

subject to me again. The convictions which have already dictated my reply, are not to be set aside by persuasion. One thing, however, I would ask of you, and I ask it in all humility—do not take my answer unkindly—do not let it separate us as friends. I have been, endeavouring, by the most scrupulous behaviour, to convince you, that I could be nothing more to you, nor you to me; and I am pained to the heart that you have not better understood me. You understand me now; and I repeat again—do not let this foolish business separate us as friends. I have no brother—I might almost say I have no father now. Do not utterly forsake me in my desolation.”

I told her then, for the first time, that I was about to return to India.

She started; but immediately went on—“Let us be like fellow-travellers, then, who know that at the next stage they must separate for ever. Let us part kindly, for the dream of our friendship will indeed have passed, when you leave your native land again.”

Of all the different kinds of romance which take possession of the female mind, there is none more unintelligible to man, and few more unacceptable, than that friendship which she sometimes proposes to him in the place of love. Had I better understood the character and situation of Kate Somerville, I should have known, in her case at least, that she both offered it herself, and needed it from me, in no ordinary or trifling degree, and that the kindness she asked of me in this melancholy and humble manner, she had richly earned the right to demand, by the noble sacrifice she was making, as she believed, in my favour.

It may easily be supposed, that after this interview I became a less frequent visitor at the Hall; for I had never, even when a youth, been sufficiently poetical to understand the luxury of cherishing a hopeless attachment. I consequently busied myself with preparations for my return to India, and thought as little of my disappointment as I could.

Kate Somerville, I observed, whenever we met, was much altered. She attempted to be lively, but her forced spirits failed her more than ever; and it was not difficult to perceive that some mental, or rather spiritual conflict was absorbing every thought. My sister often wished that she had some experienced adviser, with whom she might converse confidentially; but, happily for her, she had already begun to feel that there is a consolation beyond what human love can offer—a Friend whose counsels are more salutary than those of an earthly adviser.

Unacquainted with the exercise of a mind thus engaged, and unable to sympathize in its deep experience, I became gradually estranged from the society of my sister's friend. An indescribable feeling that our destiny was tending different ways, seemed to keep me at a distance from her, though whenever we met, there was an humbled and a chastened expression in her features which made my heart ache to think what she was suffering, or had suffered. At times I wished to escape from the pain of seeing her thus altered; and then again, I wished more earnestly that I might stay, and be ever near her, if by this means it would be possible for me to partake of that influence which I could not but be sensible was purifying and elevating her character.

It is often observed, that before the hour of final dissolution, the appearance of the human sufferer undergoes a striking, and almost supernatural change, as if preparatory to that great event. And is it not often, to a certain extent, the same, before some of those fearful trials which mark the most important epochs of human existence? And merciful it is in the dispensations of Providence, that so few are wholly taken by surprise. Surprise, indeed, we may feel as to the nature of the trial which awaits us; but do we not often find, on looking back from such events, that there was previously a kind of awe surrounding us—a gloom—a gathering like that which comes before a storm; or a silence still more deeply felt—a suspension of our ordinary being—as if

to give us time to call up from long-neglected sources, the support which our suffering and feeble nature was about to require?—(To be Continued.)

INTEMPERANCE THE GREAT CAUSE OF CRIME.

BY WILLIAM LOGAN.

Our object in the present paper is to prove that intemperance is the principal cause of crime in the United Kingdom, and we shall proceed to support this proposition not only by the testimony of gentlemen best qualified to give judgment on the subject, but by well authenticated facts; and in the outset we submit the testimony of the following distinguished judges:—The venerable Sir Matthew Hale thus writes: “The places in the judicature which I have long held in this kingdom have given me an opportunity to observe the original cause of the crimes and enormities during the last twenty years; and by that observation I have found that if the murders, burglaries, robberies, riots, tumults, adulteries, rapes, and other enormities that have been committed during that time, were divided into five parts, four of them have been the product of excessive drinking.” Baron Alderson, when addressing the grand jury a few months ago, at the York assizes, said, “Another thing he would advert to, was, that a great proportion of the crime to be brought forward for their consideration, arose from the vice of drunkenness alone; indeed, if they took away from the calendar all those cases with which drunkenness has any connexion, they would make the large calendar a very small one.” One of the judges stated some time ago, at the Circuit Court in Glasgow, that more than eighty criminals had been tried and sentenced to punishment, and that, with scarcely a single exception, the whole of the crimes had been committed under the influence of intoxicating liquors. From the evidence that has appeared before him as a judge, it seemed that every evil in Glasgow began and ended in whisky.” Judge Erskine also declared at the summer assizes held in the year 1844, when sentencing a gentleman to six months' hard labour for a crime committed through strong drink, that ninety-nine cases out of every hundred were for the same cause. Judge Coleridge stated, at the Oxford assizes, that he never knew a case brought before him which was not, directly or indirectly, connected with intoxicating liquors; and Judge Patteson, at the Norwich assizes, said to the grand jury, “If it were not for this drinking, you and I would have nothing to do.” These are only a few testimonies of many that could easily be adduced. We shall now proceed to furnish a careful selection of facts and statistics on the question, and refer, in the first place, to Captain Miller's statement respecting the city of Glasgow. “You see,” says he, in a letter addressed to myself, “that in my various papers and reports regarding the state of crime in this city, I have attributed to intemperance a great portion of the crime committed in the community, and I have yet seen no reason to change my opinion; on the contrary, every day's experience tends to confirm it. The number of persons brought before the police court, in 1842, was 8,986, of whom 4,505 were for being drunk and disorderly. The total number of persons brought before the magistrates in 1843, were 9,679, of whom 4,364 were charged with rioting and drunkenness.” The following returns have just been furnished by the respective superintendents of Glasgow, Gorbals, Calton, and Anderston police establishments, showing the number of persons brought before the magistrates in the course of 1844:—“In Glasgow,” says Capt. Wilson, “there were 10,736 prisoners, of whom 7,775 were males and 2,951 females; and of these, 2,035 males and 37 females were drunk on the streets, 1,596 men and 839 women were drunk and disorderly,” giving a total of 4,507 cases of intemperance. In Gorbals (the following are the returns for 1841, but they serve our present purpose) there were, says Captain Richardson, “5,013 prisoners, of whom