

being destroyed by opium, have not a word to say against the greater destruction of lives and morals, and souls that is going on in their *own country* by the use of the equally pernicious, if not more deadly drug, *alcohol*. And why are these loud professors of religion "dumb dogs" on this important question? Is it because they themselves drink and love alcoholic liquors that they do not ask Parliament to interfere and prevent the bodies and souls of their fellow countrymen from being destroyed by the wicked traffic in intoxicating liquors? We fear some such unworthy reasons prevented them from being consistent and faithful. Were these eloquent advocates of the Chinese to attend to the scripture precept—"first cast the beam out of thine own eye and then shalt thou see clearly to pull the mote of thy brother's eye," and wash the blood of their countrymen from their skirts, then their exertions might be crowned with success. But so long as they drink and advocate the use of alcoholic liquors, monstrously perverting scripture to sanction their conduct, and make not the slightest rational effort to deliver their country from the curse of intemperance, politicians will continue to look upon all their declamations against opium as the mere cant of pharisees. They that would reform others must first reform themselves. Their monstrous inconsistency did not escape the notice of Sir Robert Peel, who, on the presentation of the petitions already referred to, remarked that, "We who are so delicate in this matter raised £3,400,000 a year by a revenue on the tobacco we smoked and chewed, exciting and stimulating us and this in addition to a duty on *gin, spirits, brandy, and wine*, luxuries which men who had no command over their appetites often used in great excess, and produced many disastrous consequences. We who raised £3,000,000 or £9,000,000 by the duty on barley alone, and £3,400,000 on a weed which many considered most noxious, would yet interdict the growth of opium in India, in order to preserve the morals, and take care of the health of the Chinese."

This castigation was as deserved as it was severe, and we hope it had a salutary effect upon the petitioners. Alcohol and opium are both *noxious poisons*, and till these benevolent men cease from using every description of alcoholic liquor, they cannot consistently say a word against the traffic in opium. Opium is a natural product of the earth; alcohol is not. If it be lawful to use alcohol or sell it, we should like to know how it is unlawful to traffic in opium. May not the one poison be as lawfully used in moderation as the other? And if it is proper to use, it cannot be wrong to sell either. Let not our readers mistake us. We are as decidedly opposed to the opium-trade in China, as we are to the traffic in alcohol at home. We deem both immoral, and will not cease to labour for their utter destruction. Our christianity teaches us to do the one, and not to leave the other undone.

We do not admire the reasoning of Sir Robert Peel on this occasion. His sophistical mode of arguing may agree with the maxims of politicians, but it is opposed to all sound morality, because we permit one evil at home, we are not entitled to inflict another abroad. Two blacks will not make one white.

Although Government, with the approbation of ministers of religion, and christians of all denominations, maintain the traffic in intoxicating liquors at home, which, it was admitted in Parliament on all hands, was producing evil as enormous as the opium trade abroad, that is no reason why they should not aid the Chinese in keeping opium away from their shores. Surely we may be beneficent to our neighbours although unmerciful to ourselves. But it is folly to expect that the present generation of politicians will regulate their actions by the precepts of christian morality. They generally seem to hold that what is profitable is right. Those who shoot and plunder their enemies, cannot be expected to love their neighbours. The growth of opium in India, and the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors at home, produce large revenues to the Indian and British govern-

ments, and neither will be suppressed till christians become consistent, and politicians moral.

Opposition to this anti-opium cry seems to have united all parties for a season. Even the *Examiner* and Sir Robert Peel are at one on this point. But as no party is guided by christian principle, their coalition need not surprise us. When it was going to serve a common political object to put Jesus to death, it is said that, "the same day Pilate and Herod were made friends together: for before, they were at enmity between themselves."

Government sees and admits the mighty evils which intoxicating liquors are daily inflicting on our miserable and godless population. Will government do its duty, and protect the people from this plague, by endeavouring to suppress the manufacture and sale of these liquors, and so remove the cause of the wretchedness? We believe it has no such intentions. It is remarkable that when politicians are asked to do good, or assist in any enterprise of peace or mercy at home or abroad, numberless and unheard of difficulties are placed in the way; but if money or men be wanted to aid a despot, or plunder the defenceless, the request is granted with scarcely a scruple. "Their feet are swift to shed blood—and the way of peace they have not known." They even make their vices an argument for not being merciful! Such may be political morality—the morality of British senators; but far different is the morality of Jesus. When governments become wise, and are guided by the unerring precepts of christianity they will no longer partake of the sin of making and selling intoxicating liquors at home, nor countenance the infamous opium-trade abroad. They will endeavour to give their subjects no opportunity of injuring themselves or hurting their neighbours; and will be always ready to assist friendly powers in every good work, they will love their enemies and do good to those that hate them.—*Scottish Tem. Journal*.

Give me back my Husband.

BY ELIHU BURRITT.

Not many years since a young married couple from the far 'fast anchored isle,' sought our shores with most sanguine anticipations of prosperity and happiness. They had begun to realize more than they had seen in the visions of hope, when in an evil hour, the husband was tempted 'to look upon the wine when it was red,' and to taste of it 'when it gave its colour in the cup.' The charmer fastened around his victim all the serpent spells of its sorcery, and he fell; and at every step of his rapid degradation, from the man to the brute, and downward, a heart string was broken in the bosom of his companion.

Finally, with the last spark of hope flickering on the altar of her heart, she threaded her way into one of those shambles where man is made such a thing as the beasts of the field would bellow at. She pressed her way through the bacchanalian crowd who were revelling there in their own ruin. With her bosom full of 'that perilous stuff that preys upon her heart she stood before the pander of her husband's destiny, and exclaimed in tones of startling anguish, 'Give me back my Husband!'

'There's your husband,' said the man as he pointed towards the prostrate wretch. 'That my husband! What have you done to him? That my husband! What have you done to that noble form, that once like a giant oak, held its protecting shade over the fragile vine that clung to it for support and shelter? That my husband! With what torpedo chill have you touched the sinews of that manly arm? That my husband! What have you done to that noble brow which he once wore high among his fellows, as if it bore the superscription of the Godhead? That my husband! What have you done to that eye, with which he was wont to 'look erect on heaven,' and see in his mirror the image of his God. What Egyptian drug have you poured into his veins, and turned the rumbling fountains of his heart into