

es of useful trade and commerce, and to the promotion of honest industry in the land.—Our national exchequer will have the deficient revenue more than made up by the consumption of articles of real utility, and its savings from the county, and police, and poor rates of the nation, and from the fearful sum annually demanded for the punishment of criminals who are mainly the victims of strong drink. We shall then have an abundance of means for all purposes of art, science, and literature, and benevolence, and religion. The amount of our drinking means in three years would pay for the emancipation of every American slave, and in three more for the utter extinction of that horrible stigma on humanity throughout the world. It is in no wise chimerical to affirm that, let this movement be successful, and in thirty years—the limit of only one generation—our sea girt Isle may convey to the whole earth the blessings of freedom, peace, and the Word of eternal salvation.

THE FIRST MAINE LAW SPEECH AT THE HUSTINGS IN ENGLAND.

On Monday, the 2nd ult., at the election of a member for the borough of Salford, in the room of the late Joseph Brotherton, Esq., the Honorary Secretary of the United Kingdom Alliance took occasion to bring the subject of Prohibition before the assembled electors. The *Alliance Weekly News* gives the following report of his excellent speech:—

SAMUEL POPE, Esq., as an elector of the borough, would say a few words upon the subject of this election. He thought he might venture to say that the prospect afforded by the platform on which they were standing, was something unusual at least, if not unprecedented in the history of Salford contests. He saw, surrounding the gentlemen who would probably be the representative of this borough, gentlemen of all shades of political opinion. Old political opponents had now become new friends. (Hear, hear.) They were about to carry out an election without politics. Their representative would be sent into parliament through the universal confidence and cordial affection of his fellow-citizens, rather than as the representative of any particular political party. It would ill become any one of them to say a syllable in disparagement of Mr Langworthy; his generosity and courtesy must have endeared him to all of them. But it appeared to him, that something more was appraised in the appearance of that platform, than the mere fact that they had gained a temporary accession of political amiability amongst parties. It signified that there was now no political question over which political parties thought it worth while to fight. There were no political parties here, or elsewhere in this country. The political coherence of statesmen was confessedly impossible. That part of the press of the country which was in the interest of the ministry, was found tauntingly inquiring during the recess, "What has become of the opposition to Her Majesty's government?" Mr Disraeli, the leader of the opposition, was found declaring that Her Majesty's government was a government of suffrages only, and Mr Gibson, member for Manchester, had told us that parliament was divided into three parties,—the government,—the opposition,—and the out-

—the last being the most important of the three. (Hear, hear.) We, (said Mr Pope) may learn something more than this: statesmen themselves are gradually dying for want of political food. We have Lord Stanley breaking entirely free from party and political trammels, setting his political party on one side, and devoting his free and independent mind to questions of social and criminal reform. We have, on the other hand, Sir John Pakington hand-in-hand with his own political opponent Mr Colden, devoting himself to the question of education, and endeavouring to reconcile those jarring elements which have hitherto prevented anything like a solution of that great national question. We see that everything in the temper of the people and the necessities of statesmen, points to this fact; that, in the future, public discussions must turn, not on emasculated political dogmas which may be of real or of very doubtful utility, but on great questions of social ethics on the settlement of which the prosperity of this country will depend: and it is because I believe Mr Langworthy will be in his right place in the discussion of such questions that I am here to raise my voice as a burgess of Salford in support of his election. But I stand here, sir, not only as a burgess, but also as the representative of a large and growing feeling in this and every other constituency in the country, which will make social reform the rallying point of every great party in the future. This moment of political stagnation ought to be the people's opportunity. The people of this country are sick to death of the everlasting great promises and no performances of political parties. There is not a hustings in the country which is not strewn, as Lord Brougham has said, with the fragments of broken promises of old political parties; and therefore, as part of the people, and as depending for the success of our measure on the voice of the people, we say, now is the time to come forward and claim from our future representative, and from this and every constituency in the country, the consideration of questions of social reform, and, as lying at the basis of them, that great movement by which the people, sooner or later, sweep from their path the great obstacle to progress.—I mean, the traffic in intoxicating drinks. (Loud cheering.) I claim for that question, Mr Langworthy's attention in his place in the House of Commons; because it lies at the basis of all the questions in which he has already expressed an interest. Is he a political reformer? What can there be which so much enslaves the constituencies, and so deeply debases the people, as this traffic in strong drink? (Hear, hear.) I feel, sir, that this is somewhat of a new platform for the discussion of our side of the question; but the other side of the question has certainly been no stranger at elections. We think the time is come when constituencies should have an opportunity of hearing that something may be said on our side of the question. (Loud applause.) As political reformers we have to ask that Mr Langworthy shall support the suppression of this traffic in strong drink; and why?—because, in the first place, the liquor traffickers are bound together by a bond of union, and exercise their franchise, firstly, for the welfare of their own trade and only secondly for the welfare of the public. Is it not monstrous that a traffic which, by its own confession, prospers in exact proportion to the demoralization of the people, should so exercise its franchise? And is it not clear

that our measure would be the enfranchisement, not only of the constituencies, delivering them from the power of a traffic which, exciting the appetite of the people and arousing the lowest passions of humanity, is able to control the free and independent action of the representatives? (Hear, hear.) I do not speak without some knowledge of what are the feelings of some people's representatives, when I say that there is no class of men who would more rejoice at being set free from the thralldom of this political agency than they, and, therefore, I claim from Mr Langworthy a due consideration of this question. Again, sir, is it taxation of which you complain? How much does this traffic cost you? What proportion of your poor-rate, your police-rate, and the expenditure for apprehending, maintaining, and punishing criminals? And what is the amount of social virtue, moral power, and industrial energy which the traffic creates among you? How much of your taxation is due to that source? (Hear, hear.) Is it not, therefore, clear, that that must be not only a great political, but also a fearful financial blunder, which at once increases the necessity for taxation and diminishes the resources from which taxes are drawn? Education is another question which Mr Langworthy has publicly attended to. Do you seek for the education of the people? Ask the gaol chaplains what they think about it;—they will tell you that the public-house is much stronger than the school. Two-thirds of the children in the Glasgow House of Refuge are there in consequence of the drunkenness of their parents; and Mr Mahew tells us, in the *Times*, that notwithstanding all efforts, philanthropists have been able to produce no sensible effect upon the supply of juvenile criminals. Where do they come from? Ask Mr Wright, the prison philanthropist; he will tell you what the public-house has to do with that question. And therefore, is it not clear, that the first step you can take upon this subject must to get rid, at all events, of that which is the great teacher of vice? Perhaps the electors all agree with me so far as regards the immense evils of intemperance, and yet may say, as I believe has been said with reference to this election, that ours is not a question to intrude into political warfare. If that be true, I have no business here; I feel bound, therefore, to justify my present course, and shew why we conceive this is pre-eminently a question which must come for settlement before the legislature of this country. It may be objected that this evil, of which we, and all are sensible, is a moral evil; and that moral questions cannot and ought not to be made the subjects of interference by the legislature. I take it, however, you may or may not disagree with me as to the desirability of the removal of drink, the truth will not be questioned, that if there were no drink there could be no drunkards. (Hear, hear.) Well now, sir, that is a way of putting it; but what do I learn from that? I learn that the cause of the drunkenness is not internal to the man, but is an article external to him, and over which he has, if he chooses to exercise it, positive and actual control. Were it an operation of moral feeling, law could not penetrate; but being an external agency—something out of the man, developed into a trade—law can deal with it, if it choose (cheers.) And I think it ought to deal with it, because we say at once this is not a question of moral legislation; the injurious agency is external acting upon him altogether irrespective of his