

The press, only too eager to get rid of a "fad" which is inconvenient to both political parties, has generally followed the lead of the *Times*, declaring the whole movement to have been founded on a delusion, which the commission has finally dispelled. It is not yet clear how the attention of the British public can best be recalled to the main question at issue, which the majority of the commission has done its best to obscure: Shall the name of Christ still be blasphemed among the Chinese because of Britain's participation in the traffic which feeds her great national cancer? Not only have the commissioners overlaid this question by devoting more than nine tenths of their report to the Indian branch of the subject, notwithstanding their own admission that more than nine tenths of the opium produced in India is exported to China and the Straits Settlements, but they have actually stooped to gross misstatements of facts and garbled quotations of evidence in their discussion of the Chinese traffic.

A veteran American missionary, Rev. Dr. Ashmore, of Swatow, one of those invited by British consuls in China to furnish replies to questions issued by the commissioners, is a victim of the latter offense. He had stated: "Some men of *vigorous vitality* will use opium for many years and not show marked results." In the rest of his evidence, all the more weighty for the careful reservation of these exceptional cases, he clearly expresses his opinion that "nearly all of those with whom the habit is fully formed" consume opium "with great injury." Yet he is quoted in support of the statement that some of the missionaries "take a less decided view" than the majority of his colleagues, by whom, it is admitted, "the use of opium is strongly condemned." He is made to differ from them by the simple expedient of omitting the three important words in italics, the rest of the sentence being quoted without any indication of its incompleteness. The Rev. A. Bone, of Canton, is even worse treated—two disconnected passages being pieced together as if they formed part of one sentence, in order to make him out a dissident from the general voice of his brethren. Three sentences may be quoted from the report containing three allegations directly contradictory to fact. "It may be added," says the report, "that there is no evidence from China of any popular desire that the import of Indian opium should be stopped." There is, in fact, a considerable body of such evidence. "In the British consular service the prevailing opinion is that opium smoking in moderation is not harmful, and that moderation is the rule. . . . The medical opinions were in general accord with those of the consular body." Two careful and accurate writers, Mr. Joshua Rowntree and the Rev. F. Storrs Turner, have shown that these are untrue representations of the balance alike of the consular and the medical evidence, both of them, in fact, showing a strong preponderance of opinion contrary to that here stated. It is difficult to get the British people to believe that a number of presumably honorable men have put their signatures to a dishonest report; yet when these charges, which have already been publicly made without any attempt being made to answer