

QUITE CONTEMPTIBLE.

That Is How Our Washing-  
ton Correspondent Views  
the Proposition

Of the Library Committee of the Senate,  
Which Wishes to Fill Certain Panels  
in the Capitol Dome With Repre-  
sentations of Romanism.

CAPITAL PATRIOTIC PRESS BUREAU,  
Washington, D. C., June 30, '96.

In a former letter I referred to the contemptible proposition of the library committee of the senate to fill the remaining panel in the celebrated frieze in the dome of the Capitol building with representations of Grover Cleveland, Mrs. Potter Palmer and the Duke of Veragua at the Chicago World's Fair. If the American people were to search the world over they could not find a more objectionable trio with which to adorn this sacred temple of liberty. Grover Cleveland, whose name will go down to history in blackest disgrace; Mrs. Potter Palmer, than whom a more dangerous female emissary of popery in America, since the demise of Mrs. Ellen Sherman, does not live, and the Duke of Veragua, that alien aristocratic tramp and royal beggar, gambler and bullbroeder of Inquisitorial Spain—ye gods! Should this crowning papal infamy be perpetrated, the American people would be justified in raiding the historic building and smashing into smithereens every Romish idol and effacing every papal fetish object in sight! Here, friends, are the names of the senate committee on the library who have this matter in charge: Henry C. Hansbrough, of North Dakota; George P. Wetmore, of Rhode Island, and Daniel W. Voorhees, of Indiana. Their addresses, respectively, follow in the above order, viz: Devil's Lake, N. D.; Newport, R. I., and Terre Haute, Ind. Write each and all of them—flood them—drown them with protestations against this outrage, and continue to remonstrate when congress re-convenes in December, and do all you can to thwart this most damnable Romish invasion of our nation's most sacred edifice. Hansbrough's term expires next March. He has served the Romanists well, both in the house and senate, and should be promptly retired when his term is out. Wetmore's term unfortunately does not expire till 1901. Voorhees has always been the faithful tool of the papists, during his long career in both branches of congress, and to his influence on the library committee is due much of the disgraceful befouling of the Capitol with objects of Romish fetishism. It is high time to retire him also.

That there has long been a concerted scheme on the part of Roman authorities to fill the Capitol with statues and portraits of noted Catholic personages and pictures of conspicuous events in the history of the Catholic church, is apparent. One meets with them at every turn. Their introduction has been so quietly and clandestinely managed as to be scarcely observed by the public. The Catholic crosses confront you upon all sides. It is seen prominently in one of the four paintings that adorn the walls of the hall of Representatives, and is carefully pointed out and exhibited to visitors by the Catholic guides who swarm in the building. Romish emblems and pictures of prominent characters in the annals of the Catholic church in America, from the landing of Colombo at San Salvador to the present time, stare you impudently in the face wherever you go. The massive bronze outer doors of the main entrance are covered with representations of striking occurrences associated with the bright side of the Roman church in the old world; while at the same time in a dark and obscure corner, hidden away among the rubbish in a crypt in the basement, covered with dust and mildew, lies a bust of the immortal Garibaldi, and no manner of urging and petitioning has been able to have it brought forth from its obscurity to public view. The agents of Rome prevent it.

But of all the bold intrusions of papal portraiture, holy heraldry and trashy trappings which abound in the Capitol to constantly remind one of the presence of popery, none is so impudently offensive to Americans as that magnificently-wrought statue of Pere Marquette which disgraces Statuary hall. As a work of art, it is superb, as a representative character in the history of the republic, it is a stupendous fraud and egregious lie. It is a pernicious presentment of one whose notoriety alone consists in his having

been, in life, a Jesuit priest—a member of that band of impious brigands well styled "burglars of the universe." He lived and died one hundred years before the republic was born. He came to the wilderness of America at the command of his master, just as all Jesuit priests go wherever they are sent. When he became a Jesuit priest he took this oath. Read it, Americans, and then say if I am asking too much of you, when I recommend the unceremonious exclusion of this insulting embodiment of murder and treason from the hall set apart for statesmen and patriots, and the prompt punishment of the pious villains who had the effrontery to desecrate the republic's pantheon with its offensive presence. The oath Marquette took reads, in part, as follows:

