

A. It is destructive to public property, as it consumes 20 millions of money annually which might be employed for the public welfare.

36. Q. Is there any other evil produced by it?

A. There are innumerable accidents which result from it by land and by water, through which thousands of lives are annually destroyed. It leads to all sorts of crime, such as Sabbath breaking, swearing, uncleanness, injustice, robbery and murder. It involves thousands of families in poverty and domestic broils, and destroys those affections which would diffuse happiness, contentment and comfort.

37. Q. Can you name any other injury it produces?

A. It contributes more to impoverish and burden the state than any other crime.

38. Q. How does this appear?

A. In the enormous expenses inseparable from the erection of poor houses, hospitals, lunatic asylums, prisons, and penitentiaries, and in supporting the inmates of these establishments.

39. Q. By whom are all these supported?

A. By the temperate and respectable classes of society, who have to pay directly or indirectly all the expenses connected with intoxication.

40. Q. Who are the persons who should join temperance societies, and support them by their influence and example?

A. All young people, all persons in business, all temperate persons, all who pay poor rates, all who wish the best and eternal welfare of their fellow creatures, and especially ministers of religion.

41. Q. Why do you say all temperate people should join them?

A. Because they are the most respectable and influential part of society.

42. Q. Why do you say all young people should join them?

A. Because an immediate union with them will prove a great preservative against the danger of temptation, and the formation of intemperate habits.

43. Q. Why should persons in business encourage them?

A. Because the immense sums saved from drunkenness, waste of time, pauperism and crime, will be devoted to the purchase of useful articles of commerce, and will have a powerful and beneficial influence on the trading interest and prosperity of the country.

44. Q. Why should those join them who wish the eternal welfare of their fellow-creatures?

A. Because their example will operate in reclaiming some, and preventing others, from the downward and destructive path that leads to perdition.

45. Q. Why should ministers of religion in particular join such societies?

A. Because their example is the most extensive and operative, and because the minds of men, when freed from the debasing influence of spirituous liquors, will derive a tenfold advantage from the ministry of the word.

46. Q. Can you state any objections made against temperance societies?

A. Yes; the friends of temperance societies have had to contend with numerous objectors. It has been said, for instance, by some that they are opposed to the gospel.

47. Q. What reply can you make to this objection?

A. They are rather subservient to the designs of the gospel, inasmuch as they produce sobriety and morality among a numerous class of persons, who without this influence, would not be disposed to listen to the gospel.

48. Q. Does not the gospel itself enjoin temperance in all things? and is not this sufficient to secure the object contemplated by these institutions?

A. The gospel does require temperance, and where its influence is felt it leads to the practice of it; yet there have been many who have professed the gospel, who at first practiced the moderate use of spirituous liquors, but who afterward gradually sunk down into the character of confirmed drunkards.

49. Q. Is not every creature of God good, and to be received with thanksgiving?

A. Certainly; but it is not to be perverted to produce evil; and distilled spirits are not a creature of God, but are an invention of man.

50. Q. But in order to be consistent, ought you not to abstain from wines and malt liquors?

A. In reply to this I should say that, as wine, cider, and porter, are known to possess nourishing and wholesome properties, they may be taken moderately; while spirits even taken in small quantities, are injurious to the constitution, and therefore to be avoided.

51. Q. As the abuse of a thing is no argument for its disuse, are we to deny ourselves the use of spirits because some persons destroy themselves with them?

A. Distilled spirits being evil in themselves, and the bane of society, the use in any degree is an abuse; and if our using them is an inducement to others to injure themselves, we ought to deny ourselves as Paul did; he said, "If meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no meat while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend."

Original Articles.

To the Editor of the MONTREAL HERALD.

SIR,—The enclosed communication was sent to the *Temperance Advocate*, under the following circumstances. It was known I was opposed to the *principle of Temperance Societies*—and I was invited to a discussion of the subject in the columns of the *Temperance Advocate*—an invitation which I readily accepted. The first article was kept back a whole month that it might not appear without its antidote. The present article was sent fully three weeks (as appears by its date) before the issue of the last number of the *T. A.*; and yet that paper does not even contain any acknowledgment of its receipt—thereby leaving the students of the *Advocate* to suppose I have been silenced by the *triumphant refutation* of A. Under these circumstances I trust you will not refuse me a place in the columns of the *Herald*.

Your obedient servant,
Q. E. D.

Montreal, October 9, 1835.

REPLY TO THE REJOINDER OF A.

A. asserts that there is sophistry in the following, "Neither should he (the true Christian) join with the view of keeping other Christians (whether real or nominal) temperate, because, what it is inconsistent with his Christian profession to do himself, it must be equally inconsistent for him to teach, or induce others of the same profession to do." In proof of this assertion, he tells us that the whole force of the proposition lies in an omission and consequent misapprehension of his concession. Here is his concession—a Christian "should not join the Temperance Society, with a view to be kept temperate." But A. says my omission consists in leaving out the particle "for," and that my proposition, to express his concession, should have been "what it is inconsistent with his Christian profession to do for himself, &c." I can assure A that this was my meaning, as expressed in the first part of the sentence of which he has only quoted a part. "It has been shewn that a Christian should not join a Temperance Society with a view to be kept temperate, neither should he join, &c." Here is his concession embodied, in his own words, in my proposition, the fallacy of which, he says, lies in an omission and consequent misapprehension of his concession; whereas the omission is entirely his own.

A. proceeds to say that my proposition "makes no distinction between two very different things, viz., signing for one's own good, and signing for the good of one's neighbour." Not perhaps as he partially quoted it, but certainly as it is: Do not the words "with a view" as applied, in my proposition, to both the *Christian himself* and to *other*

* Q. E. D. is quite mistaken when he asserts that his first communication was kept back "that it might not appear without its antidote; for the fact is, it was too late for that number, and in the meantime his opponent A, called and requested a look of it, and wrote an answer to it, which appeared in the next number. We acknowledge it was not right to give A. the article, but it was done without thought. Q. E. D.'s second assertion, that we kept back his last article that the readers of the *Temperance Advocate* might suppose that he had been refuted by A. is also incorrect; and that Q. E. D. knows, for we told him why it was not inserted, namely, that it was too late, and from having numerous other matters to attend to, we forgot to insert a notice in our last, stating that it would appear in our next.—Ed. T. A.