

### IMPORTANT TESTIMONY FOR THE LABOURING MAN.

Mr. Richards, of Elland (Ohio), in a communication made to the American Temperance Union, makes the following statement, which we commend to the special notice of the labouring man:—

We had an extremely troublesome milldam, made of brush and stone, across the great Miami river, which required repairing every year; this had been kept up some twenty years previous, and five men had always been considered necessary to propel the boat against the stream where the stones were, and there they had to be taken from the bed of the river, which subjected them to great exposure. Extraordinary wages were given on this account, and the liability to fever and ague. For two years I acquiesced in the prevailing opinion that whiskey was absolutely necessary to command the services, and protect from disease the persons employed in this duty. A barrel was placed where they could draw as much as they chose, under the understanding that any one using it to interfere with his work, would be discharged. This I was soon obliged to change for a jug full, such as they agreed, when sober, was enough. This I was obliged to change for five allowances in separate vessels; even this subjected our little village to disturbance, and myself to abuse, for withholding further supplies, until I concluded, let what would happen, to dispense with the use of it altogether, and if possible, to have the work performed by men who did not require it. The third year we commenced on this plan, which was continued while I had control of the establishment, and it proved that the work was better done, at less expense, without riot or disorder; and that three men then, ever since, and now, perform the service for which five had always been considered necessary, and that not one case of fever and ague occurred, where five had formerly.

We extract the following from a letter of Gerrit Smith Esq., in reply to a pamphlet of a Mr. Hopkins, in defence of the use of vinous and fermented liquors:

"It is in the conclusions of science and observation that we learn what is best to eat, drink and wear. The Bible is valuable, is indispensable, to enforce these conclusions upon us. Having learnt, from the legitimate sources of such knowledge, that raw meat is unadapted to the stomach, and calculated to shorten human life, I cannot eat it without doing violence to such scriptural injunctions as "Do thyself no harm," "Thou shalt not kill," and having learnt in like manner that certain drinks are pernicious, the Bible equally requires me to yield to my convictions of truth, and to refrain from them. To run to the Bible for contradiction of a fact which has been clearly taught us by nature and providence, is to be guilty of attempting to bring the God of revelation into collision with the God of nature and providence. To run to the Bible for authority for the indulgence of an appetite which nature and providence clearly teach us is injurious, is to be guilty of attempting to make the Bible the minister and cover of sin. Whether fermented wine and cider are suitable beverages for

us, turns not at all on the question whether they were drank by the holy men of the world eighteen hundred years ago. It turns simply on the question, whether we find it healthful and safe—safe to ourselves and to others—for us to drink them. Now I venture to say that not one distinguished chemist or physician in this State, or in all New England, would assert that fermented liquors are useful to persons in health; and I take it for granted that your own observation long ago convinced you that for the sober to drink these liquors, is to keep streams of death open to the unhappy drunkards who are intermingled with them in the relations of society."

### AN IMPORTANT QUESTION.

*From the Temperance Recorder.*

The following facts were sent us by a worthy and highly respectable minister of the Methodist Episcopal church—and we hope the alarming truths, with the natural and necessary inferences, will produce abiding conviction in the bosom of every reader, *that it is not right to license men to do such wrong.*

Who is most to be blamed, he who sells the *first* or the *last* poison to the drunkard, or are both guilty alike?

A tavern-keeper of my acquaintance, a *professor of religion*, related to me, a few days since, the following circumstance: "A man who been to market, probably with a load of wood, on a very cold day last week, as he was returning just at night, called at my house. Not being in the bar-room myself, he desired my boy to let him have some rum. The boy, not considering that he was nearly drunk already, complied with his wishes. He drank it and went his way. Not long after his departure he was met by a man, who found him lying on his sled upon his back, totally helpless, and nearly frozen to death. He contrived to turn his oxen about and drive them back to my house. We carried him in and worked at him until near nine o'clock in the evening before he became perfectly recovered. Indeed, a little more and he would have died, on our hands. After he had recovered he insisted on going home, which was a considerable distance, as his family would be much concerned about him. So I let him depart, sending my hired man to see him safe over the river. But for all this kindness he never offered to pay one cent, nor even thanked us." What do you think was my reply to this unfortunate tavern-keeper? Why, I told him the man served him *just right*. He had administered the *poison*, and I thought he ought to take on himself the expense of the *cure*. I told him I thought he might be very thankful the man did not die under the influence of the dreadful poison, and he *have been* subjected to an arrest for manslaughter, if not for *murder*! And how do you think this *pious* tavern-keeper justified himself in this case? First he remarked, that he did not give him the rum, it was his *boy*. When I had driven him from this *subterfuge*, by showing him that he was the one who was accountable to his country and his God, he then remarked, that he had not laid the foundation for his drunkenness, for he was more