I, James Marquette, in the presence of Almighty God and (then follows a long string of names of blessed virgins and saints and angels and archangels and apostles and somebody's "ghostly father," and Ignatius Loyola himself) to declare and swear that his holiness, the pope, \* \* \* hath power to depose heretical kings, princes, states, commonwealths and governments, all being illegal without his sacred confirmation, and they may safely be destroyed. Therefore, to the utmost of my power I will defend this doctrine and his holiness' right and custom against all usurpers of the heretical or Protestant authority whatsoever. \* \* \*

I do now renounce and disown any allegiance as due to any heretical king, prince or state, named Protestant or Liberal, or obedience to any of their laws or magistrates or officers. That I will go to any part of the world whithersoever I may be sent, to the frozen regions of the North, the burning sands of the desert of Africa, or the Jungles of India, to the centers of civilization of Europe, or to the wild haunts of the barbarous savages of America, without murmuring or repining; and will be submissive in all things whatsoever communicated to me.

I do furthermore promise and declare that I will, when opportunity presents, make and wage relentless war, secretly or openly, against all heretics, Protestants and Liberals, as I am directed to do, to exterminate them from the face of the whole earth; and that I will spare neither age, sex or condition, and that I will hang, burn, waste, boil, flay, strangle, and bury alive these infamous heretics, rip up the stomachs and wombs of their women, and crush their infant's heads against the walls, in order to annihilate their execrable race. That when the same cannot be done openly, I will secretly use the poisonous cup, the strangulating cord, the steel of the poniard, or the leaden bullets, regardless of the honor, rank, dignity or authority of the person or persons, whatever may be their condition in life, either public or private, as I at any time may be directed so to do, by any agent of the pope, or superior of the priesthood of the holy father of the Society of Jesus.

In confirmation of which I hereby dedicate my life, my soul, and all corporeal powers, and with this dagger which I now receive, I will subscribe my name, written in my blood, in testimony thereof; and should I prove false or weaken in my determination, may my brethren and my fellow-soldiers of the militia of the pope cut off my hands and my feet, and my throat from ear to ear, my belly opened and sulphur burned therein, with all the punishment that can be inflicted upon me on earth, and my soul be tortured by demons in an eternal hell forever.

And of which I, James Marquette, do swear by the blessed Trinity, and blessed sacrament which I am now to receive, to perform, and on my part to keep inviolable; and do call all the heavenly and glorious host of heaven to witness my real intentions to keep this my oath.

In testimony hereof I take this most holy and blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist, and witness the same further, with my name written with the point of this dagger, dipped in my own blood, and seal in the face of this holy covenant.

To assist in promoting the objects indicated in the form of oath from which I quote, and which is imposed today upon every Jesuit priest, Marquette was sent to the "wilds of America." After roaming about through the northwest in the interest of his holiness, possibly running against the Mississippi river at some point in the wilderness, but "discovering" nothing, for Desoto had discovered it nearly two hundred years before that time, while Joliet explored its banks in what is now Wisconsin twenty-five years before he met Marquette, the latter died and was buried in what is now Michigan, a century before this nation came into existence, and this

was the extent of his connection with its history. But the papists of Wisconsin had no one else to select to represent them, and so they decided to take Marquette. And there he stands, toweringly, by the side of the immortal Lincoln, whom his fellow Jesuits in later years slew, as per oath above quoted. He is clothed in cowl and gown and priestly habit, a rosary and crucifix and medallion of the Virgin Mary resting beneath his girdle. Two papist detectives, paid by the government are in constant watch over the precious marble, lest some exasperated American should in his indignation break it to pieces. One of these Romish watchmen, named Joyce, has in his possession and prize as a holy relic a portion of an arrow which some American vandal kicked from the figure of the savage on the base of the pedestal.

The whole obnoxious pile should be toted out to the American vatican—erroneously called the "Catholic University"—a few miles to the north of the Capitol, where already the statue of a Pope Leo graces the campus, or Wisconsin should promptly order the objectionable thing back whence it came.

A bill accepting it passed in the senate, owing to the preponderating papal influence in that body, and especially owing to the efforts of the senate library committee, which had the matter in charge, and of which I speak elsewhere in this letter, but the corresponding committee in the house is not likely to report the bill favorably because an American—Mr. Harmer—is its chairman, nor will the house, as at present constituted, pass the un-American measure. Friends should write to Mr. Harmer now, protesting against the acceptance of the statue. His address is, Alfred C. Harmer, Philadelphia, Pa.

