

TERMS AND NOTICES.

The RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCER is published weekly, at the Office of Messrs. BARNES & Co., 55 Prince William Street, St. John, N. B.

TERMS.—\$2.00 a year, in advance. All Communications for insertion should be addressed, Rev. JOSEPH McLEOD, Box 51, Fredericton, N. B. All exchanges should be addressed RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCER, Fredericton, N. B. Subscriptions must be paid to Messrs. BARNES & Co., St. John, or to the Editor, at Fredericton.

Religious Intelligencer.

REV. JOSEPH McLEOD, EDITOR.

FRIDAY, AUGUST 6, 1875.

SUFFER THEM NOT TO SUFFER.

A word in behalf of benevolent enterprises. Are they to be allowed to suffer on account of the hard times? There is danger. In a communication in another column, addressed particularly to the Nova Scotia brethren, the fear is expressed that many people may, on account of the financial depression, withhold from the Foreign Mission Treasury the contributions usually made. We hope our brethren's appeal may have the effect of preventing what we fear.

When people have many purposes to which to apply money, and the supply is limited, there must, of course, be retrenchment. It is a mistake, however, into which many fall, that the retrenchment must begin by a lessening, or withholding altogether, of that which they have been wont to contribute to religious purposes. Something has each year been paid to Mission work—Home and Foreign—Ministerial Education, for the Mission, the religious paper, support of the ministry, etc. Support has been given to these because they are believed to be good and for the honor of God. Should interests admittedly of unsurpassed importance be crippled unnecessarily? They are weakened when those who have all along aided in their support persuade themselves that, because money is not quite so plenty as in some former years, they must cut down their contributions, or decline paying at all "till the times get better."

Such a course is wrong; it is not economy. It is harmful to the people pursuing it, and it is not a little dishonoring to God. There are very few who have felt the pressure of the times to the extent of depriving themselves of many, if any, of the comforts of life. They have enough to eat, drink, and wear; and the majority have something to spare. A Chicago merchant had for many years been in the habit of paying \$300 a year to the Foreign Mission Society. By the great fire he lost heavily. His pastor, in collecting money for the Mission, did not call on him. The merchant, after waiting long beyond the usual time for his pastor to call, sent him, and asked him why he had not come, as in former years, for his contribution. The minister replied that, knowing the very great losses he had sustained by the fire, he feared to burden him by asking for anything that year. The merchant, handing him a cheque for double the usual amount, said:—"True, I have lost much, and an amount comparatively a poor man, but my indebtedness to God is the same, my interest in His cause is as great as ever, and while I find it necessary to reduce my expenses, economizing in every possible direction, I dare not, nor have I any disposition, to rob God of what is His due." That man had the right spirit. We have no doubt he prospered, and is probably now as good, perhaps better, circumstances than before the fire.

There is that scattereth and yet increaseth; and there is that withholdeth more than is meet, but it tendeth to poverty. The liberal sower shall be made fat; and that which he sows shall himself also be watered. Where then should we economize? An exchange makes this point:—"We suppose very few men are in the habit of giving to benevolent enterprises more than one-tenth of their annual incomes. Indeed, if all gave as much as that, we believe our contributions would be twice as large as they now are. But suppose a man who gives one-tenth in charity, and devotes nine-tenths to the support of his family. It is necessary to economize, where should he begin? Governor Tilden, of New York, in speaking of the canal recently pointed out the fact that about nineteen-twentieths of the time of boats is spent in the locks, and that any great shortening of the time of transit must be made on the nineteen-twentieths rather than on the one. So in the case we have supposed, it seems clear that the place to reduce expenses is on the nine-tenths and not on the one-tenth. How much do you think you would save? How much do you think you would lose? A question which would put every one of us into bankruptcy, were it pressed. The Master's money, which we handle but may not hoard, must be accounted for by and by the last penny. We wish to lay it close upon the hearts and consciences of brethren, whether they permit religious enterprises to suffer; whether they permit good men and true men, who are laboring unselfishly for small pay, to be pushed to the wall; whether they will permit any work of God to be crippled. Paul tells us how the grace of the God who wrought upon the churches of Macedonia: "that, in a great trial of affliction, the abundance of their joy and their deep poverty abounded unto the riches of their liberality." God grant that such grace may be upon all our churches, and let us highly resolve that our contributions to benevolent objects shall not be diminished.

