

A. An extraordinary concern, extending to multitudes in reference to religious subjects.

Q. Can you state any instances of this kind?

A. Yes, there have been many; but in one only in America, where a Temperance Society was formed in 1829, it excited great attention, and led many persons to attend the means of grace; and the same year 300 persons were hopefully converted, most of whom had previously joined the Temperance Society.

Q. How are these Societies likely to operate on posterity?

A. They will preserve all who adhere to their principles from ever becoming drunkards, and hence intemperance will gradually diminish, as the present race of drunkards drop into their graves, one of the greatest causes of immorality will be removed, families will be better clothed and fed, children will be better taught, and parents more happy and useful.

Q. But may not a person take spirits in moderation without the danger of intemperance?

A. No; for if a person use spirits at all, however moderate, there is a danger that his love of it may induce him to increase the quantity until he fall into the snare.

Q. Were those who now wallow in the sin of intoxication ever careful in the use of it?

A. Yes; multitudes of them were once very moderate, and detested the idea of intoxication, and would have trembled at the very thought of becoming drunkards.

Q. How came they then to be such?

A. They began by taking a little, until the usual dose failed to produce the original excitement, and they continued to increase it till their love of intoxicating liquors overcame all moral feeling, and they sank into habits of dissipation.

Q. What are the effects of intemperance on society?

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

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.

Q. Can you name any other injury it produces?

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

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.

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.

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 wish the best and eternal welfare of their fellow-creatures, and especially ministers of religion.

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

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

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.

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.

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.

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 ten-fold advantage from the ministry of the word.

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.

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.

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 professed the gospel, who at first practised the moderate use of liquors, but who afterwards gradually sunk down into the character of confirmed drunkards.

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.*

* This statement admits of a little qualification.

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.

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, when 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."

(From the Morning Chronicle, March 1.)

The defeat of the Attorney-General, Sir John Campbell at Dudley, in a constituency of seven hundred, which triumphantly returned him as their representative in December 1832, is a political event which has created an uncommon feeling of surprise and regret. No member of the bar, of modern times, has more justly been esteemed as a liberal politician and a lawyer. His consistent profession of liberal opinions, and his acknowledged services in the cause of law-reform—the soundness of his judgment, and his official connexion with many important measures for the reformation of the common law and the law of real property, and his relation to the ministry, confer on the result of the Dudley election no ordinary importance. The Tories will of course turn this event to every possible party advantage. It is therefore important that the real facts of this case should be fairly stated. The Tories are the last persons who have any just cause for rejoicing. Dudley contains a population of 23,042 persons: it has 800 ten-pound householders, of whom only 670 were entitled in 1832 to the elective franchise? In December 1832, in the contest between an Ultra Tory, Sir Horace St. Paul, and Sir John Campbell (then Solicitor-General), 540 electors polled; of which number Sir John Campbell had a majority of 90. We believe the gross number of registered electors is now about 710. Of these 564 polled on Thursday—Sir John Campbell 242, Mr Thomas Hawkes 322—leaving a majority of 80 in favour of the latter. Now, who is Mr Hawkes? The successful member for Dudley is a man uninstructed, utterly unfit for a representative. His political principles are as unknown to himself as they are to his constituents. In 1831-2 he signed the county protests against reform, and at the same time contested the rotten borough of Stafford as an advocate of the ministerial measures—being defeated by Sir John Campbell. On the enfranchisement of Dudley Mr Hawkes was a candidate for its representation, but ultimately withdrew his pretensions! We are well informed that his personal and former commercial