

Shall the Nunery Go?

I was much impressed, not long since, by a story told me by a woman who was deeply interested in the subject of the Catholic incarceration, if I may so term it, of young women. I suppose some Catholic prelate would pronounce that term a libel; let us say self-incarceration, then, if that will be the nearer to exactness, though I still submit it is incarceration in essence, for which the Catholic church is responsible.

She had lived in an eastern city, and her daughter had been the playmate of a young girl who had but recently been located in a Catholic institution in a city here in the west. The two girls had not seen each other for several years, and one day the mother and daughter went to the convent to meet the young nun. By some unusual clemency they were allowed to see her without much red tape, and to see her comparatively alone.

The young woman who had gone into the convent had been a reigning belle in the eastern city, but she had been something more than this, had been a young woman of strong mental parts, and a very useful and valuable member of the society in which she moved. Some heart distress had come to her, and she looked to a convent for relief. The two girls entered into conversation, although they were closely watched by an old nun, whom the mother tried to engage in conversation as much as possible, in order that she might give the two all the time she could for the exchange of confidences.

Before she entered the convent the young woman had had, among her other attractions of face and figure and manner, a beautiful head of hair, which had been sacrificed when she entered the convent walls. In the conversation between the two this was mentioned, together with many other things which related to her past life, and the visitor soon found that the cruel deadening of all affection was slowly but surely doing its dreadful work. She had sacrificed her beautiful hair without a murmur—that was nothing, but not even the vows of nunship could prevent her telling the pain she suffered at the separation from her friends. She told her friend, her bosom friend in the happy days of the past, that she could not write to her more. She told her, also, that the rules of her life would eventually prevent her from in any way showing affection to her sister, her dearly beloved sister, whom she had loved with a passionate devotion before she entered this living tomb. She had been compelled to gradually make her letters to her sister less and less endearing, and all this with the knowledge that before long the terms of endearment must cease altogether, and finally the letters themselves must cease wholly.

"The tears were streaming down our faces," said the lady, "when we said good bye to her. She stood at the little lattice window and waved her hand to us. Nothing could wholly remove her wonderful beauty, but, Oh, the sadness of that face as she looked at us—it was all so terrible! I cannot understand how such things as this can be allowed in a country like this."

Is the day ever to come when such scenes as this will cease to be enacted under the name and cloak of religion? I quite fully appreciate the fact that some oily prelate may say that all this is the business of the Catholic church alone, and not the business of any one else; but is there anybody inside or outside the Catholic church, who has not wholly surrendered his power of thinking and deciding for himself, who will say that such scenes as this are the product of a wholesome religion, that they are, in fact, the product of any religion such as that which Christ taught?

I fall to find in my Bible anything which is warrant for such a hideous perversion of all that is noblest and sweetest in human life. I hope the day will come when the Catholic church members, a large number of whom in America are getting tired of the yoke of Rome as I most firmly believe, will rise up and say that there is no need for any more fostering of this shocking perversion of truth and justice and religion. I would that there might be some provision in the principles of a free government like this which would prevent this wholesale immolation, this travesty on religion, this unnatural act which is as un-American as it is un-Christian and un-Christian. Of course, no one doubts the legal right of entrance to a convent, but there are thousands of people in this country today who do question the propriety or justice of allowing such a system as this to maintain its foothold in this country.

It will be to the unending credit of some fearless Martin Luther of these later days if he shall nail upon the door where all may read it for all time to come, "THE NUNNERY MUST GO!"—Marcus Duncan in Chicago Standard.

The Papacy Illogical.

EDITOR THE AMERICAN:—Dear Sir: I wonder how the thoughtful and patriotic citizen must have been struck by reading the following sentence in the encyclical of the pope a few days ago: "The first care of Columbus was the evangelization of this country, which evangelization was realized by the Franciscan and Dominican monks and

Jesuit fathers." Just think for a moment! All the religious influence of the Pilgrim Fathers who came with their open Bible; the Presbyterian church with its profound learning; the early Dutch founding the reform church, the Methodists with their host of pious men and women, which molded and shaped our national character into a great and free nation; is counted for nothing. The Franciscan monk and the notorious Jesuit did it.

For so much courtesy, so great a toleration shown to papal authority giving full sway to the Roman church in our midst, the holy father sees only fit to repay us by slapping Protestantism in the very face. And still we do not protest. We bow our heads in profound silence and swallow every insult that holy man pleases to throw at us.