EDITORIAL NOTES AND COMMENTS. VACATION FOR MINISTERS.—Dr. Talbot knows them. The people who think ministers never need rest, we mean. He knows the argument (? some of them use too. He says—"It is not your rest, which is so new to the active Christian. They expiate on the rest "that remaineth" with a furor that almost depicts the picture of its loveliness. Especially do they deprecate the practice of granting ministerial vacations. "Why do ministers need to go off and rest more than other men? It is a disease of Central New York." We hire our ministers "as much as I do my servant girl, and if he loses "a time it ought to be deducted from his wages." Liberal soul! Did he expect in this way his Church would be made fat? Admitting that "the harvest is great and the laborers few," he urges this as a strong reason why we must beware of thinning the ranks by fatal over exertion. Haste makes waste, sometimes, in Christian labor. When trembling men and dizzy brains give warning, we must heed. Where is there a class of men that, as a rule, are harder worked than ministers? It is very true there are some lazy clergymen, just as there are lazy doctors, lawyers, and clerks; it is true there are some who are expert at shirking reduced to *finis*; but these are exceptional cases. Your average clergyman is an industrious and patient toiler, whose labors are increased in proportion as he is conscientious. His vacation is one of the most taxing to which any man is called, and if any one is worthy of having a few weeks rest it is he. Votum him a generous vacation. And with the vacation vote him money enough to enable him to enjoy it to the full.

DEATH OF AN EX-PRESIDENT.—Andrew Johnson, ex-President of the United States, died on Saturday morning last. At the time of his death he was sixty-seven years old. He was no ordinary man. His life is a striking proof of what may be accomplished, what great successes won, in spite of what would appear almost insurmountable obstacles. When but four years old his father died, leaving his family in the humblest circumstances. From the age of ten to seventeen he spent in learning the tailor's trade. He had never

been to school, but desiring knowledge he managed during his apprenticeship to learn the alphabet, and by the time his term of service had expired was able to read tolerably. His mother was dependent on him, but soon after he became a journeyman tailor he added to his responsibilities by supporting his mother and a sister. If you could have done for him, he seems to have got a good wife. She encouraged his desire for knowledge, and greatly assisted him in the prosecution of his studies, so that in a few years he became a man of no mean acquirements. He entered political life early, his first office being that of Alderman in the village where he lived, to which he was elected when about twenty-one years old. Two years later he was Mayor. Three years after that he was elected to the Legislature of Tennessee, and to the State Senate, then to Congress, and in 1855 Governor of the State, to which office he was twice elected. Following this he was elected United States Senator. At the second election of President Lincoln, Mr. Johnson was elected Vice President, from which he succeeded to the Presidency on Mr. Lincoln's assassination, a month after his inauguration. His term of office was a stormy one, the force of the opposition to him culminating in his impeachment in 1868. He was acquitted, however, much to the discomfiture of his many political enemies. It was his policy towards the South, which was to treat the conquered with leniency, that brought the tornado of hate upon him. That very policy proved to be the right one, and he lived long enough to see it adopted by the very party who sought to destroy him because of it. While the deceased ex-President had his share of faults, he possessed many admirable qualities, and was, taken altogether, an extraordinary man, one whom the United States may well be proud to record in its history.

THE MOUNTAIN MEADOWS MASSACRE.—Eighteen years ago (in 1857) occurred the horrible massacre known as the "Mountain Meadows Massacre." A party of emigrants, about seventy in number, men, women and children, were on their way across the Plains to California. When they were some distance beyond Salt Lake City they were surrounded by a large party of disguised white men and a few Indians, and utterly destroyed. Women and children begged in vain to be spared; the blood-thirsty villains would spare none. It was surmised at once that the murderers were Mormons, but it was not possible to fasten the crime upon them. But "murder will out," and judgment though long delayed is sure to come. John D. Lee, a Mormon leader, is now on trial for participation in the horrible crime. One Smith, a Mormon bishop (one of those indicted for massacre) has turned "State's evidence," and, in his testimony on Saturday last, frankly told the whole story, giving names, places, and dates. The massacre was planned at a Mormon Church Council, and the principals participated in the deed. As described by him, a more revolting crime was never perpetrated. During the testimony there was great excitement in Court. The jury is composed of eight Mormons and four Gentiles. It remains to be seen whether the former will dare to find a verdict against the officials of their Church. The trial will, however, probably bring out the truth as to the authors of one of the greatest crimes of the age, and will doubtless go far towards bringing to an end the little kingdom presided over by Brigham Young.

MORE SABBATH DESERICATION.—The *Protestant* writes calls attention to and earnestly protests against another form of desecration that has been introduced into Halifax. It seems that a steamer has been organized Sunday Excursions by steamer from the city to Bedford. This daring desecration of the Lord's Day is boldly advertised in the papers, and it meets, we are sorry to say, with not one word of rebuke in the editorial columns of the secular journals. Our contemporary very properly calls this an outrage upon our Sabbath laws and upon the feelings of the community; and calls upon the authorities to put a stop to it.

