same time believe that that article is not necessary. If, therefore, there be anything like a libel, I think it is in the *Banner*, and not in the *Advocate*. I think the best vindication which their conduct will admit of is, that they are, as we all were, ignorant in this matter, having never studied it, and, therefore do not know nor believe that they are "spending their money for that which is not bread, and their labour for that which satisfieth not." And for this error and its consequences, their moderate drinking clergy are greatly to blame. "They that lead them, cause them (in this matter) to err." The *Banner* says that the quantity now drank is much less; I believe, and am glad of it; but would ask the *Banner* whether this happy change is to be traced to the doctrines, example, and efforts of moderate drinkers, or to those persons who abstain entirely?

A SCOTCHMAN.

When this was written, the writer did not know, what, he is glad to learn since, that Dr. Burns has since joined the Temperance Society; and it will be observed that the remarks only apply to those who used intoxicating drinks.

LETTERS FROM THE REV. A LILLIE AND MR. A CHRISTIE.

MY DEAR SIR,—I have so long regarded you with respect and affection, on account of your untiring generous efforts on behalf of temperance, that it is with exceeding pain I address you in the language of complaint; but the attack made upon me in your Editorial of the 16th June, in consequence of my presence at the dinner given to Dr. Burns, on occasion of his Induction to the Pastorship of Knox's Church in this city, leaves me no alternative.

How could you, without first taking the trouble to inquire into the circumstances of the case, or into the motives under which I acted, think of holding me up to the reprobation of the community, as encouraging what you knew me to hate and condemn, what I have for years joined, and am still joining with others in labelling to put down. As pursuing a course calculated to interfere, with the effect of such advice as I might think it my duty to tender to my pupils, in relation to the subject of temperance, or to disturb my conscience in giving it. What obligations have I violated that you should thus treat me? I cannot be shewn either to have infringed any law of God, or to have broken the Pledge which I gave on becoming a member of the society here, which has chosen, since the commission of the alleged offence, for which you have dealt with me so harshly, to place me upon the list of its Vice Presidents.

The article of which I complain, involves principles in which it is impossible for me to concur—principles the urging of which I conceive to be mischievous. I have never held, cannot hold the strictly moderate use of the drinks which Teetotalism rejects to use, in itself sinful. At the same time, as their use cannot be shown to be a matter of imperative obligation;—a religious duty, every man must be at liberty to abstain from them, who imagines himself to have a good reason for so doing. The ruin produced by the use of these drinks should, I think, be felt by every christian and patriotic mind, to constitute such a reason; on this ground I hold, that every man not compelled by disease to use them, (which very few are), is bound to lay them aside. To ask of the man who does not feel them to be essential to his comfort, to abstain for the sake of his children, and friends, and neighbours, is to make a small and not unreasonable demand; where they are felt to be essential to that, the party's own safety requires their abandonment. This is the principle by which I have been led, not merely to abstain from them myself, but to