Where are we at? It would be well for the pope—or whomsoever wrote that famous epistle for him—to refresh his memory on his history. As early as 1484, Columbus publicly discussed his great scheme; and if the evangelization of the new world was the first care of Columbus, what, then, must we think of the pope (Innocence VIII) who neglected so great an opportunity, leaving the famous navigator a subject of poverty and distress. And that great time Columbus had at Salamanca is still amusing to read. Those ignorant and bigoted friars and monks, who were so able in detecting the slightest flaws in heresy, but totally blind to behold the idea of a new world, sneered at him, calling him a crank and pointing with their fingers to their empty heads as the mad man went out of the hall. Poor Columbus! Being 300 years ahead of his time, he had to remain a Catholic, for the simple reason there was no Protestant church yet for him to join.

And now, after Protestantism laid the foundation of this great commonwealth; after centuries of wonderful blessing and prosperity, this country, by its intelligence and civilization, is not to the front as the foremost nation of the earth; its free and generous institutions are such a desirable field of operation for the hierarchy of the Roman church that the pope over and over again, claims this country for his supremacy. But we are not ready for that yet, and in the name of the cold facts of history and of our good common sense, we protest against such poor logic, and frankly tell you, old man, you were off your base this time.

P. CHICAGO, Ill., February 8, 1895.

A Few Inequities.

I should like to ask a few questions of Americans who profess to be Protestants, who claim to love their flag, and to be independent, loyal citizens.

What is the reason that so many positions of trust, from the bank clerk and railroad official down to the boy laborer and kitchen girl, are held by Roman Catholics?

Why, if you feel such an antipathy towards the papacy, do you not, on hiring a servant, make the question of his or her faith, as to whether Protestant or papist, an important one in determining your decision?

Why, if you pretend to uphold the word which says, "Touch not, taste not, handle not," are you hand and glove with Roman Catholics in fetes and public receptions, such as the one given two weeks ago in Leavenworth, Kan., at which time I happened to be there, to the new United States senator, the pope exercising his exclusive prerogative, and rooking the otherwise compulsory Friday fast, to allow everyone to gorge and gormandize at the banquet as much as they pleased?

Why is it, when an A. P. A. lecture is delivered in a certain place, no matter how eloquently or ably it may be presented, it is not generally reported in any morning daily, but only in some local contemporary, representing the same cause?

Why do ministers of the gospel not denounce from their pulpits oftener than they do such an enemy to the Protestant Bible as the papal hierarchy?

Why does not the American immigration society make it a rule to admit to American shores only those willing to become Americanized?

And why is not the influx of Irish, Germans, dagoes and other foreigners, nine tenths of whom are the pope's adherents, discouraged instead of encouraged?

These questions have involuntarily intruded themselves upon my consideration, and I do not know where to look for the solution of them.

The following statement of a bishop of the Episcopal church is rather alarming to one who believes in "America for Americans": "We are fast becoming a conquered people. All the elements that have made our constitution work so easily for one hundred years, are changing every day, with every foreign vessel that lands its cargo at Castle Garden. In another generation your children and your children's children will be in the minority, and aliens will possess the land."

While I am pondering on the truth of this, I read in a certain California newspaper: "If on Sunday next nine clergymen should speak in favor of the A. P. A., and one should speak against it, the sermon of the one would be tele-

graphed all over the country, while the nine would not be noticed."

And as explanation of this was given the incredible information that "Rome rules the press!"

Can this, indeed, be so? Citizens and patriots, can it be said of you that you are cowards?

Are you traitors to the memory of the ancestors who "sailed through the bloody seas" to gain your country's freedom?

Then may liberty extinguish her lamp and sit down in the dust and ashes of departed glory?

HENRY S. HILTON.

Mother Superior in Court.

KANSAS CITY, Mo., February 12.—Last Saturday the county court room was filled to overflowing. The first writ of habeas corpus ever issued in this county was served on the mother superior of the "House of the Good Shepherd" for the possession of two girls.

The father of the girls is dead and their mother married a man named Greenwalt. Not long ago she ran away with another man, deserting her children, and leaving them in Greenwalt's possession. He placed them in the "Door of Hope," but the older girl, not liking to stay there, went with her sister to a friend's house on Oak street. From there she advertised and obtained work in a private family.