Next winter will witness a royal contest in congress over the matter, and it behooves the Americans in and out of congress to stand by Mr. Linton and his friends in their vigorous and righteous warfare against this culminating infamy of Romish aggression upon the nation's Capitol. A. J. B.

WHO WILL GET THE PROPERTY?

Sister Carmelita or the Roman Catholic Church?

NEW YORK, July 2.—The trial of the action brought by Richard White Hennessy to contest the will of his aunt, Mary Frances Baker, known in religion as Sister Carmelita, was resumed yesterday before Surrogate Fitzgerald. Sister Carmelita, it is contended, was a Sister of Charity, and among other vows, took the one of poverty. She died last August, leaving an estate valued at between \$150,000 and \$200,000. This property was left to her niece, Mary Sullivan, by a will executed February 27, 1895.

M. J. Sullivan, a brother-in-law of Sister Carmelita, denied yesterday that she was a sister of Mercy. Mr. Sullivan said that Sister Carmelita became a Sister of Charity when she was about 18 years old, and had always remained in that order. He also said that Sister Carmelita inherited the property about two years after she became a Sister of Charity. When she was asked if she had not taken the vow of poverty, Mr. Sullivan said that Sister Carmelita had done so, but had received permission from Vicar-General Quinn, the principal advisor of the order to which she belonged, to hold the property.

Only a Piece of Bunting.

As we read in a Boston journal that "the American flag is no more than any piece of bunting," we can almost see the bright sun-light which covers the Bunker Hill monument turn to a bluish of shame. What changes a century brings! It was there that the resistance to British oppression had its birth. It was there and at Lexington that the first blood in the great war which gave us liberty and national existence was shed. It was there that the life current of the immortal Warren moistened the glorious banner that a Boston paper now characterizes as "only a piece of bunting." Can it be that the spirit of liberty, that love for our flag, no longer finds a place in the hearts of the children of the patriots of long ago? We cannot believe it. We would rather believe that the words above quoted are only the vapors of some English lordling, and that his sentiments find no echo in the hearts of the people who live in the shadow of that grand monument which Webster said "would stand through the ages as a testimonial of patriotism and liberty."—Missoula Republican.

\$100 Reward.

I will give \$100 to anyone satisfactorily answering the diamond proposition on pages 109 and 110 in Coins Financial School. A. S. LONDON, 382 Washington Boulevard, Chicago.

TORE DOWN THE FLAG

Widow of Jack Galligan, ex-Chief of Omaha Fire Department,

Shows Her Hatred for the American Flag by Pulling It Down, Tearing It into Shreds, Stamping and Spitting Upon It.

People who were passing along 18th and Webster streets last Friday morning were witnesses to a most tragic affair. They saw the American flag pulled from its staff; saw it torn into fragments; its beautiful folds crumpled and twisted; then dumped into the dust of the street, where it was both stamped and spat upon.

The dastardly act was committed by a woman, and the woman is the widow of Jack Galligan, an old Roman Catholic soldier, who had been a member of the fire department of Omaha for about twenty years, and a good portion of that time the chief of the department.

Friday, however, Mrs. Galligan got into a tantrum because a lady who rents from her a beautiful American flag to the house.

As soon as Mrs. Galligan saw it she ran and jumped the fence, pulled down the flag, and desecrated it as above described.

Mrs. Galligan is a large woman, while the lady who nailed the flag up to the house is not up to the average in height or weight; but, in spite of this, when she saw what was happening to her country's flag, she started to its rescue. Before she could get the screen door unlocked, however, the mischief had been wrought, and Mrs. Galligan was yelling and stamping and spitting at it in a most disgraceful manner.

As the owner of the flag stooped to gather up the pieces she saw a boy driving by in a delivery wagon. She hailed him and asked where the nearest telephone was located, as she wished to telephone for some friends or to an editor.

Just as she did so two gentlemen came up Webster street, and she hailed them also, and called their attention to the torn and dirty fragments of a once beautiful flag.

While she was explaining that Mrs. Galligan had torn and stamped and spat upon the flag, that worthy yelled back: "Yes, and I'll tear you, too, if you don't stop hanging that dirty old rag on my house."

