

THE MERCHANT AND HIS CLERK.—In a recent lecture, Prof. Tatlock related the following anecdote:—About forty years ago, a young man with limited capital commenced business in Boston, and was obliged to employ a single clerk on a small salary. A lady called at his store one day and made some purchases, which she wished delivered at her residence.—The Merchant requested his clerk to deliver the bundle as required. He declined; the merchant immediately took the bundle and delivered as directed. The clerk never was worth one hundred dollars in his life.

Now it is a providential fact, that misfortune has the privilege to ennoble man's character. There is a natural instinct of human dignity in the heart of man, which steels his very nerves not to bend beneath the heavy blows of a great adversity. The palm tree grows best beneath a ponderous weight—even so is the character of a man. There is no merit in it—it is a law of psychology. The petty pangs of small daily cares have often bent the character of men, but great misfortunes seldom.—*Kossuth.*

The Boston Post says there was a very impressive funeral in that city recently. A barrel of porter had fallen from a truck, and some fifty mourners were standing round the beer.

A man may be a degraded creature. If he should steal a sheep, the whole community would help to hunt him out, and not a voice would be raised in his favor or a petition be got up to have the prosecution abandoned. Let the rum-seller who perhaps manufactured that thief out of an honorable and respectable citizen, be prosecuted for a notorious violation of law, and the same community will rush between him and justice! Some communities are death on small fry villains made in their midst, but the moment the manufacturer is touched, their sympathies are all alive.—*Cayuga Chief.*

In order to lead an irreproachable life, people ought not to do what they blame in others.

WANTED, AT THIS OFFICE.—A single good reason for continuing the licensed sale of intoxicating drinks.

SLY YOUTH.—Our special reporter asserts, on his honor, that he was an eye witness to the sequel of the following dialogue: "James, my son, take this letter to the post-office, and pay the postage on it." The boy returned, highly elated, and said, "Father, I seed a lot of men putting letters in a little hole, and, when no one was looking, I slipped yours in for nothing."

DWIGHT'S DEFINITION OF DRUNKENNESS.—"Drunkenness is that singular state of man, in which he loses, either partially or wholly, the use of his bodily and mental powers, under the operation of spirituous drink, opium, or other means of intoxication. Drunkenness is either occasional or habitual. Occasional drunkenness exists only in irregular, separate, solitary, or even singular instances, and is produced sometimes by design, and sometimes by accident. Habitual drunkenness is a frequent, and usually a regular intoxication; occasioned by that increased and peculiar love of strong drink, which is generated by occasional drunkenness." So that, if so much intoxicating drink is swallowed by man or woman, as to cause some loss of bodily strength, or to obscure the reason, or infuriate the temper, or excite any other corrupt passion, you have then a case of drunkenness.

[This accords with Luther's definition of drunkenness, who asserts that a man is drunk who does that under the influence of drink which he would not have done before drinking.—*Ed. B. T. H.*]

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We are sorry that we must still omit the following communications till our next number:—Boston, Clarence, Trafalgar, Brome, and the communication of K. Cameron. Several communications are under consideration.

Canada Temperance Advocate.

MONTREAL, OCTOBER 15, 1852.

THE TRUE WITNESS ON STATE RIGHTS, &c.

With that patience and perseverance that becomes us, in consideration of our responsible position, we have overcome our hesitations, and have (though somewhat wearily) urged our way through something over two columns of good type work, badly employed by the Editor of the *True Witness*, against the Maine Liquor Law. The whole is but a repetition of several former efforts to mystify the matter, and misrepresent both the nature and design of the Maine Law. Sometimes our opponent would be considered rather amusing, if he were not really blasphemous; and at other times quite witty, if he were not very wicked. What can be thought of the following sublime passage—"Then again we are called upon to do honor to a new Yankee Messiah, called Neal Dow, or some such name, who has discovered a notable plan for redeeming man by Statute, and whose mission is destined quite to eclipse that of an obsolete Galilean Reformer, once in high repute, but now far behind the requirements of an enlightened and progressive age, though well enough suited to the dark times in which he lived." Such poison can do no harm to sensible persons, just because they don't swallow it, but we sincerely pity the man who, knowing better things, can descend to such mean and contemptible misrepresentations.

As we have intimated, this further effort of the *True Witness*, against the Maine Liquor Law, is only a rehashing and extension of the oft-repeated and oft-answered objections to the measure—the law is classed by "the adversary" with sumptuary laws—and liquor is considered as harmless as tea, sugar, and other articles not "malum per se;" whereas every child in the land knows that such a classification of "articles of luxury" is wholly improper and unjust; and also, that the Maine Law says not one word about what a person shall or shall not eat and drink.

The *True Witness* says that the State has the right to raise a revenue upon all manufactured, imported, or merchantable commodities, whether they be sugar, tea, or spirituous liquors; "but he argues that the State has no right to abrogate or annul a natural right, which he alleges every man possesses, to import, or make and sell liquor if he chooses. Now, the questions of natural rights and State rights may be fitly introduced into this controversy, but not in the way set forth by "the adversary," who speaks of natural rights as though each individual was entirely independent of every other, and could act, or had a right to act irrespective of the rights and claims of others. Man was made for society, and the individual possesses not any "natural right" which, when exercised, inflicts a social wrong. The rights of the individual, and of society, "naturally" harmonize. In a perfect state they could not conflict, but, as we see every day practices opposed to what is right, so there arises a necessity for society to take some method of expressing its sense of what is right or what is wrong. The *True Witness* says that every man has a "right" to make or import sugar, tea, or liquor; now, if tea and sugar were as injurious to society as liquor is known to be, then, we contend the right to make, import or traffic in them does not exist. The law may give a legal right to do what is morally wrong, but that cannot change the nature of things; and when the immutable principles of the supreme law of action are acknowledged and felt in all their power and authority, then the human law must be repealed and made accordant with the law of inflexible justice.