Mrs. Dillon, an aunt of the girls, living in Georgia, read the account of her sister in the papers, and telegraphed here to the girls, saying that she would come and take them home with her. Greenwalt received the telegram, and, saying nothing of it to the girls, placed them in the "House of the Good Shepherd."

Mrs. Dillon, on coming here and finding that the girls were at the "House of the Good Shepherd," went there and asked to see them. She was refused admittance, the sister who met her at the door saying that no one was allowed to be seen unless the applicant came with or held an order from the person putting them in. She then went to C. E. Burnham to see what the law would do. She employed him, and Friday he filed the writ of habeas corpus. Burnham then went to the "House of the Good Shepherd" and asked to see the girls, but was refused.

Saturday the case came up before the court and was laid over until Monday. Burnham asked the court for an order to interview the girls in the absence of the mother superior. It was granted. While Burnham and two ladies were speaking to the girls, the mother superior left and was seen no more. Burnham then asked that, as the mother superior, who came in charge of the girls, had left, the case be dismissed.

The Church Was Loser.

The Christian World refers to the subject of lotteries, and remarks: "Roman Catholics are great encouragers of gambling at bazaars. At Liverpool recently there were raffles for such trifles as a case of champagne, a litter of puppies, a pony and trap, a suite of furniture, and even for banknotes. At Peterborough a lottery, pure and simple, without even the bazaar, was organized, in aid of the building fund of All Souls' church and presbytery. The police, however, have stepped in and nipped the scheme in the bud. Canon Moser and Mr. Patrick Manley, a county councillor, were summoned for illegality, and it came out that thousands of books of sixpenny tickets were sent out all over the country. The defence was that it was thought a lottery on the Art Union principle would be legal. The bench ruled otherwise, but as the defendants had returned all money received, and had incurred a loss of £200 in expenses, they were simply acquitted in costs."

A Worthy Son.

John A. Logan, jr., of Youngstown, Ohio, has offered to donate 100 acres of land, being a portion of a beautiful farm close to Youngstown, as a site for the Orphans' Home of the Jr. O. U. A. M. He is the son of General John A. Logan.

CINCINNATI ITEMS.

The first number of a new patriotic paper to be known as the Cincinnati Constitution was issued last week.

Cincinnati council, No. 133, held what proved to be the most interesting meeting since it was organized. Sattoli's letter before the Gridiron club was read, and the debates and discussions that followed it made the meeting interesting and instructive. The first entertainment takes place on the 19th. It will be a hummer.

Cincinnati Lodge, No. 73, reports a large attendance for Tuesday night. After initiating eleven candidates the president addressed the council on "Pope Leo's Latest Encyclical—An American View of it," which subject he handled in a masterly manner. This council is apparently destined to be the largest in the city. The committee appointed to have charge of the open meeting which this council will hold on February 12, reports that they are progressing nicely, and will have an interesting programme to offer. Friends from other councils will always receive a hearty welcome from the members of "Old Glory" council, although standing room is usually at a premium after 8 o'clock.

SAVED THE WAFFER.

A Romish Priest Takes a Wafer Out of the Throat of a Dying Small-Pox Patient and Swallows It Himself.

In the Washington News of February 5, 1895, is an account of a Romish priest, named Father Rabbert, who had been several times called to the posthouse here to administer the last rites of his superstitious to the dying Romanists. In one case the poor fellow was nearly gone, and the priest lost no time in putting the sacred wafer into the mouth of the poor man, whose throat was so swollen that he could not possibly swallow it. This put the priest in a dilemma, for he teaches his people that the wafer, once consecrated by repeating over it the magic words, "hoc enim est corpus meum" (the origin of the expression *hocus focus*), is the body, soul and divinity of Jesus Christ, and of course it must not be thrown onto the floor, for this would be to offer the greatest indignity to our Lord and Saviour. The god must be swallowed by somebody, and if the moribund could not do it, the priest must. So the priest actually took it out of the mouth of this man, dying with small-pox, and swallowed it himself. Surely, "ignorance is the mother of devotion," is the hierarchy teaches.