Later in the day the husband of Mrs. Galligan's neighbor came to our office and gave us the above information, and advised us to go to his house and have his wife verify the statements.

It was about 4 o'clock Friday afternoon when we reached the Galligan property. In the corner house lives Mrs. Galligan and south of her are two cottages which she rents to Protestant families. It was from the house next to that occupied by Mrs. Galligan that the flag was torn, and it was there we went for information. From what we could glean, the widow has for some time been referring to the flag as "that old rag," and has been ranting against all secret societies, declaring that she would be living when they were all dead and in hell, and that she had no use for any of them except for what money she could get out of them.

Mrs. Galligan has applied for a pension from the city since the death of her husband, and is now applying for a pension from the national government. The disgraceful and disloyal exhibition above narrated should forever stand as a bar to her appeal for aid. No person who deliberately, maliciously and traitorously desecrates the American flag is worthy aid or even protection under its folds, but all such persons should be shot down with as little compunction as if they were rabid dogs or actual invading enemies.

Long wave the flag.  
Death to its despoilers.

What of the Convents?

BY SCOTT F. HERSHEY, PH. D.

The very safety of the government rests on the supremacy of law. One power has always opposed the supremacy in the United States over a certain class of institutions. This power is the Roman Catholic church. Its institutions are conducted in violation of both the principle and letter of our laws, and the church coolly nullifies the law at pleasure. This right to abrogate civil law is clearly expressed in the organic law of that church. According to the latest issue of her canon law, bearing the authorization of the pope (that of Smith) it is expressly held that the church alone can define

the jurisdiction of the civil power, and warn the state off the domain of the church.

Nowhere is this shown more than in the management of her conventual institution. They are men contrary to law in every particular. Long ago we should have taken this Spanish importation of the Romish inquisition into hand. The convent is subversive of rights and liberties, and ought to be made subject to law, or abolished altogether.

They are rivals of the working classes, of conducting, in the larger cities, extensive industrial enterprises, and so reducing their field for a livelihood. In some of the countries of Europe this has contributed to the cause for their suppression. There is a bad odor about the convent. There are too many tales of wrong, crime and vice issuing from these places. No Protestant church in the land could survive under a like unsavory odor. Have we a lower standard for the Roman Catholic church?

The convent is Spanish and cruel. It is more like the Spanish inquisition, in its cruel methods, than anything we have in this country. According to the latest issued canon law of the Roman church, the church has the right, and irrespective of any civil law, to punish by fines, whippings, imprisonment, and even death. No reasonable person, informed with the facts of convent life, doubts that this law is enforced behind the convent walls. Some of us know of actual cases investigated.

The convent establishment is contrary to our law in every particular. We have two fundamental principles of constitutional law bearing upon this subject of individual rights. The one is that of those "certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness;" the other declaring that "no person shall be deprived of liberty without due process of law." Out of these have sprung an elaborate system of statutory provision to protect the just liberties of the individual. Thousands are held by restraint behind convent keys, deprived of all show of these guaranteed rights. It is a thing wonderfully strange to contemplate that our people submit to such wrongs against their fellow beings.

The most recent report issued by the Roman Catholics, covering these institutions, which happens to be at my hands, is for the year 1894. In that year is reported seventy convents for the diocese of Boston alone, with twenty-two monastic institutions, which are fully as bad as the convents, and quite as un-American in their character.

In the entire United States, in 1894, there were 1405 convents. Each of these is a prison, not established by law, but forcibly holding in confinement, women who have committed no crime. If certain calculations and estimates made are not wholly misleading, these places average about sixty inmates. This makes an aggregate of 84,300 conventual prisoners in the United States. Close by this statement I desire to make that made by a Roman Catholic authority, that there are only 300 total abstainers from strong drink among the 6,000 priests in the United States, and refer to the provision made in the law of that church for a lighter penalty against ecclesiastics who keep concubines, than for having wives.

The convent door should be opened for civil inspection, and the call of any friends of the inmates, or the thing should be abolished. In every country in Europe, except Great Britain, the convents have been made subject to state inspection, or made liable to suppression. In some countries they have been abolished. I think it was some twenty years ago they were all suppressed in Italy but about two. Mexico has had to take up the convent and monastery evil with a strong hand.

