

to be treated as either having or imparting any assessable value. Further careful examination shows that from hotels, on account of the comparatively small amount of personal property contained, are paid proportionally less taxes than are paid from any other equally valuable places of business. Still further, the contiguity of a tavern or a saloon always depreciates the market value of other real estate, specially of such as may be used for private residences. No respectable person wants to live next door to a bar-room. The real state of the case is that a license to sell liquor is an injury to all property in its neighborhood. Less taxes are paid, insurance is higher, adjoining property is depreciated, and the business instincts of the public, as well as the common sense of all thoughtful people, and the moral sentiment of those who have the best interests of their fellow-men at heart denounce the whole thing as **UTTERLY BAD.**

WESTMORELAND.

The Scott Act has never been repealed. No place that has secured its blessings has ever gone back to license. Another attempt has met with the same fate as those that went before. We have not the exact figures before us, but we have enough to assure us that the electors have again declared their faith in the Temperance Act of 1878. The majority is small but it must be noticed that the number of votes cast by the temperance party is much greater than at the former election. This makes seven consecutive victories, and the last defeat we sustained was only the defeat of a tie vote. It is nearly three years since our opponents had a majority. The tide is still rising. We "thank God and take courage."

Selected Articles

WILL YOU VOTE FOR IT?

What is the form of evil that most excites your compassion, and for the reform or diminution of which you long, and are willing to labor, pray and pay.

Is it the ruin and prostitution of young girls? That is one of the most appalling evils that afflict society; but in probably nine cases out of ten they are first betrayed by means of liquor at picnics, dance gardens, moonlight excursions, or pleasure parties. Prohibition of the liquor traffic, therefore, will do far more for the diminution of licentiousness and prostitution than any other means that can be used. For every fallen woman reclaimed by the most earnest and benevolent efforts, ten would be saved from falling by the prohibition of the liquor traffic.

Will you vote for it?

Or is it the ruin of the young men, many of them sons of worthy families, that excites your compassion most? Are you sorry for fond fathers and mothers who see their darling boys going down to destruction? In ninety-nine cases in the hundred of the ruin of young men, intoxicating drinks are the chief means of that ruin, and the prohibition of the liquor traffic would prevent it.

Will you vote for it?

In a singularly powerful poem, entitled the "Devil's Walk," that adversary is described as laughing especially at those who are working earnestly for a good object, and defeating their own efforts by their own example or business. How he would laugh at those who pray and labor for the reformation of their ruined sons, whilst all the time using intoxicating drinks at their own tables!

Will you vote for extricating them from this bondage of fashion, in obedience to which they thus lead their offspring astray?

Or is it the working classes, whose families are destitute of comfort, and often in extreme poverty and want? Do the poor, overworked, sickly suffering wives excite your compassion? Do the scantily-clad and gutter-loving children awaken your sympathy? Do the tales of wife-beating and, not rarely, wife-murder, excite your horror? And does the aversion of these classes to religion alarm you? All these evils are brought on chiefly

through the use of intoxicating drinks, to which they are tempted by liquor shops at almost every corner, and often three or four in a single block. Depend upon it, the stopping of this infernal traffic would do more for the working classes than any or all other kinds of benevolent legislation.

Will you then vote for prohibition?

It may be that it is the intemperance of the higher classes, as they are styled, or "first families," or "upper ten," which most excites your sympathy; and truly many of them have a skeleton closet somewhere. Even this class may be saved from most of their domestic woes by one word—prohibition.

Will you vote for it?

Is its Sabbath desecration that you most bemoan? Prohibition would do more to prevent that than all other preventive laws put together.

Will you vote for it?

Is it the thinness of the attendance on the greater part of the churches that especially affects you? The same answer comes up. Drinking habits are at war with religion, and they consume the means necessary for decent clothing, or for helping to support a church. The most effectual way to fill the churches with working men and their families is to prohibit the liquor traffic.

Will you vote for that way?

Perhaps you painfully contrast the amount of money used for the conversion of the world to Christ, and sigh and cry over the enormous disproportion between the money paid for intoxicating drinks and that given for the conversion of the world. If you want to increase the latter a hundred fold, vote for the prohibition of the drink traffic.

Will you do so?

We might go on multiplying these self-evident arguments, but we leave the intelligent reader to supplement those which we have embodied in this article, which is written to entreat and persuade all readers to come to the help of the Lord against the mightiest enemies of His kingdom, by voting for the prohibition of the traffic in intoxicating drinks.

Reader, will you do so at this time when there is a good prospect of the success of prohibition by a long pull and a strong pull and a pull altogether on the part of the good elements of society?—*Weekly Witness.*

POOR IOWA.

HOW PROHIBITION IS GOING TO RUIN IT.

It all comes to me like a revelation—how your beautiful State is to be ruined by prohibition. I beg of you to let me lift my warning voice and let me try to convince you of your error before it is too late. There is time yet to save your State from the foul destroyer, temperance.

Hear me! Now suppose you prohibit the sale of whiskey, and the other states have to drink the entire product, where will it leave your fair State! Take one thousand bushels of Iowa corn, and watch its progress under the soul-saving regime of intemperance: This corn is sold for fifty cents a bushel to the distiller; the state gets \$400 for it; the distiller makes this thousand bushels of corn into 4,000 gallons of whiskey—beautiful, health-giving whiskey. If he is a Des Moines distiller, he pays \$4,000 revenue tax on it to the government, or to the other states; this \$4,000 goes out of the state. Then this 4,000 gallons of whiskey is diluted and sold to the people for \$8,000. What a beautiful idea! How lovely for the farmer to sell his thousand bushels of wheat for \$400 and buy it back for \$8,000. Then, without prohibition, the happy farmers all go to work to drink up these 4,000 gallons of whiskey. What a beautiful sight! I can even now see the happy farmers as they come home at night and stagger in upon their happy wives. I can see them put mortgages on their beautiful farms; I can see them whip their horses and children and make them so happy! Some go to the beautiful goals—some sleep in picturesque station-houses instead of those miserable feather beds in comfortable homes. Then when the 4,000 gallons of whiskey are all drunk up, and the \$4,000 revenue tax on it has all gone out of the state of Iowa, and the farmers have paid out \$8,000 for what they sold for \$400—when you see all this how can you favor prohibition?