Mr. L. I. Weller, a bigoted Romanist (by occupation a plumber) tells the above story as a proof of the devotion of the priest. On one occasion when Bishop McNamara came to this city and scattered his hand-bills, advertising a course of lectures on Romanism, Mr. Weller went to the commissioners and endeavored to persuade them not to allow McNamara to deliver his lectures, on the ground that it might cause a riot.

It is said that most of the priests are not foolish enough to believe what they teach about this wafer; but Father Rabbert is either a genuine believer or he has been practicing a slight-of-hand on his dupes by making believe he swallowed it, when in fact he did not. It is a question whether he is a fool or a knave.

Men are naturally superstitious, and there is but one way to get rid of it: Educate the children in a sound and sensible way, as it is done in the public schools. It must be a mental training, an intellectual development, calling forth and exercising the reason. A parochial school training on "hail Marys" will not do it. If Mr. Weller had received his early training in the public schools he certainly would not have reported the story of the priest swallowing a wafer out of the throat of a small-pox patient as a meritorious act, but rather as the act of a bigoted, superstitious fool. The question is a very serious one, whether our government should allow any and every superstitious body, calling itself a church, to take the children of our republic and cheat them of a sound education by filling their minds with vain and harmful superstitions. It is the right of every child to be fairly educated and fitted for the great battle of life, and it is the duty of the state to see that each of its children gets his rights. This ought not to be left to ignorant parents, nor to superstitious priests.

Most assuredly it should not be left to a foreign potentate to direct the education of our youth; and the American people should wage unrelenting war against the minions of the pope as long as he interferes in the education of our children.

CHASE ROYS.

Probably Afraid of Rome.

KANSAS CITY, Mo., Feb. 11, 1895.—EDITOR THE AMERICAN, Dear Sir: Please allow me a little space in your much esteemed and valuable paper, one that is read by every fair-minded and impartial reader, and which should be in the hands of every true American in Kansas City.

We have made an attempt, and a most glorious attempt, to redeem the fair name of Kansas City from boodling and hoodlums. The late election has voiced the sentiment of the people; already the issue is beginning to bear its fruit, and ere long the antagonism against the much abused A. P. A. will be a thing of the past.

But while Kansas Cityans, and Americans of every age and clime, are rejoicing and singing a *Te Deum Laudamus*, it is with much sorrow that I notice a sectarian spirit existing in our midst. One of our best known and most popular grocers, when asked for a donation to the "Door of Hope," an institution founded for the elevation of the wayward, I am sorry to say, positively refused to contribute by word or act one iota for its benefit. Can it be prejudice, can it be bigotry, can it be malice that would inspire a gentleman professing a non-sectarian feeling, and who has heretofore respected the patronage of the American citizens of Kansas City? Can it be that R. N. Williams, of 537 and 539 Main street, wholesale and retail grocer would, when called on by a committee of benevolent ladies, actually refuse and in ungentlemanly language condemn the "Door of Hope?" If such is the case, then Americans must know with whom they are dealing—they must know the time has arrived for action; and they must know where to place their dollars and cents. Americans, take warning! A word to the wise is sufficient. Respectfully,

LEONADAS.

If you desire to assist the cause subscribe for THE AMERICAN.

Special Master Commissioner's Sale.

Under and by virtue of an order of sale on decree of foreclosure of mortgage issued out of the district court for Douglas county, Nebraska, and to me directed, I will, on the 13th day of March, A. D. 1895, at one o'clock p. m. of said day, at the east front door of the county court house, in the city of Omaha, Douglas county, Nebraska, sell at public auction to the highest bidder for cash, the property described in said order of sale as follows, to-wit:

Lot thirteen (13) in block seventy-six (76) of Dundee Place, an addition to the city of Omaha, Nebraska, containing the sum of four thousand four hundred forty-five and 30/100 dollars (\$4,445.30) judgment with interest thereon at the rate of seven (7) per cent. per annum from September 17th, 1894.

To satisfy the American National Bank of Omaha, Nebraska, defendant herein, the sum of four thousand four hundred forty-five and 30/100 dollars (\$4,445.30) judgment with interest thereon at the rate of seven (7) per cent. per annum from November 3rd, 1892.

To satisfy Paxton & Vierling Iron Works, defendant herein, the sum of thirty-three and 10/100 dollars (\$33.10) judgment with interest thereon at the rate of seven (7) per cent. per annum from November 3rd, 1892.