The gigantic fault of the American people is, that we allow an evil to grow until it becomes entrenched in power almost equal to that of the national government.

BOSTON, Mass., July 6, 1896.

Papal Dictation in Politics.

Has it come to this, that Archbishop Ireland controls the great Republican party and dictates what shall not go into the platform of the Republican national convention at St. Louis? It is stated by good authority that a few days before the convention this Roman prelate sent to T. H. Carter, chairman of the Republican national committee the following telegram:

ST. PAUL, June 17, 1896.—To Hon. Thos. H. Carter, National Committeeman, St. Louis.—The clause in the proposed platform opposing the use of public money for sectarian purposes and a union of church and state is unnecessary and uncalled for. It is urged by the A. P. A. Its adoption will be taken by them as a concession to them,

will a waken religious animosity in the country and do much harm. The Republican party should not lower itself to recognize directly or indirectly the A. P. A. I hope the clause, or anything like it, will not be adopted. JOHN IRELAND.

By his dictation the offensive plank was knocked out of the proposed platform. Hence in view of these facts it is evident that the Roman Catholics politically dictate and control to a great extent the Republican party, and it does not seem that the American Protective Association was organized any too soon.

The Archbishop knew his man, to whom he sent his telegram. Chairman Carter was, we think, the same Senator Carter who voted for the confirmation of Coppinger, and he was associated in the convention with two other gentlemen, to whom he showed the telegram. R. C. Korens also of the national committee, a strong Roman Catholic and political adviser of Satolli, and E. Lauterbach, from New York, all of whom obeyed implicitly the dictation of the archbishop and removed every vestige of patriotic Americanism from the Republican platform. What a sad spectacle for angels and men to behold! The great Republican party in its delegated national convention in 1896 surrendering every principle of true Americanism to the behest of the papal hierarchy, the well-known enemy of American free institutions.

The great political pot is now fomenting and running over in all directions as never before, and no one can tell how politics will pour out in November. Although the Republicans now feel sure of the election of McKinley, but the most that can be truthfully said is that if so and so takes place so and so will be the result.

The political results of Archbishop Ireland's telegram to the Republican convention shows very clearly the strong political grip the Roman Catholics have upon the Republican party to-day. In time past Rome has generally voted in a body for some party and have often elected its president, and we think it will unite more closely at the polls in this ensuing campaign than ever before. Without question the hierarchy has of late done its utmost to Romanize the Republican leaders, either by offering boodle or fair promises of political promotion, but some of its wily schemes have totally failed. But since the nomination of McKinley the Roman Catholics evidently do not like him and will not support the Republican ticket, for the following reasons:

First—Because McKinley would not make pledges to the Roman power.

Second—Because the Roman boodle scheme to break up the American Protective Association proved a dead failure.

Third—Because when the special committee sent by the supreme council of the A. P. A. to interview McKinley as to his Americanism and showed him its platform of principles he replied, "Gentlemen—I am already familiar with the principles of your organization and sympathize with them. I can see nothing in them which any good American cannot support."

Fourth—Because the A. P. A. removed the political boycott from McKinley, making him equally as eligible to A. P. A. support as other candidates for presidential nomination.

Fifth—Because the Roman hierarchy hates the A. P. A., its platform of principles and the nominee for president that it cannot use for its own special political advantage. Now under these circumstances we do not believe that the Roman Catholics will support McKinley. Neither do we believe that Romanized Republican politicians and their constituents will all support him, and we know that the silver Republicans will not; and furthermore we believe that the A. P. A. will not vote for him, standing on such a platform of principles, though he may be himself considered an acceptable American. And as to what the great American Protective Association will do in this political emergency we cannot say, nor are we much concerned about it, for it is fully able to take care of itself, and not only so, but it is strong enough, wise enough, brave enough and persevering enough to check the political power of Rome in this country and to entirely turn it down in the near future. J. G. P.

Two Pails.

Because you are steady,  
And take on your shoulder,  
A pailful of water,  
Do not become bolder,  
And say to the people:  
"Come hither, my brother,  
This work is so easy,  
Just give me another."  
The political Rome  
Is one pail of water,  
And the silver and gold  
Is another; it brought her.  
X. SAW WOOD.