

sees the husband of her early affections going fast to the drunkard's grave, and to the abodes of blackness and darkness forever? We can see our friends suffer; we may stand by and witness the amputation of a limb—and we may pity; but when we see that the suffering of the body is but a prelude to the pain that must follow; when we see the being that we have loved, deliberately sacrificing both body and soul to a demon that has slain his thousands and ten of thousands, and delights in carnage and blood: It is this that will cause sorrow which mocks all consolation. It is a worm that never dies. To lean on the arm of a tottering inebriate—to sleep on the couch with the startling, troubled, maddened, woe-gone sleepless drunkard—are living, abiding sorrows, that can die only with life itself. And such sorrow, poor woman feels and endures because she cannot die—because she is constituted to suffer, till the attenuated life has spun its last fibre, and the bleeding heart has throbbled its last. When the grave shall tell, when the trump of the archangel shall reanimate the sleeping dead—Then, O! then, the murdered, slain—the thousands, yes, hundreds of thousands of immolated wives shall be swift witnesses against the cruel assassin, who drop, by drop has drained the last particle of blood from the heart of her whom he had sworn to love and cherish, who has wept and hoped, entreated and prayed till despair had fastened its talons, and the angel of mercy had fled forever.

### Original Articles.

However much we regard as sacred the right of giving a person accused the benefit of reply, yet we are, on the other hand, equally averse to continue discussions of no interest to our readers. Q. E. D. makes some preliminary remarks, which would occupy nearly a column, in answer to those of the editor, (now indisposed,) which we think as well not to insert. Very likely, as the case in almost every matter, there has been misunderstanding on both sides; and, for our friend, we will willingly take the blame of one half, and trust Q. E. D. will feel satisfied to take the other.

We insert the letter to A., in order that Q. E. D. may have the benefit of a reply, but decline to continue the correspondence, as we are persuaded the arguments used by each will be sufficient to enable the reader to form his opinion of the question at issue.

We beg to remark to Q. E. D., that we feel grieved to find him and other individuals of his talents and standing, opposed to temperance societies. It is to be feared doubts and difficulties are raised in their minds about minor points, in order that their influence and usefulness in promoting the great object may be lost.

Let Q. E. D., and the many respected individuals who hold similar views, but consider the much real benefit to society and the church, which the statistics of temperance societies show, apart from the

imperfection and errors attending their operation; and we feel convinced they will allow that much more good than evil has resulted from them, or is likely to do.

If Q. E. D. on examination, feel convinced of this, he will no doubt accede to our request, to aid us in promoting, by means of temperance Societies, the great principle of temperance, which he is striving like ourselves to further, although in our opinion by a way less likely to be successful.—Ed. T. A.

To the Editor of the Temperance Advocate.

SIR,—I proceed to the consideration of A.'s last communication.

Since A has made no attempt to refute my comments upon his rejoinder, I am left to consider them, in general, unanswerable—one specimen, however, he gives of their *general fallacy*. For argument's sake, let us admit that the fallacy of one comment is a sufficient proof of the fallacy of all others coming from the same person, and it will follow, that because A. has failed to shew the fallacy of the one in question, he cannot show the fallacy of the others. He merely calls upon me to show how his proposition "that it is *not* inconsistent with Christian profession to sign the temperance pledge for the sake of one's neighbour," contradicts his admission that "a Christian should not join a temperance society with a view to be temperate himself." A. must have seen that I had shown this contradiction, viz., that the adoption of his proposition and admission would lead to the inevitable conclusion that it is not inconsistent with Christian profession to do that which as Christians we may not do. If A. thought this conclusion erroneous, it was his business to shew it.

It is asserted, that the terms of the major proposition of my first syllogism are contradictory. To this assertion I need not reply, until it is proved that human exertion is equal to the only power that can effectually preserve. A. has evidently lost sight of the difference between mere exertion and effectual preservation; and with regard to his syllogism, if his major proposition has any meaning, it is this, at which we arrive by transposition of its parts, "It is an essential doctrine of Christianity that while in the proper use of the *necessary* means to preserve us from falling in the time of temptation, we should rest upon; and, therefore, should seek for the assistance of the Holy Spirit." What are the *necessary* means to preserve us," if it be not "the assistance of the Holy Spirit," which A. tells us "we should rest upon, and therefore seek for,"—that is, we are to seek for that of which we are "in the proper use." I confess I cannot see how his manner of expressing my proposition has made it better "to accord with the doctrines of the Gospel." His minor

proposition is a *petitio principii*, and has no reference to the question at issue,—the question of the pledge.

In stating my second syllogism, my christian brother has omitted the first proposition. In his own syllogism he avoids the question at issue—the question of *moral* legislation. His major term is, moreover, a *petitio principii*, I deny the fact therein stated,—It is therefore incumbent on him to prove it.

We are told that the pledge is nothing more than a promise; and yet it is admitted that those who sign it consider their "signature as a solemn vow or oath." This is precisely a main feature of the temperance society to which I object. Are not christians already pledged to God by "a solemn vow," to be temperate in all things? If this be not considered insufficient, why this substitution of another, or is the temperance vow more solemn and binding than the other? It appears indeed to be so esteemed, if we are to judge by the consequences which have resulted from the use of it—such consequences as I pointed out in my last communication.

The reasoning of A. is too evidently not analagous to require any extended notice, I shall confine myself with one observation on his concluding argument, *his clincher*. The borrower of money who signs a note "to prevent himself from being tempted to defraud the lender," must abandon the high gospel principle of morality for this low one. But I apprehend no such reason ever existed for signing notes, I should rather suppose the signature to be *required* by the lender as an *evidence*, and can have no more to do with the christian pledge than the title deeds of an estate.

It may perhaps be necessary to make a remark on the case of the Rechabites, which is quoted by my opponent as an example of "a temperance society without a pledge." The Rechabites were a family or tribe living under patriarchal government. It was one of the commands of the Patriarch or Father of this family, that they should abstain from the use of wine. They were not evidently associated for this special object, but living, according to the customs of the country in which they resided, subject to the controul of one head, and acting in obedience to that controul. God approved of their obedience, not because they abstained from the use of wine as an act in itself meritorious, but because "they obeyed their father's commandment;" because of their filial obedience they are brought into contrast with the disobedient Jews. If the Rechabites obeyed their earthly father, how much more should the Jews have obeyed their heavenly Father.

Q.E.D.

Montreal, Nov. 9, 1834.