To satisfy the American National Bank of Omaha, Nebraska, defendant herein, the sum of four thousand four hundred forty-five and 30/100 dollars (\$4,445.30) judgment with interest thereon at the rate of seven (7) per cent. per annum from November 3rd, 1892.

To satisfy the American National Bank of Omaha, Nebraska, defendant herein, the sum of four thousand four hundred forty-five and 30/100 dollars (\$4,445.30) judgment with interest thereon at the rate of seven (7) per cent. per annum from November 3rd, 1892.

To satisfy the American National Bank of Omaha, Nebraska, defendant herein, the sum of four thousand four hundred forty-five and 30/100 dollars (\$4,445.30) judgment with interest thereon at the rate of seven (7) per cent. per annum from November 3rd, 1892.

To satisfy the American National Bank of Omaha, Nebraska, defendant herein, the sum of four thousand four hundred forty-five and 30/100 dollars (\$4,445.30) judgment with interest thereon at the rate of seven (7) per cent. per annum from November 3rd, 1892.

To satisfy the American National Bank of Omaha, Nebraska, defendant herein, the sum of four thousand four hundred forty-five and 30/100 dollars (\$4,445.30) judgment with interest thereon at the rate of seven (7) per cent. per annum from November 3rd, 1892.

To satisfy the American National Bank of Omaha, Nebraska, defendant herein, the sum of four thousand four hundred forty-five and 30/100 dollars (\$4,445.30) judgment with interest thereon at the rate of seven (7) per cent. per annum from November 3rd, 1892.

To satisfy the American National Bank of Omaha, Nebraska, defendant herein, the sum of four thousand four hundred forty-five and 30/100 dollars (\$4,445.30) judgment with interest thereon at the rate of seven (7) per cent. per annum from November 3rd, 1892.

To satisfy the American National Bank of Omaha, Nebraska, defendant herein, the sum of four thousand four hundred forty-five and 30/100 dollars (\$4,445.30) judgment with interest thereon at the rate of seven (7) per cent. per annum from November 3rd, 1892.

To satisfy the American National Bank of Omaha, Nebraska, defendant herein, the sum of four thousand four hundred forty-five and 30/100 dollars (\$4,445.30) judgment with interest thereon at the rate of seven (7) per cent. per annum from November 3rd, 1892.

To satisfy the American National Bank of Omaha, Nebraska, defendant herein, the sum of four thousand four hundred forty-five and 30/100 dollars (\$4,445.30) judgment with interest thereon at the rate of seven (7) per cent. per annum from November 3rd, 1892.

To satisfy the American National Bank of Omaha, Nebraska, defendant herein, the sum of four thousand four hundred forty-five and 30/100 dollars (\$4,445.30) judgment with interest thereon at the rate of seven (7) per cent. per annum from November 3rd, 1892.

To satisfy the American National Bank of Omaha, Nebraska, defendant herein, the sum of four thousand four hundred forty-five and 30/100 dollars (\$4,445.30) judgment with interest thereon at the rate of seven (7) per cent. per annum from November 3rd, 1892.

To satisfy the American National Bank of Omaha, Nebraska, defendant herein, the sum of four thousand four hundred forty-five and 30/100 dollars (\$4,445.30) judgment with interest thereon at the rate of seven (7) per cent. per annum from November 3rd, 1892.

To satisfy the American National Bank of Omaha, Nebraska, defendant herein, the sum of four thousand four hundred forty-five and 30/100 dollars (\$4,445.30) judgment with interest thereon at the rate of seven (7) per cent. per annum from November 3rd, 1892.

To satisfy the American National Bank of Omaha, Nebraska, defendant herein, the sum of four thousand four hundred forty-five and 30/100 dollars (\$4,445.30) judgment with interest thereon at the rate of seven (7) per cent. per annum from November 3rd, 1892.

To satisfy the American National Bank of Omaha, Nebraska, defendant herein, the sum of four thousand four hundred forty-five and 30/100 dollars (\$4,445.30) judgment with interest thereon at the rate of seven (7) per cent. per annum from November 3rd, 1892.

To satisfy the American National Bank of Omaha, Nebraska, defendant herein, the sum of four thousand four hundred forty-five and 30/100 dollars (\$4,445.30) judgment with interest thereon at the rate of seven (7) per cent. per annum from November 3rd, 1892.