THE RIGHT SPIRIT.—It is related that when the late Dr. Scudder, of India, was arousing the children of America to care for the heathen, he received a note from a little boy who had heard him, saying: "My dear Dr. Scudder, I send you ten cents. Now that you are so busy, I think I will give you a large heart. Ten cents was a great deal to him; if he had possessed more it would have been readily given to the good cause. We wish the Church was full of grown up boys of his stamp.

A GREAT WORK.—Rev. Dr. Boardman and his wife have just returned from Europe, where they have been engaged with other evangelists in preaching and conducting religious services. They bring most cheering reports of the progress of the work of the Lord. They say that in Great Britain, France, Germany, Switzerland, and other countries of Europe, and in all the world, there is such a work in progress as never before since the days of the apostles. Many thousands of Christians are coming into such fulness of vital union with Christ as they have never known before.

WAY.—It is now the time to hear Priests and other blasphemous Roman Catholic Church affirm that their church is "a friend of education, only seeking to have such education accomplished under proper religious supervision." In this country we have for many months been deluged with statements of this character. Why is it that the facts concerning the condition of the people in the countries where the priests have for ages had absolute rule prove the statement false? How does the assertion "harmonize with the fact that in Italy, under the immediate practical domination of the papacy for so long a period up to the unification of the kingdom under Victor Emanuel, over sixty-four per cent. of the population could neither read nor write! In the city of Rome and the country adjacent the percentage of ignorance was the greatest."

STATISTICS.—Now that Messrs. Moody and Sankey have concluded their labour in London, a statement is made of the meetings held and the attendance during their four months' stay in London. The figures are as follows: In Cambridge, 60 meetings, attended by 480,000 people; in Victoria, 45 meetings, attended by 40,000; in the Opera House, 60 meetings, attended by 300,000; in Bow, 60 meetings, attended by 600,000; in Agricultural Hall, 60 meetings, attended by 720,000. The amount of money expended for buildings, printing, stewards, etc., is \$140,000. Messrs. Moody and Sankey have declined to accept any pecuniary compensation for their labors. The evangelists have taken passage for New York in the steamer *Spinin*, which sails on the fourth August. A prominent business man in London has bought the Victoria Theatre, and intends to fit it up for religious work. How many thousands have professed conversion can scarcely be computed. Not till the great day of reckoning will it be known how great good has been done by the blessing of God on the labours of these evangelists.

FATHER CHINIQUEY lectured in Woodstock and Fredericton last week. At the former place, a storm threw him into the water, falling on the platform while the Rev. gentleman was speaking.

FOREIGN MISSIONS. TO THE THREE BAPTIST CHURCHES IN NOVA SCOTIA. Brethren in Christ.—The dear approach of our Annual Conference and meeting of our Foreign Mission Society reminds me of my duty to again bring Incia's claims to your notice. I am aware that in these times of financial depression many are ready to excuse themselves from entering into enterprises of the most religious "money beggars" who so frequently appeal to their sympathies for aid, and that in consequence some, though the object is commendable, shrink from the work of asking for help to carry out the Lord's work in the world.

But we must not expect that the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof; and that the use of what He lends His children for a little while He asks them to return Him in proportion "as a faithful prospector" them, and only in that proportion. I have no hesitation in asking you through this channel of communication to make up, of the Lord's money, the amount which should go to the Foreign Mission cause, and forward it or bring it to the Annual Conference in September, that the Lord's work may not be hindered by any neglect in that respect.

Will the brethren in the ministry please see that in the churches in which they labour, collectors are appointed to call upon all of the members for subscriptions, that no one can have any excuse on the ground of their having been neglected in that way, and that the largest amount possible may be gathered? Some churches are, I suppose, so unfortunate as not to have a minister to attend to this work. In such cases, will the deacon or some other sainted officer in the work and urge the matter to success?

In a former article I stated that in consequence of our missionary's return home the expenses connected with her support would be increased, and also that, in my opinion, we ought to make up her whole salary hereafter. All this can be done, and much more, if all contribute "as the Lord hath prospered them."

This thought prompts me to call your attention to the collection of statistics in the printed minutes headed "Foreign Missions." I never look at it but I feel ashamed that such work was done by a committee with my name on it, and without wondering why the work was not subsequently revised.

All must see at once that the error was not in asking too much from any church, but in asking so many of them to contribute so small an amount when their membership would justify the asking of twice, and in some cases, three times the amount. I wonder that some of the churches are not moved by a holy indignation by the insult.

