

The father lamenting,  
As David, his son,  
The youth unrepenting  
The dead he has done;  
The mother enfolding, her perishing one,  
Who thrives by such doings?—Thou, thou art the man.

The blood of thy brother,  
It cries from the ground;  
Yet louder, and louder,  
From many a mound.  
It pierces the heaven,  
It reaches the throne;  
Commandment is given,  
That blood to atone,  
Gainst whom flies the mandate? evade if you can,  
The voice of thy conscience.—Thou, thou art the man.

Maryville Nichol.

G. P.

### 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.—*Macnight'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 DISCOURTAGE THEIR USE THROUGHOUT THE COMMUNITY

MONTREAL, AUGUST 1, 1845.

A SCOTCHMAN AND THE BANNER.

To the Editor of the *Temperance Advocate*.

I am sorry, for his own sake, to see that the Editor of the *Banner* was so angry when replying to you. When a man is angry, plenty of thoughts and words will occur, but not the most happy or suitable. He was evidently more hot than clear, rather burning than shining. Hence, the terms *outrage*, *libel*, *foul malicious libel*. It would have been better for him to have left such terms to be used by some rude person who does not understand what a libel is: for what has that word to do with your free and friendly remarks on the public conduct of the men referred to. You had no possible temptation nor any inclination to *libel* them. He thinks the worthiness of their character ought to screen them. But what if it can be proved that the excellence of their character was what made, what he very strangely calls an *outrage*, proper and necessary. There are some ministers in Canada, as well as elsewhere, who, though they should drink ten times as much, and drink toasts too, would be unworthy of notice, because nothing better could be expected of them. It would not give such encouragement to temperance men to play with temptation, nor furnish others with such an argument in favour of their drinking usages. But the high character of the men at the Toronto dinner, does both in a high degree; the more excellent their character, therefore, the more dangerous their example in being so far conformed to one of the most dangerous customs of the world. Dr. Burns came to Toronto to teach men, that denying ungodly and worldly lusts they should live soberly, righteously and godly. &c., and I believe he will do so; but would he not be more likely to do it with success, because more consistently, had he acted otherwise on this occasion. Might they not dine together in the house of some Christian friend, or if they must dine in a hotel, might they not have had a good dinner without intoxicating drinks. Could they not be social and cheerful enough without this insidi-

ous auxiliary. If they could not refrain from it as *unlawful*, might they not let it alone, as, in the present state of society, *inexpedient*, after Paul's example? To hold forth this drink as any way necessary to sociality or cheerfulness is a most dangerous error, and teaches the poor who cannot afford it, to be discontented with their circumstances. And if ministers and rich brethren must have wine, how can they blame their poor hearers or members for indulging in the more cheap and more vulgar habit of drinking whisky, or warn them against this most ruinous custom? and if they do not warn them what kind of hearers and members are they likely to have?

The *Banner* praises the dinner and the wine. No doubt but the dinner was good—good for the purposes for which food was designed. But what was the wine good for—perhaps it was not wine at all, or had nothing of the grape in it. Wine, as good as it was likely to have been, was found, on being scientifically examined, to have nothing of the kind in it. I should like to know how the Editor of the *Banner* would answer the question, what was the wine good for? If they needed some liquid with or after dinner, might not water, tea or coffee do. Or to change the question—what purpose can wine or any other intoxicating drink answer, or what effect can it produce besides intoxication, which could not be produced by some un-intoxicating drink? This, I think, is a fair question, and I have long wished to see it answered. I know that intoxicating drinks are necessary to produce intoxication, but the Editor of the *Banner* will not call that a good effect, and I know not of any other effects, which the use of them as a beverage, can produce, but might, with much more safety be, produced by some other drink. He speaks of multitudes who are sincerely desirous—of the introduction of perfect sobriety into the habits of all, &c.—but who do not see it their duty to come under vows of total abstinence. How comes he to speak of this as a vow? It consists in a man's considering what may be the effects on himself and others, of his taking or not taking some intoxicating drink; and after seeing, that if he continue to take a little it may lead him gradually, as it has led millions already, to drunkenness; but if he abstain entirely he will be free from that sin, and thereby find it easier to keep from other snares and sins, so that he resolves to abstain, and for the benefit of others, makes his resolution known by joining a temperance society.

Does the *Banner* think that a man will do more good by secretly approving of the cause, than by avowing his approbation in openly joining and supporting it? If the former be the best way, why would it not be best also that a man should secretly approve of religion or of the Bible society, but not avow his sentiments respecting these objects, or as he calls it, "coming under a vow!"

But his speaking of the lawfulness of taking a little, leads me to think, that by "perfect sobriety" he means moderate drinking: just what even drunkards plead for—they dare not, and will not plead for more though they take, more—and those who are fond of intoxicating drink, will call any thing, short of stupid beastly intoxication, moderation.

Is it possible that so excellent a person, as I consider the Editor of the *Banner* to be, can seriously think, that the man who drinks a little intoxicating drink of any kind, is as likely to be successful in promoting perfect sobriety or even preventing drunkenness, as the man who abstains entirely, and advises others to do the same? Let past experience and observation decide this important question. It is of the utmost importance for the glory of God and the happiness of man that it should be decided soon; but if the past do not satisfy the Editor, let him and all who are of his mind, make the experiment—let them try