To satisfy the American National Bank of Omaha, Nebraska, defendant herein, the sum of four thousand four hundred forty-five and 30/100 dollars (\$4,445.30) judgment with interest thereon at the rate of seven (7) per cent. per annum from November 3rd, 1892.

To satisfy the American National Bank of Omaha, Nebraska, defendant herein, the sum of four thousand four hundred forty-five and 30/100 dollars (\$4,445.30) judgment with interest thereon at the rate of seven (7) per cent. per annum from November 3rd, 1892.

To satisfy the American National Bank of Omaha, Nebraska, defendant herein, the sum of four thousand four hundred forty-five and 30/100 dollars (\$4,445.30) judgment with interest thereon at the rate of seven (7) per cent. per annum from November 3rd, 1892.

To satisfy the American National Bank of Omaha, Nebraska, defendant herein, the sum of four thousand four hundred forty-five and 30/100 dollars (\$4,445.30) judgment with interest thereon at the rate of seven (7) per cent. per annum from November 3rd, 1892.

To satisfy the American National Bank of Omaha, Nebraska, defendant herein, the sum of four thousand four hundred forty-five and 30/100 dollars (\$4,445.30) judgment with interest thereon at the rate of seven (7) per cent. per annum from November 3rd, 1892.

To satisfy the American National Bank of Omaha, Nebraska, defendant herein, the sum of four thousand four hundred forty-five and 30/100 dollars (\$4,445.30) judgment with interest thereon at the rate of seven (7) per cent. per annum from November 3rd, 1892.

To satisfy the American National Bank of Omaha, Nebraska, defendant herein, the sum of four thousand four hundred forty-five and 30/100 dollars (\$4,445.30) judgment with interest thereon at the rate of seven (7) per cent. per annum from November 3rd, 1892.

To satisfy the American National Bank of Omaha, Nebraska, defendant herein, the sum of four thousand four hundred forty-five and 30/100 dollars (\$4,445.30) judgment with interest thereon at the rate of seven (7) per cent. per annum from November 3rd, 1892.

To satisfy the American National Bank of Omaha, Nebraska, defendant herein, the sum of four thousand four hundred forty-five and 30/100 dollars (\$4,445.30) judgment with interest thereon at the rate of seven (7) per cent. per annum from November 3rd, 1892.

To satisfy the American National Bank of Omaha, Nebraska, defendant herein, the sum of four thousand four hundred forty-five and 30/100 dollars (\$4,445.30) judgment with interest thereon at the rate of seven (7) per cent. per annum from November 3rd, 1892.

To satisfy the American National Bank of Omaha, Nebraska, defendant herein, the sum of four thousand four hundred forty-five and 30/100 dollars (\$4,445.30) judgment with interest thereon at the rate of seven (7) per cent. per annum from November 3rd, 1892.

To satisfy the American National Bank of Omaha, Nebraska, defendant herein, the sum of four thousand four hundred forty-five and 30/100 dollars (\$4,445.30) judgment with interest thereon at the rate of seven (7) per cent. per annum from November 3rd, 1892.

To satisfy the American National Bank of Omaha, Nebraska, defendant herein, the sum of four thousand four hundred forty-five and 30/100 dollars (\$4,445.30) judgment with interest thereon at the rate of seven (7) per cent. per annum from November 3rd, 1892.

To satisfy the American National Bank of Omaha, Nebraska, defendant herein, the sum of four thousand four hundred forty-five and 30/100 dollars (\$4,445.30) judgment with interest thereon at the rate of seven (7) per cent. per annum from November 3rd, 1892.

To satisfy the American National Bank of Omaha, Nebraska, defendant herein, the sum of four thousand four hundred forty-five and 30/100 dollars (\$4,445.30) judgment with interest thereon at the rate of seven (7) per cent. per annum from November 3rd, 1892.

Special Master Commissioner's Sale.

Under and by virtue of an order of sale on decree of foreclosure of mortgage issued out of the district court for Douglas county, Nebraska, and to me directed, I will, on the 20th day of February, A. D. 1895, at one o'clock p. m. of said day, at the east front door of the county court house, in the city of Omaha, Douglas county, Nebraska, sell at public auction to the highest bidder for cash, the property described in said order of sale as follows, to-wit:

Lot ten (10) in block seven (7) in Clifton Hill, an addition to the city of Omaha, Douglas county, Nebraska, as the same is surveyed, platted and recorded.