By a reference to the Society books you will notice that while some individuals seem to make it a point to pay the sums of two dollars and one dollar a year, many others, who we believe, contribute only about twenty-five cents. We do not "despise the day of small things." We are aware that the small contributions help to make up the sum total that is required, and God will bless the giver of the small sum, when it is given out of a pure heart, as beautifully as the one who gives the large amount of his abundance; but we aim to remind the many who enjoy much at the hands of God, of their individual obligations in this matter, and hope that the future will show that this part of the Foreign Mission work is more justly divided among the churches and their individual members, than God in His mercy, has allowed.

THE MISSIONARY WORLD. To the Watchman and Reflector we are indebted for the following very interesting news of the progress of the work in May last. The report of the Ninth Annual Report of the Baptist Missionary Convention, just published, gives the attendance during their four months' stay in London. The figures are as follows: In Cambridge, 60 meetings, attended by 480,000 people; in Victoria, 45 meetings, attended by 40,000; in the Opera House, 60 meetings, attended by 300,000; in Bow, 60 meetings, attended by 600,000; in Agricultural Hall, 60 meetings, attended by 720,000. The amount of money expended for buildings, printing, stewards, etc., is \$140,000. Messrs. Moody and Sankey have declined to accept any pecuniary compensation for their labors. The evangelists have taken passage for New York in the steamer *Spinin*, which sails on the fourth August. A prominent business man in London has bought the Victoria Theatre, and intends to fit it up for religious work. How many thousands have professed conversion can scarcely be computed. Not till the great day of reckoning will it be known how great good has been done by the blessing of God on the labours of these evangelists.

FATHER CHINIQUEY lectured in Woodstock and Fredericton last week. At the former place, a storm threw him into the water, falling on the platform while the Rev. gentleman was speaking.

THE SABBATH EVENING, Temperance meetings in the Academy of Music, continue to be well attended and interesting. Rev. E. Weyman, of Apsalqui, was the chief speaker last Sabbath evening.

GOOD SUGGESTION. These acts called forth spirited remonstrance from the American and English ambassadors, and for more than a year the Turkish authorities have been promissory in refusing to permit the withdrawal. Before Mr. Broker was transferred from Constantinople to Russia the assurance had been given to him and to Sir Henry Elliot the full permission to print the Bible in Turkish would be accorded; but the permit never came, and the Government of the American and British Bible Societies were subjected to provoking delays and postponements from day to day, and it was the subordinate officials of the Government had been instructed to put all possible obstacles in their way.

Still the promised permits were expected until about a month since, when a new set of regulations respecting the press was promulgated, by which the Government assumes the strictest censorship over the press, and forbids the printing of any book or pamphlet until it has been submitted for examination to the Bureau of Public Instruction, and received official approval. Then the printed copies must be examined again by the same Bureau to see that they correspond exactly with the original manuscript, and no copy can be issued until the publication is authorized and attested by the official seal.

These regulations apply to the Scriptures only, but to every book or pamphlet on every subject. Nothing can be lawfully printed until it is expressly sanctioned by the Bureau, and whatever is printed without its sanction is liable to be suppressed. The same rule applies to the provinces as well, and to the importation of books, the custom-house officials being empowered to seize such as are deemed undesirable to have circulated.

These regulations apparently proceed from the antipathy of the Mohammedan Government to Christianity, and from dissatisfaction with the enormous sales of Christian books and Scriptures both in the shops and by means of peddlers. Rules of all kinds are put in the way of the circulation of such articles, and opening the way for such annoying interference with the work of classes of authors and publishers, will very likely bring out remonstrances which the Turkish Government will not be able to resist.

But, so far as the publication of the Bible is concerned, the Government has made too many concessions and pledges in the past to be allowed to retract. It is the duty of the American and British Bible Societies to press their claims, and to demand that the Government should be held to its promises.

THE "MOURNING" CUSTOMS. As occasion has offered we have referred to the absurdity of many of the mourning customs of the present. That they are wrong, having been carried to an extent which makes them really burdensome to a great majority is to our mind very plain. We are glad to learn from the *Queen*, a London paper, that an earnest endeavor is being made to do away with the custom of mourning customs, which are so entirely unchristian, and which when the multiplied occupations of the living forbid the dedication of rags to the dead. The *Queen* says: "Apart from the absurdity of clothing an entire family—including the servants and horses—in mourning, the custom is a costly and unnecessary one, and one which does little, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life. Take a case not uncommon. A man has a wife and two children, and a large household, and the domestic not at all, is the ruinous expense, and beyond the expense is the discomfort. It is the duty of the State to prohibit such a custom, which is condemned to mourning for the greater part of his life.