

outlawed by Christian nations, Great Britain having led the van. Slavery itself is a parallel, and its deep stain tinges the national ermine of Columbia. The Rum trade, with its awful trains of crime and woe, with its blasting effects for time and eternity, is another parallel, but while its guilt is common to many nations, the Opium traffic is peculiarly Britain's. The clippers of many nations convey the drug from Calcutta to Canton, but it was previously grown as a monopoly by the Indian Government and about Five Millions of Pounds netted, which go to swell the revenues of that great corporation.

*But are its effects on the Chinese so very injurious?* What have been its effects for the last ninety years? Such has been the increase of the demand that the two hundred chests then sent have expanded into sixty thousand, chiefly used in smoking shops, thus described by Lord Jocelyn, and those of you who once enjoyed his acquaintance will probably agree with the Editor of *Household Words*, from which I quote, that he may not be suspected of over sensitiveness,—“In these houses devoted to their ruin, these infatuated people may be seen at nine o'clock in the evening, in all the different stages, some entering half distracted to feed the craving appetite, which they have been obliged to subdue during the day, others laughing and talking wildly under the effects of a first pipe, whilst the couches round are filled with the different occupants, who lie languid with an idiot smile upon their countenances, too much under the influence of the drug to care for passing events.—The last scene in the tragic play is generally a room in the rear of the building, a species of dead house, where lie stretched those who have passed into the state of bliss which the victim madly seeks, an emblem of the long sleep to which he is blindly hurrying.” Walking skeletons, (says Dr Ball,) families wretched and beggared by drugged fathers, and husbands, and who have lost house and home, may be seen dying in the streets, in the fields, on the banks of rivers without even a stranger to care for them while alive, and when dead left exposed to view till they become offensive masses.” Time forbids me to add the united testimony of Protestant and Roman Catholic missionaries.

*To what extent does this destructive habit now prevail?* Its apologists concede that between nine hundred thousand and a million are indeed victimized smokers, while its opponents maintain, and in fact maintained at the breaking out of what was called the Opium War, that the number could not fall far short of two millions and a half. These victims then far exceed the whole population of Australia, or of all these Lower Colonies.

*Why do not the Chinese exclude it?* Because they are corrupted and paralyzed by it as we are by the influence of strong drink. For sixty years it has been prohibited, and occasionally sincere efforts have been made to exclude it. Why unsuccessful?

1. Because those smugglers are *swift, well armed, and manned by daring men.*
2. Because those officials are, but men, and liable to corruption. They may be corrupted by *bribes* to be *elsewhere* when the daring smuggler glides along. They may be doubly corrupted by *relish* for the fatal drug.
3. Because no heathen people have sufficient patriotic and moral principle to resist such influences. But whence come those bribes? Not from Christians certainly, but from those who hail from Christian nations and are protected by their Consuls; and thus the prohibitory law of half a century is rendered null and nugatory for want of moral power in the people, integrity in the officials, and justice, honor and the love of humanity in Christian nations.

*Do the British officials really approve of the trade?* Hear the Directors of the East India Company in language printed thirty years ago, “So repugnant to our feelings is the Opium traffic with China, that were it possible to prevent the use of the drug altogether we would gladly do it in compassion to mankind.” Hear Captain Elliot, the Superintendent of Trade at Canton, writing to his Government, “If my private feelings were of the least consequence upon questions of an important and public nature, assuredly I might justly say that no man entertains a deeper detestation of the *disgrace and sin* of this forced traffic, than the humble individual who signs this despatch. *I see little to choose between it and piracy.*” Again, “This course of traffic is rapidly staining the British character with deep disgrace, and exposing the regular commerce to imminent jeopardy.”

Is this its real character? *Why then is it not prohibited by the British authorities?*