Said property to be sold to satisfy Alonzo P. Tukey and others, plaintiffs, the sum of five hundred and thirty-three and 10/100 dollars (\$533.10) judgment with interest thereon at the rate of eight (8) per cent. per annum from September 17th, 1894.

To satisfy thirty-three and 10/100 dollars (\$33.10) costs hereon, together with accruing costs according to a judgment rendered by the district court of said Douglas county, at its September term, A. D. 1894, in a certain action then and there pending, wherein Alonzo P. Tukey and others were plaintiffs, and John Bishop, Jr., and another were defendants.

Dated at Omaha, Nebraska, January 24th, A. D. 1895.

WILLIAM T. NELSON, Special Master Commissioner.

J. W. Houlder, Attorney for plaintiffs, 123-5 Tukey et al. vs. Bishop et al. Doc. 41, No. 389.

Under and by virtue of an order of sale on decree of foreclosure of mortgage issued out of the district court for Douglas county, Nebraska, and to me directed, I will, on the 13th day of February, A. D. 1895, at one o'clock p. m. of said day, at the east front door of the county court house, in the city of Omaha, Douglas county, Nebraska, sell at public auction to the highest bidder for cash, the property described in said order of sale as follows, to-wit:

Lot number one (1) and the north sixteen (16) feet of lot number two (2) in block number five (5) in Deere Park, an addition to the city of Omaha, in Douglas county, Nebraska, as surveyed, platted and recorded.

Said property to be sold to satisfy the Mutual Investment Company, plaintiff, the sum of eighty-seven and 10/100 dollars (\$87.10) judgment, with interest thereon at the rate of ten (10) per cent. per annum from September 18, 1893, and twenty-two and 10/100 dollars (\$22.10) costs, with interest from September 18, 1893, together with accruing costs according to a judgment rendered by the district court of said Douglas county, at its September term, A. D. 1894, in a certain action then and there pending, wherein the Mutual Investment Company is plaintiff, and Marion Hild and others are defendants.

Dated at Omaha, Nebraska, January 11th, A. D. 1895.

SEYMOUR M. SADLER, Special Master Commissioner.

W. H. Mutual Inv. Co. vs. Drage, et al. Doc. 40, No. 109.

Notice to Non-Resident Defendants.

To Carl Schultz and Mrs. Schultz, first name unknown, his wife, defendants.

You are hereby notified that on the 31st day of May, A. D. 1895, the Walnut Hill Savings and Investment Company, plaintiff, filed in the district court within and for Douglas county, Nebraska, in an action wherein the said Walnut Hill Savings and Investment Company was plaintiff, and Herman Schwabe and Carl Schultz and Mrs. Schultz, first name unknown, his wife, were defendants, the object and intent of which was to foreclose a certain land contract executed by the defendant, Herman Schwabe, and afterwards assigned to Carl Schultz wherein they agreed to purchase lot fifteen (15), block five (5), Walnut Hill addition to Omaha, Douglas county, Nebraska, that there is due on said contract to the plaintiff the sum of nine hundred and ninety-three and 10/100 dollars (\$993.10) with interest from May 7, 1894, at the rate of ten (10) per cent. per annum.

It is hereby notified that if you do not appear and answer to the said complaint and defend the same, the plaintiff may be sold to satisfy the amount due and that the defendant may be held liable for the amount due thereon that it have a judgment rendered by the district court of said Douglas county, at its September term, A. D. 1894, in a certain action then and there pending, wherein the Mutual Investment Company is plaintiff, and Marion Hild and others are defendants.

You are further notified that you will be required to answer to the complaint of the plaintiff on or before the 25th day of February, A. D. 1895.

Dated at Omaha, Nebraska, the 13th day of January, A. D. 1895.

THE WALNUT HILL SAVINGS AND INVESTMENT COMPANY, plaintiff.

Saunders, Macfarland & Dickey, attorneys for plaintiff. 1-18-4

FREE HEAT! The Lamp that Lights your Room with HEAT if you use a FALLS HEATER.

Take the place of stoves in medium-sized rooms. No successful use in New England. Lightest and most economical. BOSTON ENTERPRISE MFG. CO., 27 Milk St.,